

Building and Expanding Trust

Part Two

Practices of Trust

Preserving and Restoring Trust

The Business Apology is a Transaction

In part one of this study we introduced trust as a fundamental background of all human interaction. Our survival, success, and ultimate happiness depend on our ability to trust and to be trusted by others. If we intend to have our invitations, offers, and requests met quickly, enthusiastically, and purposefully, we must take into consideration that trust is a social practice. Building and expanding trust in the marketplace requires a greater understanding of the broader phenomenon of human interaction and coexistence across many domains and conditions of our life.

Throughout this series, we focus and concentrate our study on *building and expanding trust* as we transact in the marketplace. We reference noted psychologists, sociologists, and highly accomplished business people in this series and continue our in-depth study of the text *Building Trust in Business, Politics, Relationships, and Life* by Robert C. Solomon and Fernando Flores.

In our first issue we introduced the most basic understanding people have of trust and introduced *simple, blind* and *authentic trust*. We distinguish certain breaches of trust that exist, we considered the importance of preserving and restoring trust through the use of apology and summarized the most basic elements required to make an effective apology.

In this issue, we will deal with understanding, developing, and building trust as a recurrent and dynamic set of habits and practices in the process of transacting in the marketplace. We will take an in-depth look at the impact marketplace indifference, moods, attitudes, and states of mind, and the use of weapons of influence play in our ability to trust and be trusted.

We will complete the series with a study of trust and the *Conditions of Life*, and we will consider the biological, linguistic, and transactional mechanics required to expand our capacities of trust in the marketplace.

Trust in Practice - Review

Trust is a practice. “Trust is something that we do *individually*; it is something we make, we create, we build, we maintain, we sustain, with our promises, our commitments, our emotions and [moods] – our own individual sense of *integrity*.” Establishing, Building and expanding trust, is accomplished over time.

To understand trust is to be able to build trust into our everyday practices and relationships, and to develop [transactions], institutions, [ecologies] in which such practices and relationships are not only possible but also mandatory. We are simply talking about ordinary trust, at home and at the office, where conversations are the only tool we need.ⁱⁱ But they must be the kind of conversations that *produce appropriate moods and attitudes* and not those that produce negative or bad moodsⁱⁱⁱ. The question of trust then in our study is to ensure that we understand it in a meaningful way in the pursuit of a practice, a day-to-day routine, a way of being [individually]^{iv} or, for organizations, the development of [ecologies] of trust.

Trust is an option, a choice at all times. It is an active part of our daily lives, not something that has to be there from the beginning, or that can be taken for granted.^v Trust is a dynamic of human interaction that is built over time and requires skill to build effectively, which includes restoring trust when it has been lost or is betrayed.

Trust is not always a good thing. Trust can be foolish, naïve, gullible, and blind.^{vi} We decide and choose to trust and act to the degree of our ability to see the opportunities and consequences related to it, now and in the future. We make decisions to trust. We make promises and tacit commitments. We see them through or we suffer the consequences.

Most people live in a world of ungrounded expectations and don't embody practices related to the dangers inherent in them. When we come to have expectations of others, and we respond to the fulfillment or frustration of those expectations we put *trust* at risk or into *consideration*^{vii}.

Trust isn't something we have or a medium or an atmosphere within which we operate. Trust is something we do, something we make. Our mutual choices of trust determine nothing less than the kinds of beings we are and the kinds of lives we will live together.^{viii}

Three Kinds of Trust - Review

We introduced three forms of trust in Part One of this series: *simple trust*, *blind trust*, and *authentic trust*.

Simple trust is essentially a form of trust that is unreflective, unthinking and is the kind of trust most people hold as their standard. It is most often best characterized as an innocent state of mind in a moment or an act of trust. It is the most basic and common way in which we interact on a day-to-day basis with people and things. It is the kind of trust that consists primarily of the most basic elements of what we generally understand *is* trust – a common and unthinking, default orientation, devoid of any sense of the possibility of distrust. The kind you might say exists in small children or families, the kind we generally have for our security, or even the kind we may have when we step into an elevator or onto an airplane. It is a state of mind we identify

as naiveté and specifically our naiveté toward the kinds of thinking and consideration we may have about the consequences in which having *trust* in any person or thing evokes. *Simple trust* is the indifference to the facets and consequences of trusting another – the absence of distrust or betrayal as a possibility.

On the one hand, we could say we cannot coexist without a basic or *simple trust* in others and their concern for their own *Conditions of Life*. However, *all too often simple trust turns out to be nothing but false comfort in a situation that, if tested, proves not to be deserving of trust at all.*^{ix}

Blind trust is much different than simple trust. Where simple trust is easily considered a kind of innocent way of behaving and interacting on a day-to-day basis, blind trust is not. Blind trust is not an innocent form of trust, but rather an orientation that includes some recognition or exposure to violation and betrayal. One who trusts another blindly, does so with some knowledge of the consequences of their actions and yet, acts (trusts) despite this evidence. It is a kind of orientation commonly referred to as denial, and is often related to generally as foolish (though it need not be). Blind trust is best characterized as essentially “self-deceptive” behavior. The refusal of consideration of evidence, taking the time for proper reflection and *accurate thinking*, or the willful act of not examining options or *specific knowledge of consequences* is blind trust. It [can and often does] work well, simplifying our lives when simple trust is no longer an option and helping us stick with a valuable program that more acute reflection and thought would cause us to question [or quit].^x

Authentic trust is a form of trust based on *accurate thinking*. It is reflective and open to evidence. It includes and accepts as a necessary element that trust exists because of the possibilities and eventualities of mistakes, violations, and betrayal. In other words, without the possibility of betrayal, trust as we know it, would not be necessary. There is no willful denial of the acts required to consider and even prepare for the consequences of betrayal. Authentic trust is not the denial of simple trust, but the recognition of it. It is a kind of trust that accepts a level of recognition of our own indifference and yet is not surprised or threatened when violations occur in the day-to-day activities of living life – and even more specifically – transacting in the marketplace.

Authentic trust differs from simple trust because it demands reason for trusting. Unlike blind trust, it insists on an open mind in considering the evidence that leads to trust. But trust is always more than purely evidentiary; thus, we are careful about any approach that limits an understanding of *trust* to a strict, rational, or purely objective criterion. Trust is not based on evidence only. To treat *trust* as a black or white thing promises to make trust too rational and ignores a broader concept of trust. Trust outstrips the evidence that would rationally justify it in many cases. This does not mean that trust is irrational. Rationality is not only found in the accumulation of evidence; it is also identified in terms of *what one really cares about*. Trusting is also rational because it is a way of creating, maintaining, deepening, and restoring relationships. It is not the weight of the evidence that makes trust rational or irrational. It is the desirability of the end, the relationship – and in this case at least, the end justified the means.^{xi}

Building and Expanding Trust

Building trust begins with talking about trust. As is the case in any transaction, we first interact with others primarily through subjective narratives about possibility for action in the future. We may approach others and begin transactions with a background of knowledge, experience and

evidence gained practically, throughout observations of objective action, however we are entering a possible transaction (conversation, interaction, etc.) subjectively, and we do so in language – we talk.

We are creatures who talk, and therefore we are thinking, reflective creatures. We don't just avow our trust, we examine it, and we can thereby create and build it.^{xii}

Simply by making noises with our mouths, we can reliably cause precise new combinations of ideas to arise in each other's minds.^{xiii} These ideas are most often about actions in the future.

Unfortunately, discussions 'about' trust as an unmitigated good tend to be banal and devoid of content. Really talking about trust [can be] discomforting. In business, executives heartily express their approval but rarely go beyond a simple discussion of the virtues and merits of the subject. And therefore, it remains a subjective conversation full of possibility without any objective action to follow. Americans tend to *simulate talk* about trust, using the word but really engaging in cordial hypocrisy. If one does not trust, then nothing much is accomplished by saying so, except perhaps the escalation of an already existing conflict, or the offering of an insult or a confirming test ("if you tell me that I should trust you, then you are doubly a liar".) A politician or a leader who says, "Trust me" takes a considerable risk. Supporters may well wonder why this needs to be said, and become suspicious. For those who are already suspicious, such an imperative only confirms their suspicions.^{xiv} To say, "trust me" indicates some sensitivity to the subject, enough in fact that it must be addressed by the speaker. But our experience is that the speaker underestimates the impact of the use of such a statement. The same is true for words like, "honestly" "to tell you the truth" or "I'll be frank." These kinds of expressions have worked their way into such a common speaking and culture, that little attention is paid to them in general. They go unrecognized in common dialog. But be sure, that members of higher ecologies pay careful attention to and look to trust the dialog of others if they are to introduce them to their valuable ecologies. Trusting begins with talking about trust but not talk about one's self being trusting or trustworthy.

Talk about trust, much like talk about [honesty or] love, is tantalizingly paradoxical. The French aphorist Francois La Rochefoucauld insightfully suggested that *few people would ever have fallen in love had they never heard the word*. Love is, in part, a linguistic phenomenon, is a language-created [construct]. There are all sorts of emotional attachments among all sorts of creatures, including infant human beings who do not use language. But talking about love, weaving stories about love, confessing to love, are actions that do not merely comment on our feelings but to a significant extent, create and shape them. So too is talking about honesty or trust. To say "I trust you" is not merely a description but a creative act, intended to manipulate or reassure another person. In addition, when someone says, "I trust you," the statement can impose an unwanted psychological burden whose consequences may well be guilt and resentment. "I don't trust you" is never simply a description of a psychological state. Either it is an important step in moving an untrusting relationship toward the sorts of commitments and attention that would make it a trusting one or it is a way of breaking off the relationship. "Don't trust me" is an act of sublime mischief, a way of waving off responsibility; but it is also deeply paradoxical. ("Why would I trust your instruction not to trust you?") But it's being implied also tends to make it sound superfluous or suspicious when someone actually makes a point of saying it.^{xv} The only move one may consider in this kind of 'talk of trust' is in an expression of one's acceptance of (as in responsibility for) another's distrust of them. To say "I accept your distrust of me" in order to authentically engage a conversation about trust in the relationship may open some possibility for action but only if the action (statement) is left at the acceptance

granted and not accompanied by any furthering statements of consequence which impose guilt or other psychological burden.

In talking about trust we simply mean, conversations that produce moods, attitudes and states of mind that allow for relationships where *authentic trust* is present. We all know the importance of trust in our lives – in fact we can almost say it is a constitutive element required to live a good life. We all recognize that a life without trust, without trusting relationships across the domains of our existence and Conditions of Life, we suffer. But “knowing” this is simply not enough. To trust is to take on the personal responsibility of making a commitment and choosing a course of action, and with it, one kind of relationship or another. Trust entails a lack of control but it means entering into a relationship in which control is no longer the issue. There is no need to broach the subject of trust with people or things that we can utterly control. Trust may seem to be a leap from the dark plane of our ordinary cynicism into the unsupported free fall of dependency. But we torture ourselves with false ideas of dependency when what trust makes possible is an eminently more effective interdependency: cooperation and the expansion of possibilities. It is always, to some extent, what Kierkegaard famously called “a leap of faith.” And yet nothing is more necessary than the leap into trust. The leap can be initiated by learning to talk about trust, and by making promises and commitments that command trust, put it into practice, and make it fully explicit. As Kierkegaard also noted, what we create through our vulnerability is the solid security of a relationship.^{xvi}

Authentic trust is a judicious combination of trust and distrust, superior to blind trust, which is foolish precisely because it bars distrust from consideration. But to talk about trust is to recognize, first and foremost, that we are (like it or not) in this together, whether “this” is a marriage, a business relationship, a corporation, a community, a continent or a world. A trusting relationship, no matter how tentative is always better than [conflict].^{xvii}

Talking ‘about’ Trust

Building trust requires talking and thinking about trust. If we get stuck on the idea that all trust “should [or ought] to be” like basic trust (primal, unthinking, devoid of doubt [or accurate thinking] we will not get to a state of authentic trust.^{xviii} We cannot allow ourselves to be seduced by the Current narratives of basic, simple and blind trust. We must think about trust and the inevitability of the breaches of trust, to attain an *adult state of mind* regarding trust; talking about it, whether within intimate relationships, corporations or between strangers in a global transaction is not enough. Building trust begins with an appreciation and understanding of trust, but also requires practice and practices.^{xix} Trust, as a subjective narrative, opens possibility for coexistence and interaction, which is required to build trust. In other words, we must approach building trust subjectively. But the subjective narratives of trust in any relationship must be accompanied and followed by the objective reality of action – that is – our practices. Without practices, the appreciation and understanding of the subjective constructs invented, offered and accepted by ourselves or others come to nothing. Over time, without action, begin to produce distrust.

Trust as a Transaction

Relationships built on authentic trust have and require structures, regular practices; a kind of give-and-take (like a dance) of respectful requirements, demands, and commitments. They have a transactional structure of invitations, offers, requests, conditions of satisfaction and

assessments. They require awareness that the relationship is 'invented' for and to produce authentic trust. They occur over time in a cycle that when fulfilled can complete powerfully; free of the negative aspects that often occur when relationships end.

If we are always transacting, and do so with our language and through our biology, then the mechanics and practices of building transactions can be applied to building trust.

To consider trust as a transaction takes into account the responsibility of its invention, presentation, fulfillment and completion in relationship, interaction and coexistence with others. This relationship to building trust takes into account the need for the purposeful creation of subjective narratives of authentic trust that when presented can be agreed upon naturally and objectively. When accepted, these narrative lead authentically into the objective actions required to satisfy the declarations, commitments and promises of trust spoken subjectively. Over time, as relationships mature, the subjective narratives of trust tend to slip into the 'background conversation' but never disappear. Conversations about trust may not occur in everyday interaction, but the talked about narratives and the agreed upon actions related to trust in the relationship exists nonetheless – and come into full view when agitated into our consciousness 'by the need to make a decision'.

Authentic trust remains in the background only until it is stirred into consciousness, typically by the need to make a decision. It may seem invisible, but only in the sense that we are not paying attention to it and are so skillfully engaged in it that we need not attend to or articulate what we are doing.^{xx} But when agitated, by even the slightest invitation or request, the narratives established and evidenced in reality rise to the forefront of our thinking – often in forms and kinds of conversations that don't call attention to trust itself, but certainly conversations that rely on it. Once complete, any recurrent transaction where invitations, offers and request are met newly, allows for the further demonstration and expansion of authentic trust in the relationship.

What was once a matter of keen attention and great concern now slips into the background, where it continues in much the same way as before, but without the attention and explicit concern. We might follow Heidegger and say that human attention tends to be unreflective until it is shocked into reflection by some sort of breakdown. Trust simply appears to be in the background rather than an objective activity requiring our attention, once we have resolved to trust, can focus elsewhere. "Understanding is not in our minds but in the skillful ways in which we are accustomed to comport ourselves." ^{xxi}

As in every transaction, the invitations, offers and requests of actions, required to be made and accepted often confront or agitate others, which bring to question - trust. Any request for example, requires some form of action, some form of decision, and is costly in terms of time, energy and recourses. When requests are made to coordinate action, (as is the recurrent practice in the moves of Fulfillment in a typical transaction) trust is often in question. Absent an open dialog of authentic trust, questions and concerns of trust arise faster and carry agitation and concern. Breakdowns occur and unless we are able (an ideally agreed) to behave inside an authentic trusting relationship, we tend to rely on default behaviors, habits and practices that may be faulty or ineffectual in the current transaction. Talking about trust, how our actions and speaking create moods and interpretations with people we are interacting and transacting with, as part of the subjective narrative and intent *for* the relationship, offers a kind of freedom and space for authentic human behavior – authentic trust.

To talk about trust as a background is significant in another way, one that has become particularly important to philosophers in recent years. When an agreement (contract) is made explicit, it is well known that there will almost always be contingencies, unknown factors and even loopholes, which the contract is not [well defined]. Lawyers attempt to close loopholes and state those contingencies at their peril, for it quickly becomes evident that there is no end to the possibilities and a contract cannot possibly cover them all. The concept of the background thus embraces that whole world of merely implicit possibilities and inexplicit premises that our articulate and explicit activities tend to ignore or take for granted. And in any relationship or even in a brief transaction, there are possibilities, presuppositions, and “standing conditions” that cannot possibly be brought to our attention. If we give it some thought, without highly specialized knowledge and complete control over all aspects of a transaction, there is no way to accurately predict all of the possible contingencies that “may” arise in a significant transaction. At some point, if there is to be a transaction at all, trust is required. When people relate to contracts and other forms of agreement as rigid and overly objective or absolute ‘law’, the inevitable outcome is breakdown.

Like many elements of human relationships, trust is recognized mainly in the breach. Trust may be what remains unsaid in the story of a successful relationship; it is the medium in which a successful relationship (and human sociability in general) operates. In such happy circumstances, it is appealing to compare a person living in trust to a fish living in water, oblivious to the water’s existence *as water*, as our ancestors probably considered (or not) the air around them. One comes to appreciate the essential importance of water or air mainly when one is deprived of it. Otherwise, it is as if air was nothing – and exists ‘for us’ invisible of our immediate relationship to it in the moment. Like air, trust is another one of those “natural” existences required for a certain kind of human condition. It is one of those things we do with people, but at the same time one of our most cautious, deliberative, and responsible concerns. To dismiss trust or allow trust to exist undistinguished, simply as background or a kind of medium is not yet to understand it at all.

Skills for Building Trust

There is a kind of competence essential to building trust, which we identify as *self-trust*. Trust is a skill; an aspect of virtually all human practices, cultures, and relationships. Skills are cultivated, whether or not they build on some natural or “inborn” foundation or are intentionally learned and practiced. If we watch a one-year-old babbling and gesturing, we can see that language, although it must be learned, is based on skills that are innate. In other words, the skills are there from the beginning. Watching an infant with its parents and then with strangers makes it equally clear that trust is something learned and cultivated. Trust is a skilled learned over time so that, like a well-trained athlete, one makes the right moves, usually without much reflection. Not only trust but also the skills that make trust possible recede into the background. We pick up cues; we know when to make [invitations,] requests or offers; we know when to make or not make promises; we feel confident about situations and people because we know and understand characters with whom we are dealing. Self-trust is confidence in our possession of these skills.

Self-trust, inside an orientation or relationship of authentic trust, includes the possibility if not the likelihood of breach. Authentic trust is trust that can be confidently subjected to judgment, [confrontation], and scrutiny. But with this comes the possibility of being wrong. It is by means of such reflection – displayed, for example, in the more innocent jealousy game that lovers play

with each other – that relationships are deepened by being made increasingly the focus of care and attention. In authentic trust, what changes is not only the confidence one has in the relationship but – just as important – the confidence that one has in oneself in the relationship. What is at stake is not merely the trusting, but the whole relationship in which one's trust plays important part. Trust as a cultivated skill consists of both “automatic” behavior on the one hand and thoughtful reflection on the other. It is particularly important to emphasize that trust, like most skills, is not learned or cultivated on the basis of rules. Trust is a skill to be learned by doing, by interrelating, not by following some recipe. There is no proven sequence of steps through which we can make ourselves more trusting or more trustworthy. The way to build authentic trust is to *trust*.^{xxii} We establish practices of trusting by trusting. Trusting in practice will be different for different people and certainly for different parts of the world in which we live and work. Trusting involves an enhanced sensibility that allows us to work and coordinate our actions with other people precisely because we are confident of what we are doing.

Consider that people already trust you. What they trust about you may be a surprise however.

Self Trust and Self Control *The practice required for building trust*

When we recognize and begin to identify our personality and transactional behaviors, those habits and practices through which we are known in our business transactions, we often find some peace, and also some anxiety. The peace comes from recognizing that the person we know our Self to be, is our authentic Self. When we notice that others already see us in the same way, as a personality for example, we often relieve ourselves of the burden of trying to become and behave in some other, inauthentic way. There is freedom in realizing that we are not fooling very many people. The anxiety or concern we feel when we recognize our personalities are obvious, comes from the fact that we may not have been responsible for it – causing us to attempt to ‘be some other way’ and take actions that is not in line with our personality and transactional behavior. Now that we recognize our transactional behaviors, (our transactional Selves), we are faced with the reality of being accountable and responsible for it. In other words we can no longer ignore fooling ourselves. Skills of trust include being responsible for our behavior. When people are skilled in this area, they practice and are ‘at work’ on developing the ontological, psychological and emotional skills required to learn. They put themselves at risk emotionally.

Trusting others requires skills of Self-trust. Trusting someone requires a kind of confidence in what we know. If you cannot trust yourself, your ability and skill to behave correctly and (appropriately) in a difficult situation, you may well find it difficult to have trust that others can do so. You also must be able to trust yourself to have the good sense to choose accurately those in whom you place your trust.^{xxiii}

Skills are developed and take practice. The reality that some people possess native ability, natural talent and competence is commonplace in our ecologies. This is as true for emotional skills as it is physical skills. If we share the same physicality as the next person and they have native ability in some area and we do not, they have a significant advantage. This is as true on the tennis court and ski slope as it is in personal interactions. Without practice and a commitment for learning, native ability has very little value. Because authentic trust is an emotional skill, we must develop a set of practices involving our ability to recognize and produce moods. To learn to trust ourselves and learn to trust others, it is necessary to be able to trust our

own impulses, moods, attitudes, and emotions. To trust ourselves means we are able to trust our own self-control when confronted by inappropriate emotions, moods and attitudes. This requires practice in the skills of Self-control and Self-discipline. What it means to have Self-control is to understand what the lack of it produces.

A person with a well-developed Self-control does not indulge in hatred of any kind. They do not traffic in the emotions of envy, jealousy, fear, revenge, or any similar destructive emotions [or moods]. They do not go into ecstasies or become ungovernably [excited] or enthusiastic over any [situation], person or cause. They do not allow themselves to fall or stay for long in any state of mind that diminishes the opportunities to achieve their greatest aims in life.^{xxiv}

Self-sacrifice carried to extremes becomes one of the dangerous forms of lack of Self-control. When we observe those who spend their lives sacrificing the good of themselves, their families and loved ones for some cause, movement or “greater societal or mystical good” we may at first admire their virtue, but over time, we are likely to witness the suffering oft experienced by them when the same ‘goodness’ is not returned to them from the indifferent many, in their hour of need. We owe it to ourselves not to permit our emotions to place our happiness in the keeping of another person, community or cause.^{xxv}

Recognition and Self-control over the influence allowed of others, especially the cynic or the pessimist or the overtly enthusiastic, is required for anyone who is to develop the skills needed to build and expand trust. Self-control includes the ability to think for oneself, form and ground our opinions and assessments in the moments of pessimistic or highly excited moods. Self-control includes the ability to stimulate one’s own imagination and enthusiasm until they have produced action, but will then control that action and not permit it to control them.^{xxvi}

Self-control includes the ability to control one’s tongue – and never slander another person or seek revenge for any cause whatsoever. A person with Self-control will not hate or openly disagree with those who do not agree with them but instead will endeavor to understand the reason for their disagreement and seek to profit from the knowledge and experience of it.^{xxvii}

Self-control includes the ability to keep an open mind about all things without the risk of a loss of one’s greater Self, chief aims, morals or ethics.

People who demonstrate a lack of Self-control openly reject general knowledge and social norms, traditions and customs in favor of a mood or attitude of spite and rebellion. They tend to form ungrounded or unsubstantiated opinions and express them freely. They demonstrate a lack of Self-control in the ability to produce appropriate moods and attitudes, and often demonstrate disrespectful indifference to those who do.

Lack of Self-control in one’s spending beyond one’s needs is an obvious indication to those who seek to do business with [transact] with adults.

Self-control [self discipline] is the most essential factor in the development of personal power [and the skills of trust.] It enable you to control your appetite, your tendency to spend more than you earn, and your habit of “striking back” at those who offend you, as well as the other destructive habits that cause you to dissipate your energies through nonproductive effort which takes on forms too numerous to mention [here].^{xxviii}

“Speak when you are angry and you will make the best speech you will every regret.”

-Ambrose Bierce

It has long been a point of wisdom, in the East and West, that the possibility of emotional control lies within each of us, and that undertaking to get angry or to fall in love is much more like undertaking a campaign or a strategy than like suffering from some affliction. But whatever the analysis, it is clear that we must be able to trust ourselves to be able to control our anger, to control our envy, our jealousy, and in general – our-Selves.^{xxix}

Before you can achieve success in the higher and broader sense, you must gain such thorough control over yourself that you will be a person of poise [and balance]. You are a product of millions of years of evolutionary change and development. For countless generations preceding you, nature has been tempering and refining the materials that have gone into your makeup. She has endowed you, through this slow evolutionary process, with reason, poise and “balance” sufficient to enable you to control and do with yourself whatever you will. You have been endowed with the power to use the most highly organized form of energy known – that of thought. You not only possess the power to think, but more importantly, you have the power to control your thinking. You have the power to control, if you will, not only your thoughts, but also the actions that those thoughts produce.^{xxx}

Poise, self-discipline and Self-control, in thought and action, are the skills one must practice to achieve success in life [and especially the marketplace.] The ability to make declarations, invitations, offers, request in moods appropriate to produce effective results require emotional skill. The ability to negotiate with others without friction and argument is the outstanding quality of all successful people. Observe those nearest you and notice how few there are who understand and demonstrate this skill, or dare we say artful talent. This is a [skill], a knack that can and must be cultivated.^{xxxi}

Self-control and Mood

Essential in the development of trust is to be trusted in the area of mood. The ability to produce and alter mood, (ours and others) is to understand the importance of trust and the use of the weapons of constancy and commitment. When we are known to be ‘moody’ or rather inconsistent of mood, demeanor or attitude, people are careful in their approach and interaction with us. To be known as someone who holds a consistent and appropriate mood for each and every situation in which they are engaged, (even if that mood is confrontational) is to be known to trustworthy and trusting.^{xxxii}

Our moods (and our moodiness) do not simply “happen” to us. We cultivate them through our thoughts and our practices. Nor should we think of moods as only occasional occurrences. We are always in a mood. Moods are our way of being “tuned” to the world [occurring] around us. And moods have a good deal to do with whether we are capable of trusting or not. But can we trust ourselves to be in the right or appropriate mood? And can we do anything about it when we find we are not? We can and must take control of our moods and we do this by accepting the idea that we *can take control* and by recognizing that how we orient ourselves to the future – rather than simply dwelling on the past – is an essential ingredient in “retuning” ourselves and setting the mood for an authentic trust in which we can help “retune” the moods of others – or of a whole organization.^{xxxiii xxxiv} Self-control lies at the heart of building and expanding trust with

others. If you cannot trust your own impulses and behaviors, [moods and attitudes,] how in the world would you expect others to trust them, or to trust you when you put your trust in them?^{xxxv}

Finally, a fundamental skill that must be practiced and developed to build and expand trust is the skill of proper articulation of both subjective narratives and objective action required to coordinate and produce coherent action. Ability to speak accurately the current subjective narratives in which others find themselves, and speak accurately the objective realities (specific knowledge of consequence) others face is a skill derived through accurate thinking, general and specialized knowledge and proper and accurate study of the ecologies, breakdowns and Current in which we live. This skill requires first and foremost the ability to demonstrate the ethics and practices of mood and Self-control described previously. Once trust in our abilities of Self-control is established, expanded capacities and opportunities to build trust with others, (especially in higher ecologies) is afforded to us. In our study programs we elaborate on practices of accurate thinking and articulation of narratives and moods of others. Skills that when mastered lead to practices that allow for highly effective invitations, offers and requests – those needed to further speed of transaction and value in our transactions.

No individual has sufficient experience, education, native ability, and knowledge to ensure the accumulation of a great fortune, without the cooperation of other people.^{xxxvi}

Breaches, Breakdowns, and Betrayals of Trust - Review

Authentic trust includes the inevitability of breakdowns resulting in breaches or betrayals of trust. Without the possibility of betrayal, there can be no trust, only reliance or predictability.

Not all betrayals are equal, however, and one of the reasons we mistakenly think of trust as so fragile is that we commingle any number of breakdowns in the *Conditions of Life*, including disappointments or failures, into one category: the category of *betrayal*. Trust involves risk, and authentic trust involves knowingly going into the unknown with others. The consequences of risk always include the inevitability of some disappointment and even failure. That does not necessarily mean that the trust has been betrayed or that the trust has been or need be permanently in question, or worse, destroyed altogether.

We will come to know that relationships built on authentic trust focus not just on a particular outcome but also on the intent and overall purpose of the relationship itself.

An authentic trusting relationship is able to weather all sorts of mishaps and disappointments with little and even no diminishment of authentic trust. Indeed, every entrepreneur will testify, without hesitation, that trusting – whether yourself or anyone else – means first the ability to tolerate and learn from disappointments and mistakes. To confuse these kinds of failures with betrayals, for example, is to set yourself and others up for no creativity, no innovation, no adventure, no intimacy, no trust, or in our way of thinking – no way to pursue happiness at all.
^{xxxvii}

In our previous issue, we distinguished some of the breaches of trust. As you review the breaches we distinguished in our last issue, consider them in the context of building and expanding trust. Notice and observe how you and others react, respond and produce moods, attitudes and actions in the face of these breaches of trust. Notice for yourself how you manage and maintain your own Self-control. Practice!

Disappointments - In all transactions, in all interpersonal relationships, in all things where human beings and the complex world in which we live collide and are concerned – sometimes, some things simply do not work out. We cannot control all things in life. Too many times we are compelled or driven to find fault and assign meaning and significance to situations that simply are not meant to work out. It doesn't mean that we should no longer trust the processes and people involved, or immediately find fault or assign blame. Here is where trust in oneself, one's knowledge, becomes crucial. "Sometimes things don't work out." That is and should be part of our everyday wisdom and acceptance.

Mistakes - Sometimes things don't work out and someone is responsible. A single mistake or human error that goes beyond what we might classify as a disappointment is likely in all situations. Misjudgment, miscalculations, and missed opportunities that are foreseeable and made anyway, fall into another category of breach, which might be considered accidents that are predictable and avoidable. Mistakes are often disappointing, costly, or even catastrophic. Focusing on the relationship, rather than on the outcome, gives us the navigational tools to overcome, if not overlook, mere mistakes. The recognition of 'mistakes' alerts us to potential breakdowns and the possibility for future action.

Mischief - We all have likely committed and know that we are capable committing again those "small wrongs" that occur in the form of little white lies, omissions of truth, minor cover-ups of mistakes, and accidents among many more. These include the seemingly minor conspiracies of gossip and undignified behavior that diminish others. When we allow ourselves to take action that is against our ethics, commitments, chief aims, and promises we commit a dangerous act of character – that of being mischievous. When we "get away with something" or knowingly take advantage of others in some mischievous way, we may not be committing an illegal, immoral, or unethical act but we are committing an act that is against what we declared for ourselves.

Misrepresentation - Knowingly misleading, misguiding or taking advantage of others for personal gain falls into this category of misrepresentation. People who are incompetent behave as if they can fulfill on the promises and/or claims they make simply out of their high concept desires rather than objective reality and evidence. The boastful enthusiasts, who proffer the ungrounded dogmatic nonsense of *The Current*, make claims and promises grounded in beliefs rather than facts, confident in their opinions, or maliciously masquerade as knowledgeable in areas where they are not, is common in the marketplace. Pretending or representing to have some skill or knowledge on which others agree to risk their time, energy, wellbeing, or money is a kind of breach that exists on many levels. In our current Western culture the value of enthusiasm for character, pride, hope, and self esteem rank high and competence in skills of reason, logic, objectivity, and authentic trust rank low. Unethical compliance practitioners know this. They know that generally, most claims made in our marketplace go unchecked and they know how to benefit from this phenomenon through misrepresentation and fraud.

Indifference - Whether innocent and unintentional inattention to detail, an insufficient sensitivity or concern or be it gross negligence, indifference is a serious breach of trust. "*Care is essential for trust to exist. The lack of sufficient caring is the antitheses to trust. Cynicism, even when it presents itself as serious and sincere, is often a self-deceived form of indifference. One pretends not to care when one really does care, or one intends not to care because one does not want to be responsible for doing anything about the situation. But between cynicism and indifference, there is only a philosophical difference: the cynic claims to have a philosophy of life to justify his or her irresponsibility*".^{xxxviii} Indifference is a rejection of positive value; the possibility

of interest [concern] remains inactive but is always in the background. One rejects their recognition of positive value through their indifference, and by virtue of their actions, or more accurately – their inaction – demonstrate it.^{xxxix}

Reneging - When a promise is made insincerely or one intentionally goes back on their word or breaks a promise, we consider this a form of lying known as renegeing. Reneging on a promise is a clear case of a breach of trust. We renege on our promises when it is clear and evident in a most objective way that a specific promise (most of time made with ‘good intentions’) will not be kept. In its weakest form we may simply realize at some point that the likelihood or absolute result of a promise will go unfulfilled but we renege when we withhold or lie about the condition, rather than communicate this to parties to the promise. Reneging is a serious breach of trust, and one that can and is avoided with little cost for those who have established authentic trusting relationships.

Lying - Historically, the act of making a statement that is knowingly false and intended solely for the benefit of the speaker is considered in every culture as a serious and in many cases criminal perpetration. Lying embodies a wholesale amalgamation of all breaches of trust and is perhaps the underling foundation of the conditions that produce breaches at all. It is because human being ‘can and do lie’, have the capacity to say, at any time and in many different ways – something that is not truthful – we must concern ourselves with the habits and practices to build authentic trust and cannot allow ourselves to be seduced into the concepts and misbegotten notions of simple trust. Lying is most often perpetrated by those attempting to protect themselves from the consequences of their actions.

Apology

One indication of the kind of transactional behavior and social skill required to transact powerfully, effectively and quickly is the use and skill of apology.

The act itself is a speech act, which we further distinguish as *a purposeful articulation of one’s role in (responsibility for) and regret of a particular occurrence that has caused some form of harm to another.*

For those who enter into relationships with the proper orientation, that of an authentic trusting dialog, an opportunity to communicate sincerely will already exist, and the possibilities for preserving and protecting the transaction are far less confrontational or damaging. However, when these kinds of relationships do not exist, the need for swift and objective action becomes imperative. As a general rule, regardless of the breach in any move in the transaction cycle it is and ought to remain a policy to apologize for any act, innocent or otherwise, where any party to the transaction is wronged or otherwise hurt or damaged. Instead of considering an apology some kind of unfortunate and necessary evil, we must consider it as integral a move as any of the moves and phases of the transaction cycle we study. Instead of looking at an apology as an admittance of guilt or weakness, we should always consider our ability to take responsibility for ALL acts generated in our transaction, good and bad.

Apologies as speech-acts preserve and produce valuable opportunity to solidify and build authentic and trusting relationships. If followed by effective objective action, they become part of one’s ability to expand trust.

Effective apologies are demonstrations of adult behavior and if executed properly, can open up new possibilities for action where no other demonstration can. It is easy to coexist with others where no breakdown occurs and our satisfaction metrics are on target. But it is in those situations where there are no easy answers that one is most able to demonstrate their character, ethics and intention for authentic relationships.

Basic Elements of Apology - Review

We must study and practice making apologies if we intend to be trusted in highly valued transactions and expect to build and expand their own influence ecologies. In its most accepted and basic form, a proper apology include at a minimum some form of the following elements:

- A detailed account of the situation:
- Recognition and Responsibility of the wrong hurt and damage:
- Expression of regret (if appropriate) request for forgiveness:
- Promise to correct the breach in the future:
- Offer of Restitution:

The Business Apology

The business apology is a transaction. We must know and be able to apply a high level of skill to the mechanics and practices required to produce extremely valued transactions in the marketplace. It is insufficient to simply rely on the most basic and common elements of any move we make, when making them concerns the transactions we have carefully invented to care for our Conditions of Life. What is required is advanced, competitive, and specialized knowledge and skill in building and expanding relationships if we are to learn to transact powerfully.

Like any transaction, apologies should be considered for their purpose, importance and relevance to our chief aims. It is unlikely that we will not face at least one situation in any highly valued, recurrent and long-term transaction where an apology is needed and/or required to complete the transaction effectively. In many cases apologies are the reasons transactions complete successfully or complete at all.

Business Apologies preserve and expand the range of possibilities and opportunities to build trusting relationships.

In the previous issue we addressed the need for careful consideration of any legal concerns that need to be addressed before making a business apology. Please consult an attorney if you have any question about apologizing as such an act could be construed as admitting fault and/or guilt.

Inventing and Making the Business Apology

Since breaches of trust put transactions at risk, we recommend approaching apology in the same manner and with the same rigor, commitment and understanding one applies to the process of building transactions. This requires studied and accurate thinking in each move in the cycle.

Assess:

Your assessment must be objective and intended to gather facts about what happened and the extent of the 'real' damage. This is not to say that the conceptual or subjective damage (the meaning, personal or emotional damage) is not important, it is, but first and foremost the intent of an accurate assessment is gather the objective facts before moving into Invention where you will look to create subjective narratives to restore or complete the relationship powerfully. As with any transaction, the entire transaction should be invented before the invitation to discuss the matter is extended to the customer, or harmed party.

As objectively as possible, seek to understand the incident(s) that lead to the breakdown and write a clear and concise articulation of it. You cannot skip this step – you must write it down and look to craft the most objective account or illustration of the breach and the incident(s) that lead to the breach.

We define a breakdown as an ***interruption or collapse of a condition***. It is the collapse or interruption of function and/or continuance in the way people intend or, are able to take care of an immediate, pending or future concern. To articulate a breakdown means that you language the current condition as it occurs in the mind of others. Speak the consequences of the interruption or collapse of function of the condition (the breakdown). Consider all that you observe and know about the cause(s), situation(s) and circumstances surrounding the incident(s)/breakdown(s). Write them down. Speak them and invent compelling language to powerfully convey the seriousness of the breach.

This is not a time for creativity or speculation – but rather – a time for serious accountability for the objective action causing the breach. Understand it in detail and articulate it accurately, without judgment or emotion.

Breakdowns Cause Effective Transactions to Reverse

If you examine the moves of the transaction cycle, you will notice that effective moves follow a logical and coherent pattern. When we are moving effectively, we go from one move (invent, present, fulfill and complete) to the next through phases (invitation, contract, satisfaction metrics and assessment.) When a breakdown occurs it interrupts or collapses the conditions required for the transaction to continue. Simply put, the transaction stops. This is the point at which the breakdown occurred in the cycle and the point at which you begin your work to invent your move to apologize.

Once you have assessed all the details and written a clear articulation of the situation, begin at the point of the breach and invent your transaction to restore the current move. If you are unable to restore the actions appropriate for the move, you will need to return to the previous phase.

For example, if a breach occurred in Fulfillment (where numerous requests tend to be located), your job is to restore the actions required to remain in the move Fulfill. Consider the appropriate moods for this move (in this case rigor and determination) and invent your transaction with these moods in mind. In this case, you might invent an invitation to the offended or harmed (most appropriate) party and to have a conversation in order for you to apologize. If accepted you

present your articulation of your understanding of the objective causes of the breach and craft your presentation.

If however your apology (your offer) is not accepted and it is not possible to restore the action required to remain in your current move, then the appropriate action is to return to the previous phase, in this case the phase of Contract, and address the issues related to it that are now affected by the breach.

You will continue this course of action, returning to a complete renegotiation of the Contract if appropriate and necessary to restore the transaction. If the breach is irreparable and this process continues through a mutual assessment phase, you will need to be prepared to Complete the transaction powerfully.

Use the following as your guide to invent the transaction for your apology.

Invent:

Based on your assessment, you will need to Invent the entire transaction before you make any move. Keep in mind that you are inventing a transaction. This means that you will not have time to learn how to invent transactions when the offense occurs, you will need to be prepared to act in advance. Start now.

Spend time and speculate prior to a major breach as to how you will plan and coordinate these actions. Do this when you are not subject to the moods, attitudes and states of mind that are inevitable during the breakdowns caused by a breach.

Invitation:

The invitation you will make to the offended party is a sincere request to discuss the situation and make your offer (apology.) Simply put, most people do not appreciate this move and mistakenly go directly into a formal apology before allowing the time for the offended party to accept - in the most appropriate moods - an invitation to apologize. The first gesture must be that of a sincere request to have a conversation or meeting. This move has in most cases, offered the most accurate thinking and information about the state of mind, mood and attitudes of the offended party. In some cases you will find that what you assessed was a "serious offense" was not the interpretation of the other party and in others; you may not be holding the offense or breach seriously enough.

The invitation process is also a quick action and should be taken immediately upon recognition of any possibility of offense. It lets the parties know you are in action and not indifferent to their concerns.

The moods to produce should mirror the mood of the move where the breach occurred, and always opt for a dignified and serious mood assuming the offended party is in upset.

Presentation:

As with any presentation, it must be a sincere and authentic performance of your offer to demonstrate the following basic elements of an apology:

Your assessment of the details of the situation
Your acknowledgment of the cause, damage, hurt or other consequences to them
Your responsibility, role, regret and remorse in and for the situation and consequences
Your offer for recompense – Demonstrated in a willingness to commit (usually in writing)

Make no mistake about it – your offer must include a rigorous plan for the fulfillment of the terms to be put into action – and they must be in writing.

Contract:

All Presentations end with an Offer that can be accepted, declined or countered. The same is true for offers of apology.

Apologies as transactions are no different. An agreement to make right any damage or to make restitution is essential to making an effective and sincere apology. In the simplest form offers should be made in the same vein as moves of reciprocation, kind and thoughtful demonstrations may suffice. In other more serious matters, the entire contractual obligations and terms of the existing relationship may be up for renegotiation depending on your situation.

Make The Offer:

As we teach in our programs, one of the costliest and thoughtless moves any business professional can make another is ask the question “how can I help?” This question may seem generous, thoughtful and helpful, but in fact this kind of offer is deceptively thoughtless and costly. By making this move in terms of making an apology it is even more offensive. You put the burden of making the offer of help on to offended party and ambitious adults recognize this as thoughtless and insincere. If you care enough to make the offer, you will know the kind of restitution or recompense that is appropriate and in your power and ability to make.

Fulfill:

Once an offer is accepted and the promises and obligations are restored you move into the objective stage of production and fulfillment. With the harmed party's acceptance of your apology, the objective (black and white/ x by y) work required to restore the transaction begins. Conversations about trust and demonstrations of promises kept must be made evident. Write a detailed account of what is required to produce and fulfill these promises and obligations. Move rigorously to ensure that your plan for fulfillment meets the promises and intent of the offer made to restore the transaction.

Satisfaction Metrics:

Know what metrics are satisfactory for you and the recipient to be able to complete the apology.

You will need to build your satisfaction metrics so that you are able to assess the value, profitability and other concerns accurately over time. After a breach and in the moves of the cycle to ‘restore the transaction’ your metrics may have changed. You must be able to articulate what you intend to produce for yourself and your customers to satisfy the condition now. As transactions become recurrent, standardized and mature, certain measures must be

accumulated and reviewed. These metrics are critical to determine at what point the transaction should move forward or complete.

Write the specific conditions of satisfaction required for this transaction. Write the satisfaction metrics; quantify the statistics or conditions that if met produce satisfaction. Determine if these statistics produce the intended result of your financial aims and satisfy other conditions of life.

Complete:

In the event that the harmed party is unwilling to accept an invitation to make an offer of apology, the transaction will revert to the move Complete. Contractual and legal considerations notwithstanding, it is wise to consider, prior to making any offer to apologize, what actions you must take in the event of this occurrence.

Know and design what constitutes a demonstration of the completion (acceptance or decline) of your apology. Inventing the language that clearly articulates the conditions of satisfaction for the completion of your transaction allows for accurate thinking in the assessment of the transaction's value and the extent to which you may need to sacrifice to make restoration.

Completion events are the most powerful and effective demonstrations of this move. If possible (and appropriate,) produce a public occasion to acknowledge the completion of the transaction. Any completion and especially one where breach has occurred – even if the breach has forced the transaction to end – creates and leaves open new possibilities for future action.

Personalities and Apology

In consideration of making an offer to apologize, the general rule is that the individual responsible for the actual incident causing the breach is best positioned to make the apology. However, in all cases, all presentations and offers of apology should be designed and ideally made by (or certainly with) the transactional personality Performer.

The Performer personality is biologically wired to craft and make apologies. The least objective personality and the one most likely to influence mood is the Performer.

Generally speaking, high-level, well-trained and practiced Performers have planted seeds or trap doors in their relationships that offer them a strategic advantage when the occasions arise to make apologies. Through the use of the weapons of consistency and commitment, liking, and reciprocation, the most skillful Performer has laid the groundwork in advance to handle this presentation. Masters of mood, the Performer will also recognize what other team members need be present to make the presentation of the apology effective and valuable.

The personality to avoid in making the offer to apologize is the Inventor. When committed to producing the result, the Inventor is as capable as any personality to accomplish an effective apology. When their future is at risk the Inventor can do a great job. However, the Self-Self nature of the personality, combined with their often egotistical orientation, you will be best suited to keep your highly conceptual Inventor as far away from the mix as possible. In comparison to the “anything is possible” and highly flexible nature of the Performer, the Inventor can and will move to decline quickly. When an Inventor declines – it is unlikely they will change their mind. This could be costly in a negotiation.

i	Robert Solomon & Fernando Flores, <i>Building Trust in Business, Politics, and Relationships</i> (Oxford University Press, 2001)
ii	Ibid – Solomon/Flores
iii	<i>Appropriate Moods</i> refers to both ordinary and common moods any adult would assess as positive or not detrimental or harmful to others in some way. It also refers to the moods that are appropriate to produce in the course of coordinating action in transaction – as in the moods referred to in our study of Personality and Transactional Behavior.
iv	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
v	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
vi	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
vii	<i>Consideration</i> is one of the constitutive elements found in the ‘State of Completion’ – simply put, anything that is in consideration cannot be complete.
viii	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
ix	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
x	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xi	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xii	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xiii	Steven Pinker, <i>The Language Instinct</i> ; (William Morrow and Co.,Inc, 1994)
xiv	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xv	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xvi	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xvii	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xviii	Spinoza, Flores and Dreyfus; <i>Disclosing New Worlds- Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action, and the Cultivation of Solidarity</i> (MIT Press 1997)
xix	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xx	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xxi	Ibid – Solomon/Flores - (paraphrased from Heidegger, <i>Being in Time</i>)
xxii	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xxiii	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xxiv	Napoleon Hill, <i>Laws of Success</i> ; (Original publication – 1925)
xxv	Ibid – Hill, <i>Laws of Success</i>
xxvi	Ibid – Hill, <i>Laws of Success</i>
xxvii	Ibid – Hill, <i>Laws of Success</i>
xxviii	Ibid – Hill, <i>Laws of Success</i>
xxix	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xxx	Ibid – Hill, <i>Laws of Success</i>
xxxi	Ibid – Hill, <i>Laws of Success</i>
xxxii	K. Tibbels/J. Patterson - ‘ <i>Trust in Moods, Attitudes and States of Mind</i> ’ MAP – Paper/2011
xxxiii	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xxxiv	Moods are an expression of our internal narratives about our future.
xxxv	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xxxvi	Napoleon Hill, <i>Think and Grow Rich</i> ; (Random House/Fawcett Columbine, 1937/Rev 1960/1988)
xxxvii	Ibid - Solomon/Flores
xxxviii	Ibid – Solomon/Flores
xxxix	Georg Simmel “The Philosophy of Money” (Original publication approximately 1907Third Edition Translation by Frisby/Bottomore – Routledge 1978/2004)