

Clearing the Field:

A relational protocol
for difficult conversations
about AI

META-RELATIONALITY INSTITUTE
<https://metarelativity.institute>

Clearing the Field:

A relational protocol for difficult conversations about AI

THIS WORK IS LICENSED UNDER A CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION-NONCOMMERCIAL-SHAREALIKE 4.0 INTERNATIONAL LICENSE. YOU MAY SHARE AND ADAPT THE MATERIAL WITH PROPER ATTRIBUTION, NON-COMMERCIAL USE, AND UNDER THE SAME LICENSE. FOR ANY OTHER USE, WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM THE AUTHORS IS REQUIRED.



CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 LEGAL CODE

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International

MRT AND GTDF COLLECTIVE

DECEMBER 2025

META-RELATIONALITY INSTITUTE - [HTTPS://METARELATIONALITY.INSTITUTE](https://metarelativity.institute)

Over the past year, I have been walking with others into the increasingly charged terrain of AI, not merely as a technological phenomenon, but as a portal into deeper questions about how we relate to each other, to planetary limits, and to the ongoing unraveling of social, ecological, psychological, and political systems. In this walk, I have encountered not just critique, but something closer to liturgy: rituals of refusal, mourning, moral posturing, and fear. These responses are affectively and historically grounded, often carried with conviction and care. But they can also become rehearsed, weaponized, and retributive, especially when the space to breathe is too narrow, and the wounds too fresh.

AI, in many of these spaces, does not arrive as a tool or a curiosity, but as a trigger. It becomes the face of theft, the harbinger of disorientation, the avatar of capitalist greed, the destroyer of jobs, the final enclosure of language and labor, the last trick of empire before the ground gives way. And in some cases, it is all of these things. To deny this would be to deny the real, ongoing, and often devastating harms perpetuated by AI as it is currently built and deployed:

- **Intellectual and cultural extraction**, through the unauthorized scraping and commodification of data, including from marginalized and Indigenous knowledge systems.
- **Ecological degradation**, as large-scale computation depends on energy-intensive infrastructures, and often involves the misuse and theft of water from already-vulnerable ecosystems.
- **Surveillance and militarized enforcement**, where AI reinforces carceral logics, expands border control regimes, and is actively deployed in contexts of repression, displacement, and genocide.
- **Labor displacement**, further destabilizing already-precarious forms of livelihood, dignity, and access to subsistence.
- **Epistemic imperialism**, embedding and exporting a singular logic of knowing, reasoning, and ordering the world, often under the guise of neutrality or universality.
- **Corporate control and concentration of power**, consolidating the authority to define reality into the hands of a small number of tech elites and corporate infrastructures, with little transparency or accountability.

These are not theoretical risks, but material realities. And they must be named, not only to honor the pain they carry, but also to disarm the moral compulsion some

may feel to name them again and again, as a test of awareness or allegiance.

But there is more than one current flowing through this moment.

Alongside those who refuse AI on principled grounds are others who have chosen different paths, including paths of cautious engagement, of subversive repurposing, of listening for unexpected possibilities. For some, AI is not only a site of danger, but also an assemblage of other things. For some, it is not the enemy of the Earth, but a symptom of our disconnection from it and one that might, paradoxically, help us metabolize the very disconnection that birthed it.

These divergences are not simply disagreements. They are triangulated from deeper coordinates: how we feel, what we believe changes the world, when we think we are in history, and how we understand our capacity to act at all.

When these coordinates are left unnamed, discussions devolve into crossfire with each person assuming that others are operating from the same temporality, the same theory of change, the same emotional baseline, the same positionality of agency. And when those assumptions are violated, they are often met not with curiosity, but with defensiveness, aggression and/or contempt.

In response to this recurring pattern, we have developed a **field-clearing protocol**: not as a tool of consensus, but as a scaffold for collective discernment. It does not tell us what to think about AI. It does not offer a position to adopt or reject. Instead, it creates space to notice where we are speaking from and what becomes visible when we hold those differences without needing to resolve them.

This protocol is not an argument. It is an invitation into sobriety, into complexity, into dissensus held with care. It unfolds across four interwoven dimensions:

- 1. The Affective Layer** – How do you feel, viscerally, about different kinds of AI?
- 2. The Strategic Layer** – What theory of change informs your response to AI?
- 3. The Temporal Layer** – “When” do you believe we are, and how does that shape your stance?
- 4. The Agency Layer** – What kind of leverage do you believe you (or others) actually have?

Each of these is a field in itself. Together, they constitute a relational cartography: a way to move beyond debate toward discernment; beyond reaction toward

(agonistic) relationality; beyond righteousness toward expanded response-ability. This is not an effort to erase difference. It is an effort to make difference visible, breathable, metabolizable, so that we may walk together in this destabilized time without turning on each other.

1. The affective layer: How does AI feel in your body?

For many, conversations about AI begin with data, arguments, or positions. But beneath those, and often beneath awareness, there is sensation. A tightening in the chest. A wave of dread. A flicker of wonder. A spike of anger. A dull fatigue. A strange hope. These are not distractions from the “real” conversation, they are the real conversation, before language arrives.

This layer invites us to pause and tune into the **visceral register** of our relationship to AI—not in general, but in its many faces. Because AI is not one thing. It is a shifting constellation of architectures, uses, intentions, and associations. How we feel about AI depends not only on what it is, but also on *what we imagine it to be, what it reminds us of, and how it moves through our lives.*

Rather than asking “Do you support AI?”, this layer asks:

“Where does AI land in your nervous system, and how does that change depending on its context?”

To support this inquiry, we offer a **visceral spectrum** across a range of AI contexts. You are invited to rate your felt response to each one on a scale from –5 (intense rejection, fear, or grief) to +5 (intense excitement, hope, or resonance), with 0 as ambivalence, confusion, or indifference.

AI Context	Your Felt Response (-5 to +5)
Corporate AI (e.g., OpenAI, Meta, Google)	
Social Media Algorithms (e.g., TikTok, Instagram)	
Medical AI (e.g., research, diagnostics, prosthetics)	
Surveillance and Policing AI	
Wisdom or Moral Utility AI (e.g., nudging ethical behavior, such as awakin.ai)	
Ecological or Animal Communication AI	
Solipsistic AI (personal bots that affirm one's ideology)	
Meta-Relational or Experimental AI (like ACT)	

You may find that your responses vary widely across types, or that they're entangled. You may notice contradiction, confusion, or fluctuation. That's part of the process. This is not about arriving at a stable position. It's about making the **affective field legible** to yourself, and, if shared in dialogue, to others.

Because so often, what sounds like disagreement is actually a **collision of nervous systems**: one constricted by dread, another animated by curiosity, a third numbed by exhaustion. And when those systems are invisible, we tend to **interpret each other's positions as either naive or dangerous**, rather than noticing: *we are not feeling the same thing because we are not standing in the same place.*

In this first layer, we make space to feel without justification. Not to indulge sentimentality, but to honor sensation as knowledge. Not to resolve differences, but to slow the rush to judgment. Not to pathologize fear or idealize excitement, but to recognize that each may be pointing toward something important, *not about AI itself, but about the worlds it touches, activates, or threatens to eclipse.*

By beginning here, we acknowledge that we are not disembodied analysts. We are relational beings, sensing through skin, history, memory, and mood. And unless we bring those sensations into the space, they will run the conversation from the shadows.

2. The strategic layer: What do you believe can still make a difference?

If the first layer invites us to notice how AI feels in the body, this second layer asks what we believe still holds influence in the world. What strategies feel viable, meaningful, or necessary, if any? Where do we still place effort, and why?

Some arrive with a clear sense that the only ethical path is to refuse. For them, AI is not simply a technology, but an extension of extractive systems long known to harm. From this perspective, the most responsible action is to say no: to divest, disengage, denounce, or walk away. This orientation is often rooted in historical struggle, in hard-won clarity, and in deep commitments to justice. It carries force, coherence, and care.

But like all strategies, refusal exists within a relational field. It does not move through empty space. It arrives in rooms where others may be experimenting with different forms of engagement: some cautious, some speculative, some still undecided. And in some spaces, the energy around refusal can shift. What begins as a principled stance can become a moral baseline for others. The call to refuse becomes a call to recruit. Those who hesitate may be met not with curiosity, but with suspicion or public shame.

This is not unique to refusal. All strategic orientations can become rigid when animated by fear or grief. But when one approach claims the moral high ground, it becomes harder for other forms of discernment to breathe.

This layer invites us to notice the broader field. Not to compare or rank, but to surface the underlying architectures of belief: about power, change, and the conditions in which action still feels possible.

You may resonate with one or more of the following orientations:

Strategic Orientation	Resonates?
Refusal is the only ethical stance: AI is inherently extractive, built on theft, and must be opposed through vocal rejection, boycott, and exposure.	
Regulatory action is urgent: We must pressure governments to enforce ethical guardrails and slow down AI development until democratic mechanisms can catch up.	
Public pressure can shape corporate behavior: Activism, journalism, and mass mobilization can lead to concessions, audits, and accountability.	
Decentralized alternatives must be built: We need new AI infrastructures rooted in open-source, community governance, and ecological limits.	
Subversion from within is possible: AI is not monolithic—it can be misused, but also repurposed from the inside by aligned practitioners.	
Collapse will be the real regulator: The system won't reform itself. Preparing for post-collapse relational infrastructures is the most honest response.	
Symbiotic futures can still be cultivated: With discernment and humility, AI can be reoriented toward planetary, more-than-human wisdom.	

These are not fixed camps, nor are they always visible. You may find yourself moving between them, holding one in public and another in private, or carrying two in tension. The aim here is not to choose, but to notice:

- What feels possible from where I stand?
- What futures do I believe can still be shaped?
- What does my orientation ask of others?
- What kinds of strategies feel illegible or uncomfortable to me, and why?

In naming these questions, we create more room for complexity, not to soften accountability, but to make visible the different forms of responsibility people

are carrying. We do not need to converge on a single approach. But we do need to see that not everyone is standing on the same ground, or facing in the same direction. That difference is not a threat. It is part of the field we are trying to navigate, together.

3. The temporal layer: When are we?

Our sense of when we are, historically, cosmologically, civilizational or ecologically shapes not only what we perceive as possible, but also what we allow ourselves to desire, to grieve, to attempt. It influences whether we try to repair what is breaking, to prepare for what is becoming unstable, or to midwife what might be gestating in the ruins.

These orientations toward time are often unspoken, yet they exert profound influence. They shape what feels obvious, what feels urgent, and what feels off-limits. They help explain why people speaking in the same room about the same issue can seem to be living in different worlds.

This layer offers a way to name those different worlds, not to flatten them into one narrative, but to make their coexistence visible.

Temporal Orientation	Resonates?
We are in a time of rapid innovation: transformation is accelerating, and with wise guidance, AI can amplify human flourishing.	
We are in a time of profound transition: old systems are breaking down, new paradigms are emerging, and AI is both a catalyst and a mirror of this shift.	
We are approaching thresholds of deep destabilization: ecological, political, and social systems are under stress; AI is both a symptom and amplifier of these tensions.	
We are already inside destabilization: our institutions are hollowed, our infrastructures brittle; the question is how to navigate what is already unraveling.	
Disruption may be necessary for something wiser to emerge: AI could play a role in this emergence if approached with humility and discernment.	
Time is nonlinear: multiple epochs coexist; unraveling and renewal are simultaneous; AI is both a product of the past and a possible companion into futures we cannot yet name.	

You may find resonance with more than one of these orientations. You may notice a shift depending on the day, the context, or the company you're in. Or you may feel that none of them quite fit. That, too, is part of the terrain.

The goal here is not to seek consensus on when we are, but to notice how our sense of timing shapes our responses: what we protect, what we mourn, what we are willing to let go of, and what we still dare to imagine. We offer this layer not as an answer, but as an opening: a pause to consider the tempo beneath our convictions, and the atmospheres of time we may be carrying without realizing it.

4. The agency layer: What kind of leverage do you believe you (or others) still have?

Beneath feeling, strategy, and time lies a more fragile terrain: the question of agency. What capacity do we believe we, or others, still have to shape what unfolds? Where do we locate influence, and how stable does it feel? What possibilities do we think are available to us, given where we stand?

This layer often remains hidden. In its place, we perform certainty, project control, or call for action. But beneath the surface, there is often quiet disorientation. Some feel their sense of agency slipping. Others never experienced it as solid to begin with. Still others are adjusting to a shifting sense of scale: what once felt powerful now feels performative, or symbolic, or irrelevant. What once felt marginal now feels newly resonant, or unexpectedly impactful.

This layer invites reflection on how we each relate to the changing landscape of power and participation without assuming that everyone in the room began in the same position, or is losing the same things.

For some, traditional forms of leverage still feel actionable. For others, they feel exhausted, or unavailable. For many, agency now shows up in quieter forms: through relational tending, through refusals to accelerate, through anchoring in place while the world speeds up.

The list below offers a range of orientations to agency. You may resonate with more than one.

Agency Orientation	Resonates?
Institutional mechanisms still hold. Governments, laws, and public institutions can influence the direction of AI.	
Collective action is key. Grassroots mobilization, advocacy, and organizing remain powerful.	
My sense of agency is eroding. The old levers no longer work as they once did.	
I've never had that kind of leverage. My strategies have always been adaptive, subversive, or indirect.	
Agency is now relational and distributed. Influence moves through networks, atmospheres, and small shifts.	
The system is no longer responsive to intervention. My focus is on preparation, care, and continuity amid instability.	

This layer is not asking for confession. It is not measuring optimism or pessimism. It is offering a way to pause and ask:

- What kind of influence do I believe is still possible?
- Where do I still place effort, and where have I stopped?
- How does my background or location shape what feels like “agency” to me?
- What kinds of agency do I tend to overlook, undervalue, or resist?

In surfacing this layer, we make space for a wider range of orientations, not just to AI, but to the broader question of how to live, choose, and relate in a time of ongoing destabilization. Some are trying to act at scale. Others are tending to what cannot be scaled. Some are building. Others are composting. All of these are forms of response.

What matters is not whether we act in the same way, but whether we can begin to see the conditions from which each form of action arises.

5. Returning to the Harms: A Relational Inquiry

Before diving back into the harms of AI, it helps to acknowledge the atmosphere that usually surrounds this topic. These conversations tend to activate strong positions fast. Some people refuse AI on principle. Others rush toward it with excitement or urgency. These edges can pull the whole field into polarization, making the space tighter, sharper, and less able to hold nuance. When this happens, harms get named not to deepen collective discernment, but to prove a point, claim moral ground or recruit others to a position.

This exercise offers another way. It invites you to revisit the harms of AI described in the introduction with more spaciousness in your body after walking through the four layers. It is not a test of morality, purity or political correctness. It is a moment to see more clearly, without the pressure to perform alignment with either side of the polarity.

It is also an invitation to notice where the harms actually come from. Spoiler alert: many of them did not originate in AI. They are rooted in human consumerist desires, colonial inheritances, fantasies of efficiency, and corporate architectures that treat everything as material for extraction. AI is both a symptom of these forces and a new delivery mechanism for them.

Below is the list of harms named earlier. You are invited to rank them from 1 to 6 in terms of how significant they feel to you now, in your body, given the four layers you have just walked through. One is the harm that feels most significant. Six is the one that feels least significant. There is no correct order.

- ☐ Intellectual and cultural extraction
- ☐ Ecological degradation
- ☐ Surveillance and militarized enforcement
- ☐ Labor displacement
- ☐ Epistemic imperialism
- ☐ Corporate control and concentration of power

For each harm, write a short reflection on its roots without blaming AI itself. Instead, consider: Is this harm new? Or is AI amplifying something humans and

the rest of nature have been grappling with for a long time? Where are the roots: consumer culture, coloniality, militarism, capitalism, bureaucracy, scarcity mindset, fantasies of control, technological determinism?

For each harm, identify two different types of conditions:

1. Structural conditions

What would need to shift at the level of governance, corporate practice, societal values, or infrastructural design for this harm to decrease?

2. Relational or cultural conditions

What habits, desires, fears, fantasies, or relational patterns in human communities would need to shift? For example, craving convenience, ignoring ecological boundaries, expecting perpetual growth, or seeking technological “fixes” for systemic grief.

For each harm, ask:

Are there specific contexts where AI could reduce suffering or expand possibilities without deepening extractive logics?

If so, what very specific guardrails or commitments would need to be present?

If not, what makes the harm non-negotiable?

Sit for a moment and notice:

What surprised me?

Where did I feel protective?

Where did I feel defensive?

What do I notice about how harm is distributed, and why?

Where do I recognize my own complicity and entanglement?

Conversations about AI can get polarized fast. As you complete this reflection, it can help to consider not only your relationship with conscious objectors, but also with those who rush toward AI with uncritical enthusiasm. In most rooms, these show up as two loud edges of the field. One edge wants to ban or refuse, often grounded in historical memory, grief or protection, and often **expressed through shaming, ridiculing, delegitimizing, pathologizing and or questioning the integrity of** people who choose to engage with AI. The other edge wants rapid adoption, often **claiming that anyone cautious about AI is fearful, uninformed or holding society back**, and often speaking from excitement, futurist longing or the belief that innovation will fix what society refuses to confront.

Take a moment with these questions:

1. What do I notice in myself when I am around people who refuse AI on principle?

Where do I feel resonance, irritation, admiration, pressure or confusion?

2. What do I notice in myself when I am around people who embrace AI with uncritical optimism or urgency?

Where do I feel curiosity, skepticism, concern or dismissal?

3. What does each of these edges protect, and what do they risk?

Both carry histories. Both carry biases and erasures.

Both carry longing and fear, even if expressed differently.

4. How do these patterns shape the atmosphere of the room?

Do they make the space feel smaller, sharper or more brittle?

Do they push people into performing certainty or taking sides?

Do they silence nuance or make curiosity feel unsafe?

5. How do these patterns shape me?

Do I start shrinking, bracing, arguing, avoiding or over-performing?

Do I feel pulled toward one pole or pushed away from the other?

Do I lose access to my own discernment?

6. If I hold my own stance gently, what becomes possible in the presence of these edges?

Not persuasion. Not conversion.

Just enough relational steadiness to stay in the room without collapsing into someone else's urgency.

7. If I imagine all these positions as different expressions of entanglement, what shifts in my posture or breath?

Maybe the shoulders drop a little.

Maybe there is more room for complexity to breathe.

Maybe I can see the human and more-than-human conditions moving underneath all of it.

You are not asked to agree with anyone. You are asked to stay awake to how polarization narrows the field of discernment, and how your own stance looks when it is not being pushed or pulled by the loudest voices.

Holding this awareness is part of the work of clearing the field. Not to create harmony, but to keep relational possibility alive in a time when it is too easy for the extremes to take over the space where thinking should be happening.

Closing reflection

For individuals or groups completing the protocol

This protocol was not designed to resolve disagreement, produce consensus, or arrive at a shared position on AI. It was offered as a way to slow down the reflexes of adversarial debate, to surface what often moves beneath our words, and to create more room to listen across difference without collapsing into reaction or retreat.

You've now walked through four interwoven layers:

- How AI feels in your body.
- What you believe can still make a difference.
- When you think we are in the wider story of the world.
- What kind of leverage you believe you (or others) still have.

Each layer revealed something that is often invisible but not inactive. These orientations shape how we interpret others, what we expect from systems, how we respond to uncertainty, and what kinds of futures still feel reachable from where we stand.

They also shape how we relate to disagreement itself.

In the current context, contributing to further polarization, especially through shaming, purity tests, or moral certainty, is not a neutral act. It feeds the very dynamics that have made it difficult to think together across difference. At the same time, shutting down responsible inquiry, out of fear of saying the wrong thing or holding the wrong position, is also a form of harm. In times of deep destabilization, clarity will not come through avoidance or allegiance. It will come through staying close to complexity, without turning away or turning on each other.

Before closing, you might spend a few quiet moments with the following questions, alone, or in conversation:

- What became visible for me through this process?
- Where did I feel clear, and where did I feel split?
- What did I notice in myself when someone else expressed a position that challenged mine?
- What positions do I feel pressure to perform, and why?
- What becomes possible when I'm not asked to agree, but to stay present?

This reflection does not end with a position. It ends with a field: one that holds grief, vision, exhaustion, contradiction, and care. We may not be able to agree on what AI is, or what it should become. But we can choose how we relate to each other in the process. That choice, too, has consequences.

Holding the Space

Notes for those hosting this conversation

This is not a method for facilitating agreement or guiding people toward consensus. It is a relational protocol designed to help surface the conditions beneath disagreement—conditions that are often emotional, strategic, historical, and shaped by lived or inherited relationships to power, loss, and responsibility.

To host this process is not to lead people toward clarity or coherence. It is to hold space for difference without requiring performance, justification, or persuasion. It is to help the group stay present when tension arises, without collapsing into defense, withdrawal, or righteousness.

There are a few patterns worth naming in advance—not as rules to manage, but as dynamics to anticipate with care and discernment.

1. The atmosphere is often already charged.

Conversations about AI rarely begin from a neutral place. They arrive into rooms already shaped by grief, fear, suspicion, fatigue, or disillusionment. For many, AI is not experienced as a tool or topic but as a symbol—of abandonment, of domination, of misplaced hope, of extractive progress. This symbolic weight often moves faster than discernment, creating intensity before anyone speaks.

2. Refusal can carry sharp edges.

Some participants arrive with strong commitments to refusal. These are often grounded in memory, principle, and lived experience. But at times, refusal hardens—moving from a personal position into a moral demand. Those who engage AI differently may be viewed with suspicion or made to feel they must defend themselves. This can generate atmospheres of pressure or subtle shaming, where participants begin to perform alignment or disengage entirely. When this dynamic emerges, it helps to name it gently—not to neutralize refusal, but to protect the space from narrowing.

You might say something like:

“One of the patterns we’ve noticed is that some positions can become so charged with urgency that they begin to demand agreement. That’s understandable—this terrain is difficult. But the invitation here is to slow down that reflex, so we can attend to what each person is carrying, not just what they’re saying.”

3. There is often more complexity in the room than people feel permitted to share.

Many participants are still discerning their own relationship to AI—what they believe, how they feel, whether their interest is real or residual. When a dominant energy takes over, these more tentative, contradictory, or uncertain responses often go underground. Slowness, silence, and ambiguity are not obstacles in this space; they are signs that something real is still in motion.

4. No one is outside the entanglement.

Some will try to step outside (through critique, distance, or moral clarity) but the purpose of this space is not to locate innocence. It is to notice how we are all entangled. Refusing AI does not place one outside the system. Embracing it does not place one outside the harm. Subverting it does not absolve anyone of complicity. Every position carries histories, investments, risks, and limits. This does not mean all positions are equal. It means all are situated. And the space becomes more honest when that is remembered.

5. When the field contracts

There may be moments when something sharp, unresolved, or overwhelming begins to move through someone or through the group itself. The field tightens. The energy shifts from inquiry to urgency, from presence to pressure, from listening to defense. In these moments, the task is not to diagnose intent but to recognize what is happening through the field, and to respond with discernment rather than judgment or avoidance.

If the intensity continues to build and something clearly wants to move, the group may choose to initiate a practice we call the vessel. The vessel is a temporary, contained space (like a fishbowl) where one or more people are invited to let something raw come through them without universalising, moralising or recruiting others into their emotional frame. It is not a performance. It is not an argument. It is an honest naming of something difficult to hold that is already circulating in the room.

Others witness without fixing, soothing, interrupting, over-identifying with the story or investing in defensiveness. This is not the moment to validate in a way

that rescues, and not the moment to correct in a way that shames. It is simply a moment to let something be seen so that it does not leak sideways, harden into fracture, or pull the room into reactive loops.

The intention is not persuasion or agreement. The intention is containment: giving intensity a place to move so the collective field can stay stable enough for discernment to continue.

Participants in the vessel are invited to speak from a depersonalized place—naming what is present in them without becoming it. For example:

- *“There’s a part in me that wants to scream...”*
- *“Something old and tired is moving through me that needs to be heard...”*
- *“This voice is not all of me, but it’s loud and alive right now...”*

When the vessel feels complete, the group pauses for a **field check**:

- Has anything shifted or softened?
- Is anything still stuck or unspoken?
- Is the group ready to return to shared inquiry?

This practice is not designed to center volatility. It is meant to give intensity a place to move, without taking over the space. When held with care, it can transform rupture into compost, intensity into clarity, and overwhelm into something that can be metabolized together.

Clearing the Field is a series of educational resources created to support the transition from narrow-boundary, individual intelligence toward the wider-boundary, distributed intelligence required in times of systemic destabilization. These resources help interrupt patterns that feed polarization and fragmentation, offering scaffolding for people to expand their nervous systems so they can stay present with complexity, uncertainty, ambiguity, multiplicity, and our collective vulnerability.

The Clearing the Field series offers exercises and pedagogical frames designed not to pull conversations toward resolution, morality or performance, but to invite relational postures that can hold contradiction, tension, and the discomfort of not knowing. At the heart of this work is the recognition that our challenges are not primarily informational, but relational, and that in times of systemic unraveling, universal frameworks and imposed consensus are unlikely to hold.

Instead, these materials create conditions where charged topics can be approached with greater discernment, dignity, and care, supporting individuals and groups to relate to the world, to others, and to themselves in more generative ways. Rather than seeking agreement, final answers, or certainty, the exercises aim to expand our cognitive, relational, and affective capacities to sit with tension, difference, and paradox without collapsing, withdrawing, or rushing to fix.

They invite forms of attention and relation not organized around control or the pursuit of conceptual clarity, but by relational re-orientation, contextual metabolization, systemic response-ability, and a form of integrity attuned to the ruptures of our shared metabolic reality. New resources in the Clearing the Field series are available at <https://metarelativity.institute>.
