



Join our free membership site, **The Duke Humfrey's**, and get access to full transcripts, past episodes, exclusive downloads and more.

You'll find it all at www.MBS.works/podcast

MBS ([00:00](#)):

Human resources. Ah, we've heard that phrase so often, we can grow deaf to the mechanistic, coldness of the words. How on earth can we build organizations that are people-centered, that allow for human flourishing, when we consider people just resources?

MBS ([00:25](#)):

Welcome to 2 pages with MBS, the podcast where brilliant people read the best two pages from a favorite book. Dan Pontefract is my guest today. And here's an interesting fact. Pontefract is an old English word that means, broken bridge, but honestly, Dan is anything but. He's a bridge builder. He builds leadership. He builds organizational culture. He's written four books, all of which I can recommend and in fact, two of which I make a brief appearance in and he's done numerous TEDx talk. He writes regularly for kind of famous publications



and truth is, he's also a great friend of mine. There's nothing I like better than hanging out with Dan Pontefract when I can. I don't get to see him as often as I might. He lives on the other side of Canada to me. So, it's just a real treat to have him here in conversation with me and with you all today. Dan and I have a lot of the same heroes when it comes to business authors. We enjoy reading and the book he chose to read from today is definitely written by one of those heroes, Charles Handy. I don't know if you've ever met a personal hero before, but there's always a chance you'll be let down, that your expectations will be dashed when you meet them. Here's what happened when Dan met Charles Handy at the Drucker Forum in Vienna.

Dan ([01:45](#)):

You know, I stopped, obviously at the line there? I said, "Mr. Handy, Dan Pontefract, you'll never remember me, but I sent you this book called The Purpose Effect." He looks at me, he stands up, he shakes my hand, he says: "Oh. No, I do recall that book. Quite excellent" and sits down and then signs the book. And it says: "Dear Dan, thank you so much for the fab book. The Purpose Effect was excellent. Love Charles."

MBS ([02:18](#)):

So, sometimes your hopes are dashed when you meet a hero and sometimes it's something you cherish for the rest of your life. I followed Charles Handy's work for a while. And I wanted to ask Dan whether his influence has waned of late.

Dan ([02:32](#)):

Yes. And I don't know why. Is it because there's far more noise and draw with others who are on social media? Handy has always been a counter-culturist in essence. What he wrote in 1990, what he wrote in 2016, it's so relevant and applicable today. It's just that society has TikToked on.



MBS ([03:01](#)):

Both Dan and I feel Charles Handy should be better known, should be in the spotlight more. And particularly this new book. It's different. It's not only as philosophical as some of his others, but this one feels much more accessible.

Dan ([03:15](#)):

Well, this one is... it's heartfelt, because it may be his last book. And it came out in 2019, if I'm not mistaken. It's called 21 Letters on Life and Its Challenges. And this book of the 21 letters are all written to his four grandchildren, but what he writes in here are... It's almost a grandfatherly poetry and philosophy that can be applied to your life and or your role as a leader individual in an organization.

MBS ([03:51](#)):

I asked Dan, which ideas really struck him, which ideas really influenced him, as he read through the 21 letters.

Dan ([03:59](#)):

Well, he didn't come up with it, but sort of the career lattice is one of those. And he kind of called it the shamrock of the organization, was a huge model where the three points of the shamrock are how I started thinking about my career and what organizations should be made of. There are the permanent employees. There are the part-timers, that can be like gig economy, if you will. And then there's the contractors, or suppliers, or partners. And that makes up, him being Irish, the sort of green shamrock [inaudible 00:04:28]. Because all too often, what happens is, organizations treat their full-time employees one way, they're part-timers or gig economy people, another way, and then suppliers and partners and whomever, just totally awful. And he's like, "No, we're all green, if you will, we're all parts of the shamrock." That I loved.

Dan ([04:48](#)):

But then his notion that really, the word corporation is awful. And what we should be thinking about is that the place in which we work is like a village. No



one owns the village. It's not incorporated. And if we think about the bread maker, the village butcher, the florist and so forth, the chemist, they make up the culture, and that comes and goes, but the village remains. So, we all have to tend to the village, no matter your role, no matter your part. I think that's just a lovely, lovely metaphor.

MBS ([05:32](#)):

So Dan tell us which of the 21 letters did you choose and why?

Dan ([05:38](#)):

Well, a bit of an homage to you, and perhaps our profession, and where we stand in this world. The letter is called, "You Are not a Human Resource".

MBS ([05:47](#)):

Oh, fantastic. I just heard Brené Brown going on about this the other day, and I was shouting in agreement in the background going, "Exactly". It's like a dehumanizing moment. So, we have Dan Pontefract reading from Charles Handy's book, 21 Letters on Life and Its Challenges. Dan, over to you.

Dan ([06:07](#)):

"Organizations do need to be organized. The flow of work needs to be compartmentalized and people need to know what they are required to do, by when, and to what standard; but that is managing the work, not the individuals. The difference is crucial. If I know what I am meant to be doing and I believe it to be either useful or necessary, I will do it without someone looking over my shoulder. I remember Mel, a colleague of mine at the London Business School. He specialized in the management of groups and teams. Then one day he left to start his own restaurant. A year later I bumped into him. 'It must be nice,' I said, 'to be able to practice all that you were preaching back at the school.' 'It's funny,' he replied, 'But I found that if you choose the right people to start with, and if they know what they are meant to do, they just get on with it without any checking or fuss.'"



Dan ([07:07](#)):

"I call that leadership: creating the conditions for good work, choosing the right people and setting them standards of achievement that they can understand, and rewarding them when they meet them. You may say that I am just playing with words — but words describe the world, even the local world of the organization. I now believe that work", all in capitals Michael, "needs to be organized", all in capitals, "that things", all in capitals, "should be managed", all in capitals, "but that people", all the capitals, "can only be encouraged, inspired, and led", all in capitals, and "(By things, I mean the buildings, information systems, or anything else physical.) There are those, however, who prefer to elevate the idea of management to include organizing and leading.

Management, said the great Peter Drucker, is a human and social art. Much though I admire the thinking and writings of Drucker, I do wish that he had avoided that word because it has been so misinterpreted and abused by people who see it as an excuse to exercise their power over their fellow humans."

Dan ([08:27](#)):

"Words do matter. They change behavior. They shape our thinking because of the implicit messages they send; then our thoughts shape our actions. Call someone a human resource and it is only one step further to assume that he or she can be treated like other things, be oiled and fueled, perhaps, but also controlled and even dispensed with when surplus to requirements. Good managers know this, you may say, but language can trick you into behaving in ways you would normally avoid. Words are devious, dangerous things. Always watch your language lest you send messages that you never intended." Now he just finishes this little bit here, so that's why I just want to sidebar note, there's a kind of a final paragraph here. He's talking about the word, "Management" here. "But at first I felt naked and longed for the handbook of so-called management. I now know that there isn't one. Any that you may come across, including one that I wrote myself, will turn out to be practical common sense dressed up with long words to make it seem professional. I would only urge you to remember



the three different activities of organizing, leading, and managing, and to apply them appropriately, because I truly believe that managing people, instead of leading them, is wrong and has resulted in too many dysfunctional and unhappy workplaces. You are more than a human resource." Boom.

MBS ([10:05](#)):

Boom. Exactly. That constant battle against the dehumanizing effect of capitalism. Let me just call it. It is relentless. What was it about that? What's at the heart of that, that struck a chord for you?

Dan ([10:23](#)):

Well, three things, first of all, the book is to his four grandchildren. He's reminiscing on life as a corporate philosopher, poet, and prescient divulger of what's to come in our organization saying, "Hey kids, don't be like this." That would be number one. The fact that it's to his grandkids. He's all how... Well, I struggle with what audience I'm writing to in a book or an article, or what have you, a column? He's writing to these four kids. Okay. Number two is the fact that...

MBS ([11:02](#)):

Before you go on, and why does that matter, do you think?

Dan ([11:06](#)):

Well, because to me, the organization is a family. It's a village. So, although he's writing to his four grandkids, in turn, how I interpret it, is that Handy is actually writing to me, the leader of an organization or a team, asking us to indeed perhaps treat our team members like family. Why should there be this different raincoat that we wear, so to say, to work? I shouldn't be Teflon. You should just be. You're you, right? Bring your you to work.

MBS ([11:40](#)):

I love that.



Dan ([11:41](#)):

So that's what strikes me first.

MBS ([11:43](#)):

Yeah. Thank you.

Dan ([11:44](#)):

Second, is of course, he's using almost pejoratively the term human resource. I don't... What's a stronger word than hate? Is it loathe?

MBS ([11:59](#)):

Loathe is an upgrade on hate, I think.

Dan ([12:01](#)):

Okay. I loathe human resource. I can't stand when departments are still called human resources. I mean, people in culture, to me at least, a far better term. My disdain, first of all, for human resources. I thought, "Okay well, I'm going to talk to Michael about this one." But then again, what we're getting at is, which I've wax lyrical and verbally about before, is Drucker's insistence on managing versus leading, or managing being the leading, and Charles Handy, a peer, an equal, in my opinion, to Drucker, calling him out and saying, "Actually, yo Pete..."

MBS ([12:47](#)):

Pete, I know, Peter Drucker, the Peter Drucker, in this insight, the emperor has no clothes. It's like, this is the price you pay for management, which is objectification.

Dan ([13:00](#)):

This is true. I could imagine back in the early nineties, they're sitting down having a pint or a glass of wine. It's like, "Hey Chuck. Hey Pete. No, it's management. No, it's leadership." Just going back and forth. "Chuck, you're wrong. Pete, don't let me whack you. What's happening?"



MBS ([13:18](#)):

I know, you need an Irish accent though, for our man here to give the full effect, but sure.

Dan ([13:25](#)):

You know, maybe they'll bring us to the Drucker Forum when you and I... And we'll re-enact a play of sorts, Peter Drucker versus Charles Handy.

MBS ([13:32](#)):

That's great.

Dan ([13:35](#)):

What Charles is on about here is, you manage assets and buildings and things. You lead people. You lead vision. You lead behavior. You lead yourself. And I think that's just such a distinction that, far too often in my time leading organizations and leadership development programs and leadership philosophies, what have you, you have to get leaders to understand that love, compassion, empathy, these leadership behaviors, are so crystal important, than just managing assets and managing the human resource if you will.

MBS ([14:12](#)):

Right. So, Dan you know that I'm just going to violently agree with you on this because you and I have a similar people centered approach to what we hope for and wish for organizations. Whether that's for-profit or not-for-profit, just for organizations in general. What's the challenge in bringing this idea out into reality?

Dan ([14:37](#)):

How long do we got? We got another three hours here Michael? [crosstalk 00:14:40] Longest podcasts ever. In no particular order, you have greed. So, what happens is, an executive leadership team, a C-suite and its board, are at the top of the pyramid, and why would you want to uproot the apple cart of



your stock options or RSUs? What is the system of how I get paid, and they get paid royally? Why do all that hard work? I mean, it's not going to benefit me. I'm still like... We should keep it going. So, greed, number one. Number two, power, which is probably the sister twin of greed. But power, when you start empowering your organization, when you start acting with class and with dignity and with humility and eating humble pie and caring about the wellbeing of your people, be it mental wellness, be it physical wellness and so forth, takes a lot of time, first of all, MBS. And secondly, how's that going to help my power grab? I'm just trying to manage up more time, more budget, more people, more resource to get more stuff done. So, does that help me?

MBS ([16:01](#)):

Even if it's not even a power grab, if you're committed to this, it actually means they're giving up a power. So, it's not even just holding steady, it's an active diminishment of the power and the control that you might have, and the comfort that can bring you, that kind of security that our little amygdala brain, part of our brain desperately wants.

Dan ([16:25](#)):

I have three teenagers that are acting on just their amygdala right now. There's literally no prefrontal cortex. It's just absent and missing. Those are my parenting years right now. Time. Time is the enemy. It's the killer app right now. It's literally killing the app. I don't know. You get to work with all kinds of executives, as I do. We're kind of almost two peas in a pot here. And more often than not, when I asked an executive or its team to open up their outlook or their Google calendar or whatever, and then I stare at it and I say, "So, I see this back, to back, to back, to back, to back, to back, to back, to back, to back, to back meeting. I see that Monday to Friday, and I'm just wondering, Chuck" or whoever I'm talking to, "What are you leading? Where are you leading your people? Tell me about this meeting right here. Is this a leadership meeting, or is this a make more money meeting? It's just a get stuff done meeting, or is this a lead people meeting? Where is your leadership of self? When are you..." Time.



Time is just a burden these days. So, back to why is this not happening here, your question. I don't think executives have time to actually even think about acting with empathy or care or love. It's not coming up, man.

MBS ([17:47](#)):

When you go, the only three things we have to surmount to, to move to this non-human resource, human centric way of working is, greed, power, and time. Does that just mean that this is a fool's errand? Is this just like an indulgent little conversation between you and me and Charles Handy around what would be nice in a perfect world, but it's pointless really to go on about it, because it just feels, when you put it like that, this is just never going to be achieved.

Dan ([18:19](#)):

Well, what I try to do, at least in the work that I'm privileged to do with organizations, is to be that blunt to call it out and to then outline what is arguably the reward. And I think that's really important. You have to be that almost arrogant leadership strategist to tell them what is happening to their people negatively, but what might happen and what will happen when you are a human being with them, when you're humane. And that is the intangibles, because it's that residual residue, the effect, et cetera, the aftereffect of things. Do you want your likelihood to recommend to increase, i.e., customers saying nice things about you? Well, imagine your employees who feel good. That say great things about you at the cricket match, at the ballet, when we used to go out to these things, of course. So, things like likelihood to recommend. Things like attrition levels, hopefully going down as a result. Things like... And you've seen the data, you're a very well-read individual. Think about the mental and health and wellness issues that have plagued us now, pre-pandemic, and what's happening now, midst and going into post-pandemic.

MBS ([19:54](#)):

But here's the thing, Dan, I've also seen the research that says data doesn't persuade anybody. Everybody nods their head to it, but a rational argument is



very unlikely to persuade. If a rational argument is all you've got, it's very unlikely to persuade a shift in behavior. So, I'm curious to know when you think of the people you've worked with, what's the difference between the people who've actually taken this on board and made some progress on it, versus the ones who nodded politely, went "Sure Dan, we appreciate the talk. We appreciate the pep talk. Here's a cheque for the work that you've done", but actually nothing much changes, because my guess is you've got both of those in your portfolio.

Dan ([20:37](#)):

Yeah. Firsthand, inside an organization, like Telus. As well as, or as a sidecar or as a Sherpa, a guide on the side, someone that's helping from the outside looking in. It sounds such a cliché, but you start pulling at the emotional heartstrings. Questions, when you're doing one-on-one stuff or small group, things like, how do you want to be known when you leave this planet? How do you want to be known when you leave this organization? How do you want to be known when you leave this room? What do you want your reputation to be? What do you stand for? What do you want your kids, your neighbors, your pastor to say about you? I mean, you're as good as your last interaction with somebody. So why are you making them all crappy or making people feel without worth and so forth? I think that existential questioning at times, at least for me, has helped.

MBS ([21:43](#)):

I can see that's a powerful strategy for you to use. My guess is if I'm looking across the table, there are some people who go, "Look, I want to be known for being a rich person who's senior in an organization, and that's all playing out quite nicely. Thank you. So, I don't know why we're having this conversation." Take me onto the other side of the table. What do you see over there that makes them more likely that they're willing to commit to something like this, or at least have a good go at it?



Dan ([22:13](#)):

Those are very difficult personalities to begin with. That goes without saying. And what I try to do at least, is to infiltrate by, again, both either legacy type of questioning or what do you ultimately want to stand for? There are those that may not be able to come all the way, but can see if you give them that carrot of, would you like to maybe earn a little more, would you like your portfolio to be a little larger? And again, it seems antithetical to what I'm preaching here, but maybe I'm not going to get you all the way on the purpose driven life. That's fine. But what if you employ some of these tactics for your team, for the organization on the whole, what you're doing is the do-good model within, is going to help you off of, or help you in a way that might be monetarily beneficial. I'm not sure you can unlearn sociopathy, Michael.

MBS ([23:26](#)):

I don't think you can either. I think if you look at senior leaders and we know the research that says, "There's a disproportionate number of sociopaths at the top of organizations, because sociopaths are the least interested in a conversation about a human centered purpose driven organization." They're like, "How do I optimize for results, and I don't mind if a few people get crushed along the way, because, whatever, I'm a sociopath." I mean, I just sit with this Dan, because it's such a powerful question. When I think of the organizations I work with, but also the organizations I'm trying to build myself, whether that's Box of Crayons or MBS.works, we're really trying to embrace this idea of being human centered.

MBS ([24:15](#)):

And I do wonder whether it's almost impossible to retrofit an organization with it. I can see how you can try and build an organization with these principles. It's hard. They give you a better chance, but trying to retrofit... I'm thinking of, pick a bank in Canada, where we both live. There are four big banks, and I know a bunch of people in all of those banks across in the L&D and the OD and the HR worlds. They're people who would agree with this conversation, and I wonder



how you'd go about shifting an organization as big and as complex and as financially driven as one of the banks.

Dan ([25:05](#)):

Let me play it back to you with a different example, because I know you have firsthand experience, I'm not asking you to divulge, but I know of friends and acquaintances inside the organization that have been through, really the two kind of pivot points that the organization has gone through. And that was, Gates to Ballmer at Microsoft. And Ballmer to Nadella. Now with Satya Nadella, its current CEO at Microsoft, and obviously with Kath Hogan, what you have are two people that came in around the same time, six years ago I think, if not mistaken, having accepted the task that the rains that they were holding was a very power mongering, hierarchical, almost [crosstalk 00:26:01]

MBS ([26:01](#)):

Very old school.

Dan ([26:02](#)):

Yeah, very old school. And to Nadella's credit, and Hogan's. They basically came in and said, all right, we got to shift the culture from know-it-alls to learn-it-alls, from sociopathy to empathy. And their hundreds of thousands of employees around the world.

MBS ([26:20](#)):

And pulling it off. It's amazing actually.

Dan ([26:22](#)):

And pulling it off. But if we're at going into their tenures, year seven, it took about three years to begin with, to unravel a lot of the antiquated ways of what Microsoft thought leadership was. Right? And so again, from my direct knowledge of people inside the organization at executive levels, the team there had to re-engineer what leadership meant. Because you asked about the four



banks in Canada, and I think there may be five, but that's another story for another day.

MBS ([27:01](#)):

Apologies to the fifth bank.

Dan ([27:04](#)):

It's the lesser known. But it's possible, it's my point. If a Microsoft, languishing in its own awful management practices, not leadership even, just management, can do it, and quite well, from the know-it-all to learn-it-all mantra. Why can't a bank?

MBS ([27:23](#)):

Yeah, that's true.

Dan ([27:24](#)):

Larry Fink at BlackRock is a pretty good example. When Larry Fink, circa eight years ago, was Larry Fink, he was shareholder driven. Never uttered the word purpose in his life before. My opinion. And then somehow, somebody or just society caught up with him, and they pivoted. They did a 180 on how they're investing their \$8 trillion. The annual January shareholder letter is amazing, because he calls out what should be an ethical way in which we operate and live. Even during the pandemic, he came out basically on March the 15th, four days after it was announced there was a pandemic and said, "We will not lay off anyone. And if they can't come into work or they can't whatever, we're still going to pay you." So, I do think it's possible. It's just that we don't have enough Satya Nadella's and Larry Fink's out there.

MBS ([28:19](#)):

Yeah. In the news recently had been how Goldman Sachs has handled the pandemic, and it stands in kind of stark contrast to that.



Dan ([28:29](#)):

Completely. And others, like Citigroup, now with its new CEO, and thank gosh that she's come in and said things like, "No Zoom Fridays", and "Everyone gets one mental health wellness day." The company is taking a day off this July, I think everyone. It's a start. We're starting there, I can see in Citigroup. I think Goldman Sachs has some issues.

MBS ([28:53](#)):

Unless you just like lots of money in which case it's doing just fine. So, Dan, when you think of organizations... Charles Handy, I think is an optimist, but I'm wondering now, 2021, do you feel like you're an optimist or a pessimist in terms of the evolution of organizations, the human, the un-human resourcing of organizations?

Dan ([29:18](#)):

I'm both. There are certainly individuals and organizations, as a pessimist, that I believe, will never change. They're not incented to, or incentivized. They just don't want to, and it's not going to happen until there's a change. But generally speaking, as an optimist, and knowing that, I do believe that most of us wake up and say, "How am I going to do a good job today at work? How can I help someone?" Right. I do believe that. There's the bureaucracy and the chains and the scientific principles of management that get in the way. Taylorism, command and control, procurement teams. I'm just kidding procurement teams, I love you. [crosstalk 00:30:03] But I think both, for sure. I am both a pessimist and an optimist.

MBS ([30:11](#)):

I fluctuate. I want to be optimistic. I am most of the time. I also wonder sometimes whether optimism grows from a place of privilege? Where the fact that we're both middle-aged, white, straight dudes, helps us feel more optimistic? Just reading some of the stuff that's become more apparent around,



what is it like to be a person of color? What is it like to be a woman? What is it like to be differently gendered? All of that. I wonder if they'd feel the same degree of optimism that you and I might feel?

Dan ([30:52](#)):

No. I grew up in Hamilton, Ontario, and I grew up with a very dear best friend, best man at our wedding, Kendall Knights and Kendall... Just living vicariously through Kendall, through my upbringing, and to this day, I learn and learned so much of the plight of a non-white individual. And it stops me in my tracks every time when I just think about Kendall, but then I think about my other friends of Asian descent, of Indian descent. It just maps itself into this cauldron of pessimism for me, because I start thinking about what I haven't perhaps done as good as I could have done when in leadership roles. And I'm completely disappointed in myself where I could have taken other actions than I tried to. There's a running conversation in our family of two girls and one boy, and then Denise of course, about equal pay. And we're just coming off the heels of Equal Pay Day. I mean, 20 years ago, Equal Pay Day was September 15th, and now it's March 24th. Should we say hooray? I suppose. That's the optimist in me, but Equal Pay Day should be January 1st, Michael.

MBS ([32:25](#)):

Right. Exactly. And the way Equal Pay Day works, is you celebrate the day that... What does that? The women... It's proportional to the percentage that women get paid relative to men, right?

Dan ([32:36](#)):

Correct. Right. That's exactly it. Hence, women are waiting to get paid on until March 24th is the point. And it's just ridiculous. And then you look at Latinos and just different races. It's just insane. So, when we start talking down that rat hole, not optimist at all, because there's so much work to do, but there's the optimist in me that says, "We can do it."



MBS ([33:05](#)):

Yeah. The language that's used is, "Othering" other people, but that idea, objectifying it, making them a thing rather than connecting to the complexity and the messiness and the beauty of all that humanity, that's where you make that connection back to Handy going, "You're managing that, not leading that" and that piece I love. You and I have talked about this many times in fact, which is that sense of how do you bring the complexity of humanity back into the heart of organizations to make it a rich place to work, in all the meanings of that word? Dan let me ask you this. This is my wrap up question. I'm really enjoying asking at the end of interviews... What needs to be said that hasn't yet been said in this interview?

Dan ([34:00](#)):

I would say this, Michael, look in the mirror and ask yourself what more can I do tomorrow to further the cause of our humanity? This is a conversation with yourself. You are the only one that's going to change you. And once you begin to change you, you can then help to change others. And if you're unable to change you, I don't want to deal with you. You're not my kind.

MBS ([34:38](#)):

You manage resources, and you lead people. That's such a clear distinction. I'm not sure I'd ever quite got that before. But honestly every time I speak with Dan, I'm reminded that the very nature of organizations is to be efficient, and organization and its strategy want to be managed. Numbers. Impact. But there's a tension. The tension is that organizations are not just their strategy. They're also messy, brilliant, difficult, extraordinary people. Those too are your organization and the best organizations, in gender autonomy, and growth, and wisdom, and connection, and courage, and love.



MBS ([35:26](#)):

You can learn more about Dan's work at danpontefract.com. That's D-A-N-P-O-N-T-E-F-R-A-C-T.com. You can find him on LinkedIn as well, and he's on Twitter [@dpontefract](#). Honestly, I can recommend all of his books, but if this episode in particular has struck a chord, I would personally start with his latest, which is called, Lead. Care. Win.

MBS ([35:50](#)):

Thank you, dear friends for listening to the podcast, 2 Pages with MBS. It is a joy for me to do. It's a joy also to be building a community. We have a free community called Duke Humfrey's. The Duke Humfrey's Library is what it's named after. The cool library at Oxford University, where they used to keep all the most precious, most valuable books. If you join the free community, you'll get access to transcripts, and unreleased episodes and much more as well. Check it out, Duke Humfrey's at MBS.works, that's the website, /podcast. And of course, the podcast grows best and most easily and most gracefully through word of mouth. So, if you've loved Dan's talk, and you're like, "Oh, I know other OD people or HR people, or learning and development people who should hear this conversation, pick one and let them know about the episode. I'd be grateful. They might be grateful as well. And speaking of gratitude, if you have a chance to leave a review and a rating on your podcast app of choice, well that just warms the cockles of my heart. Thank you. You are awesome. And you're doing great.