Facilitator moves

THE MAIN MOVE

"What supports that?" Ask for the grounds of a judgment about the person, including an explanation offered to reassure or excuse.

Then ask: **"Who sees it differently?"**

When the room needs help

- **Silence.** Wait ten seconds. Return to the case: "What did we actually observe?"
- **Dominating.** "Let's hear from someone who hasn't spoken and wants to."
- **Excusing.** "Which part is established, and which part are we guessing?"
- **Erasing the pattern.** "What repeated conduct do we have good grounds to name?"
- **Seeking payback.** "What would that consequence protect or repair?"
- **Personal hurt.** Thank them; offer a pause, the shared case, or moving on. Do not probe.

PROTECT THE TIME

Discuss from minute 10 to 60, including the reading at question 1. Apply until minute 80. Shorten follow-ups or omit the reveal if needed; close at minute 80 and finish at 90.

When asked for your view

Offer it briefly: "Here's my tentative view. What would make you doubt it?" Keep the question open.

Notes and follow-up

Fuller explanations, sample responses, and the readings are in the April expanded guide and Meeting Primer. Key texts: Epictetus, *Enchiridion* 45 and 43; Seneca, *Letters* 95.51–53. *On Stoic Living*, Weeks 14–17.

Before You Judge Someone

What did this person do—and what have I added?

Today we examine what conduct supports us in judging about a person, and what fairness still asks of us.

THE MEETING

Date: _____ **Place:** _____

90 minutes of discussion · Justice · Discipline of Assent

Before you begin

Silence your phone, set a quiet timer, and keep this guide open. Have the reading ready on a phone or printout, and a pen for your own notes.

Open (10 minutes)

Welcome. Challenge ideas, give reasons, and share the floor. Passing is always fine. The shared case gives everyone a starting point; no experience with the weekly lessons is needed.

THE SHARED CASE · READ IT ALOUD

At a team meeting, a colleague interrupts you twice. A judgment forms: **"He thinks nothing I say is worth hearing."**

Ask the whole group: **"What do the interruptions give you reason to believe about this person?"** Read the shared case aloud before asking the opening question. Hear two or three initial interpretations without settling them, then carry them into the discussion.

Discuss

READ ALOUD · EPICTETUS, ENCHIRIDION 45

Read the passage aloud from the linked text or the QR code. Epictetus separates a description of what someone does from an evaluation that requires knowledge of their judgment.

Enchiridion 45

Introduce this passage during question 1, where it helps examine the issue already under discussion. Read it aloud and return to that question; avoid adding a separate preliminary round.

1. Where does describing the interruption become judging the person?

Probe: Which words in the first impression go beyond what happened?

2. What evidence would support a broader judgment about the interruptions?

Probe: What does the pattern establish, and what does it leave open?

3. What other true fact deserves a place beside the conduct?

Probe: How could you include it without excusing the interruption?

4. What changes when "that was unfair" becomes "he deserves to suffer"?

Probe: What purpose would make a consequence fair in this case?

5. What fairness is still owed to someone whose conduct you rightly oppose?

Probe: Could you keep a firm criticism while withdrawing a total label?

GOING DEEPER · IF THE ROOM IS READY

When does a warranted judgment of a pattern become a claim that nothing the person says deserves consideration?

Application: test a fair judgment

Work through the steps aloud. Take two or three answers at each step.

1. **Describe.** What did they do, and what have I added? Separate conduct from motive, character, or a verdict about what they deserve.
2. **Test.** What supports my judgment? What else is true and relevant? Include a real pattern; test reassuring explanations too.
3. **Keep it fair.** What can I conclude while keeping their claim to fairness in view? Accept, revise, reject, or leave open; criticism can remain.

IF TIME ALLOWS · THE REVEAL

You recall that he has interrupted several colleagues at each of the last three meetings.

Probe: What does this pattern support? What remains uncertain about his motive or his view of you?

The test is the accuracy, scope, and fairness of the judgment. A complaint or boundary can be mentioned, but performing it is not the measure of understanding.

Close

Return to the opening: **"What did this person do—and what have I added?"** Ask what became clearer or what remains unsettled. Hear brief answers and reasons for a changed view; passing is welcome.

UNTIL NEXT TIME

Notice one judgment about a person and ask what its scope is justified by.

Thank members, confirm the next meeting, and finish on time. Next month we turn to the Discipline of Desire: **How can my desires make room for the good of others?**

After the meeting: send a short recap through your group's usual channel with one or two insights or open questions and the take-home invitation.