



— HUMAN DEVELOPMENT ARCHITECTURE · VOLUME VI

The Systems We *Forget* We Made

*Why organisations keep producing what no one intends - and the bounded, real power
we still have to change them.*

How the structures we build shape who we become.

About this volume. Volume 5 held its boundary to the group you can see and feel - the team, the family, the room where a single honest voice can change the weather. But you also live inside something larger: organisations of hundreds or thousands, institutions older than anyone now in them. And at that scale something changes in kind. A large organisation is not one field you can feel. It is a system - a structure of many groups, bound together by hierarchies, rules, incentives and an enduring culture, that no single person designed, no single person controls, and that will outlast everyone now inside it.

This volume steps up to that scale: the system. It is the most impersonal of the worlds we live in, and in some ways the most powerful, precisely because it shapes us not through anyone's presence but through structure itself - and structure is invisible in a way a mood is not. We will keep the focus here, on the organisation and the institution. The largest scale of all - society, the whole cultural water an entire people swims in - is a further step still, and it is the subject of the final volume.

The organising question of the whole volume is this:

How does a system - larger than any group, outliving everyone in it, authored by no one now alive - shape who people become, and can it be changed?

This is the scale at which it is easiest to lose the reader in one of two ways: into cynicism, where systems are so powerful that nothing can be done, or into naive heroism, where one determined person will fix everything by force of virtue. This

 © 2026 Anna Tan - Human Development Architecture, volume VI: The Systems We Forget We Made - hda.life

volume refuses both. It aims to show the real and often sobering power of systems over the people inside them - and, honestly, the bounded but genuine power those people still have to change them.

A note on knowing, as before: claims resting on solid research are named as such, considered stances are named as stances, and load-bearing claims are marked in brackets using the project's vocabulary - *Evidence-supported*, *Theory*, *Professional judgement*, *Working hypothesis*, *Philosophical reflection*, *Open question*.

CHAPTER 1

The Water You Cannot Feel

The person the place made you

You have joined an organisation and, some months later, found yourself behaving in ways you would not have predicted.

You arrived direct, and became careful. You arrived collaborative, and learned to guard your territory. You arrived full of energy, and found yourself slowly ground down, going through motions you once would have questioned. You did not decide any of this. There was no moment where you chose to become more cautious or more political or more tired. And yet, watching yourself, you could see it had happened - and you could see it happening to others, the bright newcomers who arrived idealistic and, a year on, sounded exactly like everyone else. Nobody set out to change. The place changed them.

In the last volume, a group shaped you through a field you could feel - the mood in the room, the warmth or chill of the people around you. A system does something different, and stranger. It shapes you without anyone being present to do it. It works through structure - through the arrangement of the thing itself - and structure is invisible in a way a mood is not. You can feel a tense room. You cannot feel an incentive, or a reporting line, or the way work has been divided. So the system's influence reaches you not as a felt pressure you could point to, but as a slow, authorless

change in who you are becoming, which you only notice, if you notice it at all, by its results.

Structure, not presence

This is the step up in scale that defines this volume. A group is people you can see, close enough that a single honest voice can shift the room. A system is too large for that. It is a structure of many groups - who reports to whom, who is allowed to talk to whom, how the work is carved up, what gets counted, what gets rewarded, what the rules permit and forbid - and that structure shapes the behaviour of everyone inside it, largely regardless of who the individuals are. Swap out the people and keep the structure, and you tend to get the same behaviour from entirely different human beings, because the structure, not the personalities, is doing much of the shaping. (*Evidence-supported: structural and situational features of organisations shape behaviour powerfully, often more than individual disposition.*)

This is why you cannot deal with a system the way you dealt with a group. In a group, you could name the unspoken norm and watch it crack. A structure does not respond to being named in the same way, because it is not held up, moment to moment, by the immediate participation of people you can see. It is built into the arrangement, and it keeps working whether or not anyone is attending to it. The forces here are more impersonal, and correspondingly harder to move - a fact we will have to take seriously, and not pretend away, when we come to the question of change.

You entered something already running

There is a second thing that makes a system different from every scale before it. It was here before you, and it will be here after you.

You did not, on joining, gather a group of people and build a shared world with them from scratch, as the last volume described. You walked into a structure that was already running - designed, if that is even the word, by people who are mostly gone, refined by decades of decisions no one remembers making, and now simply *there*, the given reality of the place. You inherited it. And it began shaping you immediately, before you had any chance to shape it back, teaching you within weeks how things are done here, what is possible here, who you have to become to succeed here. The organisation is older than your membership and will continue after it, absorbing and reshaping each new person who arrives, including you. When people say "that's just the culture here," this is what they are pointing at, even if they could not say so: the accumulated, inherited shape of the structure, older than anyone in it, quietly forming everyone who enters. (*Evidence-supported / Theory*: organisations socialise newcomers into established patterns, and those patterns persist across generations of members.)

To develop consciously at this scale, then, begins with an unsettling recognition: that some meaningful part of who you have become was authored not by you, nor by any person you could name, but by a structure you entered already running - a water you have been swimming in without being able to feel it.

Before you turn the page

We have established the scale of this volume and its central strangeness: a system shapes you through structure rather than presence, invisibly, and it precedes and outlasts you, so that you are formed by an arrangement no one is standing behind.

But "structure" is still abstract. If the system shapes me through its arrangement rather than through anyone's will, what, precisely, in that arrangement does the shaping? Of all the parts of a system - the hierarchy, the rules, the divisions, the culture - which one actually reaches into a person and changes what they do, day after day, until it changes who they are?

There is one force stronger than all the others, and most organisations barely notice they are wielding it. It is not what they say they value. It is what they actually reward.

End of Volume 6, Chapter 1.

CHAPTER 2

What the System Rewards, You Become

The values on the wall and the rules of the game

Every organisation tells you what it values. It is on the wall, in the handbook, in the leader's speeches: we put people first, we care about quality, we act with integrity, we are one team.

And every organisation also teaches you, quickly and wordlessly, what actually gets you ahead. Perhaps it is hitting the number, whatever it costs. Perhaps it is being visible, looking busy, being seen to work late. Perhaps it is never being the one who raised the awkward problem. You learn the real rules within weeks, and you learn them not from the wall but from watching who gets promoted, who gets praised, who gets paid, and who quietly gets passed over. And when the values on the wall and the rules of the game point in different directions - as they so often do - you do not have to be told which one is real. You already know. Everyone knows.

This gap is not a minor hypocrisy. It is the doorway to the strongest force a system exerts on the people inside it. A system shapes you, above all, through its *incentives* - through what it actually rewards, measures, promotes and punishes. And over time, you become what your system rewards.

People become what is rewarded

Recall from Volume 3 that you become what you repeatedly do - that identity is built, from the outside in, by accumulated action. Now place a person inside a structure that rewards certain actions and punishes others, day after day, year after year. The incentives shape what they repeatedly do, and what they repeatedly do shapes who they become. This is how a system reaches past behaviour and into character. It does not just get you to act a certain way; over enough time, it makes you into the kind of person who acts that way, until the behaviour the system rewards no longer feels imposed but simply feels like you. (*Evidence-supported*: reward structures powerfully shape behaviour; the claim that they reshape character over time follows from how repeated action builds identity.)

This is why "culture" is not what an organisation professes but what it actually rewards. You can post "quality first" on every wall, but if the only thing that gets rewarded is speed, you will get corner-cutting from conscientious people, and you will get it reliably, because the incentive is real and the poster is not. You can preach collaboration and promote only lone heroes, and you will get silos, no matter how many team-building days you run. The stated value is a story the organisation tells about itself. The incentive is the truth the organisation lives, and its people read the truth unerringly, because their livelihood, status and security depend on reading it right.

That last point is why incentives are so much more powerful than exhortation. When a system tells people to behave one way while rewarding another, the reward wins every time - not because people are weak or venal, but because the incentive is tied to the deep drives we met in the last volume, to belonging and security and survival, while the exhortation is only words. You cannot sermon a person out of the behaviour their livelihood rewards. This is the single most important reason that appeals to "try harder" and "do better" fail to change systems, and we will return to it when we ask how systems actually change.

The character a system quietly grows

None of this means incentives are wicked. Every system needs them; a structure with no rewards or consequences cannot coordinate anyone toward anything. The danger is not that incentives exist. The danger is that they are usually invisible to the very people they are shaping, and that they keep working whether or not anyone has checked what character they are quietly growing.

Because you do not experience yourself as chasing rewards. You do not think, "I am becoming ruthless because ruthlessness is rewarded here." You simply find that, over the years, you have become someone who does well in this place - and you may not notice, until you leave or look closely, how much the place selected and shaped that person. Good people become complicit in bad outcomes this way, one rewarded action at a time, never crossing a line they could name, each step feeling normal because the system made it normal. And whole organisations become something no one intended, because the incentives were set once, for some local reason, and then left to run, shaping thousands of people toward an end no one ever chose.

The developmental move, as always, begins with sight. Look at any system you are part of and set aside, entirely, what it says it values. Ask instead: what actually gets rewarded here? What gets punished? And what kind of person is that, slowly, turning people into - including you? To see the real incentives is to stop being shaped by them blindly, and it is also the first step toward the only kind of change that works at this scale, which is not changing what a system preaches, but changing what it rewards.

Before you turn the page

We have found the strongest structural force: incentives, which shape what people do, and through what they do, who they become - reaching past behaviour into character, and overriding whatever the organisation claims to value.



But the system has a way of shaping you that is more intimate still, and stranger. It is not only that the system rewards certain behaviour. It is that the very *position* you occupy within the structure reshapes you - so that the same human being becomes a noticeably different person depending on the seat they sit in. The kind colleague who becomes a hard manager. The reasonable person who, given power, changes. It can seem as though the seat, and not the soul, is the thing in charge.

How a position remakes the person who fills it is where we go next.

End of Volume 6, Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 3

The Position Makes the Person

The seat that changed someone you knew

You have watched a position change a person.

The kind, reasonable colleague who was promoted into management and became, over a year, harder, more distant, more willing to disappoint people they would once have gone out of their way to help. At the time you may have thought, "power went to their head" - but it might be truer to say the role remade them. Or you have felt it in yourself: the moment you had to enforce a rule you privately disagreed with, deliver news you hated delivering, defend the organisation's line against your own instinct - not because you had changed your mind, but because the position you now held required it, and the position, it turned out, had requirements of its own.

Beyond rewarding certain behaviour, a system shapes people through the positions they occupy. And a position is not merely a job. It is a location in the structure, with its own pressures, its own information, its own view of the world - and it reshapes whoever sits in it.

The logic of the seat

Every position carries a logic that is not the occupant's. The manager must sometimes disappoint the very people they would rather please, because the seat demands choices the individual would never volunteer for. The gatekeeper comes to see risks and threats that were invisible to them as a newcomer, because the seat faces those risks. The person accountable for the results feels a relentless pressure that is genuinely invisible from below, and behaves accordingly, in ways that look cold or driven to those who cannot feel what the seat feels. Sit a different person in the same position and, remarkably often, they end up behaving much the same - not because they share a personality, but because they are subject to the same logic, the same pressures, the same view. The seat shapes the sitter.

Power is the sharpest example. Holding power over others tends, quietly, to change people - how they treat those beneath them, how much they attend to others' needs, how they see themselves. There is evidence that power can dull our attunement to other people, making us less attentive to those we have power over, even in people who were perfectly attentive before. (*Evidence-supported / Theory*: holding power tends to change behaviour and can reduce attention to others' perspectives.) The person did not necessarily arrive corrupt. The position did some of the corrupting - or, in better cases, some of the maturing, for seats can call out largeness as well as smallness. Either way, the point stands: the seat is not neutral. It presses its own shape onto whoever fills it.

Why replacing people rarely changes anything

Here is the consequence that matters most, and it is one of the hardest lessons about systems. Because positions shape their occupants, a system reproduces its behaviour through whoever it seats - which means that replacing the individual, while leaving the position unchanged, usually changes very little.

You remove the manager everyone complains about and install a good person in their place, and for a few months things feel different, and then, slowly, the good person begins to behave like their predecessor - not because they were secretly the same, but because the position, the incentives, and the structure around the seat are exactly as they were, and those are what were producing the behaviour all along. This is why the endless organisational hope of "if only we had better people" so often disappoints. The people were frequently fine. The positions were the problem. As long as the seat's logic and the surrounding structure are untouched, new occupants will be reshaped toward the same old behaviour, one after another, and the system will look, from outside, as though it has a permanent character - which, in a sense, it does, a character that lives in the structure rather than in any person.

This also means you can never fully read a person from their behaviour in a role, because the role is speaking as loudly as the person. And it means that stepping into a position will change you, whether or not you intend it - you will feel the seat's pull the moment you sit down. That pull is real and strong, and it is underestimated by almost everyone who has not felt it. But - and this matters for everything ahead - it is a pull, not a puppet-string. People do vary within the same seat. Some retain, inside a demanding position, an integrity and a humanity that the seat does not require and does not reward. Holding onto yourself within a role that is trying to reshape you is difficult, and it is possible, and it is one of the real freedoms left at this scale.

Before you turn the page

We have now seen two of the system's deepest powers: it rewards people into a certain character, and it seats them into a certain behaviour, reshaping whoever occupies its positions and reproducing itself through each new arrival.

But this raises a question that should be growing uneasy in your mind. If the positions shape the people, and the incentives shape the people, and the whole structure precedes

© 2026 Anna Tan - Human Development Architecture, Volume VI: The Systems We Forget We Made - hda.life

everyone now in it and reshapes each newcomer - then who, exactly, is in charge? Who designed this thing that is shaping millions of lives? Where did its structure and its incentives and its positions come from, and who is running it now?

The answer is stranger and more unsettling than a flawed designer or a hidden hand. The answer, very often, is: no one. And understanding that no one is at the controls is the key to everything that follows.

End of Volume 6, Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 4

The Author No One Remembers

Looking for who decided

You have gone looking, at some point, for whoever decided.

The process that makes no sense and wastes everyone's time. The rule that serves no living purpose. The way things are done here that everybody complains about and nobody can change. You followed it up the chain, trying to find the person responsible, the one you could reason with - and you found no one. Each person pointed elsewhere. Each said, in their own words, "that's just how it is," "it's always been this way," "that's the system." The chair where the author should have been sitting was empty.

This is not a failure of your search. It is the truth about large systems, and it is stranger than any villain. Nobody designed this. There is no author to find.

How a thing no one made comes to be

A large organisation or institution was not designed by anyone. It accreted. Over years and decades, many people - most of them now gone - made countless small decisions, each solving a real problem in their own moment: a rule to prevent yesterday's disaster, a position created for a person long since departed, a process bolted on to handle a situation that no longer exists. Each decision left behind a structure. The structures

 © 2026 Anna Tan · Human Development Architecture, Volume VI: The Systems We Forget We Made · hda.life

layered, tangled, and hardened, until the whole became something that no single mind designed, no single mind understands, and no single mind controls. It is less like a building than like a coral reef - the accumulated deposit of generations, grown rather than built. (*Theory*: institutions largely emerge and accrete through path-dependent decisions over time, rather than being designed as wholes.)

And you inherit the whole accumulated result as if it were simply reality. This is the crucial move, and it happens automatically. Because the structure was here before you, and because everyone around you treats it as given, it comes to feel as natural and fixed and authorless as the landscape - not a human artifact full of old, forgotten choices, but just "how things are." This is the same trick we met at the very start of this journey, where an interpretation felt like reality itself; here it operates at the scale of an entire institution. The made comes to feel given. The chosen comes to feel necessary. The temporary solution of some vanished afternoon comes to feel like a law of nature. (*Theory / Philosophical reflection*: human-made social arrangements tend to be experienced by later generations as objective, given features of reality.)

The peculiar powers of an authorless thing

Three consequences follow, and together they explain much of what makes systems so hard to live with and to change.

The first is that there is often no one to appeal to. The maddening arrangement has no author to reason with, no mind behind it that could be persuaded to see sense. The buck stops nowhere. This is the peculiar helplessness people feel before systems - not that a powerful someone is refusing to help, but that there is no someone at all, only a structure, running.

The second is that the system reproduces itself. It selects and promotes the people who fit it, and quietly filters out those who do not, so that its character is carried forward.

 © 2026 Anna Tan - Human Development Architecture, Volume VI: The Systems We Forget We Made - hda.life

across generations of members without anyone carrying it forward on purpose. The system perpetuates its own kind, staffing itself, over time, with people shaped to keep it as it is. (*Theory*: systems tend to select for and reproduce the traits and behaviours that fit them.)

The third is that the system has a momentum of its own - a strong tendency to preserve itself and resist change, not because anyone wills its preservation, but because all its parts, the incentives and positions and norms, are arranged to reproduce the current state. We have met this force at every scale of this work: the self that defends its shape, the relationship that restores its dance, the group that pulls a deviant back into line. Here it appears at its largest and most impersonal - a whole system defending its own equilibrium, with no defender in charge. Systems, like selves, are built to stay the same.

The forgetting, and the hope hidden in it

And yet, buried in all this, is the most hopeful fact in the volume, and it turns on that single word: *made*. The system feels fixed, permanent, given - but that feeling is an illusion produced by forgetting. The structure was not handed down by nature. It was made, by human choices, however old and forgotten those choices are. And what was made by human choices can, in principle, be remade by them.

This does not make change easy - we will be honest about that in the final chapter. A thing made by so many people, so long ago, so tangled together, and actively defending its own equilibrium, is genuinely hard to remake. But there is a vast difference between *impossible* and *very difficult*, and the whole difference lies in remembering that the system was made. Forgetting that it was authored makes it feel like weather, and no one tries to change the weather. Remembering that it was authored - that every fixed-seeming structure is the frozen residue of some human decision - makes it, once again, a human thing, and human things can be touched. The simple act of asking, of a

© 2024 Anna Tan - Human Development Architecture, Volume 7: The Systems We Forget We Made - hda.life

maddening arrangement, "who made this, and when, and for what problem that no longer exists?" begins to thaw its false permanence. You will usually find a reasonable answer to a vanished question, still running long after its reason died - and seeing that is the first loosening of the system's grip.

Before you turn the page

We have reached the strange heart of the system scale: a structure authored by no one now alive, inherited as reality, reproducing itself, defending its own equilibrium, with no one at the controls.

But if no one designed it and no one is running it, a hard question follows. How does a thing with no author produce such definite, reliable outcomes? And, more troublingly, how does it produce real harm - waste, unfairness, cruelty, suffering - when you often cannot find a single person inside it who wanted that harm or chose it? How can a system full of decent people, each trying to do right, reliably produce a wrong that none of them intended?

That is perhaps the most important thing to understand about systems, and it is where we go next.

End of Volume 6, Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 5

The Harm No One Chose

Good people, bad outcome

You have seen an organisation harm the very people it exists to serve, while nearly everyone inside it was trying to do right.

The caring institution that somehow grinds down the vulnerable people it was built to help. The company full of decent employees whose combined work produces something that hurts its customers. The process, designed with good intentions, that reliably crushes the person it was meant to support. And when you go looking for the villain - the one whose cruelty explains the cruelty of the outcome - you cannot find them. Everyone is doing their job. Everyone is, more or less, decent. Each person, asked, would be genuinely distressed by the harm, and each is, in their own eyes, simply doing what their role reasonably requires. The wrong is real, and it has no author.

This is the most important thing to understand about systems, and it is the hardest to hold, because it violates a deep and comforting belief: that bad outcomes must come from bad people. Sometimes they do. But an enormous amount of human harm is produced by good people inside bad structures - and that is far more unsettling than villainy, because you cannot fix it by finding and removing the wicked. There are no wicked to remove.

How a structure manufactures harm no one wants

A system can reliably produce an outcome that no individual in it intends, because the outcome emerges from the structure, not from anyone's heart. Three features of systems, which we have already met separately, combine to make this happen.

First, the structure fragments the whole. Each person sees only their piece - their task, their metric, their part of the process - and no one sees, or is responsible for, the total result. The harm appears only when all the pieces combine, and by then it is downstream of everyone and owned by no one. Second, the incentives pull each person toward behaviour that is locally reasonable but collectively harmful: everyone follows the reward in front of them, as the last chapters described, and the sum of all those rational local moves is a harm that none of them would have chosen if they could have seen and willed the whole. Third, responsibility diffuses. "I'm just doing my job." "I only handle my part." "I'm following the process." Each statement is true, and together they mean that no one experiences themselves as the author of the outcome, and no one feels able, or entitled, to stop it. (*Evidence-supported / Theory*: responsibility diffuses across many hands, and complex systems generate emergent outcomes that no participant intended.)

Put these together and you have a machine for producing authorless harm. It is the darkest expression of a theme that has run through this entire body of work - that wholes produce what none of their parts intended - and at the system scale, what the whole produces can be genuine, large-scale human suffering, generated by an organisation full of people who each go home believing, correctly, that they personally did nothing wrong.

Complicity without malice

This leaves you in a genuinely difficult moral position, and it is worth naming honestly rather than resolving too quickly. It means you can be complicit in real harm without any wrong intention at all - simply by faithfully playing your structural part in a system whose combined output is harmful. Most people who have participated in terrible things were not monsters. They were ordinary people doing their jobs inside structures that added their decent individual actions up into something monstrous.

There are two ways to get this wrong, and they are opposite errors. The first is denial: "I'm only doing my job, it's not my responsibility, it's the system" - which is true as far as it goes, and which becomes, if you stop there, the most ordinary way in which good people let harm continue. It is the excuse that keeps the machine running. The second error is the reverse: to collapse under guilt for a systemic outcome you did not design and cannot individually stop, taking the weight of the whole onto your single conscience until it crushes you into paralysis or despair.

The honest place is between them. You are not the sole author of the system's harm - you did not design it, and you cannot end it alone. And you are not innocent - you are a part of it, and your participation is part of what sustains it. The right response to complicity-without-malice is neither denial nor guilt, but *responsibility*: to see clearly what your part actually contributes, to refuse the pieces you can refuse, and to direct your real energy where it can actually go. And here is where seeing the truth about systems stops being bleak and becomes useful. If the harm is produced by the structure, then the structure is exactly where change can be made. "No one chose this; the system produces it" is not a counsel of despair that ends in "so nothing can be done." It is a map. It tells you that the leverage is not in hunting for villains who mostly do not exist, nor in exhorting good people to try harder, but in changing the arrangement that turns their good efforts into bad results.

This does not mean no one is ever responsible. The people who knowingly design, maintain and defend harmful structures bear real responsibility, and so do those who hide behind "the system" to excuse a cruelty they could personally refuse. The claim is not that responsibility vanishes into the structure. It is that systemic harm usually cannot be reduced to individual villainy - and that seeing this changes where a serious person looks for the solution: away from blame, and toward design.

Before you turn the page

We have now seen the full, sobering power of systems: they shape people through incentives and positions, they are authored by no one and defend their own equilibrium, and they can manufacture real harm through the combined actions of people who each meant no harm at all.

Which brings us, at last, to the question this whole volume has been circling, and the one that matters most for a person who wants to develop rather than despair. If the system is this powerful - impersonal, self-reproducing, authorless, capable of turning good people's efforts into harm - can it actually be changed? And what can one person do, especially one without power, without falling into either of the two traps that swallow most people at this scale: the cynicism that says nothing can change, and the naive heroism that burns itself out believing one virtuous soul can change everything?

How systems really change, and what your real but bounded power over them is, is where this volume ends.

End of Volume 6, Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 6

Changing What No One Controls

Why the usual attempts fail

You have watched people try to change a system, and you have watched most of them fail in one of two predictable ways.

The first is exhortation. Someone stands up and says the organisation must care more, try harder, act with integrity, put people first. There is an inspiring speech, a values retreat, a new poster. And nothing changes - because the incentives, the positions, and the structure that were producing the behaviour are all exactly as they were, and a speech is no match for structure. The second is replacing people. Out goes the individual everyone blamed, in comes a good person - and within a year the good person behaves like the last one, because the seat and its surroundings are unchanged, and the seat, as we saw, shapes the sitter. Both attempts fail for the same reason: they aim at attitudes and individuals, when the system's behaviour lives in its structure.

And when these attempts fail, as they usually do, people collapse into one of two attitudes. Cynicism: nothing ever changes here, so why try. Or burnout: the lone crusader who believes their own virtue and determination will fix the whole thing, and who exhausts and breaks themselves against a structure that barely notices. This volume has been building toward a way past both, and it rests on a single principle we have proven from every angle: at this scale, behaviour follows structure. So to change the behaviour, you change the structure.

© 2026 Anna Tan · Changing the System of Structure, Volume VI: The Systems We Forget We Made · hda.life

How systems actually change

Real system change works with that principle rather than against it. It has a few recognisable forms, and none of them is a rousing speech.

The most direct is to **change the structure and the incentives** - what gets rewarded, how the work is arranged, who is accountable for the whole rather than only their piece, what information flows to whom. Change these, and behaviour changes, even with exactly the same people, because you have altered the forces that were shaping them. This is the core leverage at the system scale, and it is why the serious work of changing an organisation is design work, not motivational work. You do not have to redesign everything, either: systems have leverage points, places where a single well-chosen change - a different metric, a new line of accountability, a redesigned process - ripples outward and reorganises far more than itself. (*Theory*: complex systems can shift substantially in response to changes at key leverage points.)

The second form is **coordinated pressure**. A lone voice, we saw at the group scale, is easily absorbed; at the system scale it is absorbed even more easily. But organised people - a coalition inside the organisation, a movement around it, enough members pushing together in a sustained way - can move structures that no individual could budge. Systems change under collective, persistent pressure. This is the group scale's lesson, "find your second person," raised to institutional size: if you would change a system, do not go alone, because alone is precisely the size a system knows how to ignore. (*Evidence-supported / Theory*: sustained collective action is one of the principal ways large systems are changed.)

The third form is **disruption**. A system defends its equilibrium relentlessly - until a shock cracks it open. A crisis, a public failure, an external threat, a technological upheaval: these break the system's normal functioning and, for a window, make it genuinely changeable in ways it never is during calm. This is the system-scale version of something we have seen at every level - that change so often begins with a

© 2024 Anna Tan. All rights reserved. For more on systems, design, and the systems we forget we made, visit [hda.life](https://www.hda.life).

disruption that forces a closed thing open. Crises are dangerous, and they are also the rare moments when what was frozen becomes briefly liquid. The people who change systems often are not those who generate the crisis, but those who are ready, when it comes, with a better structure to put in its place. (*Theory*: systems tend to change in punctuated bursts around crises rather than through steady gradual reform.)

And the fourth form is simply **time**. Systems change slowly, through structural pressure sustained over years, far more often than through overnight transformation. The patience we found essential to changing a single self is essential here too, multiplied by the size of the thing.

Your real, bounded power

So what can one person do? The honest answer refuses both traps, and it has four parts.

If you hold a lever, use it. If you occupy a position - even a modest one - that can shape structure, incentives, or accountability, that is where your leverage lives, and using it well is worth more than any amount of exhortation. Design, at your level, better than you were handed. Second, organise. You usually cannot move a system alone, but you can find others and help coordinate the pressure that does move it; much of an individual's real power at this scale is the power to help build a "we." Third, keep your integrity within your part. Even when you cannot change the system, you can refuse to let it fully author you - retain your humanity inside your role, decline the pieces you can decline, treat the people in front of you well even when the structure does not require it. This is small against the size of the system, and it is not nothing: it keeps you whole, it slightly alters the system at your point in it, and it gives others the same permission, which is how larger change so often begins. And fourth, sometimes the honest move is to leave - or to build anew. When a system is too rigid or too harmful and your leverage too small, the clear-eyed choice may be to step out, and to put your

energy into building a new structure, better designed from the start. A great deal of system change comes not from reforming the old but from building the alternative.

Hold this against the two traps and see how it refuses them both. Cynicism says nothing changes - which is false, and worse, self-fulfilling, since it is a decision to do nothing, and doing nothing is precisely what keeps the system as it is. Naive heroism says one virtuous person will fix it all - which is also false, ignores the reality of structure, and ends in exhaustion and self-blame. The truth is between: system change is structural, collective, slow, and genuinely possible, and your part in it is real but bounded, best spent on structure and coordination and integrity rather than on sermons or solo crusades.

This is also where leadership takes its system-scale form, and, as promised, it stays one expression among many. At the group scale, leadership was tending a climate you could feel. Here it becomes design: shaping structures and incentives so that ordinary people are drawn toward good outcomes rather than bad ones - tending, through structure, the conditions for thousands of people you will never meet. It is the same act of creating the conditions in which people can be their better selves, now performed on the impersonal machinery of a system rather than in a single room. And it remains one expression, not the frame: anyone who improves a structure at any level is doing it, with or without the title, and no designer ever controls the whole.

The whole of it

Stand back and see the volume entire. A system shapes people impersonally, through structure, incentives and positions, reshaping whoever it seats. It precedes and outlives everyone in it, was authored by no one now alive, reproduces itself, and defends its own equilibrium. It can manufacture real harm through the combined efforts of people who each intended none. And it can be changed - but through structural redesign, coordinated pressure, disruption and time, not through exhortation or virtue or the

© 2026 Anna Tan · Human Development Architecture, Volume VI: The Systems We Forget We Made · hda.life

swapping of individuals; and the power of any one person over it is bounded, though genuinely real.

This is the reframe the volume delivers. You are not only a self, a set of relationships, and a citizen of groups. You are an inhabitant of systems - impersonal structures that are shaping who you become through arrangements you cannot feel and did not author. To develop consciously is now also to see those systems: to remember that they were made and can be remade, to refuse to let them author you completely, and to spend your real but bounded power where it actually works - on structure, with others, over time.

Before you turn the page

But notice one last thing about even the largest system we have discussed. An organisation, however vast, has a boundary. You can name it, join it, and, in the end, leave it. There is an outside.

There is one system with no outside. Every organisation, every group, every relationship, every self that this whole body of work has explored sits inside the largest system of all: society - the vast, ancient web of shared meanings, worldviews, institutions and assumptions that shapes what an entire people takes to be normal, possible, and real. You can quit a job; you cannot quit your civilization. You could, on leaving an organisation, finally see its structure from outside - but you can never step outside your own culture to look at it, because your culture made the very eyes you would look with. It is the water so total that it has never once, in your whole life, looked like water.

How does the largest system - the one with no outside, that shaped what you take to be reality itself, that precedes and will outlive everyone - shape who we become? And at

that ultimate scale, where we are most shaped and can least escape, is there any freedom left at all?

That is the final question. It is where the journey ends.

End of Volume 6.

— *End of Volume VI* —

 ANNA TAN'S BODY OF WORK

ABOUT THIS WORK

The Human Development Architecture is a coherent, evidence-informed account of how human beings develop - and the single source from which Coaching Go Where's leadership, coaching and team programmes are derived.

CONTINUE & CONNECT

THE BODY OF WORK

hda.life

Anna Tan

anna@hda.life

PROGRAMMES & ORGANISATIONAL WORK

Coaching Go Where

coachinggowhere.com

hello@coachinggowhere.com

© 2026 Anna Tan. All rights reserved.

Human Development Architecture, Volume VI: The Systems We Forget We Made (Version 1.0). This work and the architecture it describes are the intellectual property of Anna Tan and Coaching Go Where. It may be read and shared in full and unaltered for non-commercial purposes with attribution. It may not be reproduced in part, adapted, taught, or used to derive programmes, assessments or other products without written permission. UK spelling. hda.life · coachinggowhere.com