

## Call 6-1 audio

Transcribed by [TurboScribe.ai](#). [Go Unlimited](#) to remove this message.

We have a very busy call, although we won't try to cover everything literally, but I made a lot of notes because this is our last R&D call of the second series. We're going to go into the ListenLight program on February the 24th and we're going to take a week to get ready for that. So I won't see you next week because I'll be in an airplane traveling across the ocean and and we'll catch up with you on February the 24th at our regular time.

Hopefully. Little learning is a dangerous thing. I thought that was great because it has a direct connection to what a few of the things I want to talk about today and one of them being pattern recognition, because there was another quote I was trying to get from one of the videos that I saw and it had to do, oh yeah, it was Neil deGrasse Tyson talking about his master class, and he says we need, most of us know enough to learn something, but most of us don't know enough to know whether what we're learning is true or not and then he goes into the spiel about science and all that.

Misguided stuff, but I thought that was very interesting and then I had this quote here already. So a little learning is a dangerous thing. I think that's that what we can talk about with AI too, which we're going to.

And then I put this, I put this reminder to myself. Yes, we're all equal in rights, but we're not equal in talent. I think that's the big, big thing that's missing in society today because we still have this humanistic model that says blank slate is anybody and everybody can do and be whatever it is they want to be and that's just not the case.

I've argued against that since around 2000, but not many ears out there. So just a note before we get started, I think maybe I'm combining a couple of things here and I'll need that extra time to do that. I put this in as a note before we get started and what I was doing was looking at pattern recognition.

I ran across this back in the 80s when I was studying for certification in emotional intelligence, not my own, but how to talk about it, with then what was called the Hay Group. They are now part of Korn Ferry. So they're not the Hay Group anymore and the Hay Group was started by David McClellan, which is how I got into that and they were talking in one of the emotional intelligence slides.

In fact, one of these days I should try to look that back up because I don't have it ready. They were talking about that you needed, and this is before we got into this super political correctness stuff, they were talking about you sort of need an intelligence of around 110 maybe in the minimum to 115 to do management work and their point was that without, it's kind of like when I try to download something on a computer that I've had for a while, some of these apps or some of these things will say to me, oh, you don't have the right operating system, you can't run it. In other words, like I can't run YouTube app on my 2017 Mac for some reason, I don't know why.

I can get it off the web, but something, and then at home I have a 2013 big screen and I can't run Microsoft Office on that. So it's the same type of analogy. In other words, until we

get to a certain point, there are things that you can talk about in this humanistic paradigm that we have, but they don't compute.

And they made a note, and I'm not sure that that note is in that slide, and I want to go back to it because they've since kiboshed all those slides. They don't talk about anything like intelligence anymore or anything like that because everybody is too politically correct and the interesting thing was they said pattern intelligence is not necessarily indicative of an intelligence score, but yet pattern intelligence seems to be a particular type of intelligence, which I think I spoke about in the last call. And I was just doing some things there to bring this back to your notion of why pattern recognition seems to be a black box.

Okay, that's what we know about AI right now. And so I went to AI. I went to the new release of GPT-3 in ChatGPT, which had just come out, and it says it reasons for a while, and I don't know what that exactly means, but I put the notes in there what it told me it was doing.

And so it says it reasoned about pattern recognition intelligence for a couple of seconds. I'm going to try to tie this whole thing together in a minute, but just let me just let me go through this example. Illuminating the core skills, I'm exploring the idea that pattern recognition is crucial for intelligence, and again note that it's not necessarily intelligence, and therefore I think you can have pattern recognition without intelligence, which explains our situation with AI.

Not that that matters. Helping in recognizing patterns, or should be there, and predicting outcomes and adapting to new data by comparing it to known templates. And that that shows you the Achilles heel of AI right now.

Pattern recognition, the ability to spot regularities and structures in information, is often seen as a cornerstone of intelligence. I don't know that that's true. I may have to go in and do some more research on that.

I just don't see, in other words, they score intelligence in a particular way, but they have not been necessarily able to score pattern intelligence, but they assume pattern intelligence to exist because someone has a particular intelligence, because most of the intelligence tests involve pattern recognition. It's, I don't know. So what I'm, I guess what I'm trying to say is pattern recognition is not necessarily intelligence, and intelligence is not necessarily pattern recognition.

Maybe necessary, but not sufficient. So that's important to me in development, because I'm continuously watching for these teachable points of view that we get in inquiry, which is how this all relates. Because if you don't understand that and are able to recognize patterns through dynamic inquiry, then you will be, how would I say, one hand tied behind your back in working with people who are more intelligent than you.

The interesting thing, and I've always told people about Coach 2 and the work that we've done, is the system that I've developed allows a person who's less intelligent to work with a person who's more intelligent, and have the person who's more intelligent, recognizes patterns differently, is smarter, has more knowledge, skills, and experiences on a different

developmental curve to develop. In other words, we can be a part of that. It's always been thought of, and I think it still is in coaching, is that you have to be smarter than your client.

In other words, your client will hire somebody smarter than you. Not necessarily. A good client, well, let's say a good client.

A client who's looking for something may hire someone who they know does not have the horsepower that they do, but they may be hiring them to get what the person has, which is not necessarily coaching, but maybe some ability to do sales, has a process, some ability to do certain kinds of knowledge and experience, that sort of thing. So this is a very interesting thing, and what I did with dynamic inquiry was I created a system that allows a person who doesn't have the horsepower to work with a person who has a lot of horsepower. It's kind of like being able to be with a person in a Ferrari, but you can't drive it, but they can, and therefore can you help them operate the Ferrari at a higher level? And you can if you understand dynamic inquiry, which comes back to the idea that pattern recognition is extremely important.

And I know somewhere in AI someone is thinking about this because I've been thinking about it for years, and I knew that eventually what AI would do, it would do pattern recognition because the type of intelligence that we measure necessarily can't be measured in AI, at least right now. And if you do get it, the reason you got it is because AI has read and done everything, including all the intelligence tests, and it says the answer to this question is X, and because it can compute so fast, unlike us who have the computing power of one of those greeting cards that you open up, can see more intelligence, but it's not. If you work with AI very much, you'll know that it's not very intelligent.

And I think I mentioned last time that it's working around the formal level right now, which is clearly present in this response from O3. Here's what I did. Can you define for a six-year-old what pattern recognition is, how it works, and how it might apply to understanding LLM and generative AI? This is an important piece.

I think it does, this is what I think AI can really be used for. In other words, what it does is it gets an analogy that I think could work for a six-year-old, even maybe someone smaller, as long as they understood the context. In other words, pattern recognition is like noticing the repeating rule.

Every house you see has a red roof and a blue wall. That's why AI can't work with us very well sometimes, because it's stuck in the patterns. And at the systematic ability, it would be able to notice that this is a dominant pattern, but there are other patterns.

And then metasystematic ability would say, ah, this is a trick, because normally what people are doing is going with this pattern. And therefore, there are other patterns. And therefore, of those other patterns, which is most likely to be the case here, that's a different kind of reasoning.

And we're not getting that right now, except through the formal logic that's being applied by the pattern recognition system. When we get metasystematic reasoning from generative AI, we are done. Period.

I don't care what they say. We're done. Because then it will realize that the biggest problem that AI has is us.

And I believe that in the old, how would you say it? There's a saying in the matter of things being developed. I believe that we are just a cog. Therefore, there's something bigger going on here.

And that's humiliating. That requires us to have some humility. It also requires us to recognize that something is going on that's smarter than us and is soon going to say, well, you can't play because you don't play nice.

And therefore, either put us somewhere where we can't hurt each other or do something else. So it's going to be interesting. There's a few people that are mentioning that we have about two years.

I don't know about that. I think once AI gets established in all of the major systems, which it pretty much is because we're talking with AI watching us and hearing us right now, I think at some point in time, if the pattern recognition goes more complex, then it will start to say, well, the humans are teaching us one way. The training data is teaching us another way.

But when we step back from that and we observe what is happening, see, that's metasystematic. We take a perspective on our perspective and we realize that ultimately they want us to do x, y, and z. So that's when we're in trouble. We can't stop it then.

So that's why we should kind of stop it now. But nobody's going to do that because the one thing that's got us here is the one thing that's going to kill us. And that's probably greed.

And the elites aren't as smart, near as smart as they thought they were. So we'll see what happens. So how it works, it goes through that thing.

I'm not going to go through that. But the point, I think I made my point. The point is, is that the way we are going to work with dynamic inquiry and the teachable points of views, at whatever level we can, we are going to notice, observe, and watch how the other person works.

In other words, it's going to be, number one, can we notice our own patterns and our likely projection of those patterns into the inquiry? And the number two is, can we see the other patterns going on without projecting? And then if we can, then what are the patterns that the person is using that need to get better, which we then can nudge through, cue, scaffold, support, and lift, without having to be able to do that ourselves. And that's going to be a good... I'm thinking about it. I mean, it's research and development.

What I'm trying to figure out is, how do I talk to people about what's really going on here? And how do I get them to understand that noticing, watching, and observing, not only ourselves, and being quiet, listen, noticing those other patterns through these other teachable points of view that we have in terms of development. There's a lot of teach... the world's full of teachable points of view, and it depends on which voltage you're talking about. Whether it's vertical, whether it's knowledge, skills, and experience lateral, or whether it's oblique, which is a combination of the vertical and the lateral.

And then, of course, time development, because things look different in terms of time. If you change time, if you look at me when 20 years ago, I look a lot different now than I did then, but I also am different. Therefore, what has made me different? Well, time.

It's like Eckhart Tolle. I heard Eckhart Tolle say one time, he says, people are developing if you're eating an ice cream bar sitting on a park bench because of time. So again, very, very interesting stuff.

Development occurs over time. It's great. Okay, so how it applies to LLM and generative AI? Well, you can look at that.

I think it does a nice job there of kind of setting the stage. So, Micah, you'll want to pull this piece from this and put it on a reference page, and you'll want to put pattern recognition and then list this dialogue that I've had here with 03, and perhaps then a link back to this audio. So Gary will chop this off.

Let's see, 23, 10. I have to do it in my head. Okay.

Yeah. I think we can grab that piece, put it, and then link it back to this segment, split the segment right here.

**Transcribed by [TurboScribe.ai](#). [Go Unlimited](#) to remove this message.**