

## Call 6-3 audio

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

Going into the book portion of this, it's important to know the context the book is emergent from, and the context, believe it or not, you might call it a subliminal or subconscious context, is we are living a lie. And this was a statement two minutes or so by an astronaut who went to space and says, you know, what you guys have seen and what we've seen is different, and you guys are living a lie, so we're living a lie. Okay, that's just context.

I don't necessarily believe that's true, just like I don't necessarily believe, although it's important to note this perspective, the next one called a metacrisis, as it relates to hemispheres of the brain. There's a video that talks to you about why all these metacrisis have developed, and it's directly related to the brain. Now, there's a good piece, and the reason I captured this was this piece, I don't know, not even a minute long, carved into stone of the ancient temple of Apollo at Delphi was the injunction, know thyself.

This isn't very important to us because this is how you get to purpose, at least a way, a turn on the road, so to speak. Without such knowledge, we are tossed this way and that by forces we neither suspect nor understand. And this all starts to tie in to the philosophy that Sapolsky wrote about in his book, *Determined*, and I didn't know that he was a best-selling author before this because he said, when you look at the guy and you listen to him for any period of time, he's amazingly humble, but he seems to be extremely experienced and extraordinarily intelligent, but he doesn't come off like that.

That's a very interesting thing to watch. If you ever watch any of his videos, it's very interesting. Knowing ourselves helps explain our predicament, and doing so is greatly aided by understanding an aspect of the way in which the brain constructs the world.

Now, this is where the pins get a little loose, the screws get a little loose. I believe we have adopted a limited vision of a very particular type, agree with that, and precisely because it's limited, we cannot see that it's limited. This is metasystematic thinking.

This is metaperspective. In other words, the same thing that he said in his lecture is the same thing that I wrote about that he couldn't see, which explains why he couldn't see what he couldn't see. Now, again, that's just a performance.

Whenever you're dealing with someone in dynamic inquiry and you're watching for patterns, it's a performance. It's not them. What you need over a period of time is a number of performances to know that you're within that half to third of level of where they are in terms of development, that you then can open the door for them in terms of cues, scaffolding support, and lift.

I know that's all gobbledygook for most people, but if you're a coach, if you're a developmental coach, or you want to learn developmental coaching, or if you want to learn to help people with this stuff so that you know when to shut up and just walk away because nothing you say or do is going to help them because they're not ready to be there yet, and that's an important part. That's why I love dynamic inquiry because we don't commit to anything when we're doing inquiry. We're only committing to helping them reveal their

story, narrative, and, of course, where they are, and then we're going to go meet them there.

We're going to do what Rumi said. There's a place, there's a field between right doing and wrong doing, and I'll meet you there. That's exactly what we're trying to do in dynamic inquiry.

In researching all this gobbledygook, you've got to figure out how to tell people some of these things that they don't just go over the top of their heads, but they can actually begin to say, oh, yeah, I see what you're meaning because when I'm talking to some people, I can see X, Y, and Z. It's not outer space, which I chose the background for this call to be outer space today. Anyway, that's a nice piece. That's a transcript from an auto-generated captions.

The process that I told you we were going to use that I mentioned a couple of calls ago, that's below in case you want to see that, what process we're trying to develop, and I'm still working on that. It's R&D, so we're trying to understand. I still don't know that fair use law.

Whether or not if somebody puts something in the public sphere like YouTube, can we transcribe that? Obviously, Google has, okay, and then can we summarize it? Yeah, I can. And then can we make another video about it showing what was summarized? And then can we put that in the public space? I don't know the answer to that. I think we can, but I don't really know the answer, so I'm going to have to research that a little bit more.

Don't have any attorneys here, do we? Okay. Okay, I wrote my quick thoughts after the little note for see below for the process of what we're going to do with these videos, what I think we're going to try with these videos. I know, I'm pretty sure that because we're teaching and in a school environment, education environment, that we can take short clips of what other people say, and that's not a copyright violation.

I know that's true because we've been doing that forever, and so does everybody else. They always grab, here's a clip, watch this, blah, blah, blah. As long as it, like the copyright law says, as long as that doesn't get put as your idea and as long as you don't take the whole thing.

So if you have an hour call, you take five minutes of it, there's no problem. So again, that sort of thing. I just explained what I was feeling about my feeling watching this lecture, which I thought was excellent.

I thought the lecture was excellent, but what I saw in it are the things that were missing, and I'll jump right into this other segment because it's kind of a thing. I want to scroll down. Let me see if I can scroll down here.

I give you some videos to watch if you want to watch because they're very different. I put Krishnamurti down. We've got to get Krishnamurti put on a reference page, so you want to list him as one of our reference pages.

That's the first time I've ever seen Krishnamurti work, and I ran into Krishnamurti through David Bohm. He and Bohm had conversations. Bohm was kind of the left hemisphere

thinker and certainly could do right hemisphere work because Bohm was a physicist, and I read him 30, 40 years ago, and I was just extremely impressed, and then he mentioned that he started talking to Krishnamurti about some of these things, and there are some of these interviews on YouTube.

Thank goodness for that. Anyway, at around this time, Krishnamurti by himself says, The brain is really not ours. I may be paraphrasing that.

He may not have said those exact words, but I think he came pretty close to saying that. Well, that's profound because then that fits in with all the pieces that Shelldrake talks about in Morphogenic Fields, and we've got to have Shelldrake in there too for a reference because Shelldrake's work is on the outside, and again, he's a botanist or a biologist. He's an uber biologist or something, but he studied this stuff, and Morphogenic Fields is the field that exists, that we are a part of, that exists outside of us, which then fits the high-energy physics stuff that says there's a structure beyond space-time, which then allows for the narratives that are coming from that, including religion, including God, including atheism, including all these things exist in that structure beyond time, which was then proved by the fact that particles and waves that are separated by long distance can come up with the same thing without it traveling at the speed of light.

I don't want to get too crazy with you. At the same time, this is extremely important in our work, and the only reason I'm not doing it right now is I've got to take you through inquiry first. I've got to lay that down first because you must understand that inquiry is the door to all of these things and understanding not only the structure beyond space-time, but also understanding why it is we are who we are, which is an important thing that other people don't have to understand, but we have to realize, and we may not even say anything about it, but we're going to meet them where they are.

That allows us to work with people of totally different narratives and stories without labeling people, which is something that the world needs right now, which is why I'm pushing forward with dynamic inquiry. I don't know how to say all that stuff. There's Shelldrake right there.

He has a short TED talk. That's really good to listen to that if you're interested. I dropped this other one in there because that's the history of the WEF.

They are the force behind a lot of things, including Davos, where I read you that quote last night where everybody goes up to the Davos mountain and then descends with the information, like Moses coming down with the Ten Commandments and stuff like that. So anyway, that's probably an important perspective to have, one in which I've had for a long time because I've been aware of them for a long time. At the same time, you can see the conflict between narratives right now, and this is really a totally interesting time that we live in.

Nice article on sleep. This is totally off the wall. The idea being here is that if you have trouble sleeping, look at this article.

It's a nice piece. It helped me with a couple of things, too. Having monkey mind is one of them.

There's the video summary process, which I told you we were going to try to replicate. So we take the video link. It's not quite complete because we've got to transcribe it.

So you can see, Micah, that process that I scribbled down there for everybody to see is incomplete because the first thing you do is transcribe the video. Well, the transcription is assumed in the video because Google does it, so we can get the transcript there, but I prefer taking the video out and then letting somebody besides Google transcribe it for whatever reason. And then summarize it.

Take the transcript, AI, summarize, create a 400 to 500-word summary, make a new video from the summary. That's a general idea of what we're doing there. What I wanted you to notice about the metacrisis that Ian McGilchrist, who's probably the closest thing that we have to modern-day polymath like Da Vinci and some of these people who studied all these different kinds of things and put them together.

Although, my impression of Gilchrist is not the same impression as other people have because I'm looking at him, where he's coming from, where he is, and noting that maybe he's meeting us where he thinks we are. And that's good. That would show that he's a metasytematic reasoner rather than just going among fields and gathering flowers.

So, I don't know. But in this thing, he talked about, the reason I wrote this down, this needs to go to Ian McGilchrist as a reference. He's the one who came up with this idea of metacrisis and the hemisphere theory.

That's important. And he talks about all this. You can look at that, left hemisphere, right hemisphere.

He explains all the brain and all that. Remember, the brain is not ours. I'll just keep reminding you of that.

So, whose is it? Who's the brain? Who does it belong to? Well, depending on which narrative, and this goes back to spiral Gravesian dynamics, is depending on the attractor basin, which is what Graves called the level. And it's not a level because it's a network, and that was one of my things that I talked about in the manifesto, is that if you get into a hierarchy, you get into problems. It's really a heterarchy, and it's really a network.

And once you understand what a heterarchy is, then you'll understand how hierarchy can exist within a heterarchy and how they can both be networked. And that's what dynamic inquiry tries to help us understand at the basic level is the skills are not hierarchical. They're networked.

So you'll have some of each. You'll have a little of ping. You'll have maybe a little bit of probe.

You'll have maybe a little bit of permit in there. You might even have a perturb in with the permit, the probe, the things. In other words, they're combinatorial.

You each could say, oh, well, 50% of this has got to be a ping, you know, because it hasn't been talked about yet. But look, it's a perturb. Oh, and you notice this.

It's part of the pace that the person needs to go ahead, so we've got a perturb here. So anyway, all that stuff. But that's what we'll try to understand in dynamic inquiry.

McGilchrist said these are metacrisis. Now, there's a reason that I put this down. It's important to notice all this stuff.

He gives a historical context. It's really good. He goes down here.

He talks about a path forward. He talks about look at the countering path, a path forward. To counter this, McGilchrist advocates reconnecting with nature to regain a sense of interconnectedness.

Okay, I'm assuming that he means something that he didn't say, which didn't say it. Although a person at this level, you would think, would assume that. But I don't think so.

And this is why I wrote it down. Because, look, he does not say that we have to go back and know ourselves, even though he used the analogy at the temple at Apollo and Delphi with one of the axioms, know thyself. It's very confusing.

Because what I believe we have to do to get on purpose is you must know where your purpose is and where it's coming from and why it's not yours. But you're riding along with it. I know that seems crazy, which is why I'm doing outer space today.

But that's the point. The point is that he's right at some levels, but he doesn't mention the differences and the diversity in each of us in terms of our talent, in terms of our narratives, in terms of our connection to the structure beyond space-time, which Graves tends to do, although he never said it. Graves, Cowan, Beck never said anything that I'm saying right now.

However, when I reanalyze it, what they have connected into is a recognition that there are particular attractor basins. Attractor is one of the strange and strong or one of the two of the four forces in nature, although I read something the other day that said there's another one. But assuming there's four, strange and strong attractor are the two.

Strange attractor is most likely related to the values basins that emerge from the way our brains are wired. So the only reason I say this is it's important to understand that you are not your brain. Therefore, you've got to know what your brain is doing, and you've got to know why your brain is your brain, and you've got to know what it is, but that's not you.

And so how do you know what your brain is going to do? Well, you go back to self-knowledge because your brain is going to just do what's already wired into you. That's why we have different narratives. That's why we have different brains.

That's why you have different potentialities around each of these systems. So this is a very important demarcation that he did not make either the SGD people or Gilchrist, and nobody else is making it. Although we're getting some hints from people like Shelby, Krishnamurti, some of the high-energy physics people are talking about this.

Hey, we can actually mathematically say that we're in an app, a simulation, and that there's something else out there that's feeding us. So it's like a cloud. Like our brain is part of a cloud, and we can use the computer analogy.

And if that's the case, what does a cloud do? This is where we're merging with AI to try to understand what's happening in AI, in my view, in my opinion. Okay, so I mention that because you've got to have a reason for being. That's why being purposeful runs the gamut across all of the issues and narratives that we have today.

That's important. Okay, so he says ultimately addressing the meta-crisis requires restoring balance between the hemispheres, embracing a richer, more interconnected way of understanding ourselves and the world. And I don't believe that's the case.

Although that was interpreted by Chad GPT from the lecture, we have to understand Chad GPT is not working at probably the level that Gilchrist is and therefore may have missed that because AI misses nuancing. Nuancing occurs at the systematic and metasystematic levels. That was great.

Good timing. By the way, I just listed that summarizer for you where you can find it if you're interested in working with this stuff. Let's see what else I did.

We'll grab all this stuff for Ian Gilchrist and put all this stuff in there that I summarized already with using the AI and stuff. I think it may be even in there twice, so you'll have to look at that, Mike. And then, of course, all I think what I did was I used two different AI.

I looked at two different AI to see what the differences would be in their summaries. That's what I did. And then if you made it that far, there's a little video there that you can check out.

I don't know what the heck it is. I put it in there for those that made it that far. Let's see what it is.

I'm going to see if I can call it up right quick. Anyway, that's a good call to end on and set the context for the practical work that we have to do to get to where we can understand what the purpose of inquiry is. Ah, this supposedly is the best guitarist you've ever heard of, so that's a good way to end the session in the video.

If you have any questions or concerns, just would you please write us in terms of that process. I never heard of this guy before, and I got it in my feed, and he looks like he came from the structure beyond space-time. But boy, the music, it's called Blue Frog, is amazing.

And I can hear it in my headphones, but you all can't hear it. You can hear it if you listen to it. It's amazing blues.

So that's probably a good way to end this session. Okay. If you have any questions, comments, please put those in the comment chat bar right quick.

We'll grab those, Gary. Anything else, Gary? We're kind of shutting this down as the last segment here, and then we'll be going into what will be much more tighter work in trying to

get done what we're going to get done, actually laying down what ListenLight is and how I'm going to bring all this together. I do not know yet.

I know what I'd like to do, but I can't do that, so I'll have to figure out some other way to do that. Yeah. Anything, Gary? Micah? All right.

Hasta la vista. Thanks, everyone, for being here for these sessions and letting me talk through this. Appreciate it very much.

That'll be the sign-off.

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