

## RDT 2025 Call 3.1

You're in the kitchen, and I really wish sometimes you would see what it is we're doing in the kitchen, because you would laugh. I have to laugh because it's a crazy kitchen. In the quote of the day, AI will forever alter how society perceives reality.

That came from a little video that we tacked on to the last call with Whitney Webb. She was sort of reviewing *The Age of AI* by Schmidt Kissinger, and I forgot the other person's name. I apologize.

I keep looking at that quote, and we have no idea what is really happening. That's a pun intended. We don't really know what's happening with anything right now, because there are so many forces at work.

So when we look at the mechanics from the path of consumption to a path of purpose, we're continuously validated that the idea would be is that if we discover, disclose, and accept each other's path of purpose, it changes the way we think about things, the way we attribute. I think that probably needs to have its own feasible point of view, attribution. In other words, what do we attribute something to? Belief, assumptions, cause and effect, actions, behaviors, whatever.

I'm always reminded that it's engagement plus engagement, and the idea that what we're going to be talking about soon in terms of the dynamic inquiry skills that sort of make much more robust this puzzle in terms of a path of purpose are these ideas that I came up with after listening to Albert Ellis before he died. I went back and looked, and I'm thinking that this was probably around 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 at the latest. I think he died a year or so after we were with him, or a couple of years.

He had let us come in and do a presentation, and we came in and did our thing at that point in time. We were pretty green at that point in time, having just begun to codify a lot of this work. After listening to him and his experience, he said that he had conducted group therapy at his Upper West Side clinic for more than 40 years, I think he said.

He was 90-something at the time. And he said that there were basically only two things you need to be okay. I hope that I am this clear when I'm 90.

He said you need to be able to accept yourself unconditionally, and you need to be able to accept others unconditionally. So those are the two things that you need to do to be okay. Everything else is just sort of stuff.

And I incorporated this Olympic diagram because we were heavy deep into self-discovery, self-disclosure. Again, probably as an extrovert, I colored this frame a little bit more than I should in terms of disclosure because introverts don't do that. But my sense is that they need to find a way to get that lieutenant up to speed.

And one of the things that we can do that with is self-knowledge work, which gives us a language with which to express meaning-making in terms of, let's just say, our predisposed behaviors, sort of the behaviors that we default to, our preferences, our traits, the things

that we do without thinking those kinds of things. And so what I wrote next was this is a paradigmatic. In other words, it's a paradigm-level shift that we're asking people to make.

So it's very difficult. It's much like what's happening right now in geopolitics and everything else. It's a very difficult shift.

At the same time, since we are already at that level, what's involved? And what I was giving some thought to, and I could probably do a whole call on this, is what we've really got to do if we're looking at this whole process where path of purpose replaces path of consumption and all of these other sets of ideas that go along with that, we're probably going to have to construct a model of generativity. Now, it's funny that back in 1988, when I coined this term generati, which came to me as a result of hearing about literati, and it was actually digerati that I heard about at that particular point in time, the people of the digital world, literati being the people in the enlightenment of the literal world, I think it was in the enlightenment that term was created, generati being this idea of generativity. In other words, it's different than the great psychology guy, I forgot his last name.

I guess it didn't make a big impact on me. But he has a model of generativity, but he's talking about that being generations. In other words, when I did a quick search for generativity, all I came up with is definitions of people wanting to make sure the next generation succeeds and all that sort of stuff, that kind of generativity.

I'm talking about something else. I'm talking about something that can generate a triple win. In other words, it's good for me, good for you, good for us, or sustainable.

It's efficient and effective, but it's sustainable. It's considerate. It's appreciative.

It's thoughtful. Those kind of things like that. And so what I realized, this was a little bit of a step back, because what happens when you're doing this work is you go, go, go, go, go, and then you realize it's something you get at a certain level, and you realize when you solve at that level, it discombobulates you from the lower order actions.

Well, you know then that that's not generative. In other words, if we make all the 1% of the people in the world rich, there's going to be a problem with wealth inequality by doing that, for whatever reason. They're not benevolent.

They think about themselves. They think of people as tools or puzzle pieces, those kinds of pawns, I guess they call them. So in other words, generativity means that if you're going to solve things in different stratum or levels or positions, that when you solve something, it doesn't make hell for those lower order or pawns as you solve it.

And that's the mess that we're in right now in terms of geopolitics, because people are solving problems sideways. They're solving problems laterally. And so when you solve a problem laterally, it gets more complex laterally, but it doesn't necessarily look at the complexity vertically, if you notice my gyrations on the screen there.

There's another curve that most of us are familiar with, and that's in voltage. I don't know if I've talked about it lately, but it talks about oblique. In other words, oblique development,

where you get some of vertical and you get some of horizontal, and what that does is lift the whole thing up.

Well, it does so in an oblique fashion. That's how we develop. So when we look at this model of generativity, the most important thing that we can do and feel the consequences of our decisions, and that's why path of consumption as a paradigm shift has led to the problems, which means we need to change the paradigm if we're going to take a shot at, let's just say, renumerating those issues that we have, and there's a lot of them.

So that's the thing that came to me and started to cause the problems that I'm having, because you work, you work, you work, you work, you work, you build, you build, you build, and then all of a sudden you found out foundation's not working. And then what do you have to do? Well, you have to recurse everything back. That's why this whole idea of dynamic inquiry has been around since before 2000 in our work, and yet I can't get a book out on it.

Well, why? Well, because every time you get to a point where you say, well, we got it, and then we come back down and we go, wait a minute, we don't have this, and then we go back to the foundation again. The good thing about it is every time you recurse back to the foundation, you validate some of the things that you did before, and dynamic inquiry as the seven skills is holding up very well. It's just these other pieces that you have to talk about when you talk about inquiry.

In other words, the objects of the subject that you end up having to have an interplay with. So basically the model generativity, as we pour into it all this stuff, into the mold, it's basically it's not up, it's in. So that's another dimension.

If you're looking at vertical and you're looking at horizontal and you're looking at oblique, well, there's a dimension of time involved, but there's also another dimension, and that's in and out. So things get very complex as we begin to put all these pieces together so they hold up, because what I want to do is I want to have a foundational system or a construction of a model of generativity using inquiry, which you have to use no matter what model you're constructing, and make sure that you can spend some time actually working on the model instead of finding out all the mistakes that have been made at the foundation of the model, which is what we have right now. There's a very interesting video I've tagged on.

I think it's to the Next or whichever call it is, and it's a guy talking about that we just had a new president inaugurated, but it's just for show because all of the systems that have been built up globally around the whole process are still in place, and they will be kept in place, and what was branded as globalism will be rebranded as patriotism. Nothing will change. That's a very profound concept when you think about it.

And so the idea would be is what we're looking for is we're not looking for a Band-Aid or a paste-over, we're looking at a set of tools and a model that actually allows us to get to this model of constructing generativity. So I'm continually looking for things that validate what it is we're doing, so I know that we pretty much got that foundation solved, and if you apply complexity to this through VUCA, VUCA has just evolved to uncertain, complex, and ambiguous conditions, what's the next best thing? In other words, if you can't – I'm going to show you in a later call that you can actually control VUCA. Some people do.

It's not easy for most, but some people can. About 5% of the people can actually control VUCA, which means if you can control the conditions and the culture and the requirements that you're in, your psychology, your behavior can also be a reflection of that control, which means you don't always have to have complexity. That's why some people, quote, unquote, go off the grid, go away from the Internet, go away from geopolitics, find a place in the world that you can actually control the amount of complexity because if you try to attempt to control your response to complexity but complexity itself is an open system and has no controls, then what is it you do? You're chasing your tail all the time.

So some people have figured out naturally they're predisposed to say, wait a minute, I'm only going to allow so much complexity into my life, and therefore by doing so I'm going to eliminate a lot of the issues that I would normally have to respond to. That's a very interesting thing. I call that the numerator-denominator theory because I figured it out after about 20 years of being exposed to a couple of people who were able to do this, and it was very hard for me because I'm the type of person that tries to chase complexity.

And so therefore I'm predisposed to that, to continue to open, open, open, open, rather than limit, limit, limit, limit. So that's an interesting thing. Now in terms of the next best thing, if you can't do that, only about 5% of the people will, what's the next best thing? Well, the way in which I figured out how to do that was on purpose.

In other words, if you have a specific purpose, what you say yes and no to based on that purpose, then you automatically limit a lot of the things that are going to be problems for you or, in a broader context, a team or an organization or a community or a society. So people on purpose, if you look at my bullet points, they get more benefit or less my team. In other words, if you're controlling what you say yes and no to based on purpose, in other words, purpose sets guidelines, purpose sets boundaries, and you say, well, that's not quite on my purpose.

Am I required to do that because of my role or the situation I'm in? In other words, you're required to get out in front of a speeding car or a bus. So you've got to suspend all those things at that point. That was a noise.

Did you hear it? Okay. I just wondered what was going on because I heard a noise in the background. You can still hear me, yes? Okay.

Sorry about that on the recording. I thought somebody was trying to say something. Anyway, back to the bullet points.

Let me restart that. People on purpose participating in this Path of Purpose project, okay, people on purpose participating, they get more benefits because they use up less my team. My team is money, information, time, energy, attention, motivation.

So, in other words, by saying yes and no, what happens to you is that you limit things that are not purposeful, and even if they're easy, you don't do them. It's easy to scroll. It's easy to watch YouTube.

It's easy to do those things. But if they're not on purpose, you only listen to the things on YouTube or scroll to those things that are on purpose. That doesn't mean you get rid of YouTube.

That doesn't mean you stop scrolling. It just means you do it purposefully. So if you can get that idea.

Less noise, more signal, obviously there. Promote self-knowledge. In other words, the reason that being on purpose promotes self-knowledge is that you have to know what your purpose is, and the only way to do that is know yourself.

And, of course, by doing that, you pay attention to, do I know myself? Am I on purpose? That enhances awareness, which brings in those kinds of things that may test those limits, those boundaries. And then, of course, it uses a different currency. In other words, instead of making money, we're looking at getting a return to purpose.

Therefore, you may choose things that may not yield as much quote-unquote money currency, but may yield a lot of purpose currency, which would then a person painting, because they get a lot of joy out of that, may not be able to sell their painting. But the currency really is they were on purpose and that they enjoyed doing the work, and they got good response back from that in terms of what they were doing, but they didn't get a lot of money. So, therefore, in a capitalist world, where you measure everything on money and wealth, in that particular mode, what would happen is, is that you would begin to understand, wait a minute, there's different currencies available.

So, in other words, if I'm spending most of my days joyful and happy, then the currency of that is different if I don't make a lot of money in addition to that. Now, ideally, monetizing your purpose is very important, at the same time enough so that you can have a purpose, obviously. It does improve energy efficiency.

That's the whole thing. In other words, everybody's talking about improving energy efficiency. Well, you do that by being on purpose, because you do a whole lot fewer things with less effort.

You probably do them better, likely to get a higher return. It does build IMO effectiveness. In other words, we talk about IMO being importance, motivation, urgency, leverage, and longing fruit.

You get a lot of that when you're on path of purpose. And then, of course, improves sustainability. It's a lot easier to sustain everything when you're on purpose.

And the other thing is upstream as little as downstream. In other words, if I know about purpose, then I can begin to set in place things that select for it and attract it. So I can use it upstream and downstream.

Obviously, you make higher quality decisions for you. And as long as you're clear on culture, conditions, and requirements, you won't get yourself into trouble. Because sometimes we have to do things because they're appropriate for requirements, they're appropriate in the culture, they're appropriate for the conditions.

They would not be purposeful per se except to allow us to stay on purpose and to monetize those moments that we have that we can set aside a store of savings, a store of currency, a store of something, so that we can remain on purpose more. So the old thing about path of conception to path of purpose is really important. You switch the whole paradigm.

It's really a paradigmatic shift. And then, of course, you'll add much more collaboration in terms of being purposeful if it is collaboration is purposeful. If it's not, then you may collaborate for CCR, CCR conditions and culture or culture conditions and requirements.

I've put it in that order. And then, of course, the idea at the higher levels, integrate the path of purposes. So I'm going to stop this video at this point in time because it's gone long enough and I've given you so many powerful ideas.

It might be a good idea if you just replay this so that you get the understanding of what it is we're going through in our process and also what it is that you could go through in your process. So I'll sign that off for now. And this is Mike Jay and hope you'll return.

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