

RDTeam 2025 Call 5 Transcription

Okay everyone, it's Mike Jay again and we're here in R&D. Boy are we in R&D. You ought to see the kitchen, it's a mess.

But got a lot of things to get through today, so let me get started with that. I want to tell you what we're going to do in the Listen Lite program, but that's not till next week, so I'll get my mind bent around this particular quote in the Call 5. You may not be interested in geopolitics, but geopolitics is interested in you. I thought that quote was very interesting.

If you drop into mechanics, which is the first part of the call, I wrote, is that a yellow Volkswagen? And somebody said that there's some kind of thing in psychology where if somebody mentions something that it puts it in your subconscious and that from then on you can start to see them, but before you can't see them. So I always remember the story about the yellow Volkswagen and nobody saw a yellow Volkswagen and then once somebody said look for a yellow Volkswagen everybody saw one. Well, the reason I put that there is we really have to understand this whole concept of this paradigmatic shift that I'm suggesting.

And I think that's where the big problem is. I've been suggesting it for a while, but I haven't been able to explain it very much. And that is, you know, if you go back to the 30s when Lehman Brothers analysts said, hey, we've got to figure out how to get people to want more so that they will buy more so that we can grow.

That was the big thing. 25% of people unemployed were facing that same cycle again, by the way. So if you think UBI was important, just wait till we get to this next cycle, which is coming now.

The point being is that the paradigmatic shift that we're all going to have to look at is what is good for us in terms of things that we can do in terms of our attention. And I think that's going to be so key. I put an example here.

I love this. They say the best con is where part of the con is an accepted truth. And then the rest can be made up as a con.

In other words, as a confidence play. That's the same thing that rules for radicals said. And I mentioned that a few calls ago, that what if we looked at rules for radical and we took the things out of there that were working and we left the other things that weren't working and didn't have to become so radical, but used the things that worked.

And the thing that works is narrative in narrative. The idea is, is that part of it has to be an accepted, non-questionable truth. And then whatever else you put with it, you can spin it however you want.

And so this is this example that I put here is a great example because all of us would say, yeah, the key to a happy and life is to invest deeply in things you know will never change while remaining adaptable and open minded about the many aspects of evolving life. If the core of your identity is deeply rooted in thriving, then you might be able to enjoy seeing

how things unfold in your lifetime. While change can be hard and disorienting, it also opens up new opportunities for those open to them.

Most of my energy, and this is the author, most of my energy is directed towards seven areas I consider important, no matter how much the world changes around me. And then I put the link there where I got this. And then if you go over to that link, what you'll notice is there's seven fairly acceptable points of thing.

The only problem is they apply to 5% of the people. So in other words, this is the whole game that's being played on us, is that you have to be very careful about what it is you agree to, not only subconsciously, but in terms of consciously with your, what we were talking about earlier is the spotlight versus the floodlight. And if you look at all those seven anchors, which I did, which is why I pulled this article as an example, none of them have to do with saying, well, if you're like this, then this will be good.

Because if you're not a person who is geared towards certain types of things, this won't be good for you. So in other words, it's an anchor. It's true, it's an anchor for stability in life.

But the thing is, you won't be able to keep doing it. And unless it matches your motivation, then you won't be able to keep it up. So consciously you'll focus, you go to class, you do the 21 habits, you do all these things and you say, great.

But then you notice over a period of time, it wanes. The reason it wanes is because your motivation energy is directed in another place. And so you've been taking energy from a particular pool that says, generally this pool is available in terms of energy and information for everything.

You know, we got to adapt, we got to do all those things, which the person says. At the same time, the pool does not get filled unless you're doing things that are directly aligned with who you are. And see, this is the paradigmatic shift.

So they're using marketing and they're using all technology certainly to give us all these things, just like AI is giving us all these things. At the same time, it's not taking into consideration. And it doesn't come with a warning that says, well, this may not pertain to you.

This may be good just for 5% because there's probably about 16 different types. And you could say there are more because if you look at Reese's 16 desires, you'll see that there's one on each side, that's 32. So the virtues are 16, but the polarities are 32.

But once you get out there, you get out too far to where on the tail of the bell curve, it's way out there in the middle. So it's like, oh, well, you know what? I'm going to do this. I'm going to do that.

I'm going to do that. I'm going to do that. I'm going to do that.

I'm going to do that. I'm going to do that. I'm going to do that.

I'm going to do that. I'm going to do that. But that other 5% is the differentiator.

All you have to do is I have this genetics service that I got involved with. I don't know. It's been 20 years ago when they were fledgling.

And the guy, I think, is a Russian, Russian scientist. But they do, they look at genetics and reports and they send you all these reports. And it says based on your gene snip here and this, you'd be more inclined to be this.

And it's just amazing the genetic correlation. So in other words, we are with that 5% that's different is really different. And therefore, it makes us all kinds of things.

So the thing is, is that the big thing for me overarching in terms of mechanics is that this paradigm shift that we are having to make as a generative thing. In other words, I'm trying to keep it generative, which I noticed this morning when I was doing some assumptions and beliefs about this work that we're trying to do. Because what happens is you have this big, broad paradigmatic piece of work.

Now you've got to go in and give people the tools and the reasons to actually follow along and believe it. The DIS or the dynamic inquiry system skills are the bottom of the pyramid. It's flipped over like we were talking earlier about flipping your life over.

Well, skills are some of the last things that we think of. We think of all the theory and we think of all the reasons and the assumptions, the beliefs, principles and values, but we don't really ever get down to the skills. Well, we're turning it on its head and saying, wait a minute, let's learn these skills.

Then once we have these skills, then let's apply all these things. And so that's part of what we're trying to get done in the book portion. Okay.

So going back to the switch over between mechanic and book, I gave you a good lead in. A good segue is we're finally out of the cul-de-sac because what has been bothering me so much is to try to understand, look, I'm having to do this dynamic inquiry system skills. And I've wrote that 15 years ago, which means we've been using it for more than 25 years intuitively.

Now I have codified it. So if you're not intuitive like me, then you can get it because we give you the ways in which to get it. So that's good.

25 years later, but the thing is, that's not what interests me. And so the thing is, how do I get from the book that needs to get published that we've been trying to publish, I don't know, for five or 10 years. But every time I publish, I go, that's not what I want to tell people.

That's not what I want to be known for. But if I don't teach the skills, then the other stuff doesn't seem to work. So that's the cul-de-sac that I've been in.

So I think I'm finally out of the cul-de-sac and I figured out a way to tie the book to the work that we're doing, which is the core idea that's on purpose. Now, just for those of you that haven't heard me talk about this before, I believe, and it's like the FDA claims on vitamins, you know, when you're being sold stuff, they say there's no therapeutic claim. Well, the only thing I have to have to show you is that I believe that all the genetics and all the mimetics are there for a reason.

And we called them early on when I was talking about emergentics, which is way out there, mimetics. And that has to do with the human process of being, doing, having, becoming. That's the first tier.

That's probably all you should worry about remembering. Being, doing, having, becoming. That gets that first tier of memes in place because we're all doing those things all the time.

It's pretty easy. That's the accepted part of the con. But the thing is, along comes Sapolsky and a whole lot of other people talking about, well, we really don't have free will.

So you mean to tell me that I'm behaving the best I can as a result of the best I can with what's in me? Yeah, that's sort of true. Now, there's a few people, and the percentages are so small that they're not even worth mentioning. But when you talk about people that are at the metasystematic level of reasoning and above, AI hasn't got there yet.

But when it does, we're in trouble. I can tell you that right now. When we get to the metasystematic reasoning level of reasoning and up, there's only 0.8% of the population.

Now, that's a lot of people. Does somebody want to do the math on 0.08 times 8 billion or 7 billion? I know we got somewhere between 7 and 8 billion. I've lost count.

That's still quite a few people. But the thing is, for me to run around and say to you, oh, let's go to that state. Let's get to that level.

Let's be able to observe ourselves in action and then be able to make changes on the fly because we have self-awareness about our own purpose. Well, number one, most people don't have enough self-knowledge to know why they're on purpose and why they're not. So they're full of blind spots, as we talked about from the Johari window.

And we don't know what we don't know. So until you know some of that, you don't even know you don't know. So that gives us trouble.

So going back to this core idea is that we're all on purpose and it's not our fault, so to speak, which then should say, phew, don't have to worry about that. Okay, now let's find out a little bit about ourselves and find out why we do the things we do. So that's the whole paradigmatic shift.

That's a very difficult shift. And that's what I've been struggling with for 30 years once I realized, oh, that's it. And can you do it? Well, I can only do a little bit.

You know, obviously, those of you who know me know I can only do a little bit of that. So even people who have a dispensation for the awareness of I'm behaving badly in the moment and to be able to have the tools, skills, wherewithal in place to shift that are very rare. So we're just not going to encounter that.

So we all run around and say, oh, well, we're everybody's choosing to behave badly. That person is not choosing to behave badly. It's probably a combination of who they are, what they think subconsciously they need to, quote unquote, survive.

We triggered that survival mechanism and they're behaving that way because those are the tools that they have. Okay, that's a whole lot different attribution than I just told you. Then you did that on purpose.

And see, this is the whole thing is our idea of what do we attribute people's behavior to? And that's if we don't have free will, then that's just us. So how are we going to check? What's a paradigmatic shift? Because the previous paradigm is saying you have control. You can do it.

All you got to do is learn X and Y. All you got to do is follow your guru. All you got to do is follow your teacher. All you got to do is follow the rule.

They're saying that to all of us. And then we should behave well. Well, that paradigm is marginally ineffective at this point.

And of course, A.I. is going to show that because A.I. looks up and says, well, here's all these patterns and you guys are just unaware of them. Continuing on to validate the purpose of my purpose, that whole idea from consumption to path to purpose. Look, the World Economic Forum annual meeting has concluded.

It was a couple of weeks ago. Despite a backdrop of complex global challenges, to say the least, delegates descended. This was written by McKenzie.

I think I maybe I didn't give you a resource on this. Sorry. It was McKenzie.

The delegates descended as if they were somewhere on the mount with somebody important from Davos with a renewed sense of possibility. Key things that emerged. Now, this is the important part.

Key things that emerged included the responsible development of A.I., which is insane. There's no such thing as responsible development of A.I. If you're going to develop A.I., you're in trouble. So we're developing A.I., we're in trouble.

Forget about that responsible development. We don't even know what A.I. does. We don't even we can't even look inside the black box and predict what A.I. is going to do most of the time.

Proactive risk management and adaptability in the face of disruption. Now, I really like that one, but I don't know how you make that proactive. In other words, that seems more like reactive.

In other words, we've got to be better at resilience than we are at anti-fragility because we don't know what's going to happen. And that's exactly going to be increased by 100, 200, 1,000, 2 billion fold with A.I. doing what it's doing. And the need for collaborative.

And here's my point. Purpose driven leadership in the 21st century. In other words, here's the thing.

If purpose is guiding the decision process, even when we don't have free will, at least we can be aware of why we notice that we're not in line or in alignment with or happy with

or whatever, that they don't match up to our values, that they don't do it. At least we can begin to understand that process and understanding the process and knowing that purposefully it's difficult for us to go along. But on the other hand, most of us don't have UBI yet.

So we're going to have to figure out how to monetize at least part of our actions. That's the unfortunate thing about right now. That's why I said for years we need a new currency and artists paint not because they want to sell a painting mostly.

I mean, they do have to do that. They don't have a choice if they want to buy paint and brushes and stuff. And at the same time, they paint because it's in them.

Okay, so there needs to be a currency for that. They need to be rewarded for doing what's in them. They're doing purposeful work that we don't have a currency for that.

And that when I talk about the failure of capitalism, this is the failure of capitalism in my view. We really don't have anything better right now. But the thing is, capitalism is failing us because it doesn't provide us with a currency with which to make the exchange with people doing what it is that's in them.

So we're forcing everybody. It used to be you were forced to farm. Why? Because you had to eat.

Then we started doing mechanized stuff. Technology came and it started making it so everybody didn't have to farm. Well, how many people stopped farming? Everybody.

There's less than 1% left. And why? Because they still either have a sunk cost in it. They know how to do it and it's not that big a deal.

They might want to do it. There's probably 1% of the people who want to farm, enjoy that stuff. And at the same time, the rest of us don't.

Now what do we do? We don't have to do what we had to do because we can eat now because we can go to the grocery store. The grocery store requires money. So can we paint and take a painting into the grocery store and buy eggs? Those eggs that are going to cost you 25% more this year? We grow chickens so we know about eggs.

But I mean, we have chickens that lay eggs so our egg costs are not going to go up too much. But the point is that we need a new currency. And see, if I said to you that if the person goes in and trades a painting and gets bread or meat or eggs, well, that's good because the currency allowed for that.

But they got to change the painting to money. And money is the currency rather than currency being what's in it. So this is going to take a lot longer.

This is why Sapolsky said, yeah, you know, there's no free will. And then he said, well, can we fix this? And he says, yeah, maybe 500 years. So it's kind of a long, long shot.

But that's important. That's important to know because some of us changing, and this has always been my point when I got the book at Flow Out, the whole point was to help people

begin to see a way that they could change because if everybody changes out of growth at the same time, we're all dead. We're all dead.

It'll be nothing but fighting over eggs and bread and all that sort of stuff again. So we got to influence people and organizations as Graves tried to do. Graves' A1N1 statement is the most profound statement of all because no one had made a statement like that before that I ever saw.

I'll get you that 1981 summary statement. But you look at A prime to N prime, which is yellow in the spiral dynamics world. But he said, look, we're going to have to see things as they are.

And we're going to have to adapt our systems, our organizations to that rather than continually thinking that we're going to make things happen. Because when everybody says I need a job and I'm willing to do anything, but I don't want to farm and they come to work, they'll do anything. They'll put cars together.

They'll do menial work. They'll like my grandfather, he scooped out incinerators for a dollar a day and spread manure on a farm, cleaning out the pens. That's what he did until he got enough money.

Grandma saved enough egg money that they bought him a little shop and he could fix anything. So this is this transition that we're going to make. It's a huge transition.

And this is why Musk and a lot of forward looking people, and I'm not sure about Musk, so don't ask me. But at the same time, he's a very smart person. He said a long time ago before anybody even really knew that the guy knew anything that we're going to have to do something because people are not going to be able to keep up with the technology.

And what are they going to do? From the farm, it was easy. There's thousands of jobs, entrepreneurial and stuff like that, that they can do. But now AI is going to do most everything.

Capital is hard to get and we're making it even harder to get with what we're doing right now. Therefore, you're not going to be able to do what you want to do. You're going to have to do what is available.

What's available is AI work. I mean, even when I look for an assistant, the reason I grabbed Micah, I said, maybe I can take Micah, who's a college graduate, and maybe she can learn some of these things that I know I'm going to need to know and we're going to need to have. And maybe she can do that, which she is.

She's very bright and she's able to learn some of these things as we give her time to pick up some of these things. And the new mind, the mind that grew up, just like my kids, they said to me, dad, why did you force us to go to computer camp? Because all of our friends were going to baseball camp or volleyball camp or things like that. And I said, the reason was, is I saw what was going to happen and you needed the computer.

And to this day, they say, thank goodness for doing that, because that gave us that period of time where we could, you know, we could monetize our efforts easily. Well, if you're going

to monetize your efforts going forward, you're going to have to do it somewhere using AI. In other words, you're going to have to, you're going to, you're going to have to figure that out because it's the only way.

Well, how many of us are going to do that? Not many. I am, but you know, I'm not expecting people to be like me, the weird life. So I leave you with that little thought.

UBI is coming. It is already here in some forms. It's going to come drastically though, depending on what happens with Europe.

Europe is in big trouble right now. They're going to have, they're the canary in the coal mine. They're going to have to figure it out first.

So we'll see what they do. Are we nearing the startup of the formal listen? Oh, as we are nearing, yes, we are. I'm testing the waters in IMULL.

You know, IMULL, it's one of my favorite things. It stands for Importance, Motivation, Urgency, Leverage, and Low-hanging fruit. It's the best five-letter problem-solving model you can find, other than the scientific method.

Scientific method doesn't have importance in it, just like IT doesn't. It's important to get back to the path of purpose and understand as they value action or non-action. Non-action is going to become as valuable as action.

In fact, saying no, as I pointed out in 2012 when I released the book, *At Flow*, saying no is just as important as saying yes. So what you say no to is just as important as what you say yes to. Use the explanation of the numerator, denominator.

Okay, what I'm trying to I probably need to get a math person to help me with this. I've always had this idea. Let me explain it to you figuratively.

I've been trying to work on it literally so that other people can understand it. But here's what happens. Let's assume, and I should put that diagram in the note of the complexity curves.

I showed these complexity curves 30 years ago when I started working. I said, look, here's the curves we've been on. Here's the curves that are changing.

And now we've got this complexity curve that's non-linear. So that means complexity is coming at it faster than we can deal with it. If we do that, there's no way we can keep up, okay? Some people, there's about, I think maybe a little bigger than 5%.

I think there's two basic types, and they have S in them, in the dominant function. One's an internal dominant, one's an external dominant. The ISTJ and the ESTJ, actually the ESTP would be the dominant S on the outside.

The ESTJ seems to be the combination like ISTJ, although not a dominant S in the Myers-Briggs. And those two seem to be able to do something. And what that something is, is limit the growth of complexity that they will accept.

In other words, I ran into a significant other in grad school, and they lived a life that showed me that they were not going to allow complexity to dictate their need to keep up with it. They were going to accept only so much. And that's when I realized that I was being turned loose.

And they never said any of this stuff. I just had to figure it out afterwards, kind of like the football thing. When 25 years after I was playing football, it dawned on me, I was in the wrong offense at the end.

I did good when I could get back away and see everything. I did not do as well when I was in it and had to make incremental decisions because I'm farthest from the S. S is my inferior function. So you can even use this personality step to go back and say, oh, no wonder I didn't do as well as I had done.

And this was the reason it had nothing to do with me, yet everything to do with me because I was in the wrong situation. I was in the wrong office. And this is the same thing.

This person says, you know, I'm only going to go, I'm only going to, this is my world. Okay. And I'm, I'm going to bound that world and I'm not going to keep allowing things to come in.

I had a client who said, you know, I'm not really big on conspiracy theories. And that's the same type of thing that they were sending a message to me that said, I'm going to bound my world. And there's a lot, I know there's a lot of stuff out there, but I'm, but I'm not going to buy into that until it becomes real.

So I'm going to cut that off. Well, when they do that, they eliminate the need to move as quickly as complexity. People used to be as move, be able to move as quickly as complexity, but what you see is a big wagon.

Imagine a big wagon and everybody's going to town and everybody's on it. And as you go to town, things get more complex. And the people who can keep up with complexity stay on the wagon and the ones who can't fall off.

Now we've got a wagon where there's one or two people on the wagon, everyone has fallen off. And the one or two people on the wagon says, we can't keep on the wagon very much longer unless we get this. And they got AI.

So they get, they get AI doing everything for them so they can extend themselves. But even that, even that means that at some point, those two people will fall off. You see what I'm saying? So in other words, when I talk about the numerator denominator theory, I'm saying, wait a minute, it's a complexity is an open system.

This is the mistake that most people make in development. They think higher is better. Higher is not better.

What is best is a match between who you are and the situation that you're attracted to. That's best. Not continue, continue, continue, continue, higher, higher, higher, higher.

And of course I've made, I tried to make that argument now for 30 years and it falls on deaf ears because people, our paradigm says you should try to keep up. Our paradigm says it's a good idea if you know everything. It's a good idea for all that.

Well, it's not because what it causes in the numerator denominator theory, if you let complexity run, you got to run with it. Well, in my case, see, I'm one of those, I'm one of those that can't listen to that. So I'm running with it.

So I got AI, I got four AIs, hell with one. And I use them depending on what situation I'm in, but, and I'm not using as much as somebody like the people who know how to code. You know, I don't, I, I should have finished the Fortran class in 1974, but I didn't, I, I knew it, I knew it, but it was just something that didn't work with my little brain.

And it was hard. And, you know, back then I could, you couldn't force me to do anything because I had a football scholarship and school was paid for, so I could take whatever courses I wanted. So nobody said for the football quarterback to take Fortran, but I did.

I thought it was cool. It was until it got down to where you had to punch all those cards. And I'm not good at that.

I'm not good at any S activities. That's why I got Mike and Gary. They did there.

So that's the thing that's going on. So when we talk about where we're going with all this, and numerator is not denominator, just what we call a teachable point of view, is that at some point, your purpose has got to deal with complexity. And you're gonna have to decide, well, do I get that big house and then have to get a bigger job to pay for that? Or wait a minute, maybe this small place is okay.

And see, those are the daily practical life decisions. And you may not have a full job, but you can't take that job, And you're not really gonna have a job So I think that's the thing. That's when you can't decide what to do.

So I think we're on. What we've got to do now is to take those questions and put them in the Q&A section. And I'm not going to read any off the top, just going through all of these questions And the reason I hate it is because it's woke and I'm not a woke person.

I just, I mean, I get, maybe I'm too old to be woke, just stay asleep. And then I use chat GPT. And by the way, this morning, I just turned on chat GPT.

Oh three that. And why did they release it? I'll tell you why they released it so fast. They couldn't release.

Oh two, because Oh two is trademarked. So they had jumped from Oh one to Oh two. Just in case those of you who play with AI follow me.

They released Oh three. The reason they released Oh three is because of one of the other AIs that I use. And that's deep sink.

And it just came out a few weeks ago. And it's from China. Now they're saying all bad things about it.

Just like everybody who has a different view of things says bad things about things that compete with it. I don't know. I do know that each of the AIs have a particular personality.

That's my business. I'm an expert in that. So the personality with copilot is different than the personality with GPT is different with the personality of deep seek.

And it's free. By the way, you don't have to pay any subscriptions or anything. It's just free.

You can download it. But they say it spies on you. Well, Christ, everything spies on you nowadays.

So I don't know. Well, do we want China to spy on us? We want US government to spy on us. Who do we want to spy on us? It's like you're not going to use deep seek because it spies on you.

Well, everything spies on us. So I don't know what they're doing with the information. But if anybody wants to spy on me, I have nothing to hide.

So I'm okay. So I'm using deep seek. And that has a different personality.

I actually don't know if I like it. But the reason that I do use it is to get a difference of opinion because the other day I put something in all four AIs and they all gave me a different answer. That's what you have to understand.

And the other one that I use is Chatsmith, which is a version that OpenAI developed, which is not as, I don't know. It doesn't have as many features. I bought a lifetime subscription back two years ago when it first came out and said everybody started using it in November, December.

In January, they said lifetime subscription. And I said, hell, I'll buy that, you know, because I love using it. And I love anything that saves time.

So those are the four that I'm using. I don't use Google. Don't force me into that argument.

I don't use Google anything. I mean, the closest I've gotten to Google is Osna. And she's a Googler.

And I appreciate that. And Mike is a Googler, too. But I just have principles.

And I'm sure they're not very good ones. Yes. No, I haven't.

I think there's about a million AIs out there. One of the software developers that I used in India just wrote me the other day and wanted to buy Generati. And I'm not selling Generati.

I mean, obviously, I coined the term. I'm keeping it. But he said he had a use for it because him and another guy are putting it together in LLM.

And they want to run it under that. And I said, no, I'm going to keep it. I'd never seen the term when I coined Generati back in 88.

I'd never seen the term. There was no definition. And when I got to the Internet in 95, there was nothing, you know, off of Usenet and Nexus and all these things that we were all using, which, quote, unquote, I saw used in a movie the other day.

And I go, I can't believe we lived in a world with no Internet. But anyway, we do. That's another thing.

People turning off their Internet, turning off. So, in other words, I used to have a Facebook page, but I don't anymore. Stop that.

It's just too distracting. I do have a LinkedIn page. But, yeah, anybody, please send all your cards and letters.

Gary, can you grab that out of chat? Micah, can you grab that out of chat? I'll go have a look at that AI. If a doctor recommended it, then it might be more have a medical personality or something like that. So that's interesting.

But, Bill, I realized early on that the AIs had different personalities. I haven't used Gemini. We do use Grok, but I don't use it.

Micah uses it. We use Grok. And I haven't used Grok very much because I'm an ex-user, but I'm not a power user.

So I don't run into Grok that much. I try to use the old Twitter X for information from people who are on the ground where things are happening. So usually what will happen is X gets that first.

So I try sometimes if I'm curious about something, I'll go over there and look at that. But I don't use Grok. But Micah uses Grok.

How's Grok for you? It's okay. She uses Grok. Gemini is also out there.

They say it's really good. Claude is really good. But I'm probably going to stay pretty close to Chad GPT for now.

It's more or less like me, I guess. Speaking of relevant inquiry, anybody else have any questions, let me know. Speaking of relevant inquiry, and we'll finish this session off because there's so much stuff in Q&A.

I have read this person for more than a year on Substack, and this is a guy who writes about AI, by the way. And I tell you the reason that I was attracted because I love this quote from Shakespeare. And I was just reading it before class again.

The thing with Shakespeare is I probably should go back and maybe punch this into AI and say what exactly was the context that in Julius Caesar they were talking about. In other words, is it a bigger context like I think it is, or was it written there based on the context of boating or seagulling or something like that? I never thought about that because I always saw the figurative view in it. Because I see this happen in my life all the time.

People have an option to change their life, and they will not change it. Fifteen years I've spent trying to bring people out of poverty, we have had very little success. The only success that we have had in all the millions that I have given away and helped people with is, and you can include Gary in that mess too because he's helped me.

We built, I don't know the exact count, but we built about 36 houses for people. That is the only thing that we have done that has been successful. We have not changed their minds.

We have not changed their mindsets. We have not been able to get them out of poverty. The only other thing that we've done besides build houses is school.

We started a school here, and as a, how would I say it? It's a Montessori type approach. And we started it here called Lead You School, and we hired a licensed teacher. And I coached the teacher on what we should do and what we shouldn't do and all that sort of stuff.

And that's working. So I'm thinking that over time we will expand that. But everything else that we've tried does not work.

And so going back to purpose, and you look at a research lab. I have a huge research lab here. The thing is it's true.

If a person is on purpose, they will not choose those things that are good for them even if they're good for them if they don't value them. They won't. So it's a very interesting thing.

So I wrote down unimaginably it still applies. And the note that I put together is that we have AI, generative intelligence, on the ground as we speak, and it's just going to get smarter. I was challenging myself because me and CHAT GPT are developing a scoring model for development.

And I've been working on it for about two years because I saw that was the first thing that I had prepared AI to do. So I had to change a lot of things that I did, and I started working on this scoring model. And what my sense is is that AI is working right now about formal level of intelligence, which is pretty damn smart.

It's more than I would say Jack said 44% of the people don't even get into the stratus, the work stratus. So and then another 44% are up to level four. Formal, we have most organizations run by formal intelligence.

So you can see the power that AI is going to bring as it can start to do systematic and metasystematic work. Once it gets to metasystematic, we're done. I'm sorry, we're done because it's going to realize how inefficient we are because of all the things that are born into us.

So that's going to be interesting to see that kind of debate because I'm sure AI will sue us at some point and say, hey, you guys are screwing up the world, you know, for the rest of the people because you believe X, Y, and Z. And that's true. So anyway, the interesting thing that we have to do is if you want to go to an island, as I have, and shut everything down, that's one way to do it. There are then other ways to do it all the way up to getting involved with AI and doing whatever it is that people are doing at the top levels right now, which is amazing stuff.

So very interesting guy to read, though. If you don't know much about AI, he's a, I think he's an instructor or something somewhere, teacher somewhere, one of the big schools. And he writes this Substack blog, and I've read it for quite a while.

It's very, very good. In fact, I have one in my box I'm going to read. I put some videos for you, and I added this section into this new R&D focus, so I'll get out of this pretty quick.

Let's see where we are. Okay, so we're under an hour. We took 20 minutes to get started, so we're about at 40.

Let me just list these for you and why I put them here. One of the things that I'm struggling with in research and development is trying to get to a place to where I don't have to align with anybody. In other words, can I just show you information and that information then be taken in by you, or can you even take it in? Some people cannot take any information in that contests their values, so I got you on that.

But the idea here was is if I can bring information, this is what I'm thinking out loud. If I can bring information to people, information like I get all the time, and then let them decide about it. Now, I will give my opinion, but let them decide about it, like I used to do in the old days.

That's what I'm thinking this new channel will be, because I need that in order to inform, on purpose, the lead you way. If that makes any sense, this Gerald Celeste guy has done this trends thing for a long time. That was a very interesting interview that he did.

The CBC, the end of money, that's a very interesting video. Quantum computing just proved Einstein wrong. That's very interesting.

If you just go to 1241, you may not identify with much of the rest. That's very interesting, because what we're talking about is paradigmatic changes. In other words, paradigm shifts you have to pay attention to.

All the rest of the stuff that's going on is just stuff. It's like today, I learned this thing called the Lindy effect. Does anybody know what the Lindy effect is? It means that history tends to last longer than we think it will last.

So in other words, when people are saying, we're going to change this current paradigm. Well, yeah, maybe in 200 or 300 years, because the Lindy effect says it will persist. Because the beliefs are already instilled, and they're true enough that people will accept them.

And they will not take on new beliefs and hold two paradoxical beliefs in hand. They will either have to get to the point where they realize this doesn't work anymore, and they're not going to do it. And then they jump to the other one, but they can't hold the two.

Well, yes, this is working at some levels, and this is working at some levels. And they're both true. Ooh, our brains are not made for that.

So that's a paradox. So that's the idea. So I just put those videos in there.

One of the things that I did was I put those in there for Micah. Because what we're establishing is when I run across a video that somebody sends me, and by all means, all of you send me. If you could just send me one line that attracted you to the video, that would be great.

But we're going to take these videos, go through a process, and make them available. And then bring those into our field. And what I want to share with people is what is in my field.

I've been keeping track mostly of a thing called my own information center. Because I believe that the first part of IT is information. Because if you look at the quantum world, you've got energy and information.

That's all there is. Okay? Everything else we're making up. Okay.

Not to say that there isn't a structure beyond space-time. We're going to talk about that later. But the thing is energy and information.

So the information that you're getting is directly related to the subconscious filters that you have placed because of the values that have emerged on your perceiving stimuli. And what you have to do at some point is you have to read, look at, and think about things that you don't like. That is really hard, especially for somebody like me.

It's hard, especially to be a psychologist and to be a C.R.I.T. researcher. I've had a hard time with C.R.I.T. research because I'm so obsessed about the fact that, when you can't write, you can't think, you can't read, you can't talk about anything. That's what you do, and that's the way you do things.

ability to synthesize this ability to recognize patterns this Ability to do that that that's a form of intelligence. I'm not saying it's very smart Because you know intuition is only right half the time So that's why the AI's are about right about half the time because all pattern recognition is based on intuition Because what you do is and by the way I went to AI today before I came on and I said tell me about pattern recognition as if I were a six-year-old and I got a little thing there that explains it really well And I'm not going to spoil it for now But I'll show it to you next week, and they talked they talked about how pattern recognition really works because I knew That I have pattern recognition as a form of intelligence, but it is not pattern recognition is not necessarily Part of how they score intelligence. It's kind of like a black box so over the years.

I'm not that smart But at the same time I have pattern recognition so that puts me in sort of another another class So what I'm what I'm trying to do and what I'm trying to say to myself is How can you be on purpose with that and then provide that as a value so that you can? Give people this Opportunity that then allows you for some of them to say hey this guy says some things sometimes. That's okay Maybe I'd like to listen to him from time or get in one of his programs or something you see That's that whole thing there you got it down to the 2% you got it Well, I got to make some money because I got to pay the bills. We got to eat got to buy rice So how do you do that? You know I guess I'll have to do it through what I do well, and that is use this talent So that's the idea behind that Mike is working on a process right now And we're going to get this done so that you then don't have to spend the time that I spend So that you can get the points a lot easier and quicker, so that's that's the idea

Thanks everybody for putting up with this R&D process I promise you it'll be a lot tighter once we get into listen light which is coming up the orientation is coming up on the 24th of February and We hope you'll all show up for those 10 weeks so that we can get that in the in the record and then After that we're going to start getting our butts ready to go live, so thanks a lot appreciate it

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