

KenMarc-Success3.0-Dialogue1

Track: IntegralSuccess-Part1-KenMarc.mp3

TRT: 63:52

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Ken Wilber

Marc Hello, I am here with Ken Wilber, and I am delighted, Mega-Pandit, to be with you. And, yeah, we are starting our landmark Integral Success Series. We are leading up to the first Success 3.0 Summit, which is going to be held this coming November at the St Julien Hotel in Boulder where the topic is Success 3.0 from the perspective of Integral wisdom.

And, Ken, like we always do in these big series, let me kind of just begin with a framework and a joke, which is always the good way to start life. A framework and a joke work well together. And I'll start with the joke and go to the framework, and then we'll begin our Integral Success Series. For those of you listening – I know there are many, many, many people listening around the world – each of these conversations is going to be not more than an hour, but usually around 50 minutes, and there'll be a series of them, and we're going to slowly, carefully go through and recast, rearticulate the core myth of success. What's the successful person?

So, just to begin with the joke, this is a joke that I heard from Sally Kempton. She called me up and told me this joke a few weeks ago. It's about a man who becomes the Indian chief of his tribe in North Dakota, and it's the beginning of the winter. He inherited it from his father who was really rooted in the old ways in a deep and profound way. The son is a little more modern and went to college, not really rooted in the old ways, but he's become the chief. So they come and ask him, the Indians in the tribe, "How much wood should we chop for the winter?"

And he's not sure. His father had a way in the old ways of giving that information, getting that wisdom. So he says, "Well, come back tomorrow." And he does what a good modern person would do. He calls the National Weather Service and asks them, "How's the winter looking?" And he gets a response. They come back the next day and he says, "Okay, chop this much wood, because it's going to be this cold."

They come back the next week and they ask again, "Well, how much wood should we chop?" He's a little surprised they came back, but apparently that's the custom. So he says, "Okay, come back tomorrow." He calls the National Weather Service again. He says, "How cold is it really going to be?" He gets a more precise measurement. They come back the next day, the Indians. He says, "Okay, chop this much wood. It's going to be this cold."

And, finally, the third week, the final week, they come back, because that's the ritual, and they ask again. So calls again the National Weather Service – and he tells the Indians to come back tomorrow – and he says, “Okay, how cold is it really going to be?” And the guy tells him over the phone, “It's going to be really, really cold.” And he says, “Well, how do you know?” because he doesn't give him a measurement. So he says, “Well, I know because the Indians are chopping a shitload of firewood.”

So it's a great story, because it really captures the premodern, modern and postmodern perspective. The premodern, of course, is the dad, the old Indian chief who knows the old ways and he has the lineage. That's the way he gets information. The modern, of course, is the son who's gone to college. He's into measurement. He calls the National Weather Service. That's the modern perspective on gnosis. And of course the postmodern is the joke itself. And of course what the joke itself is saying is that there's no real knowledge, it's just a circle. It's actually all a game of mirrors. It's all a joke. It's all laughter of some kind.

So, premodern, modern and postmodern, these three periods, if we had to map it, Ken, just as a framework for our conversation, if we have to map it we could say that there's a premodern success literature. And we've talked often with our colleague, John Mackey, and the co-chair of our center, about this particular topic, kind of a premodern vision of success, which has a success literature. The Bible, the Koran, the New Testament, I mean, all of the Axial religions, the Mahamudra, the Tibetan Book of the Dead, these are all various versions of success literature, some focused on this world, some focused on successful transitions through *bardos*, but it's a success literature. It's how you do it, how you do it in the best, most profound way that's most aligned and most successful?

Then you have a modern success literature. The modern success literature is that which emerged from the modern period, the books that kind of guide us which are rational, which emerge out of the Western Enlightenment, which are establishing the classical barometers of modern success, which involve hard work, creativity, social advancement, social mobility, and alignment with the general universal principles of ethics, natural law, etc, kind of a modern success literature.

Then you have postmodern success. And I'd say postmodern success, Ken, is gender equality, environmental activism as kind of a postmodern version of success, which has really just emerged. Rachel Carlson's “Silent Spring” was when, in 1960, right? So we didn't even know we had an environment in 1960. Who would convene a conference on the environment so we could become aware of this? And postmodern success is about this new awareness, particularly gender, the environment, the emergence of the feminine. These movements become expressions of postmodern success. And there's a new one added on. I mean, computers began really in the 50s, but of course the Internet really only explodes in the mid-90s in its explosion, so another postmodern that's kind of riding this viral wave in some way. But these are all kind of postmodern moves of success.

And we're looking for something that's beyond, that transcends and includes. What would an Integral vision of success be that includes the best of premodern, the best of modern, the best of postmodern – which is the great question that we're asking in our activist think tank – what does an Integral wisdom have to say, speaking to the key issues in the world?

And perhaps one last slightly run-on sentence and turning over to Mega-Pandit, to Ken Wilber. The myth of success is particularly important. Of course, I use the word myth not in the false or falsified historical sense, but in the sense of the story, the evolutionary attractor, the strange attractor that calls us. We all want to be successful. Who wants to be unsuccessful? You don't want by your name, "He was a failure." That's not good for the biography. You want to feel like you've led a successful life. And every day when we get up we're kind of evaluating ourselves against standards of success. At each level of, for example, Maslow's hierarchy, one developmental level, at each level there'll be a particular standard of success.

So we have to look for what's the myth of success? We're trying to articulate a myth of success that can become the strange attractor, that actually the new emergent generations in education, in church and in civil society, we have a standard, a vision, a myth that attracts us. In order to be successful, you have to meet these criteria. And, of course, implicitly what we're saying is the old premodern ones don't quite do it – ethnocentric, homophobic, no sense of democracy, no sense of human rights. The modern ones, the kind of classical success – money and power – have left us personally and globally exhausted, depleted, on the brink of potential extinction. The postmodern, although there is environment and gender equality, which is beautiful, but there's no actual grand narrative, there's no larger sense of the patterns that connect. We can't quite locate ourselves.

So we need a new myth. We need a new myth of Integral success. And so that's the conversation we're having. Myself, Ken Wilber, who's the inspiring, archetypal voice leading the Integral movement today, John Mackey, who's one of the great grocers in the world and a good philosopher on the side, and the rest of our gang are coming together with Vice-President Gore and Chip Conley and Tony Robbins and a whole cast of characters from Hollywood, and Arthur Brooks from the Enterprise Institute – just the list goes on and on of people – Tony Hsieh, Adam Bello, to kind of talk about and articulate together this new myth of success. And these conversations are kind of our guiding source code conversations. So, with that big introduction, welcome to Mega-Pandit, Ken Wilber. Delighted to be with you! Integral success, take us inside.

Ken Yeah. The basic idea that we're looking at here indeed is that success isn't just a given thing, that in large scale there are as many definitions of success as there are human beings in a sense. So what we're looking for are certain sort of generic similarities and certain items that people would have in common when they have particular types of characteristics: personal characteristics, spiritual characteristics, physical characteristics, whatnot.

And so what that means is that you can go through virtually all of the various components of the AQAL Integral model – and AQAL stands for all quadrant, all level, which is really short for all quadrant, all level, all line, all state, all type – and these are just the minimum fundamental dimensions of a human being that everybody has, that are incredibly important in determining what a human being is, what they want, what their motivations are, what their morals are, what their idea of the good life is, and each of these dimensions has something to say about that.

So you can go through literally each of those areas, and several of them or even most of them have levels of development. Most of the things in this universe have an evolutionary history. They unfold through various developmental, transformational or evolutionary stages, and each time that happens there's a new emergent that comes on the scene. There's an embrace of the previous, but then there's an addition of something new as creative advance into novelty, and that's true for virtually any dimension or any area that you can think of for human beings.

So, in going through all of these dimensions, you can just by looking at them see that each of them, because they are covering a different area of reality, that if a person puts emphasis on that particular area or dimension then that's going to be how they define success. And so there will be individuals that will stress interior success, and there will be people that stress exterior success. And likewise there are people that will stress individual success just for one person. Others will stress success for a whole group of people or possibly all humans. Every Miss America pageant contestant, for example, wants world peace. So that success is no hunger, everybody's free of hunger, and there's world peace. But the point is that there can be group notions of success, and somebody's success is tied into that group status.

So it's a very, very broad range type of entity. We'll go through just a few quadrants and a few levels just to give an indication of how widely this indeed can vary, and these are just very short and they're only just a few types of examples. They could be multiplied almost indefinitely. But if you look at the quadrants – and quadrants are four essential perspectives that you can look at anything and that turns out to be an actual dimension of the occasion, the thing that you're looking at.

So you can look at a thing in terms of its individuality or, since all individual things are part of some sort of group, are part of some sort of collective, then you can look at an individual in terms of the various collectives that it's a part of. This can be physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, economic, political, philosophical – it doesn't matter – but there's no such thing as a single thing existing on its own. It always is part of some sort of community and some sort of collective, some sort of group. And of course most individuals are members of numerous different groups. So those are two axes of the four quadrants.

And the other two are each of those can be looked at from the interior or from the exterior. From the interior simply means how does it look from within and exterior means what does it look like from without? So, if I look at myself from within, I

introspect and I see feelings and thoughts and desires and emotions and so on, and that's a first-person perspective. And if I look at myself from the exterior, the way say science would or medicine would, then I have two lungs, one heart, two kidneys, 208 bones, so many blood vessels, etc. That's what I look like in an objective, exterior type event. But, of course, that's an important perspective, and for much of certainly, let's say, modern western, that's the only perspective that's real. It's the only thing that a doctor will look at.

Then we have groups, and so we can look at groups from within, and that means the shared values they have, the shared understandings they have, mutual resonances, types of linguistic structures that they use, their overall goals and purposes and items that are valued, items that aren't valued, and so on. These are all intersubjective. These are all experiential components that individuals have in that group.

You can also look at that group from the exterior in an objective fashion, and then you see things like its birthrate, the type of monetary system it uses, the types of exterior behavior that the society engages in, so its economic systems or its technological systems or its legal systems. The environment itself is a collective that's generally looked at from the exterior in an objective fashion. So, all of those are important ways that any occasion can be looked at.

And then in each of those quadrants, as we were saying, virtually everything evolves. Everything that exists has some sort of evolutionary or developmental history. And so that means that there are some sort of stages or emergence or unfoldings or leaps that have occurred in a particular thing's history, and that leaves a type of archaeological strata to any occasion.

And so when we look at a human being, for example, since we're looking at human beings right now, then what we find is that, among other things, certainly their physiological systems have developed. All human beings started as a single cell zygote, and that divided, and differentiated and integrated, and differentiated and integrated, and certain different systems were developed, so the circulatory system, digestive system, neurological system, muscular system, and so on. And all of those were then integrated into an overall functioning organism.

And of course any of those parts or systems can break down. And that, again, is what western medicine has focused on, although every culture has some sort of medical system that it uses to try and treat what happens when things break down. And many cultures, of course, have ways of treating what happens when things break down on the interior, and so that usually would be known as something like a soul disease. Modernity would refer to it as a psychological illness or an emotional illness. And these have been handled by everything from medicine men or shaman up to modern day psychiatrists. Certain spiritual teachers have gotten involved in the process and so on.

So, if we start with that upper-left quadrant – and upper-left and upper-right and so on simply means that if we put these two axes together, the interior and the exterior of the

individual and the collective, we'll get four boxes, and that is just the way we generally write them down on a sheet of paper. It just happens to be that the individuals are the upper two boxes and collective is the lower two, and then the two left-hand are interior and the two right-hand are exterior.

So the interior of the individual, the subjective space, the I-space is the upper-left. And we've found that there are several items that occur there that are important, and not all of them are generally related to how a person would define success. So, for example, there's something called the self or the self system or the self sense, and that usually has things like will and capacity to navigate. It has something that's called metabolism, which is capacity to digest experience and integrate it and bring it into the system. It has something called free will.

Not too many of those are tied in with success unless you are doing something like taking a specific training course in how to increase your willpower. Then of course the success of how well you do that is tied to how well you can increase your willpower, how much you can gain control over it and so on. So in that case then, will would be hooked to success. And that's just an initial example of how almost anything can be hooked to success, because human beings can value almost anything.

There are of course general priorities or lists of the order in which people tend to value things, so many people put things like happiness or love or something like that towards the top of the list. Many people put money towards the top of the list. Some people put fame. Some people put power. Some people put food. Some people put sex. So we can attach value to any of those, and then success becomes a measure of the degree of that value that we get.

So, one of the things that we find is that not only do human beings have not just a single intelligence, but something that's become popular under the term multiple intelligence. So that means not only that we have a cognitive intelligence. We have an emotional intelligence. We have a moral intelligence. We have an interpersonal intelligence. We have a mathematical intelligence. We have a spiritual intelligence. We have a kinesthetic or somatic intelligence.

And if somebody puts a particular value on one of those – we also have a musical intelligence – maybe somebody has wanted their whole life to be a great concert pianist, and so under those circumstances success is going to be measured in terms of musical intelligence and how well I do in that and the type of success that I gain in that particular intelligence. Somebody else – there's not a ton of them – but somebody might want to be a great mathematician. They might have actually been inspired by Albert Einstein and want to do something like that. So under those circumstances mathematical intelligence becomes a measure of success.

And in each of those cases those different developmental lines or multiple intelligences themselves develop or unfold or evolve through specific stages of development, and we have a fair amount of research on those, so we know what those stages are. In the case

of somebody valuing musical intelligence or valuing mathematical intelligence or some such, then success would be straight-out the higher the stage of development they achieve in that particular line. And that would be what they would refer to as success. So that's just simply one aspect of a person's interior and how they could use that.

If we look at these generic levels of development through which the particular lines of development proceed, then we could look at success in terms of those general levels. So, looking at some of the major ones, and of course we could do this using any number of models that usually focus on one particular line or another, so you had mentioned Maslow's Needs Hierarchy. That measures the developmental line of motivation or needs, and those go from physiological to safety to love and belongingness to self-esteem to self-actualization or self-realization to self-transcendence.

And using Maslow's levels, then somebody who valued that particular aspect of themselves – and many, many people who take self-help courses or self-improvement courses or buy the millions of self-help books each year are interested in exactly that – and they want to know how to develop their self-esteem, and there are many, many, many courses teaching that. Then they want to know how to develop their self-realization, develop their highest potential, and places like Esalen and Omega Institute are devoted to teaching people how to do that. They might want to develop their self-transcendence capacities, and then there are numerous meditative or contemplative traditions that will help teach them that. So those become a measure of their success.

If you look at something like magenta which is essentially similar to the second chakra or emotional/sexual energy, often the stage is called impulsive or immediate gratification, and for some people that actually is a measure of success. We have unfortunately a large number of criminals that valued nothing but immediate success. They saw a car and they wanted it. They steal it. They saw drugs they wanted to take. They take it. The measure of their success was how quickly they got them. So that is simply coming straight off of that stage of development, and so for them that's what's valued most. That's what success is measured by.

If you move up a stage to what's referred to as red in Integral theory – in other developmental models it's called egocentric – it's essentially the stage of power. It's sometimes known as safety or security, but here power is an essential value. And, again, there are many people that generally cause problems for society, because what they want is power. So you find them heading street gangs when they're younger, and when they're older they grow into Stalins or Hitlers or Pol Pots, and they actually consider the more power they have, the more successful they are.

This type of person traditionally considers somebody who has compassion or loving kindness to be a sucker, and people have a hard time understanding this. They don't understand the motivation of somebody driven by power as a measure of success, because they think if we're just kind and we just treat them right that they'll treat us that way. And what they don't get is that's exactly what the person driven by power is

looking for, are suckers that are driven by compassion, because they're easier to take, they're easier to have, and we seem to never ever learn that, because those of us who have developed beyond that just can't imagine it. It's literally out of our mind. We thought that way when we were five years old. We don't think that way anymore, and it's hard for us to imagine somebody thinking that way, but history is full of Neville Chamberlains, "I bring you peace in our time," as Hitler was cranking up to take Poland in 28 days.

Marc Sudetenland was just an appetizer.

Ken Absolutely. And then you can move into the next higher general level of Maslow's belongingness needs. It's the beginning of love. Love can expand to much higher dimensions, because this is ethnocentric. It takes a second-person stance. So identity can expand from red egocentric where I care only for myself into care for a group. So in Carol Gilligan's model of development, the first stage, which is red egocentric power, she calls selfish, and these are stages she particularly developed using women, four major stages.

And the second major stage is this stage, which she calls care, and that means that the woman expands her capacity for care from herself to a group. It could be a small group like her family or maybe her clan or her tribe. A little larger group, it could be her nation or it could be people that believe in her same religion, so they're all brothers and sisters. Somebody who is outside of her religion is an infidel and is not cared for. And, as a matter of fact, infidels don't have souls, so it's not a sin to kill an infidel. It's actually taken usually as a promotion on your religious CV, but that is this person's version of success is to achieve in that capacity.

And then as we move to orange and get a third-person stance, the person is capable of taking a more universal view, but what this often means is that they value those things that seem to have more universal appeal. So they have a sense of meritocracy. Their idea of success is to achieve something, to accomplish something, to make something that's considered valuable, or to invent something that's considered valuable, to somehow achieve something, to make a mark, to win an award, to be an Olympic athlete, to be head CEO of a huge and fabulously successful company. That's success for this person. So it can often have to do with profits that are made, how much money you have.

And for somebody who values this, one of the things that people that don't value it as much have a hard time understanding is that no amount of money is ever enough. They have to have more and more and more and more, and they're never satisfied. So studies continually show that happiness is hooked to money up to an amount where you can sort of cover your basics. So in some countries it might be \$7,000 or \$8,000. In sort of more expensive developed countries it might be \$15,000 or \$20,000. And you get happier as you make up to that amount of money, but then beyond that amount of money you don't get happier. You could add hundreds of thousands of dollars and you're not any happier. You can add millions of dollars and you're not any happier.

So people that don't have that as a success index have a hard time thinking that way, but people that think that way, that's how they think. So they think that they will get happier and happier and happier, indefinitely and indefinitely and indefinitely, and many of them will do exactly that. I remember one therapist telling me that he had a very, very rich person come in who was worth something like \$1.5 billion and his complaint was he was worried because he didn't have enough money, and it bothered him so much he wanted to see a therapist for that.

Marc At reduced rates.

Ken Yeah. The therapist asked him, "Well, how much money would make you happy?" And without hesitating the guy said, "Five billion." So he actually had a notion of what would make him happy. And, of course, the joke was he would get five billion and he would not be happy, because he's unhappy for other reasons, and those other reasons are of course what therapy might possibly help him uncover, but he's got a set of values that are just simply slightly skewed. So because of that, Rule No. 1 is skewed values, no matter how many of them you get, won't actually make you feel successful. So selecting one's values carefully is requisite to being able to ever feel that you're successful. And so as we move from that orange, universal, achievement, profit stage of development into green, then green, as is often the case, one of the things that it particularly enjoys disliking is the immediately preceding stage.

Marc Right, particularly the success myth.

Ken Yeah. It's like someone that just gave up smoking. They hate it. They hate it. And everybody they see smoking they can't stand it. It drives them nuts. And nothing is worse than a reformed smoker. They're just on everybody. And that's sort of the way many of the developmental stages are. It's like you've identified with it for so long, and now you're finally moving on, you're disidentifying with it, and like a teenager learning to disidentify with its parents' values, it just goes through a whole period of just absolutely loathing anything that their parents say or do or want or anything. The kids want just the opposite.

This is particularly true with green and its relationship to orange. So, does it want achievement or excellence? Odd as it sounds, no. Excellence actually is bad. Why is it bad? Because it selects some people as being better than others. That's not allowed. Green is purely egalitarian. Everybody is worth the same. Nobody is worth anything more than anybody else. Now, the difficulty with that stance, it sounds good in a certain sense, because of course we want to love everybody, etc, and in an absolute sense from using the distinction between relative truth and ultimate truth, using absolute love, then that extends equally to everything that's arising. But on the relative plane, to say that excellence is bad, first of all, it's a contradiction, because you are actually counting the people that think the same way you do as being better than the people that disagree with you.

So you have your own version of good or what's excellent or what's right or what's better, and that is people that don't like consciously those things, even though you're actually using them without acknowledging it. So you have your own hierarchy. You have your own values. You have your own good versus bad and better versus worse and so on. You just deny it. In other words, there can be a real hypocrisy involved here.

But, on the other hand, if it's relatively healthy, a fair amount of good can come. And so one of the things that healthy green helped usher in, for example, was the civil rights movement, and what was considered success here was the extent to which they actually gained rights for minorities. And there were some very idealistic people that did a lot of work and a lot of effort – marches on Selma, Alabama, and so on – to help get minorities rights in the 60s and 70s. And in that sense that was success for them and it was a fairly decent success. They also brought in the environmental movement in a large sense for the first time, and that also had a fair amount of success, and they were very happy with that.

Then as it went on the sort of self-contradiction in it just started to kind of catch up with them. So it really became problematic. And, also, just their ongoing anti-orangeness became a real problem. The anti-excellence and anti-achievement notions just almost devastated the educational system, because what you were being measured on, what the educational system started teaching kids was not how to learn something and how to achieve and become better in that sense. All they were trying to teach them was self-esteem. So by simply doing that they were simply taught that they were special and everybody was special, but unfortunately self-esteem is effectively gained only when you actually accomplish something. You have to actually do it in order for the organism to relate to it as a real achievement. Simply telling yourself you achieved something when you didn't is known as lying.

The recent graduating class showed the highest rates of narcissism since testing began, some two to three times higher than their boomer parents, and the boomers were known as the 'me' generation. So this is being called the 'me-me-me' generation. So there are all of these sort of back sides. The notions of success for green started to backfire. So that was genuinely a problem.

With the emergence of second tier, which is Integral, there does tend to be a general qualification that ties Integral notions of success together, and I'm just going to come back to that, but I first want to give just an extremely quick run-through of the other quadrants and what success can look like if you're valuing some of those.

So, in the lower left quadrant, which is the shared interiors that we have in any group, then what tends to be looked at as successful there are of course things that mark a group occasion. So they can be things like love and relationship. And certainly being in a relationship and having a successful marriage, for example, can be looked upon as a great source of success and something that a person could take a lot of pride in. And, generally speaking, since birds of a feather tend to flock together, since individuals at both similar lines of development, meaning people that put emphasis on the same types

of intelligence, they tend to flock together, and people being at particular levels, they tend to flock together, and so what you have is so if you have a green organization, for example, then most of the people in it are at the green stage. So what becomes valuable here is simply sharing those values.

So when there's some sort of success at getting some environmental measure pushed through, then that joint success is celebrated and everybody together considers that a great thing. And they might have a party or a celebration or in one way or another celebrate their shared values and their shared success. And that tends to be the case throughout those intersubjective cultural realms. It's a way to simply resonate with the value that you are putting success on and resonate it through other individuals, which sort of just makes it more fun. A lot of people that are in relationships, for example, when something really good happens to them, they can't wait to get home and share it with their partner, because it just amplifies it. It just sort of makes it resonate, makes it more fun, and you can feel the success by sharing it like that.

In the upper right, which is essentially the individual exterior, which largely means the individual's physical situation, then any number of items tied to the physical nature of a person can be valued and therefore can be looked at as success. So this could include things like athletic success. Winning the Boston Marathon, that is taken as a great success for some people. And some people, that's what they work for. And of course professional athletes that are involved in individual races or individual achievement or accomplishment or something, that's what they live for. That is their idea of success.

And that probably means that they're at a particular interior stage of development such as orange, but this is where they're actually seeing the success, is in this physical domain, in the physical accomplishments that they're making in this particular domain. And if they are at green, but coming from this upper right quadrant, then what they would be looking for is actual success in something like an environmental measure where particular amounts of carbon dioxide are limited, and so on.

If there's a health issue, then temporarily your idea of success could be that the operation this Friday goes well. And all of a sudden that's what you are putting all of your hopes in and all your value in, and that's almost all you want for success at that point, so any of those types of things. You can undertake a particular course of self-improvement in anything from hatha yoga to weightlifting, and then your success is measured on how well that is done.

And then in the lower right quadrant, the elements in the lower right are often summarized by the term PESTLE. There are actually sociological theories that are based on this and they name it PESTLE, because it's what they think are the only real realities. So it's a good summary of a quadrant absolutism in the lower right. But PESTLE stands for political, economic, social, technological, legal and environmental, so success in any of those areas, whichever of those that you are involved in. If it's legal of course then winning the particular case that you're arguing becomes your idea of success. If it's technological then coming up with the new discovery that's going to

drive the latest web application or whatever that is, that's a peculiarly exterior collective item and that's what you want. You measure your success by this technological invention or the technological capacity that you have or that you can achieve.

In economic terms, of course will often be driven by orange, but if you're putting your actual measurement sense on what's important and what's valuable and it's the lower right, then you're going to look at the actual economic outcome. Does this company make quarterly profits or not? If it does then that's success. Incidentally, on Wall Street that's the only acknowledged success now that's actually on the books.

A CEO can be fired for not producing quarterly results. It's the only thing they can be fired for. If they produce an environment where their staff is not happy – a lower left culture – they can't be fired for that. If they produce an environment that doesn't allow their employees to grow and develop and achieve their own self-realization and self-potential, can't be fired for that. If they produce a company where there's a high illness rate and very high turnover rate, can't be fired for that. But, legally, they can be fired if they don't bring up their quarterly profits. So this is a lower-right absolutism economic drive that is the definition of success. If we're working with individuals in the business community, the interior driver will almost certainly be orange, and then the measurement of it will be this lower-right economic success.

Marc Right, which of course is an arbitrary business move, because even if you were making a lower-right evaluation and you wanted it to be measured in those ways, you don't necessarily need to pick quarterly. In Asia, for example, many of the companies are actually demanding from the CEO a kind of broader timescale. So that's kind of the pathologized version of that quadrant absolutism.

Ken It's crazy.

Marc It's crazy metrics.

Ken Yeah. I talked to a guy who's the head of a very, very successful, very large consulting firm out of London. He said they just had this large gathering of around 170 of the world's most successful CEOs from the largest, most profitable companies on the planet, and they were describing what they just loosely took to calling Business 2.0, which would be something like firms of endearment or conscious capitalism or something like that.

And if you look at those, if you look at something like conscious capitalism, Mackey, his four values come from the four quadrants. He has multiple intelligences or lines that he says are important. He goes through the major levels of development and explains how he tries to make all of the activities in each of his teams such that individuals can grow and develop up those levels and still find something more and more engaging to do. And his stakeholder integration are the six stakeholders as viewed from the lower right quadrant, all integrated. It's essentially an AQAL business that he's talking about.

So that was sort of what was being discussed in this meeting. So they asked all of these, after they were presenting it and stuff, and a lot of these guys have heard of this stuff anyway, “So, how many of you people think this is a good idea?” And virtually everybody raised their hand. They said, “Okay. Now, how many of you are willing to start doing this?” And nobody raised their hand. So they said, “Okay, why?” And every single one of them said, “Well, it would like take a few quarters to get this into place. In the meantime, profits are going to drop, and I can’t afford to have that show up on my record. I’d get fired for that. I can’t do it.”

So we’ve locked out any way of getting sanity into Wall Street with these types of laws. It’s just insane. And it’s their one very narrow version of success. That’s all it is, is a narrow, pathological, dysfunctional definition of success. And because of that much broader types of success are being excluded. And it doesn’t even help the profit side of the success definition, because if you look at the data that the firms of endearment and Sisodia and Mackey and so on have done, they’ve pointed out that over the last 15 years the percentage that the S&P has gone up has been around 157%, but the percentage of profit that these firms of endearment, these conscious capitalist firms have gone up has been 1646%.

Marc Yeah, wild! And Raj, by the way, was completely surprised. And so when he went into writing that book, he told me that he thought the best that would happen is that he would be able to show that the conscious capitalist firms at least weren’t suffering, that they were at least kind of vaguely holding their own. And he was himself – this was in 2007 – shocked at the findings.

Ken Yeah.

Marc They were wildly significant findings.

Ken Well, that just goes to show what happens when these dysfunctional versions of success become inherent in the culture. Once that happens then you’re sort of stuck with it, because the culture determines the essential frameworks that people will interpret their realities with. And if you have that kind of dysfunctional definition of success then you’re going to have dysfunctional success.

Marc Yeah, completely. That’s a dramatic endpoint. I think we finish the tour of the quadrants, and then we’re going to pick up the next step to dive in, next step in next dialogue. We’ve covered upper-left, upper-right, lower-left, lower-right. We got all four quadrants there?

Ken I was going to come back to the second tier definition of success that kind of tied it together.

Marc Let's do that. I think we need that actually to conclude. So let's go back to second tier vision of success. Then we'll move after that, totally good. Second tier vision of success, sir.

Ken Yeah. It actually defines the emergence of the second tier level or levels themselves, and this is why a lot of psychologists were really confused when it started showing up, and it didn't start showing up until a decade or two ago. So it was something that even though you've heard the occasional brilliant philosopher talk about in the past, hasn't reached more than a tenth of 1% of the population. And that can be put in several different ways, but they started noticing it because each of the previous six or so major stages of development felt that its view and its view alone was real, that all the others were just categorically wrong, stupid, childish, idiotic, woo-woo, whatever, and that they had the only truth and the only values that were really worth anything. And that marked every previous stage of development.

And then all of a sudden when this stage started to emerge, the thing that's so confusing about it is it started to maintain that all previous stages had some significance. They were there for some reason. They either had some partial truth or, if nothing else, at the very least they were ingredients of each higher stage, just like atoms are parts of molecules, and molecules are parts of cells, and cells are parts of organisms. If you get rid of molecules, you get rid of cells. So these earlier stages weren't just worthless and goofy and all that. Just even by that notion they were an important ingredient in overall growth and development.

And then as they looked at it more carefully, what it started to show up as was that second tier were the first true levels where genuine understanding of wholeness emerged. And so anything that helps wholeness, anything that makes the world a little bit more whole than it was the moment before is something that is a sign of success. So it all sort of comes down to being able to hold all of these different aspects in awareness simultaneously.

So in terms of looking at success, it would be almost a meta-version of success, is that it would look at all these different types of success and realize that different people hold all of those different things in mind as their version of success, but then if you were going to overall have a more successful world, a more successful planet, a more successful culture, you would have to make room for all of these types of success or you're going to be leaving out somebody's values and somebody's version of what's important, so that's not the best way to do it. So, wholeness starts to stand out as a crucial item, and it is indeed an absolutely foundational notion.

Marc Right, wholeness and – as you've pointed out before and we've talked about before – hierarchy, because of course heaps not wholes, to be able to create a hierarchy. I think maybe that's our topic for the next conversation. So if you basically give weight to all of the quadrants, you're giving weight to all the different lines of development, your different levels of development in each line, then we begin to talk about – and we'll talk

about it next time – what does it mean, success from the perspective of states and that particular line of development? That’s a pretty big vision.

And that’s our topic, friends, for next week. How do you begin to create a hierarchy? How do you begin to actually say, okay, you know, there’s so much time in a life, which ones are the more important ones? How do you create the beginning of a moral picture, if you will, which requires you to make choices and to actually prefer certain kinds of success over other kinds of success? Because the nature of success is you can’t have it all, in other words, you actually have to make choices. So what are the discerning guidelines? Now that we’ve set up this gorgeous meta-picture this week, so next week we’ll talk about what are the discerning guidelines in creating a hierarchy out of the wholeness?

Ken Excellent.

Marc Topic for next week, awesome!

Ken All right.

Marc What a delight, Mega-Pandit! Thank you so much.

Ken Okay.

Marc Success 3.0. Have a great day. Thank you.

Ken Bye-bye.

Marc Bye.