

Summit Dialogue 1 – Marc-Ken

Track: Marc-Ken_SummitDialogue1-Mar_31_2014__3-40PM

TRT: 45:08

Speakers

Marc Gafni

Ken Wilber

Marc Welcome everyone. I am here with Mega-Pandit Ken Wilber. And for those of you who are unfamiliar with the word mega, it means large, but pandit is a less familiar word. Pandit is a master of wisdom, an integrator of wisdom in the Indian tradition, and Ken is a master integrator of wisdom. My name is Marc Gafni. I am the co-founder with Ken of the Center for Integral Wisdom, which is the leading edge activist think tank in the world today that we're really privileged to have initiated, which is seeking to articulate a global ethic for a global civilization emergent from core integral principles.

And we just finished a dialogue series on integral sexuality, and we're now turning our approach to a no less sexy area and no less Eros-activated area, but sexy in the sense of ideas sex, as Matt Ridley calls it, sexy in the sense of enormously important, alive and vital for the nature of who we are as human beings and who we are as a civilization. We're going to turn our attention to business, to integral business, to a higher vision of business, to a movement from unconscious to conscious capitalism, which is reflective of the larger movement of unconscious to conscious evolution.

And, Ken, my thinking is – tell me if this works for you – I'll just kind of introduce a couple of core frameworks like we did in the Integral Sexuality Dialogues, then kind of turn to you to introduce some frameworks, and then we'll kind of pin the ball back and forth and see if we can kind of begin to articulate a framework for our upcoming summit.

Ken Sure.

Marc Yeah. The summit, just to say a word about it, Ken, myself, Kate Maloney, John Mackey, and a series of maybe 25 other super wonderful leaders in the worlds of politics and business are coming together to put forth what we're calling Success 3.0, which is an integral vision of success, an integral vision of business, an integral vision of capitalism, to actually move beyond what's available now. And maybe that's a good place to start from. So let me just offer two frameworks and then turn it over to you, Mega-Pandit.

Ken Okay.

Marc So, success, let's talk about success for a second. So, from a success perspective, I've just got to first tell you a joke, because we can't actually talk about these unbelievably serious things without a joke. So here's the joke. So there's this new chief, Ken, who becomes the chief of his North Dakota tribe. And he's not really

that well-versed in the old ways. He's more of a new ways kind of person. So at the beginning of the winter the Indians come to him and they say, "Well, how much firewood should we chop?" And he says he's not really sure. Of course his father, who knew the old ways, he would kind of go into some interior shamanic trance and be able to access based on the old lineages, but he wasn't sure. So he says, "Well, just chop wood. It'll be enough." So they say, "Okay." This is the new chief. That's what he said. They chop some wood.

They come back a week later and they say, "But how much should we chop? Is it going to be cold?" Now, he doesn't know the old ways, so he figures, "Well, just come back tomorrow." And he calls the National Weather Service. The National Weather Service tells him, "I think it's going to be pretty cold. I think so. We've done all our tests. It's going to be pretty cold." He says, "Okay."

The Indians come back and he says to them, "Chop a lot of wood. It's going to be pretty cold." They come back a week later, the Indians, and they say, "But how much should we really chop? How cold is it going to be?" Now he's got his new idea. He knows how to handle this. He says, "Well, just come back tomorrow." He calls the National Weather Service again. "How cold is it going to be?" They give him their best predictions. He tells the Indians, "Chop a lot of wood."

Finally they come back a third, final time. "How much should we chop?" So he calls the National Weather Service again, and he says, "Okay, like how cold is it going to be?" They say, "It's going to be a *really* cold winter." He says to them, "But how do you know?" "Well, the Indians are chopping a shitload of wood."

So when you look at this joke you actually get that we've got three periods of history here: premodern, modern and postmodern. Premodern is the old ways, the old lineages. Modern is the sciences, the National Weather Service. And postmodern is the joke itself, which makes fun and basically claims there are no true sources of knowledge, either premodern or modern. It's all a kind of circular joke which is context-bound, which you expose through laughter.

Ken Right.

Marc So actually in this joke you've got the premodern, modern and postmodern period, and in some sense that's actually mirrored in approaches to success.

Ken Yeah.

Marc In other words, the premodern world has its success literature, and it might be the Koran, it might be the Bible, it might be the Upanishads, but these are actually versions of success literature. They actually map what a successful life looks like in accordance with premodern principles, many of which we in an integral world fully accept as we transcend and include up the evolutionary chain of knowledge, but it's clearly premodern.

So, for example, if you were gay you would clearly be unsuccessful from a premodern perspective. You'd be in very big trouble. If you were universal you may also be in trouble if you were living in an ethnocentric context. And if you

challenged the divine right of kings you might be put to death. So there'd be a lot of things that could make you profoundly unsuccessful, but we clearly do have a success literature, which is deep and nuanced and profound and premodern.

The modern world produced a success literature, which is about achievement. It's about taking care of your family. It's about being loyal to your country and patriotic. And it's got a lot of really important values about being rational. So there's a modern success literature.

Then of course the postmodern success literature is there's no such thing as success. It actually rips apart, it laughs at both the premodern and the modern version, and basically says it's all context-bound anyways, there is no real success, and kind of reduces everything to a kind of relativistic heap lacking, as Wilber points out – you can read him some time – any sense of being a whole. So that's our postmodern success literature.

So we now need to move to a place where we have an integral success literature. How do we actually integrate the best premodern, modern and also accept the postmodern laughter and its context undermining of certain objective frameworks and its integrating of evolution? How do we begin to kind of accept and integrate a kind of post-postmodern, a kind of integral success literature, A? And then, B, we want to then apply that to business in particular.

But perhaps we might begin in this first dialogue really just looking at this issue of success. What's a vision of success that we might be able to articulate, which is Success 3.0, in other words the next vision of success that's emergent from integral wisdom? How does that sound for a framework?

Ken Excellent!

Marc Awesome! Take it away, sir.

Ken Oh, I'm up.

Marc That would be me... on this recorded dialogue with several thousand people on it, yes. Go ahead.

Ken Yeah. Well, it's pretty straightforward in an introductory sense to say what is successful from a general integral perspective, and what's successful from a general integral perspective in virtually any area are approaches and ideas, visions, practices and so on that are as comprehensive and as inclusive as possible. So if we are drawing a map of the Rocky Mountains and we want to fly over the Rocky Mountains and don't want to crash into it, of course we don't want to confuse the map with the territory – we all know that – but at the same time we don't want to have a completely screwed up map. A really narrow, partial, inaccurate map will get us crashed into the Rocky Mountains.

And what is interesting, of course, is that the continuing evolution of humans has simply continued to expand consciousness, expand perspectives, increase capacities, and make more and more dimensions of reality more and more apparent and

obvious to human beings. So, I mean even 500 years ago, if you think about what humanity actually knew about the world that it was living in compared to today, estimates show that somebody 500 years ago learned as much information in their lifetime as a person today does in a single day.

Marc Wow, unbelievable!

Ken It's just overwhelming. And one of the really extraordinary things is we can look at certain areas that have become prominent after the discovery of evolution, such as the idea of development or growth in general. Virtually all the premodern and even early modern views of the world had essentially an unchanging static world. For the premodern traditions, everything that existed, every animal species, plant species, every rock, every item was essentially an idea in the mind of God, and so that's where species came from, and that's where humans came from, and so on. And those weren't changing, because ideas weren't changing. God just simply had an idea of the universe, created it, and that was that.

Then increasingly we started to understand that there was actually a lot greater lengths of time involved in evolution, much more than suggested by the Bible, which was by counting up generations it was estimated that the world was like 4,000 years old, something like that. And then all of a sudden we understood millions and eventually billions of years, and during that period, the farther we looked back the more we saw evidence of earlier less evolved, less developed, less complex beings.

So as we go all the way back to the Big Bang what we get coming into existence initially are just some of the absolutely most fundamental physical particles. There are no living systems and no biology. There's no mind in the sense of conscious ideas or concepts and so on. There's certainly no self-realized souls or self-realized Spirit. It's just insentient strings, quarks, eventually coming together into atoms. Atoms eventually came together into molecules. In a really stunning step, a large number of very sophisticated long-string molecules came together in one location, a cell wall dropped around them, and living cells came into being.

It's just staggering, unbelievable. The chance of that being random mutations or anything like that is absolutely astronomical. There's a force, a self-organizing force of creative Eros that lines the fabric of the universe from day one. You don't even get a chance for Darwinian evolution until you have sex. There was a lot of evolving, creative, novel emergence that went on before there happened to emerge and evolve sex. So it was the same Eros operating there. Of course when it hits sex it reaches a new way of developing and evolving and growing, and so we see that.

And then it hits human beings, and all of a sudden human beings are undergoing growth not only in the physical dimensions, but in their interior dimensions, which have become increasingly conscious, increasingly aware, and so culture and individual psychological beings are undergoing growth and development and evolution themselves. And then at one point several hundred years ago evolution became conscious of itself, and we really moved into the modern era, and that was dominated increasingly by the notion of an evolutionary unfolding, a growth and developmental unfolding. And so we started to study that.

And essentially everybody who studied human growth and development found, at least in the past hundred years or so, that human beings had on the one hand a series of multiple intelligences, and that's recently been particularly emphasized, of course, with Howard Gardner's well known work on multiple intelligences, and most people know what the phrase 'multiple intelligences' means, which is that we don't have just one type of intelligence, cognitive or IQ.

We have emotional intelligence. We have moral intelligence. We have aesthetic intelligence. We have intrapersonal intelligence. We have interpersonal intelligence. We have kinesthetic intelligence. We have musical intelligence. We have mathematical intelligence and spiritual intelligence, among others. And as different as all of those are, we've also found that they all grow or develop to the same basic levels of development. So we have multiple developmental lines going through the same developmental levels, and that's been a huge breakthrough in our understanding.

Human beings were also aware of another type of development that they can go through, and whereas multiple intelligences and levels of development, those levels referred to structures of consciousness, whereas this other type of development referred to states of consciousness. And states are something you can directly immediately be aware of. So we're in small states of joy, happy, sad, etc, on an ongoing basis, but then there are sort of big states, like waking state or dreaming state or hypnotic state or deep dreamless state.

The wisdom traditions add something that in Sanskrit is called *turiya* which literally just means 'the fourth' and the fourth is after the first three major natural states of consciousness, which are waking, dreaming and deep dreamless sleep, and then the fourth, *turiya*, is witnessing or pure radical infinite awareness, itself empty or unqualifiable, but aware of all of the objects that are emerging, whether those are waking or gross objects, dream or subtle objects, or deep formless or causal objects.

And then beyond even *turiya* is *turiyatita* and that actually means a union of that emptiness/witness with all form. That generally is referred to as a non-dual stance, and we see that essentially in most of the world's sophisticated branches of their own religion. Virtually all of them have some sort of non-dual school, and the non-dual schools all essentially maintain that the individual human soul has what the Sufis call a supreme identity with God. So soul and God are one in godhead, and that oneness, the discovery of that not-twoness is the ultimate summum bonum of human existence.

And that involves state development, and if you look at the great meditative systems around the world, most of them have essentially similar stages that they describe, going from kind of a gross state of random thinking, so-called monkey mind, oriented towards gross material realm of money, food, sex, and so on. And then as you sit and simply watch that mind in an introspective, meditative or contemplative fashion, then sooner or later that gross mind dies down and subtler images and audible illuminations and luminosities and deity forms start to appear, the whole subtle realm.

And as you continue to watch that you might even move into the realm of formless unmanifest awareness, which is simply being aware of the primordial uncreated, unmanifest Ground of Being. And you can even continue and wake up to the source of self-awareness itself, one's own True Self or Unique Self. And beyond even that one can recognize the actual identity of this observing witnessing self with all of manifestation, so oneness with the entire universe and a unity consciousness, one with absolutely everything that's arising, moment to moment. And that is simultaneously a liberation, a great freedom from being identified with this individual body-mind, which essentially arises, suffers for a while and dies, so this awareness of one's supreme identity is also a great liberation and a great ultimate realization of an ultimate reality. And that has to do with states.

Now, the structure development – and then we'll more quickly get into business – you can't see structures easily by simply introspecting the way you can the states. When you have a state experience you know it, because it's what's conscious. It's right there. You're aware of it. You're immersed in it. You can't miss it. But structures are more like the rules of grammar. So everybody who's brought up in let's say English-speaking world will learn to speak the language more or less accurately, and they are in fact following dozens and dozens and dozens of grammar and syntax rules. None of them can actually sit down and write out what those rules are. They really don't even know they're doing that, but they do, they follow those rules implicitly. So they're following these structures.

Marc That's a great analogy.

Ken And what developmental psychologists in the west have found is that humans, all these multiple intelligences go through these stages or levels that are like levels of grammar. There's an actual deep structure to each of the stages that a multiple intelligence goes through, but a person is rarely ever aware of what those levels are. And what they involve, as you look at all the multiple intelligences, is they involve different values, different ideas of ethics, what's right, what's wrong, different worldviews, different motivations, different needs, and so on, and these turn out to be overall completely different worldviews or even different worlds.

So we can use a little variation on one of the pioneering developmentalists, Jean Gebser, who was one of the first to examine these overall worldviews and stages of grammar, so to speak, and he named them – and I'll just give a little variation on it – but his names were archaic stage, to magic stage, to mythic, to rational, to pluralistic, to integral. So what that means, for example – and we have abundant evidence for all of these – if you look at the cognitive line of intelligence, that there's an archaic cognitive, a magical cognitive, a mythic cognitive, a rational cognitive, a pluralistic cognitive, and an integral cognitive. If you look at emotional development, there's an archaic emotional stage, there's a magic emotional stage, there's a mythic emotional, a rational emotional, a pluralistic emotional, and an integral emotional.

So those different levels of worldview, values, needs, drives, motivations, turn out to be profoundly important. We can look at our culture wars, for example, and they are made precisely of three of the most prevalent of those levels of development, namely the mythic or traditional values which believes in fundamentalist religious

orientations and family values, etc, and that's common in the so-called traditional or premodern value structure. And then the next major level, the rational, is the modern, the level of achievement and excellence, and scientific evidence and proof. And that sort of achievement, excellence, meritocracy, rational-driven level is the level that was at the heart of modernity itself. It first became a major stage of development in the Western Enlightenment, and has continued to be probably the single most common level of development in the western world, around 50% of the population coming in at that level.

And then in the 60s there emerged the level after rational which is pluralistic, and that marked the postmodern. And pluralistic is a level of multicultural sensitivity and environmental concern and real concern with marginalization, wanting to make sure that we try and include as many people as possible. It drove the civil rights movement, and is still at about 20-25% of the United States population. It's still sort of the leading edge. Most humanities and most professors come out of that stage of development. Most progressive liberals come from that stage.

But we're also on the very verge of an emergence of the next and generally highest level so far, which is referred to as systemic or integrated or integral or integral-aperspectival. One of the early developmental pioneers, Clare Graves, as he was studying these, and he came up with those first levels in his own terminology, he was studying value systems, and so he came up with archaic, magic, mythic, rational, pluralistic values.

And then he found a very small percentage of individuals at a stage that almost didn't make any sense at all, because what marked all of the earlier stages, which were grouped together and referred to as first tier, is that each of those levels thought that its truth and values were the only real truth and values in existence, and that of course is what we see in the culture wars. The whole point of the traditional values and the modern values and the postmodern values is that each of them thinks that they are right and everybody else is wrong.

Well, the integral stage, which he started to call second tier, it found that there was some value, some truth, some significance to all of the previous stages, and that an overall worldview, in order to be complete, had to include them all. This also meant that the individual at that stage was starting to find a completeness and a fullness in their own being. Graves called it a monumental leap of meaning, and that monumental leap of meaning is right where the leading edge of evolution is today.

So what we're starting to see in rare cases, but in virtually every major area of human existence, is we're starting to see a small percentage of the approaches in those areas, whether it's medicine, government, business, politics, art, psychotherapy, psychiatry, you name it, we're starting to see systemic or integral or integrated approaches, and they are starting to emerge. And they are having a small but significant and fairly rapidly growing impact, and they're having an impact because they work better, they're more inclusive, they're more effective, and they're more efficient. They're also simply more accurate.

Marc I'm going to jump in for a second, because that's such a perfect place. Instead of going to business now, I want to make a suggestion that we now just kind of

naturally reflect this back on success, because so far in the integral model you've talked about a lot of the model, but you've really focused on states and structure stages of consciousness. You haven't gotten to types yet. You've talked about lines, you've talked about states, and you've talked about structures. We haven't gotten yet to types and we haven't yet gotten to quadrants. So far, so good?

Ken Yeah.

Marc So just here, just so people can have kind of a bite-sized piece, just letting everyone know on the call, Ken could go on for about another six hours with fascinating... but I'm just kind of having mercy on you so you can actually absorb what he said so far. So I just want to, with your permission, Mega-Pandit, kind of reflect this back into the world of success. So therefore implicitly you've of course offered, just from the perspective of lines and of states of consciousness and of structures, a new vision of success.

So, first, you can't be successful if you're only in one line of development. You need to actually be across a series of lines. And you might be successful in one line and unsuccessful in another, and because you're successful in one you can't hijack and claim that you're successful in others. So, for example, let's say a person's really successful in the enlightenment line, and we're defining the enlightenment line in the old way. It means you have a spacious awareness of non-dual consciousness, of the seamless coat of the universe that you're identified with, as you described so beautifully earlier. So you're successful in that line.

Then you say, "Well, because I'm successful in that line, let me give you really good business advice." Well, it doesn't work, because these are two different lines of development, and by actually parsing out individual sets of criteria, validity tests for success in every line of development, we actually prevent one line of development from commandeering the other lines, because we're actually demanding independent standards for success in every line. Is that fair?

Ken That's correct. That's particularly true in the issue you mentioned, because that enlightenment line isn't just a line. It's an entire different axis of development, namely state development. In the multiple intelligence line we also find a spiritual development that's occurring, but it's referred to as spiritual intelligence, and spiritual intelligence was first mapped out, for example, by James Fowler, and he found, again, that there were essentially archaic, magic, mythic, rational, pluralistic and integral levels of spiritual intelligence.

What's the difference between spiritual intelligence and enlightenment or states? Spiritual intelligence, again, is this grammar of the map that you have of spiritual reality. So it tends to be the ideas you have about spirit, what you consider to be ultimate concern, how you think about these.

Marc With a lot of ramifications in practical areas. So, for example, in Fowler's map how you deal with uncertainty would be a great litmus test for which one of these levels of spiritual intelligence you're at.

Ken Exactly right. And so in a sense what these multiple intelligences and lines are dealing with in almost every case is how we grow up in our understanding of those areas, so how we grow up cognitively, how we grow up emotionally, how we grow up morally, how we grow up aesthetically, and so on, whereas state development is how we wake up, how we actually get to not just an intellectual understanding of Spirit, but a direct immediate first-person experience of identity with Spirit, with ultimate reality itself.

And virtually all of the great traditions that have a path of great liberation, a path to enlightenment or awakening or Metanoia, maintain that that experience of ultimate reality makes all of the previous levels, realms, dimensions of reality seem to be merely relative and, if considered apart from Spirit, to be actual illusions, the realm of *maya* or *samsara* or the fallen realms. And so not only are the spiritual line, you can be good in that, but you still might not be awakened, you still might not have state development. And either one of those doesn't guarantee success in the other line.

Marc Exactly. So, in other words, here's the paradox. I could be incredibly talented in the awakening line. I could be profoundly awakened and spiritually stupid.

Ken Yeah, exactly.

Marc That's an enormous paradox. And I want to kind of really hold it here for this week, and next week get to quadrants and types, and *then* get to business so we can actually parse out this vision of integral success in a very, very clear way. So let me just try and re-articulate it for a second. So I can be enlightened in the classical definition, meaning I have a genuine awareness of, a Sufi way of saying it, my supreme identity with the godhead, or I experience in a more kind of Buddhist sense the Ground of Being that's not separate from me a.k.a. my Buddha nature, or in Kabbalistic terms my *yesh* (my relative embodied sense) is identical with my *ayin* (my infinite sense).

I can have that genuine experience. I can truly know that, and at the very same time I can be a fundamentalist who is bound to a position which says that I either need to convert, or, when I can get away with it, maybe even do worse to anyone who doesn't believe in my faith structure. And as you've pointed out, 70% of the world lives in that structure.

Ken Yeah.

Marc So only by disambiguating – and, Ken, really the purpose of this dialogue was to allow me an opportunity to use that word – only by disambiguating between states a.k.a. waking up, and structures, growing up, in all the multiple intelligences do we really establish a vision of success. I need to actually be independently successful in each of the lines of development. I can't claim success in one line gives me rights in another line, which is really, really important. And I can't claim that success in growing up – structure stages of development – gives me success in waking up. And within growing up, again, as you say, I can grow up in moral consciousness, but I've also got to grow up in cognitive consciousness, and I've also got to grow up in

psychosexual consciousness, and I've also got to grow up in creative consciousness, etc.

So if you put these together, we've actually mapped a new vision of success that actually wasn't available to the great traditions. Just generally – and let me just take a look for a second, Mega-K, at the premodern, modern and postmodern move – the premodern move, whatever your basic vision was of waking up or obedience, piety, that was considered success, and those people therefore had rights in other areas in other lines of development.

So, in other words, if you were really good at waking up or you were really good at fulfilling whatever the pious obligation was, then that gave you ecclesiastical authority in areas of the cognitive, for example. So, for example, science, you might have authority over science. It might give you authority in prescribing things in the psychosexual realm. So, in other words, success in one area in the premodern era actually was used by people to arrogate to themselves the ability to legislate in areas outside of their realm of success.

Ken It's the standard example of the church fathers not even having to look through Galileo's telescope because they know what was there. The Bible told them.

Marc Because we were so successful in the spiritual realm, that basically that success then hijacked the other realms.

Ken Completely.

Marc Now, of course the modern period did precisely the opposite. The modern period got really successful in the techno-cognitive scientific realm, and here the exact same reverse thing happened. Because we managed to put a person on the moon a.k.a. we were successful in that line of development, we then said, oh, and let us tell you about the interior nature of spirit. Well, that doesn't work. The fact that you can put a man on the moon gives you no authority in anything that has to do with genuine interior realms. And so what the modern period did is it got really successful in one realm, just like the premodern period, got intoxicated by its success in a particular realm, and didn't parse out or demand different standards of success in every line of development.

And then, finally, the postmodern realm – and, again, I'm just deploying it in terms of success – the postmodern realm was really successful in pointing out that actually there's a hermeneutic prism, a fancy word for there's a prism of interpretation, there's a lens through which we're always seeing the world. And that lens is culture-bound, and that lens is relative, and that lens is connected to meaning and language, and all that stuff was invisible before. And the success of postmodernism in pointing out that everything is context within context within context therefore gave postmodernism the sense that it could also be successful in deconstructing any sense of interior knowing in, for example, ethics.

So each period got really successful in a particular way – premodern, modern and postmodern – one way of saying it, and therefore claimed that it was successful all across the board. Or, said differently, each line of development – another way of

looking at it – got really successful, and then claimed authority in other lines of development.

And so the integral view would be then – I’m just in a certain sense recapitulating what you said and applying it, integrating with what we said in the beginning, to these three levels of success – so the integral view would be, to be successful, A, you require the highest state of consciousness available, meaning the best knowledge of the true nature of what is available through practicing which yields states of consciousness; B, you’ve got to actually gather up the best knowing about success at each of the structure stages of consciousness in all the levels of development, because all of them are valid, and then integrate them in this larger vision of Success 3.0.

Ken And that sounds to some degree complicated, but the point is it’s happening anyway. All of those areas are there. They’re unfolding moment to moment. Every one of us has all of those, and we’re either aware of them and therefore consciously engaging them, and that’s incidentally why so many of the recent “paradigms” have the word conscious in the title – conscious parenting, conscious aging, conscious business, conscious capitalism – and we’re either aware of them or we’re not. And if we’re not aware of them, they’re still there and we get blindsided by them.

We also, not knowing about them, don’t even know that if necessary and we have some lacks or limitations in those areas, we can practice in those areas. There are exercises and techniques for improving oneself in every single one of those lines through every single level of development. And that’s part of, of course, what overall Integral Life Practices and Integral Transformative Practices are doing, is they’re taking exercises from a half dozen of the most important developmental lines or multiple intelligences, and they’re helping to move people through as many levels as possible, and also in many cases working with state development, so you can not only grow up, you can wake up.

It’s generally the nature of all of those earlier levels, those first tier stages, that they do have what you can think of as an exclusivity orientation. So in premodernism it was indeed generally speaking the religious orientation, and whoever got the inside track on *that*, whenever that person said jump, you said how high? And the one thing you didn’t want to do is mess with whoever it was...

Marc No, bad idea.

Ken From medicine man to the pope, who was the head of that thing, because you are dead meat. And then we get to the modern area, and as Weber pointed out, the modern era was marked by the differentiation of the value spheres, in other words, the good, the true and the beautiful were no longer mashed together and under control of one dominant force, the church and religion. They were actually differentiated into art and morals and science, and each of those was allowed to go their own way, making their own discoveries and so on. Modern science exploded.

And in the first hundred years the three of those tended to be fairly balanced, but with the increasing outrageous success of science, all of a sudden everybody wanted to be science. And so we had the whole period of positivism and the rise of

scientific materialism and scientism, and because that's still coming out of first tier, essentially the scientific materialist view took over.

Marc Because it was successful.

Ken It was successful. And everybody wanted to be science, and every science wanted to be physics. So we had this massive reductionism going on, and we'll see that it actually involves quadrants and what that means, but that went on until the rise of postmodernism. Postmodernism, the name implies trying to go beyond modernism, so one of the first things that it started challenging was scientific materialism, and it did that by pointing out that all knowledge, as you pointed out, was context-dependent.

So, as one leading interpreter, Jacques Derrida, pointed out, you can summarize deconstruction by saying all meaning is context-bound, contexts are limitless. Now, because of that there is no final ultimate interpretation you can give. So truth becomes a matter of fashion, a matter of interpretation, a fad, skirt lengths. Science is no more real than that. Skirt lengths go up, they go down. Who knows why? But they certainly don't have anything to do with truth.

So postmodernism actually got itself locked into a particular quadrant, which as we'll see is the cultural, interpretive, intersubjective context, meaning mutual understanding quadrant, and claimed that that alone created everything. So it was a social construction of knowledge, and a social construction of this, and a social construction of gender.

Marc And here again postmodernism was successful, meaning it pointed to things that no one saw before.

Ken That's right.

Marc All of a sudden people realized, wow! So my suggestion, with your permission, is let's hold here, give people a chance to kind of absorb, and let's pick up next week exactly at this place of the differentiation of value spheres, the good, the true and the beautiful, and then from there really move into quadrants and types, and show why they're essential. So, everybody listening, this week we did structure stages of consciousness (growing up). We did waking up (states of consciousness). We did lines of development. And we began to show why in order to have an integrated vision of success, integral success, Success 3.0, you actually need to integrate success according to each structure stage of consciousness, in every line of development, and accessing the greatest possible number of states.

We just began talking about these three lines called the good, the true and the beautiful that Ken just began to unpack, which is going to lead us to two other key dimensions of success, which are quadrants and types. And we promise – I think we promise, Ken – that next week we're going to give you specific examples of why you need all of these to be successful, why without them you're actually stuck. Does that sound like a good place to hold and let people absorb for the week? What do you say, sir?

Ken You bet. And a certain conclusion is very easy to put right now, and that is that every attempt that you can find out there that is a really sophisticated attempt to come up with something like conscious capitalism or conscious business, what marks them is that they are explicitly including all of those dimensions that we've already talked about.

Marc We'll point to that. That's a great conclusion. I have to add one more piece to the conclusion, because there's a line of development called loving. I totally love you and I'm so delighted to talk to you. And we can't forget in Success 3.0 to love each other, because that's the beginning and end of it all. And I publicly proclaim I love Mega-K. You're awesome!

Ken Love you, buddy.

Marc Thank you, man!

Ken Okay, pal.

Marc Awesome! Next week.

Ken You got it.

Marc Have a great day.

Ken Bye-bye.