

Actualize OS

10 WEEK TRAINING

WITH KEN WILBER



ACTUALIZE OS

Q & A

INSTALLATION FIVE



Q&A

Ryan: Hello everybody. So, we're going to jump in with some questions in a minute, and we're going to ... We've got some interesting and somehow complex, of course with quadrants you can get a bit complex questions today. And so, I'm excited-

Ken: And also because we've gone through so many of the other elements, people's questions also now reflect knowledge of all the other elements, so the questions can get more and more complex.

Ryan: Yeah, that's the great thing about it. And we did that on purpose, we built it in such a way that each piece adds something new and it all comes together in these quadrants model. This is where all quadrants, all levels, AQAL framing and Integral framing comes from.

Ken: Right.

Ryan: I'm going to ask some questions but Ken, I really love the story of how you stumbled on this very simple and elegant solution for organizing pretty much all of the world's knowledge. Can I ask you about that briefly before we jump in?

QUESTION 1: How did Ken go about organizing the world's knowledge into a single system?

Ken: Yeah, it's a funny story. In the earlier books I did, up to Sex, Ecology, Spirituality, and this is some probably 20 books, I was exploring in each case, what turned out to be a different quadrant. So I started out my first couple of books focused on the upper left quadrant, and I did A Spectrum of Consciousness and No Boundary and The Atman Project. These were all looking at development and levels and states and so on in the upper left. Then sort of the more I looked at that, the more I could sort of see that there were other areas that were getting left out. It wasn't what I had written was wrong, but just that it was incomplete, there was more stuff. And so I expanded into the lower left. And, the first book there was called Up From Eden and it still went on ... Atman Project and Up

From Eden, were the first two really developmental books. For a lot of people there're still some of their favorite books.

And I still stand by virtually everything that I set in them. But they were focusing on the upper left, and the lower left. So I started to see how those actually were going together. So I kept expanding into other areas and doing other books and did stuff on strict science, Inside the Holographic Paradigm and Quantum Questions and things on strict philosophy like Eye to Eye, things that focused on the lower right, things focused on the upper right and so on. And then I sat down to work on Sex, Ecology, Spirituality, and it all been coming together. And what I started to notice was that in each of the areas that I had worked on, there were developmental nested hierarchies, not domineering hierarchies or dominator hierarchies. Those were universally condemned, and of course I condemned them as well, but most people just put all hierarchies in that category of just being domineering, being bad, like oppression or racism or sexism, the cash system, all horrible stuff.

But they were all overlooking the fact that most hierarchies in nature were nested hierarchies or what Arthur Koestler are called holarchies. That each higher level actually got more and more inclusive, not more and more dominating. And we see this in everything from atoms going to molecules, molecules to cells, cells to organisms. We see this in human development, moving from egocentric to ethnocentric to world-centric to Cosmo-centric. We see in language systems, we see in sociological systems, we see it in biological growth, from a single cell multiplying, dividing into four cells, differentiates and then integrates and differentiates and integrates into higher and higher levels, each of which is more inclusive. I actually sat down and just started looking at all of the developmental holarchies that existed everywhere. And existed everywhere because evolution was everywhere.

And evolution unfolded by transcending and including, transcending and including or differentiating and integrating, differentiating and integrating. So there were holarchies nested hierarchies wherever you looked. And so I just sat down and started looking at those and they all sort of seemed similar but in many ways they are also really, really, really different. So if you looked at a hierarchy focusing on physical individual elements, it's like going from atoms to molecules to cells to organisms, and then the organisms themselves going from simple organisms to more and more complex, differentiated, integrated, more holistic organisms and so on. That sort of seemed to be one kind of sequence. But then if you looked at the sequence of let's say worldviews, Jean Gebser's and that went from archaic to magic to mythic, to rational, the pluralists, the integral, somehow that was really different than the atoms to molecules, but they still had something in common.

Each level's still got more and more inclusive and each level transcended and included these previous levels. So there were all these similarities, but also there were some really fundamental differences. And that started to just obsess me. I really couldn't get over the fact that this was going on, because somehow in every area I looked, there were holarchies, and yet all have similarities, and

then there were these fundamental differences. And so I actually started writing down in every field, linguistics, sociology, physics, astrophysics, biological evolution, microbiology. I started writing down all of these holarchies, one holarchy each on one large legal sheet of paper, and I'd write it down, and I'd tear the sheet off and then set it on the floor, and then the next holarchy I'd find, I'd write that down, set it on the floor.

And within a month or two, I had over 200 sheets of paper lying all over the floor. My whole house was covered with sheets of paper. And I would just stop, every single day I would have walked through and look at every one of these sheets of paper, and I'd go, "Okay, what the hell is going on?" So I kept looking at it, looking at it, and all of them had ... all of them had certain things in common and that's what made me keep thinking, "All right, somehow these things are related. I mean something is going on here." But then I'd look at the actual details, and they were really different, and I'd go, "They're not the Ryane, but they're not different either. Something is going on, but it's going on in really, really, really different ways." And so I just kept looking at it, looking at it, looking at it, and the first thing that started dawning on me was a lot of them seem to be dealing with subjective realities, interior realities, psychological states, emotional states, cultural states, that kind of thing.

Jean Gebser's was that type. And then the others seem to be dealing with sort of objectified exterior things, the atoms, the molecules, the cells, that kind of thing, or foraging to horticultural, to agrarian to industrial, that thing. Those are all sort of objective, exterior material things. I went through all of them, broken to one of those two. And so that was the first break. And I started focusing on each of those groups and trying to look at them and trying to figure out what was going on. And finally, at one point on the exteriors, it started dawning on me that about half of them were dealing with individual things like an atom going to a molecule, or a molecule going to a cell, or a cell going to an organism and so on. And in each one of those cases, the holon got bigger, because it didn't transcend and include its predecessor. And so molecules are bigger than atoms, because molecules actually included atoms, actually contain them, they surround them, they envelop them. And so they always got bigger.

And yet they seem to be dealing with collectives or social holons, and what happened there was they always got smaller. Now they were still including their predecessors, but they got smaller because, being made of these individual holons, each individual holon, because it was getting bigger and included lower holons, there was always fewer higher individual holons than there were lower holons. So when you go from atoms to molecules, there's always, with no exception whatsoever, fewer molecules than there are atoms. And there always will be because every atom is made of at least one or more ... I mean every molecule's made up at least one or more atoms. So there has to be fewer molecules than atoms always. And so because there's always fewer higher elements than lower elements, then when you bring those elements together, when higher elements congregate, and the lower elements congregate because there are fewer of the higher elements, congregations of them will always be smaller than congregations of the lower ones that are much, much larger.

So congregations of atoms are things like galaxies, congregations of molecules are things like planets, congregations of cells are things like ecosystems, congregations of animals, complex animals are things like families. And so the social holons are getting smaller, and the individual holon is getting bigger. And so that was just some of the differences that started to strike me. But also the fact that we have what we had, was the individual, and the collective looked at from an exterior objective viewpoint. And that that was half of these 200 holarchies broke down into exterior views. And those exterior views broke down into two halves, individual and social. And so based on that individual and social, I went back and looked at the interior, and they also broke down into individual and social. So they were individuals at particular levels of development. And then when those were brought together, those levels of development were the Ryane, they were in collective cultural world views.

So as individuals went from magenta to red, to amber, to orange and so on, collective worldviews did too. And so we found the Ryane relationships between them, and so as I put all four of these together, it became really, really clear that these were four dimensions of the Ryane occasion. We were looking at one occasion, but from either the inside or the outside and either in an individual or collective perspective. And they always went together. You'd never found one of these without the other. So even biologists, as they looked at evolutionary biology, they didn't have any understand of how it happened. But there was a rule that came up, it was called never a first incident. In other words, when frogs first evolved, there was no such thing as just one frog itself showing up. First of all, if it did, it would never live because it couldn't reproduce. You need at least two.

And so somehow, and again, they never talk about this, they still won't talk about this. Integral doesn't have any trouble with it because all things being produced moment to moment from radical emptiness and so pretty much anything can come out of that. But when a species shows up, it's just more or less, one day it's not there, and the next day there's a whole group of frogs or a whole group of deer or a whole range full of cattle, how it comes about, there's never an individual without a collective. And clearly there's never collectives without individuals. So these are all coming together, and you never have an exterior anything including an atom that doesn't have an interior. One version of this, which I don't fully agree with, but one version, this is called panpsychism, namely that all material objects have interior proto-feelings or what Whitehead called prehension.

And so you could draw all of this out on a four quadrant diagram, and the paper itself represented sort of ultimate reality or absolute emptiness or pure suchness. And then as that manifests, it always manifests in four quadrants. There was always a subjective and an object or an inside and an outside or an interior and an exterior. And if you think about it, they don't make any sense. You can't have an outside without an inside. It makes no sense at all. You can't have an inside without an outside, they show up together. And you can't have a singular, without a plural, you wouldn't recognize one if there wasn't the other. You wouldn't even have an understanding of singular if there wasn't something also called plural. The terms would just never show up in your awareness at all. So the fact that they show up means that they show up together.

And so it was common in a lot of the sort of more mythically oriented traditions including mystically oriented philosophers, Spinoza and Whitehead and Boethius and Plotinus and so on, to say the universe comes into existence when you separate the subject from an object. And that was still true, but that wouldn't really do it because if all you had was a subject versus an object, that's just a single boundary, and so it could like run in all directions forever, and you just have one big subject or one big object and that couldn't quite work. So the subject object boundary has to be broken up itself, and it is by the singular and plural boundary. So you need at least both of those boundaries to get a universe up and running. So you divide into a subject and an object or an interior, a proto-feeling, an awareness apprehension and then an exterior is material for what it actually looks like in the material external world.

And then those show up in singular and in collective forums or an individual and in groups and so on. And so you put those together, and you get the four quadrants. And then what once I sort of got that in mind, then everything, when I added elements I already understood, which were levels and lines and states and types, then all of those existed in the quadrants and all of them look different in each quadrant because as I increasingly understood, each quadrant was actually just a different perspective. And at first I just looked at sort of the upper left quadrant, which is first person perspective, and the lower left was second person and all that. But in order to actually determine to have enough perspectives to determine a quadrant, you actually need at least three perspectives. So the upper right quadrant is a third person view of a third person view of a third person view.

And the upper left is a first person view of a first person view of a first person view. And then there's also an inside and an outside in each of those quadrants. And so that brings in a first and a third person view for each of them. So in the interior, the inside zone one, upper left is the first person view of a third person view of a first person view, is a first person looking at an objective view of an interior holon. And so that gives us sort of our intellectual models of our interior realities like levels, the notion of a level dealing with interior realities. First of levels not dealing with an exterior reality. So it's already a first person perspective, and it's held by me, I'm the one that's thinking about these levels, but I'm looking at these interior holons from an objective stance.

So I'm not simply feeling them in a first person way. I'm looking at them thinking about them, forming a third person objective view of them. So I'm having a first person view of a third person view of these first person realities. And so whether I believe in a Freudian theory of these first person realities or whether I believe in a structural developmental view, whatever that is, that's a zone two or looking at the interior of an individual from the outside and so on around the quadrants. So you end up with eight zones because each quarter can be looked at from the inside and the outside, as well as each quadrant is also already an interior or an exterior. And so, it just sort of built from there, and it ended up being one of those really fundamental frameworks that every reality that we looked at would fit into.

And those are just rare. You don't find those showing up very often. And then within each of those quadrants, of course, you have many things that are similar. So each in the quadrants has

levels. Each of the quadrants evolutionarily develops, each of the quadrants has different lines. Each of the quarters has types, and there're states in quadrants. States in a lower right quadrant are things like weather states. There are also political states and economic states and so on. In the lower left, there are mob states, mass hysteria, cultural shared worldviews and so on. In the upper left there are waking, dreaming, deep sleep, cross, subtle, causal states, et cetera. So we find similarities in all the quadrants, but we find the quadrants occurring virtually everywhere. And then as I went back and started looking at all the human disciplines that it developed, you can see that all of them tended to focus on one quadrant to the exclusion of others.

And in many cases, some of the disciplines would actually have one quadrant that the main discipline thought was real, but there were often secondary schools in that discipline or schools that there were alternative views. And they usually ended up emphasizing another quadrant. So in law, for example, most law still today focuses on right hand approaches, and they just believe there's one legalistic interpretation, and for every wrong, there's a particular punishment and so on. But then there's a smaller school that actually calls itself interpretive law, and it focuses on the left hand quadrants, and it believes that each legal occasion has to have its own interpretation. So it tends to do that. So all of a sudden this AQAL framework, which by that time had five major elements, quadrants, levels, lines, states and types. And the whole point about those elements is that each one of them was absolutely crucial.

And what you want to do with a good model is a good model, explains the most amount of reality with the fewest number of variables. And so we've stuck to these five. There are several others you can put in, but they're not present everywhere, they're not as all inclusive, they not as universal. And so I don't include them in the fundamental framework. But as you go from, different discipline to different discipline, you can always add other elements, and that's why I have types as a catchall. You can always add other types if you want to. So like we say, just even in the upper left, in types we have things like, masculine and feminine and Enneagram and Myers-Briggs and five factor and all of those can be brought in and are part of an integral framework. But for the actual integral framework itself, we haven't found more than these five that are absolutely mandatory because are present everywhere.

Ryan: Yeah. Ken this is awesome. I really think it's fascinating how you took what was 200 different schools of thought with their own structural developmental models within their domain of school ... I mean their domain of thought and then did the Herculean effort for the rest of us to figure out how all those things fit together, because I know we all have that sense. We're all probably nagged by the Ryane question, you're nagged by, of like, what's the big picture here? What's going on? How does all this fit together? And then, I always love the visual and I find it really entertaining of seeing you standing there in your office with 200 legal sheets of paper, just spread all over the floor, trying to make sense of it, until really it comes together in this really simple, elegant, framework in quadrants where all these 200 schools of thought pretty quickly fall into one of these four dimensions, or quadrants of reality that we can look at.

And all of the other things that we've covered so far also fall into these four dimensions. So levels, lines, states and types all express themselves in different ways in the different quadrants. So when we're talking about dream states, it's a different thing than when we're talking about matter states. But they're both states. So it's really fascinating because we've done all the legwork now, everybody in this course of understanding levels, lines, states, and types, and now it really comes together in these quadrants where all of these dimensions, all of this stuff fits together in this simple four square, this four dimension map that has essentially all of reality in it.

And as you said, it's a bare bones framework. We can add to it more models and more frameworks, as it applies to our domain.

Ken: Absolutely.

Ryan: So if there's more specificity that's needed, this is just like, when we look at a map of the world, if we're just looking at the cardinal directions and continents, you've got everything there.

Ken: This is the minimum absolutely required elements.

Ryan: Yeah. The visual cracks me up often, I just imagine you standing there among those hundreds of papers.

Ken: Yeah. It was all over the house. It wasn't just the office, it was in the living room, the bedroom, the kitchen, the bathroom. There wasn't an inch in my house that wasn't covered in it.

Ryan: Yeah. Well, thank you Ken for doing the Herculean effort on behalf of all of us.

Ken: Sure. Yeah.

Ryan: I wasn't going to do it. Thank you. All right. So let's get into the question.

Ken: Sure.

QUESTION 2: HOW CAN WE TEACH INTEGRAL THEORY TO KIDS?

Ryan: So we have numerous questions on the subject and you have actually already touched on some of them, like going into this stuff that you've talked about already. So, we're going to go into first question, which I always find interesting and I hear all the time. So I just thought it'd be great to ask. So this one's from Robbins Stevens Hays, asks. "Thank you, Ken for teaching this. I'm very much enjoying the course, though sometimes you discuss material, I'm new to. I'm going at my own pace," which is great. I always encourage everybody to take it at their own pace. "So wondering if you have any thought about creating a system to teach to kids or provide some psychological framework for growing up in today's world. Is that possible given what they're going through the stages of childhood brain development until their mid 20s or so? What might that even look like?"

Ken: Yeah. This is one of the really important areas that we're talking about. One part of the integral is of course the various lines or multiple intelligences and the levels to which they all grow.

The developmental component, and remember it was really only about a 100 years ago, that a truly adequate understanding of development, and its stages was really gained. The very first psychologists to define structure was America's greatest psychologist, a guy named James Mark Baldwin. He was writing around a century ago, and he was a contemporary William James, who is probably America's second greatest psychologist, but while James was explicitly focusing on states of consciousness as in his masterful varieties of religious experience, Baldwin was focusing on the harder structures of consciousness. And so Baldwin was the first to outline several major lines of development and the six or so levels that he saw them going through.

And, rather amazing these levels stretched from what he called pretty logical to quasi-logical to logic, to extra-logical to hyper-logical. And all of them ended at their highest in what he actually called cosmic consciousness. That is ultimate unity consciousness, to have a psychologist over a 100 years ago, giving such a sort of comprehensive account of development to its nature levels and several of these lines to ultimate unity consciousness, is just stunning. But then James too, William James who was investigating ultimate unity consciousness, this time as a state as it appeared around the world in various mystics. We usually don't think of American psychologists having anything to do with higher spiritual structures and states, but here are two greatest psychologists ever fully embracing these. I mean, it's astonishing. Where on earth did that go?

At the end of Baldwin's life, he moved to Paris and started teaching there. And among his many students was a Swiss kid by the name of Sean Piaget and Piaget using Baldwin concepts went on to become probably the finest and most brilliant developmentalist of all time, certainly as a pioneer and certainly one of the greatest thinkers of the 20th century. And as Piaget studies started to become well known, they had a profound impact on how we viewed the growth and development of humans. And that affected everything from education to parenting practices. So schools begin integrating the levels of the cognitive line with what and how they taught elementary school and parents watching for the signs that there is major levels of development they can be expected to see in their children. And this is probably an enormous sophistication and rigor to these areas. Now, of course, the Piaget system wasn't fully integral.

It didn't even cover all the ground that Baldwin's system did. Baldwin included more lines than just the cognitive, and he certainly understood higher stages including cosmic consciousness. But these deficiencies in the Piagetian system didn't really have time to do any damage because the whole postmodern, pluralistic anti-hierarchy movement had begun sweeping into educational systems and completely undoing and rejecting anything like the Piaget system. And parenting was also completely reconceived. And we lost the developmental component from our culture, more or less permanently to this day. And of course with today's integral models, the Piaget system is now included as just one component. It deals with the earlier and middle levels of the cognitive line. It's one version of those. There are also a dozen other lines that need to be included as well as the higher levels of cognition up to and including cosmic consciousness.

But could you imagine what education would be like if they actually taught cosmic consciousness anyway, as integral approaches are starting to intubate virtually every major discipline and existence, in the Journal of integral theory and practice over 60 disciplines had been fully reinterpreted using the AQAL integral framework and every case the result is more inclusive, more satisfying, more accurate. But as that started happening, we've seen disciplines from education to parenting completely reinterpreted in integral terms. And so for parenting and child rearing, this includes understanding the important lines or the many multiple intelligences and the eight or so levels that they all go through. And working closely with the child to help move that development along as smoothly and as function free as possible. And this means understanding, the major stages of development emerge in an order that cannot be altered or skipped or reversed.

And although there are average ages that these stages emerge, the stages themselves are not rigidly tied to particular ages. So the red power driven stage, for example, can emerge anywhere from around ages three to five. So instead of looking for a particular capacity or characteristic to emerge at precisely a given age and getting all panicky, if doesn't, we simply track emergence and make sure that once a particular stage fully emerges, then the next stage can begin to emerge, and will do so depending on all sorts of factors in all four quadrants. And then we can work with all these factors to help that stage emerge in a healthy and more adequate fashion. And we do track factors in all four quadrants. So quadrants particularly help parents track changes in their own I and in their child's You. And how these come together in various We relationships between the parent and child.

And things can indeed go wrong here in these We relationships. Not to mention it, individual I and You. And so integral parenting watches these relationships very carefully and especially tracks how dramatically these relationships change from level to level of development. So at the early stages of the impulsive magenta stage, for example, the child is a wild explore, it's crawling off and all sorts of directions and sticking its nose everywhere. But towards the end of that stage, during the so called rapprochement sub-phase, as the child starts to waken to its separate vulnerable set apart self, it comes running back to mommy, fearful and frightened, and will end up hugging her legs and being afraid to move. If a parent doesn't understand that this is perfectly normal, they'll often think the child is regressing, and they might sort of repeatedly try to push it away and encourage its previous exploration habits.

This can cause some very deep dysfunctions in the child and land them with even a borderline pathology for most of the rest of their lives. So, tracking changes in the I, the You, We and the It dimensions, becomes an important part of integral parenting. So basic integral child development is in the AQAL matrix, is a basic roadmap for the changes that your child will be going through. Because the whole point about all of these aspects and the AQAL matrix is they all develop. And so they all have history. They all have an evolutionary trajectory. But because of its comprehensiveness, the AQAL matrix covers many more of the important bases than typical approaches that parenting do. Although the AQAL approach will incorporate many of the important true but partial aspects of those approaches. And there are many, organizations out there that teach and practice integral parenting, and you can Google them.

One I would recommend is the Martineau's integralparenting.com. But one of the most important things a child raised in an integral atmosphere is going to get, is a view of the world that is a truly big picture. They're going to be much more inclusive, much less exclusive and marginalizing. They'll have a much more adequate view of this cosmos and their place in it, and the many ways that everything is connected to everything else, top to bottom. So imagine having that view when you enter high school and all the questions it will answer for you, that high school will not answer for you. So anyway, you can start to picture how important integral parenting truly is.

Ryan: Yeah. Integral parenting and education. And actually as you mentioned Ken there are a lot of people pioneering approach it in this both integral parenting and integral education. And a lot of it is focused on using the map to design the education system and curriculum. And not necessarily to teach integral to kids until, it's developmentally appropriate, but teach somethings like states early on because we can be developing states of consciousness, we are actually-

Ken: And quadrants can be taught fairly early too.

Ryan: Yeah. And they're also designing it like we want to make sure that kids go into the ethnocentric phase of life in the healthiest way. Rooting for your school's sports team or participating in chess club. Doing something that gives you a sense of community in a healthy way is better than a really violent way of doing it, which happens all around the world, so-

Ken: Healthy versus unhealthy ethnocentric is probably one of the biggest, most important, decisions an individual will make. Healthy ethnocentric has wonderful qualities. It teaches beginning love and belongingness and loyalty and trust and care. It's just incredibly important, and it's the whole stage that gets a person out of their egocentric, narcissistic, super special, I'm the only one that exists awareness. So it can be really important. On the other hand, there's probably nothing anywhere on the planet, literally more dangerous than unhealthy ethnocentric. It's the basis of everything from every terrorist on this planet is unhealthy ethnocentric. Every Nazi is unhealthy ethnocentric every KKK-er, unhealthy ethnocentric is probably the single largest cause of human suffering and torture and murder in our history.

Ryan: Yeah-

Ken: And we can go either way. I mean, there's nothing in the ethnocentric stage itself that says you must be healthy, or you must be unhealthy. That's a four quadrant affair. And how they are taught from all four quadrants will determine how it goes, so it's crucial.

Ryan: Yeah, it's crucial. So much hangs on the line and I think to the question, it's about using the integral model to bring the education into harmony and health as opposed to pathology and unhealthy and so that's what what our charge is. If it's something that your passionate about, if you're listening on the call, if you're interested in and childhood development and education, look for others on the internet, on Facebook groups and meetups because these conversations are happening, they're having at the integral conferences in Europe and the Integral theory conferences in the US. So, it's a big, it's a huge potential for really good stuff.

Ken: Yeah.

QUESTION 3: HOW DO I CROSS-TRAIN MY QUADRANTS?

Ryan: So Ken, it was quadrants week, so we have a bunch of questions that I want to get to. But there's one from, Derek that I want to ask. So can I ask you the one from Derek?

Ken: Sure.

Ryan: Okay. So Derek says, "Ken, this week you covered quadrants really profound. You pointed out, that there are these four fundamental dimensions to reality that they are all colorizing, I, We, It and Its. I really appreciate learning it, but I wonder how I can actually use this information to know more about my own potential or more specifically, do anything to grow. Can I somehow make an intentional shift in one quadrant or dimension that will provide me leverage in another dimension? For example, I've always wanted to be more fit. Recently I've been forcing myself to do pushups, but what else can I do given my new understanding of quadrants and how could it possibly help me develop potential?"

Ken: One the first things we find out about quadrant is that almost every individual tends to favor a particular quadrant. And one of the reasons that nobody ever really saw quadrants before, I mean the way viewed them as the interior and exterior, the singular and the plural as far as I can tell, I'm the first person in history, that saw that. And the reason is that most people end up latching onto just one quadrant so they don't ever put it next to the other quadrants and see that there are other quadrants or how they fit together. So individuals tend to look at world through either a subjective I perspective or a relational You-We perspective or an objective It perspective or systems network Its perspective.

So somebody focusing on the upper left quadrant focuses on the I space, and I perspective is always seeing things the way they look to just this person. These folks tend to think that their opinion is basically the only one that really counts, that others were just not as sharp or perceptive or as smart as they are different. They're primarily first and foremost with how something would benefit me, what good it is for me, what I have to gain from it. Now this will vary depending on the level that they're at in this quadrant. So egocentric level will be extremely self centered and think only and constantly of their own gain. Predators take all, prey are suckers and they're of course predators. Somebody at ethnocentric, will be focused on the group, the client or the tribe or their organization or their religious group, whatever group or groups that they belong to.

And they'll give much importance to that group, but it was so always be with an eye on what's good for that group and but they'll still have it in mind for ultimate benefit for themselves. So it'll be the group, but it'll also be sort of what I can get out of it. The group is important because of ways that it can help me and that type of thing. This is for somebody who's coming from the upper left quadrant as they're going through an ethnocentric stage. And somebody at world-centric in upper left, there'll be fully aware of others and they'll be aware of their significance too, and they'll tend to

treat them with respect and tolerance, but winning is still everything for them and they'll still divide the world into winners and losers and they intend to be winners no matter what it takes.

But the I space is always, first with somebody who's coming from that quadrant. Somebody who focuses on the upper right quadrant, will tend to see everything in an objective sort of detached dispassionate analytic way. The world is viewed as a collection of independent, isolated objects. And that's the only thing that's really real. So emotions, relationships, usually even things like spirituality, even things like systems, it's not really real. They can all be reduced to individual material objects, which alone are real. So in general, they simply look at the world in very objective, very detached ways. Their reduction is that, with not much emotion or feeling just sort of objective ideas and thoughts. Somebody focusing on the lower left quadrant will always orient their group to their relationships, their friends and family and colleagues first and foremost.

Often they'll wait and see what the group wants before deciding what they want. They'll usually define themselves in the terms of the group they belong to, this particular political or this particular religion or this job, this profession, they see themselves not as their own person, but as members of these groups, they don't want to stand out, they want to fit in. And being excommunicated from the group is one of the worst things that can happen to them. So they never want to make waves or upset anybody. They'll see themselves as being good team members, reliable and loyal. A standard religious, true believer is focused on this quadrant as is say a Japanese life or the true blue ... member of a political party or member of the Mafia. But the group and group in particular is what comes first. Now somebody who focuses on the lower right quadrant also sees themselves as being good members of a group, but they'll see it not so much in emotional terms or mutual understanding terms like someone in the lower left.

Someone in the lower left relates to the group because of their mutual understanding, and because they see things the Ryane way that other people see it. But somebody in the lower right isn't focusing on people. They're focusing on objects and the way objects relate to each other. So they're focused on group, an objective network term. So a staunch environmental activist for example is focused almost entirely on this quadrant. What's real is the great web of life, which is the sum total of all objects conceived as one great big system, and everybody is viewed as an equal strand in this great big system and saving this great big system is the only value worth having. So it is so much understanding other people in the group, it's just the one single large objective group. So individuals themselves are not the real reality.

This great big system is the one and only real reality and we all owe ourselves to saving it. So somebody else focused on this inner objective systems' quadrant might see their political party as the one big system. That's the most important reality there is. And their life is devoted to that in a very objective sort of academic, intellectual way. Others dedicate themselves to an economic system. Others, a legal system, others an educational system, but it's always a system larger than the individual and of which the individual is just an insignificant strand in this much larger system, which is the only real thing. And of course there's a partial truth in all of these, well in all of the quadrants for that matter. So it is true that humans are strands in a great web of life.

But by not giving equal emphasis to the other quadrants, this person misses the fact that not all strands and the web are absolutely equal. The great web is holarchical, that means nested hierarchy with each higher level being more inclusive, more whole, more unified and containing more reality. And these are not equal relationships. So all of the lower is in the higher, but not all of the higher is in the lower. So they're not equally related. That's all of an atom is in a molecule, but not all of the molecule in an atom. All of the molecule is in a cell, but not all of the cell is in a molecule. All of the cell is in an organism, but not all the organism is in a cell. All of the nervous system is in an organism, but not all of the organism is in a nervous system and on and on and on, with every strand in a great web is an unequal series of relationships and not everything is related to everything in that strict sense.

So you have a profound misunderstanding of reality and that leads to something that's called bio-equality. And this means that every single living being is equal to every single other one. They all have an equal vote in what should be done. So this means, for example, that a single virus is equal to a Siberian tiger or take AIDS. According to bio-equality, one AIDS virus is equal to one human being. Now, since a person with AIDS produces several billion AIDS viruses a day, then clearly we want to support AIDS. It's a billion times more important than a single human or a single Siberian tiger for that matter. That kind of deeply confused thinking is what happens when you get caught in quadrant absolutism. And this defines the environmental bio-equality believers, which is disastrous. I've actually heard them say the AIDS virus is just as important as a human being.

And again, it's also as important as a Siberian tiger, although they'd hesitate to say that because we're supposed to be supporting Siberian tigers, so they get confused. Alan Watts, at least got the right understanding. Somebody asked, why he's a vegetarian. He said, "Cows scream louder than carrots when you kill them. So these kinds of quadrant absolutisms distort the important but partial truths of each quadrant. And so, when people naturally focus on their favorite quadrant, they tend to embrace that quadrant absolutism, and that ends up badly distorting the realities in all the quadrants. And that's what I mean problems we see with all the various disciplines that focus on just their quadrant. They get it right when they're referring just to their quadrant, but they screw up every other quadrant in existence and reduce it to their quadrant and it's disastrously wrong.

So what we do with integral is make sure that we give each quadrant it's due and we work to free ourselves from any and all quadrant absolutisms that we might have. So somebody overly focusing on the I or that We or It, or the Its would want to look at that carefully and work the balance and harmonize all of those, not just their present favorite quadrant. And this dramatically changes how we see the world in every single area we look. And it's absolutely crucial that we do this, and it also then directly affects our own growth and development, which this individual is asking about, because we'll start to emphasize all of the quadrants in our own being, in ourselves instead of neglecting and let wither the quadrants that we ignore. So our own wellbeing is directly at stake here.

There've been studies for example, that show that if you are focusing on medication in the upper left quadrant and you also take up weightlifting in the upper right quadrant and there was an actual

study that did this. They took two groups of people and they divided them in half, and for one group they had them just meditate for so many hours a week. And then the other group, they had spent just as many hours a week, but half of those hours they spent meditating and half those hours they spent weightlifting. And then what they found at the end of a six week period was that judged by the teachers of meditation themselves who didn't know which group, the students were in, the teachers found almost uniformly that the students that were weightlifting and meditating progressed more in meditation than the students who were spending all their time meditating.

So that cross quadrant training has a profound impact. Now weight lifters are starting to meditate because they find the reverse works and they grow muscles faster if they meditate, because what you're doing is enhancing the capacities of quadrants. And we find the Ryane thing happens, for example, for people that meditate in groups. So if you bring the lower quadrants in individuals that meditate in groups proceed at on average a faster rate than those who meditate alone, even in medical sciences, it's been demonstrated, which is shocking that women with breast cancer, which is medicine itself, looks at it just in upper right quadrant physical thing, and you can only treat it with physical things like chemotherapy or radiation or surgery. But women with breast cancer who join a support group in the lower left, live a staggering 100% longer than women who don't.

That's twice as long than women who don't, simply by exercise that lower left quadrant. So any physician not recommending that is a legally incompetent physician according to empirical studies. So this isn't just a matter of how we sort of theoretically view the world, it's a matter of how we approach all the problems in the world, and it's a matter of how we approach our own growth and development and our own being. If we're not exercising all the quadrants in ourselves, for that matter all of them AQAL elements. But certainly if we're not exercising all the quadrants in ourselves, we are crippling ourselves. We're hobbling our own growth and development. We're hurting ourselves, we're not the person that we were meant to be. And so that's one of the reasons that the individual who is seeking to improve himself wants to start weight lifting.

And also once you start meditating and also wants to join groups to do so and on and on and on. These are all a time of across quadrant training, this mutually reinforcing to all of them. They all get better when any of them are engaged and the more of them are engaged, the more cumulative and more powerful the effect. So it's meaningful just in personal terms, let alone how we approach our world's problems, which of course are staggering and not one of them is being approached from all four quadrants basically.

Ryan: Yeah. Thank you, Ken. Thank you, that was awesome. That was just a mind-blowing description of why this is all so important to approach our life with, to have as an important thing. Almost all of us have grown up in a world before this understanding, so we have major areas that are completely neglected in our life because there hasn't been of understanding of being able to analyze, what we're neglecting, what we're not getting to that is fundamentally a part of it. So, yeah it's important to look at your own life through these lenses and see what is being left out because of your priorities and the things that you're familiar with, as you said Ken, we all have a

tendency to order the thing that we're most familiar with and most comfortable with. As a result, we neglect some of the areas of our life that are going to be most significant for our wellbeing and our happiness.

Ken: This four quadrant understanding isn't a part of our background, cultural understanding. It's like you say, we all grow up unaware of it. And so not only do we end up usually emphasizing one, at most two quadrants, we don't know that we are actually taking up a broken view of reality and ourselves. So we're practicing a broken view and we don't know it's broken. And yet we're actually practicing that broken view, we're emphasizing that broken view. I mean, it was even interesting to see in Robert Kegan's latest book, *An Everyone Culture* where he introduces the very important concept of a DDO, a deliberately developmental organization. And he describes his work with businesses that now make human growth and development, that is said to these specific levels that we're talking about.

They actually incorporate this in their job activities. Every single activity in the organization is geared to promoting human growth and development with no exceptions. They're viewed as one thing profit making and growth making are viewed as the same. And so these organizations of course, end up being places of profound growth and transformation. And very interestingly, even though Robert, bless his heart as a founding member of Integral Institute, because it's just so ingrained in us to not look at all four quadrants in the very last chapter of the book, they actually fess up and they say, "Okay, now we have to ..." In the chapter's called *How to Make Your Own Organization a Deliberately Developmental Organization*. And he says, "Okay, now we have to fess up. We actually have been incomplete in the approach that we've taught you so far.

Our colleague Ken Wilber has developed a four quadrant model and it gives a much better picture of all the areas that we have to focus on to be a genuinely developmental organization." And it goes through all four quadrants and they say, "Okay we're psychologists, so we focused on the left hand and we deliberately didn't include right hand." And so once we saw that this is actually some of the organizations that we worked with started calling us on it. They started saying things like, "Wait a minute, there's this and there's this. We're not including that. How can you leave that out?" So they went back and looked at it and this and they basically said, "They're absolutely right, we've left these out." And so they started developing tests and questionnaires and approaches that would test and help the organization see how well they're doing in all four quadrants.

And then they developed practices to help individuals grow not only in the left hand quadrants but in the right hand quadrant. So it can show you that even somebody as sophisticated as Robert Kegan, a founding member of Integral Institute, how long it can take to get this into your system. We are so brought up with these broken, fragmented views, it can really take forever sometimes for us to realize how deeply they infect the way we look at everything. And that means the way we look at everything in a broken fragmented way, which is deeply unhealthy and deeply does not work.

Ryan: Totally, wow Ken. In my experience that's true and that I think is the really significant factor of the psychoactive nature of this framework, really studying it at the pace that works for

you, I want to emphasize that, so that you start to get it and you can start to see it dynamically in your life. Right now in my life, I've been studying integral now for 10 years, and I can start to self-diagnosed because I've learned there's this area in my life that's not working out, or there's major weaknesses in the lower right and the lower left. I need to address that and I need to actually put some structures in place in the lower right systems part of my life and I need to build some culture around it and some community around it in the lower left of my life and I really want to actually have the results that are possible and necessary.

And so that's true to Derek's question here. If you're doing pushups, you're doing an action, which is like an upper right observable, repeatable thing. But having systems in your life, your daily diet regimen, all these systemic things, and you also involve yourself in a community, a collective of other people, or trying to get in shape or who are part of an exercise community and support you and celebrate you for your progress. That will help enhance the entire thing. So in addition to adding stuff like meditation and cross-training, even within fitness, there are things to add in all four quadrants that will help you increase your-

Ken: Keep in mind, I mean even talking about doing something like pushups that not only, something like meditation in the upper left is going to help, but again, group sharing in the lower left, that community is going to enhance it. But also remember that even in things like the lower right, that what you're going to get is just one part of what you're going to get from the lower right is. We have this whole spectrum of subtle energies. And so in the upper right, we have these individual entities running from gross energies to subtle energies, to causal energies. And whenever we engage in any sort of activity in the upper right, we're engaging in those subtle energies. Now when two or more people get together, let alone a group of people get together, then you have this whole ocean of subtle energies that are influencing you.

And if you have people that are dedicated to working on, let's say even something like muscle building there, brain force energies that are actually going to be transmitted, they're communicable, these energies, like any energies float through space. We transmit our energies to each other all the time. And so if you're in a group doing pushups and with everybody exerting themselves and making progress and so on, you're going to benefit from that. You're going to get a transmission of those subtle energies and that's going to have a big impact on how your own growth and development unfolds. I mean, that's just not only mentioning the whole, diet and all these other things that come out of the lower right that are going to make a huge impact on what happens. So it really is a four quadrant cross training that you want to keep in mind.

Ryan: Absolutely. Thank you Ken for that, for pointing that out. That's also one of the reasons why it's so significant and helpful to participate in the community. There is actually a subtle energetic field that is being built when you share what your insights are and you ask what your questions are. You are both helping other people who are part of the Ryane field in their process of learning this course at whatever rate you're learning it and they are helping you. So the more that we build these subtle energy, lower right networks, the more we're enhancing the learning experience for all of us.

Ken: Right.

Ryan: So I want to reiterate that and that actually leads into next week and next week we are headed into, the application. So we just finished the five core installations, the five core lenses. This is the AQAL model, levels, lines, states, types and quadrants into which all of them fit. And then next week we go into applications and we're going to talk about the three bodies. We're going to talk about the gross subtle and causal bodies and these energies and we're going to go into these in a lot more detail. We're going to go into this subject of where the rubber meets the road, a lot more over the next three weeks and it's very exciting. So Ken,-

Ken: Yes sir.

Ryan: I want to thank you so much for crystallizing this. It's really exciting to me because I've been learning and studying and talking about this stuff for 10 years and still continues to blow my mind, after all this time. And I get to share this experience with a whole bunch of people who are doing it for the first time and they're having the Ryane experience that I had, which is that for some reason it sounds familiar from the get go. So thank you so much for this amazing, amazing gift and-

Ken: Great. It's great to be here with all of you.

Ryan: Yeah, we'll talk to you next week for the Q&A and thank you everybody else-

Ken: You got it.

Ryan: Okay. Bye, bye Ken. Have a great day everybody.



ACTUALIZE OS