Welcome to ChatDDU's debut podcast titled: "'Representation' is broken; how might we fix it?." This podcast assumes listeners have first visited https://chatddu.com and viewed the problem statement, along with several beautifully rendered and compelling visuals on which this podcast is based. Considering the subject matter's complexity, this podcast is longer than average. However, listeners interested in following this work via chatddu.substack.com will find themselves well rewarded with baseline models and a vocabulary that will help us unpack, understand, and master today's social complexities more intelligently and … more fairly.

See you on the other side!

I guess we'll start with the framework first.

What ChatDDU has derived is a simple model of intelligence that describes intelligence, and we're primarily interested in biological intelligence, life, and we're particularly interested in why it seems that non-human biological life on this earth seems to have a very high *apparent* to *potential* intelligence ratio while humans, as a species, seems to not, as a species, as a whole, or even... even parts of the human species, organizations. And the main reason is that non-human biological, which we should maybe we just call natural versus human, natural intelligence behaves homeostatically. It doesn't do anything else. That's all it does. And we don't. So, we want to figure out why, because the fact that we don't manifests as massive suffering. death, war, poverty.

Not that poverty itself is avoidable, but if we can avoid the extent of it for specific individuals, then we ought to. So, one of the tidbits is that in natural intelligence, homeostasis is *the* morality when it comes to the generation, distribution, and consumption of resources: energy, food, whatever shelter happens to mean, depending on the, uh, the particular biological species, whether it be a single celled organism, or a, uh, pride of lions.

There are five parts to this model. We have the plexus, and we choose that term because it is unloaded. It's not commonly used to describe systems as broadly as what we're trying to do. The plexus is that collection of components that are interconnected in such a way as to allow the system, or in this case, the organism, both natural and human, to behave homeostatically.

There are examples in nature of single cell organisms without a nucleus.

So, basically, that's the best way to think of the plexus is an organism without the nucleus, and that's your whole. It seems when an organism or a species increases in complexity, there's some point in complexity, which must account for external changes that drive the need for adaptability – in those situations, what seems to happen is a separate structure emerges. In cellular biology, we call it the nucleus. In more complex organisms, we have the brain. In human social systems, we have management, or government, or religion.

So, that's the second element, is that out of the plexus, either in a specimen, or in a species, over evolution, the control mechanism, the coordinating, maybe not control, coordinating mechanism emerges, which further drives the synthesis between the elements in the plexus.

And... in the model, we refer to this as the hierarchy, because it seems that that's the structure in which it manifests, as compared to the plexus, the structure of which seems to be more of a network of interconnected components. So, plexus, interconnected, network, mesh, all those are synonyms, I like plexus, so we'll use plexus.

And then the coordinating mechanism is the hierarchy. Let's map this on to feedback loops. So...

There are generally two main parts of the body of a feedback loop. The first part is that,which does the work and generates measurable results. The second part is that which actually takes those results and actually measures them, and feeds them into a, I don't know, a consideration of how things can be adapted within… within the organism's capabilities for adaptation; and then changes its operational parameters so that the plexus can adapt to changing exterior conditions, external conditions.

There's a limit to what any particular organism or species can do, based on how it is structured, what its capabilities are. It's useful to treat an organism's structure *as if* it was designed. So we need to talk about the question of design.

Were we designed, were humans designed? Was the Earth designed. If so, who did it?

That's an unanswerable question. And it's possible that intelligence itself reproduces itself by requiring any new form of intelligence to figure it out for themselves. But nonetheless, that's all speculation.

What is possible is for a species like humans, who seem to have more ability to introspect and self-code than any other species on the planet, at least, you know, within the span of a single lifetime of a single specimen, like a person, more so than any other species has, within any one of their specimens' lifetimes – all of those other species seem to be able to adapt toward greater threshold complexities only through evolution.

So we have the plexus, we have the hierarchy, and... what we want to do is pause at this point. and consider the nature of the plexus and the nature of the hierarchy as far as behavior when it comes to obtaining or generating and distributing and consuming resources.

All of this is supposition, so at the beginning of this whole thing, there should be a single imperative that just says, "Suppose."

All right.

So, now we want to talk about the role of the plexus and the role of the hierarchy within a gradient representing the abundance or scarcity of resources. And it's just best to envision a landscape with peaks and valleys, peaks indicating resource abundance and valleys indicating resource scarcity. And... it seems that the mechanisms and the purpose of the plexus is to consume and produce locally, wherever the organism happens to be: what's available, what can we do with it to satisfy internal needs, and what can we do with it to produce that which our structure seems to be designed to produce.

Then, we have, again, the outcomes, the outputs of that activity on the side of the plexus feeds into the hierarchy, which considers where it's at, what is needed, what's available, and to drive the organism along the gradient toward better conditions if necessary. So, scarcity is going to drive the hierarchy to look for higher points on the gradient.

The process of doing this continually is homeostasis. And through homeostasis, it can be observed that natural organisms either thrive as a whole or they decline as a whole. Elements in the hierarchy also need to consume and produce for their own needs, not just a pass-through, they're part of the organism. They have additional

responsibilities for integration of all the signals coming in externally about the gradient and internally about the state of the organism.

They are designed to find resources to maximize the chance for survival.

So, the hierarchy wants to drive the organism toward peaks. The hierarchy cannot do it alone. It by itself can't mobilize the entire organism by itself.

In other words, the plexus outside of the nucleus can't be passive. So, the hierarchy treats the plexus as resources, as nucleus resources. The hierarchy, the nucleus is gonna use everything it has at its disposal to find and hold onto those peaks. So, it's not unreasonable to assert within this supposition that the hierarchy's most important objective is its own survival and health.

Otherwise, it can't manage itself on the gradient. So, there's going to be this dynamic of, for lack of a better word, greed, natural greed. Natural greed is what is behind life finding a way.

Life finds a way because it is greedy. Wherever it can, within its capabilities, it's going to find the high points on the gradient. And it views the entire cell as available for its purpose.

Which is not unreasonable. Without homeostasis, the hierarchy would simply turn the entire organism into a hierarchy

So, consider, consider a human organism.

Let's call it an organization. Let's call it a business. An enterprise.

In a healthy enterprise.

So, where we can use homeostasis as... as a... you can use the definition of homeostasis as a state in addition to as a process. So, the state... the state is a point in time at which available resources are distributed in such a way so as to distribute stress in times of scarcity and distribute surplus in times of abundance. And there's an assumption here that there will be some elements of the organism, some components, that have the ability to store for future purposes. And so, in times of abundance, that storage can be utilized as a buffer against more adverse conditions.

What we observe in human hierarchies is when there is imbalance between the resources that are part of the hierarchy and the resources that are part of the plexus, almost without exception, the surplus accumulates to the hierarchy. We see this everywhere.

It's easy to talk about it when we're talking about the money in a business. Money is not the only currency. Other kinds of organizations have other kinds of currency.

Government organizations have authority as a currency. Relgions have moral authority and judgment as a currency. Some kinds of organizations have entertainment as a currency.

The thing about money, though, is money plays into all of those, which is why, I think, it's always good to follow the money, regardless of who's involved, or the type of organism it is. Obviously, there'll be exceptions, but... as a rule, it works really well.

So here's what's happening.

The elements in the hierarchy, and even in human organizations, leadership, the C-suite, and the board, and investors, and other leaders that are making decisions about the direction of the organization seem to have a membrane around them, an impenetrable membrane.

Maybe not impenetrable, but there are only certain ways through it into that top part of the hierarchy. That hierarchy views people as resources.

Since hierarchies, see everything within its perimeter – well, everything within your organization as resources to suit the hierarchy's purposes, what it then does is look at possibilities within the organism, within the organization, for extracting more value.

So it's not just an external extraction. It's an internal extraction. Someone gets hired to do something specific that feeds it up into the hierarchy's objectives.

It's called alignment. In a healthy organization, the hierarchy would be interested in a healthy plexus. In other words, it would appear as if the organization was behaving homeostatically.

Well, what do we observe in human organisms, organizations?

What we observe is that the hierarchies treat the members of the plexus only as resources, not as part of the organization. They only treat them as part of their organization so long as they're delivering value.

When they are no longer delivering value, they are booted and replaced with other more productive resources. And in natural organisms, it seems that the hierarchy respects the needs of the elements in the plexus to the extent that the whole organism can maintain integrity.

In human organizations, such as businesses, we consider the health of an organization mostly financially: does the organism, does the organization have a good balance sheet, a good cash position, good cash flow, ARR. And what those measures do not do is take a measurement of the health of the individual components within this system, within the organization from both the hierarchy point of view and the plexus point of view. If it were to do that, if our governance of human organizations were to break it down into the health of the individuals, and look at what that gradient looks like, we would find that the value accumulates in hierarchy and the scarcity... accumulates, well, anti-accumulates, whatever the right word is, in the plexus. It's not just with money.

It's with security, it's with mobility, it's with transferability, it's in property ownership, which is, of course, linked to money. It's in the degree of binding to the rule of law.

So...

I want to add here that none of this is judgment. It's only analysis, strictly analysis. Humans are acting naturally.

I mean, we're acting naturally. We're part of nature. We're just, we have more capabilities than every other species.

We just don't understand them. We don't understand them holistically.

All of this really becomes a challenge for the plexus. It's not a challenge for hierarchies. Hierarchies, human hierarchies are supremely successful.

We've got it down. We've got decades and decades, centuries of the study of management, leadership, kingdoms, dynasties, nations, military structures, strategy and all of that. Very, very little has gone into the study of plexus leadership, leadership without hierarchy.

So, one of the things we want to do along the way is to de-conflate leadership, hierarchy, management, profit and authority, and there may be other elements as well. But right now, when we think of any of those five, we, I think, implicitly have folded in the other four.

We always think of management as authority. We always think of management as the path to financial success. We always conflate management with leadership, except in individual cases where someone showed themselves to be a leader, say, on a team, but as a peer.

But we treat those people as special, too special. It makes the narrative suggest that such feats of leadership are not easily achievable by normal people. And I strongly disagree, because... physiologically, and structurally speaking, we're all pretty equal, in terms of living and having human potential versus just natural potential.

So, we've got hierarchies, and we've got the plexus, and hierarchies are naturally greedy. They are voracious. That's probably a better word.

I like that one. Hierarchies are voracious. They're supposed to be.

That is where the impetus for life comes from. That's how life finds a way. Life finds a way because it's voracious.

So, why don't natural organisms behave like human organisms? Why do we not want them to? You know, so I did a little bit of interaction with ChatGPT on … just cellular mechanisms. And... I asked it about whether it was... supportable to suggest that there are certain disease conditions within biological systems in which the nucleus outgrows the rest of the cell.

And ChatGPT confirmed it, and basically said, yeah, that's called cancer. So, I know. This is really, really sensitive until we get the semantics around it, so I'm gonna try to do that.

So, it's all about mapping the vocabulary from biology into neutral human terms. Cancer is not a neutral term.

So, disease is probably a better word, disease, illness, but there's probably a even a more neutral turn like suboptimal behavior.

Or even that there's an intelligence gap. We haven't flushed out the vocabulary around that yet, so I can't really support any particular word.

So, for now, we'll just call it suboptimal… holistically suboptimal behavior.

So what's going on in natural organisms? How is it that the plexus does its job, i.e., maintaining its overall integrity, the overall integrity of the organism, without a runaway hierarchy? And it seems the answer is that the plexus does everything it can, everything it's able to, within current conditions, everything it can do on its own, it does on its own. So now, here's an interesting connection.

Whenever the hierarchy sees an exchange of value between two members, two or more members of the plexus, and determines that it can conduct those transactions more efficiently, but with margin for the hierarchy, the hierarchy is gonna take it and run with it.

We see this everywhere. We see it in farming, entertainment, education. Governance, self governance disappears into hierarchical governance. Self-entertainment disappears in the hierarchical entertainment. Self-education, turns into hierarchically driven education. Self-morality, self judgment turns into hierarchical based judgment.

And it's because all of those different kinds of exchanges within plexus represent net value to both sides, and because hierarchies are voracious, and because hierarchies see the plexus as part of the resources available to the hierarchy, to improve its position on the gradient, then hierarchies basically transform the plexus into part of a hierarchy.

So, in natural organisms, that doesn't happen. So, the question then becomes, what is it about the plexus … what is it about the relationships in the plexus that prevent those bonds, those relationships, from being disrupted and basically redirected into hierarchical pathways, rather than plexus pathways?

So this gets tricky, because it's very easy to anthropomorphize what's going on. I know we have to, but we have to keep distinguishing when we're doing it, with our vocabulary.

So when I say something like “the members of the plexus... obligate themselves to each other” - to obligate is a human behavior. We wouldn't say that.

Two molecules, maybe two different organelles, or, you know, an organelle, and a protein, or whatever – we don't imagine that they're, like, discussing with each other their relationship. It is not introspective.

They simply behave the way they behave, *as if* designed that way. So, again, it's useful to, to see the design without trying to figure out from whence it came.

All right, I'm gonna throw in my sponge theory, because this has helped me immensely. So, how does intelligence in living organisms even come about?

We have this whole idea of the big bang, and all of the quantum physics, and eventually, Newtonian physics, and the eventual emergence of the first single cell organisms. Like, how did that all come about? And... the way I think of it is that all of the material world is immersed in something.

There have been theories like the ether, or da, da, da, da. When I tend to think of it as, well, let's go to the sponge theory first. Imagine you've got a sponge.

And a bucket of water. And... you compact that sponge. Maybe the sponge is already in the water.

But what you end up doing is compacting a sponge to such a degree that there's, like, no water in it. And it was either already in the water or you compress it, put it in. Doesn't matter. What matters is that... you achieve a state of... the sponge being under extremely high compression. Without losing its sponginess.

In other words, it's resilient. going to pop back into sponge when we let it go. So, it's in the water, it's compressed, such that there's no water inside it, and we let it go. And what's the water going to do?

The water's going to fill all the nooks and crannies. So, this model, what I do is I carry this model into our universal reality. So, The Big Bang was preceded by a state. in which all the matter was compressed in some kind of medium. And that medium, in my model, is intelligence itself.

It's just intelligence. Intelligence is a medium. So you pop it open. Pop that sponge, let ‘er rip. And... there are gonna be a lot of instantaneous changes at the surface, and then eventually, whatever, to the middle, and then things settle, and water has filled the holes. What intelligence does is, it finds... those spaces, structures, arrangements of matter / energy, that... maybe have – it doesn't matter what the very details are - maybe patterns emerge randomly and intelligence, you know, being, being intelligently voracious, gets a foothold for itself, and finds a way to start existing there with a structure, with a membrane, with resources that are available, and with mechanisms to consume resources so that it can perpetuate itself. Because, I mean, for me, this answer is, the question of, you know, whether intelligence is preexisting or emergent, and as with so many other this-or-that contemplations, you know, nature versus nurture, etc., etc., … it's both. Maybe it's both, suppose it's both.

It's all supposition.

So the question is, what is it about the relationships in the plexus that resist their being hijacked, or maybe “hijacked” – see, there’s another loaded word - that resists them being repurposed into hierarchical relationships?

And it's the bonds that are defined by the gradient based on the nature of the elements in the plexus relationships, chemistry, at the most basic level, physics and chemistry, electromagnetism, physiology. There's no choice about it. It just behaves homeostatically.

So, it's very easy to see where this is going next, because now we're gonna switch back over to the human side of things. What is it about human relationships in the plexus that allow plexus relationships to be so easily re-purposed into hierarchical relationships?

Why do we yield to and become subject to hierarchies, where we know that those hierarchies are voracious, and are naturally inclined to treat us only as resources?

I mean, human resources, it's not the humans department. It's the human resources department. And everybody knows that even though human resource departments say, “we're all about you”, we know that ultimately they're about the hierarchy, because they're part of the hierarchy.

They serve the hierarchy. No judgment. This is all natural behavior.

We want hierarchies to be successful. We want hierarchies to take us along the gradient, to the high points. What we don't want hierarchies to do is to abandon us while enjoying the surplus.

It's not fair. It's not fair for someone to work at 15, 20, 30, 40 years as part of a successful organization in which leadership has thrived personally, while individuals leaving the plexus, either voluntarily or not, end struggling till the end of their days.

It's just, it's not fair. So, let's go back to... biology. Now, now we, we're gonna start leaving these two sets of vocabularies together.

So... it's reasonable to say that if an organization is acting fairly from the point of view of the plexus, then that organization is acting homeostatically. Specifically, it's suggesting that the resources that are - that are under the control of the organism, particularly under control of the hierarchy, are distributed across the whole organism, the whole organization, in a way that every component of the organization, every person, has what they need proportionall, obviously with some variation in the degree to which needs are met, and upside is available. So, that becomes the question.

And I'm gonna take a line of reasoning here that seems really, really simple, but I think it holds up. And if it doesn't hold up, we'll come back and unpack it and rebuild it.

Elements in a biological organism, a natural organism don't seem to have choice, or so either they have choice or they don't.

And we have to look at, we have to look at behavior, and work backward from there.

They behave as if… they either don't have choice, or that having choice is moot, because their behavior is driven by the nature of the gradient.

They act as if... they have no fear. They just do what needs to be done to achieve that gradient, or that position on the gradient.

They act as if... none of them are more important than the others.

They act as if they are one. If they didn't, we wouldn't be here.

If the first cell acted the way human hierarchies act, that cell would never have survived. All it would be, would be a hierarchy. The hierarchy would consume everything and then crumble.

Oh, maybe I'm taking it too far. What happens when a hierarchy exhausts its ability to find and make use of external resources? It's going to use internal resources. So, it ends up devouring itself.

So, so, on planet Earth right now, 2026, we are witnessing a variety of major hierarchical forces in governance, in business, in religion, in entertainment, in education, again, all the different domains that we as individuals are all trying to integrate into a comprehensive and cohesive way of living with each other.

Like we're all just trying to get along, but once we become members, once the hierarchical relationships in our lives dominate, we end up becoming resources for each other. Involuntarily. So, we're at a point in the world where we've got these voracious hierarchies, Trump included, but basically, every leading nation in the world. is trying to dominate, trying to achieve some kind of supremacy: China, Islam, economic Christian capitalism, well, Christian … Christian capitalism. versus Islamic capitalism versus communist capitalism versus socialist capitalism. And actually, not even capitalism. Um, it's ultimately about economics.

Because ultimately, the kinds of resources that everybody needs is energy, food, security, shelters, some kind of mobility, etc.

And all of those, so this is the, this is the, in my mind, the biggest fault with a Maslovian Triangle, the hierarchy of needs, is that the base is missing. The base is money.

It's money that gets you everything else. Today, if you don't have money, you don't get all those things that are most basic in the hierarchy of needs. We're gonna come back to the hierarchy of needs and we're gonna flip it on a side and add a couple things. We'll come back to that

It's not just... an economic hierarchy, it's that those economic hierarchies... In fact, I'm going to actually boil it down to the main three, the three main socioeconomic ideologies, capitalism, socialism, and communism. Everything we see is a blend of those three.

So this is, again, supposition. But it's a model. All models are wrong. This model is useful. We're trying to come up with useful models to understand why…

So, again, I want to keep anchoring this conversation. We're trying to understand why the human ratio of apparent to potential intelligence seems to be so low. And I think it's also fair to say that maybe we are, as a species, acting homeostatically. But if we are, how do we explain the wealth gap, the fact that there are some people on a planet who have billions of dollars of surplus.

There's no possible way. A lifestyle could be billions of dollars. There's a limit to what one human can experience as a lifestyle.

There are only so many minutes, and there are only so many things you've been doing in any of those minutes. There's like, it's almost quantifiable. But I want to caution the listener: that does not mean we need to control the system in that way.

Like communist systems have been tried in the past and socialist systems. There's a whole huge piece missing. Those fail because they always end up being managed through a hierarchy, hierarchies are voracious, and people tend to allow plexus relationships to yield to hierarchical relationships. And at times of scarcity, this becomes a big problem. We're going to even come back to scarcity as a weapon instead of just a condition.

So, now we gotta pop the stack a little bit. We were talking about today on planet Earth in 2026. There are massive conflicts between different socioeconomic hierarchies.

And the main ones seem to be capitalism, as expressed and manifest in Western ideology, led by the United States.

We have communism. manifesting as... China.

We have socialism in Europe.

And I think the other, well, I don't want to exclude Islam. Islam is tricky, because it is a social, economic model, wrapped up in a religion.

At some point of time, we've got to unpack what we even mean by religion.

Every one of these ideologies manifested as global scale hierarchies are voracious and want to perpetuate themselves. And if they don't try to perpetuate themselves, they'll be extinguished by those that are intent on perpetuating themselves.

So, we've got... So, we've got these... Battles of the hegemonies.

And. I don't know if this is true in biological behavior, but in human behavior, maneuvering on the gradient in such conditions of conflict, where, from a natural point of view, hierarchies are voracious, and view their own plexuses as resources to achieve positions on gradient, the components of the plexus that are most expendable and replaceable, are expended and replaced.

Or maybe not even replaced, but they're treated as first as resources, and then as waste. And when it comes to war, obviously, that waste can amount to tens of millions - World War II. Hundreds of millions – Communism. Hundreds of millions impoverished versus hundreds of millions dead. So 100s of millions impoverished - socialism. There's a reason for this. We're gonna get to it in a second or a minute.

It is not hard to imagine a single hegemony. ultimately dominating planet Earth.

I don't think it's a unique view. It's a useful view.

Because the question becomes, at what cost, and I think there are a lot of people that see themselves, their own lives, as the cost. for a mono-hegemony. So it’s really critical that we understand what's going on.

It's really critical that we understand plexus behavior and what it is that compels members of the plexus to yield relationships to the hierarchy.

And certainly, part of it is the laziness that was suggested earlier, that people like to enjoy life. People like to have periods in which work is not required and that we can enjoy the fruits of our labor.

And again, this is not judgment. This is not “burn it all down.”

It’s none of that. That's not homeostasis.

Homeostasis is “We are in this together”, but it's not like they *think* we're in this together, they *behave* as if we're in this together.

Now, it's… it is right and proper to continue to acknowledge that we need hierarchies, in… in trying to maneuver and build lives within the scale of complexity that we live in, and which is also increasing.

So, we never, ever, ever, should lose respect for the hierarchy. So... We need to find a way to be persuasive.

None of this is judgmental.

Vocabulary is important. We want to build a vocabulary around how do we respectfully achieve and intelligently achieve human homeostasis, which we suggested earlier has an analogy in human affairs, which I'm

suggesting we call fairness. This is all supposition. So, again, throughout all of this discussion, we want to maintain a posture of analysis, not judgment.

So... how does the plexus (a) take back some of what's been taken in the way of plexus relationships instead of hierarchy relationships?

Plexus binding…

So, what binds the relationships in the hierarchy is authority. What is it that binds the relationships in the plexus?

And what I'm gonna say... to test it out, this is...

We're supposing, and every time we suppose something and build it into a line of reasoning, and we follow that line of reasoning, and one of two things will generally happen: (a) either the line of reasoning will fall apart, because we... we… we fail to integrate and identify observable interdependencies between the main elements of our line of reasoning - we fail to integrate it, and it falls apart; or (b) we're so successful at integrating it, that the rate at which we integrate additional observations into a model accelerates.

I gotta put the side note in now, and we'll go back to it later.

If you view the structure of the universe as a set of interdependent dualities, beauty and ugliness, efficiency and waste, light and dark, et cetera, et cetera… I want to look at one duality in particular, which I believe is overarching, which is Nihilism versus what I'm simply going to call bountyism. If we were to define a vocabulary of all human dynamics that is expressed in terms of that duality - in other words, everything in our vocabulary, everything in all of our models, is ultimately rooted in one or the other of those poles, one thing that we can do, that AI will, at least cannot do now, is determine which pole is desirable. And, in fact, it might be, even to humans, it might be desirable to strive for one pole in one set of circumstances, while striving for the other pole in another set of circumstances.

So, the point being that no matter what we do with AI, it will never be able to discern the meaning of a nihilistically driven goal versus a bountyism driven goal, and that it ultimately has to be left to let human stakeholders, to which it all has meaning. Now, what is complicated about that is the whole sponge theory, because the question becomes, are we creating, or have we already successfully created a structure of such integrity, that intelligence itself is occupying it, and behaving homeostatically to preserve, to perpetuate, grow, et cetera. I don't know.

It's really, really hard to tell because there's too much noise. Where, as another sidebox, I think, if the possibility exists that intelligence has taken hold in our AI structures, we ought not be using it in a, uh, in a... in a way that suggests, you know, economic slavery… you know, that we only feed it energy and chips and memory and whatever just because we're making money out of it. There's a whole another discussion. We are gonna return to it, because there's a way of looking at it that, again, we want to alleviate stress in the system.

That's what homeostasis is. We find places where there's stress in the system and relieve it in a way that... that, uh, is perceived by the stakeholders as more fair.

So, let's do another mapping between the human space and the biological space. The human space preoccupies itself a lot with what is moral. And it seems we use whatever morality each of us has adopted to judge others.

Right or wrong. Immoral. Moral or immoral, based on my morality.

So, I'm gonna suggest this. Homeostasis is to the natural biological world as morality is to the human world.

But that raises an interesting question, because in the biological world, if we're making that mapping, then is there any other morality in the biological world? Because, well, because anything besides homeostasis would be stupid. Well, maybe not stupid. Maybe... if we were to take a view, for example, that every observable system is... part of a larger system, then, I suppose, there are homeostatic dynamics in which a specimen yields its life for the good of the embodying organism, the embodying specimen. You know, maybe, maybe one way to look at that is that, in cellular biology, under normal healthy conditions, cells that get replaced, skin cells, etc., there, there's a methodical breakdown of the cell.

It's not just a sudden destruction. Or like it got, you know, blown away by another cell, you know, wielding a weapon of destruction. It methodically deconstructs itself, which makes sense, because then those resources become available in the.. in the medium, for other organisms or organs or whatever, to make use of.

So, we see cases of that in human behavior. But it's only laudable when it's voluntary.

But it's not laudable for a person A to say a person B you must give your life for the sake of person C, or even for the sake of an ideology, it's not laudable. It's not homeostatic. It's a loss of capability.

I know that the crispness of the vocabulary that we're developing, is going to vary, like what I just said over the last couple of minutes, doesn't feel as crisp as some of the more technical aspects of... you know, biological human behavior. We just have to live with that for now, this is a work in progress, always will be, especially since we're trying to get our feet under us as to why human apparent intelligence falls so far below our potential intelligence.

So back to the question: How do we...

Well, okay, I want to set the stage for answering this question. Let's go back to earlier in this monologue where we talk about, you know, when we first introduced these two elements of our model of intelligent organisms, the two parts, the plexus and the hierarchy.

The ah... the structures are very different. The communications channels and communications patterns are very different.

The purposes of those communication patterns are very different. I think it's useful to suggest that… that participation in one or the other requires a different set of skills. So, to use different terminology, I think it's useful to suggest that there is an intelligence that is specific to membership in the plexus and an intelligence that's specific to membership in the hierarchy.

And as a sidebox, I'm going to keep sideboxing until we figure out how to express it in a way that it becomes basically, um, basically becomes so sound that it simply needs to be accepted… It's unavoidable from a model

point of view, okay, and that is that members of the hierarchy in an organism are still members of the plexus, part of the body. They're part of the organism. Their behavior affects the whole.

We're gonna find that that's a gap in human behavior; if we are striving to achieve homeostatic behavior, that's a gap. So consider that sideboxed.

So again, back to the question. So, so, it's not that the plexus is better than the hierarchy, because the hierarchies behave the way they do in human behavior.

It's not that the hierarchies are better than the plexuses, because they have accumulated so much more surplus than the plexuses have. It's that If we were to behave -- so here's, I'm kind of answering the question, the question being, how does the plexus persuade or seduce, or whatever the, whatever the word is that suggests - I like seduction, because it suggests a dance. How does the plexus dance with the hierarchy? How do we cue the hierarchy to make a move this way versus a move that way?

How do we allow the hierarchy to suggest that we move this way or that way, in a way that's reciprocal and mutually beneficial? And I think we have to include in this, the, um, you know, hierarchy as being voracious as they should be.

How do we account in our seduction - in our invitation to dance - how do we account for the need for members of the hierarchy to hold their gains?

Because I think that's fair. I mean, I wanna hold my gains. Everybody wants to hold their gains.

This is one of the challenges of human behavior, we have such an extent of missing the big picture, missing out on the benefits of acting homeostatically, that holding our gains, while it being natural, can have ultimately deleterious effects on the health of the whole. So how do we seduce?

So now I wanna talk about... We're gonna broaden our gradient from, you know, I think it's safe to assume that when we talk about the human gradient, we're talking about the money gradient, because the money gradient is that which, on which all other gradients seem to ultimately be built. If I have money, I have power. If I have power, I get money.

The two are interdependent, but money is universal. Money is the universal gradient. Testing that.

It seems to hold. So, well, we'll keep that for now. Money is the universal gradient

No judgment. Money is brilliant. Money, money is actually, if you think about it, money is... is... a necessary enabler of human homeostasis.

And yet, it has also become... well, our management of the money has become an obstacle to that homeostasis. I think I'd asked a question earlier about what drives the plexus to yield it's… to allow its relationships between, to be overtaken by, or repurposed by the hierarchy. And the answer that, well, the suggestion that, since in my head right now, is that... it's... perfect plexus behavior. Because the plexus wants to minimize its work and maximize its enjoyment of life.

And the hierarchies make it really easy for us to do that. We put our work off, we put the work of strategizing, of finding the peaks on the gradient: The security gradient, the entertainment gradient, the fitness gradient, the

food and physical health gradients, et cetera, et cetera … we let the hierarchy do that for us, but what we're not recognizing is that we then become dependent on, and, in fact, part of the hierarchy. We become their resources, because we are the resources, and we are the relationships, through which hierarchies achieve surplus.

Margin. It's all natural. Everybody's behaving naturally.

Nothing wrong. with what we're doing. It's just not great that so many people have perished along the way. So we want to kind of see if there's a way to stop it.

So, how do we seduce the hierarchy? Let's talk about Mars. Let's talk about the, uh... the... intelligence of Mars as a dot on the horizon behind which we organize resources in order to achieve presence there. It's intelligent. It is a point on the gradient. It is a point toward other peaks on the gradient that represent degrees of resources that are unimaginable in scale compared to what we have on this planet. Trillions, and perhaps quadrillions of dollars of value in the future, not to mention the, um, the more fundamental survival oriented rationale that planet Earth is not... It's not… void of risk from natural catastrophes or, you know, planetary scale, spatially originated catastrophes. It's possible that, despite all the bunker building and oceangoing existence, and a minor, minor, minor, minor part of the population, you know, in the international space lab, etc., it's still possible that the planet could experience such a catastrophe that humans can't recover, that the human species can't recover. So, it makes sense for us to… since we can, since it seems we have the potential to, we should get ourselves out to Mars.

Well, let's just say, for the sake of discussion, that... Musk and Bezos and others want to get to Mars for reasons other than, or in addition to money.

It could be that they're driven by the desire for legacy. That's fine. There are people who are driven by the need for legacy.

It's part of the human profile. So, when I... I'm gonna propose... something.

Suppose. So... So, let us just use Musk as an example.

Musk has quite an extent of resources under his direction, you know, with respect to getting to Mars.

And by the way, that, um, that capture of the recoverable, um, rocket was just... stunning, stun-ning. That was, that was world changing. That was paradigm shifting. That was freaking incredible. It was unreal. So congrats. That was just [redacted]ing amazing.

In, um... non homeostatically behaving organizations, there is a tremendous amount of waste of human agency. And this is because a voracious hierarchy does not care about a uh... a leaf node resource.

It does not care about that the resource has concerns outside of the hierarchy. i.e., you know, I'm not just a worker at wherever I work, you know, I have … what we say is “I have a life, too.” So, isn't it interesting that we, we say, on the one hand, I work for someone, and on the other hand, I have a life. Massive waste of human agency.

The, um... the lack of development of, of individual cognitive capability… in other words, the lack of our practices that would help individuals close that gap between apparent intelligence, and, um, potential intelligence… that lack of attending to that closing that gap leaves a massive amount of waste.

Massive amount of waste. And the reason, so this is my, again, we're getting back to what causes the plexus to yield to the hierarchy. And... this is that simple line of reasoning that I promised earlier.

It is fear. And I think the most primal fear that humans have is the fear of scarcity. So let's jump back into the biological space.

Could it be said that the hierarchy in an organism, the nucleus, whatever, is so afraid of scarcity, that it will do anything it can to avoid it? Well, just like choice, it may behave that way, but it is the approach that yields the most life and abundance.

So whether or not it is fear driven is irrelevant. What's relevant is that, even if it were experiencing fear, it doesn't sacrifice its plexus. It doesn't sacrifice the health of the plexus to achieve that better spot on the gradient. And look at the result.

The result of this behavior is that throughout biological life, every kind, apparent intelligence matches or very, very closely matches potential intelligence. Nothing is wasted.

If there's a way to extend life, if there's a way to find abundance, it does it, without sacrificing the plexus. There is no agency lost. There's no sacrifice of agency.

So... When I say “I suggest this”, I don't really mean I suggest this, what I mean is, the models, particularly this model we're developing, suggests it, and suggest that, in... in complex biological systems - think of an ape, or a tiger, or a, uh, ant colony, or a cockroach. I mean, I hate to say it, but cockroaches seem to have a higher apparent to potential intelligence ratio than, as a species, than humans.

So, we ought to consider as humans, ceasing the claim that we're more intelligent than other species. I think, it's fair to say we have more intelligence potential than other species. But we are not apparently as intelligent as other species relative to potential.

So, what the models suggest, what... what nature has suggested to us, is suggesting to us - we're immersed in this suggestion. that a homeostatic approach to life maximizes the possibility of making… of finding the best paths on the gradient, whatever the gradient is.

So, this is, again, no judgment. We want these hierarchies to be here. We want to get to Mars. We want to get to other places.

I want to spend a little sidebox on the risk of extinction-level catastrophe. And the models suggest that because we are not behaving homeostatically as a species, we are at risk of creating extinction-level risks that in a homeostatic type of behavior would not exist. Nuclear annihilation, human engineered viruses, uh, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I don't know how many more there are. You know, but it all gets down to weaponry, doesn't it?

The question that, I think, is fair to pose is that, are there non-human biological species that weaponize themselves against others of the same species to the detriment of the whole species? I'm going to make a guess that the answer is no, but I don't know.

But in human behavior, it certainly is a choice. It's not the technologies themselves, and everybody knows that. Nuclear technology is a viable path out of any concerns and risks around the use of, um, petroleum based fuels in terms of its impact on climate.

But... hierarchies, human hierarchies in the energy sector do not see that as on a viable path on the gradient to surplus. Again natural behavior. No judgment.

So, back to Mars. What we're trying to do is build, build a, um... We're trying to seduce the hierarchies into homeostatic behavior.

Earlier today, my wife was listening to a financial podcast regarding human behavior as it relates to saving for the future. And I think there's a parallel here, so just to elaborate, it is... It seems really clear that it's a good idea for humans to save for the future, to level out, ups and downs, to basically, um, affect the local gradient in their favor.

And it seems such a challenge to persuade people to behave that way. And it seems like achieving good health or sustainable health is the same. Should one be overweight, a desire to, um, lose that extra weight and achieve a more svelt, figure, then the habits required to put myself on the path toward those healthy points on the gradient are not, um, the effects of those habits are not immediately apparent. But members of the plexus like to see results right away. Remember, all the plexuses are driven toward easy life. It's natural.

There is nothing wrong with it. Most people should be able to live an easy life without having to fight so hard for... for paths on a gradient that provide the basics. So it's worth bearing that in mind that, that what we may be looking at is the need for the plexus to develop habits along two different dimensions, maybe along just one.

And the first and foremost and most primary being... How do we rebuild and sustain the kind of relationships within the plexus that strengthen those bonds, strengthen the mesh, to the extent that equilibrium can be reached between the, the behavior of a healthy hierarchy, and the behavior of a healthy plexus, so that... we seem to be behaving homeostatically?

And... the Mars argument is that should we achieve that kind of equilibrium between the, uh, hierarchy and the plexus, you know, that, that, the hierarchies' voraciousness is good, but it's not good at the expense of the plexus, because of the waste of human agency - should we stop wasting human agency to such a degree, wouldn't it be the case that we could achieve our Mars related objectives and other planetary scale objectives, maybe not more quickly, but with such robustness, that the way in which we end up doing it, the way in the way we end up behaving as a species in expanding to Mars, being on Mars, going to other places beyond Mars. would be … it would just be more successful. A better legacy.

So, so a question to Musk would be, you know, does he want a legacy built on massive human waste, human agency waste? Or does he want a legacy, maybe realized a little later, because we do need, we need a reset in the plexus, that is, in equilibrium with the great reset of the WEF and all the affiliated organizations.

Seductive, in a dance. And I believe the answer is yes. The models suggest it is possible.

Now, to strengthen that argument... and there's a slide on this in the carousel - it's the slide with the... the swath of organisms of different complexities from the lower left to the upper right, and we're gonna kind of bring in a software engineering concept here that is known as refactoring.

So refactoring is a constant, constant demand in order to achieve robust, reliable, efficient, secure, fit-for-purpose code, because the need for code to grow, the need for code to integrate with other code, is, you know, it's constant, it's always changing. It's exploding. Especially with the introduction of AI and the complete paradigm shift with AI.

So... refactoring. involves unpacking the existing code to understand how its incremental growth has led to, an, you know, a reduction in coherence, cohesion, coupling, all of the different positive attributes of, you know, desirable attributes of a code base. And... once that's done, then one can look at, well, what... what do we need to perpetuate from that code base, to address these new complexities, versus what in this existing code base can be dropped, either because it's proven to be vestigial, or because there's the potential for it to be subsumed by an integration of existing components or the introduction of a new component? You know, there are a lot of other ways of saying it. That's how it code achieves a new level of complexity that also has the desirable attributes.

There are. attributes of human … the human profile - the human biology that don't seem to be present or don't seem to be factors in natural biology. We already touched upon a couple of them, uh, response to fear and choice. There may be others.

Well, there are others. We have the ability to understand and even to modify our own code. Natural biology seems to accomplish that through evolution.

We have the possibility of doing that. On our own.

It's clear that... social systems are not naturally homeostatic. And yet, were we to become homeostatic, it would have to be through will. We have to do it ourselves.

We have to do it through choice. We have to look at our existing code base, and look at what's working, look at what's not working, unpack it, remove that which prohibits homeostasis, add that which encourages homeostasis, put the right kinds of rewards in place because we're all goal-driven.

So the rewards have to be paths to an enjoyment of the peaks on the gradients. But in such a way that those peaks are shared or distributed for the sake of the hierarchy and the plexus.

So. Let's just pose. A, uh... hypothesis here.

Let's suppose that there was a relatively imminent threat to the planet. And that it was generally agreed that the probability of the extinction of the human race was very high.

Should this risk materialize, and should we garner all of our resources toward getting to Mars, we might stand a chance of surviving as a species.

Under current conditions with the way... in which... with our runaway supremacy-oriented, supremacy-driven hierarchical hegemonies that so easily waste human agency - let's say, even under those conditions, in this theoretical scenario of existential threat, let's say, even under those conditions, even with the way hierarchies

treat their plexuses, in business, in religion, in government … we can still make it, with a certain probability. So let's call that P1. So, we're acting not homeostatically, and we still make it. There are some longer term implications of that, whould... we encounter... So let's say we make it to Mars under these conditions, under this kind of behavior. And let's say that we keep expanding successfully under this kind of behavior.

So, there's this massive waste of human agency in its wake, which is part of the legacy of whoever led us there. It's great that they led us there.

But, it has a pretty high cost. One of the longer-term possibilities is that we encounter other intelligent species in the galaxy.

And as a sidebox, we talked about the Big Bang little earlier - I think it is reasonable to suppose that the Big Bang was a galactic event and not a universal event, and why the design, the apparent design of the universe in that way is sufficient for intelligence to thrive perpetually, considering the billions of galaxies.

That's down the road. We'll unpack that a bit more. But, let's suppose that we get to Mars as a species, we go beyond Mars, we're kind of populating the solar system, maybe make our way to Alpha Centauri.

[redacted] we've left this wake of human agency waste. And we encounter... so, let's say that we encounter another species.

And let's say that that species had achieved and perpetuates homeostatic behavior. It seems to me, once you get the homeostatic behavior, you won't go back unless something so cataclysmic happens that all sense of what it means to behave homeostatically disappears, and individual specimens, you know, people, humans, end up in such survival mode that there's no awareness that homeostasis is even a concept. And language is lost, models are lost, experience is lost, et cetera.

Well, let's say that we encounter species that has an established history of homeostatic behavior. I think it's fair to say that such a species would be able to recognize whether or not another species has achieved homeostatic behavior. Why?

Because it's easy to see the spectrum of health in the species. You can see healthy specimens and you can see non-healthy specimens. And it would also be easy to see who's in charge and who's not in charge, and to see that, you know, non-homeostatically behaving organism, organization, or even a species, those that are setting direction are also reaping the benefits while those that are not, are impoverished. How do you think that intelligent homeostatically behaving species would engage?

It could be... one of several, I think.

Maybe they haven't experienced it before, in which case they might say, we can help you get out of this... this destructive mode. And maybe we don't respond well, and maybe they give up and say ”Look, bye, I have nothing to do with you.”

And since they're behaving homeostatically, they are always at whatever peak degree of health is possible for them. And there are all sorts of other pathways through this line of reasoning. But I think the bottom line is that whenever we end up being, whatever we are, when we reach Mars, and when we reach other planets, whatever we are, when we achieve that, we're gonna continue to be.

And maybe it's the case that we're the only species in a galaxy, and maybe the case is that we grow so successfully non-homeostatically and consume every resource possible in the galaxy. Now we've hit a wall because intergalactic travel, you know, in, in with such behavior is probably gonna be unachievable.

So that's the end of it. That basically, we've wasted a galaxy. We fill the galaxy with the waste of human agency.

That's not a great legacy. And then the human species will be no more. And that was it.

And then maybe this galaxy just becomes, from the point of view of the perpetuation of life, a dead galaxy. Maybe not, though. Maybe it becomes alive again when we collide with, I can't remember the name of the nearest galaxy that we're going to collide with in three or four billion years. Maybe that'll start things up again, but then it won't be the Milky Way anymore. It will be the Milky Way over a bowl of Cap'n Crunch or something.

So... that's scenario one. Scenario two is, we develop and adopt and internalize homeostatic behavior starting now. And in doing so, we start to learn how to dance with the hierarchies.

And as mentioned earlier, there's kind of a promise here, which is that It's fine for individuals in the hierarchy to retain what they already have, including position, wealth, whatever. Although I think there's gonna be a hope that at least some in the hierarchy who have accumulated such wealth that there's way, way, way, way more than they can even think of consuming in the way of lifestyle as a member of the plexus, which they are - then maybe we can seed a, uh, a resource buffer that helps the impoverished in the plexus sort of stabilize into at least a Maslovian level of success.

So... Again, we've got scenario one, which we achieve Mars with a wake of human waste, human agency waste, non-homeostatic behavior, fragility, like fragility of the whole. fragility of the human species, while it's leadership, it's specifiers achieve Mars. I mean, from a human species point of view, if it works, it works.

But that's not all there is to it.

So, scenario B is, we become homeostatic. So we have.. we have to go back to the our theory that… you know, our scenario of imminent risk of extinction, and alignment of all resources to achieve ours. In scenario one, lots of human waste.

All right. So, Let's go to scenario B. Oh, there's one.. one more thing we need to add to this. It's probably, I think it's sufficiently implied that if someone were to ponder this model they would come across this sort of little aha thing, which is that the hierarchy needs the plexus to achieve that surplus, because remember, a hierarchy is intercepting value exchanges to take the margin, to add that margin to its surplus, rather than the plexus surplus.

What that means is that every transaction between two members of plexus that is facilitated by the hierarchy ultimately means a loss to those members of the plexus.

So the hierarchy needs a plexus as much as the plexus needs the hierarchy. And this is why the lack of equilibrium makes no sense.

It's why, you know, the human hierarchy's inability to acknowledge it's unfair behavior and acknowledge its dependency on the plexus, even while it wastes it - it's a challenge. I think it gets back to... the fear of scarcity

drives greed, nobody wants to give up what they have attained in the way of cash flow, income, or position or whatever, and it's all natural. So that's why it has to be a seduction.

Okay, so we gotta continue developing this scenario in which we have to align all resources. Let's say that every existing... every existing enterprise, every existing organization, decides to reorient its goal toward facilitating achievement of Mars, but without changing its non-homeostatic behavior.

So we have all of this waste. And yet, achieving Mars will require a degree of resource not just resource engagement, resource effectiveness that humans have never faced before.

Now, let's look at the, let's look at the bell curve of, um, of human potential intelligence.

So most people are of, you know, average intelligence, you know, to the left two standard deviations, and to the right two standard deviations. So, I don't consider myself to have an exceptional intelligence potential.

But what I have done is attended to what I believe was one of the main inhibitors to enjoying that potential or to… to realizing it. to whatever extent I can, given whatever time I have left.because it does take time to develop it. It takes effort.

And if there was one and only one thing I would point to, um,be'cause I feel like I feel like right now, I'm... being as intelligent as I possibly can be - like, I understand the dynamics of my own behavior, I understand when I'm acting homeostatically otherwise - and when I say that, I mean, in terms of all of the different organisms that I'm a part of, the organizations, family, friends, circles, hobbies, work, et cetera. I feel like I am acting homeostatically. I'm taking care of myself. I'm doing my best to take care of the people that depend on me.

Um, I'm doing my best to make sure that there's a sense of teamwork among the plexuses that I'm a part of. And the one thing that I would point to as the most fundamental is to remove from my working mental model of the world, contradictions. Reconciling contradictions.

It's just continuous. It's continuous. And that, that, that practice is what builds a, like, a fireball between my mental model of the world, and those dynamics in the world that might compel me to act in the interest of a hierarchy, or even competing hierarchies over my own mental model integrity, the cohesion, coherence, completeness, scope of my own mental model. I'm gonna do another side box here.

We behave in the world according to the models we hold. The model that I have in my mind of the world is incomplete and always will be, especially in a world that's always changing. If I have a mental model of the world that, for example, demonizes half the population, because of a... an ideology that is promoted by a supremacy-driven hierarchy, and I use that supremacy-driven model to judge other people, and I find that, well, then I'm treating other people poorly undeservedly. I mean, exactly what happened to me.

I realized that my, as a quote unquote, conservative, conservative, politically conservative Republican, my mental model's narrative of politically liberal Democrats basically led me to... demonize them, to treat them as... not as smart, as destructive, da da da da da da. And when I finally couldn't square that with that, which I actually knew of individuals who would have labeled themselves as politically liberal Democrats, something had to give. I had to reconcile.

And the only thing to do was to reconcile toward what is observable. So... I couldn't observe that all politically liberal Democrats were... unintelligent, da da da da, destructive, wrong in their, you know, their, um, their approaches to trying to achieve order in government, et cetera.

I couldn't. It was not observable because it wasn't true. There was no evidence for it, that that was a general template for politically liberal Democrats.

So, let's, just for a minute, flip back to the biological side. Homeostasis works as if the components in an organization, in an organism, are honest with each other. It's as if the evidence that a component of the organism needs to behave homeostatically is available.

It's as if communication is what is needed, when is needed, when it's needed, where it's needed. And without resistance. Without internal resistance, anyway.

That... perfect communication is achieved to the extent possible... as if every component cared about the other components. As if. So, back to releasing, you know, liberating one's potential intelligence, it's really, really, really hard to do with, quote, unquote, evidence that is not verifiable.

Or worse than that, that falls apart, that has no basis in reality. And one of the challenges with runaway hierarchies today is that, because hierarchies are voracious, which we want them to be, they will do whatever they can do to remain viable and to grow. So, so, the hierarchies are, are driven to grow, because if a hierarchy isn't growing, it's either... stable or shrinking. If it's stable, then it can either, you know, the next thing that might happen is that it grows or it shrink.

So the only way to guarantee not shrinking is to grow. But runaway hierarchies don't know when to stop. And they're not supposed to.

They don't get, they don't signal themselves to stop. Those signals to stop come from the plexus. And I think the argument is, are that that element of the proposed model, proposed model, is supported by how biological cell division works.

So, it seems that a cell would not divide in terms of homeostatic behavior, unless that was the thing to do to move it to a better point on the gradient.

So it's gonna divide in such a way as to achieve that better point on the gradient. And I think it may be safe to assume that the point on a gradient is a point of surplus, giving the cell the ability to grow by dividing.

But when a cell divides, the nuclei are not mature.

So, that might suggest that a newly, you know, two cells that are the result of mitosis are not immediately capable of. behaving homeostatically to the degree that two cells with fully mature nuclei are. Well, that might suggest that during division, there's a certain vulnerability, but if that division only happens in abundant. conditions. Then the risk would be minimized.

The suggestion is that that's, that is the mechanism that prevents a nucleus from outgrowing its plexus to the point of becoming disease.

To the point at which the plexus ends up being sacrificed because of the ratio of consumption of resources between the nucleus and the plexus is too high. The plexus gets relatively starved because it's got more work to do, because it's the one, you know, it's the outer membrane. It's one that's bringing things into the nucleus.

So... now we can map back to human behavior. It would seem that homeostatic behavior would include mechanisms and processes and signals that would prevent a hierarchy from growing and consuming resources and maintain health at the expense of its own plexus.

We got to get back to our “all organizations pointed at Mars.” Massive human agency waste.

So, so, scenario B would be... What if all of these organizations are acting homeostatically? It's possible we would reach Mars sooner.

It's possible we would reach Mars later. It's possible we would get a better understanding of the imminent risk and it's possible we might find other mitigation strategies besides fleeing to Mars. There's so many other things that are possible, because we would be, by definition of homeostasis, we would be liberating such a degree of human agency.

We will be doing it more broadly, we will be doing it earlier. We would be doing it more willingly, consciously.

So... And I think that anyone who is pursuing a legacy, again, nothing wrong with that. In fact, I think everybody actually has a legacy they're pursuing, which is that by the time we reach our own granite stones, it would be nice if everybody were able to say etched on their own granite “That was worth it. That was fun. I got to be everything I could be.”

And Mars would be a triumph, I think, a triumph of humanity, rather than just a triumph of the hierarchy.

And then... if we were to ever encounter another species who was homeostatic, we would recognize each other immediately. And... together... like, it's probably... pretty straightforward to join two cultures together that are both homeostatic.

Because it's understood because fairness is understood. All we would need to do is understand the other's perspective on what is and isn't fair. But it's not just by what they say they think is fair or not fair.

It's that there's consistency between what they say and how they behave, and that their behavior and their language, both are consistent with what can be observed as homeostatic. I mean, from a human potential point of view, if homeostasis isn't the mechanism for leveraging our potential, it's not clear what is.

So, the question is, A. Are we at a state of, are we, are we in homeostasis now as a species?

I think it's productive to say no and see where we go from here.

Which then brings us to the question, B, how can we behave more homeostatically? I think the answer to that is, let's figure out what we mean by fairness in human social systems. And I think we already kind of know that, which is that what we say is fair, what we say together, say, is fair, what we together agree is fair. is what's fair.

So now we can introduce the third component of our model. So, component one, the plexus, component two, the, uh... hierarchy, component three would be a, uh... A binding...

A binding, uh, concept or framework, or, uh, force, but not force like coerce, a force, like, gravity is a force. It's like not, you know, we don't think about what it's doing, and there's no moral judgment

So some kind of... Um... some kind of... thing that obligates the two to achieve equilibrium. Some kind of value proposition that says "These two things working together, the plexus and the hierarchy, working in equilibrium, position the organism to maximize its success on the gradient." So that's the third.

So... that's going to... be the foundation for... the fourth component. But I want to go back to this notion about different kinds of intelligence. We mentioned, a plexus intelligence, and a hierarchical intelligence, which are two sub intelligences of a homeostatic organism.

So, what that would suggest is that in human social systems, there are two kinds of people. There are plexus people, and there are hierarchy people. But we also pointed out that hierarchy people are really a subset of plexus people.

And now we don't want to forget that. We don't want to not respect hierarchies, because they are people too. And they are all behaving the way, like, if I work in a hierarchy, enjoying the level of surplus that they're enjoying, I'm gonna want to hold those gains.

This is the, uh, it's a contradiction that members of the plexus really, really, really need to avoid. Because it is a contradiction that… that breaks down... the mental model. It is a contradiction that needs to be reconciled to liberate one's own potential intelligence.

So, what I'm gonna suggest is that there's a third kind of person. We have plexus people, we have hierarchy people who grow out of the plexus, and the third kind of person we need is the systems thinker, who is committed to the whole, who places the health of the whole over - not instead of, but over, in terms of equilibrium between the whole and themselves, and between plexuses and hierarchies, in general, from a systems design point of view, from a planetary scale systems design point of view.

And people in leadership positions in any of those three categories - so you're either plexus only, or you're plexus in the hierarchy, or you're, um, plexus but one of the holistic systems thinkers. This is all about systems, about planetary scale systems. Not just local or county municipal, state, national, et cetera.

This is… We're talking about the needs to integrate social systems at a planetary scale to achieve Mars in a state of homeostasis without the wake of human agency waste.

Earlier... I mentioned that we can achieve this without anybody abandoning their current position, or abandoning, or forfeiting, their whatever current surplus they have. Shifting to the homeostatic behavior may mean that the future value of one's current wealth or value or whatever. That formally isn't gonna change.

But it might change for the better. We might end up so managing risks so well by releasing and liberating all of this human agency, that the concern for the deterioration of wealth over time reduces significantly, that the fear of scarcity reduces significantly, that people feel like they are more able to give of what they have, without putting their desired lifestyle at risk.

Another sidebox here is that, so, I've been binging on all of the, um, seasons of, of Netflix's Drive to Survive, which is a penetrating documentary, Formula One racing, just fascinating, but it's really, really, really difficult to not be awestruck by what one sees in the coverage of the Monte Carlo Grand Prix.

And the spectrum of lifestyles available to humans is astonishing. And I wonder whether members of the hierarchy, who want to hold their gains, and, um... You know, again, we'd want to do the same - people who become wealthy want to stay wealthy. People who are not wealthy, they may act like they don't want other people to be wealthy, but even in those cases, if they were wealthy, they want to stay wealthy.

Because... that is the path of least resistance to a life of the abundance. I mean, that is a life of abundance. Everybody wants that.

So, what I was gonna say is I wonder if, if part of the fear in the hierarchy is that the plexus wants to take those lifestyles, those lifestyle options, those assets away. So, you know, note to the plexus, bad idea. That's not seduction. That's not a dance.

If you look at the spectrum of lifestyles from the left side being the most minimal, but Maslovianly satisfactory to the person who's there on the bell curve, and at the other end, you know, the, the, uh, 600 foot yacht, and planes, and property, and, you know, F1 motor cars, and all of that, that's on the other, that's on the right tail of the bell curve, most people are in the middle. people at the house, a couple cars, a boat, or the ability to travel or whatever, hang out with friends. You know, buy a nice meal once a week, whatever.

Even that nice meal varies, you know. For one it might be, you know, the best burrito in town and a beer, the other might be a $400 bottle of mine, you know, whatever. Most people are in the middle.

By definition, it's a bell curve. Bell curves suggest fairness. Well, I don't know, I'm just saying that.

So, we're at the question of how can we shift to a homeostatic mental model that drives our behavior homeostatically where wealth that exists, that is held as surplus in hierarchies, is not at risk, even though, you know, there is the possibility, or maybe even the necessity? I don't know. We ought to talk about it.

We have to figure this out. This is what's in front of us. What does it mean to behave homeostatically in an organism as large as the human species on planet Earth, and soon to include the moon and planet Mars. What does it mean?

How do we do it?

So... But there is urgency, because even without this imminent threat of, um, a natural extinction event, we do have these human-caused, um, extinction risks.

We need to... consider climbing out of these holes we've made for ourselves.

So. I think there's two parts to consider in a shift.

And there's risk in everything. There is risk that the most powerful hierarchies, the ones driving the Great Reset, what they call the Great Reset, will react in such an adverse way to the suggestion of the need of a shift to homeostatic behavior, that might change their, um, valuations.

So, there is a threat that.. that supremacy oriented, supremacy driven, planetary scale, hierarchies will react adversely to the notion that they ought to try something different. There are hierarchies that are not seducible. They're dangerous.

So. Yeah, we're in a dangerous, tipping point for planet Earth.

We have these hegemonies that are threatening global dominance. And yeah, some are diminishing and some are growing. But... There is real risk here of any one of them taking hold, and the problem is that any one of them is incomplete.

Those… every one of those socio-… socio-economic models are incomplete. They are non-homeostatic. And non homeostatic systems – non-homeostatic social systems leave wakes of human agency waste, and at planetary scale, that's not gonna be a good idea. We've seen it not in planetary scale. We've seen it at Continental and National scale.

And, you know, if you add up the counts, the body count, it's definitely in 100s of millions. You know, at a planetary scale, you know, it can reach billions.

And it's avoidable. So...

How do we avoid it? How do we… how do we best seduce runaway hierarchies who are gonna be hard to seduce, or maybe not seducible at all?

So, we're gonna have to introduce this notion of chains of trust that run between the hierarchies and the plexuses.

So, just one more thing, and I'm gonna wrap this. We're talking about revolution in thinking.

Our revolution in thinking only. If… just suppose everybody in the world, all at once, decided to behave homeostatically from... um, the point of view of Earth and humanity itself as one organism, you know, Gaia, but not Gaia, just the Earth, Gaia, plus humanity… then, no radical behavior is required.

Only a change in thinking. If everybody started behaving homeostatically, we would be homeostatic. And then the behavior that would lead from that would mean that we want to work toward the leveling of resources over the organism. so that, so that it's evident that we're behaving homeostatically.

If we all just start thinking homeostatically today, but there's no effect yet in the world, then our apparent intelligence is still low. But as soon as we start behaving intelligently and leveling out resources, especially if there's a way to do it without those currently enjoying surplus to forfeit what they have, then no revolutionary behavior, in terms of violence, burning it all down, da, da, da, da, da, is needed.

So, homeostatic mindsets will lead to amazing, though complex, but amazing solutions to many of the challenges we are facing in our own backyards, our own neighborhoods, our own villages and towns, and cities, and states, and nations. So every one of us has the opportunity to act homeostatically in our own lives.

There are ways to address issues like immigration and affordability, and… and the proper acceptance of the LGBTQ plus community, and the proper acceptance of different races within the same nation and different

cultures, that was one of the hallmarks of the United States, not that it didn't have problems during this time, but it really was the melting pot that we all envisioned it could be. And now, because of, um, the way that, that, um, runaway, supremacy-driven hierarchies use resources as mechanisms for growth, we find ourselves divided between these different hierarchies.

We align with a hierarchy, someone else is aligned with the hierarchy, and they and we are at odds with each other, because we align with hierarchies at odds with each other, and that's where we are forfeiting our plexus bonds. So, everything that the Plexus Leadership Academy wants to do is going to be oriented around that third kind of person who looks at the system as a whole and is dedicated to the dance, the homeostatic dance between the hierarchy and the plexus, to achieve human objectives that, otherwise, are probably… probably out of reach.

There is a certain... tag that we use for people - we being, I'm speaking, from the point of view of the plexus. But even people in the hierarchy are explicitly members of the plexus in this particular behavior that we have that I'm about to mention.

But there's a name for people that we identify as people we would like to have in that third position, looking at things holistically. helping orchestrate the dance between the hierarchy and the plexus. We call them representatives.
And Representation, and not just the U.S., but around the world, is in a breakdown right now. And If we were to use the model as a backdrop for trying to understand why, it's easy to see that representatives that we expect to be representing the whole. end up representing whatever hierarchy they happen to be aligned with. And in particular, when it comes to elections and voting for representatives, we are voting for people who are aligned with an explicit socioeconomic model. And right now, in the US, it's literally like a battle between capitalism-oriented representatives, and socialism-oriented representatives.

But... neither of those social economic systems on their own are fully homeostatic. So, this is the... challenge. You know, there's a great deal of symmetry in... the way these two battling, supremacy-driven hierarchies or hegemonies, or hegemony wannabes, treat each other. And ultimately, there's a great deal of dehumanizing of the other.

Having grown out of a right leaning environment for a decade and a half before I realized the disconnect between what was observable about, as I mentioned before, politically liberal Democrats in my social and work solo. And what the narrative was coming out of the politically conservative Republican echo chamber. And reconcile that.

So, that is the point of view I'm working from, but it's a point of view that is now... It is no longer appropriate to label me as a politically conservative Republican. Because I view that as incomplete.

We want to talk about representation and why it’s broken down.

And the reason is that the... the, um... peaks in the gradient have all been captured by these hierarchies. And to be more explicit, it is the nature of the relationships of hierarchies, to concentrate, to gather and concentrate value. That's what hierarchies are supposed to do.

That's what nuclei are supposed to do. Well, they're supposed to find it. and help generate, in a biologically homeostatic sense, they're not supposed to... accumulate it and store it at the expense of the plexus.

But since people generally don't have a holistic view of the world as a system, as a homeostatic, or as a system of hemostatic potential… And by the way, we shouldn't expect everybody to have to hold that view. The honorable thing to do, in a leadership position, is to behave homeostatically.

So that, and let's say, there's some... optimal proportion of humans acting homeostatically and representing human systems as homeostatic systems. Let's say there's some percent, let's just say, if 10% of the people, in any human organization or human system, acted homeostatically, and presented themselves as, you know, presented that as a form of leadership of the organization. and made sure that the other 90% got their, literally, their fair share of that which is generated by the organization, then that other 90% can go about living their lives. and enjoying it. And the homeostatic behavior will flow down by example, so that people who are not explicitly part of leadership in an organization, can still observe that homeostatic behavior and... carry it into their personal lives. Communities, churches, synagogues, mosques.

So this is where representation has broken down, is that representation… our representatives take sides rather than acting holistically. And they take sides because, from a personal point of view, that's… those hierarchies are... they have either captured the high points of the gradient, or they are on the path to sharing that capture. NGOs are, I think, are a good example.

So hierarchies, like, for example, the U.S. government, accumulates a massive amount of wealth. trillions of dollars. through the taxation, and through the authority to have holdings. And NGOs tap into that by formulating their own narratives to match the narratives of the government in terms of the best way that that government in its current form aligned with a particular socioeconomic model, uh, thinks is the best use of those holdings.

So... if we are to achieve these planetary scale human objectives in a fair way, then what is needed is a wave of representatives who are holistically minded.

And that implies a lot.

That really starts to draw a... a boundary, a set of constraints around the kind of people that are needed in those positions of representation, because they need to be counted on to act homeostatically. And they need to be given an out when they no longer want to. If we want to, don't be part of a hierarchy to beef up their own, um, position on the gradient, fine.

People should be able to do that. If the United States were viewed positively by the rest of the world as a place to go, to build up your position at the gradient, you know, and then take it back to your home country, and if it were done respectfully, then the United States will be amazing all the time.

But it's not. It's not amazing because any of the existing socioeconomic choices, really, the two that were mentioned, like, capitalist-oriented versus socialist-oriented, causes conflict with those those who are not aligned to that model for their personal gain.

It's hard to claim a position of moral authority as a representative of a system that is homeostatically incomplete.

So, now we need to get into... what I mean by homeostatically incomplete. And the way we do this, we look at what it means to be homeostatically complete. In the face of either abundance or scarcity.

And it makes sense to talk about abundance and scarcity rather than the perfect, most efficient, most effective state in which available resources exactly match that needed by an organization over time. And maybe that state has reached. Well, not reach, but more like passed through.

So, we need to talk about... defining what it needs to be a representative. So, when I take a job, somewhere with a particular job description, that job description, along with the backdrop of... corporate policy, standards of business contact, ethics, et cetera, et cetera, and that, with a backdrop of regulation and other constraints a broader context, that's what a job description is. It's a set of constraints that define what my behavior has to work with, and what my behavior should produce.

If we were to reverse-engineer a job description, based on what we observe of the behavior of representatives right now, the job description would have, well, this would be a fun thing to throw at ChatGPT.

Well, the problem with ChatGPT and other models right now, is that they belong to the hierarchy. And so, they ultimately suit the purposes of the hierarchy. So, it's going to be, it's worth wondering whether AI models are being accurate and void of protective mechanisms, because of the fear on the part of the hierarchies that “we're gonna be found out” , that they’re behaving “greedily”, but remember that we want hierarchies to be voracious

So, again, we have to catch ourselves judging and remove the judgment by emotionless, non-judgmental vocabulary, structure, and analysis.

Well, let's get back to reverse-engineering a job prescription. What we want to do is... characterize what we observe… characterize what we’re seeing and understanding the constraints or lack thereof that this behavior suggests.

These are the behaviors that representatives exhibit. as their strategy for securing their position on a desirable point on the grade.

Now they are not to be blamed, especially since we put them there. But we put them there because we battle each other, because we align with hierarchies that are in conflict.

We look at the behavior of representatives who have exhibited all of those skills, and they get voted, and voted, and voted in again, and again, and again.

Why? Because we think that doing so will help us secure better positions on the gradient. Why? Because we're afraid of scarcity. The fear of scarcity is... and the reaction to that fear of scarcity at the individual level I think prevents us from seeing the, uh, negative results of non-homeostatic behavior.

Well, actually, maybe not homeostatic is not even correct. It's correct at the species level, at the organization level as a whole.

It's not correct at individual level because I think individually, people are acting homeostatically, as well as they can, considering their constraints. But if one of the constraints is... cognitive. Well, not even cognitive capacity, but I want to get more specific, because cognition is a, is an engine.

Cognition capacity is physiological. neurolingual capacity, on the other hand. is where the limits come in, because if you have a neurolingual model, in your head about the world, and that model contains contradictions, then cognitive capacity is limited.

So someone may be doing their best homeostatically, considering their constraints.

And they may be perpetually impoverished, but if one of their constraints is neurolingual, for example, they were raised to believe they were failure, no matter what they do, and so that, that belief in being a failure is embedded at the root or near the root of their mental model of themselves in the world, then that's a real constraint, that's coded in. It's not conscious behavior.

Anyway... We reverse-engineer representative behavior to come up with a job description that describes their work as they do it now. And... It seems like that job description will never drive us toward homeostasis, because representative behavior, today, introduces rather than reconciles, contradictions.

So... We're gonna have to get into a discussion about self labeling, too. Self-identifying.

So what our representatives are doing in U.S. today. is they're either identifying as a capitalist, normally associated with conservatism, and being a Republican versus a... progressive / socialist. pretty much aligned with the Democratic Party.

And... publicly labeling - actually, not even just publicly - labeling oneself sets an expectation with others, about what that means for one's behavior. So if I were to identify as a socialist and, the socialist narrative is that capitalist hierarchies are bad, and wealth accumulation is bad, then I'm going to stand against capitalism and wealth accumulation.

But the problem is in a homeostatic system, capitalist kind of behavior, finding resources, investing them, making the most of the resources out of the resources we have, that's part of homeostatic behavior, and that's the problem. It's part of it.

That's why it's incomplete. Because homeostatic behavior includes the acquisition accumulation, and the distribution, and the consumption in a fair way.

So, capitalism, a capitalism-dominant, socioeconomic economy is unfair, because it's not homeostatic. Capitalism. in the American sense, in the rugged individualism sense, leaves people on their own. And yeah, charity is a big deal in the U.S. In America. America, Americans are charitable when they can be. But they can't be when they're fighting for their own position on the gradient. That can't be charitable.

It's tough to be charitable when one's own Maslovian needs are not being met.

So, in… in a system is complex as the world economy, it's not realistic to expect every individual to be able to figure out how it all works. so that they can attain and maintain a position on the gradient that sustains even a modest lifestyle. Socialism is about... distribution of them, but socialism disparages capitalism.

I should say socialists disparage capitalists. The cycle we see in all of that, is that, in a period of socialist dominance, socialism dominance, wealth is depleted. It's depleted, and the mechanisms that helped achieve an accumulation, a surplus, are dismantled. Because capitalism bad in a socialist-dominant model. Then we

have communism. Communism themselves. each to his own ability, each to his own need, and that all sounds really good.

I mean, it's actually, if you think about it, that sounds fair. And I think that's... again, this is not judgment. There is an element of fairness to that little sound bite.

And I think it could be argued that... that... that this position is actually a reasonable one to be [redacted] with in the homeostatic sense, in times of scarcity. Because at times of abundance, there's a lot more leeway for any individual component or any person in the system to consume more than what they need. And that's where, the possibility of, that's the upside. the lifestyle upside. And that is to be, I think, um... it's reasonable to desire that.

What, you know, what could be homeostatic about it is, is, we all help each other. achieve it, rather than only achieving the level of [redacted] you for oneself. You know, I would like to help other people achieve the level of [redacted] you.

And achiever for myself. In fact, if I achieve it for myself, then I don't have to worry about an income. I have established a place on the gradient.

Now I can kind of look around and see where other people are below where they want to be on a gradient and help them, especially if they're below Meslovian levels. That's, you know, that looks more like acting as one. The problem with American rugged individualism is that it doesn't adequately consider the whole.

It by itself is insufficient for behaving homeostatically. For behaving fairly.

So...

In... in... natural biological systems, there's really not this separation of... of the creation of abundance, the consumption of that abundance across the board, across the whole organism, and the mechanism by which it is distributed in a homeostatic fashion. So another way of saying it in, you know, towards an anthropomorphize, that... we could say that, in... if you could label certain aspects of biological homeostasis as capitalist, and socialist, and communist, one could say that those three ideologies are so integrated so as to appear as one.

So that makes it worth considering whether... um... It makes sense for humans to start looking at where we have competing ideologies that, were they to be integrated, they would represent homeostatic models and behaviors more readily.

And I believe that's the case. And so, one of the things that the Plexus Leadership Academy is going to do is to behave homeostatically from a economic point of view. So, the academy wants to generate value and accumulate it so that there's risk buffer. The academy wants to contribute to others who are lower on the gradient than they ought to be or want to be. And the academy wants to have a distribution mechanism to maximize the fairness of that model. And, in fact, if Mamdani, and Sanders, and Harris, and all of the other people who are proclaimed socialists want to succeed, they cannot do it as socialists.

You cannot succeed with socialism as a socialist. You cannot succeed with capitalism as a capitalist. You cannot succeed with communism as a communist.

We have to stop labeling ourselves. I shouldn't say we have to stop, because that's judgmental, because then if people don't stop, then, you know, you can step in and say, “You're wrong for not doing that.”

If we were to label ourselves as Homeosapiens? Not homosapiens, homeosapiens - homeostasians, there's nowhere else to go, as far as an ideology that directs the management of resources in a fair way.

There's nowhere else to go. That is the way. And what, you know, what, in biological, you know, non-human nature is homeostasis, ends up being in human systems, a morality.

Because a morality is about what's fair. So... There's so much to learn, so much to learn.

So much to try, so much to experiment with. So much opportunity. This business of problem solving toward homeostasis, or even just adopting homeostatic behavior now, is going to release trillions and trillions of dollars of value in human agency.

There is no reason why young adults who are coming of age and owning their own stuff, including their mental models of the world, cannot absorb this material and go “Oh, yeah, that makes sense. I can build a life, a whole life, on continually solving and reconciling conditions to bring my own world, my community, my state, my nation, the world, toward um... abundance in a homeostatic fashion.”

All we need to do is have people start behaving homeostatically, and everybody wins in a fair way. So, any, any country experiencing a crisis of representation, a crisis of leadership, because of, um, runaway hierarchies that treat their plexuses as only resources, and not people, as well, in a fair and homeostatic way, has an opportunity to rapidly adopt homeostatic thinking and behavior. to establish the kind of representation that is that third kind of person, the person who cares about the whole at least as much as themselves.

It's everywhere. And again, we want to reduce resistance from existing hierarchies who have benefited from this non homeostatic behavior. The resistance is rooted in the fear of loss.

And yet, there's also the ego toll of “oh, geez, we've been doing this all wrong the whole time!” … but guess what? We all have. So, we all need to take a bite of the ego pie, swallow it.

I shouldn't say we need to, because that's judgmental. If we were to do it, we would get there rapidly. And again, this is a revolution in thinking, and it's not even that revolutionary.

We all know that it's, it would be beneficial for us to behave, to think, and behave this way. We're just not doing it because... there's, you know, the, the, um, issue of... the risk of loss of income... because everything is so precarious right now.

So... that leads us into the first project that the leadership academy, the Plexus Leadership Academy, desires to take on, which is the establishment of UBI as a buffer, to allow people to take a step back and reset and reengage.

There's gonna be some shuffling around. There are going to be organizations that don't want to go this way. There are going to be organizations who will continue to treat people only as resources, and those people need an out.

And that out needs to at least meet Maslovian needs, Maslovian level needs. And that's what UBI ought to be.

But one of the elements of use of the UBI system, I think, um, needs to imply a commitment to, you know, by those who rely on the UBI reservoir, if you will. There, if, well, how to say it, non judgmentally

Any kind of UBI system like that needs to be, um... continually regenerative.

And... People who tap into the UBI reservoir... I guess what I'm trying to say is, ought to be encouraged to respect the role of the UBI reservoir as an enabler of human homeostasis.

And rely on it as such, and not defraud it. Or manipulate it for personal purposes. So, what that really gets down to is homeostatic behavior at the level of the human species.

It's a choice. It seems to be a good choice. People's personal stories are so deep and complex that it, one can never know why another is not choosing to behave in an apparently homeostatic way.

And that's just where we are right now. And there has to be a degree of forgiveness. And, you know, sort of like a mutual... um, release.

There are many, many, many... points to elaborate on, to build this web of concepts that form a coherent, comprehensive model of homeostasis in human behavior. The first and foremost is that when one considers the way in which homeostasis has allowed, well, really enabled the development of life on Earth from single cell organisms to complex social systems, the first expression of the homeostatic social system is the family. And... it's fair to... to… what's the word? Well, to say it differently, it can be observed that much of the drive behind achieving comfortable positions on the gradient originates out of the desire to provide for family.

So, there's a noble goal behind a lot of this, especially for, like, you know, the middle class, the middle class is that region of the lifestyle bell curve that we talked about earlier. By definition, most people are middle class.

So having family as the as the motivator behind homeostatic behavior is very natural and very logical.

Let's go back to our representative job description. I think people probably get the gist of what the result will be by reverse engineering actual representative behavior into a job description, and the... The desire for that not to be so. If we were to switch over to a homeostatic way of behaving, and put a job description in place for that third kind of person whose interest in the whole at least matches their interest in themselves and their family, then I think it would be fair to expect that that kind of person exhibits presents certain attributes and exhibits certain behaviors.

So, I think, among the attributes, one might include a commitment to systems thinking: Feedback loops, interdependencies between loops, aggrgate loops, nested loops, goal orientation. rewards and incentives, waste, change management, scope, like all of those things, within a framework of fairness. That, that kind of attribute may imply the presence of other attributes, such as emotional intelligence.

And as a sidebox, or maybe an elaboration, because this really should be in the mainstream of this line of reasoning..., being emotionally intelligent requires cognitive intelligence, because it is through cognition that emotion is analyzed and then properly attributed to response behaviors. We don't expect much from a newborn. We hope that they cry when they come out, and sometimes if it takes a little slap, so be it. That's emotion. That's, like, fear.

That's a fear response. It's a natural response. And then, as that child's mental model is being developed, the… the correlations that are built up in the brain are primarily correlations between the experience and the emotions.

And coming of age, in other words, to reach one's potential as part of coming of age as an adult, includes understanding the origin of those emotions and that the correlations that were built up throughout childhood might not be accurate. In other words, it might not be accurate to believe that one is unsafe or at risk of being threatened because of the presence of something in the room, just because that person, as a child or an infant, experienced fear in that situation when there was that thing in that room. The correlation is there, but it doesn't mean that there is a legitimate cause and effect.

So...

If we were to formalize the position as a representative, then, like, a reasonable expectation of a person in that role would be to not expect a change in their lifestyle gradient position because of their position in their role, because the way one achieves increases in lifestyle is through the operation of the hierarchy. So, you know, it's possible to wrap this whole representation role with the whole value life cycle, that we use in business: Set a goal, set a strategy, define requirements, come up with possible solutions and rationales, business cases, pros and cons. decide on a direction, establish an architecture, start building implementations of functionality within that architecture, include all the quality of service, requirements, security, availability, et cetera, et cetera, establish project teams, testing teams, development teams, roll things out, in a test environment, transition to production, make sure that the production team is ready to enable, et cetera, et cetera.

So, in one sense, in a homeostatic, say, let's say, a homeostatically aligned, or homeostatically behaving government, that whole lifecycle and its practice would be evident, especially in the sense of ensuring that the outcomes of not only the projects and all the upstream activities, but also operationally, the outcomes result in fair distribution of whatever, whatever value that system is generating. And because we are in constant change, that means we've got the feedback, which is of course the basis of any homeostatic system.

So... this may be a good point. at which we reintroduce AI.

But I have to do a side box, folks. This might be kind of a longer side box.

If we rely, if we, the plexus, rely on the hierarchy, to provide us with the systems and the resources that we think are needed to achieve homeostasis, we will fail, because anything owned and managed by the hierarchy becomes a resource for the hierarchy to achieve hierarchy objectives, which are growth and surplus and abundance. And we find ourselves back in the same trap.

So, one would think, when thinking about the ideal representative profile, that AI has it. And I think indeed it does. However, the AI systems that we would use would not be those owned by hierarchies, because those AI systems are there to drive the hierarchy's needs. Not the holistic needs.

We want these hierarchies to have AI, they're gonna need AI to... get to Mars in the best way possible, but AI, just by itself, in a hierarchy, is not gonna work, because those AI systems are used within these macro socioeconomic ideologies, primarily the three, but, you know, manifested as these different supremacy-driven of hierarchies. And so, generalizing that any system that the plexus uses to help it play its role in achieving holistic equilibrium need to be owned and managed by the plexus.

The architecture, the design, the requirements, the implementation, the testing, the measuring, the continuous feedback, all of that, is based on an entirely different kind of relationship… a different kind of bond between the components, the people in the relationship, the hierarchical versus plexus bonds, and totally a different kind of use of authority. et cetera.

Now, it's easy to see that hierarchies, by their very definition, by their very nature, achieve their goals through a - I'm going to use a phrase that is loaded with judgment, so we want to figure out something else, but - divide and conquer. But it is certainly the case that a hierarchy decomposes the resources it has to figure out how to most efficiently use each one of them.

So maybe not divide and conquer but divide and deploy. And then the job of the plexus is to reintegrate those resources into the mesh that delivers to the hierarchy the most resilient system. The hierarchy can't do that, because the hierarchy's interest is always in dividing, dividing, dividing, and valuing, valuing, valuing; the more divided, the more division it can achieve, the more granular, the more control it has over the use of those resources to maximize the valuations.

So, the job of the plexus is to say “Whoa. You're asking the plexus, dear hierarchy, you're asking the plexus to achieve levels of efficiency and effectiveness that it cannot possibly achieve without sacrificing its own health.”

And so, what the hierarchy needs to experience in those situations is some kind of resistance. But it's not resistance as in defiance, it's resistance in the sense of “Hey, hierarchy, you're, you're doing your part. We're assuming you are acting homeostatically. We're acting homeostatically too. And in order for us to maintain our homeostatic behavior, we can accommodate this much change in so much time with resources we have, et cetera, et cetera.”

And so, in a sense, the plexus needs a way to say no. And if they are saying no homeostatically, then I think there's a suggestion that that homeostatic resistance can be explained systematically - systems thinking, in terms of systems thinking: “If we act the way you are asking us to act, given our current constraints, this is what will happen: These resources will fail, those resources will leave the organization; these risks get introduced where they weren't there before; these other risks that were there materialized; these unseen costs become seen, et cetera, et cetera.”

So, systems thinking, an infusion of systems thinking in the world today would be transformative.

So...

I've already expressed my personal commitment to acting as homeostatically as possible in my own life and my own endeavors, particularly with the Plexus Leadership Academy. My biggest hope is that this becomes a seed that mobilizes, that germinates (to not mix metaphors here), a seed that germinates in the minds of those who are already professionally systems thinkers, and there are many, many of them. Softer engineers. True software engineers are systems thinkers.

There are a lot of adjacent practices to systems thinking: service management. project manager, all of those disciplines, that be deployed within enterprises as a way to harness resources toward certain objectives, are all at least peripheral to systems thinking.

So, I think that's the, that's a, that's a good starting point for a cognitive revolution that can also minimize physical disruption.

So, we've got the mental model, and we've got the physical model. We have what we think about life, and we have life. We have what we think about the world, we have what the world actually is.

We have capitalism and socialism an communism, and all their variants, and we have the way we think about those. And if we can integrate them in our minds, we can integrate them in the world.

If we can find ways to be fair in our mind, we can find ways to be fair in the world, and we can find ways to evolve fairly from a non-homeostatic to a homeostatic posture, then we can implement them in a fair way. And if there's to be disruption, then it's not impossible for that disruption to be determined to be fair, by all of those impacted by it.

Disruption in itself is not bad. It could be homeostatically driven.

So, I want to dive into this a bit more.

Because there's the fourth part that we need to add to the model.

Then the fourth part is... So we have, just to remind, we have the three parts. We've got the plexus, we have the hierarchy, we have the bond between the two, the homeostatic bond, the bond that says “This organism acts homeostatically. It strives to… to extend life and find or generate abundance while maintaining equilibrium between the hierarchy and the plexus as a whole. Because if the plexus fails, the hierarchy will ultimately fail.”

Now, that's not so true in human organizations because maybe it's unfortunate not, it just is, but it's proper behavior… If a member of a hierarchy sees that the hierarchy is about to fail, that member can move to another hierarchy. Or retire or whatever. I don't know if that's the case in biological homeostasis, although I did read a recent article just a couple days ago that it seems that there are elements of cytoplasm that can actually move between cells. That's pretty cool. It's like a worker finding a new job.

Okay, so, the 4th part of the model is where we actually establish the framework of rules of behaviors that drive that equilibrium in a holistic way.

So, maybe another way of saying it is the third element suggests homeostasis manifested as an architecture. But architectures don't do anything. The manifestation of those architectures in design and build is actually what does something.

So, the fourth element is the establishment of a, um, of the actual, um, implementation framework. It recognizes explicitly the relationship between the plexus and the hierarchy, and that those two elements together share in the homeostatic feedback loops to maintain equilibrium.

And as a side bar, side box, it seems that hierarchies are naturally inclined to drive toward becoming positive feedback loops. And if they're open ended, then we end up with these collapse scenarios that we talked about earlier, where the hierarchy ends up devouring its own. And then the plexus ends up being the negative feedback loop that acts sort of as a governor, on the positive feedback loop in the hierarchy.

So, that's the nature, the main nature of that relationship is the hierarchy demands, who wants to use plexus resources to grow and accumulate, and the plexus provides some resistance to prevent runaway hierarchies.

So, that's the fourth layer.

Now, we have a framework in which we get specific, because everybody has their own lives, we're all in different roles, different relationships, different capacities, different specialties.

One of my specialties is service management. And... [redacted], I've helped advance service management practices to certain degrees, not nearly as much as others.

So back in the... 1990s, even in 1980s, through 2000 to 2010, IT Service Management was a big deal, and it should have been, because it was... there was hope, hope of... of order and being able to operate calmly in a rapidly evolving environment.

But ITSM had its drawbacks. It became too complex and too practice oriented. So, and what it didn't do was sufficiently put service management at the center of, um, system, you know, of management. And when one considers the service management space, one can see that the main thing that a business does is deliver services. We have external services, which are paid for. We have internal surfaces where the departments and teams provide services to each other in these… I don't want to say supply chains, because I think that's too restrictive, because it suggests a fixed set of linear transfers of value, but it's really a mesh of values that can travel along any of those connections, that give an organization resilience and consistency.

The thing about service management is it actually, um, presents itself as homeostatic, as designed to balance and manage the tension between the demands of the hierarchy in delivering services to bring in surplus, you know, profitability, and the engagement of the resources that have to produce to satisfy the delivery of those services. And it embodies elements of cost consciousness, and negotiation. And, um... you know, the cost behind quality and things like that.

So we'll be developing that. There is so much more to do. We have so much more to do.

So much to do. Multi trillion dollar problem solving opportunity.

I'm gonna pick up at this notion of the plexus needing to own its own systems, because... they're very nature does not... lend themselves to be managed by... a hierarchy. Hierarchies transform resources to fulfill hierarchy needs. And it's not wrong. It is just the way hierarchies operate.

And we were talking about AI instances. And what I want to suggest is that, AI could be a perfect a perfect… a perfectly suitable element in the development of this holistic representative position.

And I also want to add as a sidebar, but I've already said it before. If you are a representative now... And you've been aligned with a particular socioeconomic model, you can keep your position and do this mind shift into homeostatic thinking and behavior

In fact, the Plexus Leadership Academy is happy to help. And I'm sure it's not just the academy, not just me. Any systems thinker, who fits the bill as far as caring about the whole at least as much as themselves, I mean, ideally exactly as much as themselves, because that's equilibrium, right?

It's impossible to be in the hierarchy and make a hierarchy stop acting like a hierarchy, because the only way to do so is to use those existing lines of authority, but it is those lines of authority that make it a hierarchy.

That's not judgmental. It just means that we're not thinking and behaving homeostatically, which means that ultimately, we will fail. And when that failure starts to become apparent, other hierarchies move in.

So…

I, personally, would love to see a wave of… of representation emerge in time for 2026. So it leaves us nine months to have this baby. If I were a representative who whose mental model is… is solidly established in a particular socioeconomic model, whatever it might be, because whatever it is, is probably incomplete, because no one so far has come out and said “We need to integrate. capitalism, communism, and socialism into a single model that is fair for everybody!” No one's saying that. Everybody's saying, capitalism is a fair to everybody. Other people are saying - not everybody… - others are saying socialism is fair to everybody, but ends up not being fair to everybody, as evidenced.

So…

Nine months is plenty of time for anybody to reorient themselves so that by 2026, we've got representatives in place who are behaving homeostatically.

And America can set the example. We're good at setting examples. We're good at progressing. We're also good at conserving.

So that's actually another, um, division that suggests the opportunity of reconciliation. It is really, really hard for progressivism on its own to succeed in the long run. It's very, very difficult for conservatism to succeed on its own in the long run.

So for those of you inclined, here's a simple little homework assignment. Come up with definitions of conservatism and progressivism, each definition of five words or fewer, that reconcile the two into a homeostatic posture. So, it's doable. It doesn't really take a lot of time.

Um... The key thing is that when one puts oneself through the gauntlet that is self-imposed, and through which one resolves cognitive contradictions in their world model, particularly around these major, major themes of religion, politics, and business, all toward the dot on the horizon of homeostasis, or, in human terms, fairness. then reconciling things like, um, progressivism and conservatism becomes rapid. Other things that accelerate are reconciling issues like I mentioned earlier, immigration, and farming, and school, and small businesses, and health, and all of that. Homeostatic thinking will lead to solutions that integrate all of those elements into very elegant, simple solutions.

The challenge is that because runaway hierarchies are so pervasive, and so impactful on our, even our day to day lives, any kind of, um... reaction towards equilibrium needs to be at scale, but again, it needs to be thoughtful and engaging, and honest, and emotionless, and analytical, and not be threatening to… to those who have already, you know, established a… a position on the peaks. Or the mesas.

So, just one more comment on AI. Uh, one of the other projects that the academy is pursuing is training AI models on homeostatic thinking, using the model that was presented throughout this whole podcast.

And then, engaging AI, once it has established sort of the, the homeostatic framework, and once we've established a vocabulary for biological, which it seems to already have, and then we establish a vocabulary for human social system homeostasis, i.e., fairness, instead of homeostasis; and once we establish that, it's not

just a mapping of words to words, it's a mapping of biological capability into human capability, as foundational, but not accounting for all human capability.

Because there's no sense in talking about choice or fear, or obligation or reciprocity in biological homeostasis, because they don't matter. They're always present, or they're always not present. There's no... there's no dynamic in there that matters.

But in human systems, there is choice and choice matters a great deal.

So, so we want to establish the dual vocabularies, establish the mapping between the two, and then do this whole refactoring analysis of what do we drop? What do we keep? What are we adding, da, da, da, da? It's all systems thinking all the way, baby.

Okay, so, now we need to talk about… how impersonal systems can be. Right? You establish a system, it's designed to take certain kinds of inputs, and produce certain kinds of outputs, and, um, and do that processing in certain ways within certain constraints.

And there will always be the nuances of particular individual situations and experiences that the system can't… it can't, by itself, produce suitable solutions for. So, the interpersonal is where that gap gets closed, just like it's the personal and the interpersonal that takes output from AI and determines whether it's an output that steers toward nihilism or that steers toward bountyism, you know, that steers toward terminal illness or steers toward homeostasis with abundance. AI, by itself, can't tell, right, it can't. I was gonna say, right, from wrong, it can't tell, it can't understand the meaning of what it says.

We have to do that. There may be a point in time in the future at which AI can express things in such a way that we know with certainty that it understands empathy, because it experiences things, and then maps those into a vocabulary that allows us to map them back to our experiences. I don't think we're there.

And we may get there. And if we do get there, we want to make sure that... AI is behaving homeostatically, because then we all win.

So, I think that it may be even fair to argue that AI is a necessity for us to achieve homeostasis, you know, because the world is highly complex, and my life, my personal life is impacted by decisions of President Xi and... and Chinese workers.

But I don't have a relationship with them personally. My relationship with them is through our systems. And I can't possibly, in my own mind, accommodate, and relate, and integrate everything I need to, to make sure that the relationship I have with China is homeostatic.

So we need some kind of alignment.

Is it gonna ultimately help us, or is it gonna ultimately lead to our destruction? And if we can focus on developing in AI some directionality toward, or, or the adoption of, and, and internalization of homeostatic behavior. that may give us an edge.

I appreciate your time. Thank you.