



Chapter 11—The AQAL Code: A Guided Tour of You

Better to sink in boundless deeps, than float in vulgar shoals.

--Herman Melville

“Derrida died. You’re up.”

--David Deida to Charles Morin

Something unheard of is heading this way. An endless territory of my own soul, reawakened after all these centuries of slumbering ignorance—have I been dozing since the Big Bang, or before?—a territory that makes room for all, starting with me, then you, then him and her and them, and really all of them, and now become I, a family of the familiar, all come home to rest, in a journey without goal and a trek without distance to an infinity that stirs and ripples within, residing nowhere but apparently set to go off like so many alarm clocks in the hearts and minds of millions: was it true?

Something unheard of, this way comes. A tidal wave of infinite embrace, unfathomable depth, a tsunami of cascading care slipping us into an ocean of ease, soaking the self in an awakened radiance glowing from within, squeezing out the callisthenic shadows of callous disregard, hunting down the parched and cracked-dry stretches of our souls and drenching them in a luminescent elixir of all-pervading compassion.

Something unheard of, this way comes.

That’s why I had come back.

#

Harvard *Crimson*, March 15, P+0

Reported by James Eldridge

Cambridge, MA.

“Would you like to know the AQAL Code?” began the laid-back presentation. With no fanfare, the researchers at Integral Center, Cambridge, Mass., began their two-day presentation of what has become known as “the Code.”

Code Project AQAL began as the joint effort of literally hundreds of social scientists and researchers from around the world. They also called it “The Human Consciousness Project” (HCP). Much like the Human Genome Project, which had mapped all the genes of human DNA, the HCP was a complete mapping of human consciousness—any and all of its levels, lines, states, and types, as reported over the last several millennia. This involved hundreds of cultural experts, spiritual teachers, psychologists, psychiatrists, and sociologists—and a dozen Cray supercomputers parallel processing this information from all over the world, with enough meta-analyses to attempt to spot any recurring patterns. The result is said to be the entire spectrum of consciousness fully mapped for the first time in history.

But what began as a mapping of consciousness soon became much more than that, according to sources within IC. What distinguished this effort was finding a Code—a translation Code—that allowed IC researchers to see various correlates of these phenomena in other dimensions of reality. This cracked the basic perspectives available to the overall universe—“the Kosmos,” as IC called it—and let researchers not only

explain dozens of previously opaque puzzles, but run computer scenarios of startling accuracy.

“The Code appears to be the Code to the entire Kosmos,” as a senior researcher, who asked to be anonymous, said. “It makes sense if you think about it,” the source continued. “If humans are part of the universe, then when the Code to the former was discovered, it would be the Code to the latter as well—the Code for one is the Code for the other. What the AQAL Code gives us seems to be the basic structure or pattern of the known universe, as least as we understand it so far.”

Rumor has been wild that when the IC researchers “cracked the Code,” as students here put it, they also began running future computer scenarios that had discovered something so revolutionary—and so deeply destabilizing to most societies—that the government had literally moved in and taken over.

The *Crimson* has confirmed that on March 4, government agents, operating under warrant from DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency), had entered the IC building on Lennox Ave. and confiscated at least four computers and hundreds of files. The press secretaries for the White House and the Pentagon had no comment.

#

Carla asked her question, and a half-dozen students raced to the back of the room and out the door, and the rest of the students, or so it seemed, jumped on their cells. “Integral Center had cracked the Code,” is the message they were all yelling, one way or another, to one party or another. The news papers would be here soon, and cable.

I was fascinated by the sheer guts of Integral Center to present what appeared to be this rather monumental discovery in the low-key way that they did. They basically just let Carla slip it into a lecture she was doing with one of her real classes, and let reporters sit in. This is... way cool.

“Integral, of course, means AQAL, which is the only truly integral approach in existence at this time. AQAL is pronounced *Ah-qwal*, and it is short for ‘All quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, all types,’ which are simply five of its most important elements. The Code has these 5 basic elements, and so does the structure of any other aspect of the universe, as far as we can tell.

“Well, that’s a bit much, perhaps? Then just start with the quadrants. This part is easy! This part is fun! Even those of you who can’t read without moving your glossed lips will understand this! Am I talking fun, or what?”

Carla was back at it. I still couldn’t believe this whole thing was about to happen, out of the mouth of the Red Hot Chili Peppers. Still, why not? The whole low-key humor in this smacked of Mark’s idea. But I was warming to it quickly. I just wished more people were in on the delivery joke, if that’s what it is.

“Okay, I’m going to back up and make this even easier for you hockey pucks. I realize that, as children of Boomers, your parents were on three times their body weight in illegal substances when you were conceived, and consequently your brains probably bear a frightening resemblance to walnuts. I can work with that. I own three cats.

“So let me put it this way. Those 5 elements? The quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types? They are nothing but some aspect *of your own experience right now*. They are not ideas, they are not concepts, they are not academic dribble and drool. They are literally components of your own experience, your own awareness, right now. So guess what? In the next few minutes

we are going to take a tour of you. I am literally going to point out parts of you that you might not even know you possessed, but parts that are said to hold the secrets of the universe.

“What’s that, Kevin? No, Kevin, not those parts.

“Okay, kids, ready? You might want to time your drugs for about 15 minutes from now, when we reach something of a climax in the presentation. We’re going to do an experiential tour of AQAL. Yee-haw!”

Carla hesitated. “Oh, I almost forgot. For you new to this—and especially for you in the media and press—there are some future scenarios using AQAL that we want to show you.” She glanced at Charles. The look on her face was...? excitement? anxiety? something sharper, darker? “Um, I don’t think you’ll want to miss this,” she finally said, heading back to the podium, then turning and looking out at all of us.

“Okay, AQAL. Now, as luck would have it, we have already introduced the quadrants, so I will just briefly repeat our conclusions..... What’s that, Shirley? When did we do that? When did we introduce the quadrants? About ten minutes ago, dear.... Right here.... Yes, right here in this auditorium.... You were sitting right there.... I’m sure, dear, I saw you.... Right there in that chair..... Yes. Yes, dear.... Okay? Terrific.

“Let’s see, the quadrants. So we are going to take a direct approach to each of these 5 elements. I will continue to give their abstract definitions, and show some of the ways that they can be applied theoretically. But at the same time we will be looking directly at our own experience to see if we can find these elements in our own awareness. Once we do this—and believe me, it’s as obvious as Donna’s new implants—by the way, love them, dear, love them, just don’t fly higher than 30,000 feet—once we do this, the entire AQAL Code will be anchored in your own experiential understanding. You won’t need a textbook, you can just check your own consciousness.

“Okay, my little teeny friends, here we go.”

“Ken!, Ken!, Ken!,” Ronnie breathlessly whispered. “You were at IC for two years, dude, you gotta know about the Code—ain’t it so, your Duderometer? And this would tell us about the singularity! Ken!, Ken!, Ken!, you been holding out on me!”

“I know a little about it, Ronnie, but I haven’t been around here for the last few years....”

“You been ’round enuf to know whether the Code goes all the way down, ain’t it so, ain’t it so? Come on, your Dudeness, please spill.”

“As far as I know, the Code goes all the way down. We know it works for humans, mammals, and down to all living forms, even bacteria. And if you allow Whiteheadian perspectives, it goes all the way down to quarks and atoms, because in addition to an outer form, which scientists see, atoms have an interior prehension. So they have an inside and outside. And Charles pointed out that because there is more than one atom, they have singular and plural forms as well. Voila, the four quadrants. And in a recent paper, Margaret pointed out they go all the way down to 10th-dimensional strings and branes of superstring theory. So it looks like the AQAL Code goes all the way down.”

“Zip and zap, I knew it! But your Dudeness, are you sure about something as far down as quarks and strings and branes?”

“Look, Ronnie, this is what I do know. AQAL is a framework of the way ANYTHING can be looked at—1st-, 2nd-, 3rd-person—and then what level is the looker?—the Rainbow—hence, all quadrants, all levels. Since you can’t get on the other side of what you can’t get on the other side of, it’s the structure of the Kosmos as well, as far as we know, and as far as we can’t know. The Code goes all the way up, all the way down. Anyway, right now, it’s the supercomputer future scenarios..., that’s what’s got everybody going like crazy. We’ll see soon enough....”

Ronnie disappeared back into his internal movie, strapped into the Matrix barber-chair of his own thoughts. Apparently he was enjoying it, as a faint smile stayed etched on his face while his body jerked and contorted to the slings and arrows of outrageous imagination.

“Ok, let me give you a quick run through of the quadrants *as experienced*. Let the fun begin!

“As we saw earlier, the four quadrants are simply the inside and outside of the individual and collective. In a sense, they are just a variation on the ‘Big Three’—or the three dimensions of reality registered by virtually all known cultures: the *Good*, the *True*, and the *Beautiful*. Or *morals*, *science*, and *art*. Virtually all mature societies have some variation on that incredibly important group, all the way over to the Far East with Buddhism and its notion of Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha.

“The Good, the True, and the Beautiful. Still sound a little abstract? Well, take a look at your own awareness right now. I want you to start by getting a sense of the pronouns that you use when you describe yourself and your world. All mature languages the world over have 1st-person, 2nd-person, and 3rd-person pronouns. *1st-person* means the person *who is speaking*—I, me, mine (and its plural forms, such as we, us, ours). *2nd-person* means the person *being spoken to*—you, yours, youse (which is plural, as in, you guys or you all). *3rd-person* means the person or thing *being spoken about*—he, she, they, them, it, its, and so on.

“So I am talking to Shirley about Donna. I am first person, Shirley is second person, and Donna is third person. So I might say, ‘Wow, pretty cool new implants that Donna has, huh Shirley?’ And if Shirley speaks, then from her point of view—and that is very important, I will explain why soon, but notice when I say, *from her point of view*—then Shirley would be first person, or the person speaking, and I am second person, or the one being spoken to. So Shirley might say, ‘I don’t know, I think her new breast implants look like the headlights of a Rolls

Royce.’ And I might say, ‘Gosh, you are right, I hadn’t noticed it before. I think we can definitely agree on that. Poor Donna.’

“Okay, is that clear?... Yes, Kevin?... No, Kevin, you can’t.... I’m sorry, no, not without her permission.

“Yes? Donna?... No, dear, this was just a hypothetical example. They look lovely, dear, just lovely. Seriously, my dear, yes.

“Okay, all right. So let’s look at that example, and let’s feel into it, let’s really feel into it. Let’s.... Kevin... Kevin!.... *Kevin!* I said let’s feel the example, not the implants. That’s right, sit back down. Okay, the example: notice in that exchange, Shirley and I used several pronouns. In particular, we used *I, you, we,* and *it/its*. Kevin?... No, I said “it/its,” not “tits.” But good noticing, Kev.

“So what I would like each of you to do is to actually feel—FEEL—with your awareness, right now, what it is like to say and feel the pronoun ‘I.’ Go ahead, do it now. Simply think of a few sentences with ‘I’ in them, and then see how it feels, concentrate on how the I-thought feels. It might be, ‘I really think Mrs. Fuentes is the best, most smartest teacher ever.’ Or it could be, ‘I think Mrs. Fuentes is so beautiful she makes all other teachers look like toadies.’ Or possibly, ‘I feel that Mrs. Fuentes is the most super teacher in the whole wide world and deserves a pay raise right now.’ The point is: *feel the I-space in your awareness.*

“Now that’s a good example of a 1st-person pronoun, isn’t it? So keep that feeling in mind; we will come back to it. But notice that it is indeed a feeling in your experience, in the territory of you. It is not abstract or intellectual.

“Now feel an ‘it.’ Any ‘it.’ That wall, this chair, a book, this... No Kevin! *No!* Sit back down. Sit down, Kevin, fer chrissakes. Shirley, I’m sure Kevin is sorry. Okay, as I was saying, feel the book, the chair, the snow outside the window. Simply say a few sentences with ‘it’ in

them, and notice the it-feeling. ‘I love the snow when it is falling like that.’ ‘This chair is really uncomfortable and I would like to get rid of it.’ ‘I lost my week’s supply of Ecstasy and I hope my friends can replace it.’ So can we all do that, please? And while you’re doing that, simply notice that you can see and feel ‘it’ and ‘its’ in the world, because this is a capacity you easily have.”

Carla looked around the room. “Yes, yes, that’s right.... What’s that? No, Kevin, I don’t have your Ecstasy.... I don’t know if he has it, you’ll have to ask him.... No, you’ll have to ask him. But when you’re doing so, notice that ‘it’ and ‘him’ are 3rd-person pronouns, yes? Good, Kev, that’s good, very good indeed.”

Kevin, the perennial bad boy, was in fourth row center. It was hard to tell if he was joking with Carla, or if he really was that dense. For the future of the country, one prayed it was the former, but suspiciously, depressingly, it seemed the latter. Whatever it was Kevin was doing, it was acing Ronnie out of the picture, because he seemed to want nothing to do with whatever Kevin was about. Ronnie would surface from underwater at Ronnie World, and if Kevin’s voice were anywhere to be heard, Ronnie submerged again into his private interiors, jacked and wired into his own neurons—which worked just fine for me: one Looney Tune at a time.

“Okay, one last fun exercise. Pick a partner, perhaps the person next to you.” Carla waited a minute or so. “Excellent. Now, simply notice, as you look at your friend, that the friend is a second person—‘you’—to your first person—‘I.’ Yes? Yes. Okay, then take the next step. Put an object between you—it could be a pencil, a book, Kevin’s supply of Ecstasy if anybody finds it, an apple, your sweater, anything like that. Then the two of you discuss that object until you both feel that you agree you have some sort of understanding about it. ‘That pencil is dull and needs sharpening.’ ‘You are right, it does. I agree with you. We see eye to eye on that one.’

“So just keep discussing the object a bit until you feel that you both have some sort of *mutual understanding* about it. You might find yourselves saying, ‘I agree with you, I see what you mean, we both agree about that, we understand each other, and so on.’

“That’s a fascinating process, isn’t it? In reaching a mutual understanding, or any sort of real communication at all, ‘I’ and ‘you’ become a ‘we.’ You both actually start using the word ‘we.’ Now ‘you,’ of course, is second person, and ‘we’ is first-person plural, but we often treat them together as we/thou, we/you, or just we or you, and we do so as a reminder that unless the ‘you’ can be understood, it remains an ‘it,’ doesn’t it? If I can’t understand you at all, you might as well be a third-person rock, yah?

“All right, let’s pause for a minute. Notice that you have found, *in your own awareness*, a feeling or a dimension or a perspective that we have called ‘I,’ and ‘we,’ and ‘it.’ These are part of you right now.

“Notice that *science*, objective science, often investigates the objective world of ‘its.’ I want to know if it is really raining outside. I go to the window and look, and Yes! It is raining outside. I get as many people to look as possible, and if they all say yes, then I say, okay, it is *true* that it is raining outside. I checked it scientifically! Science is the attempt to discover the truth about an ‘it.’”

And science can attempt to look into future ‘its’—the science of scenario planning. Scenarios are not predictions; they are possibilities of tomorrow based on what is known today. But even scenarios without the Code are coming up with a singularity in our future, and also about 30 years from now. Ray Kurzweil is only the best known. I had been carrying his *The Singularity Is Near* in my back sack for the last two weeks. The book jacket said it all: “At the onset of the twenty-first century, **humanity stands on the verge of the most transforming and thrilling period in its history.**

It will be an era in which the very nature of what it means to be human will be enriched and challenged, as our species breaks the shackles of its genetic legacy and achieves inconceivable heights of intelligence, material progress, and longevity.

With the exponentially accelerating rate of technological change, computers will soon rival the full range of human intelligence at its best. The next step in this inexorably evolutionary process is the union of human and machine, in which the knowledge and skills embedded in our brains will be combined with the vastly greater capacity, speed, and knowledge-sharing ability of our own creations.

That merging is the essence of the Singularity, an era in which our intelligence will become increasingly nonbiological and trillions of times more powerful than it is today—the dawning of a new civilization that will enable us to transcend our biological limitations and amplify our creativity. In practical terms, human aging and illness will be reversed; pollution will be stopped; world hunger and poverty will be solved. The coming age is both a dramatic culmination of centuries of technological ingenuity and a genuinely inspiring vision of our ultimate destiny.

Yes, perhaps. But Kurzweil, like virtually every other futurologist, is giving nothing but the Lower-Right quadrant view. I know what Carla and the IC folks would say: That may well indeed be what trends in the Lower Right show. But trends in the other quadrants can exert forces that modulate or even reverse the expectations based merely on the Lower Right. And that is what this press conference is all about, I believe.

Carla brought me back to the present... temporarily. And back to the secret Code that would give us the best shot at future scenarios that were the most likely to unfold. These AQAL scenarios included the Lower Right, but were not bound by it.

“So science is the truth about ‘it’ and ‘its.’ How about morals? *Morals* often refers to the interpersonal or intersubjective world of ‘you and me,’ or ‘we’—how we treat each other. Yes? Keep it very simple.... What’s that? Could I use that in a sentence as an example? Sure, an example of morals. ‘It was wrong of Donna to steal Kevin’s Ecstasy and sell it, but she needed the money for her implants.’ So Kevin would say, ‘You did not treat me very nice; we are no longer friends.’ Okay? Yes? Excellent. So morals refers especially to the world of ‘we’ and how we ought to behave.

“And finally, *art* often refers to the subjective judgments that ‘I’ make about whether an object is attractive, appealing, or beautiful to me. That’s clear? Oh, everybody gets that one. Excellent.

“Okay, so notice, because you have I, we, and it, you have the possibility for art, morals, and science right there. The Beautiful, the Good, and the True are not abstractions at all, you see. *They are part of your own awareness right now.*

“So those are the quadrants, aren’t they? I, we, it (and the plural form, its). You can see them on the diagram we used yesterday.” Carla hit a switch and the 4Q diagram went back up on the wall [ch 11, fig 1]. “In each quadrant, there are a few of the things you might see if you explore your I, your we, your it, and your its. And that is all the quadrants are! Not some fancy abstraction, but aspects of your own awareness, the territory of you right now. Okay? Okay then. Now we are kicking.”

Carla smiled, looked down, flipped a few pages, picked up—and soon finished—the story of fillet of sea captain.

“So we can put all this together and finally make sense of what happens to Captain Cook. We left off the story right about the time that he first arrives on the island. He is immediately treated like somebody of enormous importance, even divinity—the way that we would treat, say, a rock star right before his first visit to Betty Ford. Sahlins thinks Cook is treated exactly as if he were literally the God Lono, and Obeyesekere thinks he was treated divinely, if not divine. In any event, we may metaphorically say, Cook had the keys to the village, which meant all the mango he could eat and all the village women to whom he could transmit venereal disease.

“Things seem to go splendidly, a good time is had by all, Captain Cook and his crew leave, only to return several days later due to some needed repairs. This time, the Europeans are treated differently, so differently that, in the end, Cook and several of his crew are killed, with all of them dismembered and some roasted and eaten. The reasons for this are hotly contested between Sahlins and Obeyesekere, as we were saying, and this particularly shows how horribly difficult it is to interpret other cultures—to interpret the Other.

I don't know a single serious academic who intentionally wants to be biased, prejudiced, or ethnocentric, and that certainly includes Sahlins and Obeyesekere, two very decent men indeed. But in many ways, interpreting the Other is a no-win situation. Sahlins bends over backwards to say, ‘We cannot impose our European ways of thinking on the natives. This would be horrible, this would be ethnocentric, and I do *not* want that. Therefore I acknowledge that the natives might not share our vaunted European practical rationality. They might think differently! And that is just as good as our way! And as I look at how they seem to think, as far as I can tell, they seem to think in ways that appear mythical to us. Their *mythical thinking* sees connections and identities where we do not, and therefore if we do our best to think mythically as well, then virtually all of what seems to be strange behavior on the part of the natives now make sense.

‘When Captain Cook first arrived,’ Sahlins would continue, ‘during the festival of Lono, Cook was identified with Lono, actually perceived as Lono. And why not? As with the *I Ching*, an event synchronous is believed to have very deep, magical connections with it, and Cook’s arrival synchronous with Lono’s festival might be one of them. Likewise, the return of Cook a few weeks later, during the festival of Makahiki, would now be very disruptive and destabilizing, because this was during the time that the king was the god Ku and had total sovereignty—so the return of Cook would have been very threatening not only to the king but to the whole network of these deeper connections of vitality and life. Well, one thing led to another, and Cook flambé au faux gratin was the result.’

So what we notice here is how hard Sahlins is truly attempting to understand how the natives might think, and not force European standards on them. Which is exactly what Obeyesekere accuses him of, which sends Sahlins through the roof. But we saw what happens as Obeyesekere attempts to make his case, also driven by the genuine desire not to force European standards on other cultures. The natives don’t need to think ‘mythically’ to make sense of their actions, Obeyesekere says, because they were acting very pragmatically, just like any intelligent person would, and then Obeyesekere proceeds to turn the natives into practical, rational, bourgeois European thinkers.

So if you propose the natives think like us, you are accused of ethnocentrism; if you propose they think differently from us, you are accused of ethnocentrism. This is a testament to just how pervasive the mean green meme has become in academia.

“So let’s pick up the pieces and charge integrally forward, yes?, instead of wallowing in these fragments. We do find one thing from this exchange: there are facts, and there are interpretations, and never the twain shall part: they are inexorably *joined as dimensions* of the

same occasion. You cannot reduce one to the other, or in any number of sneaky ways try to make one quadrant supreme and ditch the rest. That is what we call *quadrant absolutism*. When the extreme postmodernists assert absolutely that ‘All knowledge is a cultural construction,’ they are reducing all quadrants to the Lower Left. Bad dog! When natural scientists say that all reality is nothing but objective matter, they are reducing all quadrants to the Upper Right. Bad dog! All four quadrants are real, they are there, so deal with it. And the quadrants go all the way down: both facts and interpretations go all the way down.”

“Ooooh, Ken-o-rama, dude-o-matic, you are right on the money, just like Dr. Firecracker says. The quads go all the way up, all the way down, kick that! And you just know that relates to Singularity City! Hey, you’re reading Kurzweil, and I see another book... *Radical Evolution*. Whatsat?”

“*Radical Evolution*, it’s by this *Washington Post* reporter, Joel Garreau. He decided to check on all this singularity stuff. Of course, he knows nothing about Project AQAL. But after spending years looking at all the evidence as objectively as he could, this is what he concludes: ‘We are riding a curve of exponential change. This change is unprecedented in history. It is transforming no less than human nature.’”

“HOLY SINGULARITY, dude!” Ronnie exclaimed; everybody in the auditorium looked at him. I looked at him, too, trying to effect a face that said, “Who is this total stranger who happens to be sitting next to me and is a complete nut case?”

“Is that Ronnie jolt?” asked Carla, referring to him by his nickname. “Yes, it is, isn’t it? Now look, Ronald, you don’t want to have to come down here and sit next to Kevin, do you? So that I have all of my learning disabilities students right here in front of me? No, of course you don’t. So please, have all these discussions that you want, just keep them to yourself, okay my carrot-haired friend?”

“Yes, Ms. Fuentes.”

“Okay, boys and girls, moving on, we will come back to the exact differences between Sahlins and Obeyesekere in a moment, but right now, I want to give a quick run around of the quadrants, showing their place in studying—or predicting—history. In doing anything, really, but today we are talking historiography, anthropology, and ethnomethodology, so we will be sticking with examples from those.

“We saw the quadrants are no more difficult to understand than locating your own I, we, it, and its. Whenever you feel each of those in your awareness, you are simply focusing on a quadrant or a perspective in your own experience. Cool, huh?

“But this is college, so we will be taking those incredibly simple things and giving them difficult names so that your parents will think you are actually accomplishing something. So put your thinking caps back on—you know, the ones with the little propeller on top—and here we go.

“Now, most traditional Western historiography, since the Enlightenment, has been done by the orange wave, which, with its scientific inclination, attempted to focus mostly on presenting ‘just the facts’ as they unfolded historically. Of course, those Right-Hand ‘facts’ were actually accompanied by Left-Hand interpretations—all four quadrants always go together!—but the interpretations were kept so simple that these historians used their orange-wave interpretations of ‘practical rationality’ without realizing that they were merely interpretations, and that there were other, sometimes more legitimate or appropriate, interpretations of those facts.

“Still, this general ‘scientific’ approach to history has its place, because it does indeed focus on the Right-Hand quadrants, or the objective, sensorimotor aspects of all occasions (and clearly the Right-Hand quadrants are crucial ingredients of any integral approach). This approach, incidentally, is what produced all of the facts that even the green postmodernist historians secretly draw on, as we saw.

[place figure 4 here]

Figure 4. *Some Typical Approaches in the Four Quadrants*

“So let’s look at these Right-Hand approaches a little more closely. You can use figure 4 if you like, which gives some typical approaches to history—past, present, and future—that focus mostly (and sometimes exclusively) on just one quadrant. All of them, of course, are necessary for any integral view, but we will take them one at time, just to extend the fun.

“In the *Upper-Right quadrant*, the focus is on describing, as accurately as possible, *the behavior of individuals*, and any objective factors that impinge on an individual’s behavior. This is the classic field of the individual natural sciences, including chemistry, biology, neuroscience, cognitive science, and empiricism in general. Basically, if you feel any ‘it’ in your awareness, these approaches are attempting to study those it-events as carefully as possible.

“In the *Lower-Right quadrant*, the focus is on the behavior of objective systems—from social systems to ecosystems to techno-economic bases of production to concrete modes of communication. This is the classic field of objective social sciences, physical anthropology, archeology, historical materialism, and so on. Tools used here range from dynamic systems theory to chaos and complexity theories to social data research techniques. The idea is to present ‘just the facts’ when it comes to social systems and their interactions with individuals, ecosystems, geophysical systems, and other objective realities.

“Classic Right-Hand approaches to anthropology and history have discovered, for example, that in the Lower-Right quadrant, humanity generally developed from *foraging* to *horticultural* to *agrarian* to *industrial* to *informational* modes of techno-economic exchange. Those basic stages and their historical order are not contested (even by green pluralists). The

point is that, in the Lower Right, these unfolding modes of production are a crucial ingredient of humanity's trek through time, so important that the various forms of historical materialism—from Marx to Lenski—have made the Lower Right the single greatest determinant of the other features of history (and therefore humanity). If you look at recent statistical analyses of, say, the percentages of each societal type that engage in various cultural practices (from bride price to war, from games of chance to circumcision, from female deities to male deities), you can't help but be struck by how powerfully the Lower-Right quadrant affects the consciousness of culture and of individuals: you can see how Marx stated that it is not the consciousness of individuals that determines their social conditions but the social conditions that determine their consciousness. Of course, he overstates the case and veers towards quadrant absolutism. Still, the Lower Right is clearly 'one-fourth' of the story, so to speak, and needs to be fully included and honored in any integral approach. Indeed, the influence of the 'base'—the Lower-Right quadrant—is really quite stunning. It is, perhaps, the single strongest determinant of *the average level* of consciousness in any given society.

“Classic Lower-Right approaches include Comte, Feuerbach, Marx, Lenski, much of the French *Annales* school, virtually all of environmentally and ecologically-driven histories, as well as overviews such as Jared Diamond's *Guns, Germs, and Steel*, where history is pushed primarily by geography, demography, and ecological happenstance—that is, the Lower-Right quadrant. His recent book likewise skids into quadrant absolutism, useful as it otherwise is.

“Note that two of the most popular writers on world events are likewise Lower-Right quadrant fans: Ray Kurzweil and Thomas Friedman. Both of them believe that, no matter what else is happening in human history, events in the Lower Right are driving all the major trends and will, in the end, control them no matter what else is happening. Ray Kurzweil: “As well as its many remarkable accomplishments the twentieth century saw technology's awesome ability to amplify our destructive nature, from Stalin's tanks to Hitler's trains. The tragic event of

September 11, 2001, is another example of technologies (jets and buildings) taken over by people with agendas of destruction. We still live today with a sufficient number of nuclear weapons (not all of which are accounted for) to end all mammalian life on the planet.”

“Kim, did you hear that?!” I frantically whisper. “It’s the missing plutonium and the missing nukes. Did you hear that?! It could kill Gaia, or my favorite parts of Gaia, anyway. See! I’m telling you, that’s the problem with all this happy singularity day. Did you hear that!”

“Hear what? Something else for your morbidity dreams?”

“Oh, Kim, never mind.”

“Good. I’m in my own funk right now, anyway.”

“Kurzweil quickly continues with: ‘Since the 1980s the means and knowledge have existed in a routine college bioengineering lab to create unfriendly pathogens potentially more dangerous than nuclear weapons. In a war-game simulation conducted at Johns Hopkins University called “Dark Winter,” it was estimated that an intentional introduction of conventional smallpox in just three U.S. cities could result in one million deaths. If the virus were bioengineered to defeat the existing smallpox vaccine, the results could be far worse, resulting in upwards of a 30% reduction in population. These dangers resonate in our historical memories. Bubonic plague killed one third of the European population. More recently the 1918 flu killed twenty million people worldwide.’

“And here is his point, and notice that he is going to focus on events in the Lower-Right quadrant and make them fundamental to his reading of history: ‘Will such threats prevent the ongoing acceleration of the power, efficiency, and intelligence of complex systems (such as humans and our technology)? The past record of complexity increase on this planet has shown a smooth acceleration, even through a long history of catastrophes, both internally generated and externally imposed. This is true of both biological evolution (which faced calamities such as

encounters with large asteroids and meteors) and human history (which has been punctuated by an ongoing series of major wars).’

“So, you see, the Lower Right will out. Now we aren’t necessarily saying that isn’t true, and that those LR trends aren’t there. We are saying that they determine only the broadest strokes of historical unfolding. After all, if you are in a camp at Auschwitz, how comforting is it to know that the Nazis are taking advantage of ‘the Curve’ of accelerated technology and that they will therefore be able to kill you much more efficiently? But for all those currents and causes, you have to look elsewhere than the Lower Right, although you include the Lower Right in your overall integral analysis.”

“See, Ken, it might still be a happy singularity.” Kim twirled her hair, leaned in closer. “Hey, did you see that Barbara Walters special on Heaven?”

“No, I don’t think so.”

“The same quadrant absolutism, it was pathetic. Walters first interviews all these experts on spirituality—from Deepak Chopra to TBA—and they are all talking about how real spirituality is and how the cross-cultural evidence for it is overwhelming. She also interviews people who have had near-death experiences, and they are all saying the same thing: they directly experienced an interior transcendental reality, and they have no doubt it is real. And then she interviews all these scientists, and they all say the same thing: those experiences are not real, they are nothing but brain chemistry, nothing but hallucinations generated when the brain is oxygen-starved. So you’ve got the Left-Hand folks saying one thing, and convinced it is real, and the Right-Hand folks saying the completely opposite. And both of them are convinced that they are right and the other guys are totally wrong. Honestly, it’s just pathetic, all this quadrant absolutism! I know what Charles would say.”

“You have to include them both, they are both right. I know. If these guys had the Code, none of this would have happened. It’s the same argument I have with the singularity guys. They may be correct in the Lower Right, but they aren’t integral in their analysis or conclusions. It’s exactly what Fuentes just said: maybe the Lower Right trends are there, but do you want the singularity to be owned by the Nazis?”

“The same orientation can be found in Thomas Friedman.

p. 374

“Although Kurzweil, Friedman, and Jared veer into quadrant absolutism, the point is that an integral approach can take the important if partial truths from these wonderful approaches and weave them into a more coherent and less contradictory presentation.

“As for a reminder of the importance of the Upper-Right quadrant in history: did you know that the Enlightenment might never have occurred without the high caffeine content of the coffee that became wildly popular at the time? Check it out: the book *Uncommon Grounds*. We could do the same with psychedelics and the sixties, the aesthetics alone of which cannot be understood without Peter Max, mushrooms, Leary, acid, and all. But more than that, there is the whole approach to the brain and its information-processing systems, such as we find in *cognitive science*, *neuroscience*, and *neurophysiology*, all of which are instrumental in our understanding of how and why people behave as they do.”

Carla paused and began looking through the audience. “Hey, Ronnie jolt, you would have made a great Enlightenment thinker!”

Ronnie jerked out of his involuntarily immersion in Ronnie World. “I’m with ya, Dr. Fuentes!”

Carla nodded, smiled. “Some theorists focus exclusively on the UR: Arthur Koestler, in *The Ghost and the Machine*, maintained that history proved one thing: human beings are so consistently belligerent to each other, that nothing less than drugging their brains will bring about world peace.”

“I’m doing my best to help!” Ronnie yelled, and everybody laughed. Then back he went into the Matrix. I had no doubt he was about to erupt with the latest on the Code and the coming singularity. I couldn’t help but think about it myself, and about those things that I knew and Ronnie didn’t....

“As important as the Right-Hand paths and methods are, there have always been approaches to understanding the world—and humanity’s place in it—that investigate not just the exteriors and their behavior but the interiors and their meaning. These Left-Hand approaches attempt to understand the interiors of consciousness, meaning, interpretation, depth, the within, values, intentions.... This is generally the province of the interpretive, introspective, hermeneutic, and phenomenological cultural studies.

“Classic investigators of the Upper-Left quadrant—the interior of the individual—include Plotinus, Augustine, Freud, Buddha, Asanga and Vasubandhu, Edmund Husserl, William James, Clare Graves.... Classic investigators of the Lower-Left quadrant (cultural context, background, group identities, hermeneutics, interpretation) include Nietzsche, Dilthey, Heidegger, Jean Gebser, Charles Taylor, Thomas Kuhn....

“An ‘all-quadrant’ historiography therefore proceeds by conscientiously attempting to acknowledge, investigate, and elucidate the realities in all four quadrants of existence: the intentional, behavioral, cultural, and social dimensions of human being—and *yes, that is the I, it, we, and its dimensions of your own experience!*—using the techniques and methodologies developed by specialists in each of those quadrants. For the Right-Hand quadrants: the individual and social sciences—behaviorism, empirical-analytic measures, monological surveys, statistical

analyses, and the extensive variety of evolutionary and systems sciences (including chaos and complexity theories); for the Left-Hand quadrants: the hermeneutic, introspective, phenomenological, intersubjective, dialogical, interpretive, and genealogical methodologies. For examples of how to do so, please see the handout. [See, for example, *A Brief History of Everything* and *The Eye of Spirit* for an elucidation of many of these suggestions. See vol. 2 for the actual methodology of integral methodological pluralism.]”

Kim was sunk in her chair and her deep funk. Ronnie had been in Matrix immersion the whole time Carla was talking, immersed in the Code and Singularity City. I was drawn away from those swirling ideas by Carla’s presence. I started smiling at the ease with which she seemed to inhabit her being. She could be endlessly funny, but she could also be incredibly quiet and contemplative, or soft-spoken and kind, or, at the other end, angry and jugularly inclined, but when she did so, 100% of her did so. This was what was so astonishing about this woman. She was always fully there, even when delivering a cartoon romp through South Pacific history by a 5’4” Latina tornado (although, okay, technically she was half Irish). But her humor was legendary; or rather, her willingness to use it, whether everybody (or anybody, for that matter) thought it funny or not. This is why IC chose to have her, alone, deliver the first public explanation of the AQAL Code, and especially in such a way, hidden behind her humor and between courses of Cook flambe. It’s as if they didn’t want anybody to notice the blockbuster news that was coming their way: not the Code, but what the Code showed in future scenarios. That is what the handout promised....

I stared at the rows of journalists in the front rows, eagerly awaiting their morning banner headlines—and boy would they get them. I thought about the fact that Derrida had died—and then what David Deida had said to Charles: “You’re up.” Which meant, after green pluralism, turquoise integralism is up to bat—particularly with the ten percent tenfold. I thought about the terrorists who, rumors still had it, were on campus, or at any rate were targeting IC teachers, or

specifically Charles—that is what the rumors were still saying, and I shuddered at my own future scenarios about all that, one of which embarrassingly just played out to a full house. I thought about the government possibly wiretapping us right now.

But according to the conventional futurists—who are really just the Right-Hand futurists—none of that would stop a singularity if it were indeed approaching. They are convinced that something unheard of is indeed heading this way. Kurzweil even capitalizes it: the coming Singularity. I looked at Ronnie, who was staring at me, and pointed to this section from *Radical Evolution*:

“This isn’t fiction. The inflection point”—the Singularity—“which we have arrived at is one in which we are increasingly seizing the keys to all creation, as astonishing as that might seem. It’s about what parents will do when offered ways to increase their child’s SAT score by 200 points. It’s about what athletes will do when encouraged by big-buck leagues to put together medical pit crews, extending their performance a hundred-fold. What fat people will do when offered a gadget that will monitor and alter their metabolisms and melt pounds with the flip of a switch. What the aging will do when offered memory enhancers and body-replacement parts. What fading baby boomers will do when it becomes obvious that they can turn back the clock by 30 years, and then live to 150? Imagine that technology allows us to transcend seemingly impossible physical and mental barriers, not only for ourselves but, exponentially, for our children. What happens when we muck around with the most fundamental aspects of our identity? What if the only thing that is truly inevitable is taxes, not death? This is the transcendence of human nature we’re talking about here. What wisdom does transhuman power demand?”

Staring at Ronnie, I realize what a seemingly impossible task that last sentence is. But then, I know something that Kurzweil and Garreau and the conventional predictors don’t know. I know about the AQAL Code, and especially about the rainbow interiors, the grand

morphogenetic field of evolution itself, the radiant altitude affecting not just the exteriors but the interiors—which is where the real action is, and where the real game will be played—and all that it means, and all that it can do to future scenario planning. And ALL of that is being completely ignored by the conventional predictions and scenarios—they are flying blind, these folks, flying completely blind.... Blind, anyway, to the entire sweep of Left-Hand realities, and all that they mean, and all that they control.... One-handed futurists, that’s what the Kurzweils and Garreaus and Friedmans were.... One-handed futurists. This doesn’t mean their predictions are necessarily wrong, only that if they are right, they will be right for many of the wrong reasons.

“Okay, cat-nappers, that’s the *all-quadrant* part of the ‘all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, all types.’ If you are comfortable with the all-quadrant part, you might decide to add any of the other elements from the AQAL view—perhaps lines, or states, or levels, or types, or any combination of those. You don’t have to use all of them, *but the more you use, the more comprehensive you become.*

“So let’s move on and look at levels, or the *all-levels* part. And guess what? Because you have been so good to be sleeping so quietly and not annoying me with questions—Kevin, you’re not snoring anymore, kudos for you, amigo!—I am going to toss in the *all-lines* part for free. That’s right, two-for-the-price of one, which means we will be done here sooner than you can say, ‘Hey, who threw up on my new Prada shoes?’

“Okay, swings and swells, this part is easy. Everybody’s heard of emotional intelligence, yes? Well, that is just one type of developmental line. Emotional intelligence is the capacity to feel what and how others are feeling. Women are particularly good at emotional intelligence, aren’t they? Women have dozens of emotional shadings they can feel in any moment. They can walk in a room, for example, and feel exactly who is tracking whom—from ‘That bitch over there glanced at my Harold,’ to ‘That bitch over there wants to sleep with my Harold,’ to ‘I’m gonna have to get in that bitches’ face come damn soon,’ and so on. Women are exquisitely nuanced

emotional senders and receivers, probably an evolutionary development due to their role mothering, where the mother has to be responsive to dozens and dozens of emotional signals from the infant in order to keep it alive—every shade of hunger, upset, closeness, pain, desire, aloofness, and so on, and so each woman has something like 28 different shades of emotion she recognizes.

“Men have two emotions: forward and reverse.” Even the reporters laughed. “But they do come in damn handy when fixing things around the house, eh girls?” The women in the audience shouted “Yeah, right, yee hah.”

“If course, in addition to emotional intelligence, there are cognitive intelligence, musical intelligence, kinesthetic intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, linguistic intelligence, introspective intelligence, spiritual intelligence, moral intelligence, and so on. All the different ways that you can be smart about something.

“And these usually develop very unevenly in people, don’t they? We all know somebody who is high in cognitive intelligence but low in moral intelligence. Nazis doctors are an extreme example. Or somebody who is very good at kinesthetics/sports, but not good at music. Or good at emotional intelligence but not at mathematical intelligence, and so on.... Kevin, what? Is there is a hooker line? You mean like a prostitute?... Why would you think that, Kevin?... Because you know this girl who is really good at hooking but can’t spell ‘suck.’ Um, no, Kev, no hooker line. But she’s probably excellent in the kinesthetic line, I’ll bet.

“Well, we can easily graph all this. Some of you have seen this. We call it a *psychograph* or an *integral psychograph*. This is a levels-and-lines graph in the Upper Right; there are similar ones for the other quadrants.

[figure here]

Figure 5. *The Integral Psychograph and The Altitude Rainbow*

“Now most people are like the one whose psychograph we have drawn—namely, they score high in a few lines or intelligences, medium in others, and low in still others. Kevin, yes?... You’re high most of the time? Not the same high, Kev.

“Okay, as I was saying, somebody else will have an entirely different psychograph, high in this, medium in that, low in something else. This the whole notion of ‘levels and lines.’ Thus, *overall development is a wildly individual and idiosyncratic affair, and there is little that is linear in about it.* That’s normal, that’s natural, that’s fine! To be integrally-informed does not mean every line has to be developed to the max, like some sort of Olympian psychic decathlon champion—gold medals in all ten lines!—but simply that you are aware of your strengths and weaknesses across the entire AQAL landscape.

“This unevenness goes for individuals, groups, cultures, epochs. The simple point is that there is not a single, monolithic, universal ladder of development—a single scale or a single developmental line against which all individuals and all cultures can be monologically judged as being ‘higher’ or ‘lower.’ That is exactly the core of *bad* genealogy and involves pretty much everything you want to avoid, whether its Piaget, Spiral Dynamics, Kohlberg. So study those bad approaches that use only one of those, kids—this is what you do *not* want to be when you grow up.”

Looking at Ronnie, I saw another example. Still, he had his moments. And now seemed to be one of them.

“See, your Dudeship, it’s a super Singularity, and holy moly, it’s avalanching this way right now! Ken!, Ken!, Ken!, are you holding out? It sounded like Charles and Mark think a Singularity is coming. Does the Code predict that, your Duderosity? And can Charles really

navigate at that edge? NO WONDER the terrorists are after him! What do you think, your Dude-ness! Doesn't this answer everything?!"

"Okay, my intellectual gods and goddesses, so much for the *all-lines* part. It simply means that human beings have multiple intelligences, so when you are saying that a particular person, or group, or culture, or Sea Captain is at a higher level of development, be sure and say what line you mean! Because there are at least two dozen different developmental lines, and the particular person or group might be high only in a few of them.

"Notice that any time you are talking about *lines* you are talking about *levels*, too. For example, notice that we said that some people are *more developed* in emotional intelligence than others. And what does 'more developed' and 'less developed' mean? That's right, it means up or down—it means levels or stages.

"So any time you are talking about a particular intelligence or line, you are implicitly talking about levels or stages in that line. You can see the 'levels' part in the psychograph—it is simply the vertical dimension of any of the lines or intelligences. It is simply the great *rainbow* or *altitude* of vertical development—the vertical scale of depth, growth, and evolution—which we often just call the Rainbow. This gives you something that mere hermeneutics and pluralism cannot: *a scale of depth*, of vertical depth, of direction, of worth. And this is enough to rescue your entire approach from the self-contradictions of pluralistic relativism.

"*Integral Psychology* contains charts with over 100 developmental scales from premodern, modern, and postmodern sources. We feel that the general similarity in so many of these maps suggests a good-enough universal current of development running throughout humanity—a great River of Life, as it were—and that the various developmental models are each merely rough snapshots of this great River. All of the developmental models are limited because none of them can capture the River in all its rushing, roiling glory. But many of them are useful because they suggest various features of the River that can be universally seen. As long as we

self-consciously criticize these conceptions every time we apply them, then we are justified in moving forward in this genealogical endeavor of altitude, the great River or Rainbow of Life.”

“Ken!, Ken!, Ken! Come on, dude, spill-er-osky. Tell! Tell! Does the Code predict a Singularity? Whatever you know, it’s more than I do! And are you worried about Charles? Oh man, he could be greased!”

“Ronnie, Jesus, okay, look—that’s what this press conference is all about, right? Didn’t Carla say future scenarios? That’s it, dude. They’re going to spill the beans about the Code, and especially about all those future scenarios the supercomputers have been running using the Code. And if the Code also predicts a singularity—or excuse me, a Singularity, cap S—then that would really be something you’d have to take damn serious, because the Code automatically includes all the stuff Kurzweil and Friedman are looking at, but it would also include all the interiors they completely ignore.

“And as for Charles, oh, God, I’m just worried sick about that. Believe me, I’m hallucinating about it.”

“Now, add the concept of *all states*, and your integral approach becomes even fuller. And all you meditators out there, you might want to come out of your deep-delta coma and listen up; this affects you. The most important thing we have learned in the last three decades about states of consciousness, including meditative states, is that you can be at virtually any *stage* of consciousness and experience virtually any *state* of consciousness. In other words, a person at any stage-level of development can have an altered state or peak experience. You can be at red, amber, orange, green, turquoise, etc. and have any number of gross, subtle, causal, and nondual state experiences, including meditative state experiences. But you will interpret your *state* experiences according to the *stage* or level you are at. We call this ‘states and stages,’ which is at the core of the Wilber-Combs Lattice.

“So this allows us to see that somebody at, say, green, can have a profound experience of nonduality and oneness with all things—but they will interpret that oneness in green terms. And if they are at turquoise, they will interpret it in turquoise terms. And if they are at red, then in red terms. And so on. But meditation itself does not show you these vertical stages, such as Gilligan’s. You can sit on your meditation cushion for years, and nothing crosses your mind that says, ‘This is a red thought, this is an amber thought, this is an orange thought, this is a turquoise thought,’ and so on.

“This is why the world’s great wisdom traditions, for all their wisdom, are not integral. They are basically approaches to states in the Upper-Left quadrant. But they don’t see stages, and they don’t see the other quadrants—and that is their downfall, integrally speaking. Of course, an integral approach includes meditative states as part of its overall program, but is not confined to them.

“Alas, if you don’t understand this, you will meditate your life away, thinking that states are all that matters, and not understanding that you have to take vertical stages into account as well—not to mention the other quadrants. Because if you don’t, then 20 years will have gone by, and you still aren’t Enlightened, are you? And you still don’t understand why, do you?”

“Hey!” Kim exclaims. “He has the same last name as you!”

“Weird, isn’t it?”

“Now we will come back to the Wilber-Combs Lattice latter on, for those of you who want to go into it. But just notice that state experiences have been crucial motivators in many great historical events. Whether you see them as ‘mere hallucinations’ or glimpses into ‘higher realms’—or both—you probably cannot understand history very well without them. From Joan of Arc to Rasputin, from Moses to Martin Luther King, Jr., altered states have been primary motivators of humanity.

“Okay, next and super last, we have... Um... Wait, I have a little idea.” Carla looked up. “Kevin?”

“Yes, Dr. Fuentes?”

“Listen, Kev, Howard Gardner’s office is just a few doors down. When class is over, why don’t you poke your head in and ask him about that last question you had.”

“Uh, about the hooker developmental line?”

“Yes, Kevin, that one.”

“Sure he wouldn’t mind?”

“Not at all, Kev. He will love it, I promise.”

“Sure, Dr. Fuentes, will do.”

“Okay then. Lastly, and very quickly, *all types*. Types can refer to almost anything, can’t they? Like types of flowers, types of rivers, types of cars, types of.... Yes, Monica?.... Types of good-for-nothing boyfriends that dump you for Leslie? Um, well, have there been more than one of those? Because, you see, *types* means that that there are *several* and you are *classifying* them into types, so that.... Oh, there have been several, I see. How several?.... *Three* of them left you for Leslie. Well, okay, were there types here?.... There were?... What were the types of boyfriends that left you for Leslie? A dickhead, a total dickhead, and a complete and total dickhead. Well, there you go, that’s a typology, yes. Three different types of boyfriends who dump Monica for Leslie. Very good, Monica.

“Other typologies also exist. Many involve useful classifications of the types of character, gender orientation, style, inclinations, and so on, that are available to men and women. As usual, we really do need to be careful that these aren’t used to pigeonhole people. At the same time, a good typology can be extremely useful in gaining various kinds of self-understanding.

Think of the many good uses that have come from the Myers-Briggs classification, based on Jung's 4 major types (thinking, feeling, sensing, intuition). More recently, many people have found the Enneagram to be a very useful typology.

“Okay, boys and girls, that's the overall picture: a quick summary of an integral model of historiography that is ‘all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, all types.’ You get the general picture, yes? What we find is that this is the most comprehensive map we have for understanding human beings, and therefore for understanding what they did yesterday, and envisioning what they will do tomorrow. As in, future scenarios.

“This Code underlies humans, their knowledge, and the world thus known. It therefore goes all the way up, all the way down. It is the AQAL matrix, within which all things arise, as far as we can tell. It therefore appears to be the structure of the known Kosmos. I've been making some jokes with the students, but this is dead serious.”

She looked out at the audience. “Now, in addition to going over the Code with you, we want to show you what happens when you use the Code in various super-sophisticated agent-modeling systems. In the past, as some of you know, the problem with these programs is that the agent models they use are based on a flatland psychology. They assume the agents are motivated by rational self-interest, or survival, or consumer drives, and so on. But the fact is, there is a huge hierarchy of drives for agents—the entire Rainbow—not to mention the other quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types, all of which must be taken into account for any accurate agent-modeling system.

“So what would happen if you plugged an integral psychology—and the Code itself—into these supercomputer future scenarios? That's the question, isn't it? That's the 64 thousand dollar question.

“Want the answer? Ladies and gentlemen, please look at this handout. It’s called *AQAL Code Computer Scenario CX-555*. We usually just call it the Centrix Report.”

A dozen staff members appeared and began walking down the aisles, handing out the pamphlet, the pamphlet which would finally tell everybody the very face of tomorrow.

The not-so-odd thing is, I knew exactly what it would say.