

Masters Craft 20220806

It's August 6, 2022. It's about 10 minutes before 10 a.m. in the morning. I just want to get down a few quick notes. I'm working on the presentation for the Master's Craft, and in doing so, I reviewed some notes that I had. In this particular, I was looking at notes that were in relation to the sports metaphor of human conflict. One of the sets of notes that I had printed out had to do with Pascal. He said that it's about game theory. He was saying that the first explicitly game theoretical argument ever written began like this, God is or He is not, to which shall we incline? Now, it went on to say that Pascal's intent, his purpose for putting forth this question to draw individuals into this game, his intent was conversion. What kind of game is being played? I'll get to that in a minute, because that's part of the notes that I had added some of my own notes to. In my case, I don't think it's whether, I'm not going to approach it as if God is or He is not. I think the question that I'm approaching is, does existence have a purpose or an intent, or does it not? If we put forth a belief, or as I say, I suspect, that existence does have a purpose, then I think it's worthwhile to focus in on and clarify, be as clear as possible on what that intent is. Now, am I going to make that as my lead-in to what the Master's craft is about? I'm not sure. But, I think that framing of that question, we exist. So, is our existence completely random and without purpose, intent? I guess that's really the question. Is existence without intent? Is there no aim? Is there no end game? Is there no goal? End game, of course, that's leading right back to the game theory. And, if we can put forth what we suspect is the purpose, then I believe that part of what the Master's craft would attempt to accomplish is to define, to fathom what that purpose is, to focus in on it and clarify it in every way possible. I think this is related to the phrase that I had coined at some point about rendering clear the veil of complexity. The notes that I'm drawing from here is written by a gentleman named Jonathan Sheehan, and he entitled this collection of some of his personal notes or thoughts, The Game is the Stake. He went on to say that, more precisely, the nature of the game is the real stake. He talks about the difference between zero-sum and non-zero-sum games. When he came to a summary question, the entire struggle turned on the question, what kind of game are we playing? And, to the right, I made some of my own personal notes in answer to the question, it's a mortal game. And I base this on my concept of it's a conflict of forces between sustainability versus extinction. I'm going to go ahead and further expand on that, because in my notes I say the history of our world is a history of extinction. Once

again, the history of our world is a history of extinction. And so, if, now I haven't mentioned this, and I don't know if I'm going to mention this in the Master's Craft presentation, but if, as I suspect, if the world, if our existence, our presence has a purpose, then to expand on that purpose in the language of metaphysics or ontology, which is the branch of metaphysics that I'm focused in on, the nature and relations of being or existence. So, it's the teleological purpose, and what I suspect is the teleological purpose of existence is materialized creative consciousness. So, in my words, this materialized creative consciousness, let's say consciousness, is of infinite potential and this conscious field is of infinite extension. And so, the reason I name those is because of the concept of infinite potential and what this author Jonathan goes on to say was that the person that he was writing this about, Pascal, or actually I think it's Pascal, Pascal was not trying to persuade anyone of anything specific about God. That was his original question, Pascal's. His was an effort to persuade others to believe in the game in the first place because what he surmised was once they commit to the idea of infinite goods, and so in my case that would be infinite potential or infinite possibilities, once you start playing the game, in Pascal's view, the game is already over. So, in my language, in my terms, what I think he was approaching was if an individual accepts the premise of the suggestion, then they are cast into a role that supports that premise. And so, in that respect, the game is already won. So, again, this comes back to the power of suggestion. The power of suggestion is, to me, the power of source. Let's go back to the original intent, it was conversion. If you change the course of thought, you change the course of events. And so, how do you change the course of thought? Through the power of suggestion. So, that's really what Jonathan is trying to bring into focus about Pascal's position. That if you can frame the question in the minds of others, that I guess it's the premise of infinite goods, or in my case, infinite potential or infinite possibilities. Once that possible gain is suggested, then if they accept that premise, they've been converted. They're playing the game. And if they're playing the game, the game is won. Because Pascal's purpose was to inspire others, or I guess you could say conspire to persuade others to accept the premise of the game. The premise of infinite goods, or in my terms, infinite potential or infinite possibilities. So, Jonathan goes on to speak about zero-sum versus non-zero-sum games, and as a part of that, non-zero-sum relationships. And one of the things that he draws out is even individuals who are at odds with each other over many, many different points of contention. He put forth that there should be some basis of common interest, and I've thought about this many times during my studies, during my contemplation. That of all

the things that we can think of that we don't agree on, if we really drill down and choose not to focus on what we disagree about on the confrontational topics, there's usually some common ground that we can find. And in the case of these notes, I had written down that basic conflict of forces, which is sustainability versus extinction. So, I would think most individuals, perhaps not all, but the great majority, I suspect, the great majority of individuals would agree that we would like to see the human race be sustained into the future and not become extinct. Now, I'm not saying, I'm sure there are maybe a few that would say, hey, let them go extinct, I'm okay, they're a mess anyway, and I kind of can understand where they're coming from. But I think it's about that growth, that evolution of, well, in my terms, the essence of being is becoming. We have the potential to get sorted, to not be such a mess, and with that potential existing as a possibility, I would like the species, our species, human beings, to have the opportunity to see that through and to come out the other side if possible. Now, in my notes, and this is part of what's leading up to these notes about the Master's Craft, it says about the moving in sequence, and you start with a long shot, then you go to a medium shot, and then the close-up. And when I read about the long shot, a long shot, it immediately struck me that it could perhaps be considered a long shot that our species will not go extinct. So, anyway, with that said, you know, in my notes I talk about collaborative competition, competitive collaboration. So it's where, yes, we're in competition, but there's also collaboration for the best possible outcome. And Jordan Peterson refers to this as adversarial conditioning. What we can accomplish in this adversarial collaboration could possibly be much greater than what we could accomplish without that collaboration of competition. I mean, that's a basic tenet of productivity. You know, competition is always good. And so, you know, I have to, I do agree with that, that healthy competition is better for everybody. So stepping, so establishing that foundation of conflict of forces between sustainability versus extinction, the next level that I considered was human conflict. And I think a lot of this is based on what I term the choice of first magnitude, which is our standard of measure. And this is something that each and every individual at some level, with some level of purpose or expertise for their own particular ends, we all engage in. We choose our standard of measure. And a lot of this human conflict is based on these competing ideologies of what we choose as that choice of first magnitude, our standard of measure, how we measure. And so the way I have stated it is, you know, your choice of first magnitude, which is your standard of measure, that is, it's sort of like a recipe, it's a precept, a command, draw a distinction that goes

back to laws of form, choose your treasure. It's what, you know, and that, I guess that sort of relates to the V squared, which is vision and values. Based on your vision, the kind of world that you would like to live in, and the values which guide that vision, you know, what you value, that is part of how we formulate and choose that treasure. So in the end, what we're choosing is we're choosing our treasure of willful intent. It is our aim, that's how Jordan Peterson speaks to it. You know, it's a life adrift if you haven't chosen an aim. And that willful intent, what I thought captured me that what we have the choice to do through that willful intent is we can will guidance, and this is what I call course corrections, or we can choose to will violence. And I think that is one of the fundamental choices that we make. And I don't know if I can attribute this specifically to what I call the two natures, the avatar nature or the troll nature. But, and I think we each embody each of these natures, it's just a matter of which is dominant and which is held in reserve for times of need. Or when we feel like that nature shining through as a beacon will serve us best in those specific circumstances that we find ourselves in to serve our end game, to serve our goal or the outcome, the resultant that we're trying to manifest. All right, so I want to wind this up now with kind of expanding on the common interest. So, I came up with a packet that talks about the sports metaphor of human conflict and how we're, it is as if we're all participants in a turn-based game. And what we reinforce and diminish is the probability amplitude of certain results or resultants. And so I'm thinking about all the different pieces that have come to me that I've documented in my notes. One is, it's metanarratives, it's part of the metanarratives is getting to a better place. You are here, where you want to go, how you're going to get there. Metanarratives can tell us, it's the value and gap analysis. This is where you are, this is the value of where you could get to. Let's just say it's a state of existence, the essence of being is becoming. So, and then, so that's the gap. And this is the value between where you are and where you could be. So, metanarratives is a way that this wisdom is sort of intuitively, it intuitively exists within us and I mean that's my view, I suspect this. And the way I kind of refer to that, now this is stronger in some and weaker in others, but it's resonance. It's when something resonates with you, the ring of truth, you hear it and you know it's true and you know it's a value. So, under the sports metaphor of human conflict, so some of this is about adversarial conditioning. You can, that competition sharpens you and it builds, it's because of the adaptive nature that human beings have. The more we're pressured, stressed, challenged, the more honed our skills become. And so adversarial conditioning and then it sort of all kind of

culminates in the zero-sum versus the non-zero-sum gameplay. So, the issue that we have is that we, and this is to do with perceptions, some have vilified their competition. And the way I look at it, it's kind of like a sports team. If two football teams meet on the field and the ultimate goal is that one team completely destroy the other team, then what are we going to do next Sunday? There's not going to be a game. And so that's why I think the collaborative, the competitive collaboration of honing each other's skills by engaging in these conflicts and these competitions is healthy for all of us. And to me that's really what the whole concept of course corrections and that's kind of what I'm coming around to. And this is really, to me, this is really the culmination of the Master's craft. So what the Master is attempting to do is to formulate an impact, so I can call that impact statements. Impact imparts excitement, so the excitement is someone gets stirred up. And what a Master is attempting to stir them up to is their latent potentialities. Their, well, I refer to them as gifts, their talents and abilities, but it all comes under the heading of divine trust. That's the soulful way of naming what has been entrusted to us, but it's up to us to develop it and that's what the Master attempts to mentor in others. And the Master is appealing to that resonance that resides within them. Some, you know, strongly and some more dimly, but that ember is there within, I believe, within most if not all. Now, I don't know, sometimes when I get exposed to different characters, different individuals, I wonder if there's any light at all in them, any ember burning at all. But, you know, that's sort of a subjective judgment on my part, so that, you know, I guess there's some individual bias that could come into that on my own part. So, in the end, I have a model, I call it in the wheelhouse, where we all play a part in this game, in this turn-based game. And some of us are more active and some of us are more passive, but we all have this input into the system and our inputs are what I call individual actualities, actualities are combined within, are combined by the inherent system to render our collective reality and this is what we all share. I guess in some respects you could call this the entangled conditioning that we all experience while we're in this world with others. So, in the end, and in closing, what the Master's craft is attempting to identify is the initiative that the Master has to attempt to awaken within each and every individual and mentor them and help them develop their gifts to help steer our ship, to help to actively or at least knowingly have input into these course corrections. And so at the very bottom of this is the base, the foundation is kind of two things. One is what I call work play. It's finding something, and it's a gift that everyone I believe at some level can enjoy, can draw joy and fulfillment from, finding something that they enjoy doing and they look

forward to doing every day. And that's very diverse, you know, that's very individual. But then the next level, that's the micro level, the macro level is a playground for the children. And that really comes down to the conflict of forces between sustainability and extinction. The history of our world is a history of extinction. And at some level, maybe not at every level, there may be events that we have no control of, and it makes me think of the asteroid, most likely the asteroid that impacted the earth and took out the dinosaurs. Even that, I don't know if we could divert something like that, but you know, so that was something that's a little bit outside our venue. But so many of the risks that we have that would place our species at the brink of the abyss of extinction, they are within our control. I mean, there's just so many different challenges that we face, you know, disease, famine, climate change, we face these on every level, and it's really up to us. So that's really what the Master's Craft is about. It's trying to find a way to awaken that awareness within others so that they can take their place in the wheelhouse, on the wheel, and have inputs to the course corrections that better the chances of success. Sustainability of the human species. Signing off.