

0:06

This is a deep dive into the promise and the pitfalls of web three, with Jordan Hall. So Jordan is a tech entrepreneur who saw the waves of innovation of web one and web two up close, and is now deeply invested in web three, which he says is one of the only possible solutions to some of the biggest problems we're facing.

0:25

Humanity is currently faced with extremely heavy weight that needs to be lifted and needs to be moved maybe a significant distance. And the my sense of things is twofold. One is that nothing in the current system, and nothing in the current toolkit that we use to build systems can lift that weight. And to, to be perfectly frank, a substantial fraction of that weight actually is the current system. From my point of view, the web three fits in that transitionary space very precisely. And suffice it to say, this is not an easy thing. This is an enormous a daunting task. And in my experience, and I've looked at this for decades, there isn't anything on the horizon, at least in the context of the of the exterior, the context of the interaction with the world that comes vaguely close to having the possibility of achieving that level of strength, and care and precision.

1:24

So web one was the early pioneers, the utopians and garage innovators who created the early internet, web two was when the big giant monopolies moved in and colonize cyberspace. And web three is the name for the new wave of innovation, largely based on inventions like blockchain, and decentralized autonomous organizations, or Dows, that believers say will revolutionize the world. But it's fair to say the space is a mix of utopian claims, massive hype and speculation. And it's also experiencing its own growing pains.

2:00

Who would have thought that the Dallas would have the primary problem that Dallas would have is the problem of decentralization, decentralized coordination, the whole bunch of people pulling in different directions, fighting with each other. And I think he was being somewhat ironic. But the point is, that's where we are right now is we're actually beginning to emerge as a super real thing, and are beginning to discover the limitations of our competence on the interior side, it's almost been a blind spot, right? For the first almost decade of the blockchain thing. There's almost a religious commitment to not giving a fuck about human beings. The whole point was, we're gonna work on instead of landscapes, we're gonna work on technical architectures where Prisoner's Dilemma defection problems are exited out on the basis of a exterior orientation, meaning, we're going to create game theoretic dynamics such that at a purely rational level, I don't care if it's a human being with the human being on the other side is like, I need to worry about it at all, I know is almost like the, the, the spiritual center of the Byzantine general problem is, hey, human beings are difficult to figure out, can't trust, I need to build a system where I can trust the result, even though I don't necessarily trust any of the people. Down space, I think is not going to be able to resolve that I can I can, I can deal with and use the resolutions to the busy team general problem between and among Dallas. But in the inside, I got people, I got real life people. And that I think is the child I don't think that's the challenge is the challenge that that part of the environment is facing right now.

3:41

So given that the whole premise of web three is that it's more decentralized and more democratic, we're going to host a more open conversation next week, Jordan is going to come back to be in dialogue with a few different people. And we'll have the opportunity for questions and interactions. If you'd like to join us, check the show notes below and find out how to register and hope to see you there. Jordan, welcome back.

4:05

Yeah, thank you, David. It's been a while.

4:07

What do you think is the most important place to start for assuming people are coming in fairly new to the concept?

4:16

Well, in my mind, the, I kind of think of it as maybe a three step process. One step would be to frame the the meaningfulness of it in some sense, why what what's what's the, what's the point that makes it something that you might want to consider deeply? Right, not just superficially? Then the second piece that shows up is okay, what is it? What exactly are we even talking about? Can we can we grasp this in a way that contextualize it so we can actually get a sense of something and not just a kind of a bag of stuff that we put a label on? And then the third I think, which is maybe what brought brought us together in this conversation is say, okay, What's like, what's, what's wrong? Or what are the challenges? Maybe it's a better way of putting it, given what it is and why it's meaningful. What are the things that might be the most useful and relevant in terms of orienting those who are are attending to it in a direction that would be sort of most supportive of it realizing its meaningfulness best and and by the way, avoiding maybe some of them are dangerous pitfalls, which there are many.

5:31

Yeah, that feels like a good summary of what we've discussed so far before the conversation. And, yeah, I, I like your, from when I first came across your work, I think it was the situational assessment of 2017, you have this ability to kind of look at the minutiae of kind of what's going on, but also place it in this kind of grand sweep. So I think maybe let's start with the kind of grand sweep of web three, and then maybe go into the minutiae, and maybe some of the kind of moral dilemmas, or ethical issues that the whole scene is kind of wrestling with or coming up, around, it sounds good.

6:13

And maybe what we can do is if it feels like, it makes sense to drill down into lower levels of particulars at any given moment, just

6:23

directly, I can double click if I want.

6:27

Exactly, yeah, it's like a giant. Funny, got virtual HTML. So just to maybe provide a little context and background you mentioned, part of the reason why

6:42

we're having this call is I can't avoid having a conversation about this. I don't particularly like speaking in public. But I have a uniquely significant perspective on this kind of question. In many ways, it's been kind of the through line of my, my life, like, since the late 70s, I was engaged hands on, you know, pulling apart computers dealing with the, the interiors of, you know, flashing bios and stuff like that, and very detailed with what you might call the pre web, the early modem days, and the ISP days and things like that. And then very particularly involved in one, intimately involved in web two and now have chosen over the past decade to be involved all the way at the ground level in all the different emergent properties of web three. And with a particular perspective, that tends to also bring in things like large scale theory, right? So not just at the level of doing it, but also the level of contemplating what's happening, and how does it fit in the larger context. So. So I'm obviously coming from a very particular perspective. And we'll just provide that and then we'll see if hopefully, it's helpful.

7:58

Is it worth double clicking? On why web three? What is web one? What web two? And what is web three?

8:06

I think I think I'll get there in a moment. So just to put it just the first part to kind of put the whole thing in context. And why I think it's meaningful, not just because it's sort of lots of money is flying around and people are talking but as you know, my my my frame, the frame that I'm operating under continuously is the one that was for the moment, say there's a meta crisis, some very big significant thing going on in the world. And the way I would put it, maybe it's make the metaphor very simple. It is like we're faced humanity is currently faced with an extremely heavy weight that needs to be lifted, it needs to be moved, maybe a significant distance. And the my sense of things is twofold. One, is it, nothing in the current system, and nothing in the current toolkit that we use to build systems can lift that weight. And to be perfectly frank, a substantial fraction of that weight actually is the current system. So asking it to live to move itself is a bit of a paradox. So we're faced with the real challenge of how do we not using the current system, generate something that has the capacity to lift this enormous weight. And by the way, just to kind of make the metaphor a little bit tricky. You can imagine it being both heavy, and also very fragile. So we have to lift it, but lift it with enough sort of sensitivity and care, that we don't disrupt the world that that it's holding, and then migrate to a more stable place. I've in the past talked about this is game a game B and the transition between the two. And from my point of view, the web three fits in that transitional space very precisely. And suffice it to say, this is not an easy thing. But there's an enormous a daunting task, and in my experience, and I've looked at this for decades. There isn't anything on the horizon, at least in the context of the of the exterior in the context of the interaction with the world that comes vaguely close to having the possibility of achieving that level of strength, and care and precision. Then web three, right, so to me, this feels like this is the thing, and this is the thing we have to work with to solve the problem in front of us. Okay, so now, how do we help it become the thing that it could be? Yeah. So that's how I've positioned the notion of the meaningfulness. What are we talking about in terms of why? So now let's talk about in terms of what, what is it? What are what are we actually talking about? And I think that the name web three is particularly nice, because it's situated in an arc. And it's not just blockchain? Certainly not just cryptocurrency. We have this other term floating about metaverse. And it's not just that, or perhaps maybe it is just that, but that requires that question to be investigated thoroughly. So we have this notion of web one, web two, web three. And we're talking about a long arc, what I would say is that the right the proper way of understanding it is Andreessen coined the term Software is eating the world. And I'd say that's a nice vernacular way of talking about the relationship between this particular very foundational novel technology digital, in relationship with the human built world, and therefore also the natural world and the way that humans interface with the natural world. And on a theoretical level, these kinds of interfaces tend to operate from the outside in, you can sort of imagine it as like almost like to two suns, beginning to come into each other's orbit. And obviously, the outer portion of one sun is what's going to interface with the gravitational field of the other sun as they start coming into orbit. Practically speaking in the context of software eating the world, the more peripheral things, the more superficial things like flea markets and Yellow Pages, were the first things to be impacted by and metabolized, eaten by software, earlier things to like word processors remember that day when typewriters became word processes, and then they became computers. That's the that's the thing. And it's actually more complex than such a simple metaphor. The kind of a rhizomatic, or root structure is the right visual metaphor, because certain kinds of things have particular affordances, which causes them to become more early and fully and easily embraced by or metabolized by digital. But other things which may actually be operating at the same level, are more resistant. So for example, in my personal life experience,

12:55

music, which became meaningfully touched by the digital in the late 90s, in the context of the mp3 revolution is what we call it. at a physical level, the digitization of music was extremely important, like it was quite easy by the time we got to the late 90s, to take advantage of the ability of taking a song which already been rendered into digital by means of the transition from analog tape to CD and converted into a more portable, purely digital form in the form of an mp3 liberated from the physical substrate of the disk. And also the development of the bandwidth and the connectivity of dial up modems at 56k, which was present at that time. And the number and kind of humans who are interacting with each other by means of that earliest, earliest version of the internet began to pull music rapidly, right. And if you recall those moments of time, like the movement from the introduction of mp3, to the introduction of Napster, and the enormity of the consciousness of that, like a hit culture to the point where it actually burst all the way through to moms and dads were were finding themselves interacting with mp3 as it was on the on the news. So from that direction, it was quite quite affordance to the attractive pull of digital. But it was also very tightly bound to the legal and political infrastructure of of the world, which was at that time quite resistant to the pole of the digital rights, he actually had these two forces. And precisely as music began, the process of being completely evaporated into the digital, roughly 1999 The legal and political piece grabbed hold and pulled back quite hard actually. And so that's the notion of kind of moving from the exterior into the periphery and in the in the core of a socio technical system. At the core of the, of the kind of stuff that humans produce, to manage themselves in the world. Are things like or particularly in our current one are things like money, finance, law, govern It's those kinds of institutional framework science, ie how do we collaboratively discover what is true about the world? The point of web three is to say, Okay, now the sort of the event horizon of that digital of software eating the world has now crossed that threshold. Web three has already entered into and in many ways is already metabolized things like money and finance, and defy stands quite poised toe to toe with Trad phi, at least in terms of complexity of offering, and certainly vastly more so in terms of rate of innovation. And we can speak about that, like, the dynamics of how these things interrelate, and how what are the variables that matter. And then it's now beginning to explore earnestly, right, not just in terms of seeing it on the horizon, but actually practically having to deal with the problematics of things like law and governance, and frankly, also religion, which I've talked about NF T's as being really about that. Which is a whole rabbit hole. Well, that's the core of the core, there's not a whole lot if you like, Oh, yeah. And that said, of that set of things is the center, or there's there's not really much left. At the sociological level, right? We're not talking about the fundamentally deep actually human indigenous stuff like family. So so here we are, right, we're at the point where the the story of the emergence of the digital, and the transition of the old world into the new world is now reaching its pivot point, man. And over the next few years, as web three solves or addresses these core problems of things like governance and religion, and law, it will begin in just exactly the same way as digital has, in fact, disrupted all the other things before it in due time in the time that it took to do so at these core levels. And then the energy that has been bound the human attention, the the aspects of the world, the ways that we cybernetically go about managing nature, physicality, will shift into this new environment. So that's what I'd say as we went through is it is the simultaneously the most contemporary, the current manifestation of the long arc of the digital, but also happens to be at the moment where the pivot point between the old and the new will almost certainly occur.

17:35

I think it might be good to just double click on what is the nature of web three versus the nature of web two? Because I think that's a good kind of comparison, people talk about web three as being essentially decentralized, whereas web two was enabling these vast kind of monopolies in these different areas. Is web three, by its nature, a more democratic, more decentralized model? Or could it also be co opted in the same way?

18:09

Alright, so to, to address this question actually requires a pretty high level of abstraction, to be honest, like if we if we settle on artifacts, then we might feel like we've resolved the question because it has a feeling of rightness and simplicity, but it's not actually going to get us very far. To say, we'll discover that we were wrong. It's something like this web two was operating in the frame of the political economy of the legacy world. That's, that's the most important piece about web web two. Meaning that web two perceived itself as a function of capitalism, and it was a it was a thing that was being done at the level of the economy. And in the in the middle you have offering goods and services in the marketplace. And this creates all kinds of interesting consequences. Like, think about the nature of how Facebook shows up in the world. You know, Twitter, hey, just we're just, we're just a company, just offering a product and a service into the marketplace like, geez, you know, we didn't know that we were going to be disrupting the entire political system and causing human brains to reboot like, wow, and by the way, not our problem like that's not how you deal with that sort of thing. Government take care of that problem. Yeah. With three is not web three, may not yet have fully realized the degree to which it's actually operating in a peerage with those those frames at that level. It's actually operating fundamentally at the level of governance fundamentally operating at the level of law and at the level of religion which is profound by enormous Lee. Okay, so that's, that's obviously that's the actual fundamental difference and we're What I mean by that is, you know, I was I was there in web two, I was actually physically working on things like digital currencies and stuff like that. And the awareness of the possibility space of where digital could go and how we might go about designing. It's not like we weren't thinking about decentralization back in the late 90s. And early 2000s. We had stuff like, like BitTorrent, which was profoundly decentralized, and very effectively, so. And other like structures that are even more decentralized, like, Nutella, I believe, is what it's called. The conceptions are, they're open source software, it was there, like all the all the basic frameworks, but the ability to manifest them in reality in the context of what was available in terms of our capacity to do in relationship with the operating environment that we were in, but also the ability to actually think them clearly, given the state of where our mindset was, wasn't available. Right. So it was sort of a manifestation of a particular potentiality in an event and environment that showed up in a particular way. Yeah. And this is like, it's hard to really, I think, grasp this unless you've just been doing it. But it's, um, you come with a deep aspiration and vision, you have a sense of what's possible, but then you have to manifest it. And so the manifestation of it has to explore the actual physical reality that you're dealing with. So you could imagine somebody like, you know, oh, let's go with basis basis is a really nice example. Right? It's entirely possible that where Amazon is now like, Amazon Web Services, and the whole universe of Amazon was completely present, in his most subtle vision, way back when he was just a fucking bookseller. Yeah. But to make it legible, and to make it practical, it had to enter into the world as just a fucking bookseller, right? So from basis, his perspective, he's like, What are you talking about? Amazon has always been precisely what it is now and what it shall become yet we haven't seen it yet. But if we look at it, sort of in the linear arc of it, of its manifestation, in reality, in our physical environment, there's a path it takes. So my sense is, is actually more like that.

22:14

Now, what does that mean, practically? So practically, if we're thinking about like scaling a mountain, the the location of blockchain meaning both the strength of the innovation, like the profundity of the innovation, the amount of power that it actually represents, and what it can do, and its position precisely in the heart of money and finance, which is, like it or not the absolute most vital organ of the of the old environment that we've been operating in, establishes the movement across the threshold. So what could be in the context of web to once once Bitcoin, right, once Bitcoin emerged in the past a certain threshold of realization, it enabled the entire universe to shift into this strata, which then of course means at a technical level, you're going to be operating on top of that platform, Mike, in much the same way that say web one was sitting on top of TCP IP, HTML, and the possibility space that was secured by that. Also, by the way, Ethernet. Web three has as its sort of foundational basis, the underlying

implications of what blockchain enables as a location. And we can, by the way, talk about that a lot, too, because certainly engineers continue to scratch their head as to why the fuck are we using this weird way of solving basic database problems as a substrate for building, which is a hole? That's a very deep and quite useful rabbit hole? But that's what I would say is that, at a mindset level, or at the level of like, what's the cultural basis, right, because the thing becomes with the people who are building it believe is appropriate in real, and what's available in the environment that is operating. So both the interior and the exterior matter. At that level, the mindset of web three is profoundly decentralized. It was weaned on the underlying cultural perspective of blockchain initially. And as it brought more and more people in from different environments. One of the, the cultural biases, like almost like, You got to swear by these five things. If you want to play this game, you you wouldn't even it would make sense to you wouldn't participate. And your considerations would be rejected by the people who are already here would be an orientation towards decentralization, which by the way, has constantly gone through a process of struggle, the question of decentralization of religious faith, the notion of decentralization as a design bias, the question of decentralization in the context of centralization and decentralization as design characteristics appropriate to different kinds of you know, problem spaces. You know, that's that all that is still happening constantly. I mean, see, oh, here's another one. Really important, actually, it's not Silicon Valley. So web two was Silicon Valley, like even to the point where things like Facebook got acquired and move physically to Silicon Valley. And that implies a lot, right? It implies the humans who happen to dominate that particular environment implies the aesthetics, like the the kinds of sweater vests that you wear, and the kind of the little checkered shirt that the Silicon Valley types were around the haircuts, the facial expressions, the tones, the the Overton windows of what it was available discourse and the bias towards venture capital values pilloried in was that movie, I think the show was called Silicon Valley. Never watched it, but I get the sense of it, which was not what there is not Silicon Valley, Silicon Valley, of course, is a different sink. It's kind of claws into it, it makes succeed to some extent. But because web three actually included a way of bootstrapping its own finance by means of its magic internet money. And because it was super not obviously, part of the stuff that were the Silicon Valley was investing in at in sort of 2010 to 2017 timeframe. And what I mean by that is even to have proposed participating in blockchain and cryptocurrency, which, in fact I was doing back in that timeframe, was perceived as a kind of unclean and uncouth by your Silicon Valley, luminaires, he really wanted to invest in Snapchat. It built its own approach, and its intrinsically global web through his Indian and his African, and his Asian, as, as it is. West Coast, maybe even more. So. Places like Israel, and Switzerland played a profound role in its early stages.

26:58

It's intrinsically already sitting on top of the internet, right to collaborate in web three is, in fact, to collaborate by means of something like discord or Twitter, not by means of an office, he went about remote work, it's always been, there are some of course, things that are part of the web three ecosystem that are in fact, traditional corporations that sit in places, and there's plenty, but not the essence, not the centerpiece. And that's actually quite important.

27:23

Although, or any. I mean, people are very familiar with web two. So you can name Facebook, you can name Google, you can name all of these Twitter or these projects. Are there web three, to make it real for people? Are there web three products that people are familiar with? Or projects that people are familiar with? Or is it all still nascent? I mean, Bitcoin is an example of one that people will have heard of, I guess.

27:48

I don't know what people have heard of them. Afraid I don't. I'm definitely not people. Ethereum is a really nice example of something that is quite web three. Bitcoin is profoundly web three in particular ways. But it also includes a lot of stuff that was kind of in the childhood

stage. So if you sort of map bitcoin is pure web three. That's a little bit like mapping the Bay Area Computer Club as the essence of personal computers, which, you know, yeah, a little bit and also a whole lot now. Let's see what were what are other things that have been nice? Well, I don't know if people are aware of things like say crypto punks, and, and the board apes Yacht Club. But that's super web three. Or another one, something like say HESCO with pancake swap, or any of the sort of the big defi platforms, also very web through like much more to the center of it than the earlier ones. But the simple nature of happening, haven't gone through a couple of generations to be less bound to older inertia. And by the way, here's the fun part. If you're not at all familiar with that, I would recommend that you become familiar.

29:07

And so I spoke to my friend and former rebel wisdom guest rich Bartlett about it. He put out this amazing newsletter that I'll put a link down in the in the show notes. And he is one of the one of the paragraphs from his piece was, according to its proponents, web three is going to save us from the evils of web to mass surveillance, extractive economics, propaganda and misinformation etc. to its detractors, it's the greatest speculative bubble in history and an obscene waste of energy. I think it could be both. What I found is a lot of uncorroborated hype get rich quick mythology and Nivea naive utopianism. And I've also found some of the boldest innovations in cooperative ownership and governance that I've ever seen. Would you agree with that? Because at the moment like there's a lot of there's a lot of excitement, there's a lot of utopian thinking, but there's also like whenever I hear that I also get a sort of skeptical response kick in almost immediately as well.

30:07

That was quite complex. So Ben, wonder what the skeptical response would be orienting towards?

30:13

Well, my let's say, my guess is is, it seems too good to be true, therefore, it probably is.

30:21

Right? Well, if you take the the negative part and what he described, which was sort of at least half, that would also be maybe too bad to be true. So there we go. So let me kind of, first of all, make something quite simple. You heard my life arc, my background. And I am extremely staked in web three. So according to the pattern recognition that I have, having watched, many times, like 10, or 12 times different things emerge into the world, always having the same sensibility of what the fuck is that it's probably stupid or bad, maybe even a little bit unclean. Probably fake in some particular way, or holy shit, it's gonna save the world. My God, it's the best thing ever. I mean, I was aware of this. We had the same conversations back in the early web one days, for sure. I'm sure the guys in our early Apple felt felt very evangelical about what they were doing that as well. And, you know, my personal sort of both attention and resources are highly staked in web three. Right? So I'm not all in but pretty close. All right. So that's a very good call. It was the right that the caveat, I am in fact, an investor. So let's see, there's so much that has to be actually teased apart to speak, clearly. Let's take just like the term speculation. Right? By the way, just at a meta level, we really need to learn how to speak clearly as a species. Like the degree to which we engage in ordinary hominids, social grooming, which is really all we're almost always doing when we speak. We're really we're using words, we're strong words around, but all we're really doing is saying, Hey, are we kind of like friendly with each other? Can we maybe like, take bugs off of each other and not kill each other? As opposed to communicating and finding ways to collectively perceive reality? Is, is a challenge, right? So let's take the word or the notion speculation. Because like many things, it actually has two distinct valence. One valence has to do with the, the gap between possibility and actuality. You know, let's say I've got a I've met a girl for the very first time. And it seems like there's something that could happen here. And I choose to invest my precious life,

time energy in building that relationship, on the basis of the sense of possibility. That's speculation. I sense a possibility. And I invest my precious lifetime energy and attention in seeing whether or not and by the way, building the directionality of that, towards the felt sense of possibility. And oftentimes, the possibility is not actualized at the level that was perhaps initially sensed, okay, that happens in speculation. Almost nothing meaningful has ever occurred, that was not first and foremost, the subject of profound speculation, do anything that matters at all. And that's what you're doing. Right? You write a book, you create a song, you feel it first in this vague, profound, powerful possibility. And then if it motivates you and moves you to do so you invest your skillfulness, and perhaps the energy of the people around you in trying to manifest what it is you perceive as possible into reality. And oftentimes, you fail. Okay, that's one side of it. It's crucial. There's another side of it. The other side is, it's very easy to trade on that. It's very easy to parasitize the gap between the actual and the possible. simulation works very well in that space. And the the felt sense of what are the signals mean? How do I know whether or not this thing as possible, how do I know whether or not it's proceeding towards the possibility that it could be? Well, there's a whole category of people who do a very good job of thriving and precisely that are called Confidence men, right? Confidence is not intrinsically a negative thing. But preying on the fundamental human necessity of confidence is and when anything new emerges, particularly when the potency is very large. It intrinsically attracts a very large amount of people. Some small fraction you might think of as being the artists of the scene. I'm going to shift into seniors language by the way.

34:57

The artists of the scene are well well positioned to hear the call, they can kind of perceive the subtlety of the possibility with some unique level of kind of clarity and precision, and happen to have a unique competence and capacity to actualize it into reality, with fidelity to what the scene is about the artists of the scene. It also attracts a whole lot of people who can feel it but can't quite really enact interact with it. So they sort of they maybe mill about going what's going on here. It's interesting, I don't know why it's a little bit like a, if you walk through a city like London, like I remember walking through New York one time, and I saw a very long line, my attention was big line must be important. And people were gathering in the line having no idea was on the other side of it, right? Where, where people gather other people got it, which means there's a lot of energy. And where there's a lot of energy that doesn't know what's going on, there's a really good resource to be exploited, so that it also gathers the vampires and parasites. And that's kind of unavoidable, right, there's just very little capacity that we've been able to prove so far as humans to avoid the those three kind of dynamics showing up in anything. And the more potent it is, the more that's going to happen. Now, unfortunately. And this, by the way, there's a whole really nice blog post, I think it may be slate star Codex, or somebody proximately that because really nice words about like mops and sociopaths and shit like that. This speaks to this sort of a more simplified in vernacular way. But unfortunately, the parasites know what they're about, which is that they are trading on the lack of clarity and produce in a legible simulacra of the thing. Right, and so the, the mass in the middle, who can't perceive it as clearly as the artists aren't able to distinguish the real from the simulation. Therefore, they cannot effectively consistently choose to orient their energy and attention towards the thing that's being produced by the artists, and are therefore relatively reasonably hoodwinked by the parasites. And the artists are artists, right? They're not warriors. Their intrinsic orientation is towards doing everything they can to focus on this crazy thing and trying to bring it forth into the world with fidelity and clarity. Oh, shit, there's a parasite shooting in my head right now? Well, you know, that's just what's gonna happen. That's not their gig. And for whatever reason, we don't seem to have done a very good job of really thinking about how do you actually always bring warriors, like, with the with the artists, right? If you did that we could do this job better. So here we are, right? If my proposition is correct, which is that we're talking about something which in potential has an order of magnitude of capacity, which is maybe equal to the, to this heaviness of what we actually need to do, then it's not at all surprising that it is also showing up as quite a shit show. Alright, so be it. You know, once you're not surprised



by the natural development of these kinds of things, and you know, pick your poison. Look at the punk scene or the New Wave scene in the club scene, you may be familiar with the Madchester scene, I mean, pick any scene anytime particular if you really cared about it, and you watched it, kind of get jacked, and corroded and, and hijack, and also producing a tremendous things of beauty.

38:25

I would say, however, this kind of bridges is to the point of what needs to happen. But we can get there in we want to in the time happens.

38:34

The Yeah, what do you what do you mean, that needs to happen?

38:39

Well, web three, as it currently sits, is how would I say, on the edge of a blade? It could fall towards the good. Might not, in fact, you could fall to the very bad, like super bad, actually worse, much worse, tremendously worse, like can comprehensibly worse. And so the walking that narrow path, and trying to find out how do we nudge it? And we know I don't mean like you and me, I mean we towards the good. We say how I sort of the the appropriate thing. Yeah, let me let me bring something in right now that hasn't actually been part of this part of the conversation, but I think is quite important. I mentioned Metaverse, and let me also then mention AI. If I were to sort of sit in front of a panel of people who've thought deeply about the problem space, and said, Look, guys, we're we're kind of heading towards a cliff. The meta crisis is big and getting bigger. And obviously, the folks who have been entrusted with stewarding and steering humanity are some terrible combination of incompetent and corrupt, so we can't rely on them to do shit. And they couldn't anyway driving a 1957 Chevy and we're trying to go to the moon. Alright, what could I One of the hands that would come from be AI. And AI, in principle also has the strength to do this thing, right to lift that heavy weight. Let me see. But it's also got all kinds of trouble. AI is something that is kind of like CRISPR genetic engineering. Don't fiddle with that. I don't know. That's a. That's a Hail Mary. And we don't want to get in that context. Right? So what I would say is something like, part of the event horizon is of web three, is it building the capacity to steward things like the metaverse and AI, so that those don't destroy us all? Which they have the potency and power and frankly, proclivity to do so, as currently operated?

40:50

I'm guessing I mean, you talked about walking the blade. And when you're referring to AI, I mean, the the kind of visceral sense I get with it is that you're talking about AI being effectively kind of ethics free. It's an amazing tool, but there's no, there's no intrinsic ethic to it whatsoever. In fact, it's kind of, by definition, it has no moral sense. And I know that we've had this conversation, and I've had this conversation with quite a few people around Dows and web three, and this sense that, because it's been a gold rush so far, a lot of people, there's a sense that the the expectation and the kind of sense of reward, and maybe the gold rush in the sense of greed has massively outstripped its ethical sense. And the sense of, there needs to be some equivalent wisdom process. That is a quick equivalent to the capacity of web three. Are those things linked, I just linked quite a few things together there that maybe you might want to pull apart. Well,

42:00

in maybe the goddess of showing the slow down and take the time. ethical sense. So I would say something like an embodied ethics. Which of course, then means both a thing with an awareness of the fact that choices are meaningful. And the commitment to take a level of responsibility commensurate with the magnitude of the choices that you're making. And then a capacity and practice that has embodied your ability to actually take that responsibility, not just

theoretically, but for real. That's what I would say. And in that case, they would say for sure, this is lacking. For the most part, and by this, I mean, almost completely. Our technological horizon in general, is dominated, but I would call unconscious process. Moloch is a name that has been used in design in the space and represents nicely aesthetically unconscious process. Things like the way the prisoner's dilemma operates is of that sort. And arms races happen in those kinds of environments. The notion of, well, if I don't build a hyper strategic, bootstrapping AI, then my competitor will, so I must, Oh, but wait, if we go in that direction, then we're going to create something enormously hazardous and almost certainly going to create bad results. True, but if I don't do it, he will. That's even worse, they get trapped. So there's the both what I'm saying is simultaneously, the if you aren't using conscious process, then you're using unconscious process. You're using process to search the possibilities. But if you're not using conscious process using unconscious processes, the the lack of conscious process at the level of awareness, and then also the level of capacity. I would say that's characteristic of our technical innovation field in general. And particularly problematic in the context of things of magnitude like al CRISPR. And then Metaverse, and then web three. Yeah. And this is why with three so interesting, because while it is dangerous, it is less dangerous than these other ones. But it could produce the kind of control structure and could embody the kind of ethical capacity to properly govern the others. So this is something that you didn't mention the beginning, it kind of, you know, are heading to the to the cliff is no longer a merely a sort of a one dimensional vector, it actually has to do with the fact the road gets narrower and narrower. And on the left side is the existential risk of the tools that we are using to save ourselves are the ones that kill us. And on the right side is what I've called the catastrophic risk of our destabilization of the environment that we live in all the different elements, the human environment, the natural environment, etc. And so what happens is that every step we take forward, we we sort of up the ante in terms of the power of the technical tools that we're using to manage our life on Earth. But this actually increases the risk of the technical tools that we're using. And by the way, tends to kick the can down the road in terms of the risk of our relationship with the natural environment, because we're not wise enough to not do that. So every sort of step that you take for the road gets narrower and narrower, and the kind of the cliffs gets steeper and steeper. So that's why I said like, we're driving 57 Chevy, what we need is a an aeroplane or rocket, you have to actually go vertical, because staying on horizontal plane is not going to work. So this is the again, pointing towards the possibility that it is my estimation, that web three represents a possibility of a human based collective intelligence that has the capacity, the amount of strength available to lift this heavyweight off the ground and begin to fly.

46:37

One of the things I was thinking about in terms of the ethical framework is something that rich put into his essay about potentially web three, solving some of the coordination and alignment problems that we have with the current system. And I'll read something here. Perhaps this new technology can help us solve some of the coordination failures that have US racing towards a grim future to invent a class of virtual Institute's, so I guess he's saying that it could help deal with the prisoner's dilemma and the sort of the multipolar trap of creating feedback mechanisms, creating enforcement mechanisms that are decentralized, that might solve some of the coordination problems that we currently have.

47:25

Yeah, so let me let me just quickly, almost do a, if I can't hold it in a sort of an encyclopedic move on this, the coordination problems, I may dispense with most of them, then just focus on that one. But it's nice to have them in in context. One of the coordination problems that we have, has to do with the way that hierarchical systems have limitations. And so we have one solution coordination, which is the notion of a hierarchical system and bureaucracy and institutional Corporation, things like that. And there are very specific limitations on how much capacity in terms of perception sense making an agency that can actually produce nine. So

there's like, they're really good for certain kinds of things, but really shitty for other kinds of things. In particular, as we've seen in the context of COVID. They're extraordinarily incapacitated, in relating with complexity. It's not that's not their native meal, you, wouldn't they, they must carve out a portion of reality into the complicated domain and operate in that complicated domain, which means they participate in the whole ball of problems that have to do with the complicated domains. Right. So that's one. So it's a whole coordination thing. And there's a bunch of stuff. They're like, Okay, how do we all get on the same page? And how do we, you know, how do we share insight all that? Well, it's a coordination problem. And that's one solution. On the other side, we have markets, for example, and markets have a whole nother set of problems, not the least of which is this bias towards unconscious process. Right. So things like Mulan, and okay. There seems to be a third, this is one of the things I wrote about many years ago, is that the solution to the Byzantine generals problem, this notion of being able to produce a kind of consensus of state a consensus of what is outside of either the unconscious process of markets, or the bureaucratic process, the institutional hierarchical process, it perished, in fact, to actually just be novel. That's interesting. But interesting, it's profound. Now what do I mean by that? One thing, I mean, is decentralized organizations, in principle, have the capacity to produce a level of collective intelligence that isn't limited in the way that hierarchical bureaucratic organizations are. You can include more people more fully and more in a more integrated way, both in terms of their perception i What do they perceive as being Real invaluable. And in terms of their agency, how do they how do they deploy their skillfulness and capacity in relationship to right? So that's at the level of like, actuality, the capacity to do so. Yes, that is the case. So when I said earlier, like all the way back in the very beginning, it has the potential capacity to lift this heavyweight at the cybernetic level, the amount of complexity, the amount of richness of experience in life and challenge that, in principle could be perceived, processed and acted with the level of like subtlety and nuance and detail, to actually respond well to reality is available within the topology of these kinds of decentralized organizations. And the technologies of things like blockchain, enable these decentralized organizations to mesh and to coordinate between and among each other, in very fine grained levels that can be small, they can be fast, they can be fluid, and think about this notion of how a doubt works. The Dow is a and interiority, but the people are participating in the Dow don't live in that interiority, right? There's this really interesting new network graph, where you live as a whole human in the world. But your energy manifests into very particular projects and activities in a well coordinated fashion. That's very different than in the disciplinary environment of the late 20th century, in a corporation where you sort of teleport between environments, you teleport from being at home, then you migrate through a commute into your corporation, where you're now in the container. And all of you have to be right, don't make any personal phone calls on company time and that kind of crap. Okay, but then you have the other side of the problem, right? The Milan problem. And it's funny, this is perfect time to sort of wrap up, I mentioned that right before we got on this call, I chose to kind of run a

51:56

you say synchronistic experiment, pulled up Twitter, spun the wheel. And I looked at what the first tweet was. And it was a person individually commenting on that the who would have thought I'm paraphrasing, but as best I can, who would have thought that the Dallas would have the primary problem that Dallas would have is the problem of decentralization, decentralized coordination, a whole bunch of people pulling in different directions, fighting with each other. And I think he has been somewhat ironic. But the point is, that's where we are right Dows are actually beginning to emerge as a super real thing, and are beginning to discover the limitations of our competence on the interior side. And so at the level of the underlying technology of how do you actually create the kind of contracts and contracts out here mean smart contracts, technical software coordination? What are the entities look like? What are some of the notions like how did it how did the entities actually govern choices at the at the kind of the X here the mechanical level? Like, what does this look like? Still lots of work being done, but it's moving forward, right in the beginning to be effective. Like there's almost it's

almost an engineering problem. But in terms of the interior, how do human beings actually take care of the human part? It's almost like been a blind spot, right? For the first almost decade of the blockchain thing. There's almost a religious commitment to not giving a fuck about human beings. The whole point was, we're gonna work on instead of landscapes. We're gonna work on technical architectures where Prisoner's Dilemma defection problems are exited out on the basis of a exterior orientation, meaning, we're going to create game theoretic dynamics such that at a purely rational level, I don't care if it's a human being with the human being on the other side is like, I don't need to worry about it at all right? That was almost like the, the, the spiritual center of the Byzantine general problem is, hey, human beings are difficult to figure out, I can't trust them. I need to build a system where I can trust the result even though I don't necessarily trust any of the people. Down space, I think is not going to be able to resolve that I can I can, I can deal with and use the resolutions to the Byzantine general problem between and among Dallas. But in the inside, I got people I got real life people. And that I think is the child I don't think that's the challenge. That's the challenge that that part of the environment is facing right now. So now let me let me double click on that. Because as always has at least he has a number of different aspects. One aspect is the level of skill and practice. And the metaphor I used in that tweet, I responded and I'll use here to see if it works. In the in the run up to World War Two, a bunch of new technologies had entered the middle you have war, perhaps most notably which was radio because radio afforded a level of quality or capacity for coordination, which, of course, was quite distinct than what we saw in the pre radio period. Just think about that, like, when you were using things like telegraph, and pigeons, and couriers to communicate, which is what it was like in World War One and previous, there are a whole bunch of things that you couldn't do when you could actually communicate in real time over distance, electromagnetically using radio. When people didn't know how to use it, or the doctrine, the habits, the ways to go about using radio to coordinate people to effectively wage war took time. So that's one problem. But there's the problem of just kind of like practicing in the middle you as we begin to build new concepts. Find out what works almost like the evolutionary process of the interior socio technology of team? Yeah, that's for sure part of it. The other part that I would propose, and always seems to be the case, is that the individual capacity, right, there's, there's actually going to be a need for receptor sites and competencies in the interior of the individual, which allow the individual to participate in and perhaps produce and receive the signals and make sense of them coherently, quickly and appropriately, that are actually being produced in their environment. And here, I'd actually point someone humorously to the notion of vibes, if familiar with that term and the meaning of it. Yeah, it actually seems to be very Gen Z in general, like, it's not a web three thing. Gen Z is vibing vibes all the time. But I'd like to valorize that term, I'd actually like to say, put it put it into the foreground. In fact, I like to valorize the entire context and concept of the aesthetic.

56:49

Even more, so maybe crown crown, the aesthetic conscious valorize that, remember, we talked about art and the artist. And what I'd say is that the proper way of being in relationship to what's happening in this value into the domain or the scene, web three, is the necessity of becoming artists on the part of effectively everyone. One must actually learn how to build an attune their aesthetic sense, which is to say, to tune their capacity to perceive quality, to feel richly, and with clarity, and subtlety, and then behave accordingly. Right, and this is, I think, I've spoken about this in other contexts. You How does a musician who is playing not on sheet music, but playing in flow, know what the next note ought to be? Now, it's interesting, isn't it? It's a knowing it's annoying, that has lots of moment to it. Because if you play the wrong note, it's bad, in many ways, profane. And yet it's possible it's possible land, just the right, just the right note, that holds the whole song in continuity and brings with pride manifests itself into the world cleanly. Kind of a weird way to manage an organization, right? That's what I'm saying. That's actually what has to happen. Like I'm telling you, right, now we have three, you're going to have to become artists, all of you, in a deep sense. And as it turns out, the competence and capacity to navigate through the process of becoming injured, moving from being engineers, to

being artists, turns out to also invoke the capacity to then be stewards, right underneath, or as a result of the capacity to become an artist, you then also develop the capacity to become steward and that the choice making that begins to emerge at the individual and the group and the collective level will intrinsically begin to migrate towards the what we would say the ethical or that form of choice making, which is properly sovereign. So you know, way of saying it is that web three must become truly sovereign capital T capital S in the way that we've spoken about it ourselves.

58:59

And have you come across the argument that blockchain and web three is currently just I mean, there's an interesting graph here saying innovators, early adopters, and that, that it hasn't yet crossed the chasm of early adopters. There's an interesting article where a guy was basically trying to put together a crypto wallet and buy an NF T and found so many blocks to to to the transition to the early adopters and the early majority have, do you get that argument that it's not yet at the ready for primetime?

59:36

It's funny. So once again, it the problem with it is that it's simplistic. The problem with that is that assume that there's just one curve, but there's not. There's there's a very large number of curves that are superimposed on each other. So for example, for me as an individual, there's a curve and there are some things to which I'm that are my chasm. No as I cross the chasm that isn't necessarily for you, you cross the chasm. So we can step back and say, Yeah, of course simplistic, I can kind of integrate accounts to sort of the whole of humanity. And think of it as being a single dimensional problem of have clinical enough arbitrary abstract people cross the chasm. Yeah, am I kind of there and kind of the bell curve of Homo sapiens. But this sort of more nuanced fractal level is important, because it's, it's kind of like the way that a being grows, are talking more about like an organic development, then we're talking about a, an abstract process. So a lot of people, millions and hundreds of millions of people have crossed many chasms on this particular arc. And the question that's really meaningful is where are we on the developmental arc? So let me let me sort of expand on our toolkit. On the one hand, we have a notion of, of where we are on this story of Crossing the Chasm. Right? And what I've just said, as a high dimensional, let's take a look at it. But yeah, we're definitely not for like, an abstract notion of Homosapiens across the entire human population, across the chasm in that simple sense. But then we have something like, what's the area under the curve of the potential? How much has already been included in this? And now I can sort of think about everybody where they are everybody. Some people are way deep into web three. Some people are only vaguely vaguely aware of it, and some people don't, or whatever. They're all right, of course. So integrate that integrate that whole totality. And what's the capacity? And how rapidly is that capacity upgrading its own capacity? And how does that relate to the shape of the hill that is trying to climb? That's the question, right? My proposition is, we're over the hump. My proposition is that the, the rate of innovation on the inside of what's happening in web three is on the one hand, comprehensible. I remember, I've done this many times, like I participated in many, many, many communities, the amount of innovation that's happening web three, the rate and the magnitude is off the charts. It's mind boggling. Like literally, I've been boggled. I've gotten deep and down rabbit holes and actually physically found myself like, some time later going, what just happened, like I just literally became lost. So much faster than went one. Way faster. Number one. Okay, now, you think it's almost like, you think about these characters that we see in story like Sherlock Holmes in the in the BBC show. sort of slightly distracted hyper geniuses. And you imagine that there's like somebody who's, like, puzzling with a Rubik's Cube. Not a weird story, but let's just say there's like some reason why Person A can't get off the couch and go do the thing, until they've solved the Rubik's cube. And then, you know, Sherlock Holmes really needs like, hey, we need to go investigate this thing. And they look back and they say what's troubling you like? Why aren't you following me out the door? And then well, I got to solve this Rubik's Cube. Sherlock Holmes tilts his head

ever so slightly, it looks at it just fucking solves it and puts it to the side and the whole Oh, I get it turns out it's actually not that hard problem to solve when you're operating at IQ 50,000. Yeah, that's important. We're talking about massive problems that are being processed and solved. Like every 15 minutes in this space is crazy. And by the way, massive craziness like nonsense that's being produced as well, like, it's big magnitude. And so things like how do you develop an onboarding methodology to navigate the UI difficult to be able to get like, you know, 47 year old product managers on board, not massive problem, small problem, relatively speaking, trivial problem. And by the way, the kind of problem that was really a big problem during web two, which means one that we've actually built whole techniques around, there are people who are really good at that problem. Finally, let's just add the last piece, remember the very beginning.

1:04:22

The world is on fire. And reality has been doing a really great job of pushing people out of their dogmatic slumber and their places of comfort. And my hypothesis, of course, if true, is that that's going to continue to escalate. So, you know, a lot of people got into the earliest phases of this thing, because of the 2008 financial crisis in the 2010 in Europe, yeah. If that happens, remember the movie? The Big Short. Remember that great movie. Remember, in the end, they had this really nice ending where he's like, Yeah, And they did like they really the watts of assholes were thrown in jail and regulations were changed was all better and like, oh, wait, no didn't happen at all, like nobody went to jail. And actually everything got more brutal. Well, a lot of people took a moral lesson from that. In fact, the emergence of Bitcoin itself appears to have been produced by that, like, if you look at that sort of little secret code that was put in, in the, in the block, it's, I think, the times, and a particular quote, you know, that was a kick is a kick in the ass on the part of people to say, Hey, if you just sit around and not do anything harder, interesting, then this is gonna keep happening, and you're just going to be a victim of it. And by the way, the guys who are in engineering that they like doing it, so it's not even a matter of like pure stochastic, you got some serious assholes who are in charge of everything, and they love drinking your milkshake. Well, some people said, All right, I'm gonna play with this Bitcoin thing. And think about how shitty it was back then, like really, really shitty, and hard and confusing. And in some sense, obviously stupid. But the context was rough. Hey, we got fucked worked over and there's no possibility that's ever going to be rendered just by chance, right? Occupy Wall Street and the Tea Party, right, two completely different subcultures proceeding exactly the same thing, and both completely impotently expressing themselves into the world. Bitcoin, not impotent, actually did something, and people stepped into it, and it got a little less shitty, when people stepped into it, and got a little less shitty. And every time it spirals out, right phasic, you get a little less shitty a little more inclusive, little easier to adopt. But the more obvious, little more actual little more relevant to where you happen to be, which brings a slightly larger group of people in, then it kind of breathes in and integrates and collapses in certain ways. It's organic, right? It's growing. And come on where it is now. Yeah, that uh, it's going to go somewhere, it's going to be significant. The likelihood of it not being significant from my point of view is effectively zero, write something big is going to result in something bigger rd result of that even much bigger. The question I have is more like, can I get lift off? And can it fly? I just like

1:07:19

to, to end with a sort of combining two questions that rich sent over. Just just the sort of sense of warning, or how do you avoid the pitfalls? Which is, firstly, what do you learn from the utopian optimism of web one being defeated by the disappointment of web two? How do you prevent it happening with web three, and the sea adventure camps capitalist throwing money around like crazy? Won't they just enclose the commons and reiterate business as usual?

1:07:51

Let's work backwards. There. She'll try. They definitely will. So let's not assume that they won't try and be naive. And I'll go even further. I think this this part right here is maybe maybe a good step. Let's not be particularly naive about the reality of how that works. The key insight is something like the VC process is a train, not a boat or a car. Once you get on the DC train, you're on the DC train, you're gonna go into the VC destination, really hard to get off that train once you're on? What is it heroin, not even once? DC funding Not even once. And I'll be quite pragmatic actually. Render into Vc. What as VCs render into web three, web three, and there's big chunks of stuff who gives a fuck, like I don't really care that much about Coinbase is a centralized exchange. Nice, good, useful, the fact that it goes public and almost certainly becomes evaporated is not that relevant. It serves a purpose, but it lives and dies. That's fine, open see fine. Core stuff. No, you got to keep the most fundamental aspects I'm speaking here just directly to him three not to you keep the most fundamental aspects of this thing have to stay out of the clutches of VC. That's important. So that's the idea, right? sort of be able to render into the periphery, and allow the VCs to sort of play with and do their shenanigans and mechanics. And by the way, raise the tides for everybody else like us that VC money baby like allow it to come in and do experimental speculative things with actually some discipline and focus and intent to explore and buildings up in the possibility space, but the important stuff, put it at the center that has to be developed in the context of magic internet money. Now of course defi in By the finance have included a much larger field of all of cryptocurrency and all that environment is there's a lot, there's a lot of ways of being able to do the things that you otherwise might have used to need. God trash coins, which is a way of referring to fiat currency to do so, unlike web two, you know, addicted, web to your choices like starving artists doing open source software, almost certainly going to get either acquired or or stolen, or VC. And with three, it's, it's make a potentially shit ton of money in highly appreciating and future proof crypto tokens. Or, you know, have to surround yourself with this sort of obviously, septuagenarian and trash coin, VC universe, it's a very different kind of trade off. So I wouldn't do it that way. Notice I'm just making an aesthetic choice. It's like, you think about early rock'n'roll, or punk rock where there was a pretty good level of sort of aesthetic sensibility that selling out was a thing that you didn't do. And the challenge, of course, is the ability to choose not to. And the proposition is hated to make more and more possibilities that people can choose not to. And let's just take maximum advantage when it looks like and convert the VC stuff into a perfectly proper piece of the larger story.

1:11:29

Right. Was there anything we didn't cover that you want to before? We didn't do the

1:11:35

first question? The first question, how do you avoid the naivete of would you call it naive? utopianism? Yeah. Let me think, I have to admit, I was I was probably meaningfully part of that. So I'll just sort of remember being a naive, utopian. And I'm not a naive, utopian. So why did that happen there? Oh, this is helpful. This is actually very helpful. With Zach's Stein calls intergenerational transmission, or we might just call wisdom. I would assume that younger millennials, maybe the millennials, and Gen, certainly most of Gen Z, are going to be relatively easy prey for naive utopianism or naive dystopianism, because they're naive, because they actually just haven't lived life in a rich full way. And I don't mean that in any way disparaging. It's just the nature of what it means not to have circled the sun a whole bunch of times. We, who came in to have one, there were no elders. There was just kind of us. It's weird. Kashia did realize that like there, I don't know why. Why was that? I mean, other than the sort of basic and coachability of boomers to have not ever become an elder. So there's still no elders and Boomer viewer Boomer version, I can tell you there weren't any back in the late 90s. It's kind of weird. It was literally just kind of us. There was slightly older versions of us. But us and the older versions of us, by the way, were cynical. So you had to vibe so you had to kind of cynical and you had naive and that was kind of it. And the naive utopians. Yeah. utopians, a terrible word. But the kind of the the naive projectors, what they would they would they will tend to do

is they will fall upon their felt sense of what's possible. And then they will reify it as extremely, almost certain. And by the way, relatively soon. I think if you actually have elders, if you actually have people who have who can feel who actually can perceive, like, Yeah, I know, I know what you're talking about. I can feel the same. I can I know exactly what's what's what's speaking, in your ear. And I've actually been through this thing. I care for the same thing you care for, I want it to manifest in the world. And I'm interested in participating in the journey with you and stewarding that in a particular kind of way. And I'm not the least bit cynical. But, you know, I've had my shirt handed to me a bunch of times. So I know, the difference between a naive utopianism let's just use that term. And a kind of a realistic commitment to actually get into the top of the mountain or something like that, that might actually be really helpful, like just an ordinary human thing of reasonably integrating the natural relationship between different kinds of humans, in this case, kind of the relationship between different generations and cohorts. I don't know how much wisdom there is in those who are available to participate in web three. Here's something I would say to my own generation Stop being so fucking stupid and elitist. Like, if you have any clue, you know, the web three is a thing, like whatever is causing you to sort of either poopoo it or, or piss on it or not engage in it and tell you right now get over it. Bring your wisdom and this we don't really have a lot of opportunity to fuck around. And if you have wisdom to bring, bring that and precisely just that do not bring your trauma do not bring your cynicism. I bring your wisdom and gift, that wisdom into these people who are building and will live in the world that they're building, perhaps with your children if you're lucky. So that's that's the way I would say it like I would take responsibility. So has nothing to do with the kids has if you're asking the question, it has to do with you

Transcribed by <https://otter.ai>