

Applying Multi-Intelligence (MI) to Address Complex Challenges in Society and Organizations

Integrating Intellectual, Emotional, Somatic, and Intuitive Dimensions for Navigating Complexity

Feb 22, 2026

Authors: Nils von Heijne & Nicole Ayres

Data analysis & theoretical framing contributor: Erik Enger Karlson

Multi-Intelligence Institute
(part of the non-profit Awareness Association)

Contact: nils@innrwrks.com

---

*"We may be crossing a threshold: from seeing teams, organizations and societies as mechanical systems to understanding them as **living, sensing, adaptive collectives**."*

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

1. Why Multi-Intelligence?

    1.1 Rising Complexity and Systemic Crises

    1.2 The Limits of Intellect-Only Models

    1.3 Rooted in a Lineage of Practice

2. What is Multi-Intelligence (MI)?

    2.1 Definition

    2.2. The Power of Working with Questions

    2.3 The Multi-Intelligence Stack

3. How to Activate Multi-Intelligence

    3.1 Enablers (the Soil)

    3.2 Amplifiers (Activation Practices)

4. How We Test Multi-Intelligence (Research Plan)

    4.1 Hypothesis: A Repeatable Session Loop

    4.2 Hypothesis: What We Track (Without Reducing MI to Metrics)

5. Implications & Applications

Conclusion

Appendix - Case Studies

    Case A. The Emergence of the RCO Model for Regenerative Incorporation

    Case B. Field Observations from MI Study (Colorado 2025)

References

Executive Summary

In an era defined by complexity, uncertainty, and interdependence, it is increasingly clear that **intellect alone is insufficient** for navigating the challenges we face. This paper introduces **Multi-Intelligence (MI)** not as a finished model or prescriptive solution, but as a **working hypothesis and experimental practice orientation**: the idea that human beings and human systems function more wisely when multiple dimensions of knowing—**intellectual, emotional, somatic, and intuitive**—are consciously activated and integrated by individuals and collectives.

Multi-Intelligence appears to be enhanced through **structured practices and ceremonial amplifiers** such as sound, breath, movement, entheogenic substances, nature immersion, silence, and rituals that can induce altered states of consciousness. Our early field experiments suggest that these modalities help individuals and groups access deeper coherence, attunement, and insight, but much remains to be tested, refined, and understood.

This white paper outlines the *current hypothesis* behind MI, the *theoretical basis* supporting it, and the *initial experiments*—including the 2025 Colorado study (Case B in the appendix)—where MI practices were applied to a shared question. The Colorado study marks one of the first publicly reported empirical field studies in decades examining psychedelics in a structured setting for real-world professional sensemaking and problem-solving. These experiments are designed to **explore whether, and how, MI can support navigating complex organizational and societal challenges**.

At its heart, MI is **question-driven rather than solution-driven**. We treat "living questions"—questions that cannot be conclusively answered, only continually inquired into—as catalysts for activating MI. When individuals or groups orient around a shared question, we observe that MI functions less like a method and more like a compass for **personal, collective, and systemic guidance**. This white paper shares what we have learned so far, and outlines the ongoing research needed to understand MI's potential—and its limits—as a pathway for navigating complexity.

Neuroscience boundary note:

The neurobiological findings referenced in this paper, particularly those involving altered states, describe mechanisms of neural plasticity and network reconfiguration. They do not constitute direct evidence of wisdom, truth, or ethical guidance. Any translation from neural change to personal, collective, or systemic insight remains a hypothesis requiring careful contextualization, facilitation, and further study.

1. Why Multi-Intelligence?

1.1 Rising Complexity and Systemic Crises

The major challenges of our time—climate instability, ecological collapse, geopolitical tension, technological disruption, polarization—are increasingly recognized as **complex systems problems**, not merely complicated technical ones (Meadows, 1999; Ostrom, 2009). Complex systems involve non-linear dynamics, feedback loops, delayed effects, and emergent behavior; they cannot be fully predicted or controlled, but require **ongoing sensing, learning, and adaptation** over time (Meadows, 1999; Ostrom, 2009).

In such environments, no single actor—individual, team, or institution—can "see" the whole. We therefore require **collectives that can think, feel, sense, and intuit together** across multiple layers of reality. This is what we refer to as **multi-intelligent collectives**: groups that intentionally integrate intellectual, emotional, somatic, intuitive, and relational ways of knowing in order to navigate complexity.

"Multi-intelligence" in this sense has two intertwined aspects:

- **Within humans:** the different forms of intelligence available inside each person (intellectual, emotional, somatic, intuitive) and how they are integrated.
- **Between humans (and beyond):** the emergent intelligence that arises in relationships—between people, communities, and potentially between humans and ecosystems—as we learn to sense and respond as part of larger living systems (Varela, Thompson & Rosch, 1991; Meadows, 1999; Ostrom, 2009).

MI is proposed as a hypothesis about how these layers might be consciously cultivated and coordinated, so that our responses to systemic crises can become more **adaptive, relational, and life-aligned** than purely intellectual approaches allow.

1.2 The Limits of Intellect-Only Models

For more than a century, dominant models of problem-solving in organizations and policy have privileged **intellectual/rational analysis**, measurement, and control. From Taylorist management science to contemporary "data-driven decision-making," intelligence has largely been equated with logic, calculation, forecasting, and optimization (Kahneman, 2011; Senge, 1990).

However, research on **collective intelligence** suggests that group effectiveness is not determined primarily by average IQ, but by **interaction quality**—including social sensitivity and balanced participation (Woolley et al., 2010). Related research shows that diversity improves problem-solving **only** when groups can maintain sufficient trust and coherence to integrate differences (Page, 2007; Edmondson, 1999). Without psychological safety and healthy interaction patterns, diversity can amplify conflict and fragmentation rather than insight (Edmondson, 1999).

These findings suggest that intellect-only models are structurally limited. They underestimate the role of emotional, somatic, intuitive, and relational dimensions in how humans actually make sense and act together under complexity.

1.3 Rooted in a Lineage of Practice

The principles behind Multi-Intelligence are not entirely new. They draw upon a wide and diverse lineage of human practices —spanning Indigenous ceremonial traditions, ancient wisdom systems, dialogic facilitation, systems sensing, and contemporary research on collective intelligence. Across these traditions, a recurring insight appears: **groups can access forms of shared awareness and guidance that exceed the capacity of any one individual**.

Anthropological studies show that Indigenous cultures have long used ritual, ceremony, rhythm, trance, and nature-based inquiry to support community decision-making, conflict resolution, and collective insight (Eliade, 1964; Winkelman, 2010; Turner, 1969). These practices were not merely spiritual; they

served as **technologies of group coherence**, cultivating emotional alignment, somatic regulation, and shared meaning. Similarly, ancient Greek, Sufi, Hindu, and Buddhist traditions developed structured contemplative and dialogic methods for accessing deeper layers of understanding on behalf of communities (James, 1902; Corbin, 1998; Walsh, 1999).

In parallel, modern research has begun to identify physiological and cognitive mechanisms that help explain these observations. Research from the **HeartMath Institute** on **heart-brain communication** suggests that the heart functions as a powerful rhythmic oscillator, continuously influencing cognitive and emotional processing via afferent neural pathways (McCraty & Childre, 2010). States of **heart rate variability (HRV) coherence** have been associated with improved emotional regulation, attentional stability, and capacity for social connection (McCraty, Atkinson & Tomasino, 2001).

Related work on **physiological synchrony** shows that heart rate, respiration, and other biosignals can synchronize between individuals during emotionally engaged interactions, correlating with empathy, rapport, and cooperative behavior (Feldman, 2012; Palumbo et al., 2017). These findings suggest that the often-reported experience of "shared presence" or group alignment may have a measurable physiological substrate.

Recent neuroscience further indicates that altered states—induced through meditation, breathwork, or psychedelics—can temporarily increase network-level flexibility and neural plasticity, allowing novel associations and perspectives to emerge (Carhart-Harris et al., 2014; Beaty et al., 2016). A 2026 study in *Cell* demonstrated that psilocybin can induce **activity-dependent rewiring of large-scale cortical networks**, suggesting that intention, attention, and inquiry during altered states may influence longer-term meaning-making (Jiang et al., 2026).

Building on both ancient practice and contemporary science, Bruce Damer's work highlights how **structured, intentional altered-state sessions**—when combined with preparation, inquiry, and integration—may enhance creative problem-solving and systemic insight. Damer's historical and experimental synthesis suggests that extraordinary states can function as **catalysts for collective ideation and guidance**, not merely

individual experience, echoing the ceremonial role such states have played across cultures (Damer, 2025).

In the modern era, several facilitation and systems-sensing approaches have demonstrated that deeper collective intelligence becomes available when groups move beyond debate into **co-sensing**, **co-presencing**, and **generative dialogue**.

Examples of these include:

- **Emergent Dialogue** (Debold & Steininger, 2017) – conversational practices that cultivate collective presence and insight.
- **Collective Presencing** (Baeck, 2014) – group methods that integrate sensing, embodiment, and intuitive knowing.
- **Dynamic Facilitation** (Rough, 2002) – a process that helps groups move from conflict toward creative breakthroughs.
- **Collective Insight** (Roy, 2018) – frameworks for understanding how distributed awareness can emerge through complexity.
- **Art of Hosting** (Holman et al., 2007) – participatory processes that foster trust, dialogue, and shared leadership.

Collective intelligence research also suggests that groups can access emergent insight when psychological safety, social sensitivity, and balanced participation are present (Woolley et al., 2010). These conditions closely mirror those created in ritual and contemplative settings, suggesting a deep continuity between ancient and contemporary methods of accessing group wisdom.

Multi-Intelligence builds on this lineage and serves as a **synthesizing paradigm**—integrating relational facilitation, embodied regulation, and carefully structured activation practices into a single experimental orientation: exploring whether groups can reliably cultivate **multi-layered coherence**—and whether that coherence improves insight, alignment, and action under conditions of complexity.

2. What is Multi-Intelligence (MI)?

2.1 Definition

Multi-Intelligence (MI) = the integrated capacity of individuals and groups to think, feel, sense, and intuit in alignment—supported by relational conditions and amplified through activation practices—to generate deeper insight, coherence, and wise action.

2.2. The Power of Working with Questions

Note: *In this paper, "field knowing" refers to emergent insight arising between people; we include "relational knowing" as the interpersonal substrate that makes field-level sensemaking possible.*

Multi-Intelligence appears to activate most reliably when individuals and groups orient around a **shared inquiry** rather than a predefined solution. In complex environments, questions function as **organizing attractors**: they guide attention, shape perception, and influence interaction without prematurely constraining outcomes (Isaacs, 1999; Kahane, 2017).

Well-held questions—framed with care and sustained over time—reduce premature convergence and support exploratory sensemaking. Research in dialogic practice and collective learning shows that inquiry-based approaches increase psychological safety, widen perspective-taking, and improve the quality of insight generation compared to solution-first problem solving (Isaacs, 1999; Scharmer, 2007).

Insight research suggests that many breakthroughs do not emerge through linear, stepwise reasoning, but through **recontextualization**—a sudden restructuring of how a situation is understood. Empirical studies show that "Aha!" moments often occur when problems are mapped onto **distant or non-obvious analogies**, connecting elements that are not closely related in semantic or logical space (Gick & Holyoak, 1980; Bowden et al., 2005).

This process can be understood as the ability to **connect distal nodes**: linking information, experiences, emotional signals, bodily sensations, and implicit knowledge that are widely separated rather than locally adjacent. While analytic reasoning tends to strengthen nearby, incremental associations, breakthrough insight often depends on **long-range integration**, where seemingly unrelated elements suddenly cohere into a new pattern (Kounios & Beeman, 2014).

From a Multi-Intelligence perspective, shared inquiry appears to support this process by **loosening habitual frames of interpretation** and reducing over-reliance on dominant intellectual narratives. By engaging emotional, somatic, intuitive, and relational channels alongside intellectual, MI practices may increase access to these distal connections—allowing new representations to surface that remain inaccessible to linear reasoning alone. This emphasis on shared inquiry is consistent with early psychedelic research on problem-solving. In the 1960s, psychologist James Fadiman, who conducted one of the first empirical studies of psychedelic-assisted problem solving, observed that successful outcomes depended not only on altered states, but on what he described as **"emotional attachment to the task."** Participants needed to care deeply about the question they were exploring; without genuine engagement, the altered state alone did not reliably produce useful insight (Harman et al., 1966).

From a Multi-Intelligence perspective, this finding is critical. It suggests that **motivation, meaning, and relational engagement are not secondary variables**, but structural conditions for insight. MI frames this not as individual motivation alone, but as a *collective emotional and attentional bond* to the inquiry itself—held across intellectual, emotional, somatic, and relational layers.

When inquiry is held **collectively**, this process extends beyond the individual mind. Groups often report a shift from individual cognition toward **distributed sensemaking**, where insight emerges from the interaction between participants rather than from any single perspective. Research on collective intelligence suggests that under conditions of psychological safety, social sensitivity, and balanced participation, groups can access

emergent understanding that exceeds the capabilities of their individual members (Woolley et al., 2010).

When groups are able to stay with a shared question—resisting the pull toward quick answers—Multi-Intelligence begins to function as a **guidance system across multiple levels simultaneously**:

- **Personal:** Individuals receive guidance for inner orientation—values, emotional truths, tensions, and next steps in relation to the question.
- **Collective:** The group receives guidance for its shared work—revealing relational dynamics, coordination patterns, and collective priorities.
- **Systemic:** Emergent directions and structural patterns become legible at the level of the wider system, reflecting intelligence that arises from the collective field rather than from individual inference alone.

In this way, MI does not deliver a single answer. Instead, it enables **distributed guidance** across self, collective, and system—supporting coherent action that is responsive to complexity rather than driven by premature certainty.

2.3 The Multi-Intelligence Stack

The **Multi-Intelligence Stack** is a conceptual model describing the primary modes of human knowing that may contribute to insight and sensemaking. These modes are not hierarchical or sequential; they are **co-arising dimensions of a single living system**. While modern systems often privilege intellectual/rational intelligence, research in embodied cognition, affective neuroscience, and interpersonal neurobiology suggests that coherence across multiple modes improves decision quality and adaptability in complex environments (Damasio, 1994; Varela et al., 1991; Siegel, 2012).

The MI Stack currently includes:

1. **Intellectual (Think)** – analysis, abstraction, reasoning, and symbolic manipulation (Kahneman, 2011).

2. **Emotional (Feel)** – empathy, attunement, affective nuance, and psychological safety (Goleman, 1995; Edmondson, 1999).

3. **Somatic (Sense)** – bodily awareness, interoception, grounding, and physiological regulation (Craig, 2002; Mehling et al., 2012).

4. **Intuitive (Know)** – rapid, non-conscious pattern recognition and symbolic integration beyond stepwise reasoning, often reported in creative or altered states (Klein, 1998; Sadler-Smith, 2008).

5. **Relational / Field Knowing (Collective sensemaking)** – insight emerging *between* people through co-regulation, shared attention, dialogue, and distributed sensemaking (Clark & Chalmers, 1998; Scharmer, 2007).

Insight research supports a functional distinction between **integrative emergence** and **analytic validation**. Breakthrough insights are often preceded by sudden, holistic integration—sometimes associated with brief gamma-band neural activity—while subsequent intellectual work stabilizes, tests, and implements what has emerged (Jung-Beeman et al., 2004).

Multi-Intelligence does not privilege one mode over another. Instead, it proposes a **rhythm between emergence and verification**: insight arises through integrated, multi-layered sensing and is then translated into action through analysis, experimentation, and feedback. This alternation appears particularly well-suited to complex systems, where novelty must precede certainty and learning unfolds through iteration rather than prediction (Meadows, 1999; Ostrom, 2009).

It should be noted here that the MI stack itself as a unified system is a conceptual synthesis made by the authors—not a model derived from existing research.

3. How to Activate Multi-Intelligence

Multi-Intelligence does not arise automatically. Across both traditional practices and contemporary research, it appears to emerge when **specific relational conditions** are present and when **states of perception and physiology** are intentionally shifted. In this paper, we distinguish between **Enablers**—the relational "soil" that supports MI—and **Amplifiers**—practices that can intensify access to deeper layers of knowing.

This distinction matters: Amplifiers without the right relational conditions may produce intense experiences without coherence or integration, while strong relational conditions without state shifts may limit access to non-linear or intuitive insight.

3.1 Enablers (the Soil)

Enablers are the **psychological, relational, and interactional conditions** that make Multi-Intelligence more likely to arise. Research on collective intelligence consistently shows that group effectiveness depends less on individual brilliance and more on **how people relate and interact** (Woolley et al., 2010; Edmondson, 1999).

Key enablers may include:

- **Psychological Safety:** A shared sense that one can speak, feel, and explore without fear of punishment or ridicule (Edmondson, 1999).
- **Social Sensitivity & Attunement:** The capacity to notice and respond to emotional and relational signals in others (Woolley et al., 2010; Feldman, 2012).
- **Balanced Participation:** Relatively equal airtime and influence, which improves collective sensemaking (Woolley et al., 2010).
- **Diversity of Perspective:** Cognitive, cultural, and experiential diversity that expands the solution space—when trust and coherence are present (Page, 2007).
- **Presence & Contact:** Attention, authenticity, and embodied engagement rather than performative participation (Rogers & Farson, 1957).

These enablers are not techniques; they are **qualities of the relational field**. They tend to emerge through repeated patterns of interaction—how meetings are run, how listening happens, how disagreement is held.

Research in interpersonal neurobiology suggests that moment-to-moment relational quality strongly shapes cognitive flexibility, emotional regulation, and openness to insight (Siegel, 2012). In this sense, MI is less something that is "turned on" occasionally and more something that can be **cultivated as a baseline capacity** over time.

Helpful orientations that strengthen this soil may include:

- **Embodied awareness and emotional regulation** (Craig, 2002; Gross, 1998)
- **Intellectual humility and openness** (Krumrei-Mancuso et al., 2020)
- **Comfort with uncertainty and not-knowing** (Kahane, 2017)

When these conditions are present, groups appear better able to stay with inquiry, tolerate ambiguity, and access deeper layers of collective intelligence.

3.2 Amplifiers (Activation Practices)

While everyday relational conditions prepare the soil for Multi-Intelligence (MI), certain practices appear to **amplify and accelerate** access to emotional, somatic, intuitive, and transpersonal dimensions of knowing. In this paper, **Amplifiers** refer to both everyday and ceremonial methods that intentionally shift individual and collective states of perception, physiology, and relational coherence.

Anthropological research shows that **ritual, rhythm, breath, and altered states** have long been used across cultures to shift consciousness, strengthen social cohesion, and facilitate guidance at both individual and collective levels (Eliade, 1964; Turner, 1969; Winkelman, 2010). Historically, these practices functioned as technologies of collective sensemaking—regulating group attention, emotional alignment, and shared

meaning rather than serving purely spiritual or symbolic purposes.

Contemporary psychophysiology and neuroscience suggest plausible mechanisms underlying these effects. Practices involving breath, rhythm, meditation, and psychedelics can temporarily **relax rigid cognitive control**, deepen introspective access, strengthen co-regulation, and broaden perceptual bandwidth, allowing information to be processed through emotional, somatic, associative, and symbolic channels alongside analytic reasoning (Grof, 1985; Carhart-Harris et al., 2014; Jerath et al., 2006; Hove & Risen, 2009).

Emerging neuroscience further indicates that psychedelic states can induce **activity-dependent, network-level plasticity**, meaning that longer-term neural reorganization depends on which circuits are engaged during the altered state (Jiang et al., 2026). This finding underscores a central MI premise: **altered states alone are insufficient**. Intention, attention, inquiry, facilitation, and integration play a structurally relevant role in shaping outcomes.

Across modalities, many activation practices—including meditation, breathwork, rhythmic movement, and psychedelic states—are associated with a temporary **reduction in dominance of the brain's default mode network (DMN)** and an increase in **network-level flexibility and neuroplasticity**. These shifts allow neural signals to interact in more diverse and less constrained ways, correlating with creativity, novel associations, and cognitive flexibility (Carhart-Harris et al., 2014; Beaty et al., 2016). These mechanisms are best understood as **correlational enablers rather than deterministic pathways**, and they vary substantially by method, intensity, individual differences, and context.

Importantly, increased plasticity alone does not require—or guarantee—multi-dimensional intelligence, coherence, ethical orientation, or collective benefit. From an MI perspective, activation practices are therefore understood as **necessary but insufficient**. They may unlock creative or associative potential, but the *integration* of insight—across emotional, somatic, relational, and ethical dimensions—depends on how inquiry is structured, held, and embodied within the group.

From an MI perspective, activation practices are not primarily about producing insight for its own sake, but about **creating a coherent relational field** in which multi-layered forms of knowing can arise. We therefore treat these practices not as fixed techniques, but as **experimental amplifiers**—hypotheses about how to reliably evoke deeper layers of human and collective intelligence under conditions of safety, intention, and integration.

It should be noted that MI work involving altered states requires **careful screening, facilitation, legal compliance, and post-session integration protocols**. Without these, the same practices that can support coherence and insight may instead amplify confusion, reactivity, or fragmentation.

Primary amplifier modalities may include:

Breath

Holotropic and other forms of deep breathwork have roots in both ancient yogic traditions and modern therapeutic practice. Research suggests that breathwork can induce non-ordinary states, access emotional material, and regulate autonomic patterns through shifts in CO_2/O_2 balance and vagal tone (Grof & Grof, 2010; Jerath et al., 2006). In group contexts, breathwork can enhance emotional resonance and co-regulation, supporting access to deeper layers of MI.

Sound

Drumming, chanting, and rhythmic sound have long been used to shift consciousness, synchronize group attention, and create collective entrainment (Eliade, 1964; Neher, 1962). Research on rhythmic synchronization shows that shared rhythm increases cooperation, trust, and social bonding (Hove & Risen, 2009). Sound-based practices modulate nervous-system states and can induce trance-like experiences associated with imagery, insight, and intuitive knowing (Winkelman, 2010).

Movement

Ritualized movement, ecstatic dance, and coordinated group gesture activate somatic intelligence and support group synchrony, reducing self–other boundaries and enhancing emotional connection (Tarr et al., 2014). Movement also

engages embodied cognition and can surface tacit or preverbal insights, helping groups sense underlying relational and systemic dynamics.

Silence and Meditation

Silent retreats and stillness practices have been central to contemplative traditions worldwide. Research on meditation shows increased interoception, emotional regulation, and attentional stability (Kabat-Zinn, 2003; Cahn & Polich, 2006). In group contexts, extended silence often supports the emergence of collective intuition and subtle sensing as individuals shift from habitual speech into shared presence.

Nature

Nature exposure has been repeatedly linked to cognitive restoration, stress reduction, and improved attentional capacity —effects that support deeper inquiry and clearer sensemaking (Kaplan & Kaplan, 1989). Time in natural environments can also broaden perception and support emotional regulation, increasing access to somatic and intuitive signals (Williams, 2017). Shared nature immersion (walks, councils, silent sits) often strengthens relational presence and coherence more effectively than purely indoor settings.

Entheogenic Substances & Rituals

Indigenous cultures have ritualistically used entheogens (e.g., psilocybin mushrooms, ayahuasca, peyote, iboga) for thousands of years to support spiritual insight, community cohesion, and collective decision-making (Winkelman, 2010). Contemporary psychedelic research shows that substances such as psilocybin can reliably induce mystical-type experiences, emotional breakthroughs, and deep introspective access, often accompanied by increased neural flexibility and reduced rigid patterning (Griffiths et al., 2006; Carhart-Harris et al., 2014).

In group settings, shared psychedelic experiences can increase empathy, openness, and interpersonal closeness (Forstmann & Sagioglou, 2017), potentially strengthening the collective MI field. However, outcomes depend heavily on **context, facilitation, readiness, and intention**, and should not be viewed as uniformly beneficial or risk-free.

Recent interdisciplinary work also suggests that carefully structured altered-state sessions may support **creative problem-solving and systemic insight** when combined with preparation and inquiry. Damer's synthesis of historical evidence and contemporary neuroscience highlights how guided psychedelic contexts can amplify divergent and convergent thinking and facilitate collective ideation rather than individual insight alone (Damer, 2025).

4. How We Test Multi-Intelligence (Research Plan)

Multi-Intelligence (MI) is currently a **working hypothesis**. To move beyond conceptual framing and toward usable knowledge, we require repeatable ways to **activate MI, observe what occurs, and compare outcomes** across groups and contexts. Our aim is not to over-control emergence, but to create **lightweight, transparent research containers** that allow learning, iteration, and falsifiability.

Over time, this work aims to evolve toward **pre-registered protocols, clearer inclusion/exclusion criteria, and transparent reporting standards**, while preserving the exploratory nature required when studying complex, emergent phenomena.

4.1 Hypothesis: A Repeatable Session Loop

Based on early MI retreats and adjacent work in dialogic facilitation and altered-state inquiry, we propose a **repeatable session structure** that can be tested, refined, and compared across settings (Isaacs, 1999; Damer, 2025).

The Collective Inquiry Loop (Hypothesis v1.0)

1. **Preparation**
   Establish the shared question, clarify intentions and agreements, and cultivate psychological safety and readiness (Edmondson, 1999).

2. **Activation**
   Apply one or more Amplifiers (Activation Practices)—e.g. breath, sound, movement, silence, nature, or entheogens—to shift perceptual and physiological state and widen the field of inquiry (Grof & Grof, 2010; Carhart-Harris et al., 2014).

3. **Integration**
   Facilitate structured sensemaking to surface insights across intellectual, emotional, somatic, and intuitive

layers, and to identify emergent themes at individual, collective, and systemic levels (Isaacs, 1999).

4. **Action**
   Translate what emerged into experiments, decisions, commitments, or next inquiry questions, enabling learning through feedback and embodiment (Meadows, 1999; Ostrom, 2009).

This loop is not presented as *the* MI method, but as a **testable research container**—a minimal structure that enables comparison across sessions while preserving emergence and contextual sensitivity.

4.2 Hypothesis: What We Track (Without Reducing MI to Metrics)

Because MI spans **subjective experience, relational dynamics, and physiological processes**, no single metric can adequately capture it. Our approach is therefore **triangulation**: combining qualitative, behavioral, and physiological indicators to explore which variables tend to co-vary when MI appears to activate.

Current candidate indicators include:

- **Collective intelligence & interaction quality**
  (e.g. social sensitivity, balanced participation, conversational dynamics) (Woolley et al., 2010; Baron-Cohen et al., 2001).

- **Psychological safety and trust**
  As foundational conditions for coherent collective cognition and learning (Edmondson, 1999).

- **Physiological regulation and synchrony**
  Where feasible (e.g. HRV / HRV coherence) as proxies for co-regulation and relational coherence (McCraty et al., 2009; Feldman, 2012; Palumbo et al., 2017).

- **Outcome signals**
  Including clarity of next actions, alignment around the shared question, perceived insight quality, and follow-through over time (Meadows, 1999; Kahane, 2017).

These measures are **provisional hypotheses**, not definitive indicators. The purpose is to explore patterns, boundary conditions, and reliability—not to prematurely operationalize MI into narrow performance metrics.

Future MI research may also investigate whether different inquiry structures and facilitation styles bias neural plasticity toward different network configurations, building on evidence that psychedelic-evoked rewiring is **activity-dependent rather than purely pharmacological** (Jiang et al., 2026).

Equally important, **null, mixed, or negative findings** will be treated as informative boundary conditions for MI rather than as failures. Understanding *when MI does not arise* is as critical as understanding when it does.

5. Implications & Applications

If the Multi-Intelligence (MI) hypothesis holds—that coherence across intellectual, emotional, somatic, intuitive, and relational layers enables deeper insight and more adaptive action—then the implications for organizations, communities, leadership, and societal systems may be significant. At present, these implications remain **exploratory**, grounded in early field observations and adjacent research rather than definitive evidence.

MI is therefore presented not as a solution framework, but as a **capacity-building orientation**: a way of strengthening how individuals and groups sense, interpret, and respond to complex realities.

Organizations

Organizations increasingly operate in environments characterized by volatility, ambiguity, and interdependence. Research on collective intelligence suggests that teams perform best when social sensitivity, balanced participation, and psychological safety are present (Woolley et al. 2010; Edmondson, 1999).

MI-informed practices may support organizations by:

- strengthening collective sensemaking under uncertainty
- improving decision quality when data is incomplete or conflicting
- increasing coherence during periods of transformation, crisis, or rapid change
- enabling teams to integrate rational analysis with embodied and relational signals

Rather than replacing analytic decision-making, MI may complement existing organizational approaches by **expanding the range of information considered relevant**, especially in complex or novel situations where precedent and prediction are limited. In this sense, MI aligns with—and potentially deepens—learning organization models (Senge, 1990) and presencing-based change approaches (Scharmer, 2007).

Communities

Communities rely on trust, shared meaning, and the capacity to coordinate across difference. Anthropological and sociological research suggests that groups with higher levels of ritualized synchrony, emotional attunement, and relational coherence often demonstrate greater resilience and cooperation (Turner, 1969; Feldman, 2012).

MI may offer communities:

- practices that **r**ebuild trust and shared understanding
- tools for collective inquiry into difficult or polarizing questions
- enhanced capacity for foresight through shared sensing rather than debate
- stronger social resilience rooted in relational coherence rather than ideology

In this context, MI may be particularly relevant for communities navigating transition, conflict, or systemic stress, where purely deliberative or adversarial models tend to break down.

Leadership

Traditional leadership models emphasize authority, control, and analytic certainty. However, research on complexity and adaptive leadership suggests that such approaches struggle in unpredictable environments, where outcomes emerge through interaction rather than execution (Heifetz, 1994; Meadows, 1999).

MI aligns with emerging leadership paradigms that emphasize:

- facilitation over control
- sensemaking over certainty
- collective intelligence over individual expertise

MI-informed leadership does not require leaders to abandon rational analysis. Rather, it invites leaders to **hold space for multiple ways of knowing**, to listen for weak signals, and to work skillfully with uncertainty. This complements existing frameworks in shared leadership (Pearce & Conger, 2003), dialogic leadership (Isaacs, 1999), and adaptive leadership

(Heifetz, 1994), while adding embodied and intuitive awareness as legitimate dimensions of leadership intelligence.

Global and Societal Challenges

Many of today's challenges—climate change, ecological degradation, polarization, resource scarcity—are **complex, interconnected, and multi-scale**. Systems scholars argue that such challenges cannot be addressed through optimization or control alone, but require increased collective sensemaking capacity and coordination across sectors and scales (Meadows, 1999; Ostrom, 2009).

If MI practices can reliably support deeper coherence, expanded perception, and collective insight, they may contribute to:

- the emergence of multi-intelligent communities and institutions
- more collaborative and adaptive governance structures
- a more responsive societal "nervous system" capable of sensing early signals and responding before crises escalate

This remains a hypothesis. However, the possibility that human systems could cultivate **distributed, embodied, and relational intelligence at scale** represents a meaningful frontier for research and experimentation—particularly as existing governance and decision-making models struggle to keep pace with accelerating complexity.

Conclusion

This white paper has introduced **Multi-Intelligence (MI)** as a *working hypothesis* rather than a finished theory or prescriptive method. The core proposition is simple: when intellectual, emotional, somatic, intuitive, and relational dimensions of knowing are consciously integrated, individuals and collectives may navigate complexity with greater coherence, insight, and adaptive capacity than cognition alone allows.

MI draws on three converging strands:

(1) empirical research on collective intelligence, embodiment, and neuroplasticity;

(2) a long lineage of human practices designed to cultivate shared awareness and guidance; and

(3) early field experiments suggesting that structured inquiry, supported by relational conditions and activation practices, can unlock non-linear insight at personal, collective, and systemic levels.

At present, MI should be understood as an **experimental orientation**—a way of working with questions, attention, and relational fields—rather than a validated intervention. Its promise lies not in producing definitive answers, but in improving *how* individuals and groups sense, interpret, and respond when facing uncertainty, novelty, and interdependence.

What MI offers now is a **map of possibility** and a **discipline of inquiry**. It invites a shift from solution-first approaches toward question-led sensemaking; from individual cognition toward distributed intelligence; and from control toward attunement and responsiveness. If further research supports its early signals, MI may contribute to more resilient organizations, more adaptive leadership, and more coherent societal responses to complex challenges.

The future of Multi-Intelligence depends on continued experimentation, methodological rigor, ethical care, and intellectual humility. Whether MI ultimately proves to be a foundational framework or a transitional lens, it points toward a necessary evolution: learning to engage complexity not only

with sharper thinking, but with deeper presence, relational coherence, and integrated human intelligence in service of life.

Appendix - Case Studies

The following section outlines two case studies co-conducted by the authors of this white paper in collaboration with partnering individuals and organizations.

Case A. The Emergence of the RCO Model for Regenerative Incorporation

Note: Some of the authors took part in and co-facilitated the retreat described in Case A.

One of the earliest observations that seeded the idea behind **Multi-Intelligence (MI)** took place in 2020 during a multi-day retreat that combined structured conversation, meditation, and a guided psilocybin ceremony. Participants worked collectively with a single, open question:

How could organizational design evolve to support the future of humanity and life itself?

Rather than focusing on analytical problem-solving, the group oriented toward **multi-layered sensing**—intellectual reflection, emotional attunement, somatic awareness, intuitive insight, and field-level resonance. This early observation showed signs of what would later become the MI hypothesis: that when a group enters a coherent, inquiry-driven field, **novel patterns of understanding and system-level ideas can emerge that no individual conceived beforehand**.

From this shared inquiry emerged the foundational concepts of the **Regenerative Community Organism (RCO)** model. The RCO was not designed in advance; it surfaced organically from the group's MI-informed exploration of organizational evolution. What began as a question eventually crystallized into a new form of organizational structure—one that integrates non-profit commons, regenerative governance, community stewardship, and entrepreneurial activation. This initial blueprint was then unfolded, detailed and scaffolded over several years following the initial ceremony.

This example illustrates how MI, even in its earliest experimental form, can generate more than personal insight. It can catalyze **systemic innovation**, bridging spiritual inquiry, relational intelligence, and practical design outcomes.

Note: Those interested in the RCO framework can explore the model in detail at rco.life.

Case B. Field Observations from MI Study (Colorado 2025)

Note: *Some of the authors co-designed and co-facilitated the retreat described in Case B, in full legal compliance with Colorado laws at the time. Furthermore, it should be noted that self-report data from participants in a voluntary retreat may be susceptible to demand characteristics, social desirability bias, and what researchers call the "peak experience halo."*

Our more structured research into Multi-Intelligence was initiated with a study in Colorado (US) in 2025. To our knowledge, this is among the first publicly reported empirical field studies in decades examining psychedelics in a structured setting for **real-world professional sensemaking and problem-solving**—reviving a line of inquiry famously explored in the 1960s (Harman et al., 1966).

Participants used MI practices (breathwork, sound, meditation, movement and a psilocybin ceremony) to collectively explore the open question:

What does Business want to become — and what's its invitation for us humans?

Initial data from the retreat offer **preliminary indications** that MI practices may correlate with measurable shifts across emotional, somatic, intellectual, and intuitive dimensions. These observations are not evidence of causation but serve as early signals that MI warrants further study.

Participants (10 respondents in total) reported:

- **High emotional resonance** (8.9/10)
- **High somatic embodiment** (8.9/10)
- **Notable intellectual integration** (7.1/10)

- **Phenomenological experiences of insight sources**:
  - Self: 8.3/10
  - Group: 8.9/10
  - "Something beyond the group": 8.9/10
- **Strong connection to the shared question**, especially during ceremony (9.0/10) and group synthesis (8.6/10)
- **Significant personal impact**, with half of participants reporting changes they considered "life-changing"
- **Markedly increased importance of the shared question**, with 82% of participants rating it more important after the retreat
- **Observed associations/correlations** between insight depth and:
  - Trust (in self, facilitators, and process)
  - Question clarity
  - Life transitions participants were currently navigating

Participants were followed up regarding any adverse effects in the period following the retreat; none were reported.

These observations suggest that MI may **influence multiple layers of awareness**—particularly emotional, somatic, and intuitive—*when certain preconditions are present*: psychological safety, relational trust, readiness, and a well-held shared question.

Further research is required to determine the reliability, replicability, boundaries, and ethical considerations of MI-based work.

Three-Month Follow-Up Observations

To explore whether the effects observed during the gathering persisted beyond the immediate retreat context, participants were invited to complete a follow-up survey approximately three months after the event.

Despite the limited sample size (8 respondents), the follow-up data suggests **effects may persist across multiple life domains**. Participants reported sustained impact on their personal lives, professional direction, and ongoing personal

development, with most ratings remaining in the high range (8–10 out of 10).

Notably, the group's shared question continued to feel *alive and generative* rather than resolved or stagnant. Participants reported low perceived "stuckness," indicating that the inquiry itself remained an active orienting force months after the gathering.

Qualitative reflections emphasized integration rather than peak experience: participants described changes in how they approach work, leadership, facilitation, and personal decision-making, as well as increased clarity and coherence over time.

While these findings do not establish causation, they suggest that MI-based inquiry—when supported by trust, facilitation, and integration—may have **effects that extend beyond the ceremonial context and into lived practice**. This strengthens the case for longitudinal research into MI as a potential guidance process rather than a transient intervention.

References

Baeck, R. (2014). *Collective Presencing: A New Human Capacity*. Self-published / online manuscript.

Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Hill, J., Raste, Y., & Plumb, I. (2001). The "Reading the Mind in the Eyes" test revised version: A study with normal adults, and adults with Asperger syndrome or high-functioning autism. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 42*(2), 241–251.

Beaty, R. E., Benedek, M., Silvia, P. J., & Schacter, D. L. (2016). Creative cognition and brain network dynamics. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 20*(2), 87–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.10.004

Bowden, E. M., et al. (2005). The compound remote associates problem. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*.

Cahn, B. R., & Polich, J. (2006). Meditation states and traits: EEG, ERP, and neuroimaging studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 132*(2), 180–211.

Carhart-Harris, R. L., et al. (2014). The entropic brain: A theory of conscious states informed by neuroimaging research with psychedelic drugs. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8*, 20. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00020

Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis, 58*(1), 7–19.

Corbin, H. (1998). *The Man of Light in Iranian Sufism*. Omega Publications.

Craig, A. D. (2002). How do you feel? Interoception: The sense of the physiological condition of the body. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 3*(8), 655–666.

Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain*. Putnam.

Damer, B. (2025). It's high time for science. In D. McKenna (Ed.), Ethnopharmacologic search for psychoactive drugs: 55 years of research (Vol. 3, pp. 264-297). Synergetic Press.

Debold, E., & Steininger, T. (2017). Emergent Dialogue: A new form of collective communication. *Evolve Magazine*.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350–383.

Eliade, M. (1964). *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy*. Princeton University Press.

Feldman, R. (2012). Parent–infant synchrony: A bio-behavioral model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 21*(3), 170–176.

Forstmann, M., & Sagioglou, C. (2017). Lifetime experience with (classic) psychedelics predicts pro-environmental behavior through an increase in nature relatedness. *Journal of Psychopharmacology, 31*(8), 975–988.

Gick, M. L., & Holyoak, K. J. (1980). Analogical problem solving. *Cognitive Psychology*.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam Books.

Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology, 2*(3), 271–299.

Griffiths, R. R., Richards, W. A., McCann, U., & Jesse, R. (2006). Psilocybin can occasion mystical-type experiences having substantial and sustained personal meaning and spiritual significance. *Psychopharmacology, 187*(3), 268–283.

Grof, S. (1985). *Beyond the Brain: Birth, Death, and Transcendence in Psychotherapy*. SUNY Press.

Grof, S., & Grof, C. (2010). *Holotropic Breathwork: A New Approach to Self-Exploration and Therapy*. SUNY Press.

Harman, W. W., McKim, R. H., Mogar, R. E., Fadiman, J., & Stolaroff, M. J. (1966). *Psychedelic agents in creative problem-solving: A pilot study*. Psychological Reports, 19(1), 211–227. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1966.19.1.211

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Harvard University Press.

Holman, P., Devane, T., & Cady, S. (Eds.). (2007). *The Change Handbook*. Berrett-Koehler.

Hove, M. J., & Risen, J. L. (2009). It's all in the timing: Interpersonal synchrony increases affiliation. *Social Cognition, 27*(6), 949–960.

Isaacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together*. Doubleday.

Jerath, R., Edry, J. W., Barnes, V. A., & Jerath, V. (2006). Physiology of long pranayamic breathing. *Medical Hypotheses, 67*(3), 566–571.

Jiang, Q., et al. (2026). *Psilocybin triggers an activity-dependent rewiring of large-scale cortical networks*. Cell, 189, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2025.11.009

Jung-Beeman, M., et al. (2004). Neural activity when people solve insight problems. *PLoS Biology*.

Kabat-Zinn, J. (2003). Mindfulness-based interventions in context. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 10*(2), 144–156.

Kahane, A. (2017). *Collaborating with the Enemy*. Berrett-Koehler.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (1989). *The Experience of Nature*. Cambridge University Press.

Klein, G. (1998). *Sources of Power*. MIT Press.

Kounios, J., & Beeman, M. (2014). The cognitive neuroscience of insight. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*, 71–93.

Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J., Haggard, M. C., LaBouff, J. P., & Rowatt, W. C. (2020). Intellectual humility and decision-making. *Self and Identity, 19*(2), 216–236.

McCraty, R., & Childre, D. (2010). Coherence: Bridging personal, social, and global health. *Alternative Therapies, 16*(4), 10–24.

McCraty, R., Atkinson, M., & Tomasino, D. (2001). *Science of the Heart*. HeartMath Research Center.

McCraty, R., Atkinson, M., Tomasino, D., & Bradley, R. T. (2009). The coherent heart. *Integral Review, 5*(2), 10–115.

Meadows, D. (1999). *Leverage Points: Places to Intervene in a System*. Sustainability Institute.

Mehling, W. E., Price, C. J., Daubenmier, J. J., Acree, M., Bartmess, E., & Stewart, A. (2012). The MAIA scale. *PLOS ONE, 7*(11), e48230.

Neher, A. (1962). A physiological explanation of unusual behavior in ceremonies involving drums. *Human Biology, 34*(2), 151–160.

Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social–ecological systems. *Science, 325*(5939), 419–422.

Page, S. E. (2007). *The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies*. Princeton University Press.

Palumbo, R. V., et al. (2017). Interpersonal autonomic physiology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 21*(2), 99–141.

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Shared Leadership*. Sage.

Rogers, C. R., & Farson, R. E. (1957). *Active Listening*. University of Chicago.

Rough, J. (2002). *Society's Breakthrough!*. Great Bear Press.

Roy, B. (2018). *Collective Insight*. Online essays and talks.

Sadler-Smith, E. (2008). *Inside Intuition*. Routledge.

Scharmer, O. (2007). *Theory U*. Berrett-Koehler.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline*. Doubleday.

Siegel, D. J. (2007). *The Mindful Brain*. W. W. Norton.

Siegel, D. J. (2012). *The Developing Mind* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Tarr, B., Launay, J., & Dunbar, R. I. M. (2014). Music and social bonding. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*, 1096.

Turner, V. (1969). *The Ritual Process*. Aldine.

Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The Embodied Mind*. MIT Press.

Walsh, R. (1999). *Essential Spirituality*. Wiley.

Whyte, D. (1997). *The House of Belonging*. Many Rivers Press.

Williams, F. (2017). *The Nature Fix*. W. W. Norton.

Winkelman, M. (2010). *Shamanism: A Biopsychosocial Paradigm*. Praeger.

Woolley, A. W., Chabris, C. F., Pentland, A., Hashmi, N., & Malone, T. W. (2010). Evidence for a collective intelligence factor. *Science, 330*(6004), 686–688.