

PRE-TRUTH, POST-TRUTH AND BEYOND

How Integral thinking helps us transcend the turmoil

Podcast transcript

2/2/2017

Hello, everybody! Jeff Salzman here, and welcome to The Daily Evolver. I am happy to be with you at this, the beginning of the second week of the Trump Presidency. Oh Lord.

The good news is we only have 207 weeks left! Actually, if he wins two terms, we have 415 weeks left - I did the math. So wow, here we are. If there was any shred of hope that Donald Trump would change and become more presidential after the oath of office, that hope has been dashed upon the rocks, and we are into the first moment of the chaos presidency.

Now he, Trump, and his movement are also often referred to using the 2016 Oxford Dictionary Word of the year, 'Post-truth': *He's the post-truth president. We're in a new post-truth era.* That's instantly interesting to an evolutionary because they're talking about "post-something". There's a movement. There's something beyond what we have, something that is worth looking at and unpacking, so I want to do that on this podcast.

Before I get into all of that, I want to give a shout out to my friends at Integral Life who have debuted their new website. It's still Integrallife.com, but spiffed up all around. A lot easier to navigate and snappy, and I really like it. I also want to point out that on the site is something that I've talked about at least in the last podcast, and that is a paper that Ken Wilber wrote on this topic of the post-truth world. It's titled 'Trump And A Post-Truth World', and it is available free - 90-pages, brilliant. I wish everybody in the intelligentsia would read it, so pass it around to your smart friends.

I know a lot of you are members of Integral Life, but if you're not, you ought to consider it. If you're interested in Integral Theory and what's going on in the Integral community, it's the central portal for all of that. It's a hundred bucks a year and it's the original home of The Daily Evolver. I now have my own site, DailyEvolver.com which you can go as well, and I have other things posted there.

One of the things I have posted at The Daily Evolver is a chart of the [Levels of Development](#) which is a key part of Integral Theory. Integral Theory posits that there is evolution happening in culture and consciousness, as well as the evolution of the material world and the biosphere. If you want to follow along, if you're new to this or if you want to just get deeper into it, go to DailyEvolver.com. Scroll down a bit. You'll see "About Integral Theory". Click that, and at the top is the chart and there are a couple other charts and other things there as well that you'll find interesting.

All right. Okay already. Let's take a look at this post-truth meme, this word of the year which the Oxford Dictionary defines as "Relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief". I'll say that again. Post-truth is "Relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief".

Now, I would argue that the mode of communication and influence that they're describing here is, developmentally speaking, not so much post-truth as it is pre-truth. I mean, thinking that comes out of the gut, thinking that is based on emotions or hardened prejudices, this is as old as the hills. This is the mode of thinking that virtually everybody had, and it's all they had for the vast majority of human history. If we say that human culture is 70,000 years old, and that seems to be the latest guess, then what we do know is that about 69,500 of those years - all but 500 - were spent in a mode of thinking that was superstitious, magical, mythic, based on great stories, emotional, full of prejudices of all sorts, often inspiring, still inspiring, but not yet arriving at the level of development of thinking that was brought on by modernity beginning 500 years ago and really kicking into gear about 300 years ago. And of course the great realization of modernity is that the world is knowable in its objective manifestations ... that thunder is not the product of an angry god, but it's the sound that colliding ions or something make. I don't know. We'll have to check Ben Franklin for that, but there's a scientific explanation, and whatever it is, it's not an angry god.

If you're looking at our Levels of Development chart, what I'm referring to is the pre-truth era, everything that leads up to the modern stage of development, so the stage directly before modernity is traditionalism. There are a lot of people who are fundamentally traditional thinkers around now.

Before that is what we call the 'Warrior stage of development' or the 'Red stage of development'. This is the world of magic, power gods and fighting. (This is actually the world of Donald Trump in important ways which I've talked about in previous podcasts and we'll look at in a minute.) But beginning 500 years ago, all of that, the red magic, the amber myth, all of that was overwritten by a mode of thinking that we call 'Rational', 'Logical', 'Objective', a mode of thinking that opens up a whole new world of technology and tripled lifespans and the modern world. Look around, the skyscrapers, all of the amazing benefits. For those of us who are living in societies that take advantage of those benefits, those of us who are living in the developed world, we really appreciate - or we ought to for sure - appreciate its safety, its freedom, its bounty.

And we respect the world of objective fact that undergirds modern life, and we get nervous when we see the factual world come under assault. Because whether or not we are aware of it consciously, there's a part of us that's nervous because we know

that this subterranean world of spirits and emotions and passions and hysteria and revenge and mobs - of history in other words - is just right under the surface.

And incidentally, it's all right under the surface of our own individual psyches too. Think about your own crazy appetites and lusts and rages, and for some of us, these things occasionally pop through our veneer of rationality, and we have to keep an eye on that.

To recap, walking up the developmental ladder, we have the early stages of pre-truth, the stages before modernity ... we have the stage of truth which is modern, factual, scientific ... and then we keep going - God is too good to just let us rest - and we move to postmodernity. Postmodernity is where this idea of post-truth begins to get very, very interesting.

A minute ago, I mentioned Ken Wilber's new essay, 'Trump And A Post-Truth World'. It turns out that I interviewed Ken a few days ago on the paper, and we're going to post that interview soon, but I wanted to play an excerpt from it now because he so beautifully sets up how philosophical postmodernity came into being and of course kicked off and co-arose with the great flowering of postmodernity in the '60s. Here's Ken:

Ken Wilber: It started out by someone noticing as a lot of the early postmodern writers put it, "There's nothing but history". The reason is as they've tried to look for universal truths and things that you could count on to be true for all people at all places at all times, and they couldn't come up with much. All they would see is boy, 500 years ago they believed this, and then a thousand years ago, they believed that, and everything was changing. Everything was a product of history. If you take all of the great postmodernists, if you take Derrida, Foucault, Bourdieu, Lacan, Lyotard, Paul de Man, Stanley Fish, all of them would agree on one thing, namely there's no such thing as truth. Truth is just a cultural fabrication, and whatever anybody calls truth is simply whatever some culture at some place or time can convince people is true, but that's it. Truth is a fashion. It's a fad. It's no more real than hem lengths.

And this goes for science. The difference between science and poetry: none. Not in terms of truth, there is no truth. I noticed this starting to dominate academia 30 years or so ago. I mean, it came in in the early 1960s and the people who then heard of deconstruction or postmodern poststructuralism were a very, very small percentage of the population. But by 1979, the most widely quoted academic writer in America was Jacques Derrida, and the humanities itself became just overtaken by a postmodern poststructuralism, or deconstruction, and all of a sudden, truth was out.

Jeff Salzman: Okay, then what happens to a culture when its philosophical underpinnings are that there is no truth? It's the opposite of underpinnings. What is the popular expression of that? People have talked about this in the Integral community for a long time: that every stage of development has some way of saying "you're in or you're out" or "you're good or you're not," and they divide the world up.

Red warrior culture divides the world between the predator and the prey.

Amber traditionalism divides the world between the saints and the sinners.

Modernity divides the world between the winners and the losers.

So what does green do? Green divides the world between people who are cool and people who are not cool. Can't you just feel it? That's the vibe of all things postmodern. What does that even mean? What does cool mean?

You can trace it back to this idea of being post-truth, because one of the things people realized after the first half of the 20th century, which was barbaric ... it was a modern technology wedded to pre-modern morality, it was this freak show ... so after the conflagrations of World War 2, people realized that all of these grand narratives of history were all just a bunch of shit. Look where they led. Science, the great enlightenment project, dedicated to the idea that once all people became rational that our problems would be solved ... all of that, look where it led. To concentration camps, to nuclear bombs. So don't tell me about the superiority of your rationality and science.

Then, you can go back to the previous stage: traditionalism with its focus on god. Where was your god in all of this?

So God, science, all of it is out. And so since there's nothing to believe in anymore, the only thing we have left is to feel sorry for - and superior to - the poor schmucks who still believe in anything like God and Country. And make fun of them.

But oh Lord: the empire bites back with Donald Trump, who if you think about it is not cool. He's not a cool guy. He's vulgar, he's ostentatious, he's embarrassing, he has a hideous combover, he ran casinos, beauty pageants, the whole bit, and now he's the transfiguration of the God and Country people -- who are like him proud to be uncool.

They never got it in the first place. I remember when I visited some of my old friends after I moved to Boulder and become postmodern and cool, I guess, or I thought I was. I literally started using the word 'Cool'. "That's cool. Let's do this. Cool."

One of my friends stopped me one time and said, "When did you start using 'Cool'?" He said "That's annoying. I don't like that cool thing." I didn't quite get the significance of it at the time. It seemed odd to me, but it really does epitomize this move into Green, what is the expression of a post-truth world where we just bebop around. We're on this rock hurtling through space and, yeah, at least let's not be a square. And you see the expressions of this in the culture of irony and cynicism and anti-heroes ... and transgression itself became a basis for art.

All right. We've now seen the evolution of truth in human history, and of course Integral Theory shows us that this pattern repeats itself in each of our own individual histories. We're born as babies into a magical world than we download the great national and religious myths, and then some of us are drawn into a scientific worldview, and some fewer of us are drawn into a postmodern worldview. And of course the beat goes on, hallelujah, and some more fewer of us are drawn into the next stage of consciousness, and that is what we call the *Integral* stage of consciousness, and it has its own unique relationship to the truth, and we're just figuring out what it is.

The fact that it's so up and in our face, and in our culture with Trump and the whole post-truth meme ... it just begs to be explored, and we're the explorers. We're exploring new territory and we're planting our flag so that we can cut the grooves for the next stage of human development.

Okay. What does this integral territory look like? What is beyond post-truth?

I start with what I consider to be a core integral practice, and that is to welcome in all of the previous stages with an open heart and an open mind. That means the Trump supporter. That means Trump himself - and Kellyanneo Oh my God. Let's remember that practice is the thing we do not to be successful, but faithful. So we can do it!

I mean, we want to see the value in everybody. That's actually one of the principles of Integral theory and practice, and I love that. Each stage and each person has some precious piece of the truth that others of us don't, and as an integral practitioner, we want to be able to see that truth, and to include it, to integrate it into a larger, more complex consciousness, a consciousness that can hold multiple perspectives.

Because let's face it, the aforementioned stages of development are all natural enemies in the wild. Liberals and conservatives basically hate each other. They don't understand each other. They don't process information the same way. We see they don't relate to truth in the same way, and this is the basis of the culture wars.

But as integralists, we say to the culture wars, or at least I do: "Bring it on". The way of evolution is that we fight our way forward. We "the other F-word" our way forward, too, but that's another podcast. Or actually, it's what we're going to do here and now, and that is to love, let's say, our way forward by taking a breath ... expanding ... and including more of our crazy, mixed up human family.

Okay. Let's start with those crazy Trump people. Actually, before we do that, let's just do an update snapshot here of Trump himself. Here we are in the aftermath of his first consequential official act, this Travel Ban from seven muslim countries. And how

poorly executed it was, whatever you may think of the merits, with rookie mistakes like not vetting it with your own Secretary of Defense or Secretary of State or National Security Advisor. So the pundits are all sitting here wondering, "How could he do that?" My answer is that the guy acts out of an unadulterated red warrior consciousness, and red is about fighting. That's the real fighting meme.

Red is where if you wake up in the morning, and you don't have an enemy and you don't have somebody that you're going up against, then you don't feel alive. And you also don't feel like you're doing your job, that you're not being responsible, because the enemy is out there, and they're fighting and they're scheming, and it's a fight to the finish, it's either you or them. And if you're really good at this you can apparently get a long way in life - including to the presidency of the United States.

Donald Trump, unfortunately I guess, has had zero feedback from life that this behavior doesn't work. I've explained a lot of my argument for Donald Trump's redness in previous podcasts - including I think 'Trump the Terrible: The Boy Who Would Be King' and the latest one was right before the inauguration, 'The Trump Era: Day 45 - Prepare For Impact' - so I don't want to repeat all of that here, but I do want to say that one of the best ways to understand Trump's leadership style, if you will, is to look at what the leadership style of red is, which is that of a warlord basically. Warlords rule by being ruthless, by being impulsive, decisive. I mean, it's almost like 80-plus percent of the job is just keeping everybody's eyeballs on you, and you don't do that by going along and getting along. You do that by keeping people at a certain level of chaos and confusion, and then going in and setting thing straight. Will Trump learn his lesson from the chaos he caused from this Travel Ban? I don't think so; not if he continues to play to his red type.

So to me, there are a couple questions at this stage of the game. The first is, "Is Donald Trump deploying these red actions, this creation of chaos and his red persona as a tough guy ... Is he using these deliberately, from a higher place where he has a choice in the matter?"

If so, that would be basically an integral move, a move that understands that creation and destruction are indestructible polarities and they have to happen at the same time. It's like the Zen master: sometimes I have to hit people with a stick. And when necessary, I can be amber and believe in God, and I can be orange and I can plan and work in the capitalist system, and I can even be green and hobnob with Manhattan glitterati for several decades. If he's doing that, he would be what Spiral Dynamics would call us 'Spiral Wizard', a virtuoso in playing in many stages of development. But I fear he is not doing this out of choice, but simply out of compulsion - and frankly a personality disorder that is some combination of narcissism and ADD.

That's one question. The second question is "Can the system contain him?" Whether or not he's red by choice or compulsion, can the system stand? I'm talking

about the other branches of government, the military, the bureaucracy, the world community? Can they withstand this force of nature that has suddenly blown into a category five and threatens to blow down the house ... and Senate? I think we're going to see a test of this actually coming up, and that's a specific test where Trump has asked his Defense Department to see how we can defeat ISIS in 30 days and to change the rules of engagement to make that happen. This is really going to be interesting because all he's actually asking us to do or the military to do is to go back to the rules of engagement that we had in World War 2 where we didn't worry about civilian casualties - or at least we didn't worry about them enough to stop us from firebombing and ultimately dropping nuclear bombs. And people who are at that traditional stage of development, which is basically the center of gravity in World War 2, can't understand why we fight these long, endless wars with these little piss-ant enemies when we defeated the Nazis and the Imperial Japan in four years.

The answer is is because we have had enormous moral development since World War 2 and we're not willing to kill innocent people, women and children, and wreck cities, and instead, we fight these long, low level, grinding wars that actually create, historically, compared to any wars in history, stunningly small numbers of casualties. We're actually seeing a throwback to the World War 2 rules of engagement in Syria where Russia is bombing civilians and cities. And Trump's like, "Why don't we do that? What's up with that?" That certain percentage, 30, maybe 40% of the population thinks that that's what they want too. Now, wait until they see it on TV ...

Anyway, to get back to this question of "Can this system contain him?", will the military go along? He's the Commander-In-Chief. There's a chain of command. The military ethos is that you obey the chain of command unless the order is illegal, and that we learned from World War 2, so we're about to see something very interesting unfolds here.

I would also add that the longer grinding war can eventually pay off. I mean, we're seeing that with ISIS. ISIS is about to lose the rest of Mosul, and they're on the run, which to a red mindset says "This is the time you squash them like a bug so they never come back". Then actually, if you use World War 2 moral development, you go in and rebuild the country. You don't occupy. You don't exploit. This is the move into modernity where you realize that the way forward is to build a trading partner, to become friends with this country that you defeated.

That's where Donald Trump doesn't even make it to traditional amber. I mean, he's down in red where it's like "defeat Iraq and take their oil." That's the plunders of war; I get that from a red perspective. You would be irresponsible not to. "Build a wall and make Mexico pay for it." These kinds of statements, I mean, they're garden-variety red. In a real historical red culture, you'd enslave the Mexicans and make them build it.

And it just shows how much moral development has taken hold, that to hear people talk about that now, you'd think they were the drunk at the end of the bar ... or the President of the United States! I've got to stop laughing about this. A friend warned me the other day, "Trump isn't funny", so sorry for laughing.

But really, we're about to see if this system can contain this guy, and I suspect it can. It was a little bit hopeful that Trump while still insisting that torture works and he's for it, said he would defer to his generals (who aren't for it), so we'll see how this goes. I think it's pretty much the way Bill Maher put it in his last show: it all depends on sane republicans. Will John McCain and Lindsey Graham and Jeff Flake and Ben Sasse, will these guys join with the democrats to oppose Trump when he goes too far outside of the box? Or the generals as I mentioned, or the bureaucracy, which is well-known to throw a monkey wrench in the plans and orders of presidents that they don't agree with? It may turn out that the bureaucracy is our new best friend. And I certainly don't rule out that all of this could lead to a constitutional crisis. And the dreams of some of my liberal friends will come true, and Donald Trump will not finish his first term ... And the land will be blessed with President Pence.

Okay. Enough about Trump for now. Let's look at the people who support Trump, and we all know who these people are: the racists, the sexists, and the xenophobes. At least this is the perspective of many people on the left, and that's the perspective that keeps the culture wars going. An integral perspective, however, would maybe choose different words to start: words like "ethnocentric", "nationalistic", "people who prefer traditional sex roles".

Although we can see that the bulk of Trump's supporters skew around the demographic of white, rural, non-college educated voters, millions of people who supported Trump are really all over the culture. I mean, they live modern lives, they do modern work, they have higher education, many of them, many of them are very successful and make a lot of money. But there's an essential part of their identity, of their self-sense, that just is more comfortable with, that resonates more with, traditional values. You see people like this in the integral movement. There are number of people who have written to me and say, "Don't assume that I wasn't for Trump. I listen to your podcast all the time, and I get it, and I think he's the better choice."

A lot of these people come to these values after giving them a lot of thought. I think one of the best examples of this is Steve Bannon or who was the editor of Breitbart News and has become Donald Trump's philosophical advisor and visionary of the Trump Presidency. Steve Bannon and a lot of intellectual conservatives believe that western civilization was bequeathed to us by Almighty God. In the case of Steve Bannon, and I'll quote him, he says that "The Catholic church and our western

civilization is the flower of mankind". Now, I don't agree with that, and at least not in the more or less literal way that he does, but can I respect that position?

The answer is yes. At any rate, I can see that western civilization is an astonishing achievement of mankind and that it needs to be valued and protected. Bannon argues for an "enlightened capitalism" where he asks the question, "Should we put a cap on wealth creation and distribution?" That's interesting to me. He says, "This is something that should be at the heart of every Christian who is a capitalist. What is the purpose of whatever I'm doing with this wealth? What is the purpose of what I'm doing with the ability that God has given us, the divine providence that He has given us to actually be the creator of jobs and the creator of wealth?"

Now, you drop the God part out, there's a lot there that liberals could agree with policy-wise. But it's hard to drop the God part out because it's so central to his worldview, and this gets to how a premodern mentality deals with truth. They see that there is a truth that is greater than facts, and that is that "we are living in a world created for us by God who created each of us deliberately and specifically, and that the first spark of life in the womb is the touch of God, and that we are here fighting a battle for God in a fallen world, and that we are indeed God's chosen people. And it is our duty to notice that and to fucking act like it. God put us here to do something. Let's do it." They really do believe in the superiority of Christianity, or whatever religion, and their culture. That's part of the deal at that structure of consciousness, which we can refer to as 'Absolutistic'. Not only do they have truth, they have *absolute* truth. For them the grand narratives of history are still very much alive.

Now, a modernist hears this and says, "This is silly and unverifiable. The idea that Jesus walked on water, the resurrection, all of it ... it's myth." Then, a green postmodernist sees this and says, "It's not only silly but it's dangerous. And it's regressive in trying to pull us back to dark times of racism and sexism and xenophobia, and all of the ethnic conflicts of history that are still going on. Can't you people see that?"

From an integral view, we can see all of those perspectives. We literally identify with a space within which perspectives arise, so all of those perspectives can be on line for in an integral consciousness without us being contracted around any one of them. Now, we may have a home-base perspective that we used to be contracted around. Most of us integralists are coming out of green or some version of modernity, but we don't necessarily privilege it because we can see that there is truth in the whole system. And we can see through the eyes of a traditionalist in the sense that yes, we too can see that the world is a miracle, that life is a miracle, that there is some loving intelligence that appears to be online and available to us. And that we can relate to it, and it can be a beacon in our life and provide the greatest meaning to our life. But we

drop that ethnocentric mythology that says that we are in a battle with the forces of evil - AKA other religions and cultures. And so that's what Integral does. Integral takes the goodies and runs.

Actually, Integral sees what's healthy about any single first tier perspective and also sees what isn't, and separates the two. It's not that hard. When you're expanded enough to hold a perspective, there's a natural intelligence. This is maybe God, this loving intelligence that comes in and lets you know what's good and what's not so good about any single perspective. It's just there. It's called 'Wisdom' I think.

We can bring this same wisdom to our investigation of the modern perspective which we can also easily and fully hold. Here we say, "Hey, rationality, how fabulous are you that you led us to free ourselves from the tyrannies and cruelties of superstition, to unlock the secrets of nature, to turn a big pile of dirt into a Toyota?" We send these amazing, giant eyeballs out into space to get an ever bigger view of our cosmic neighborhood. And apple martinis ... as my friend, Maria would say, "What a world it is when we can have an apple martini whenever we want?". So yeah, thank you modern rational world of facts and physics and chemistry and biology! And as integralists, we appreciate this immeasurably.

And we also see where rationality has overstepped its bounds. Rationality, science, fact ... these are all the domain of exterior manifest reality. In Integral Theory, these are the right hand quadrants, the material world, and material sciences are very potent in this world. The principles and formulas of chemistry and physics and biology are as true in China as they are here or anywhere else. But like all first tier memes, rationality falls in love with itself and thinks that it's the only game in town, And it either ignores or tries to colonize interior reality, the world of faith, belief, meaning, creativity, and free will. And science and rationality wants to expand itself into what we call the 'Social Sciences': Anthropology, Sociology, Psychology, even Biology to a degree. I think it's just astonishing that the whole medical dogma on saturated fat that I grew up with, that dominated medicine for 30 years, is now out the door. Now, we're on to sugar.

I don't know. I saw a study the other day that said that flossing your teeth doesn't do any good. I mean, I'm betrayed by 'Science' - and by the way, I'm still flossing. And in social sciences, there's a movement to try to duplicate well-known social science experiments about how people act in various situations. You read them all the time. They're the stuff of Psychology Today magazine and countless websites.

It's interesting. It's good. It moves the ball, but these studies are not always true in the sense that they're not replicable. I mean, that of course is one of the basic pillars of science is that what's true in one place is always true in all places. You can say that about water molecules, but *can't* say that about human beings. So as integralists, we want to both value the amazing tool of rationality and we want to be careful that it's not

overextended into dimensions of life that aren't rational. And those are the left hand quadrants, the world of interiority. In the upper left quadrant it is the world of my individual psyche, which is trailing 10,000 years of karma. And of course in the lower left quadrant it is the culture, which is just a bunch of people trailing millions of years, you might say, of karma. So we just get smarter about all of it, and we hold truth claims a little more lightly. And we also want to be more steadfast, and ferocious even, in defending what is factually true about the material world, such as how many people were on the Washington Mall during Trump's inauguration. That's a knowable fact. We have photographs.

But how about his tandem claim that he would have won the election if it weren't for three to five million people who voted illegally? Now, that's a little softer fact because we don't have photographic proof, but we do have enough information from people whose job it is to know such things to know that this is not a problem, certainly nothing of the magnitude that he says. And we're seeing an interesting pushback from the mainstream media who are planting their flag for facts against this pre-truth president. You'll see it even from Fox News or at least some quarters of Fox News, the mainstream part of Fox News (by that, I mean, the non-Sean Hannity part or Fox & Friends). But often, throughout the day on Fox News, you hear a solid factual pushback on this. I offer you this snippet from the other day on Shepard Smith's midday show where he pushes back against Trump's claims:

Shepard Smith: Fox News is not aware of any reliable studies or information that suggests that there was widespread voter fraud anywhere in America. Individual secretaries of state across the nation oversee elections. Most of them happen to be Republican, and every secretary of state in the United States reports there is no widespread voter fraud. A Pew study once cited by the President's team shows not a single incident of voter fraud across the nation, and even Republican House Speaker, Paul Ryan said yesterday, "There is no evidence". President Trump has said that he would have won the popular vote, except that millions of people, three to five million people voted illegally. Again, he has presented no reliable evidence and neither Fox News, nor any other organization of any kind has presented any evidence of voter fraud.

Jeff Salzman: All right already, Shep, we get it. Facts, evidence ... you're all about it. I got to say that gives me a lot of reassurance. As did Greg Gutfeld on the same day on the show, 'The Five' where he was commenting on how reasonable sane Republicans can deal with Trump's obvious lies. Here's what he had to say:

Greg Gutfeld: The one thing that I think is important about The Five and us here is that nobody is actually agreeing with Donald Trump, and we're showing you don't have to agree with everything that he says. It's not a loyalty test every time he says something. When he says "There's three million fraudulent votes", you could still like the guy and go "that's BS". The problem is he's surrounded by a lot of people that just go "Do we agree with him or not? Will I lose my job?" It doesn't have to be fealty 24/7. You can actually say, "Lighten up. It's nuts. You won."

Jeff Salzman: That, my friends, is the sound of the modern system trying to contain a pre-modern, pre-truth Donald Trump. A modernist system based on facts and evidence is pushing back against a essentially red premodern, pre-truth president who is used to reality being whatever he says it is. That people on the right are making the kind of distinction that Greg Gutfeld just made is just a real-time sign. It's evidence of cultural evolution.

And so again, as integralists, we take a breath and hold all of it as we expand to include the postmodern view. How does integral relate to the post-truth world? Again, I go to Ken Wilber and his new paper, 'Trump and A Post-Truth World' where he talks about the green post-truth ethos that says, and I'll quote him here. He says, "There is no universally valid perspective. Therefore, all knowledge is based on mere interpretation announced from a privileged, therefore oppressive perspective."

For green, since there's no universal truths, what history really amounts to is one group of people oppressing the next, and whoever was able to do that was in charge and got to write the rules for what was true. Ken continues. He says, "Also, there is no universal moral framework. What is true for you is true for you, and what's true for me is true for me." Isn't that just the motto of the postmodern world? He goes on to say, "Neither of those claims can be challenged on any grounds that do not amount to oppression". Very interesting, and so that becomes the story of the green meme. That's the truth of the green meme. That's the one truth that they will buy, and that is that there is no truth, and therefore, all claims to such are oppressive.

If the truth is really nothing more than a power grab, then our first job as postmodernists in this post-truth world is to rescue all the people who have been shut out, who have been left behind and marginalized, the victims of the earlier truth claims, and this kind of thinking gave rise to a whole new cultural emergent that started taking shape in the '60s and continues to this day, and that is the anti-authoritarianism.

The job here is to challenge authority, rehabilitating the powerless, rescuing women from the patriarchy, minorities, gays, the poor, the oppressed, the indigenous population, the people who are living in countries that have been plundered by

colonialism, exploited by modern capitalism. This becomes the organizing energy, the principle, the motivating energy behind green consciousness. And this too is an astonishing achievement of humanity ... that after creating this modern world, that we want to look back and see who has been left behind. This realization comes out of the ever greater sensitivity that comes online at the postmodern stage.

It is just the natural evolution of human consciousness that we develop a sensitivity towards other people's interiors, other people's feelings, other people worldviews, other people's culture. Except of course for the culture we ourselves we're trying to escape, so it's still okay to make fun of and look down on the Christians and hillbillies and all of that, but we want to open our hearts to Muslims. Which is of course is all good unless you're rejecting your own traditionalist truths, and this is where we start running off the rails.

I think it's really interesting to look at our green selves and to really touch into our own sensitivities, and to realize that those sensitivities have evolved over our own individual lives. I mean, I think of myself as a gay kid in the Steel Valley in the '60s and '70s. By any standard of how I understand human rights now, I was oppressed. I was unable to speak about my love or my passions. Young teenage love was off the table for me. But was I angry about it? Did I feel oppressed? No. It's just the way things were. I couldn't reveal who I was and I was willing to live my life accordingly. And that's true for people who are at traditional or early modern stages of development. You accept your lot even if you get the bad end of the stick.

I have so many of my liberal women friends who were just deeply outraged that Trump, this misogynous molester, this pussy-grabber, is the president of the United States. They can't understand how 51% of white women voted for him. Two or three of them have told me stories about how they in their earlier life were groped, one of my friends had somebody exposed himself to her as a 11-year old girl ... and they didn't tell anybody. It didn't register for them as outrage then as deeply as it does now, and that's simply the result of evolution. We have a graduated outrage, and now, we just ... I mean, it's viscerally repulsive.

There's a simple example of I grew up in a household where both of my parents smoked. They smoked in the house. They smoked in the car. They smoked. It was just how it was. Now, if I walk up next to somebody who's smoking *outside* and I smell it, I'm outraged. I can't believe that my first job, we had an ashtray on the conference table in the advertising agency I worked in. This is back in the '70s. That you could smoke on airplanes. It's viscerally repulsive to me now ... but that's the evolution of our own sensitivity and we don't get that until we're moving into the postmodern world or late modern. To expect that people who aren't at the same stage we are, or who aren't looking through the same set of lenses that we are, get it in the same way ... that we do that is actually a form of aggression, and paradoxically, a new kind of oppression

that we see in the overreach of political correctness as green, multi-culturalism and pluralism falls so deeply in love with itself.

As integralists, we see all of this. We can relate to it. We can find it in our own histories. We can feel it in our own chakric systems, and in so doing, we become bigger. We become more tolerant of and/or friendlier towards our own failings and the failings of others, and maybe even stop seeing them as failings.

We certainly don't think of a nine-year old as being a defective 12-year old. A nine-year old is a nine-year old. All of us are on a trajectory of development. That's just built into the system, and that becomes essentially the new grand narrative of history. Yay, we get our grand narrative back!

Except this grand narrative isn't obviated by science. In fact, it is science that reveals it to us. Science shows us that we banged into being 14 billion years ago and we worked our way from stardust to Starbucks. There really is something happening here and we're not in charge of it. We're in charge of our piece of it, but there are whole systems at work here and our new moral realization is that we're not really here to fix each other. It doesn't really work.

That's what we realize, and actually ... I don't really want you to be more like me. I actually want you to be more you. I want to see who you are and who you're growing into, and I want to help that happen. And we're going to start right where you are and right where I am right now, and that becomes our orientation as integralists, so that you can really approach everybody as a friend. That doesn't mean you let them walk all over you. That doesn't mean that you don't set limits. That doesn't mean that you don't challenge them, but it does mean that you have to love them.

I know a lot of you are thinking about this and what this means. I think this really is new territory. I got a lovely letter from one of my listeners, Robbie Grabowitz, and I'll quote just a couple of lines. He said, "I've thought about writing something about how our culture could benefit from reintegrating some of the imaginative consciousness of red that Donald Trump is such a master of wielding". He goes on to say, "I feel like we not only need to be able to wield facts, but also to have some part of us operating from the level of consciousness that makes alternative facts. I don't know what that really looks like quite yet, but it's an idea I've been floating around." Don't you love that? I love that.

So yeah. Where's our red? What are we doing with our red? Maybe we need to shrug off a certain kind of propriety the same way the Victorians did eventually and allow for a little less civility, a little more honesty. Remember that "radical honesty" movement back in whenever it was, the '90s, where everybody told the unadulterated truth? It's a practice. I mean, it's a dangerous one and we're not going to go all the way there, but I think we can handle more.

I think we can handle the alt right acting up at public events like the left did in the '60s. They're speaking truth to power by their own lights. We can expand ourselves to tolerate that as long as people aren't getting hurt. Now, people's feelings can get hurt, that's the thing, but people's bodies can't. That's a bright line that we can draw, and within that bright line, we can make it our business to just drink each other up, man, appreciate each other, and appreciate the different ways that truth is revealed to each of us.

I was reading Whitman the other night, and Whitman loved to hang out with the lower classes and the immigrants, and even at the slave markets when he was in the south. And he hung out with the dock guys and laborers, and he not only tolerated, he *celebrated* their uncouthness, and turned it into art. Here's a few lines from his wonderful poem, 'I Sing The Body Electric'. He says:

*The male is not less the soul, nor more—he too is in his place;
He too is all qualities—he is action and power;
The flush of the known universe is in him;
Scorn becomes him well, and appetite and defiance become him well;
The wildest, largest passions, bliss that is utmost, sorrow that is utmost, become him well—pride is for him;
The full-spread pride of man is calming and excellent to the soul.*

Ah, as always, thank you so much, Walt. What art can do!

All right, everybody. I think that's enough for now. I think we're bumping up against the one-hour mark, so I think I'll call it a podcast.

Thanks so much for listening. You can check out more of my stuff at DailyEvolver.com. All right. Until next time, this is Jeff Salzman signing off. Keep it integral, people!