

## Validation for Einstein, funeral for Scalia. Plus, gun-love in America

Jeff: Good evening everybody and welcome to the Daily Evolver Live. It's Tuesday, February 16th. I'm Jeff Salzman here in Boulder, Colorado with our producer, Brett Walker. Hey Brett.

Brett: Hey everyone.

Jeff: Corey deVos is over at Integral Radio, taking care of things over there. I am happy to be here and happy to have you with me. We have a lot we want to get to, tonight. First of all, Einstein had a big week when the General Theory of Relativity got its final proof. We might want to take another look at the phenomena of Donald Trump, who continues his Red rampage through the Republican Party.

In a few minutes, I want to bring on my dear friend and Integral mentor, Steve McIntosh to talk about the death of Supreme Court Justice, Antonin Scalia and the ramping up of political polarization that his death is already sparking between the President and Congress.

But first, a couple of words from our sponsor. Integral Life is the central web portal for the worldwide Integral community. The good folks there, Corey DeVos, David Riordan and the gang, they really generate tons of high-quality Integral content from some of the leading luminaries in the Integral world. Here's a short list of what's coming up from Integral Life.

First of all, Ken Wilber, whose home is at Integral Life as well, will be doing a live, Full-Spectrum Mindfulness presentation this weekend for the Wisdom 2.0 Conference in San Francisco. Integral Life is also about to publish the final lectures of "*Okay, I'm dead. Now what?*" -- *Practices for Living, Dying, and Living Again* with Andrew Holecek. Ken's new book *Integral Meditation* -- it's really terrific -- comes out on March 15th. Keep an eye out for that.

You know, if you're a serious Integral enthusiast or practitioner, it's really worth your trouble to check out Integral Life. And perhaps, pony up the \$100 a year it takes to be a member and join the community. There's really a thriving community and conversation going on there, as well.

### THE INTERIOR MESSAGE OF THE GENERAL THEORY OF RELATIVITY

All right, so let's look at this crazy, mixed up week in the long arc of evolutionary history. First of all what got my attention, in some ways above everything, was, as I said, the proof for the General Theory of Relativity. What actually happened is that ... well, from the bigger perspective, we human beings, we Homo sapiens, the *beings* who can *think* ... who climbed down from the trees on planet Earth two hundred thousand years ago, have detected ripples in the matrix of space and time.

That's an amazing realization: that the substrate from which we build our lives, time and space, are not nearly as solid as we thought. In fact, they are malleable. We know this because we humans (I always like to think of us as the bigger group, that's the world-centric view) ... we human beings built this amazing installation called LIGO (the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory), a \$1 billion facility that is half in Louisiana and half in Washington State ... both sites of which feature two metal shafts that are 2.5 miles long, perpendicular to each other. Last week this "antenna" detected one of the biggest things imaginable: the collision of two black holes that happened one billion years ago. It turns out that the echo, the ripple from that event, can still be felt in this moment.

That is a huge discovery. I don't really quite understand it or fathom it in a mathematical sense, but I listen to the scientists who do. I heard one describe it as it being like "The first flicker of light that someone might see before the sun comes up and illuminates a whole landscape." We're building another one of these

facilities, and in a couple of years, we're launching one into space. It's like having a new sense, in addition to seeing and hearing, that gives us a new perspective on the universe.

Ok, so now it is true that time and space are malleable. That's a scientific realization. Nobody who is scientific would disagree with that. That's the small "r" realization.

But there's the capital "R" Realization too, which is the small "r" realization, plus "Wow." It is the wow factor. The first part of the wow for me is, aren't we amazing, we human beings, that we actually know such things. Really, it's just astonishing to me that we have been able to figure something like this out. Of course when I say we, I mean Albert Einstein, who figured it out 100 years ago.

I remember when I was younger reading about the beauty of mathematics and the music of the spheres and all of that stuff. I always felt bad because I was never good at math. I never really figured that I would ever really get the beauty part of that. But I do, now. I now realize that, what human beings have been able to do is to create an abstract system of thought, mathematics, that can distill the principles of *exterior concrete* reality -- what we can see and feel and measure and peer into, such as the universe -- we can distill all of those principles into an *interior abstract* system of thought.

In this abstract reality, we can describe things about concrete reality that we otherwise haven't been able to see, feel or demonstrate. That's exactly what happened. 100 years ago Einstein mathematically figured out that, "If this abstract system really indeed does reflect reality, this is what reality has to be like." That's astonishing to me. That's what human beings can do.

From an Integral perspective we would say that, that is a modern realization, the small "r" realization. But then, there is another step that Integral consciousness can take. There's the capital "R" Realization that time and space are not solid. This Realization opens up and lights up our present moment experience. There is a quote from Emerson that Steve shared with me this afternoon. What Emerson said is, "Every natural fact is a symbol of some spiritual fact."

Likewise, Ken Wilber's quadrant theory says that for every object in the exterior quadrants, there is a correlate object in the interiors. For every object in the exterior world, we have an object in consciousness that correlates to it.

So what is the interior Realization of the General Theory of Relativity?

This week I had a semi-traumatic experience, for an Enneagram 5 at least. I read an article that gave a beautiful, poetic, interior view of what the theory's proof could mean means for people. It was actually in USA Today, I think. But I lost track of it. I erased my history and my Evernote didn't work, so it wasn't saved. I spent at least an hour looking for it, I couldn't find it. Normally you can Google something. It's just become this sort of white whale that I can't find. If anybody finds it, from what my description is, please send it to me.

Anyway, the science writer said that one of the ways we can think about relativity is that when we add time as a fourth dimension, which is what the theory does, we don't want to just see it as time added on to length and width and depth (the classic three dimensions). We want to see that the whole thing is one interpenetrated four-dimensional reality.

What that means is that every moment contains all of the previous moments, all of time. That is a realization that we can breathe in. It's like Whitman said, "We inhale great drafts of space" when we realize something like that. This science writer said much the same thing. I remember the example he used. He said, "It would be, as if we were dealing with people who could only see 2 dimensions, and we can see 3. We would feel sorry for these people who are limited to 2 dimensions."

I was explaining this to my friend Brian, and he gave me a great example of that very thing. He'd been watching a science documentary about the constellations of stars, specifically, the Big Dipper. Brian has been involved in Astrology, and he loves the sky and nature and all of that stuff. The point that the documentary was making is that the Big Dipper isn't actually a thing. It's simply what appears in a two-dimensional view of the stars in the night sky. If you leave Earth and travel into space and look at it from any other perspective other than from Earth, the Big Dipper vanishes. They're just seven of the billions

of stars in the galaxy. They're all light years from each other. They're different in history and age.

The capital "R" Realization came for Brian when they did some animation and it was like, "whoa." Great drafts of space! That is the feeling that we get from two-dimensions to three-dimensions. Ok, so now we have four-dimensional reality. One that includes, in an interpenetrated way, the dimension of time, which says that everything that has ever happened is still reverberating in this moment.

This so moved me because it's an analog for what I talk about all the time in terms of what Integral consciousness reveals about our interiority (our consciousness and culture): that each of us and all of our cultures are all moving objects. While we think we live in this normal consciousness that has us moving from stage to stage ... that there is a bigger consciousness that realizes that it contains the karmas of all of stages right now. All of it -- human history and our individual history -- is present in this moment. Integral theory, developmental theory in general, helps us understand that because we see that there are stages of human growth.

All of these stages: tribal and magic and mythic and traditional ... modern, postmodern, integral ... these all arise out of each other in a way where, as the new level transcends the old level, it includes the old level. We include and transcend, and nothing goes away. The energies and the karmas of our previous levels of development are still in us and available to us.

We are more verb than noun. We are not just human beings, we are human becomings. And so is everybody we meet. We can see them, and there's width and there's depth and there's height ... but there's also all of history that is moving in a creative way, adding new stuff, new creativity in every moment. I just think that is fantastic.

To go back to Whitman, I'll finish that one verse. He says, "I inhale great drafts of space. The north and the south are mine, and the east and the west are mine. I am larger, better than I thought. I did not know I held so much goodness. All seems beautiful to me."

I think that's just the nature of how integral consciousness helps us to expand and aerate the solidity that we thought was us. That the nature of that expansion is that the space into which we expand is itself loving and intelligent -- and good and true and beautiful. Hallelujah!

## **STEVE MCINTOSH ON THE DEATH OF SCALIA AND INCREASED POLARIZATION**

That was such an inspiration to me, this week. All right, so next, why don't we bring Steve in. Hey Steve! Welcome to Steve McIntosh, my dear friend. Steve is author of *Evolution's Purpose*, and his brand new book, *The Presence of the Infinite*. Steve is also the Co-Founder and President of the Institute for Cultural Evolution.

Steve: Hi, Brother Jeff.

Jeff: Hey man. Steve, you and I are going to do a talk later this week on a new paper that you wrote for the Institute for Cultural Evolution, on polarization. "Overcoming Polarization by Evolving Both Right and Left. How Polarity Theory Provides a Path to Political Progress."

I wanted to have you on tonight because this last weekend the US entered a new arena of political polarization with the death of Antonin Scalia. Of course Antonin Scalia, for those of you international listeners who may not know, is a Conservative icon on the US Supreme Court. A very, very consequential jurist who died at the age of 79, natural causes, but a surprise.

The Constitution says that the President shall nominate a replacement and the Senate shall approve or reject the nominee. That's all good, except that President Obama is a Democrat and the Senate is Republican currently, and it's leadership has vowed to not even consider any replacement that Obama would recommend because he's only got 11 more months in office -- and because they can. Because it is power politics at this level. They don't want the court to change, and apparently they can do it. So we have frozen polarization.

Steve, how do some of the principles you've been thinking and writing about apply in this situation? What do you see?

Steve: The untimely, or timely, depending on how you look at it, death of the Justice brings polarization to the forefront. It's a problem that we all know we have. It's been affecting our government for perhaps two decades at least, in terms of hyper partisan polarization. When the polarity becomes stuck, when there's so much loathing on either side, there is no compromise. When the Constitution was framed, there was an assumption that, even though there would be ranker and there would be differences -- politics would be ugly, no question -- but there would still be a binding element of us all being Americans. Us all caring about America's well-being.

While that still functions somewhat, for reasons that Integral explains and that I explain in the paper, it's broken down in ways that are interesting, and that provide, if you'll pardon the cliché, both a crisis and an opportunity. Polarization is a tremendous opportunity for an Integral perspective, because polarization's really a problem that can't be solved at the same level that created it. It takes integral thinking. Postmodern thinking can't solve it, nor can modernist thinking or traditional thinking. None of the earlier stages are capable of offering solutions and ...

Jeff: Because they still fantasize about winning.

Steve: Conquests.

Jeff: Exactly. All first-tier means, want to conquer the others. They think that once they make the unbelievers see the light then then they would win. Integral tells us, "not so fast."

Steve: For many years, for the majority of the 20th century, the traditional worldview and the modernist worldview had a kind of an establishment truce between themselves, right?

Jeff: Especially after World War II.

Steve: Right. That was the *liberal consensus* as it's known, which is broken apart by the emergence of the postmodern worldview, right? There was a truce, that truce was broken by the emergence of postmodernism, because then all deals were off between traditionalism and modernism. Now we have these three major worldviews. Even talking about the history and how polarization came about, is a highly involved discussion. The interesting thing about Scalia's death is that it brings polarization beyond just the conflict between the Legislative and the Executive branch. Now the third branch, the Judiciary is being potentially crippled by polarization.

The fact that all 3 branches are now involved means that there's a significant acceleration of the problem of polarization, which I think, creates an acceleration and the opportunity for Integral to show its power, by showing how it has realistic solutions that other stages can't provide.

Jeff: How would you describe those solutions? You talk about evolving both left and right. How do you see that working?

Steve: We started the think tank, the Institute of Cultural Evolution, in 2012 with the idea that the integral perspective could bring light to many different, important political problems. Our main focus was on climate change. That was where we thought we really had something to say about how we can overcome the cultural problem, which is behind the political problem, which is behind the engineering problem et cetera.

After working on climate change for over a year we realized that, the underlying issue was polarization itself. That, meaningful action on a climate change was being stymied by polarization. We spent 2014 working primarily on the problem of polarization and made some good progress.

Jeff: By polarization you mean, the attraction of people and Congress and our public servants, to these poles of Republican and Democrat, or left and right?

Steve: Yeah.

Jeff: To the point where we see that Congress people almost never vote outside of their caucus? Where we see that people, even regular citizens, not only disagree with the other side but they also, more now,

demonize the other side. They would be less happy to see their children, if they were a Democrat marry a Republican, than people 20 or 30 years ago.

Steve: Yes.

Jeff: That's amazing.

Steve: Right, but it's not just an inside the beltway problem. Part of the default thinking is that it's simply politicians behaving badly or the influence of money in politics. Or the influence on media is the main cause. Although those are certainly contributing factors, they're as much symptoms as they are, causes. That's why it's very difficult for people who are in the mainstream, for modernists especially, to understand the cultural roots of the problem because they can't really even see postmodernism as a coherent worldview. They don't understand how, although it doesn't have a lot of political power, it has profound cultural power, which influences politics in indirect but significant ways.

Just being able to understand and recognize postmodernism for both its strengths and its shortcomings, as a historically significant emergence in history ... If you can't even start there then you can't possibly fathom the causes, let alone the solutions to polarization. Beyond the stuckness inside the beltway the Republicans and the Democrats are highly polarized in the way that they can't cooperate. They can't exert a moderating influence on each other. They just are in gridlock or law jam, right?

Beyond Washington, beyond the electoral politics, we have a much broader polarization in the United States' culture. Social scientists have identified that as what they call *affective polarization*, or a loathing of the other side. Of course we can understand that in terms of the cultural war too. This differentiation that has led to the stages increasingly disliking each other and being unwilling to cooperate is actually a symptom of evolution itself.

Jeff: I was going to say, evolution is about differentiating. With polarization you can see this happening dramatically.

Steve: Right.

Jeff: We're actually seeing it happening even in the Presidential election. How, even the left is differentiating between Hillary and Bernie. The right is differentiating between the establishment and the renegades.

Steve: Right. I bring that out in the paper that, talking about polarization or politics in general, in terms of left and right is, it doesn't have enough resolution. Simple categories like left and right confuse the situation as much as they clarify. We do have a historically ingrained, 2-party system. We do have the left, right framing imposed by the media. There's still some meaning to left and right. But to more deeply understand you have to go to the next level. Within the left, there's a polarity. Within the right, there's a polarity.

After spending time on the problem of polarization itself, we realized to a degree that framing the problem as that is incorrect because we have to start upstream. The left and the right or Republicans and Democrats under current conditions are largely irreconcilable on most issues. Again, we can understand why that's the case. The idea that we're going to just glue the thesis and the antithesis back together, is completely naive and misunderstanding the evolutionary dimensions of what's going on.

In our work in the think tank, we've now moved to focusing on how we can make the left more mature and responsible, how we can improve and evolve the left in a way that makes it stronger and not in a 50-50 gridlock with the other side. We've found that evolving one side of the spectrum inevitably involves evolving the other. The two evolve together. That the evolution of one in a sense, gives permission for the evolution of the other and puts pressure on it.

That's what our strategy is now: evolving both the right and left independently, upstream from the polarization, with the idea that in a two-year time frame we could see measurable results by working on that as a prerequisite to greater cooperation, overall.

Another reason that progressives are often not attracted to the idea of polarization is because there's this sort of background default thinking that the solution inevitably involves a center is compromised at some

level. That centrism involves validating the right in a way that progressives are not prepared to do, and understandably, right?

That's why in the paper, I try to drill down, to below the candidates, below the issues, to get to the actual bedrock of loyalty and identity that exists, because ultimately I think that, that the way to overcome polarization is for all political constituencies to see more value, to see more of the virtue of the other. Even while they oppose them and want to beat them in an election, there's still a way in which, if you're going to follow the spiritual principle of "we are all one," that means that we're all one with all these people that we disagree with.

Jeff: I love what you said that, it's the process of increasing the scope of what you're able to value.

Steve: That in a sense is the summary of the mission of the Institute for Cultural Evolution. I think in some ways, it summarizes the overall Integral project of helping people appreciate how there's value at every stage in the spiral. That to be integral means to be able to metabolize the values at every stage. Even though you're not looking at them relativistically, as though they're all the same or equally valuable, but you've got to be able to reach back and appreciate the enduring values, the bricks in the wall that we're standing on. That applies in politics, where that's the most difficult to do.

Jeff: People on the left want to expand their value sphere, to include at least some of the values on the right, and vice versa.

Steve: Right. One of our jobs is, to translate integral thinking into terms that modernists can get, because they hold the political power and most of the economic power. We want to influence the influencers. We want to have an impact on the mainstream. That means, translating our arguments and our thinking into terms they can understand. Inevitably, that involves an oversimplification or creating potential for confusion.

One of the things that Integral philosophy and its adoption and refinement of polarity theory has really showed us is that there'll always be some version of a left and a right. Now hopefully, we need a more evolved version of both, but the polarity itself is like a morphic field. The polarity is indestructible. Our best hope for improving things, but also rescuing our democracy from the threats that it currently faces, both in terms of falling apart because the government becomes paralyzed, and being threatened by demagogues like Trump, which is a big threat to our democracy. It actually matters, democracy is vulnerable, and we have to care.

I think that people who have integral consciousness have a special duty to participate in politics because they've got thinking and perspectives and indeed answers that are really needed. It takes work, to try to translate that thinking and those perspectives into meaningful solutions, to real problems that people have.

Jeff: Just to go back to Trump for a second. He is blowing up the calcified polarity that the right has developed over the last 20 years. Of victimization and their own self-righteousness. Both sides have it, of course. But he was up there, last Saturday night at the debate, defending planned parenthood, talking about universal healthcare. He was doing the "Bush lied people died" thing regarding the Iraq war ... that's arguable, but boy, that's not a Republican talking point.

Steve: No.

Jeff: Is he part of the solution or is he just ... How do you see him? It's so interesting.

Steve: Yeah, first let me say that, of course I'm horrified and disgusted. I think he is a threat to American good governance. I think if Trump was elected, it'd be a global disaster. I'm going to just go on the record in condemning him roundly. I can also say, there are things that I like about the phenomenon of his candidacy. One is that, it shows that we do have a real democracy. That it's not just fixed by the establishment and the media, or the partition backroom dealmakers who decide it all for us.

That there is a price to be paid for alienating the working class, the 40% of Americans who are attracted to Trump. That the fallout from the recession and the gross inequality that we face right now, it has consequences. These are showing up in electoral politics in a way that's horrifying the establishment on

both sides. The fact that it shows that the democracy's not fixed, that it's not just bought and sold. That the people do have power, even though it can be frightening. That's a good thing.

I think another good thing of the phenomenon of Trump is that, it shows how the media are reactive. How he just played them like a fiddle. How they're completely mortified by the way in which they're being played and they can't do anything about it. They have to report on it, they have to talk about it, even though they hate it.

Jeff: It's astonishing, yeah.

Steve: Yeah, yeah. I think it'll improve the media because it'll force them to see how reactive they are, and how trapped by their own commercialism. That a certain amount of old school Walter Cronkite responsibility is good. Not that we want to go back to a monolithic media. But at least the monolithic media, before it got blown up in 1000 ways that is positive, had some editorial discretion about what they were going to ignore. The new media doesn't have that kind of authoritative discretion. At least nowhere near like it used to. Trump has exploited it in a way that's completely embarrassing to the media establishment. I think that's a healthy thing.

Jeff: Yeah, I do too. Myself included.

Ok, Steve, so what does it look like after at least some good portion of what you are advocating has happened? After we have created the new synthesis out of the thesis and antithesis? We have a more involved right, a more involved left that include the values of the other. What's that look like? How long do we have to wait?

Steve: I don't have a crystal ball. I'm not a futurist in that way. I think ultimately, the synthesis involves the rise of the integral worldview as a historically significant cultural stage. I think that's awaiting upon the problematic life conditions for which Integral provides a solution. For years we've said, "We have a solution to a problem that people don't know they have," in a joking way. Now we're beginning to identify ...

Jeff: The solution in search of a problem.

Steve: Right, right. Now, polarization among other choice political problems is an existential problem that can't be solved with the level that created it, as I mentioned. In my work in my latest book, *The Presence of the Infinite*, I talk about a method for evolving consciousness that involves recognizing where these existential problems are, because those are where the openings for the insertion of higher-level values exist.

Integral brings a more inclusive set of values by better including all the values that have come along and adding some new ones. That value set can start to become visible to postmodernists and modernists at least, because they now have a problem for which their thinking can't provide a solution. That problem's getting worse and it does indeed, threaten our democracy at an existential level. Evolution can certainly regress. We take it for granted. US government is such an enduring historical institution that it seems invulnerable, but it is actually quite fragile. If it were to break down, I think the integralists would be among the first to be sent to the Gulag.

This really is a matter of significant concern, and that we have to be vigilant that we include a viewpoint of conservation. A conservative viewpoint is pretty important, especially if we recognize that this polarity of progressive and conservative being interdependent. That, there's a time to conserve our democracy, and then there's a time to press it, to progress. The two are like two legs. You can't really do one without the other.

Jeff: Thank you. I look forward to having a more full conversation about this, and about all your thinking about polarity in general, as you present in this amazing paper.

Steve: Thanks. We're going to get a chance to talk about the paper in the time ahead. We'll unpack it more, in a longer, theoretical discussion.

Jeff: Yeah, great. Thanks for coming over and sharing your thoughts on what's going on in politics in this moment.

Steve: Thank you. I got to just say, I'm so proud of you for doing the Daily Evolver and fulfilling this very important niche to having Integral Media. It's really a beautiful fruit of the spirit. I'm thrilled to participate with you and to just see how it's going from success to success. Congratulations on that.

Jeff: Oh, you're making me happy! Steve, thanks so much.

Steve: Thanks Jeff. Thanks for everything.

Jeff: You bet Read the paper at [culturalevolution.org](http://culturalevolution.org).

Steve: The paper is in the first slider window. You can just read it. It's 22 pages, and it's certainly some good food for thought in this poignant moment of intense polarization.

Jeff: All right, Brett, we're going to move to our "question of the week" from our listeners. As I often say, I really love hearing from you folks. You can email me at [jeff@dailyevolver.com](mailto:jeff@dailyevolver.com).

Even better, leave me a voicemail. Go to our website, [dailyevolver.com](http://dailyevolver.com). On the homepage, you'll see an orange button at the right that says, "Leave a voicemail for Jeff." We can play it on the air. I can answer in real time.

## **GUN LOVE IN AMERICA**

We have a question tonight, from a listener from Canada, Marilyn. Brett, we ready to roll?

Marilyn : *I'm not an American. As a non-American working in America, I find the apparent strengthening of this gun lobby - and Obama's (imo) courageous stand against it in the last year of his Presidency ... very, very troubling. I have to travel via Dallas/FW on a regular basis and feel like I am taking my life in my hands.*

*I am looking for an integrally-informed POV that you might offer that can give me some hope? guidance? sane advice? Am I too hubristic to think my non-gun Canadian POV provides some grounding to the small city in which I am working (Durant OK) on a very regular basis. Or should I abandon ship - if only in protest??*

*Thanks for any insights you can offer me on this particular American dilemma of the 2nd Amendment.*

Jeff: Thank you, Marilyn. Yeah, so what can Integral help us understanding about this particular American obsession with guns? We now have more guns in America, than people. Over 330 million. They are indeed lethal. We have every year somewhere around 30,000 gun deaths. That is 6 times what you have in Canada, and 14 times what you have in Northern Europe.

Now just statistically, it's interesting to see that 20,000 of those 30,000 are suicides. Isn't that something? 10,000 are homicides and 500 are accidents. I think statistically, you're in okay shape to come to America. You're about 1/4th likely to be killed by a gun, than by a car. Still, it's an atrocious number. All 30,000 of them are individual tragedies that we want to feel into.

We have in this country, spent billions of dollars, tackling terrorism in the last 10 years. Terrorism has killed about 300 Americans since 2005. In the same 10 years since 2005 we've had over 300,000 Americans die from gunshot wounds. It's pretty out of whack.

Now, what Integral can tell us are a couple of things that I think are really interesting. A lot of the explanation for American gun-love is typological. If you think of the founding of America, it was founded, at least by the European conquerors if you will, by people who left their home. Left home with virtually no hope of ever returning. What is the psychographic of a person like that?

That kind of adventuresome spirit, that kind of independence, that kind of agency, that lack of connection of the collective. I think, from an enneagram perspective that describes a lot of 8's, who are pretty intent on colonizing their worlds at any rate. 3's who are always looking for something new. Maybe a good number of good old restless 7s, who just can't sit still. There is a psychographic that is part of the DNA of America that comes from these people who left home. Some of them were the undesirables. Criminals, religious heretics, the pilgrims, the puritans. These were people who couldn't find a place in their home countries.



When they arrived here, of course, they arrived as people in a red/amber stage of development. Yet they arrived in a magenta world, world of tribal, native people. Of course, it was conquer mode from day one, basically. Guns and bullets made for a most unfair but successful fight for the Europeans. This is the nature of history. Higher developmental levels conquer lower developmental levels. That's just part of the way it works. Red/amber beats magenta, and it did.

As Americans conquered the continent, there were no systems in place. There was no king or monarchy or remnants of the King. It was literally, as we say, the Wild West. It was every man and woman, if you will, or gang or clan for themselves. That's just the nature of the beast, here in America.

Interestingly, also the same thing happened in Canada, except Canada did a couple of things differently. I'll get to a couple of them in a minute. Part of it may just be also, typological or temperamental. We see this in Europe; the Scandinavians tend to be more peaceful. The Northern Americans in Minnesota have that sort of Scandinavian complexion. A lot of Danish in Iowa, they're also less aggressive. I think there's also some truth to that in Canada, as part of the DNA of Canada.

It's also developmental. There's a couple of things that we can see about gun ownership and the developmental stages in America. That is, first of all, as America continues to develop into modernity and postmodernity, fewer and fewer people have guns. It's a strange thing where we have postmodern people are embarrassed by guns. They have a repulsion to guns. I do. I just think, "What's up with that? What are you shooting all the time?" Moderns can feel this way, to some degree, but postmoderns for sure.

But while fewer people own guns, those who do have more and more of them. They'll often have 10, 20, 30 guns. They collect guns. It's a hobby for them. They also ... I think of some of my traditional friends from back home. They don't have the same kind of trust in the system that, modernists and most postmodernists do.

I feel like, I live in a town where the police are going to take care of me. My cousins don't necessarily feel that way, and they're not necessarily wrong. I remember, one of my young cousins telling me when I told him I didn't have a gun, he said, "You're irresponsible." He said, "I don't care so much about you because you live alone. But if you had a wife and kids, I'd smack you upside the head. You're not doing your duty. You got to protect your family."

I got it that, to not own a gun is irresponsible at that stage of development where you really have to take care of yourself. That's the way your mind works. And there's some truth to that.

Then you have the gun lobby that you talked about, they have the most passionate voters. These are the voters who go to the voting booth and they can throw elections one way or the other. You find that, there's one poll that showed that, 74% of even NRA members ... This was in the New York Times, favor universal background checks. 62% of all Americans approved of President Obama's executive actions last month. Will they get through Congress? No, because as Steve was talking about these states and gerrymander districts are so monoperspectival. They're so right or left that, to step outside of the lines is, to be voted out of office. Politicians know this.

I think another explanation of the difference between where America went with guns and where Canada went with them is a quirk of history. We wrote it into our Constitution that, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." That's pretty hard to get by. Yet the second amendment is written in two phrases. We always hear the second phrase, "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Yet the first part of the Second Amendment is, "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state ... the rights of the people etc." So we need a well-regulated militia to ensure that the security of a free state, therefore the rights of the people, shall not be infringed, to keep and bear arms.

The Supreme Court has not given much weight to the first phrase. Including Justice Scalia, who in the famous District of Columbia versus Heller decision said that, "Individual people have the right to bear arms in self-defense." That was a big move. Now forget the well-regulated militia -- any yahoo can go out and buy any gun he or she wants, and use it to shoot the candles off their birthday cake. There's no militia, and it's not very well-regulated. I think this is a misreading of the plain intent of the language, but that's not the direction we went, here in America.

Another thing I would say about most of the people who own guns, and what they want Liberals to understand, is that we don't have to fear them. They got it covered. I know, I grew up with these people. My dad, my uncles, they all had guns. It was a matter of pride that we took care of the guns, that everybody knew how they worked, that they were kept safe. Traditionalists want you to keep your hands off of that way of life.

I think in some ways, it's a little bit of a corollary to how liberals feel about gay marriage. You don't have to fear us. Gay marriage is not the end of the world. It's not the corruption of the institution of marriage. It's not going to pave the way to hell. Trust us on this. I think both are right, but it's hard for the other side to wrap their head around it.

All right, well I think we're about there for the night. I again, really appreciate everybody tuning in. Brett, is there anything we need to think about?

Brett: I think we're all complete and whole.

Jeff: Complete, perfect and whole. All right, we're taking off next week. I'm going to Mexico for a little R and R.. We will be back in 2 weeks, Tuesday, March 1st. Until then, keep it integral!