

## First tier food fight: Red Trump to Green Sanders

Jeff: Hello, folks, Jeff Salzman here, and welcome back to The Daily Evolver Live. It's Tuesday, April 19th. I am happy to be back with you as we embark on a fresh, new look at current events through the lens of integral theory. The topic tonight, American politics, which is, by any standards, at a high point on the display of human evolution in action, and what fun it is for the most part. I'm here with Brett Walker, our Daily Evolver producer. Say hey to the folks, Brett.

Brett: Hey, everybody.

Jeff: I am very grateful to Corey deVos and the folks over at Integral Life for hosting us live tonight on Integral Radio, and for those of you who are listening live. It's always a good feeling to know that there are people here in real time with us. You'll notice, for those of you who are listening on your computer, that there's a comments section on your screen where you can post your thoughts and questions, so please do that and Brett and Corey will be keeping an eye on that.

For those of you who are new to integral theory or need a little help in keeping up with some of the terminology, I would advise you to go to [DailyEvolver.com](http://DailyEvolver.com) to a section just down from the top called About Integral Theory. There are a couple charts there that I will be referring to throughout the show, particularly the Altitudes chart, or the Levels of Development chart, which, Brett, you'll put in a link in the comments section to as well, right?

Brett: Yep, just did it.

Jeff: Cool. All right. It's been a few weeks since we did this show. We've been doing a bunch of interviews and working on a couple live events that we'll be producing later in the year, one of which is The Integral Incubator, which I will be doing with my friend and integral mentor, Steve McIntosh. We'll be doing that in August. The goal is to really just develop integral consciousness, to incubate integral consciousness. We do it here at The Integral Center in Boulder. If you're interested in that, check it out.

Of course I will be working with Diane Hamilton and Terry Patten on our fifth annual Integral Living Room, which will take place this upcoming November, and that is on the cheery topic of death and dying. If you're interested in that, check it out, [IntegralLivingRoom.com](http://IntegralLivingRoom.com).

## The US presidential race

Let's turn to our topic of the evening. That is what's going on in American politics with this presidential election. Of course tonight's a big night with the primary election in New York, which is the second biggest state, a big haul for whoever wins in that state. Even though a lot of the energy and controversy and really the really interesting storylines of the election are happening on the Republican side of the street, actually tonight, the biggest nail-biter is what's going to happen between Bernie and Hillary in New York.

The polls just closed at 9:00 in New York, at 7:00 our time here in Colorado. I don't know what we'll know here in the next hour, but of course the polls are such that Trump is expected to win by 20 points and Clinton's expected to win, according the polls, by 10 point, but that has been wrong in the past here, so we'll just have to see, and we're going to see real soon. Oh, and we're going to be joined later in the show by a real live Democrat, my dear friend and brother, Terry Patten, who has been doing some good integral thinking on how the Democrats can move forward after this battle between Bernie and Hillary to a winning election and indeed an effective progressive presidency, so we'll look forward to talking to Terry in a few minutes.

One of the things that I've talked about on this show about politics is just what an opportunity it really offers us to do integral practice, because politics has a lot of juice. It really reaches down to the lower chakras, to our lower strata of development, down to our power centers and our security centers, and how we literally see the world. We know, and this has been proven with social science and psychology for the last several years in spades, that when it comes to politics, people of different political inclinations are literally wired differently.

Conservatives have a different antenna for the information that is really important to them, and indeed conservatives are tuned to making sure that we can serve what is good about the current system, while liberals, on the other hand, are more tuned to what's going to move us forward. We have people who naturally have their foot on the gas, and people who naturally have their foot on the brake, and that both of these polls of political sensibility need to be online for the system to be healthy, and being online means oftentimes being in contention.

Politics is the study of the use of power, of the application of power. You have groups of people who see the world differently and who think that power ought to be used radically differently. In other words, liberals want to invest more power in the government, conservatives want to invest more power in the private sector, that those two positions can be quite implacable and very difficult to integrate. As we do with all of evolution, we fight our way forward. We also love our way forward, we the other F word our way forward. We seem to be tuned to both, and we're seeing that happen in spades here in this election.

I love to hear from you, and I get lots of emails and lots of SpeakPipes. SpeakPipes are the voice mail feature that is on our website, TheDailyEvolver.com. There's this orange button where you can leave me a voice message. Lots of people do, and I can play them on the show and respond to them, whatever. Here's a message from one of our listeners, Lisa, who is writing about her integral political practice of trying to soften up to the other side, which is one of the things that we talk about here. Brett, would you play Lisa's SpeakPipe, please?

*Lisa: I will say that I'm pretty challenged on holding my multiple perspectives when it comes to especially Donald Trump, and I guess Ted Cruz too, obviously. I think there's an interesting thing going on though, for me at least, is I have such a hard time finding compassion for him and his supporters, except in a very, very impersonal way. Every time it starts getting close to personal, I get angry and sad and frightened.*

*I do have a sense with Trump of how difficult it must be for him now, and certainly I would imagine growing up that that's where my compassion for him comes in. I don't think a person acts like a bully and a braggart and constantly trying to impress upon the world how great he is, unless he doesn't think he is, for whatever reason, how he was treated when he was growing up or whatever, I don't know. When I accessed that point, to see him as a little child, I actually have a lot of compassion for him, and that makes it easier for me to understand.*

Jeff: That is some of what we do as we move into the integral stage of development. We really want to get beyond the idea and the practice of enemies and develop a friendliness to the whole system. That's one of the markers of integral consciousness; we see that everybody is at the stage of development that they ought to be, that there is a force, an eros at work in the whole spiral of development that is taking care of all of us, and so we want to get curious about people rather than critical about people.

Now note, and this is really important, because you can feel like, "Wait a second, what good is that going to be?" Because typically we associate resisting a particular point of view that we think is unhealthy by hating it or despising it, and we don't have to do that. There is a settling down of that. It's like Clare Graves, one of the original psychologists behind spiral dynamics. He talked about people at the integral stage of development being the universal donors. They're the people who can basically get along with anybody.

Red Trump

One of the things we want to do with, say, a Donald Trump, is first of all realize that we don't typically get a national politician who's operating at this stage of development, which is the red or warrior stage of development. This is an early stage of development. This is actually a stage of development that comes online before rules and laws, literally before the Ten Commandments.

Historically this is the world of Genghis Khan, warlords, kings, gangs, in modern times it's the mafia. This is where in a sense, it was simple, in that your job was to align with the strongest, meanest son of a gun in the valley, and hope that he or she, in some cases, particularly as we got into royalty, hope that they're as powerful as they say they are. This becomes your source of identity and safety. We can feel that strata in ourselves.

There's a part of me who ... In fact, when Trump came on for the first, when he first came down the escalator, or up the escalator, to announce for presidency, I thought, "Okay, well maybe this guy can actually come in, bust up this calcified, polarized system in Washington, D.C., and do deals," and there's an argument for that, a deal maker. I often thought that we could take a random hundred names from the phone book, give them a weekend and a couple whiteboards, and they could figure out our problems with the budget and social security and the safety net and college and all of that, if they had 48 hours to do it. There's some truth to that.

You have Trump coming in, and he is promising to do that, and the currency of his platform, if you will, is simply boasting, or assertions. You notice that he's very light on policies, position papers. He doesn't talk about those things. He says, "I'm just going to get it done." He says things like, "I'll be the greatest jobs president God ever created. I'll build a big beautiful wall and the Mexicans will pay for it. We're going to win so much you're going to get tired of winning." These are assertions. They're not policies. This is typical of red. If you read the rap music or the words of gangsters, it's this puffing up, it's this look at me. There's a lot of flashing of bling and women and sexual prowess.

This is all very, very important to Trump. His apartment in Manhattan is like a palace in the sky. It's literally gilded everywhere. The ceilings are painted, like the Sistine Chapel. Mar-a-Lago is a palace, by any standards. Going to the White House would be a significant step down for Trump and Melania, ... the jets, the Trump Towers, the casinos, it's all part of this red sensibility where you really have to "look good" because there's really nothing else to fall back on. There's no police to go to at this stage of development. There's just aligning with the strongest person you can find and hoping for the best.

It's really interesting to feel our way into what it is to be red. Like I said, all of us still have a red strata, no matter how far we have developed beyond it, but there are some people for whom their emotional center or various lines of development are centered in red, like Trump. For them, the world is divided into predator and prey, or perpetrator and victim.

You'll notice that he goes back and forth with this, with a lot of felicity. He talks about being the victim of the process. He's very good at playing the victim. He's also very good at playing the concrete hero. These are the two poles of red. He's the victim of Megyn Kelly because she asked him an unpleasant question about things that he said about women in the first debate. He's been at war with her ever since, because

for red, fighting is where it's at. That's what you're wired to do.

It's astonishing, and it has been astonishing for everybody to watch this guy take on Fox News, to call the editorial board of The Wall Street Journal a bunch of losers, to take on George W. Bush in South Carolina, the most militaristic state in the country, to dis the Iraq War, and even to take on the wife of Ted Cruz, by tweeting an unflattering picture of her, and he just fights. He fights. He just wakes up in the morning and he's ready to fight.

We perhaps know people like this. I think back on a friend I had for a long time who was like this. He was just always angry. He'd talk like, "These goddamn politicians, these people in the traffic, the neighbors, his family." He was always angry. I realized one day that anger was when he felt most alive. It was literally his source of energy. He's the last person you would ever want to fight with. You would submit or you would go somewhere else. It was just too unpleasant otherwise. I eventually did go somewhere else. We see it in ... We can even see it in ourselves. I have this red Jeff that I walk around with, with this thin-skinned sensitivity, angry, judgmental, short-fused, fearful. Fearful and angry go together.

One of the things that I think is so interesting about Trump, and about what Lisa said in her comment about him, is to consider his childhood,. People often ask me about this evolution, cultural and consciousness evolution, and how children generally are pulled up to the center of gravity of the families that they live in, and the cultures they live in, and teachers and so forth. And you see this with Trump.

A perfect example is when I remember Anderson Cooper, this was a couple weeks ago, was interviewing Trump about the tweeted photos of Ted Cruz's wife, Heidi, the unflattering photos, and Anderson Cooper saying, "Why'd you do that?"

Trump's answer was, "Well, Cruz did it first," saying that one of Cruz's the super PACs tweeted a photo of Melania in one of her semi-nude photo shoots when she was a model. And so Cruz did it first. Cruz says he didn't have anything to do with it, blah blah blah, but that's irrelevant. The justification that Trump gave was, "He did it first."

That's red.

In the house I grew up in, "He did it first," wasn't good enough. If somebody hit me and I hit them back, or somebody took something of mine and I took something of theirs, I would be corrected, and the lesson would be, "You're better than that. Just because somebody hits you doesn't mean you hit them back. You come to me. You go to a higher authority. If somebody takes something from you, you go to a higher authority."

This is what humanity realized as we moved out of red into a world that was ruled by a transcendent God who said, "Vengeance is mine." In other words You don't have to worry about getting even anymore. I take care of it. Punishment in hell. Rewards in heaven. It's all going to work out in the bigger picture." This is a huge developmental move for humanity, but it takes place in every home with every kid. Clearly, it didn't take place with Trump, and the military school he went to apparently wasn't much better.

You can say, "Okay, that's a trivial example, just pictures of Melania and Heidi," and whatever, until you hear him talk about other things. I heard him in a interview talking about torture, torturing enemy combatants and suspected terrorists. And his statements on waterboarding, which is that we ought to bring that practice back -- "and more", is what he said.

He was pushed by the interviewer: you can't do that, because it's torture because we have Geneva Conventions -- there are lots of reasons why civilized countries don't do stuff like that. And his answer was, "Look at what they do. Look at what ISIS does. They behead people. They drown people in steel cages. They kill their families." That's his answer. That's the red sensibility, "They do it, so we have to do it too."

You can see Anderson Cooper, I forget who the other interviewer was, they're like, "That's your argument? Really?" Yet it is, and it really resonates with its audience, roughly 50% of the Republican Party. Let's remember that the Republican Party is roughly 50% of the American people, so we're talking 20, 25% of the population really resonates with this, and these are people who are operating at red. The key sensibility here is authoritarianism.

There's been much made of a couple studies, in fact, one of the guys, appeared on Fareed Zakaria show a couple weeks ago, who did these studies that showed that people who support Trump have generally authoritarian impulses. Now authoritarian Red is a stage of development that was very, very functional for everybody, actually, about 10,000 years ago, and for most of human history before that. You fell in line behind the power structures. Now it's anachronistic.

What we can say about this is that it is new on the scene. We haven't had ... You can talk about George Wallace and maybe even Ross Perot a little bit. They had the big man, strong man thing going. But to have somebody, Trump, who is so purely vibrating or transmitting this red energy is really new in American politics, and it's surprising everybody with its power.

I know I promised you people that Trump would not get anywhere near the presidency, in fact, he wouldn't even win the Republican nomination. I'm no longer entirely sure about that last part, about the nomination. But I still don't think he'd win the presidency. I don't think he's going to win the nomination either, because he's just not qualified to be President, and at some point that has to count. And enough Republicans know

that, even if they're going to alienate this 20 to 25% of people who were alienated anyway. Although I really appreciate that these people now, they're online, they've been woken up. This is the big story of this election.

If we could just jump to the other side of the street here, to the liberal side of the street, we see something similar, though it's not equivalent. We can talk about some of the details. We see on the far end of the developmental spectrum up to green, post-modernism. We also in this election have something new, and that is an unabashed post-modern candidate by the name of Bernie Sanders. He too is coming online with a lot of the same purity of view or purity of transmission of Trump, only arguing unabashedly, for Democratic Socialism, which used to be a word that you would never expect a politician to utter in this country, and now it has been made safe by this 73-year-old Senator from Vermont, and it's astonishing.

Anyway, let's just get back to Trump for a minute. One of the things we can see is that, and again, this is a little bit of conjecture, but I'm going to stick with it until proven otherwise, and that is there's no way that Donald Trump will win. He'll either get cast out of the nominating process or he'll lose to the Democratic nominee, probably Hillary Clinton, and by the looks of the numbers even coming in right now [from the New York Primary], she's at 61 and Sanders is at 38.

What this means is that authoritarian far right strata, that red altitude demographic, will experience an abject defeat. Defeat is very, very good for people at red. It's one of the things they actually understand deeply, because every human being wants to grow, every human being wants to get somewhere, to become better, to become bigger. This is the evolutionary urge. This is eros itself. People don't hang on to defeated ideologies forever. There's going to be some people who are going to go to their grave with Make America Great Again ball caps, but their kids won't. People will wake up.

Throughout human history, one of the ways of getting groups of people or individuals to grow is to have them experience the hard boundaries of the stage of development that they're at. In a representative, pluralistic democracy, authoritarianism won't win. We're too far beyond that. It can still win in parts of Afghanistan. It can still win in a lot of parts of the world where the center of gravity is maybe exiting red ... red can always come in there and take charge. I would say that for those of us in the first world, orange and green democracies, red will be defeated, and that is a good thing.

## Amber Ted

Anyway, that moves us to the next stage of development, which is amber, the traditionalists. This is a strata that is well occupied by candidates in history. This is Republican territory. This is the world of social conservatives who are religious, nationalistic, pro-American to the point of being anti-immigrant, and this is the land of Ted Cruz. We talked a little bit about Ted Cruz in a past show.

In fact, I think we named the show *How To Endure Ted Cruz*, because, as I said, he's been one of the real projects for me in terms of my integral practice, one of my objects of integral practice. That is because I have such a negative chemical reaction to him. He was the guy when he came on the television screen, I'd have to run for the remote control, or I'd leave the room, I'd pause, I'd mute, I did whatever I could to not be subjected to Cruz. I kept thinking, "You think you're tolerant, Jeff? Then why don't you try tolerating Ted Cruz?" That became my project.

The first part of the problem for me, as it is with a lot of people, is that Ted Cruz doesn't come off as sincere. If somebody's insincere, it's really difficult to know who they are enough to really work with developing some empathy for them. You can have empathy for people who are chronically insincere too, but it just wasn't good enough for me. I checked into some of the history, and the real turning point for me was an interview with Alan Dershowitz about having Ted Cruz as one of his students.

Dershowitz is a famous law professor of Harvard Law School, and Cruz was one of the students. He said first of all that Cruz was a brilliant student, completely opposite Dershowitz in terms of politics. Dershowitz is a famous liberal. Cruz was, back then, just a dyed in the wool conservative. He was anti affirmative action, pro small government, pro free enterprise, anti abortion, pro death penalty, pro gun, right down the line conservative position.

That actually made me feel better about him, and helped me to understand him in terms of his, basically the karma of his life story. Of course he was raised in a family where the father left his mother and him and his sister, when, I think Ted was three or four years old. The father was a drunk and a womanizer and just basically out of control. He was a red hedonist himself. This is that red stage of development.

He found Jesus. He was converted to Christianity, he became a pastor. He made that classic move. Rafael Cruz, Ted's father, made that classic move from red, disorganized hedonistic to amber or traditionalism, where you get organized and civilized around the scripture. That becomes the story of Ted Cruz's life. He has a loving father and all is well and life goes on and he becomes the great success of Ted Cruz. That's really baked in to his whole personality, and that helps me to warm up to Ted Cruz.

Then I see that he is so committed to this point of view that his basic political strategy is to mobilize the right wing. He's not going after the middle. As he says, there is no middle anymore. Americans have found their tribe. They've been distributed to their poles. There's some truth to that. It's not about going for the middle anymore. It's about bringing out, getting out, motivating your voters.

That is first tier all the way. It's mono-perspectival, "My perspective wins. If only people understood the truth of my perspective, they would naturally go with it." Bernie Sanders has that on the left. What it misses



is that there are people who really just have different antenna and operating systems altogether, so we'll see how that goes. Ted Cruz, he was anti ethanol subsidies in Iowa, he is against abortion, even with the issue of the life of the mother and rape and incest. These are very, very losing positions, but he has faith that people will see the rightness of them and he'll win.

We see this other story going on in the country really coming from this same point of view, and this is this anti-transgender law coming out of North Carolina that says that people have to use the bathroom of the sex of their birth, and otherwise it's illegal, so transgendered men can't go to the men's room, they have to go to the women's room, and so forth.

From an integral perspective, we want to see that these are people, this is a rear-guard action against people who do not see the sexual revolution as in any way, shape, or form being progress. They see it as being a degeneration, all of it, from the '60s on up, a degeneration of the way things ought to be, which is the way Scripture says. They live in a mythical world where there's a titanic battle between good and evil. This is the amber world of the traditionalists. There's the people of God against the people of the Devil.

They may not see it quite that vividly, but there's a feeling that "you got divorce and adultery", and "then you got homosexuality", and, "Now our wives and sisters and daughters can't even be sure that the lady in the toilet stall next to them doesn't have a penis. Give us a minute to get used to this." This is too far too fast for these people. You can see that they're bunched up in the Southern states and so forth, and this is just basically a rear-guard action against progress, that is doomed to failure, but that's where we're seeing these little outbreaks of amber that Ted Cruz is trying to run with, in the guise of religious liberty. We'll see how it goes.

## The Orange middle

Ok, Trump represents our red warrior stage. And Ted Cruz represents our amber traditionalist stage. And then we have the modern stage, which is the orange stage. This is generally where we pick our presidents. This is where John Kasich is: a little right of center, two-term Governor of a swing state, on the House Armed Services Committee, Head of the Budget Committee, and just a guy who's not out to set his hair on fire, not out to blow up the system, but out to fix the system and make it better.

This is the world of Romney, of John Kerry, of Michael Dukakis, of Bob Dole, of Al Gore. Al Gore got more radical when he got out of politics. It's a mushy middle. You can see where John Kasich is, falling behind, and yet he's the only one, according to polling, who could beat either of the Democrats. We'll see what the Republicans do here in July at the convention, but orange this year is really out of luck. All of the orange candidates from both sides are pretty much out of the game.

We can talk about Hillary here, because she's a little harder to peg for me. I think to get into this topic of moving up to Hillary and Bernie Sanders, that it's time to bring on Terry. Brett, do we have Terry with us?

Brett: We're going to call him right now.

Jeff: Terry Patten is my dear brother and friend in the Integral enterprise. You can find out more about Terry at [TerryPatten.com](http://TerryPatten.com), and see his tele-course, *Beyond Awakening*, his work on integral spiritual practice. Of course, he's my partner with Diane Hamilton in the Integral Living Room. And he is a living, breathing Democrat.

Terry: In person.

Jeff: In person, on the line, live. How you doing today, Terry?

Terry: I'm doing great.

Jeff: Good. I'm looking at the numbers, and currently I don't know what percentage is in, but Hillary's beating Bernie by 60 to 39%, so 20 points. That's a big spread right now.

Terry: They say about 37% reporting is what I see.

Jeff: Is that right? Yeah. It looks like the polls are right and she'll win fairly decisively tonight. That pretty much begins to nail down her claim to the nomination and gets us mentally from this post-Bernie-Hillary struggle to Bernie-Hillary reconciliation. Do you think that's in the cards? How do you see that happening?

Terry: I think there's a deep reckoning, because the energy that animates the Sanders campaign is so passionate and intense, and there are a lot of folks on that side who have really gotten into hating Hillary ...

Jeff: I know.

Terry: ... and saying they wouldn't support her in the fall, they'll vote for the Green Party candidate, Jill Stein, rather than support Hillary. They've begun to believe the negative campaign narrative.

Jeff: You see that even in the integral world space on Facebook and so forth.

Terry: You do, yeah.

Jeff: It's really surprising to me actually.

Terry: Bernie has, what a tremendous campaign and social movement Bernie has been able to mount. He doesn't have to win the nomination to have won a tremendous political victory. He has started something of a political revolution in that he's brought a challenge from the progressive wing of the Democratic Party that is so strong in such a crucial year that he has to be reckoned with. The Democratic Party cannot unite behind Hillary without Hillary embracing some essence of Bernie's message. His message has won a central place in the platform of the Democratic Party. It can't reunite without acknowledging the nerve that his campaign has struck. I think that this recognition of the corrupting influence of money and politics is right at the center of that. That's where he's made Hillary look terrible and where she's been most vulnerable.

It's my hunch though, you see, that Hillary was, right from the beginning, quite an idealist. She was certainly ambitious, no question about that, but when I really look into what I see in the demonstration of Hillary Clinton's life, I see an idealist who wanted to, against her own and her husband's interests, but as a champion of the good, she's embraced centrist Democratic ... She's been on the left. She moved. She was raised on the right by her Republican father, but her ideals were left-wing ideals, but it was at a time that the Democratic Party was pretty well marginalized. Democrats had lost something like four out of the last five presidential elections when Bill was able to win, and it was by attacking to the center, along with Al Gore, that they succeeded in doing that.

Hillary essentially, by getting right there into the dirty business of doing politics, learned how politics is done. That's everybody who has a constituency has power, they have a seat at the table, and you've got to do business with them. Her history shows that she became a creature of the system, but there are some benefits to that. If we're going to be a functional society, we can't just have the vanquishing of some elements of a society by others. We're not going to have cooperation. We're going to have a tension of rebellion.

My diagnosis of the problem in the country right now is that more than anything, it's the gridlock, it's the refusal to cooperate that is hamstringing us. I think it's because Hillary will sit down with the guys at Goldman Sachs, she'll sit down with the Republicans, and she'll deal. She doesn't show herself culturally to be as aloof and superior as even Barack Obama. I have hopes that a Clinton presidency can actually be a unifying force in the nation, but she's not going to get there unless she first acknowledges and really validates this revolution that Bernie has fought and won. Fought and won. It's over. It's won.

Jeff: I jotted down the script of one of Bernie's latest ads, because I just that it really just crystallized the whole wave that you're talking about of what's coming on here. Let me just read it, it's a few sentences. He says ..

*... "Wall Street bankers shower Washington politicians with campaign contributions and speaking fees. What do they get for it? A rigged economy, tax breaks, and bailouts, all held in place by a corrupt campaign finance system. And while Washington politicians are paid over \$200,000 an hour for speeches, they oppose raising the living wage to \$15 an hour."*

That's powerful. That's really powerful stuff. There are a couple things that I would say from using integral theory.

One is that it's what Ken has talked to us about, that thoughts are things, that if you get enough people thinking a thought or seeing a world view, and enough people talking about it, that actually adds to the morphogenic field around that idea, so then it becomes a thing and it becomes a permanent acquisition of the system. I think what else is so powerful about it is that evolutionarily, what Bernie's talking about is next.

We have an orange economy. Orange economies are built around growth. That's a wonderful thing when you're pre-orange, when you're pre-moderate, and you're looking for electricity and material well-being and security. In fact, it's interesting to note that the fastest growing part of the world right now is Africa, which continent-wide is growing between 10 and 11%. That's astonishing. If that was happening in the West, we'd be celebrating. It would be astonishing.

Once economy gets stabilized at orange and people are living decent lives and there's enough for everybody, then we move naturally, this is eros at work, we move into the green economy, which is about sustainability. At this point, green becomes world-centric. We see the planet. We see the whole planet as being finite, that we see limits to growth. That's been well installed in Northern Europe, and that's well installed in the green meme here, the top 25, 20% of the population of the United States. Bernie is really solidifying bringing that forward in a way that, as you say, Hillary's going to have to deal with it, and really everybody's going to have to deal with it from now on. I think that's an amazing achievement of Bernie, for which I'm very grateful.

Terry: Exactly. Me too. I'm a bit older. Everybody I know who's under 40, most everybody I know who's under 45, is feeling the Bern. Almost everybody I know who's over 45 is tending to support Hillary.

Jeff: That's interesting. I think now that you mention it, I'm pretty sure I'd say roughly the same thing. It's generational.

Brett: I'm right on the cusp, and I'm feeling the Bern. Yeah, I'm definitely falling on the side of Bernie.

Jeff: Yeah. How do you feel about Hillary, Brett?

Brett: She's not very exciting, and I'm afraid that Hillary is so compromised. I get what Terry's saying as far as her positive attributes. She's been in the system and she knows how to wheel and deal, but I feel sometimes that she's just so compromised by all the people she's indebted to that I don't have any faith that she could or would change the system. And I really think it needs changing.

Jeff: Right on. Yeah. What do you say to that, Terry? I saw Bill Maher the other day, and he had Susan Sarandon on. She's a big Bernie supporter, and so Bill was pushing her on, "So are you going to support Hillary if she gets the nomination?" He was quite sure she would. Susan Sarandon, she was great actually, she said, "I just can't make those words come out of my mouth right now." She said, "Don't ask me that now."

Terry: I can appreciate that line, yeah.

Jeff: "That's too soon. I'm not willing to let those words come out of my mouth." I get it, and yet maybe Hillary could be a great President, I don't know. I don't know whether I could ...

Terry: She's not running for a vision holder. She's running for COO, when she gives her stump speeches where she goes into the specifics of the programs that she actually thinks she can champion and perhaps get through Congress. I think what will need to go on is some very serious conversations between the Clinton and the Sanders camps, and Hillary's going to have to grant some serious influence over policy to the Sanders camp, perhaps through a designated, a designee, like Elizabeth Warren. Maybe Bernie might have a direct role.

When I look at Hillary's deeply held positions, I think that she actually can embrace the intentions, the core intention of the Sanders candidacy, which is an anti-corruption move to rescue the system from money politics. The biggest mechanism for changing that has actually got to do with who you appoint to the Supreme Court. Either one of them is going to fulfill that aspect.

Jeff: For the progressive agenda.

Terry: Yeah. We're going to overturn Citizens United if a Democrat-appointed nominee joins the Supreme Court, and it'll change the balance, and it'll change that law, because it's such a consequential bad law that I think everybody in the Democratic Party agrees about. There's more to it. There's all kinds of ... There's a revolving door. There's all the complexities that Hillary has been compromised by, but I don't think that's what she stands for. I think she became a creature of the system in order to rise to power in it.

I think we have deeper problems. They have to do with the state of the planet, environmental and economic

unsustainability. That's really radical, and I don't think that even Bernie, who's rooted in a Marxist approach and really he says the right things environmentally, but when I imagine a President Sanders with a Republican-controlled House of Representatives, I don't end up with a visualization of transformative environmental regulation actually getting into the law of the land. My hope is though that if the Democrats can unite around a Hillary candidacy with a much more left-wing Vice President, possibly even Bernie, and a platform that has very strong planks that have come from Bernie's side, such that she really has to let him win the argument, even though she gets to be the person in the top position, I think that that changes the dynamic.

Then I think actually that either Cruz or Trump as the Republican nominee is so clearly unfit for that role, given the global power of the United States, that we have a possibility of a kind of reunion, under the first woman president, who as her main virtue looks a lot like the single mother who just works her tail off doggedly, day after day, week after week, year after year, taking care of things. That's Hillary's modus. I think that there is a potential for a less divided country. Now we're so divided right now, and the karmas of that division and bitterness are so strong, I'm not imagining an utter radical instant transformation of that polarization, but people are quite aware of the ...

I was commenting to you about this, Jeff, in a private conversation. I was such a Obama partisan in 2008 and I hated Hillary back then. I just hated her, hated her, hated her, and then when he appointed her Secretary of State, I was like, "Oh, you're so great, you're going to reunify the country by doing that," and I was giving Barack all the credit, but then I saw the way she handled the job and everything and I began to really appreciate her. Then I realized just how powerful, just as you were saying at the beginning of the program, these deep energies of visceral security and power energies are that are stirred by politics, and how when you're rooting for your guy and the other person is against, you hate them, you got to hate them.

I think that at least the integralists who are following this conversation need to appreciate, particularly the Bernie-supporting integralists, how they've been polarized just by those mechanisms. I too feel them. We all, we have them running through us. It's not wrong to feel them. We have to heed what they're telling us to some degree. We also have to be able to make subject object and recognize that we can't let the animal run the show.

Jeff: We'll have a bigger enemy at that point too, either it be Donald Trump or Ted Cruz, that'll help.

Terry: Yeah, especially if the polls show anything close to either of those.

Jeff: Yeah, exactly. Most people on the left aren't going to make the Ralph Nader mistake again, where you ...

Terry: They are making the Ralph Nader mistake right now by supporting Bernie to the point that they hate Hillary. That's the Ralph Nader mistake ...

Jeff: Fair enough.

Terry: ... in my opinion.

Jeff: Going into the voting booth and hitting a third party, that's a serious act.

Terry: In November.

Jeff: You might want to do it, yeah, but think twice.

Terry: If your state is anywhere close and you do that this year, I think that there's no moral defense to that. On the other hand, there are going to be a lot of people that don't even go into the voting booths.

Jeff: That's right.

Terry: It's a turnout issue. She absolutely needs Bernie's energetic support for the candidacy. The only way she can win that energetic support is to support his platform and his reformation of the direction of politics. His political revolution has to triumph. I really think that's the only point of reunification.

Jeff: Yeah, and it's really exciting. All right, my friend.

Terry: I'm inspired, yeah.

Jeff: I am too.

Terry: Thank you, Jeff.

Jeff: Yeah, thank you, Terry, for coming on and sharing your insights. We'll check in later ...

Terry: Wonderful.

Jeff: ... because we're just getting started here.

Terry: Yeah we are. The show has begun.

Jeff: Yes indeed. Thank you, Terry Patten. I think we're at the end of our time here. Thank you again, Integral Life, for hosting this. I, as always, really encourage those of you who are turned on by integral theory and the great explanatory power it has to show us more of what's going on, I would encourage you to become members of Integral Life. It's about a hundred bucks a year, and it is the central virtual portal, internet portal, for all things integral. It's the home for Ken Wilber and his work, and the original home for Daily Evolver, although Daily Evolver's now on, I have my own site, DailyEvolver.com, which Brett has been fine-tuning. I really encourage you to go there. It's looking good. Also we're on iTunes and all of the podcast aggregators.

Stay tuned and we'll keep looking at American politics and our ever-changing, ever-evolving world, here on Daily Evolver Live on Tuesday nights. See you next week. Jeff Salzman. Nighty night.

## Your voicemails

Brett: We're going to play the show out with comments from listeners.

Jeff: Thanks, Brett.

Brett: Good night, everybody.

Speaker 5: Hi, Jeff, you're thinking about this turning the camera onto ourselves, back onto ourselves, I love this. Remembering the documentary, the short documentary called The Overview Effect, which talks about the spiritual experience of astronauts after they came back to Earth and after they had looked out the window and seen the Earth as a ball floating in space, and that's that first picture that we have from the late '60s, and how turning the camera back on ourselves is actually a path to the spiritual experience.

Speaker 6: Regarding Crowdocracy and the role of the sub-Reddit moderator, or the person who protects the process, this is the person whose role is actually the ritual elder who holds the container. I think that it's a really important role, and I think that viewing these processes through the lens of ritual can be really valuable. I'm also a therapist. That's the role of the therapist in group therapy. It's the clients who do all the work, but the role of the therapist is hold the space for them to do the work. I'm also a musician. This is the role of the bass of the drums in group improvisation. They hold the center while the other people go off and discover new areas. Their role is to keep the container safe. I think that the next evolutionary step is actually development of group mind, of people working together and tapping into the shared wisdom. I think that that is not just metaphorical, but an actual thing that happens.

Speaker 7: I've been really, really inspired by The Daily Evolver podcast lately, especially the episodes of the shrink and the pundit with you and Dr. Keith. I just wanted to touch base with you about a concept you



and Dr. Keith were talking about in an episode about what depression is trying to tell us. I really loved the idea of thinking of pathologies as developmental stages rather than some character flaw, some personal shortcoming, or maybe even a genetic thing, like, "Well my dad did this too so I'm doomed to do this."

I think that seeing them as developmental stages and that they might be exactly the behaviors that we need to employ at a certain time in our lives, I think that really helps de-stigmatize and bring into the light what we might see as our own behavioral and mental shortcomings. That's really helpful because when things are de-stigmatized, we can bring them into the light so we can work with them a little bit better, like you guys say, or working with your shadow is helpful, because while things are unconscious, you can't really work with them, so they can maybe, they might control you more than if you just shed a little light on them.

Speaker 8: I would like to offer critique. There's a heavy focus on systemic or cultural analyses of attitudes with less focus given on individual attitudes and lines of development. For example, you had a political correctness episode. I think an important part of the analysis for political correctness comes down to a individual moral stage of development, like you were saying at green maybe, and how does that play in with an emotional development at red or an emotional development at amber, because having worked and interacted with the social justice space quite a bit, what I tended to find was you'd have green or teal types of cognitive world view or moral development in the individual, with a very, very obvious, maybe red or magenta emotional development.

The argument over feelings and emotional development gets conflated with the argument over social justice and moral development. I think those are important lines to tease apart when you're doing integral analysis.

Speaker 9: Hi, Jeff. Thank you for your brilliant discourse on the big history, which pretends to answer the big why questions, but really only answers the big how questions. I'm a faithful listener who's frustrated that big history gets all those big grants and big smooches from academia, and integral visionaries and practitioners like Ken Wilber get snide labels, they get tossed in the scrap heap with the New Age thinkers.

It's tempting to play down integral as a spiritual component, even though it's my favorite piece of the pie. It's the bridge that connects the heart and the brain, the art and the technology and the science and religion, but you know what? I think Jonathan Haidt is an integralist waiting to happen, maybe even Sam Harris, but it won't be debate that wakes them up. It'll be that little shift in perspective when they say, "Yes, maybe the elephant knows more than the rider." Anyway, Jeff, thanks for your beautiful work. It's a joy to visit with you every week.

