

Trump versus Clinton, the roller derby begins

Jeff: Hello friends. Welcome to the Daily Evolver live. I'm Jeff Salzman. It's Tuesday, May 10, 2016. I am happy to be with you and here with Brett. How are you doing tonight, Brett?

Brett: Hey, I'm doing well.

Jeff: Brett was just out planting some flowers.

Brett: Yes, I was.

Jeff: Beautifying the place, getting ready for summer.

Brett: It's really therapeutic.

Jeff: It's beautiful. Beauty is therapeutic.

Brett: Indeed.

Jeff: Tonight we're going to focus on one of my favorite topics, American politics. Barring some unforeseen black swan event, it will be Hillary Clinton versus Donald Trump. Here we go. It's going to be a roller derby. We're going to use the integral lens to see if we can raise the resolution a little more deeply, see some of the bigger patterns and do our integral thing.

Before we do, I do want to, as always, thank Integral Life, Corey DeVos and David Riordan and the folks ... and Ken Wilber, good Lord, for being the major integral portal to the integral world. I particularly want to point out Ken Wilber's new program, *Full Spectrum Mindfulness*, which is a real meditation teaching based on integral theory. I'm really impressed by it. I want to talk about it on a future show because I actually think it's a new thing and evolutionary potent and a baseline for an integral spirituality. In the meantime, I'd love to hear your experiences with it for any of you who are working with it.

I also want to encourage people, if you are interested in integral theory, to check out a couple of charts that help you to understand what I talk about. I do use some integral jargon. These are charts that are findable on our website, DailyEvolver.com, and are under integral theory about integral theory. It's the first thing you see. These are 2 charts, one that deals with the Altitudes of Development and the other that deals with the Quadrants of Reality.

Before I get into the actual political race, I want to share something that hit my integral radar this weekend. Somebody sent me a recording of a college commencement speech. This is of course the season for that. It was done by an integral practitioner who I admire. I want to play an excerpt of it because I thought he hit on some very important integral themes very eloquently, such as the case for progress, the case for turning toward your struggle joyfully. Also he transmits a sort of an uplift, that sense of, as he put it, *gladness* that I think is association with integral consciousness. I think it's a really nice way to start this show because I think it will actually transmit to us and put us in a state of integral consciousness.

It occurs to me also, actually, that many of you may have heard of this integral thinker who did this speech. He has a very high profile. He is the President of the United States of America. Yes, folks, this is a little transmission from Barack Obama, my hero, where he spoke at a commencement at Howard University, which is the preeminent, historically black university in the US. This is clearly something he's doing in his last 8 months in office.

It's a message to young people and particularly young African American people. As you'll hear, they receive it very well and so did I. I hope you do too. It's a little over 7 minutes so sit back and relax and take a breath and receive what I think is a true integral transmission. I'll talk a little bit about why I think that after the recording. Here's Barack Obama on Saturday.

President Obama: *Given the current state of our political rhetoric and debate, let me say something that may be controversial, and that is this: America is a better place today than it was when I graduated from college. Let me repeat: America is by almost every measure better than it was when I graduated from college. It also happens to be better off than when I took office, but that's a longer story.*

That's a different discussion for another speech, but think about it. I graduated in 1983. New York City, America's largest city, where I lived at the time, had endured a decade marked by crime and deterioration and near bankruptcy. Many cities were in similar shape. Our nation had gone through years of economic stagnation, the stranglehold of foreign oil, a recession where unemployment nearly scraped 11%. The auto industry was getting its clock cleaned by foreign competition. And don't even get me started on the clothes and the hairstyles. I've tried to eliminate all photos of me from this period. I thought I looked good. I was wrong.

Since that year, since the year I graduated, the poverty rate is down. Americans with college degrees, that rate is up. Crime rates are down. America's cities have undergone a renaissance. There are more women in the workforce. They're earning more money. We've cut teen pregnancy in half. We've slashed the African American dropout rate by almost 60%, and all of you have a computer in your pocket that gives you the world at the touch of a button. In 1983, I was part of fewer than 10% of African Americans who graduated with a bachelor's degree. Today, you're part of the more than 20% who will. More than half of blacks say we're better off than our parents were at our age and that our kids will be better off too.

America is better, and the world is better too. A wall came down in Berlin. An Iron Curtain was torn asunder. The obscenity of apartheid came to an end. A young generation in Belfast and London have grown up without ever having to think about IRA bombings. In just the past 16 years, we've come from a world without marriage equality to one where it's a reality in nearly two dozen countries. Around the world, more people live in democracies. We've lifted more than one billion people from extreme poverty. We've cut the child mortality rate worldwide by more than half.

America is better. The world is better, and ... Stay with me now ... Race relations are better since I graduated. That's the truth. No, my election did not create a post-racial society. I don't know who was propagating that notion. That was not mine. The election itself ... And the subsequent one because the first one, folks might have made a mistake ... The second one, they knew what they were getting. The election itself was just one indicator of how attitudes had changed.

In my inaugural address, I remarked that just 60 years earlier, my father might not have been served in a DC restaurant, at least not certain of them. There were no black CEOs of Fortune 500 companies, very few black judges. Shoot, as Larry Wilmore pointed out last week, a lot of folks didn't even think blacks had the tools to be a quarterback. Today, former Bull Michael Jordan isn't just the greatest basketball player of all time. He owns the team. When I was graduating, the main black hero on TV was Mr. T. Rap and hip hop were counterculture, underground. Now Shonda Rhimes owns Thursday night, and Beyonce runs the world. We're no longer only entertainers. We're producers, studio executives. No longer small business owners. We're CEOs. We're mayors, representatives, Presidents of the United States.

I am not saying gaps do not persist. Obviously, they do. Racism persists. Inequality persists. Don't worry, I'm going to get to that. I wanted to start, Class of 2016, by opening your eyes to the moment that you are in. If you had to choose one moment in history in which you could be born, and you didn't know ahead of time who you were going to be ... What nationality, what gender, what race, whether you'd be rich or poor, gay or straight, what faith you'd be born into ... You wouldn't choose 100 years ago. You wouldn't choose the '50s, or the '60s or the '70s. You'd choose right now. If you had to choose a time to be, in the words of Lorraine Hansberry, "young, gifted, and black" in America, you would choose right now.

I tell you all this because it's important to note progress. To deny how far we've come would do a disservice to the cause of justice, to the legions of foot soldiers; to not only the incredibly accomplished individuals who have already been mentioned, but your mothers and your dads and grandparents and great grandparents, who marched and toiled and suffered and overcame to make this day possible. I tell you this not to lull you into complacency, but to spur you into action — because there's still so much more work to do, so many more miles to travel. America needs you to gladly, happily take up that work.

Jeff: Thank you Brother Barack. What I love about that is and what I find integral about it is that it really is based on this idea of humanity moving forward. He talks a lot about what we've done, what we've

accomplished. He points out specifically that he's not talking about himself or his administration, as he said, "That's a speech for another time." He's talking, when he talks about *we* in this context of *we* who have "cut teen pregnancy in half," *we* who have "slashed the African American drop-out rate by almost 60%," that's the American people. That's what *we* as a collective, with a lot of and a lot of conflict and struggle, that's what *we* have done, *we* Americans.

Then he expands to a world-centric idea. He talks about *we've* "lifted more than 1 billion people from extreme poverty," *we've* "cut the child mortality rate worldwide by more than half." *We, the people of the world*. That's a delicious identity. It's a big identity. It's an identity that comes online in green and it really takes full blossom in both the interiors and exteriors at the integral stage ... Which also begins to bring online the next identity, which is this kosmo-centric identity. We have nation centric, world centric and kosmo-centric. This is the identity not just of all people, but all people throughout history. I love that he offers this thought experiment to the students to imagine that they got a random draw in life, that they didn't know where or when or who or what religion or what family they would be born into, when and where would they want to be born?

As I have argued for integral theory and for progress and evolution and all of that good stuff with my green friends particularly, man who feel that *we're* living in an ever darkening world of the corporate system and all that is bringing us to an eco-dystopic end. Where would you rather be born? With all the problems, what time? I must say, it stops people. In the '50s? 60's? 80's? Not really. Some of them go for a mythic past before agriculture and the "cancer of human civilization," but for the most part, people realize that for all of our problems, that this is indeed the best time to be alive -- and that it's getting better.

There are, of course, the big problems that world-centric people can see, such as climate change and resource depletion and pollution and that sort of thing. Those need to be solved too, the new challenges that arise, but there is so much that is in place to create lives that are free and decent for ever increasing numbers of people and ever increasing percentages of people.

I also like that he brought up the race relations thing because this has become a meme on the right. Fox News particularly has a conventional wisdom going that race relations have degenerated under Obama. They point out the high-profile police killings and the backlash that has become Black Lives Matter, which they find scary.

But I think what *we* realize as *we* move into post-modern and post-post-modern consciousness is that *we* want to get the voices in the system. It's like what *we* do for our own therapy when *we* go to a therapist. *We* want to identify the voice of anger and allow it to speak. *We* want to be able to see it and feel it. And when *we* see and feel the anger, *we* begin to see and feel the hurt that lies behind the anger. As *we* see that, *we* see what lies behind the hurt. That is the want of all of God's precious children, all human beings, to be seen and loved and included: to matter. That changes the whole project, and it is progress, not regress. There's a lot *we* could say about race. *We'll* deal more in another time, but I just love how he pushed back against that meme.

Another integral marker for Obama is that somehow he just feels post fear and anxiety. One of the major theoretical tenets of integral theory is that the first tier memes or the first 6 stages of development, right up through traditionalism, modernism, post-modernism, all of them are motivated by a lack or a fear or a sense of not being enough, that something went wrong. Human beings drove this thing into a ditch and now *we* need to fix it or *we're* going to be doomed. Every stage has that story. That's, from an integral perspective, appropriate. Those stories kept us growing and those fears kept us growing. At some point, *we* realize that *we* are seeing a system at work. Then *we* begin to ... How would I say it? Compare real life not to a fantasy of what *we* think real life should be, but to a system that is integrating and evolving to greater stages of goodness, truth and beauty.

Thank you Obama. Let's get into the roller derby. Oh my God. Brett?

Brett: Yes.

Jeff: Hillary versus Trump.

Brett: Here we go.

Jeff: Here we go. These are who we have barring the unforeseen. Let's look at how these 2 candidates line up with integral theory. I've talked a lot about both of them, but there's some new things that I've been thinking about, and I'll just share them with you here. Let me start by responding to a letter that I got from one of our listeners Holly, who is from, as she puts it, the Left Coast of Oregon. She is responding to a talk that I did with Dr. Keith Witt in our series that we do called the Shrink and the Pundit. He's the shrink, the psychiatrist, and I'm the pundit, which requires no particular training or expertise.

Holly writes, I just listened to your talk with Dr. Keith [the psychology of politics] , I am wondering why you put Hillary at the Modern level, not Integral. I understand that when we hear about her sharp intellect, her white paper plans for everything, and we think...modern stage. However I also see her agreeing with postmodern ideas, (women's and children's rights), and being able to sit down with Wall Street folks and Hammer out some good policies of regulation, (traditionalist). I also see her as a fighter when need be, Warrior, (say with radical extremists). When she is asked to explain a specific problem, I hear several perspectives coming back.

At the end of you talk with Keith, where you say that modernist don't light up the room, I wonder if that is an Integral problem. I remember you saying Integralists are not going to be the hit of the party because we are universal donors to all levels. Being Integral is a hard sell in the face of more extreme views, don't you think?

As always, love your work and honesty!

I actually agree. Of course Hillary is for sure at green. When I stacked up the candidates, Bernie is so doctrinaire green that he covers that territory in almost a text book way. Hillary, God knows she has the great downloads of green, such as environmentalism, feminism, children's rights and all of that. Of course, she also works in the modern system, and she has multiple perspective. There's no doubt about it. I think she also knows about integral theory per se. Certainly Bill Clinton does. He has mentioned Ken Wilber and integral theory publicly positively, admiringly in a number of occasions, as has Al Gore. I assume she knows.

I would say that Hillary is what we would say the entry level integral. She's at "teal", which is more multi-perspectival, able to see into other people, their perspectives, how to choose from many different perspectives, etc.. What happens in the move from teal to turquoise is we move from a head orientation to a heart orientation. That's not to say that teal can't be very emotional and connected in a heart way to people like children who are suffering and so forth. She's got plenty of that. But Obama, on the other hand, has a sort of music to him that I think is a marker of a turquoise stage, and that's the difference.

What I was just talking about with Obama is he has that sense of uplift, and she doesn't somehow. Maybe to some people. I'm just thinking out loud here, but she's more about grinding it out and fighting it out day by day. Both are important, but it's best of course when teal - that ability to fight it out and grind it out - which Obama has too, is integrated into turquoise. That's where I put her on the scale. I think this is a moving target. As integralists, we're trying to sort this out. It's not about getting it right. I'm really happy to hear different ideas on this, but I think she is solidly teal, and I'll go with that for now.

She does have political problems. First of all, she has the brand of being untrustworthy and that sort of thing, but I've got to say, I think it's pretty thin gruel in terms of what's going to hurt her in the election. The Benghazi thing was fought in the last election with Romney and Obama, and Obama won by 5 points. It was essentially a landslide. The Benghazi thing is basically that the State Department spun the attack in Benghazi as a demonstration about an anti-Muslim video instead of just basically a terrorist attack. I think there's arguments on both sides. It's hours and hours of testimony. I can't pretend to have figured it out, but let's say that they're right, that the administration did it, they actually spun an event to their benefit. That's not a great thing. It should have got exposed, but it's not anything like Watergate or Iran Contra or any of the scandals in most administrations.

The email server, the same way. I just don't quite get it. There is a Hillary hating industry. That generally has its home on the right, but it's developed unfortunately its home on the left too. You see this on particularly social media with the Bernie bros and the extreme Bernie Sanders partisans who accused Hillary of all kinds of nefarious schemes. They basically make that move from, "She's not just wrong, but she's bad. She's not just bad, but she's evil." This is the real actual slippery slope of first tier thinking. "She's the tool of the system."

... Actually regarding that last point, they're right. That's the big problem for Hillary in this election. She, despite all of her being a woman and talking about the future and new ideas and all of that stuff, that she still represents the system as it is. That may be a killer in this election. I'm just not sure.

Let's look at that. What is the system? It involves of course all 4 quadrants, but mainly when we talk about the system in American politics, we're talking about the economy and politics. The economy is always about 1) how the wealth of a people is created, how we get the stuff we need and 2) how it's distributed among the population. Every stage of development has a way of working with those two things: creating wealth and distributing it. The indigenous people do it. The hunter-gatherers do it. The feudal empires did it. Democracies do it now. Here we are in 2016, the United States, a mature democracy. What we see is that we have a situation here where for the last 40 years (that's 2 generations) ... That while wealth creation has increased ... We're creating more and more with less and less, but that 90% of that increase has gone to the top 10% of the population and more intensely to the top 1% of the population.

There was an article in the New York Times, in the front page of the business section, today talking about how hedge fund managers last year made ... The top ones made over a billion dollars each. Hedge funds didn't even particularly do that well last year, but they still made, the top ones, over a billion dollars each. I think the top one was \$1.7 billion. We have CEOs making hundreds of times the wages of their average workers.

Of course politics is very tied into this. We have a megalopolis now in Washington DC of think tanks and journalists and lobbyists, who funnel money from donors who want to influence policy, big donors. And it's turned into the highest per capita wealthy city in the country.

It's starting to feel like Rome or something, and it's built on this polarization industrial complex of media and pundits and writers and professional ideologues who feed ideology to population who sends them money. These people are the Sean Hannitys, the Rush Limbaughs. These people are wealthy. Arianna Huffington.

It's bipartisan. Hillary Clinton is ... You remember when they left the White House whenever it was in I guess the year 2000. She has said famously that they were dead broke when they left the White House. They had debt and so forth. Now she's worth \$44 million all while serving as a senator and Secretary of State. It's not like she built a big company or created wealth. She did it through speeches.

I don't know if many of you saw I thought a really damning episode on 60 Minutes about how Congress people spend 20 to 30 or more hours a week raising money. They actually have to leave their Capitol Hill offices to do it because it's illegal to use your Capitol office for raising money. They have these sweatshops down the street from the Capitol. The Republicans have them and the Democrats have them. They go there and they literally get into little cubicles with telephones and they work their lists. You'd swear they were selling Ginsu knives. 20/30-plus hours a week. That's a work week for a lot of people. Then outside are the big white boards, where it shows how they're doing and who is ahead. It reminds me of one of my favorite movies, *Glengarry Glen Ross*, which is just this hideous indictment of that orange, money grubbing culture of salesmanship and closing and getting the mark and the deal. That's what they're doing. These are our Congress people.

To just put it in some perspective, compare our industrial informational economy to an agricultural economy. Everybody in the culture works one way or the other, indirectly or directly, in tending the fields and the herds and making the equipment and growing the food. But 90% of the food goes to a tiny percent of the people to whom the fields belong. Actually we did try that for about a millennia. It was called the monarchy, and their functionaries the aristocracy. They ended up on the wrong end of the pitchfork.

There are a couple of important structural downsides apparently of a mature democracy that are really coming into view.

One of them we have seen for a while, and this is the red flag that conservatives see very easily. Liberals don't see this as easily. It's the hazard of *free riding*, where if you create this government complex with complex social safety nets and rules an ... You develop free riders. You develop people who live off the wealth created by others. Again, this is a problem that indigenous people deal with. This is a problem that people have dealt with all through history. A couple of weeks ago, I talked about the Bedouins of Saudi

Arabia. These are a nomad culture. This is a magenta, red, amber culture. They're ethic was anti-kindness. You don't want to give things to people who aren't pulling their weight. You can't. The culture can't handle it. That's still true: we have a free rider problem with this big bureaucratic system that we've created, this big orange system that we've created.

Then the other problem ...The other problem is *rent-seeking*. This where the powerful in the system use the system to spin more resources their way through regulation and legislation. That's a lot of what Washington is about right now. What we're seeing is that more and more of the country is becoming hip to not just the first problem, free riding. It's a problem. People are getting it, but also rent-seeking, that the system is corrupt, where you have people who are running the system also *working* the system. Who as they manage the system, they siphon a little their way. You end up with at the extremes hedge fund managers making \$1.7 billion a year and on the not so bad side an ex-First Lady with \$44 million who is running for office and has influence, or at least access, for sale.

As I said, people are getting hip to this and so we've moved into the situation where we have these 2 candidates, Trump and Sanders both, who radically challenge this and bizarrely neither of them are part of the traditional parties. Sanders is technically not even a Democrat. Trump, although technically a Republican, isn't actually ideologically a Republican in many, many ways that have the Republican Party freaked.

With the internet and social media and connectivity in general where every voice is online, why do we even need parties? Anybody can talk to anybody. Anybody can align with anybody. The parties have traditionally been the middleman for ideas, they create think tanks and they fund studies and they go recruit candidates and they support candidates, but we don't need that any more. We don't need a middleman for ideas. We don't need a middleman for money.

Both Bernie and Trump have shown that in different ways. Bernie has been all small donations, and he has ... I forget how many hundreds of million dollars he's raised, but he's playing with all the money he needs. We see that the system isn't necessary ... and the system is seeing that we see it's not necessary. It's a time that is very ripe for radical change.

Enter Donald Trump and his campaign of conquest that is just so red. I see him as like one of those ice-breaker ships that has just barreled through the Republican Party, and he's about to take on the larger politica world. He's driving me crazy in a way because his unorthodox positions and just his orientation of blowing up the system is appealing to me and I think to a lot of people because the system, whether it's more the Trump thing or the Sanders thing, it needs to be radically confronted. On the other hand, he's characterologically disqualified because he's ... What did Jon Stewart call him? A man baby or a baby man, and he is.

Part of him, to use levels and lines of development, several important lines of development for him, such as moral and interpersonal, are arrested at red. That doesn't say he doesn't have other lines that are up in orange and green even, but there's problems with him. Part of what makes him so compelling is he doesn't seem to have much of a strategy other than fight. That's red. All red does is fight. That's their job is to be powerful and to make an impact and to differentiate from other people and to be the guy with the most.

Trump is being interviewed by George Stephanopoulos on Sunday ... He's being interviewed about uniting the party. Now that he's the nominee his job is to unite the Republican Party. So the question is, "Does the party have to be unified?" This is Trump's answer. He says, "I'm very different than everybody else, perhaps anybody else who has ever run for office. I actually don't think the party has to be unified. I think it would be better if it was unified. I think there would be something good about it, but I don't think it actually has to be unified in the traditional sense." Stephanopoulos asks him, "So how will you win?" He says, "I'm going to go out and get millions of people from the Democrats. In fact, I'm going to get the Bernie Sanders people to vote for me."

And apparently, there's some truth to that. For those of you who pay attention to such things, you may have noticed that today there was a small earthquake that ran through the political punditry. That was the release this morning of the Quinnipiac poll, which is a respected poll, really one of the first polls that have come online since the presumptive nominees are Clinton and Trump. This is a new ball game here. It's only a week or so old. In fact, it's a week old as of tonight. The poll shows that in Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania, which are 3 key swing states, that Trump and Clinton are essentially tied. She's a little ahead

in Pennsylvania. He's a little ahead in Ohio, but it's all within the margin of error. We see that Trump's red transmission has brought out a lot of people who haven't voted before. He got a million more votes than Romney got, who was the winner of the Republican nomination last time and 60% more turnout.

That begins to upend all political calculations, even these premises of polls. Polls are based on likely voters, which means voters who have voted before. Now we have people ... I know one person who actually is a pretty significant agoraphobic. He doesn't really like to leave his house. He's a little paranoid. He's literally put tinfoil on his windows so that people can't beam in wet rays to him. He's so turned on by Trump that he went out and registered and got himself to the polls and voted for Trump. This is the wild card that is very much in play.

The liberal case against Trump. I think it was articulated probably most succinctly by Elizabeth Warren and her famous Twitter war with Trump over the weekend, where she treated out that Trump has built his campaign on racism, sexism and xenophobia. I will say that this is more true for green progressives than it is for orange modernists and particularly amber traditionalists. It's like Chris Rock said. I posted on our site under the What's New, section citing his opening monologue for the Academy Awards where he talked about racism. He says, "There's racism where people are lynched and enslaved. There's racism of 'go fetch me a lemonade,'" and there's racism where it's, 'We're just members of different sororities.' That's the evolution of racism.

There's an evolution of sexism and xenophobia too, but I really want to focus on the sexism part here because the majority of people live in a world where they feel that the political correct speech codes are oppressive. They sort of will cooperate in the public sphere, which is actually progress, in work and church and whatever, but they have a different relationship to the opposite sex than people at green and even integral do. I want to play a recording of an interview that Jake Tapper did over the weekend with ... It has Trump in it, where he's talking about this problem of political correctness. Then Jake Tapper asks one of his high profile female supporters to comment. The person that he asks ... The bulk of the recordings Sarah Palin.

Sarah Palin is the punchline for progressives, but I want to invite you to do an integral practice around Sarah Palin and that is to take her seriously, assume she is sincere in what she says. She actually is a little bit dyslexic. She really is. She confuses words and tenses grammatically, but that doesn't mean she's stupid and that doesn't mean that she doesn't speak for a strata of people. At any rate, just as a practice, listen to her and really feel what she's saying. This is actually in regard to both sexism and xenophobia. This is a response to the liberal case against Trump. Hit it, Brett.

Jake Tapper to Palin: A lot of Republicans are worried about Trump's poor standing with women voters, which is why I ask about whether or not he should put a woman on the ticket. According to a Gallup poll conducted last month, as I'm sure you know, 7 in 10 women voters have an unfavorable view of Mr. Trump. Take a listen to something he said this week.

Trump: All of the men, we're petrified to speak to women anymore. We may raise our voice. You know what? The women get it better than we do, folks. They get it better than we do.

Tapper: As a very prominent female supporter of Donald Trump, do you wince when he says things like that?

Sarah Palin: Heck no. I'm like, "Trump, you're saying what a lot of other people are thinking." He just happens to be the most candid about it in a public arena than most Americans are used to. No, I don't wince. I know the man, and I have known him for years. I so appreciate that he has great respect for women. He listens to the sharp, confident women in his life, his wife, his daughter, those who surround him in business. He listens to even a hockey mom from Wasilla, if I have an idea that would perhaps make sense with his conservative agenda. I know the man, and I respect him because he respects women.

Tapper: Let's talk about Latino voters for a second. Senator John McCain, your former running mate, has publicly maintained that Donald Trump, he doesn't think, will have much of an impact on McCain's campaign for reelection in Arizona. But, behind closed doors, McCain was caught on tape expressing concern that Trump might damage his reelection chances. How is Donald Trump going to improve his standing with Latino voters?

Sarah Palin: I give a lot more credit to Latino voters than perhaps the mainstream media would, in just assuming that they have kind of a herd mentality and are all going to go to one candidate over another. Latinos, for the most part, are hardworking, independent people who just want to be able to have a good job. Those who are here legally and will follow the rules that America has set forth, they want to work hard and provide for their family. I sure wish that politicians wouldn't worry about these racial divides that are for the most part made up by those who thrive on division and contention, and instead politicians worry about perhaps what their record has said about themselves.

Jeff: There you have it. A voice from the traditional stage of development where men and women are not quite so exquisitely sensitive to each other.

It sort of works on both sides too. There's this Hillary-as-enabler meme that Donald Trump is propagating right now, that Hillary threw the women under the bus that Bill had affairs with and that she's anything but a feminist and that she ruined these women's lives. Trump is going for it and now it's going to be right out in the open. That's not necessarily a bad thing either. There's a fruit that comes from a radical honesty, where everything is said and put on the table.. But I will just say that for a lot of the population, particularly traditional people, what Hillary did is what women do when their men stray. You go after the woman.

It was so interesting to hear yesterday on ... I think it was Anderson Cooper. It was on CNN, where they have the multiple pundits. There were 2 women arguing. One was a more sophisticated postmodern woman who was making the case that Hillary is an enabler. There was a more traditional woman who was like, "You mean to tell me you wouldn't go after a woman who came after your man? You have to fight for your man," she said, "Tell me you wouldn't try to run her off." This is what amber red does. When we talk about how men see women as objects at that stage, we need to remember that women see that of men too and their men can't be expected to control themselves. They think with 2 heads. They're property that needs to be protected. I always think of that song by Dolly Parton, Jolene, "Jolene, Jolene, Jolene, Jolene, please don't take my man. Please don't take my man just because you can." This is how premodern women objectify men, just as men objectify women.

As integralists we need to make a little more room for that because that's reality at that stage of development. We can see that people at that stage of development are chaffing at having this political correct speech police laid on them.

There's also an integral flavor to it. I think of the work of David Deida, where he talks about the polarity of masculine and feminine and how it's played out up through hunter-gatherers and the patriarchy and all the way up, women voting and now feminism and so forth. When we get to green, which is about equality and the sensitivity to the wounds of history, green's job is to notice all of the slights and all of the way that marginalized and victimized people have been marginalized and victimized. We're going for radical equality.

As he points out, that can be deadly for the male-female relationship because there's no tension. You see this in green couples, where the roles are inverted and the men do the so-called women's work and women go out and make the money. It's just part of the economic evolution of as we go through that stage. But we don't want to forget that there is a potent energetic between male and female that of course is way more complexified at higher stages. Actually women can hold some of the traditional male energies and vice versa.

I would also point out that one of the ways that people are bringing back the polarity is through bondage, discipline, 50 Shades of Grey stuff. Now those energies were the bane of humanity and certainly the bane of women for millennia. The submission of women was mostly awful, but now to play with those energies is part of what rekindles the male-female polarity and the juice of that. I say that as a gay guy because the traditional masculine-feminine polarities are also at play in same-sex couples and often times more freely because we're less stuck with the traditional roles.

Okay, folks, I guess that will do. We're out of time. What I'd like to do is end with a song that I love. It's called *Sensitive New Age Guys*. It gets a bit at this flaccid lack of polarity that arises in green culture. It's green making fun of green. It's delightful. Otherwise, we will see you next week for another Daily Evolver. Thank you for tuning in and listening!