

## Sanders' amazing race • Policing Trump-speak • An unlikely source of Muslim rage

Jeff: Good evening everybody, and welcome to The Daily Evolver Live. It's Tuesday, May 24th, 2016. I'm Jeff Salzman and I am coming to you from Boulder, Colorado as always. I am very happy to be with you tonight.

I'm joined here as always by our Daily Evolver producer, Brett Walker. Say hi to the folks Brett.

Brett: Hi folks.

Jeff: I want to offer a special thank you to those of you who are listening live tonight on Integral Radio. It's always so nice to feel my little tribe here on Tuesday night. Also, wonderful to have so many new listeners. We had 20,000 downloads last month, which really astonishes me. Okay. Actually, it was 19,908, but we're rounding up. Aren't we Brett?

Brett: Indeed.

Jeff: Yes we are. We're on Integral Life, of course. That's our home site. Thank you so much to the folks at Integral Life and Integral Radio for being our founding site. Gosh! Six or seven years ago I guess now.

We're also on our site, [dailyevolver.com](http://dailyevolver.com), iTunes, Stitcher. Where else Brett?

Brett: You said it. Integral Life, Daily Evolver, iTunes, Stitcher. Actually, Google Play. Any podcast aggregator and SoundCloud too.

Jeff: Yeah. Cool. Thank you for listening and share this podcast with other people that you think might be interested. All right. Just for those of you who are new to the integral game, what we're doing here is bringing an integral perspective to current events in culture, in politics, in spirituality. What's so great about it for me is that it doesn't feel like work in a way. It's my hobby. It's the thing I do even though nobody pays me. It's also my practice.

First of all, I think as an integral practitioner that integral consciousness is a real thing. It's a natural growth state of human evolution that emerges out of the post-modern stage of thinking. I myself am so grateful to have found integral theory, the integral maps and been ushered into an integral worldview in the mid-80s when I discovered Ken Wilber's wonderful book called *Up From Eden*.

I had always been taught that humanity had fallen down from Eden, but *Up From Eden* changed everything and that was the beginning of my integral enlightenment, if you will.

I really do think that integral consciousness is psychoactive. Ken Wilber says that, I think it's true. You really ... When you get this view of the world, you see the world differently. It's thrilling in a sense. It's like a butterfly breaking out of a chrysalis. It's a new world, a new you.

When we look from an integral perspective at human history and human development, we see that that's true at every stage of development, that every time we move into a new developmental structure, it feels like a new world.

I remember, sort of, as a three year old when I realized I was a separate person, not just part of mommy and daddy. I could run around under my own power. I didn't have to wait to be given things, I could take them. I could say yes and no. I was a free agent. That's the entry into the red stage, the egocentric stage or what we sometimes call the warrior stage.

Then later in my childhood, I realized at probably age 9 or 10 that I could control my ego, my impulses and my selfishness. I could be purified into a larger world of sanctity and beauty and safety and I accepted

Jesus Christ as my personal savior. That was thrilling. This is the amber Traditionalist stage, and it represented a new world and a new me.

Then, alas! I went to high school and started studying science and got all secular in realized that facts trump faith and that the world is knowable on its own terms and we can experiment and use logic. I dropped my mythic worldview, as many of us do, for a scientific worldview. That too was thrilling. This is the orange Modern state, and it too was a new world and a new me.

Then I moved to Boulder and I got all post-modern (green altitude) and realized that I was thinking too much! And that there was yet another world and another me beyond facts and logic. A world of subjectivity, of self-awareness, or the willingness to take positions at self-blame, or sensitivity to others. A world-centric view, a new kind of magic, and that green post-modern structure was very thrilling.

Now I am working on moving into the next stage, to the post post-modern world, or the integral world (teal and turquoise altitudes.) I talk about what it is to be living from an integral worldview or a world space a lot on this podcast.

So let's look at what it is that is new and emerging as we move into the integral stage of development. I know that's of interest to a lot of you on this call.

We can look at "being integral" in the first, second and third person perspective. In the third person perspective, we're just able to see and accommodate more of reality. All of the competing, conflicting truth claims between science and religion, east and west, pre-modern cultures and post-modern cultures, all schools of human wisdom find their place in the bigger integral view.

It's a more inclusive system where we can see deeper patterns and textures in the world. As I often say, it's like hitting the plus button on the Google Maps. That's third person.

In second person, in terms of our relationship with other people, we realize that everybody is a moving object in time. That everybody has a past. Everybody has a future and that we are privileged to be with each other in the only place we can be, which is the now. That we are subject to eros, to the evolutionary urge, to the creativity of any moment that anything can happen. We therefore understand other people better.

I think most important, we drop the first tier project of trying to change other people. Instead, we just try to see them as unique expressions of humanity, really, and help them be as healthy as they can be right where they're at.

Then we move to the first person, where we feel a shift of energy in our own minds and bodies at all chakric levels. That shift is from a fear operating system to ... what?

For those of you who are integral practitioners, I would ask you, "What is beyond the fear operating system?" I heard words like, "It's the love operating system." and that rings true. I hear it's the world of creativity and self-expression, and those are true, too.

I gotta say, though, that I love the word that Chögyam Trungpa used, the founder of the Buddhist community here in Boulder and the Shambhala community and so forth. He always used the most homely words in a way. He said that what's characteristic of this stage of development is *wholeheartedness*. I love that.

The posture of being wholehearted ... to engage life from a position of courage and optimism and a sense that all is well, because we're being lived as much as we are living our lives. Of course, I always go to Walt Whitman if I want a little poetry around this. I just think of two of his most famous poems: one is Song of the Open Road. The other is I Sing The Body Electric. I love both of those. I think they're so transmissive of what it is to be in the integral stage of development.

What we're doing here in a way is integral practice. We're trying to be aware of what's going on in a deeper way to practice it and to see eros, or evolution at work in our world. Not just in our genes, but in our hearts and minds and our collective hearts and minds. Which is otherwise known as culture. That's what integral

does. It helps us to realize this move towards higher individual consciousness and higher collective consciousness that is going on all around us.

I do use a bit of jargon in this podcast. If you are interested in a further study of integral theory, you can look at a couple of maps that we have posted at [dailyevolver.com](http://dailyevolver.com). You can just scroll down the homepage and you'll see a section called about integral theory. Click on that and you'll see a couple maps. One is the map of the *altitudes of development*; the other is the map of the *quadrants of reality* and they are helpful guides.

I'm happy that, also tonight, we have a special guest, Theo Horesh, who is here to talk to us about the Bernie Sanders movement. That's really the big story in American politics: the transformation of Bernie Sanders into a warrior of the progressive agenda.

He continues to draw huge crowds. He's got real fire in the belly, and he really feels like a crusader in these last few weeks particularly. He is bringing ... from an integral perspective, he's bringing the Green Economy online. More fully into American culture. He's challenging the establishment, the political system, particularly the Democratic Party at the stage. He has triggered and is now riding a tsunami of support that I can't imagine that he thought he would have when he first started out on this quest. It's really really fascinating to see what's going on here.

I had a couple of weeks ago, one of my guests was Terry Patton who is supporting Hillary. Tonight, we have Theo Horesh who is, among other things, a powerful integrally-informed supporter of Bernie Sanders. I really appreciate the work he's doing particularly with his huge presence on Facebook. We'll talk about that in a minute.

#### POLICING TRUMP-SPEAK

Before we do that, I want to share a couple of things that caught my eye in the last week that I think really helps illustrate some of what's coming online in terms of integral consciousness.

First, I want to look at a conversation that was had on Morning Joe a few days ago, which is a great example of pre-modern consciousness trying to talk to post-modern consciousness and not understanding each other. Instead they are talking over each other and this is our life.

This is a segment of Mika Brzezinski interviewing Donald Trump on Morning Joe a few hours after the Egyptian airplane crashed into the Mediterranean last week. Donald Trump, within hours of the crash, tweeted the following, "*Looks like yet another terrorist attack. Airplane departed from Paris. When will we get tough, smart and vigilant? Great hate and sickness!*" That's what Trump tweeted, and then several hours later we have this interview on Morning Joe. Brett, why don't you play that for us now?

Mika: I think the worry also is just how you will be as president ... there are some concerns that you might be trigger happy with your words. For example ...

Donald Trump: Oh, really? I'm the one that didn't want to go into Iraq, Mika.

Mika: I'm even talking about, for example, the tweets that you sent out yesterday morning.

Donald Trump: What's wrong with them?

Mika: I will tell you what some might say.

Donald Trump: Go ahead.

Mika: That it was very much generating hatred, focusing on the hatred and fear that terrorism brings to the American people. Maybe perhaps that first tweet ...

Donald Trump: No. You feel that way, but I said another plane was blown up and I can practically guarantee who blew it up, and another plane went down.

Mika: Listen. Listen. Donald, listen to yourself right now.

Donald Trump: Let me tell you, that's the mindset of a weak Hillary Clinton, which is four more years of Obama is not going to do it for our country, Mika.

Mika: Yeah. I'm asking you if there was any, perhaps, backing here to the concern that a lot of what you say is focused on hatred and fear and sort of generating more anger and churning it up. Perhaps, for example, that tweet. Maybe you might have thought of the families that were suffering first.

Donald Trump: No. I'll tell you what. Let me tell you what I'm thinking. I'm thinking of the future. We cannot continue to let things like this happen. We are being taken advantage of by radical Islamic terrorists and this world is changing.

Another couple of planes go down, Mika, you're going to have a depression worldwide, the likes of which you've never seen, because nobody is going to travel. There will be no anything. There will be no communication between countries and you will have a problem the likes of which you've never seen.

I will tell you. Four more years of a weak Hillary Clinton, and that's what she is ... four more years of that, it will not work. It will not work. All I did is point it out. I said, "When you find out what happened to the plane, it will be exactly what I said."

Jeff: There you go. That's post-modern talking to pre-modern. Mika Brzezinski is coming from a post-modern sensibility, where words are...It's like she said. Words are...He's trigger happy with his words. Words are actually harmful. They generate hatred, fear. Words are weapons at green, because green has a lot of sensitivity.

This is a position in one of the big cultural wars in America, and we see this particularly in the FOX News versus Obama arena. Where he is criticized relentlessly on FOX News for not using words like *Islamic terrorism*. He talks about *violent extremism* as does Hillary.

The idea from Obama and Hillary's perspective, and Mika's as well here, Mika Brzezinski, is that we don't want to upset people, because if we do, they'll be our enemy.

Pre-modern thinking, on the other hand, likes trash talk, it is actually part of the war we're fighting. We want to intimidate people with our words. We don't worry about whether they're going to like us or not. We assume they don't like us. They are our enemies.

For pre-modern people, the world is a titanic battle between good and evil. It's not going to do you any good to try to mollify the Devil. You just have to go after the Devil.

In fact, as Trump puts it, what Mika is talking about is the mindset of a weak Hillary Clinton. From an integral perspective, we can see that a lot of the population really resonates with that.

In fact, to do proper integral practice here, we would want to listen to that excerpt as if we were afraid. Let me say that again: We would want to listen to that excerpt, particularly Trump, as if we were afraid that we were in actual danger.

For a lot of us, I would say vastly most of us in the United States, we're not really afraid. I live here in Boulder, and I don't think the terrorists are really going to come here and get me in Boulder. But for people who are living in Washington, D.C. ... For people who are living in high-rises in New York City. Those are in the bull's eye of where terrorists are likely to hit.

Also, the "security moms" we talk about in politics. These are people who are women and also men who are at stages of development where they have just higher, more sensitive receptors for things that might go wrong. For them the fear of terrorism is a compelling argument.

Then Mika comes back with a classic green sentiment: "Well, maybe you could have thought about the families who were suffering who lost their loved ones." His answer to that is, "Let me tell you what I'm

thinking about. I'm thinking about the future. Another couple planes go down, no travel, no communication between countries. Depression like you've never seen."

This is an example of two world views, two world spaces that not only think differently, but they have different truth verification systems. They have different receptors, and they come to different conclusions about virtually everything. It's a great example of part of the culture war that is going on in our country.

Of course, we end up with Donald Trump's last statement where he says, "When you find what happened to the plane, it will be exactly what I said." Now, this line is characteristic of *red* communication, red warrior communication. This is where Donald Trump is really operating from. It's not about policies. It's not about plans. It's about assertion. It's about being right. It's about being the alpha figure in the room.

We have to notice that that is very very powerful and persuasive for a lot of people in the culture. And we might even, as integral practitioners, try to find that strata in our own minds and bodies that is just looking for somebody to come in and take care of things.

It's actually a fairly low-risk assertion for Trump. It seems like it's high risk because, hey, what happens if it turns out that it was a mechanical error and it wasn't a terrorist attack. He's got egg on his face. That doesn't really matter at red. You just move on to the next thing. It's like being a shark. Think back on the Birther thing, back in whenever it was. 2011, 12, when Donald Trump was running with this "Obama isn't an American citizen" thing. That was Trump's thing, remember, for a couple of years.

Obama came out with his birth certificate and it was pretty conclusively shutdown. Now when Donald Trump is asked about the Birther thing, all he says is, "I don't talk about that anymore. Next question." It doesn't seem that any questioner pushes him too hard about this, and it works!

One of the good things about red is it's simple. One of the bad things about red is it's simple. But there we have it.

#### MUSLIM RAGE FROM AN UNLIKELY SOURCE

The next thing I wanted to point out from my surveying of the world this week is something that I heard on Fareed Zakaria's program this last Sunday where he was talking about a Muslim intellectual who came here in the late 40s, after World War II as a student at the Colorado State Teachers College at Greeley, Colorado. Not far from us here in Boulder.

He has turned out to be the Alex de Tocqueville of the Arab world. His name is Sayyid Qutb, and he wrote about America for the Arabs and he was horrified at what he saw as a decadent, hedonistic society. He saw America as being red while he and his fellow Islamists were working on developing a traditional or amber stage of development, which involved taking on and civilizing red, the previous stage.

It's a classic pre-trans fallacy. Just to put us in the mood, let me ask you Brett to play the song that kicks this whole thing off. I think most of you will recognize this.

[Play music: "Baby It's Cold Outside"]

Speaker 5: I really can't stay.

Speaker 6: But baby it's cold outside.

Speaker 5: I've got to go away.

Speaker 6: But baby it's cold outside.

Speaker 5: This evening has been...

Speaker 6: Been hoping that you'd drop in.

Speaker 5: So very nice.

Speaker 6: I'll hold your hands, they're just like ice.

Speaker 5: My mother will start to worry.

Speaker 6: Beautiful, what's your hurry.

Speaker 5: And father will be pacing the floor.

Speaker 6: Listen to the fireplace roar.

Speaker 5: So really I'd better scurry.

Speaker 6: Beautiful, please don't hurry.

Speaker 5: Well, maybe just a half a drink more.

Speaker 6: Put some records on while I pour.

Speaker 5: The neighbors might think.

Speaker 6: Baby, it's bad out there.

Jeff: Sayyid Qutb heard that song when he was here as a college student in 1949 at a church social dance in Greeley, Colorado. Greeley is not the bastion of liberalism by any stretch of the imagination, particularly back then. I think most of us Americans have been to some version of the church dance. It's anything but licentious. Yet here's what he wrote:

"The dance floor was lit with red and yellow blue lights, and with a few white lamps. The young people danced to the tune of the gramophone and the dance floor was replete with tapping feet, enticing legs, arms wrapped around waists, lips pressed to lips, and chests pressed to chests. The atmosphere was full of desire."

He goes on to write:

"The American girl is well acquainted with her body's seductive capacity. She knows it lies in the face and in expressive eyes and thirsty lips. She knows seductiveness lies in her round breasts, her full buttocks and in the shapely thighs and sleek legs. She shows all of these and does not hide it."

Sayyid Qutb became very famous in the Arab world for his 20 plus books, many of which focused on the Great Satan America as being a regressive culture. A culture that they themselves, the Arabs, were trying to work their way out of.

Of course we can look at his writing ... and all the women with their breasts and buttocks and thighs and legs and lips ... and laugh at it in a way because we're all so therapized here. We're advanced, modern, post-modern people. We've all been to therapy and we realize that this is just a basic shadow projection. Just basic shadow work.

What's happening at his stage of development is ... this is the consciousness of a man who is working his way out of hedonism to goodness. That is the project of his life, to gain some mastery over his base impulses. But for those of us at the modern and postmodern stages, that war has been fought and won, and we can actually move forward into a world where there is more sexual expression allowed, but it is in a safe container. For a pre-modern person, sexual freedom is not a safe container.

It's so interesting that Qutb actually cited the song, *Baby It's Cold Outside*. As he wrote,

"The boy took the girl to his home and kept her from leaving. She entreated him to let her return home for it was getting late and her mother and father were waiting, but every time she tried to leave, he would make an excuse and reply to her with this line, "But baby it's cold outside."

Basically, for him this is a song about men dominating woman. I was looking at some of the YouTube versions of this song, and in the comment section, that is still being discussed today, "Is this rape or

seduction that's going on here?" Because the song does violate some of our more exquisitely politically correct green impulses to this day of where men shouldn't really manipulate woman. But for Qutb, that was not just manipulation. This was domination.

Again, the project of his life was to civilize his red impulses and move into amber traditionalism. This is also evident in something he wrote about the American men of the time, where he talked about their "wide strapping chests" and their "ox muscles." He said,

"Their primitiveness can be seen in the spectacle of fans as they follow a game of football, or watch boxing matches, or bloody monstrous wrestling matches. This spectacle leaves no room for doubt as to the primitiveness of the feelings of those who are enamored with muscular strength and desire it."

"Only Islamic society is unique in this respect. In Islamic society, all authority belongs to God alone. Man, cutting off his chains of servitude is freed from the domination of other human beings, enters into the service of God, and thus is able to attain that real and complete freedom, which is the focus of human civilization."

Try to imagine going back to early traditionalism where we are beginning to see that power lies in a transcendent God and not in whoever has the most brute strength. What a relief it would be to be freed of the domination of other people! It is something to hold precious and worth protecting.

What Sayyid Qutb is doing is he is mistaking *post-conventional* morality for *pre-conventional* morality. Post WWII America was sufficiently evolved that folks then could reengage sex more freely. That, and the sexual revolution of the 60's, represents progress beyond traditionalism. Yet Qutb, as a budding traditionalist, sees it as a regression back to the rape culture of red which was, of course, most of human history. It's so interesting to see how that works.

Brett: While I was looking for which version of that song to play I noticed there are so many versions in our culture, and all of them say something about us at the time they were done. There's one from a few years ago where Joseph Gordon Levitt and Lady Gaga performed it at an award ceremony and they reversed the roles. Joseph was trying to get away from her and she's trying to convince him to stay.

Jeff: Interesting.

Brett: Then there's the Key and Peele version where they do a mock version of that song and she ends up beating him up and then he begs to be let go.

Jeff: Right. Exactly. You showed me that. At the very end of that performance, she puts on a rubber glove and manually violates him. It's shocking! It makes me sympathetic to Sayyid Qutb. ;-)

We'll link to those in the actual post, because they're really fun. This song is really such a part of Americana and it's so interesting to see it be interpreted and also misinterpreted.

#### BERNIE SANDERS' AMAZING RACE, A CONVERSATION WITH THEO HOESH

All right. Well, I think we'll move on to Mr. Theo. While we're doing that, Brett, why don't you play our excerpt from the topic at-hand. This is Senator Bernie Sanders as of yesterday as he is riding the wave that he has created:

Bernie Sanders: In this campaign, we have had to take on the entire establishment. That's okay. That's okay. We have taken on the financial establishment. When we get attacked by CEOs from General Electric or Verizon, you know what, I'm fine with that.

When we got attacked by people from Wall Street, I feel great. We have had to take on the political establishment in every state, in every state that we have run in. We have had to take on democratic governors and senators and members of congress and mayors, literally almost the entire democratic establishment, and in state after state the people have stood up and helped defeat the establishment.

It is not just a corrupt campaign finance system that we are going to fight. It is a rigged economy. This is what a rigged economy is about. A rigged economy is when today the top one-tenth of 1% now owns almost as much as wealth as the bottom 90%.

Jeff: Right on.

Theo: Right on.

Jeff: Ok, hey, Welcome Theo!

Theo: It's good to be here.

Jeff: Yes, indeed. Let me just tell the folks a little bit about you. Theo Horesh is, I think, one of the leading integrally informed thought leaders in our culture right now. He has written two books on thinking globally. One is *Convergence: The Globalization of Mind*, and you have a new book coming out called *Inner Climate: Global Warming from the Inside Out*. Right?

Theo: Yup.

Jeff: Yeah. You write for Elephant Journal and you have a huge Facebook presence. This is what I want to talk to you about tonight. Currently, you're focused on Bernie and you're leading, what I think is a significant charge to get this guy as far as we possibly can. Maybe to the White House. Who knows?

We can hear, even in that excerpt from Bernie, that he's really hitting new themes right now. One is the policy theme, and that is "how quickly can we get to Denmark?" How quickly can we really install a green economy? We know from an integral perspective that that's probably what's next.

Policy is first for Bernie, and the second is process. How could we make this election process more democratic and less of an oligarchy.

Theo: Yes.

Jeff: Let's look at the first, the policy thing. You and I had a little conversation earlier. You argue that Sanders' policy agenda is not as radical as it seems, and that in some ways Bernie's talking about developing institutions that are well established and time proven.

Theo: Yup. His financial transactions tax has been implemented in 40 countries. His parental leave policies are the norm throughout Europe. Single payer healthcare has only been done in a few different countries, but the universal health insurance that's not for profit is completely the norm throughout the developed world. This is one variation and it's actually the least radical in some ways of how to universalize health insurance.

When you look back to free college tuition. College tuition was all but free in a lot of ways in the 60s. The kinds of equality that he's looking at in our society. If he got his fantasy, we'd almost be put back to the 50s and the early 60s.

Jeff: In terms of tax rates?

Theo: Yeah. We had a 90% tax is on the wealthiest tax bracket from World War II up into the early 70s and only slowly diminishing into the 80s. This is all quite conservative in a lot of ways in the sense that this is tried and true. There's no experimentation. Obamacare was a complete experiment in the world. Gay marriage is largely an experiment.

There's precedent in some societies. In the Ming Dynasty in China, there was something like that. It's largely experimental. Much of what liberalism has become in the United States is experimental largely because we have such a strange system where we don't want to mimic the best of what's in Europe. These are the most successful states ever in the history of the world by many measures.



Jeff: Yeah. I think that what we can say is that a lot of these countries, and we are basically talking about Northern Europe, Scandinavia, Germany, Denmark. They're green. Their economies are green. They got there before we did.

Our economy is still in the orange stage. As you, I think, correctly point out, we had a blue, traditionalist economy back after World War II through the 80s and then Reagan came on and that changed and we went down to, what, 36% tax rates and so forth. That began the era of go-go achievement growth. Everything is focused around growth and money.

That has run its course. In fact, one could say that that ran its course at the end of the Bush administration, 2008, with the Great Recession. Now, it's time to move into a more fully green economy which is actually better than we had in the 50s and post World War II, because it includes everybody.

Theo: The technologies are more flexible. The social attitudes are more flexible. We've got greater capacities all around. There's been a burgeoning of occupations and a shift towards a creative economy.

Daniel Bell, the sociologist who wrote *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* in 1973 said you have several stages of economies. You have primary economies, which is agricultural. You have a secondary economy, which is industrial. A tertiary economy, which is I think he focused on information. That was it.

The fourth one was financial and health services. Fifth, I think he got into a quinary economy. It started getting into creative work. That's where you see this with Richard Florida's *Rise of the Creative Economy*.

So we've got a lot of exciting things happening and our political system has not caught up. In many ways, it's regressing. We've got more liberal values in the socialsphere, but we've got this corruption. When you say that the Reagan era has run its course. In many ways, it's run its course into the corruption that could it only result in.

This fin de siècle, the end of an era. That should have happened in 2007, 2008, and one wonders what might have happened if we didn't have the Citizen's United decision that allowed for such a flood of money.

Jeff: Yeah. Yet we've seen that, despite the flood of money, there still is something else arising. I think the poster boy for the end of big money in a way is Jeb Bush who had, I don't know how many hundreds of millions of dollars and ended up with virtually nothing. Now we have Bernie who has done no fundraising, has no super pacs and has raised all of this money, I think what, the average is \$17 donation.

Theo: \$27. Big money.

Jeff: This gets to the second wave that Bernie is riding: is this anti-corruption thing. This end of big money, I think people are getting it, that the system is corrupt.

You can see it on the Republican's side too. All of the starting presidential candidate's were representatives of the system. there were 16 of them, governors, senators, the whole regular suspects. The guy who wins [Trump] is the guy who is, in a way, not even a republican and who is at least so far self-funding. He's basically a bull in a China shop just busting things up.

That's also happening with Bernie. Bernie is not even a Democrat technically. He's what the Democratic party in some ways has set the system up to guard against. The guy who comes in and hijacks the party and doesn't really respect the apparatus.

Theo: It's strange that that's true and he's the core of what the democratic party is supposed to represent. Going back to FDR and the new deal and to Lyndon Johnson who probably passed more legislation as a democrat in the 60s, post-60s era with the new society programs.

It's funny, he's coming in challenging the party with many of its core values. The thing is interesting to me that I wouldn't have said before coming in to your show. You've lit out something, some insight in me. I won't say that Bernie is an integral thinker. I don't actually think he is. It's interesting how many levels of development he resonates on. He has the red fire in him, more so than Trump. Much more so than Trump.

Jeff: It's at least more coherent.

Theo: It's certainly more coherent. If they were younger men, I would think Bernie would kick his ass. I think his supporters would.

On the blue level, the membership oriented conformist society ... Bernie resonates on that level because he's talking about safety and security and how these programs would bring that about. I actually think programs would bring about much more from the 50s than anybody else.

He resonates with orange in a sense that he's preserving the values of a democratic system, which is purist expression to me of orange values. It's the rational system. He's the only candidate ... Almost everybody misses this. He's the only candidate who uses statistics regularly in his communication. He regularly talks in statistics, believing that everybody understand statistics, which is it utterly inaccurate.

And as you've mentioned, he's very green. This is all very interesting, and there's a sense I think among his followers, if you can call them as that, supporters, that he can set the whole thing aright.

Jeff: That is in contrast to his opponent currently, Hillary Clinton. I think Hillary is a nice lady. Isn't she? Let me just put this out there. I'm 62. I've been in this system for a long time and this is where I get suspicious of myself. I think Bernie's too far out and his time will come. He's lit a fire and somebody else will carry the torch, and it's not time yet. Then I think, "Wait a second. If I was 30, I wouldn't feel that way." It's like this is a really unique time in American politics. I've never seen an election cycle like this, nor has anybody.

Between Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders, it's like somebody has come in and taken the deck of cards and thrown it all up in the air. Blowing up the old guard, the guardians of the system as it is. Hillary, of course, is a part of that. Do you think she's particularly egregious part of that?

Theo: I think she's a Nixonian in her egregiousness. Just looking at the campaign, and I usually ... When I want to enumerate her lies, I try to start with the most recent ones I've discovered going backwards. The most recent one, she creates the Hillary Victory Fund. This is supposed to fund democratic candidates at all levels. Mostly, in national elections. It raises \$60 million. It takes in the highest donations at 50,000 vastly more than you're able to raise for yourself now, for one's self. It comes out in the middle of her campaign, that they've actually spent 45% of that money for themselves.

That was only part of it. It's now come out that they've only spent 1% of it for other democratic candidates. She basically lied to the democratic party and stole their money and broke our unbelievably lax campaign finance, campaign finance laws. She's pushing us back in that way, very far.

You look at the nature of her campaign, her whole campaign has been crafted around gun control. Which is nice. I support gun control and immigration reform. Yet she's used these two issues to portray her primary opponent as Bernie as an old racist, gun-toting, rural, out of touch guy from this rural state. She's twisted around his positions on gun control. As I told you before, the main thing she's got against Bernie on gun control is that he opposes suing the manufacturers of guns in mass shootings.

This is like suing the kitchen sink manufacturers for Hillary throwing the kitchen sink at Bernie. It's an ethical position. He took another ethical stand which was opposing, along with a lot of right wing republicans and centrist democrats, a certain oversight, for Homeland Security, of the Minuteman Militia which is a nasty militia group that "guards our borders" from Mexican immigrants.

Jeff: Yeah. Right. Freelancers.

Theo: He's obviously against this. He's obviously against this because he's regularly speaking out about the abuses that immigrants suffer in the United States, much more so than Hillary is in my opinion. These two issues light up African-Americans in inner-cities. It's lights up Mexican-Americans. These two issues continually lights them up and he doesn't do well with these groups ... They become a back stop. These are relatively tangential issues to what we really need to do to preserve our country.

Her whole campaign is not even a real platform. It's not looking at the massive social problem of our times, which is inequality. It's not looking at the massive problem of our political system, which is money and politics. It's not looking at our geopolitical issues, which she should know inside-out. Which is somehow

having to do with this delicate retrenchment of American power and shifting from Middle East to Southeast Asia, and dealing with a rising Russia and dealing with more internationalist system. It's not doing that. It's not looking at the economy. She barely touches the economy.

This to me is corrupt. It's fundamentally corrupt. She's playing politics with the most important issues regarding the future of our country.

Jeff: Do you think that there is ... Let me put it to you this way. What chance do you think there is of Bernie actually pulling this thing out?

Theo: I think it's extremely low at this point. I would have said differently just before going into northeast. He lost momentum there. It was a rising momentum. His polling numbers were continuing to get better. He was just starting to beat her in the polls among Democrats. He's been destroying her in head to head polls against republican rivals, and particularly against Trump, usually, winning by more than 10 points more than her. He's actually pulled away a little. He's winning by larger margins, 10 points. I haven't been watching as closely in the last week.

When he got hit hard in the northeast, it was still possible that he could have maintained momentum, but people just seem to let it go. He's going to have to win by something like a 65% margin in the rest of the remaining states. Which favor him a little more than others.

Then you would have to win over the super delegates, I think his only shot is that something new is going to come out with the e-mails. Which I do think is a legitimate scandal. Almost everyone on the left says it's not. I actually think hiding 30,000 e-mails where you've been probably doing work using your home computer is seriously corrupt.

Bob Woodward who broke the Watergate scandal, said it's like Watergate, but worse.

Jeff: Seriously corrupt versus Donald Trump.

Theo: I call it a neoliberal oligarchy versus post-modern fascism. I'll choose neoliberal oligarchy. I think the Bernie supporters shouldn't do the "Bernie or Bust" thing. If it's Hillary we're going to have to vote for her. Unless you're a really die hard Green Party person and you're really serious about it.

I was a Green Party organizer in the early 90s. I had a right to vote for Ralph Nader, even though I regret it. Especially because I realize now how cool Al Gore was. I had a right to vote for him. I was strongly behind it. It really held my values. I believed in the candidate. I don't think most of these people who are talking about voting for Jill Stein, the Green Party candidate, really believe in her. I don't think they know much about the party.

There are other ways of punishing the Democratic party. One, you can drop out of the Democratic party. Two, you can contribute to candidates who are running against some of the centrist democrats, and the people have manipulated the process.

The Bernie campaign is now pushing someone, a challenger for Debbie Wasserman Schultz, the head of the party that's done so much to shut him out. I think it's quite appropriate.

Jeff: I think what we're seeing is that there is ... things change. The role of the political parties is obsolete in a way. They were who consolidated the thinking with the think-tanks, and they have the donors, and they have all of the infrastructure of getting elected. That's no longer as necessary and valuable as it's used to be because we have other means raising money and of getting organized.

Theo: We're all thinking for ourselves on social media, where the battle cry is: "You fucking asshole!!!"

Jeff: I know. Exactly. I always think that the comment sections on Facebook and some of these websites is like a transcript of my voice dialogue therapy sessions in the 80s. Just all these crazy voices!

I think we're seeing the beginning of the end of the party system on both sides of the street. God knows what's going to become of the Republicans after this, and the Democrats too. Things change. Why

shouldn't they? We're moving into a system where intelligence and money are more distributed. They're not so centralized. I think this is some of what we're seeing.

Theo: I think it's exciting. It reminds me of 1948, when you had the democratic party split in three. People were dissatisfied with Truman who hadn't been elected at that point in time. You had the Dixiecrat party under Strom Thurmond. Just totally racist. You had ... I'm not even sure what they were called. Under Henry Wallace, the former vice president who was a socialist if not a communist. He was far to the left of Bernie. And you had the party split. Still Truman won. That was a major shift. The party system reestablished itself.

Jeff: Now you have had your own criticisms of Bernie as well, right Theo?

Theo: I think it's important to get I to that. From an integral perspective and from the perspective of my book, *Convergence: A Globalization of Mind*. The greatest challenge before us is to actually learn to think globally. Thinking globally does not mean developing to a certain stage such as integral consciousness.

Thinking globally actually means understanding global issues, which takes a lot of time. It's at least an order of magnitude more complex than understanding our national issues I even venture to say orders of magnitude ten to a hundred times more complex.

There are vastly more issues to get our handle on. There are vastly more different cultures to get a handle on how they're grappling with those issues. Something like climate change is super complex. It's not just affecting us nationally. It's going to require vastly more diverse group of players to come together. All the deals are more complex.

The effects of it are going to touch on virtually every human system. When you expand to the global level, you have to start looking far into the future, many generations, not just seven, Jeff.

You start looking at the value of other species, the value of ecosystems, and the value of emergent systems like oceanic currents, atmospheric currents. This is so incredibly complex. That complexity requires nuance in thinking and it requires a flexibility in thinking that I just think that Bernie is ... I think in many ways, we're looking at Obama presidency has failed to galvanize people to nuance thinking, nuanced complex thinking that was subtle, that should bring everybody together. Republicans were obstructionists in the face of it, and his supporters didn't get it.

Jeff: But Obama did.

Theo: I think he got it. I think he's an incredibly nuanced complex thinker with a well developed political philosophy that's about building consensus around making big changes happen.

Jeff: Sounds quite progressive and it also is quite centrist.

Theo: It's very unusual, and he has been incredible global in his thinking. I've got great criticisms of what he's done geopolitically, but that's beside the point.

Jeff: Me too. Who gets it all right?

Theo: Absolutely. I don't see Bernie engaging on that level. I see a lot of people concerned about that. Some of the Hillary supporters are concerned about that.

Jeff: Yeah. I'm concerned about that.

Theo: Yeah.

Jeff: Here's me. Maybe it's because I'm a little more establishment oriented because I'm old, but I'm thinking, "Yeah. Okay. Whatever." Hillary is going to win, but she has had a reality check, an existential nose rub with the progressive agenda via Bernie in a way that nobody expected. So in order to really do something dramatic, which she needs, because she doesn't have a lot of the juice that Bernie does actually ... that she may offer him the vice presidency.

Theo: I was thinking that after Super Tuesday. After Super Tuesday, if I were her and I believed in what I was doing. I would say, "Wow! It doesn't look like Bernie is going to win, but hey, I stayed in the race for a long time. He can stay in the race for a long time, and it's incredible how he's galvanized the party. How he's brought all these new young people into the party. This is what we need."

I would have hinted at including him as vice president. I would have praised many of the things he did. I would have looked at two or three specific things that he supports that I could get behind. I'd take it on. I'd say, "I'm listening to what the people want. That's why I'm changing my perspective." I wouldn't have morphed in this weird way that Clinton did, where she fought him.

I would have whipped the crap out of the state parties. Instead, I think she's actually supported them and given help to them. And they have done so many weird things. Nevada was stolen delegates as far as I'm concerned. Anyone who watched it could see that.

Colorado ... the state party miscounted. Bernie should have gotten more delegates. They told the Hillary campaign, but they didn't tell the Bernie campaign. They sat on it for weeks. They probably realized that they had to come out with it publicly. It's the only reason I can imagine that they would have sat on it for weeks.

You had voter irregularities that could possibly come out as vote theft in both Arizona and New York State. You actually had the district of Columbia forget to put Bernie on the ballot. When that came out, they made a correction. He actually criticized it. This is just too many things gone wrong.

Jeff: I think this is something that we're seeing, again, on both sides of the street with the republican primaries and the democratic primaries. They're too complicated. They're too prone to spin. I think that moving forward both of these parties, if they're going to be relevant, are going to have to clean up their act and become more democratic and more responsive to their public.

That's, of course, always a polarity that governance is trying to navigate, is elites versus populism. Both are important in a way, but to the point where the elite system feels ... It feels wrong. It feels corrupt. It feels like the system is protecting itself.

I was just looking at the net worth of some of these political pundits. We have Ann Coulter's worth 9 million bucks. Sean Hannity, 55 million. Michael Moore is worth 50 million bucks. Rush Limbaugh, 350 million bucks. The average senator is worth \$1.7 million. It's enough already.

Theo: If Michael Bloomberg had run for president, we would have had 54-times billionaire, 4.5 billion for Trump (he's probably lying about it. It's probably a lot less). There are numerous indicators to suggest it. And then Hillary Clinton with 90 million. This is absurd.

And what's at least as absurd is the fact that the money that's *truly* influencing these people is not their own. It's special interest money. This moves us towards Jimmy Carter, our former president, who said we're actually now an oligarchy. It's quite scary to contemplate someone from that position saying that. This has been a change in the last five years, in the last decade. Something profound has shifted on our system that we have to clean up.

Jeff: Yeah. Bernie I think is a great standard bearer for that. I think he's made ... No matter what happens. He has awakened a worldview and awakened millions of people to the possibility that we actually can make changes.

Changes happen often times very radically. Thoughts are things. The more people who think a certain way the more there's a magnetic pull towards that kind of thinking. I credit him with really moving the ball here and I'm excited to see what will happen.

Theo: I'm reminded of two prophets of the millennial generation. I can't remember both their names. One of them was Strauss. These sociologists came up with the theory of generational cycles. Each generation has its own mission. It has its own archetypal style. These rotate every 80 years or so, the longest age of a typical living person in that generation. Then you'll have a turnover.

You have prophetic generations such as the baby boomers. Then you have a lost generation. The 20s was one, and Gen X was another. Then you have this big achiever generation, the World War II generation. It achieved great things. The millennials were supposed to achieve great things. They are huge generation and some people would say, "Oh! They're doing it with social media." It looked like that during the Arab spring. If the Arab spring had succeeded we would have said, "Yes! The millennial generation has gone global and they're democratizing."

Yet democracy is actually being harmed in this generation, globally and in the United States. I thought for a while the Obama campaign was this big generational mission and then, "No. That collapsed." It looks like the Bernie campaign could yet kick it off. The Millennial generation is a generation that's too big, that's too original in its thinking and too united not to do something great. It's possible that this will kick it off.

It's also possible these guys were wrong.

Jeff: Yes that's always possible! So Theo, for people who are interested in following you and what you're doing online, how do they connect?

Theo: You follow me on Facebook or friend me on Facebook. I'm the only Theo Horesh, H-O-R-E-S-H, in the world, H-O-R-E-S-H. You can look up my books on Amazon, *Convergence: The Globalization of Mind*. It's a book of big thinking. It's unique. It carries some of Wilber's thoughts on the need to develop global consciousness into a much more concrete, philosophical, pragmatic range of asking the question of, "How do we actually do this?" Really, how do we do it?

Look for them on Amazon. Look for me on Facebook. I'd love to have you join the conversation.

Jeff: I concur! Thank you so much for being with us Theo Horesh.

Theo: Thank you. This is wonderful.

Jeff: Yes, indeed. Thank you everybody for listening!