



## Chapter 14. **Integral Politics, Or, Out of the Prison of Partiality....**

“On average, a genuinely new political philosophy—and eventually political movement—comes along once every two centuries. Integral Politics appears to be one of them.”

--Joyce Kerner Capshaw, *A Passion to Embrace*

“*The enhanced humans are coming...*” was the first thing I read in the handout of the Centrix Report, as I raced through it. About half the press corps had bolted for the doors; the other half bolted for their Blackberries and were thumb-typing to their agencies the most important news of the last decade, or so my emotions registered it. I kept flipping through the long pamphlet—short book, actually—and catching phrases and sentences here and there: “Techno-singularity likely, but in as-yet-unrecognized ways”; “Second-tier governance a novel emergent profoundly reconfiguring world alliances”; “10%10x the deciding factor”; “Newly emerging second-tier consciousness to remake virtually all human disciplines.” My mind jerked with each impact, reeling with things I already knew, staggered with seeing it in concrete print, as if that made imagination real, and wondering what it all meant, and what it all would mean....

And what exactly *was* in this report?

As I kept leafing, racing, through the small book, and the mild pandemonium in the hall settled down, Charles Morin stepped up to the podium. The only thing you could hear, all over the small auditorium, was the sound of flipping pages.

“Good afternoon, class, ladies and gentlemen of the press, and distinguished guests. I’ll make this very brief.

“As many of you know, but I will repeat for the benefit of our guests, the AQAL Code is the result of what started as The Human Consciousness Project. Similar to the Human Genome Project, the Consciousness Project was created to map every state of consciousness, personality type, meme, neurotransmitter from dopamine to serotonin, every synapse, PET distribution scan, meditation state, altered state, peak experience, neuropeptide, stage of consciousness, neuronal display, twitch, twinge, and tingle of the human mind, or psyche, or bodymind, or brain-mind, or whatever you want to call our being. The idea was to get *a complete map* of the human brain-mind—a composite map created by looking at every known culture and its psychological, spiritual, and scientific maps of the human psyche—going back thousands of years, and then using all of those partial maps to create a composite map of the full potentials of the total known territory of the human psyche to date.”

I remember arriving at Integral Center during the height of that quest for the great composite map, and all the excitement around it. The question was whether it could be done at all. The problem wasn’t the gathering of the information from thousands of sources—Cray supercomputers had been crunching that information for a decade now. Systems scientists and information specialists said the Crays should have gathered all the data, compiled it into a composite, and spit out the answer long ago, but they simply kept overheating instead.

The problem, it finally became apparent, was that too much of the data were apples and oranges, and thus literally wouldn’t add up. The researchers could not figure out what to do with something like Plotinus’s *nous*—roughly, world-soul—and how that would fit in with, say, serotonin or dopamine. The scientists immediately broke into two camps, one of which wanted to restrict all the input data to only neuroscience, and thus toss out all the psychological and spiritual maps of humanity as being hopelessly outmoded and prescientific and mere “folk psychology”

(translation: superstitious twaddle). By throwing out all the apples, all you had left were oranges, and that was certainly one way to handle the problem.

The other camp, much smaller but just as determined, retorted that the first camp was only chucking the collected wisdom of the entire human race. This would be like trying to categorize all of the art of a collective humanity by first throwing out everything in the art museums. This kind of wrangling had gone on for the better part of a decade, with the Crays regularly overheating as new and useless classifications jammed circuits meant to hold 0's and 1's, not thoughts and desires.

It was as this point that the federal government threw the HCP to some outside sources, including Integral Center. The story becomes a bit murky here, but the rumor persists that a dishwasher from Lincoln, Nebraska, a friend of Charles, figured out the basic scheme that allowed items like both dopamine and the world-soul to fit onto a composite map. The discovery wasn't topographical—the Cray supercomputers had already tried that, thirty-eight thousand times—but rather had to do with how to envision the quadrants. It was vision, not crunching, that beat the Crays.

At that point, things fell into line, and the Crays began a massive meta-analysis of all the known maps of human consciousness, covering premodern, modern, and postmodern sources. The composite map—named AQAL—came together right after that. The kid from Lincoln wrote “Rosetta” on the bottom printout.

Somehow all of this I already knew. Somehow all of the components of AQAL were more familiar to me than the lines on the back of hands. And now Charles was going to slam right into it, with no fanfare at all, and explain it to the press and the world. Got to hand it to IC. The Government will probably kill them.

Right after the terrorists kill me. Even after my frightening near-hallucination, I can't stop thinking about the possibility, and about whether AQAL will help prevent this mess of terrorism or merely provide a good way to understand it, so that those who bury me will not have their heads mussed with questions of why, only where—in this case, to scatter the ashes.

But after The Talk, I knew how to bracket those thoughts. I knew how to Watch the Thinker, do a Walk-Through, let it all dissolve into its own primordial source, and as the manifest world arose, allow at least as much Joy as Sorrow to fill the universe....

The Singularity is going to be positive, that's what the data shows. That's not just what Kurzweil and Garreau are saying, but that's what this handout is saying, that's what the teachers at Integral Center think, and that's what I am slowly letting in. Or perhaps I should say, I am slowly allowing for the simple possibility that something deeply positive might happen in the manifest realm, because my depression had ruled that out entirely, and so I wasn't even capable of looking at the facts. The Singularity might be negative, it might be positive—but I had to be able to deeply accept both, whereas I have been ruling out one entirely. And yet this press conference is here to announce....

“Some very good news.” Charles beamed out at the audience. “Once the AQAL Code was discovered, we began using it, among other places, in various supercomputer future scenarios. Today we will be showing you the results of those heretofore secret computer scenarios.

“You've probably heard that using the Code, these programs can predict the present accurately for the first time. Therefore experts believe they can predict the future with much greater accuracy than was heretofore thought possible. At this time, **we have gone back 30 years** and predicted the present accurately from there, so we believe **we can go forward 30 years** and get a good scenario of the likely future. We are presently running scenarios even further back and forward, and we will let you know those as they become available.

“As of today, our computer scenarios suggest that, in addition to standard linear and exponential changes—and the typical societal ups and downs of all of that—there appears to be a type of tipping point in many areas around **10 years from now**, and a major *fruition* of that around **30 years from now**. We call this tipping point ‘**P+10**,’ indicating that it appears to occur around 10 years from the present, and the major fruition or transformation point ‘**P+30**,’ indicating that it appears to occur around 30 years from the present. This press conference has particularly been called to discuss the nature of that transformation point—what it is, what it might mean, and the AQAL Code that disclosed it.”

Another half of the remaining press core raced out of the auditorium. You could see most of them standing outside the door, along with their colleagues who had previously fled, talking furiously on their cell phones, which had been banned from the hall. I could see the headlines: “Tipping Point 10 Years from Now; Transformation to Follow.” I looked to the left and right of me: both Kim and Ronnie sat with their mouths slightly opened and dropped. It was the first time in real life I had seen anybody with their mouths actually dropped open. And we hadn’t even gotten to the really good stuff.

“The reason that the Code works in future scenario programs is that agent-modeling programs used up to this point had no real psychology, no 3-dimensional psychology model that had peaks and valleys in addition to forests and plains. The typical computer program assumes that human beings act as they do because they are driven by rational self-interest to maximize their economic gain. Or they are driven by basic survival needs. The more adventurous assume they are driven by the need for meaning. But guess what? As you already know, human beings—you and I—can be driven by all of those drives, and many more. What was required was a psychology that accurately captured all of that.

“And it wasn’t just psychology. We had no accurate economic models, or religious models, or political models. AQAL seems to have remedied those gaping lacunae. As I said,

using the Code, our computer scenarios were able to predict the present in certain key variables starting back as far now as around 30 years. We therefore feel that they will show us, not with certainty, but with more confidence than any other programs to date, what certain key trends will look like for the future 30 years or so. These are scenarios, not predictions, but scenarios that have gotten virtually every variable we tested with an extraordinarily high degree of positive correlation. We were particularly interested in various economic, political, military, sociological, religious, and technological trends.”

Charles paused and, for the first time, looked at his colleagues in the front row; then smiled and continued. “To start with the technological trends, you might have been following the so-called Singularity arguments that have emerged in the last few years. Our scenarios indicate what we call a *singularity-like* wave function across 15 key variables starting at around **P+25** and then crashing, or crescendo-ing—we’re not sure which—around **P+30**. Basically, our computers crash at that point. Our simplified summary is that we believe a technological singularity of sorts occurs at **P+30**, and that is why the computers are crashing at that point, but that the fluctuations and the crash that we observed cannot be explained by technology factors alone. That’s important: technology factors alone cannot and do not account for this singularity-like wave at **P+30**. For that, we need to enter into interior variables across differential and integral vector functions and AQAL algorithms in integral math probability distributions that..., well, that’s gobbledygook. In plain English, you need the Code. You need the Code with its understanding of both exterior technological trends and interior consciousness trends in order to make sense of any of the changes leading up to **P+30**. That is something you will hear again and again at this press conference: you must include the interiors if you are going to be able to understand a single thing about yesterday, today, or tomorrow.”

I felt a deep satisfaction just hearing Charles say that, as I had heard him say so many times before. But now it took on a certain urgency. And what exactly is that “crash or

crescendo” thing? Is the “singularity” a crash—very bad—or a crescendo—very good? Integral Center is assuming the later, but why?

“So we will be going over those scenarios—and the Code used to generate them—in this seminar presentation. Now you already heard Carla explain the basic elements of the Code—the quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types that any truly integral or composite map must include.”

As Charles is saying this, I am racing through the booklet looking for the section on the technological Singularity....

“And you did notice, did you not?, that these elements are themselves *without content*. AQAL itself is without content. It is simply a series of perspectives that you need to include in any endeavor in order to see it from as many angles as possible. If you don’t, you’re not being comprehensive, you’re not being inclusive, you’re not being integral. But this does not say what content you should put in those perspectives. To say that you want to include all the quadrants, or to include 1<sup>st</sup>-, 2<sup>nd</sup>-, and 3<sup>rd</sup>-person perspectives, is not to say what you should see with them, which could be virtually anything. Likewise with levels. You can use any model you want for levels of consciousness. It might be Loevinger, or Kegan, or Graves, or Maslow, or Wade, or Arlin, or any model you like that has any substantial evidence—but use *something* to cover vertical depth. And likewise with states. And likewise with lines. It doesn’t matter what developmental lines you use, as long as you realize that individuals have multiple lines or intelligences, and you don’t reduce all lines to one line and then absolutize it. But we are not saying what content you should believe with the various lines. Likewise again with states. To say you want to touch bases with states like waking, dreaming-vision, and causal-creativity, is not to say what you should think during waking, or what you should see during dreaming, and so on. Just includes states of consciousness if you really want to be comprehensive.

“In short, all of the elements of AQAL are without content. Supply whatever content you like. Just include some content in all 5 elements if you want to be genuinely integral. We will

come back to that in a moment, but it's an important point, so one last time: We are not saying what you should think, or how you should think, or telling you what to include, and so on. We are hands-off on all of that. We are simply saying, touch bases with these 5 perspectives if you want to be integral. So please remember that 'hands-off' attitude. It is particularly important when we come to what an *integral society* might look like.

“Speaking of an integral society, that is indeed our next topic.”

Ronnie sees me flipping back and forth through the booklet, a puzzled look on his face. “Tech singularity?” I say.

“I found it. Page 87.”

“Thanks.” I start leafing toward page 87, curious what indeed the Center was finally reporting on the exteriors at **P+30**. What is their final stance on this thing?

“I want to introduce Dr. Lesa Powell, who will start us on our adventure in seeing what **an integral society might be like**. Why is understanding an integral society important? And let us capitalize it, shall we?, to give it a super-important, hyper-inflated importance: capital ‘I,’ Integral, capital ‘S,’ Society. Integral Society.

“But, I wonder, is it an over-inflated importance to capitalize it, or perhaps not? Because, ladies and gentlemen, this is part of the very good news. Various polling and research tools have disclosed that the percentage of the population at second tier—or turquoise, or vision-logic, or integral, or centauric—whatever model you are using—the percentage of the population at second tier has today gone from 5% in the last decade to 7% now. *7%, ladies and gentlemen*. This leads us to believe that we will in fact reach a 10% level *within a decade*. In other words, by the time that the scenarios refer to as **P+10**, we expect 10% of the population to reach second tier. We call this 10% level a **tipping point**.

“What does that mean, tipping point? Historically, as you will hear, whenever the leading edge—whether that was red or amber or orange or green—reached 10% of the population, there was a massive tipping point, a point that ushered in profound social, cultural, and political changes. These might take anywhere from 5 to 50 years or more to materialize once the population reached 10%, but materialize they did. When 10% of the Lower-Left quadrant reaches the leading edge at any given time in history, then leading-edge transformations follow in the society at large, *even though society itself still has only 10% at that leading edge*. The entire society does not embrace the new paradigm—90% do not embrace it!, in fact; but the 10% leading edge does, and that reaches down and changes everything in many profound and far-reaching ways. This 10% tipping effect, incidentally, is now called the **Carlson Effect**, after Dr. Margaret Carlson, who first spotted it.

“So, ladies and gentlemen, fasten your seat belts. It’s not just a coming **technological singularity**, which may or may not occur—we’ll talk about that in a minute. It’s the coming **cultural singularity**, if you will. Our future computer scenarios indicate that 10% of the population will reach second tier around 10 years from now, or **P+10**. And if that happens, along with hundreds of other variables I needn’t bore you with, then our computer scenarios indicate it is highly likely that there will be a newly emergent World Federation at **P+25**. We will be describing what that might mean later today.

“We indicate these major projected changes with a few symbols. Here are some of them:

**P+10 = 10%10x**

Or, 10 years from now there is ten-percent tenfold (10% of the population at 10 times more efficient second tier); also called the second tier *Tipping Point*

**P+10 -> P+25 = WL/G**

Or, if there is a ten-percent tenfold Tipping Point, then 25 years from now will show a World League/Governance, which is too soon to happen if first tier is in charge, but not if there is a ten-percent tenfold at second tier

**P+30 = T-S + C-S = OTW**

Or, 30 years from now, a Transformation Point occurs, which is the result of the combination of a **Technology Singularity** (or more accurately, Singularity-like wave) and a **Cultural Singularity**-like wave. And these results are OTW or **Off the Wall**—which is all we could think of to call it; the second tier *Transformation Point*.

“So **P+10** is the Tipping Point, and **P+30** is the Transformation Point. You’ll further see what some of these symbols mean as we progress, particularly 10%10x, or ten-percent tenfold, which holds the secrets to so much that will follow. And OTW means..., well, as I said, it means Off the Wall—a future that in some ways is so positive that neither we nor the computers can figure it out. More about that later.

“So let’s start this discussion with integral politics. What would an Integral Society, governed, or at least influenced, by **Integral Politics**, look like? We need to understand, not what an Integral Politics is precisely, but what it might be like in very general terms—or what we call **orienting generalizations**. So an outline of Integral Politics and integral governance—which are the cornerstones of an Integral Society—will give you a better idea of what that **P+10** Tipping Point is all about, as well as that **P+30** Transformation Point. Keep in mind, although technological singularities are said to be headed this way around P+30, the cultural Tipping Point begins at P+10, **a mere 10 years from now**.

“So, to get us started, let me introduce Dr. Lesa Powell.”

As I reached page 87, Lesa stepped up to the platform. Urgent as my search through the booklet was, I couldn't help but watch her for several minutes. She was simply the most striking-looking person I had ever seen. Her famous dreadlocks had been shortened dramatically, cut from their down-the-back length to something like..., let's see..., like maybe Halle Barre in the movie “Bullocks.”

(Speaking of that film, it's amazing how silly writer/directors can get when they are struggling towards Integral Politics, isn't it? Warren Beatty correctly perceives that humans will keep oppressing each other, killing each other, and brutalizing each other, as long as there is an Other, and so he wants to see human organisms inter-racially mate until there is only one biological race in existence. Seriously—he sees a biological uniformity in the Upper Right as the only way to truly accomplish getting rid of an Other. The human race basically fucks its way to an integral political stance. As much as I am deeply in favor of that approach in general, the problem is, we might get rid of white men and black men that way, but we won't get rid of amber men and orange men and green men and magenta men: in other words, everybody is born at square 1, and thus the great spiral of development in its entirety continues to exist, with each level at first tier seeing the other levels as a great Other, and therefore as a potential demon, and thus somebody to fight, dominate, oppress. That will never go away, any more than atoms, molecules, and cells will. What is required—and this much I already knew—is indeed an Integral Politics to handle all these levels that will continue to exist.)

Important as that is, what I am most curious about right now is what Integral Center has to say about the possible technological Singularity-like wave at **P+30**, and how that was related to the Tipping Point at **P+10** and the Off the Wall at **P+30**. I look back down at the booklet, page 87, as Lesa launches into Integral Politics, capital I, capital P.

“Okay, this is a rough draft, so bear with me. My book in progress is called *Integral Politics: The Possible Contours of a Post-Tipping Point Governance*. The first chapter is an introduction to Integral Politics, and I thought it would serve as a good intro here. I’m going to hand it out in a pamphlet so you can refer to it, and I’ll go over some of its major points now—but please, don’t hesitate to interrupt with any questions you might have. And also, please remember that this is first rough draft.

“The first chapter is called, ‘Why Do Humans Suffer?—The Democratic and Republican Answers.’ It deals with this issue: It’s amazing that, to this date, nobody has been able to give a satisfactory definition of liberal and conservative, or more generally, Left and Right of the political center. We will refine these definitions as we go along; for now, we use them all very loosely as referring to Democrat and Republican in America.

“There are, of course, many definitions that have been offered for ‘Democrat’ and ‘Republican,’ and many of them are useful enough. But none of them seem to hit the nail on the head in a simple, clean, obvious way. Except one, and I’m proud to say it was first suggested by one of our own IC members in the book *Up from Eden*. What is the basic difference between Democrat and Republican, or between the Left and the Right? Here’s an easy way to tell. If you ask the simple question—*Why do human beings suffer?*—you will get two major answers. The Right will say, *You suffer because of yourself*; the Left will say, *You suffer because of someone else*.

“For example, why are some people poor? The Republican will say: ‘Because they are lazy, they don’t work hard enough, they have an entitlement mentality, they are indolent, they don’t have family values, they’d don’t have a proper work ethic: I worked hard for my money, let them work hard for theirs!’ The Democrat will say: ‘They are poor because they are oppressed, they have not been given a fair chance, they are downtrodden, they are victims—it’s not their fault, it is society’s.’ *The Republican generally places blame within; the Democrat, without.*

“Thus, take the heated issue of gun control—what should we do to curb the almost 50,000 deaths annually in this country from guns? The Republican says: criminals will get guns anyway, so let responsible citizens have all the guns they want, because the problem is not out there anyway; rather, we must instill morals in our society: raise children who have family values and will not go around killing people with guns or other means.

“The Democrat says: take away all the guns.

“In other words, the Republican thinks the problem is internal, the Democrat, external. And they get infuriated—absolutely infuriated—with each other. Take the shootings at Columbine, Colorado, where [TBA.] The liberals wrung their hands and made films like *Bowling for Columbine*, which had a simple solution to the whole mess: ban guns, period, and this tragedy would never have happened. The conservatives responded red-faced and just as angry: criminals will get guns anyway, so the real problem is not the guns but a liberal society that has no internalized sense of shame, doesn’t believe in ethical **self-control** and so must use **gun control**, which almost invites people to engage in this type of ultimate narcissism.

“And so goes the interior-exterior raging debate about the cause of human suffering—from guns to poverty to abortions to unemployment. *Economic wellbeing*—**Republican**: instill values of personal industry, work ethic, and free-market capitalism, and those deserving will prosper; **Democrat**: redistribute the wealth. *Abortion*—**Democrat**: abortion on demand; **Republican**: practice responsible sex and abstinence and you won’t need abortions in the first place. *Homelessness*—**Democrat**: make housing available to those who are disenfranchised; **Republican**: teach the values of self-responsibility and industry and you won’t have many indigent. *World hunger*—**Democrat**: feed the hungry; **Republican**: teach them to feed themselves. In each case, the Republican mostly recommends *interior* changes, the Democrat, *exterior* changes.

“Likewise, when it comes to social change, the Republican recommends *interior development* (character education, family values, God values, industriousness, self-responsibility, work ethic); the Democrat recommends *exterior development* (material improvement, economic redistribution, universal health care, welfare statism). Of course, there are all sorts of exceptions and mixtures. But more often than not, that is a genuinely basic difference in socio-political orientation between the Democrat and the Republican.”

I was curious how the press would respond to Lesa. Where Carla was all jokes, Lesa was all business (translation: boring). I finally looked down from Lesa’s radiant visage to page 87, “A Possible Technological Singularity.” And that’s when the Garreau section caught my eye, which the IC booklet had reprinted with approval:

**The enhanced humans are coming, and within your lifetime**, so enhancement is a choice you will soon have to make to increasing degrees. The enhanced humans—you in a few decades—have amazing thinking abilities. They have photographic memories and total recall. They can devour books in minutes. Although they don’t put much of a premium on exercise, their bodies are remarkably ripped. They talk casually about living a long time, perhaps being immortal. They have been vaccinated against pain; they never feel acute pain for long. They are always connected to each other if they want, sharing their thoughts no matter how far apart, with no apparent gear. They call it ‘silent messaging.’ It almost seems like telepathy. They have this odd habit of cocking their heads in a certain way whenever they want to access information they don’t yet have in their own skulls—as if waiting for a delivery to arrive wirelessly. Which it does. For a week or more at a time, they don’t sleep. They are the enhanced humans, and they are you in a few years.

The enhanced humans. And that's just the Right-Hand part. Integral Center adds the Left-Hand part, or the coming Transformation Point that includes a "Cultural Singularity" and not just a Tech Singularity. Garreau's book *Radical Evolution* was about the coming enhancements to human biology, so much so, that within a few decades, human biology might indeed be transcended to a huge degree. So simply look in booklet to the section right here on "The Technological Singularity" and you can see that much of that indeed does come to pass by **P+30**. And this, again, is looking only at the Right-Hand quadrants. Add the Left-Hand, and things get downright spooky, in a dizzily happy sort of way, if you let them. I thought about the Turquoise Kid Dies an Ignominious Death. And then about The Talk, and then maybe, the Turquoise Kid Lives Happily Ever After. Because "happily ever after" seems to be coming this way. Garreau is simply reporting research that is happening right now, and much of the AQAL future computer scenarios seem to agree. That's why they think that **P+30** will be Off the Wall.

I look at Ronnie. He is mouthing the words, "Off the Wall."

"I know," I mouth back.

"I always liked that definition of Republican and Democrat," Mark Jefferson commented from the first row, where the other teachers were sitting, and loud enough for the press to hear. "And I noticed that, starting a few years ago, it began to gain some popular acceptance and use. Even *Time* magazine started using it. I'm quoting from *Time*." He shuffled around in his briefcase. "Notice that it explicitly uses that definition [p. 163 *A Theory of Everything*]:

This is the line between what might be called the Externalists and the Internalists. Externalists, who tend toward the political left, say that America's racial problems are to be addressed through outside interventions (affirmative action, busing and other government programs to repair the damage of the past and enforce racial justice). Internalists, who are apt to be conservative, stress solutions that require efforts from the

inside: education, hard work, self-motivation, morale, bourgeois values, deferred gratification, the old immigrant virtues....”

“Thanks Mark,” Lesa said. “Did everybody hear that? Great. So that is the first variable of an Integral Politics, namely, *where does the political theory or movement locate the source of human suffering?* This is the *internal-external scale*, which is particularly important because it is ultimately responsible for whom, or what, you blame for your problems—and society’s problems—and what you recommend to solve them. This is a huge divide between many political parties, and one of the major fragments that an Integral Politics will have to integrate. But, as we will see, there are several major variables in an Integral Politics, and we want to look at where any political movement falls in terms of all of those variables.

“In terms of Code AQAL, this simply means that the ‘interiorists’ or the ‘internalists’—which are mostly Republicans in this country—emphasize the importance of the Left-Hand quadrants in the causation of human suffering, while the ‘exteriorists’ or the ‘externalists’—usually Democrats—emphasize the Right-Hand quadrants as the primary cause of human suffering. In order to make the world a better place, the Republicans mostly wants to tinker with the interior (Left-Hand) quadrants, the Democrat wants to engineer the exterior (Right-Hand) quadrants.”

“Dr. Powell, could you briefly relate that to militant actions like 9/11?” a student in the fourth row asked.

“Sure. Good to see you, Steven. Try it like this. When you ask Republicans what could possibly cause the militants themselves to engage in such desperate acts, they will not hesitate to ascribe virtually all blame to the terrorists themselves: they are evil, they are subhuman, they lack any sort of values, they lack character, they lack the true God, they lack something or other, but in

every case, it's *their fault*, period. It's an interior problem—their interiors are fucked up real good.

“And the typical Democrat will go to the other extreme and blame the exteriors: yes, the terrorists are responsible for these acts, but it's something horrible in their environment that made them do it. And in this case, that something horrible is a four-letter word: the West.

“The AQAL Code tells us that *both* of those views have a degree of truth to them (simply because *all* occasions have both Left- and Right-Hand quadrants!). But let's come back to terrorism, shall we? Nobody on the world scene—absolutely nobody, here or abroad, theoretically or practically, in academia or in office—is taking an Integral Political stance, so the responses to militant terrorism predictably and unfortunately fall into one of those dualistic and partial and fragmented stances, and we want to see if we can do better.”

“Thanks Dr. Powell.”

“Thank you, Steven.” Lesa paused, looked down at her notes, glanced at Margaret, who for some reason had walked in accompanied by Sharlene, and continued reading. “Now, **that is the first variable in an Integral Politics that we need to include—internal versus external emphasis, or Left-Hand and Right-Hand quadrants.** The second variable involves the levels themselves: *what general level of development* is the political party or movement coming from, emphasizing, or acting from?

“I will give several examples of this in a moment. But you see where I am going with this, yes? The AQAL Code—all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, all types—gives us a way to understand politics in a very deep and meaningful way: you simply need to locate the political stance or movement within the AQAL matrix. I'll say it again: simply locate the movement in the AQAL matrix. Simply find its Kosmic address, and you will begin to understand exactly what that political party is all about, and what it wants to do to you....”

And what technology it wants to use on your ass, I thought, as I continued reading about the coming Singularity-like waves in our future. . . .

“Okay,” Lesa said, “we’ll come back to that. In order to simplify that Kosmic address when it comes to politics, we use four major variables (and several minor ones), and we attempt to integrate all of them in Integral Politics. Those variables are interior/exterior quadrants, individual/collective quadrants, altitude or levels, and transformation/translation type.

“*Interior/exterior (or internal/external)* we just introduced. It covers the reputed cause of human suffering: where does the political movement look for social reform, to individual responsibility or to state responsibility? *Individual/collective* refers to the Upper quadrants and the Lower quadrants: does the political movement most emphasize individual rights or collective rights? *Altitude*, of course, refers to the *level of consciousness* from which the political party stems, as well as the level to which it is aimed—in other words, the *levels* part of the matrix equation. And *transformation/translation type* refers to the type of change process that is recommended: progressive and transformative, or conservative and translative? There are other, minor variables, which we will mention, but those are the main items. **They constitute three independent axes (internalist/externalist, individualist/collectivist, progressive/conservative)** at each of the major **levels**, and using that scheme allows us to index and accurately classify every single major political movement in existence.

“Integral Politics, very simply, means a politics that includes and integrates all of those items disclosed to us by the AQAL Code—particularly all quadrants across all levels. Since AQAL is the very structure of human existence, any politics that fails to take all of those dimensions into account is doomed to wander in the prison of partiality, cutting and torturing and enslaving those it claims to help and govern.”

I looked up from my reading when she said that. The room had become quite still, for the first time since she began speaking.

Except for Ronnie, who had discovered the section on the technological Singularity-like wave headed our way, and saw the whole Off-the-Wall thing in blazing techni-color.

“Oh yeah-yeah-yeah, your dudeness, I’m off the wall myself!” Ronnie hyper-whispered. “And Integral Center thinks that the good guys win, and P+30 is Off the Wall! Awesome squared! Here’s our future-rama, dude: Second tier plus Singularity! Integral Center has nailed tomorrow. What a gloriosity! What a hoot and a half in Tomorrow Land! Second Tier plus Singularity. And in my lifetime, dude. And James says you’ll still be a virgin! This is—”

“Ronnie, hush, please, Lesa will hear you,” I implored. “And I’m not a virgin!”

“Yes, right, right,” he whispered, then crashed back into his chair, ready for the next launch. Kim leaned around me, glared at Ronnie, and sank back into her chair.

“As an example of levels of consciousness in politics, I will focus on one area that is dramatically affected by levels. And we will do so by briefly reviewing the history—the genealogy, if you will—of *vertical* political movement in the West, by giving the view from 50,000 feet—that is, a very broad orienting generalization—which is spotted by using the AQAL Code....

“Let’s begin our story by noticing that in this country, mainstream Republicans or conservatives have very strong amber/traditional values. Hence, when they say that ‘character counts,’ or that they want to ‘instill values in people,’ or that they are ‘the party of values,’ they almost always mean *amber* values *only*, traditional values, ethnocentric values: nationalism, family values, militarism, patriotism, patriarchalism, good ole Biblical injunctions and command morality. They do *not* mean green values, red values, teal values, turquoise values, etc.

“But that sort of traditional, conservative political movement—grounded in mythic-membership and the amber value system—was the dominant form of governance for most of humanity’s civilized history, East and West, from the great Axial Period (around the 6<sup>th</sup> century

BCE) up to the Enlightenment in the West. This amber value structure, and the governance systems that it supported, were those of the great Republican empires and ancient nations, East and West, North and South, Rome being one of the mightiest. These were agrarian societies (in the Lower Right), and therefore typically they had a corresponding mythic-membership culture of amber or traditional values (in the Lower Left). At their best and healthiest, and *for their time*, these cultures were a thing of beauty and wonder.

“Of course, prior to those amber, [AMBER] traditional, ethnocentric, agrarian societies, there were mostly the red, [RED] egocentric, warlord societies of raw power and enslaved humans, all set in tribal warfare and frequent social anarchy. Every now and then a present-day political party will appeal to the red anarchical, tribal, and power instinct in people, especially males, but there are few governments in today’s world that can sustain these values solely on their own, although some dictatorships—and we must include Saddam Hussein’s—have come awfully close to doing so. And when you see the breakdown of the Soviet Union, with its amber totalitarianism—however much that totalitarianism needed to be dismantled—instead of transformation upward there was transformation downward, a loss of altitude; and thus as amber crumbled, red resurfaced, and the Russian mafia is now the most feared red-tribal society anywhere on the planet.

But the important point to note is that, precisely because the spectrum of consciousness and the spiral of values are constantly regenerated—*everybody is born at square one* and begins their growth through the spiral as it exists in their culture at that time—then, even in today’s modern/orange world, magic/magenta values are still around, and egocentric/red values are still around, and traditional/amber values are still around—and hence there will always be human beings who, stopping at those value stations in their own lives, will be attracted to political leaders, philosophies, and systems that give

voice to these values—their values. And thus, as we will see, there are red blocks of voters, and amber blocks of voters, and orange blocks and green blocks and so on. . . .

Historically, the **magenta** or magical-animistic stage emerged in humans perhaps as early as 500,000 BCE. By 50,000 BCE, the **red** wave had begun to emerge and start its long and colorful career. Starting around 10,000 BCE, with the invention of farming, the **amber** wave began to emerge, and it gained a mature and dominant form during the first millennia CE, with Greece and Rome being typical, and it continued to be the dominant mode of consciousness certainly up to the nascent nations that existed in Europe at the time of the Renaissance. Of course, the whole point is that even if a society's dominant culture is amber, there are nevertheless pockets or subcultures of all the earlier stages, where many people still reside, and a small percentage at a few of the higher stages as well. And thus in a culture whose center of gravity is amber, we will still find large pockets of magenta and red alongside amber, as well as some nascent orange and green. Thus, a running series of culture wars is always played out in various ways within every society. (We also find small pockets of one or two stages higher than the dominant mode—pockets from which future revolutions or progressive transformations will be born.) Nonetheless, most societies have center of gravity and thus a dominant mode of discourse that especially reflects the altitude of the governing or steering systems of that society, and this Governance system effectively marginalizes—and must marginalize—competing modes of discourse and power. (It can do so in a healthy or unhealthy fashion: functionally or dysfunctionally. We will return to this.)

Up to around 1200 BCE in the West, the highest major mode of average consciousness was traditional amber. In its sophisticated forms, the great Republics organized at that stage produced the roots of what we today would call Republican or conservative political philosophy—aristocratic, hierarchical, disciplined, agrarian-

patriarchal, traditional, amber-value oriented, with emphasis on military defense, national identity, and ethnocentric religion. Over 90% of such societies had slavery.

“But beginning around the Renaissance and culminating with the Enlightenment, an entirely new level of values began to emerge—namely, the *orange*, modern, worldcentric value system—and with it, a radically new type of political philosophy was born: **liberalism**.

“Liberalism reflected many things at once: a move from ethnocentric to worldcentric perspectives; from monarchy/aristocracy to democracy; from slavery to equality; from a society informed by myth to one informed by science; from a role-identity to an ego-identity; from duty and honor to dignity and recognition; from ethnocentric values to universal values (especially freedom, equality, solidarity).

“In short, it involved *a vertical transformation in levels of consciousness*: a move from amber to orange, from ethnocentric to worldcentric, from conventional to postconventional. It was the birth of liberalism in the modern Enlightenment.”

I wondered what Kim thought about all this. She had been very quiet after the... I almost said, after the terrorist attempt on her life. It was actually right after I yelled “What?” and Carla dropped that PMS line on me. I turned to my left, where Kim was sunk in her chair, not dejectedly, but determinedly, it seemed; she looked as if she were trying to super-absorb what Lesa was saying, and thinking hard about what it meant, but in a distant, far-away, dejected state.

“Kim, whatsup?”

“They are about to go over all the extraordinary things that will happen in the wake of 10%10x in the Left-Hand quadrants, and maybe the start of an Integral Society. If 10% of the population reaches second tier, and second tier is 10 times more efficient than first tier, then we will get a staggering Tipping Point at P+10 and an off the wall Transformation Point at P+30.

And that's just in the Left-Hand quadrants. I'm still reeling from the possibility of a techno Singularity also occurring as part of the Transformation at P+30 in the Right-Hand quadrants. Look at this," she said, pulling several crinkled sheets from her purse.

"What is that?"

"A Xerox of several pages from a converging technologies report."

"Say what?"

"It's a report that Charles was carrying around with him for several weeks. Look, Integral Center refers to this report on page 125 of the Centrix555 Report."

I glanced down at the sheets in her hand, then flip through the Centrix booklet to page 125. Yup, right there.

Kim looked around as if making sure she wouldn't be heard, then continued whispering. "Do you know how seriously even the White House and Congress take this Singularity business? Charles told me about this report, and do you know who wrote it? You won't believe this. It's from the National Science Foundation and the Department of Commerce. You can't get more conventional than that, and yet they issued this unbelievable 416-page document called *Converging Technologies for Improving Human Performance*."

Kim held up the crinkled three sheets. Ronnie leaned over my lap and google-eyed them. Kim ignored him.

"'In the next 10 to 20 years,' she whisper-read from the report, 'we will see the following from the technological revolution's affects on human biology: direct connections between the human brain and machines; instant access to information anywhere; human biology tailored to order; the production of wealth accelerated beyond any reasonable demand, eradicating most poverty; cure of all biologically-based diseases....' And it goes on and on.

“What I can’t believe is where this is coming from. I mean, if the National Science Foundation and the fucking Department of Commerce believe this, it’s damn near certain, don’t you think?”

“That’s pretty amazing,” is all I could think to answer. Then: “You say Charles was carrying that report around with him for several weeks before this press conference?”

“Before writing the report, but yes, same thing basically, why?”

“Oh, just thinking. Trying to let some good stuff in, that’s all.” I looked at Kim, then at Ronnie, then at Lesa on stage. I began smiling and shaking my head slowly, as if about to open a really nifty Christmas present. **10%10x...**, **10%10x...**, **10%10x...** I mean, think about it. A Tipping Point leading to a Transformation Point. Slowly but surely, gloriously, wildly, beautifully, **10%10x** became the mathematical formula of my future. This doesn’t mean there won’t be ups and downs; the point is, there will be ups—actual, real, amazing ups, and that is what I needed to let in. The Talk was starting to seep into my pours, headed for my soul.

“But, of course, the Western Enlightenment was many other things as well, not all of them healthy. Remember what we call *the dialectic of progress*—the mixed blessing—of modernity: the good news is that the quadrants themselves were finally differentiated in a conscious, large-scale way. The four quadrants—or simply the Big Three of I, we, and it; or art, morals, and science—were finally differentiated and allowed to pursue their own truths in their own ways, which resulted in a spectacular freedom and progress in each domain. Science, for example, could pursue its own truths without the Spanish inquisition breathing down its throat, art could pursue natural themes instead of religious themes, and moral action could be conceived as a natural right apart from a mythic God giving it sanction, all in the freedom bought by this extraordinary new differentiation—what Max Weber called ‘the differentiation of the value spheres,’ which has also been called the **dignity of modernity**, which indeed it was.

“The downside was that the Big Three of art, morals, and science did not just *differentiate*, they soon began to *dissociate*, and this allowed an aggressive and highly successful science to colonize the other values spheres, inadvertently reducing art and morals—the Beautiful and the Good—to mere tools of instrumental rationality. This has been called *the disenchantment of the world*. This disenchantment was not a definition of modernity, but of unhealthy modernity. Please remember that distinction, because every critic of modernity has forgotten it—or was, forgive me, too stupid to understand it in the first place.” Lesa looked up and smiled.

“But as for that disenchantment, what happened? Well, put bluntly, the interior dimensions of ‘I’ and ‘we’—the Left-Hand quadrants—were all reduced to puppets of the Right-Hand world of sensorimotor ‘its’ and exteriors: **scientific materialism** was born. The modern version of flatland was born.

“And liberalism was born with it. Liberalism grew up in the same flatland atmosphere, the atmosphere that recognized only exteriors, only matter, only things you can see ‘out there’—which is precisely why, to this day, most liberals can only comfortably think about what needs to be fixed in the exteriors (such as economics) in order to make society a better place. To think about fixing interiors would imply that some interiors are better or worse than others, and liberals usually recoil at the implication—thus inadvertently paralyzing any effective interior development and focusing almost exclusively on the exterior engineering of social systems.

“But there is also a very positive reason for the liberal reluctance to discuss interior development, and it needs to be carefully noted, namely: **the separation of church and state**. The previous political philosophy (conservative traditionalism), stemming from the mythic-membership wave (amber), was essentially a *church-state fusion* philosophy: the Pharaoh, Caesar, Czar, or King was either God or God’s representative, a one-party command-and-control political system plugged straight into an ethnocentric religion and its one-and-only God. Liberalism wished to go beyond this **ethnocentric governance** to **worldcentric governance**

based not on religious mythic values or conventional family values, but on postconventional freedoms extended to as many individuals as possible.

“Therefore—and this is incredibly important—the defining general liberal stance, when it first emerged, is that *the state shall not officially promote any specific or favored version of the Good Life*—it shall not promote any particular religion—which is often summarized as the separation of church and state.

“In simple terms, this means that the State cannot force you to belong to any religion. Prior to modernity, if you belonged to any religion other than the state-church, your existence was tenuous. Often, *the head of state* was also *the head of religion* (as was true for many Pharaohs, Caesars, Khans, etc.), and thus to disagree with that office was to be guilty of both the *political crime of treason* and the *religious crime of heresy*, a double punishment known for its barbarity.

[Foucault quote]

“Remember that in the 13 American colonies, prior to the Constitution, weekly church attendance was mandatory in every single colony! Can you imagine what that was like? Not to attend church was a criminal offense. When liberalism demanded that there be a separation of church and state, such practices were in essence eliminated. This is stated by liberalism as: *Right precedes Good*—which means, it is your right to choose your own religion, or no religion at all. It is *your right*, not the state’s, to choose your version of the good life. Hence, your right precedes the good, and you can choose whatever good you want; whereas in traditional cultures, *Good precedes Right*: the group’s spirituality is the one you must accept, or the tribe’s Goddess is what you must embrace, or the state’s religion is the only good allowed, and you have no right to publicly disagree with it without severe punishment, as we saw—or just ask Galileo, or ask al

Hallaj, or ask Giordano Bruno—not to mention perhaps 200,000 European pagans and witches burned or stoned for not adopting the correct Good.”

Kim, who had been listening to Lesa with that look of rapt, unblinking concentration that signaled she was actually absorbing what was said, finally started blinking like crazy, and slowly turned and looked at me.

“So, okay, check out the conclusion that the friggin’ National Science Foundation reaches. And remember, this is the conclusion that is getting whispered into the ear of the President of the United States: ‘The 21<sup>st</sup> century could end in world peace, universal prosperity, and evolution to a higher level of compassion and accomplishment.’”

“The government of the United States concluded that? Our government? They care about a higher level of compassion?”

“You know, they’re compassionate conservatives.’

“Gimme a break!” I scoff.

“Look who’s not being integral.” Kim grinned. “You’re supposed to integrate Democratic and Republican.”

“Yes, the ideas, not the assholes.”

Kim smiled. “You should pay more attention to Lesa. Look, in the Centrix555 Report here, it says that we are likely going to reach tenpercent tenfold in 10 years, and if that Tipping Point happens at **P+10**, then a World League—which would not exactly replace but dramatically supplant the present United Nations—will come into existence around **P+25**. But if you read between the lines here, this means that the United States first reaches a climate that an integrated political governance system can be reached. Then the tech Singularity-like wave will also likely occur at P+30. You know what that means, don’t you?” Kim looked at me piercingly, urgently, again with that unblinking stare.

“I’m not sure.”

“It means that the good guys will control the Singularity. Integral Politics will control the Singularity.”

Ronnie, overhearing the last part, said, in a voice loud enough for several rows to hear, “Second Tier plus Singularity is Off the Wall! I’m in yee-haw heaven, female-lady-type person!”

“The separation of church and state put an end to that persecution. It is your right to worship if, when, where, who, what, and how you wish. Liberalism therefore recommends what is known as a *procedural republic* (where right precedes the good), not a *substantive republic* (where the good precedes right); and it generally defends negative freedoms (the freedom from) more coherently than positive freedoms (the freedom to). The liberal stance therefore advocates a type of *equality* and even *egalitarianism*. But in all cases, the emphasis is on *exterior* and *social* equality. Interior hierarchies are looked upon with suspicion, as are interiors in general. And, in fact, in the classic liberalism of, say, John Locke, interiors are pretty much denied altogether—the so-called *tabula rasa*—more about that later.”

Then Lesa, her voice rising and falling in massive emphatic bursts: “But there is a great difficulty with such liberalism: the very capacity to protect and promote *universal equality* is the PRODUCT or the RESULT of several stages of *interior* hierarchical growth (egocentric to ethnocentric to worldcentric—or magenta to red to amber to orange, which is why representative democracies show up no place in history until the orange level begins to emerge). The liberal stance that says all people are equal *is itself an elite value reached only by a minority of the population at most times*. Liberalism is the product of several major hierarchical stages of growth that then turns around and denies the importance or even the existence of hierarchical stages of growth.

*“Liberalism thus denies the very path that produced liberalism.* And one of the major reasons that it does so, I am suggesting, is that not only was liberalism born in the higher atmosphere of worldcentric awareness over ethnocentric awareness—a significant plus—it was also born in the climate of the disenchantment of the world—the climate of flatland, of scientific materialism, of economic reductionism, which maintained that all the truly important realities are exterior/sensorimotor occasions—a significant minus.

“Even the psychological systems that grew up with liberalism—empiricism, behaviorism, positivism—maintained that the interior world is nothing but a series of pictures or representations of the exterior world, which is the only really real world (again: liberal science maintains there are only facts, no interpretations: that is, there are only exteriors, no real interiors). *Tabula rasa* interiors was the widespread belief, and this just further embedded the prejudice that all real realities are exterior, and therefore all real social change must be exterior.

From the beginning, liberalism therefore *misunderstood the genesis of its own stance*. It failed to grasp the fact that liberal values arise only through a series of interior, nested, hierarchical stages of growth—and liberal values are fairly late-emerging values at that (beige to magenta to red to amber to orange, at which point liberal values begin to emerge...). Therefore liberalism—because it was *in fact* a postconventional, worldcentric, universal wave of fairness, justice, and tolerance—immediately extended to all the other stages the status of equal value, even when those lower stages, such as red and amber, had no intention of returning the favor—and, in fact, were they in power, would crush liberalism as soon as they possibly could. And every time those lower stages do come into power today, the first thing they attack and attempt to eradicate is liberal freedoms.

*'We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal....'* Well, all men might be created equal, but very soon they reach different developmental levels, *only the higher of which* start producing liberalism. Whereupon liberalism begins vigorously denying interior hierarchies and thus effectively dissolves the path to its own genesis.

“Thus, liberalism works very hard to destroy the path that produced it. In place of interior development, merely exterior development is then recommended by the flatland liberal. Material improvement and economic reshuffling become the major aims of governance—redistribute the material wealth, provide *physical* healthcare for everybody, provide *physical* shelter for everybody, provide *physical* food for everybody, provide *physical* wellbeing for everybody. All of which is wonderful, but in itself, *this leaves all values, all interiors, all meaning, all significance, all spirituality, and all depth to the conservatives*, who often represent a lower wave of development (traditional amber instead of modern orange) but who at least haven't forgotten the interiors!

“*Interior talk*—values talk, spirit talk, character talk, meaning talk—is thus left largely in the hands of the conservatives. The liberal then looks at the typical traditional-amber conservative values—which are ethnocentric, nationalistic, and jingoistic, but which are adaptive and *unavoidable* at that stage, yet can easily slide into homophobia and gay bashing, sexism and misogyny, militarism and imperialism—and says, ‘If those are what we mean by “instilling values,” *then I'm staying out of the values game altogether!*’—failing to see that its own worldcentric fairness is simply the next stage in the nested hierarchy (or holarchy) of unfolding values. Liberalism thus attempts to escape ethnocentric values, not by transparently championing its own higher worldcentric values (itself a Good), but by ‘claiming’ to be value-neutral and egalitarian, whereas in fact it is championing the next stage of value structures, the next wave of

interiors, the leading edge and truly progressive edge of development. And this it calls being ‘value-free’ and ‘egalitarian,’ where it is nothing of the sort, not really. It is coming from a very high level of values that then claims it is without values—and this misunderstanding of its own stance would continue, and be amplified, by green postmodernism, which, trying to overcome this contradiction, jumped out of the frying pan and into the fire. The modern and postmodern *world of whatever* was born.”

The world of whatever, the Flatland Plain on which my soul had been wandering for all its life, it seemed. And now Lesa was giving me the history of my malaise, the story of my dysfunction, the tale of my disease: the history of my case history. And in its place, after The Talk, I was trying to accommodate a more graceful tomorrow, or at least its possibility—10%10x being the formula for that ‘gloriosity,’ as Ronnie might put it, and all of a sudden—and then more and more—it felt right, deeply right, deeply and totally and profoundly right. The world of the Great Perfection doesn’t mean perfection, it means Perfection—that good or bad, it is Good. I think Plato had something to say about that.

I looked over at Ronnie. He was doing some sort of hip-hop dance in his seat, hands over his head, bouncing up and down to the rhythms of an inward groove. Seeing the Good everywhere might still be a little harder than I thought.

“Hey, Ken, I’m a freak-a-zoid in the world of whatever, dude. But guess what? Second tier plus Singularity! Dude! It is coming, baby shakes, is this the bomb-o-rama or what?”

Continuing his in-place, hip-hop bouncing in his seat, he started spurring in his hyper-whisper, “Bomb oh rama, oh yeah, oh yeah, bomb oh rama, oh yeah, oh yeah, bomb oh rama, oh yeah, oh yeah—”

“We get it!” Kim said, screaming in a whisper, which is rather hard to do.

“Ooooh, sorry, female-lady-dude person. A bit touchy, aren’t we?”

“One of us is, you dork. And according to Integral Center, it’s going to be a *Singularity-like* wave, not an *actual* Singularity.”

“Ooooh, sorry squared, Mighty Ma’am.”

Kim mouthed, “Fuck you, Ronnie.”

“The problem is that liberalism—championing equality—will not face the fact that it is an elitism. It is a value structure held by a minority in most cultures, including ours—but it is an elitism, the only elitism, that wishes to treat EVERYBODY fairly and equally, even if they disagree with you. Even if they disagree with you and your values, you as a liberal will accord them equal status before the law. *But the number of people who can do that*—the number of people at worldcentric orange or higher—is less than 50% in this country and less than 30% in the world at large. And the point in any event is that orange itself is a developmental achievement reached only at higher stages, and if you don’t get to those higher stages, you simply don’t produce liberalism.

“So if liberalism stated its own stance more accurately, it would say that liberalism is an elite developmental stance, often reached by a relative minority of people, but whose values insist on treating not just that elite but everybody equally—an unheard of fairness and generosity. It is an *egalitarianism held by an elite*. But the typical liberal, not understanding both of those clauses, often arrives at the disaster of a conclusion that it is an egalitarianism held by everybody, or easily could be. Whereas, at this time in history, very few people share that value, and it’s losing ground, by the way—more about that later.

“So if I could drop out of my professor mode and into a more colloquial delivery, I guess I’d summarize this by saying that liberalism is an elitism that is open to everybody, but to actually get there and share liberal worldcentric values requires interior hierarchical development from

egocentric to ethnocentric to worldcentric. Failing that interior development, liberalism and its worldcentric values are dead meat.

“It is such an intricately infuriating problem. But it’s true. Failing to grasp that simple developmental reality, liberalism promptly succumbs to flatland floundering. The separation of church and state—some form of which is absolutely necessary, to be sure—degenerates into an extreme and rancid version that amounts to the oppression of all interiors, via a sin not of commission but of a sin of omission, an oppression by silence and consequent ineptitude. Instead of pioneering a *new wave* of interior talk—higher values talk, higher spiritual talk, higher character talk, higher meaning talk—it talks only of tepid egalitarianism, a supposed plurality of equal values, tractionless multiculturalism, and an endless yada yada yada of whateverland.... Whereupon every interior, no matter how vulgar and narcissistic and self-serving, is accorded not just equal respect but equal value, period—and the regressive nightmare is about to begin.”

And there we are, with the generation of whateverism and pluralitis and boomeritis. The vacuum of values that is our culture. And since nature abhors a vacuum, in rushed the idiots. But an entire culture built on having no culture! Something is deeply fucked-up about this. No wonder the conservatives—an important but ultimately anti-evolutionary pull if left to their own devices—can have such a field day with how “liberals spoil all values.” It’s half true, and that’s what liberalism and the Left end up giving us, if left to *their* own devices.

A culture of no culture. Ultimately leading to boomeritis and whateverism—boomeritis if you’ve got an ego big enough to withstand this horrifying vacuum, and whateverism and irony if you don’t. Jesus this is depressing! But I will not let it get to me! Watch the Thinker, do a Walk Through, then rest in my own true nature, the Great Perfection of primordial Goodness. Yes!

“And so classical liberalism, and virtually every variety of the Left, saddled with a flatland psychology, does indeed *work very hard to undercut its own existence*.

“But let me finish this section by repeating our original starting point, namely: one of the scales we examine in Integral Politics is the **level of consciousness** that is driving any political movement. And what we have seen is that traditional Republican values mostly stem from amber, and liberal Democratic values mostly stem from orange. These are simply two examples of how important the levels component is. I’ll summarize all of these components in a moment—the three axes at each level—but these examples particularly highlight the *levels* aspect of Integral Politics.”

While I was contemplating the Great Perfection of liberal idiots, as well as conservative idiots, a reporter asked Lesa a question.

“What about the often commented on fact that liberals and conservatives have seemed to switch positions since the Enlightenment?”

“Yes, and that brings us to the second of the three major axes we examine, the **transformation/translation axis**. Those of you familiar with holonic theory will immediately recognize this axis. It simply represents the direction you face in evolution or development: Eros or Agape. Do you face the progressive side or the conservative side of development itself? Now obviously liberals are usually progressive and conservatives are just that, conservative. And both of those are important, aren’t they? As is well known, Edmund Burke, watching the horrors of the French Revolution resulting in the Terror, gave what is still perhaps the best defense of conservatism ever given: *society is an incalculably complex system*, which is therefore quite beyond the capacity of any human or group of humans to figure out and try to rationally engineer, and so we must rely in a sense on cultural selection, or those institutions that have been demonstrated and proven to work in the past. We must, in other words, *conserve* those institutions that work. Hence, **conservativism**.

“(Here we run into a terminology problem, in that ‘conservative’ can refer to this second axis and also to the general political movement of Conservatism itself, which may or may not be conservative on this axis or scale. So from now on, I will capitalize the terms Conservative, Liberal, and Progressive if they refer to specific political movements or parties, and use small letters for those words if they refer mostly to one of our axes. I think this will be clear as we proceed.)

“Thus, to continue the story, somebody who is conservative on this second axis tends to champion only those practices that have historically demonstrated that they work. They are not progressive or revolutionary—looking to the future for some sort of change and salvation—they are traditional, even reactionary, looking to the past for stable, proven anchors, and reacting—‘reactionary’—to anything new and possibly likely to cause social disintegration. According to this conservative view, *attempting to rationally engineer society is a prescription for disaster*. Engineered compassion ends up creating many more problems than it solves, says the conservative. It mostly salves the conscience of the liberal but leaves the real world in a shambles: witness the Terror.

“The Reign of Terror, incidentally, is where we actually get the word *terrorism*. The progressive (or Left leaning) government of Robespierre systematically engaged in the murder of citizens in order to ‘further the cause of compassion.’ This activity became known as terrorism. The Reign of Terror is the first action of the first progressive or liberal government in European history. Not a good start, eh?”

Oh Jesus, that reminded me!

“Kim, what do you think about the terrorists targeting Integral Center? Have you found what the Centrix555 report concludes about whether this will be a problem in the future?”

“Well,” she whispered, “there is that ‘one small way out’ that they discuss. Personally, I think there’s a chance that what they say about that is true. It’s a revolutionary idea that they introduce—‘the one small way out’ if P+30 is down the toilet, not off the wall—it was Lesa’s idea, by the way—but it looks like we will see. I have a lot of thoughts on that—and on some of the things Charles said about it—and if you’re nice, I’ll tell you over dinner.”

I got this image of us together, at dinner, getting closer, leaning over to kiss, me slowly removing her blouse, those ample breasts spilling out and... um, never mind.

“As important as conservative is, there are, of course, there are times in history where embracing tomorrow and Eros—or our upward-moving and forward-looking impulse toward higher wholes—is called for, and not just embracing yesterday and Agape—or our downward-moving and backward-looking impulse. In other words, times when we must be progressive and not just conservative. The civil rights movement in America is an oft-cited example. And ‘liberal’ itself has often been associated with the progressive (or Eros) side of politics. Where Agape reaches down and attempts to protect what has already come into being, Eros reaches up and attempts to create new forms, higher spaces, emergent wholes, higher embraces: egocentric to ethnocentric to worldcentric to Kosmocentric.

“And in order to make an omelette, a few eggs have to get broken. The **progressives** are always the **revolutionaries**. Of course, not everybody who calls themselves ‘revolutionary’ is necessarily a true progressive: many ‘revolutionaries’ are just lower levels parading as a newly-emergent higher levels: which is exactly what happened with the Terror, as every egocentric-power trip was mistaken for worldcentric compassion—thoroughly confusing pre-conventional and post-conventional—and to this day, ‘Off with their heads!’ unfortunately has been the calling card of most revolutionaries pretending to be progressive but who actually embody the worst sort of regression imaginable. Already we can see the pre/post fallacy that would come to mark so

much of the ‘liberal’ and ‘progressive’ yearnings in humans—a confusion still with us today, alas, in too much of anything called ‘liberal.’

“But the important point for now is that, indeed, any political party can be situated on this axis of transformation/translation, progressive/conservative, or Eros/Agape—along with the internalist/externalist and individualist/collectivist axes at each of the major levels. Does the political party wish to progressively transform or conservatively translate? ”

Reporter: “And those sides switched? That is, the traditional liberal progressives and traditional conservatives switched?”

“In a sense, yes. More specifically, here is what happened. The progressive/conservative stance ends up changing its actual values, simply because evolution itself continues to unfold, and what is new today is old tomorrow—and thus what is progressive today is conservative tomorrow. So this axis itself is an independent variable—Eros/Agape, or transformation/translation, or progressive/conservative, or (r)evolutionary/stationary. When we call it ‘progressive/conservative,’ those terms mean only that axis, which is one variable in the AQAL matrix, and, as I said, not the political parties by those names, which can be all over the place. But this is indeed an independent axis, as when we speak of the progressive wing of the Republican party or the conservative wing of the Democratic party. So Left and Right are not the same as progressive and conservative, since you can have progressive Left and conservative Left, as well as progressive Right and conservative Right.

“But here is how the progressive/conservative scale unfolded historically, up to today (where we believe an Integral Politics might begin to kick in and change things by integrating or balancing them)—and it’s actually quite fascinating.

“Around the time right before the Enlightenment, the establishment level was amber. Because the establishment level was amber, then to be conservative meant, of course, *to conserve*

*amber*, to conserve traditional amber values. That was the Agape side of the street. But evolution was about to bring forth a new and higher level of consciousness: *orange*. And thus the Eros or progressive side of the street would soon bring forth a new political orientation, one that conscientiously referred to itself as siding with progress: namely, the progressive movement. And the new and rising political orientation of Liberalism (or the Left in general) did indeed often think of itself, and eventually sometimes refer to itself, as progressive (even though that actually was only one factor—one axis—in its overall orientation).

“Thus the birth of the new and higher level of consciousness (orange), and the birth of the Enlightenment, was the birth of a new political orientation—Liberalism—that was originally both *externalist* (as all Left parties are) and *progressive* (for reasons we just discussed). At the new and modern level of orange, this political orientation therefore believed in worldcentric, postconventional morality (“all men are created equal”); the external cause of human suffering (e.g., John Stuart Mill); was strongly individualistic (on the individual/collective scale); and decidedly progressive and even revolutionary on the progressive/conservative or Eros/Agape scale, as witness France and America. So there are the **three axes** and the **level** of original Liberalism or the original Leftist parties.

“So we can see that to be conservative at that time was to be amber, and to be progressive was to be orange. *But evolution continues, doesn't it?* By the 1960s, **a new level of consciousness started emerging in the culture at large**, and the *Revolution of the '60s* began. If you were young and *progressive*, you were no longer orange, *you were green*. Orange thus became the new status quo, the new establishment, and ‘Down with the establishment!’ now meant down with amber *and* orange. A new wave of revolutionaries swept through the streets of Paris, France, in May, 1968, and they were carrying the banner of green, not the banner of orange. Orange was not the new hero, but the new enemy. To be modern was no longer to be progressive but to be reactionary. The new hero was *postmodern*.

“And, as so often happens, that new progressive-revolutionary movement would get caught in a new Reign of Terror, driven by a new pre/post confusion—the one referred to as boomeritis. This Terror would not break bodies but minds; it would not take your life but your career. (We have evolved, haven’t we?) So again we find that under a high postconventional banner (this time, green), there was a wave of preconventional, egocentric, narcissistic, red power. A new Reign of Terror would descend on society, this time in the universities, where ‘Off with his head’ was the battlecry of *The Shadow University*—the Larry Summers affair here at Harvard being a very tame example—and where even Foucault would call Derrida a *terroriste*.

“Of course, the positive gains of healthy green must be remembered as well, which is what the best of the civil rights movement was all about. **But wherever you see the progressive or revolutionary edge of politics, watch out for a new Reign of Terror** (from Russia 1917 to the Shining Path of today).”

Same reporter: “Don’t you find terrorism at the conservative end of the scale?”

“Oh yes, but for different reasons, different values, and different drives. This has to do with Eros gone sour, which is Phobos (which drives liberal or revolutionary terrorism) versus Agape gone sour, which is Thanatos (and which drives conservative or state terrorism). The results often look the same, but the psychology is profoundly different. But yes, the conservative-looking face brought us such fun amusements as the Spanish Inquisition. State-sponsored terrorism is usually conservative, and the terrorism of those who identify themselves as rebels or revolutionaries is progressive, or rather likes to think of itself as progressive, anyway. Whether it actually is or is not is another story. Still, it sees itself as progressive and opposed to conservatism in almost every way.

“So there are two major types of physical terrorism—state-sponsored, which usually thinks in conservative terms to justify itself; and the terrorism of revolutionaries, which usually thinks in progressive terms to justify itself. Neither is a true freedom fighter—who is truly post,

and is not caught in pre/post confusions—but we will come back to that when we examine the difference between being a terrorist and being a true freedom fighter or authentic revolutionary.

“Right now, we were at the point in the historical account where ‘progressive,’ which meant ‘progress toward orange and away from amber,’ now means ‘progress toward green and away from orange.’ So what do we find in the Democratic (or Leftist) Party today? Two major wings: the conservative Democrats, who still adhere to the ‘old’ orange values of individualism, free will, truth, and individual justice; and the progressive wing, the postmodern wing, the green wing, which despises everything the old orange Democrats represent, and stands instead for green values across the board: collective values, values that are anti-individualistic, anti-business, anti-capitalism, anti-modern-rationality, based instead on feelings, sensitivity, embodiment, sharing, multiculturalism, pomo versions of Marxism, and so on.

“Thus, as the progressive or leading edge—the liberal edge—began to push into green, the progressive wing of liberalism pushed away from orange and into green and became the radical Left or pomo-green Left—violently condemning the modern West, condemning orange and all its actions (from science to business), virulently condemning the Enlightenment (by almost entirely misunderstanding it, but anything orange was guillotined), and demanding state or government-intervention to correct these evils, whereas the old-time liberals remained with the orange vales of the Enlightenment and its anti-government hyper-individualism. You all have noticed that split into the orange-*modern* and green-*postmodern* wings of the Democrats, yes? And how pomo green calls itself anti-liberal, meaning anti-orange?

“Well, this created a terrible strain and even split within the Left itself, with its fundamental base still holding Enlightenment, orange, modern values, generally pro-West, and its more radical wing championing postmodern, green, collectivist values, angrily and starkly anti-West. Both are still Leftist because both are stark *externalists*, which is the major defining axis of anything called the Left. But these two Leftist wings rather thoroughly despise each other—it is a

serious, deep, and widespread split within the Left, and one we will return to often, because it holds the fate of Western democracies, we believe. But this is why the Democratic Party itself in America has rather completely fallen apart—green versus orange—and will remain so for the foreseeable future. This is also where the *levels component* also plays such an important role in identifying political orientations, because it is the only way to see and understand these two wings within the Left.

“Meanwhile, just as the Democrats have progressive and conservative wings, so do the Republicans or the Right. The ‘old’ conservative Republicans are firmly entrenched in amber values: traditional, mythic-membership, fundamentalist, Biblical, ethnocentric, militaristic, nationalistic, patriarchal, patriotic. The ‘new’ Republicans (or New Right or neo-cons) are not traditional but modern, not amber but pushing into orange—the so-called Wall-Street Republicans—in other words, modern-worldcentric conservatives with orange values—Ayn Rand Republicans.

“And thus, today the two major wings in the Right are amber and orange: amber, fundamentalist, traditional, religious (‘the religious Right’), ethnocentric, militaristic, patriarchal (against abortion and gay rights, in favor of prayer in school and national security, all of which are their hot buttons); and orange, modern, economically-driven, worldcentric, neo-con, Wall-Street Republicans for whom not abortion but taxes, not ethnocentric but merit-centric, not homo-religious but homo-economicus has become paramount.

“Thus, the very values that a few centuries ago were the leading-edge (and literally *revolutionary*) liberal values have now become the values of many *conservatives*, who in effect began embracing and defending Enlightenment values of individualism and free-market practices—exactly the values that they fought so desperately three centuries ago! Of course, the other most influential subgroup of Conservatives stayed closer to the ‘old-fashioned’ conservative amber values, which is why ‘the political Right’ today is a strange mixture of amber and orange,

just as ‘the political Left’ today is a strange mixture of orange and green. (What holds them together? That’s correct: the Democrats are all externalists, and the Republicans are all internalists.)

“But neither of them has been able to span the entire Spiral. And that, exactly, is the problem. Both the Republican and the Democratic positions are partial, fragmented, alienated and alienating—so far, they are both totally and entirely first-tier political parties and movements.”

God, I’m so depressed. I look at Ronnie, feel the wave of depression deepen again, turn and look at Kim.

Kim..., Kim..., Kim.... Now there’s an antidote to depression. Kim..., Kim..., Kim.... I wonder just how serious she is about that baby business? Real serious, if she and Charles split up about it.

“Say, Kim,” I whisper. She turns and looks at me nonchalantly. I can’t think of what to say. She leans in and whispers back, “Yes?” All I can see are her breasts swaying back and forth gently, but, um, massively. “Yes, Ken?”

“Well, yes, yes it is indeedy. To yes or not to yes, that is the question.”

“What?” Kim squints her eyes, looks puzzled.

“Well, ha ha, what I meant is, what I meant. Well, not what I meant, but what I might have meant, if I meant anything. Which of course I didn’t.”

“Boy, I’ll say.” Kim shrugs.

That went well. I turn my head and stare determinedly ahead at the stage, my face bright red.

“Um, what I meant to say was..., um, are you that serious about kids? So serious that you and Charles broke up?”

“Yes. It’s sad, but that’s the way it has to be. When it first became clear we’d actually have to split, I sort of locked myself in my room and ate myself silly for a week. Gained ten pounds. Can you tell?”

“No way.” I have learned, the hard way, that that is the correct answer always.

“Well, I did. Anyway, I’m looking for either a sperm donor or a husband, whichever comes first.”

“I see. Um, how does that work?”

“The husband part?”

“The sperm-donor part.”

“Oh, well, I look around for somebody I think would make a good biological father, then see if he will agree to donate sperm with no strings attached. If he says yes, then that’s it.”

“Then you guys have sex.”

“Then we get a turkey baster.”

“Oh, that way. That’s no fun.”

“Correct.”

“Right. Okay, well, um, how about the husband part? Or, let me say, um, well, have you ever thought about us?” Kim stares at me blankly. “You know,” I repeat, “about us. You know, ‘us.’” I motion with my hand back and forth between Kim and me. “*Us*.”

“Oh, *us*,” Kim says, then bursts out laughing; she covers her mouth with her hand when people turn to look at her, and keeps laughing, muffled.

“Come on, Kim. It’s not that far-fetched. Have I told you I started lifting weights?”

Kim stops laughing, takes a few deep breaths, moves her head back a few inches, and stares at me. She keeps staring and looking me up and down, as I sit here shriveled up in my chair.

“You’re making me nervous, Kim.”

“I’m thinking.”

“Well stop thinking, would you? Jeez.”

“I’ll get back to you on that,” she says, and starts writing in her tablet notepad. I lean over inconspicuously to see if I can glimpse her notes; she slowly turns the pad away as I advance.

“Fine, Kim, be that way.”

“What you have to remember, Ken, is that our children—that is, should that unlikely event ever come to be—will very probably *live forever*, given the Second Tier plus Singularity-like wave. So we want biological specimens that are in very good shape, now don’t we?”

“Well, I thought the whole point about the tech Singularity, or the Singularity-like future, is that we will be able to repair our biology and turn it into anything we want.”

“So I will be able to repair the disastrous results of your being the father?”

“Exactly! All you really need is a starter-kit dad. You know, we get the kid started now, that’s all you need. Then nanobotics will take care of the rest. But no reason to wait for the starter kit, right?”

“So we should start having sex right now.”

“Well, if you’re going to put it that crudely. But I was thinking, you know, a little dinner, a little wine, a little candle light. Say, I know this fantastic little Italian restaurant—“

“Okay.”

“It’s right around the corner, has this cute little—”

“Okay.”

“—menu that I can read in Italian and I thought—”

“I said *okay*.”

“Okay I can read the menu in Italian or okay you’ll go out with me?”

“I’ll have dinner with you.”

“Right now?”

“Perhaps sometime in the evening, Ken.”

“Right, right, of course, dinner, the evening, makes perfect sense. So I’ll call you?”

“Why don’t you do that?”

“Yes, why don’t I? Why don’t I what?”

“Why don’t you call me and we’ll set up a time for dinner.”

“Oh, that. Sure, sure, I’ll do that. Good idea.” Shit.

But phat whack! I don’t believe it. I don’t believe it! This is too good to be true. In the place of depression, brilliant clarity everywhere. My Upper-Right quadrant just went from a total lack of serotonin to a rush of dopamine. God, are neurochemicals great or what? Granted, street drugs are cheaper in the long run and much easier to get and use—after all, compare the price of, say, good meth with the price of a girlfriend. Still, when a neurotransmitter rush comes on you like this, it is fucking great while it lasts.

“Speaking of the Singularity-like future, it really will be amazing, won’t it?” Kim muses.

“Charles believed in it. He said he went back and forth and back and forth and back and forth.

But then they ran this Centrix555 scenario and he said it was pretty clear. The problem was never around the technology stuff—everybody knows that is increasing exponentially, at least for a while. It was around the interiors.”

“Who controls the Singularity? What good is it we have a technological Singularity that solves so many problems, but the Fascists are in control? Or the Religious Right is in control? What good is it then? In fact, it would be a disaster. So who controls the Singularity or the P+30 Transformation, right?”

“Right. And they’re still running more scenarios.”

“That Pluraltrx666 one.”

“Yes. In their future scenarios they’re up to the 6’s, from 333 and 444 and 555, and now 666. Spooky number. But everybody at IC thinks that the 666 scenario will show basically the same results as 555, because literally all the indicators are headed that way. Charles saw the results of 555 and those changed his mind, big time. That’s when he decided that the computer crash at P+30 was indeed due to it being Off the Wall and not Down the Toilet.”

“The Centrix555 was the one that also ruled out plutonium dispersal as well as nuclear incident.”

“Yup. Less than a 9% chance of either, past P+15. So it’s looks like we’re gonna make it, Ken. Me and my baby. Or maybe our baby.” I am going to either come in my pants or have a fucking heart attack, or more likely both. I grab the armrest with both hands for support.

“Don’t get all goo-goo, Ken, you are simply a biological sperm donor who is going to be hanging around.”

“After the sex.”

“After the sex, maybe.”

“You don’t really want a child whose father is a turkey baster, do you?”

“The point, *Ken*, is that, I—okay, maybe we—have to be thinking about a child who might have something like biological immortality. This means so many things will change! Education, particularly for the interiors, becomes paramount.”

“I can hear it now. Little Angelina is 2 years old, adorable, cute as hell, running around all over the place, and she comes up to you—‘Mommy, Mommy, who’s my daddy?’ And you hold up a turkey baster?”

“And then the whole problem of accidents, attacks, terrorism, war—one good bomb and wham!, there goes your immortality. Those things just cannot be allowed in a world where biologically you might otherwise live virtually forever.”

“Or it’s Parent’s Day at the PTA—little Angelina is 6, and is supposed to bring Mommy and Daddy—so you grab her, your purse, put the turkey baster in the purse, and off you go?”

“So we need extra protection against accidents, and also something done on the world scene against war and violence. And not by peaceniks, but by world cops. That’s what IC thinks anyway. Charles, too. So we need—““

“Say, Kim, I was thinking. When we are having sex—”

“—if we are having sex—”

“—don’t look over and say, ‘That’s not how Charles did it,’ okay? I mean, that would *totally* freak me out.”

“So that’s why we need a World Federation or a World League or something. That’s why Integral Center has done all this work on Integral Politics. I mean, look at Lesa. She’s amazing. Does she know what she is saying about Integral Governance is going to be protecting our baby?”

Who the fuck cares? I am deliriously out of my mind. This is total love. This is absolute total unbelievable love.

What a difference a day makes. Fuck the Talk, fuck the 10%10x, I shall rise up to face my tomorrow because, in the UR, dopamine is coursing through my system, flooding my brain, lighting up my neurons in an overtime of chemical bliss; in the LR, Kim's body is leaning into mine, breasts brushing my arms, goose bumps all over me, chills running up my spine, subtle energies mingling in a dance of delirium; in the LL, a 'we' is forming that carries me beyond my 'me' and into a space of shared ecstasy; and in the UL, this is love, this is LOVE, the love that moves the sun and other stars and every single planet. And all of it right here, right now, and its name is "Kim."

And somewhere in the stupid background, insignificant Lesa is droning on.

"The momentous leap to second tier is heading this way, and thus we are seeing, off on the horizon but rushing toward us, increasingly shining and alluring, the emergence of an Integral Politics that very well might change everything...."