



ACCOUNTABILITY MATTERS

A Call for Ethics, Empathy, and Equality

Mark Fischler and Corey deVos

[00:00:00] **Corey deVos:** All right, and here we are. Thank you everyone for joining us on the return episode of Integral Justice Warrior. I'm Corey deVos, and I'm here as always with Mark Fischler, my good friend. How you doing, man?

[00:00:11] **Mark Fischler:** I'm good, brother. It's always feels like it's been too long, and this day, I think because it's been so long, we've got so many different things to talk about. But I love you and great to see you.

[00:00:22] **Corey deVos:** Yeah, we really do.

[00:00:23] **Mark Fischler:** Looking forward to catching up and saying hi to all our viewers out there. Hello!

[00:00:29] **Corey deVos:** Yeah, so it's really nice to reconvene here. So, Mark, we've got a lot to talk about today, brother. have a lot to talk about. And, you know, in the pre-show I was, talking to you about a concern I had, and maybe I'll share that concern right now with my audience. And that concern is basically, you know, when we're talking about politics from an integral point of view, it can be really tricky. It can be tricky because so many different people have different ways of enacting this idea of integral politics or this idea of how to apply the integral framework to sort of the political circus that we all find ourselves in, right?

One of those conceptions, for example, is like, oh, well, you know, you should make sure that you're being fair and balanced. Well, of course, everything we do, we wanna be fair and balanced in sort of a sincere way, and not in that sort of old Fox news sort of meaning of the phrase. We pursue fairness. We pursue balance. And you know, sometimes that means being able to look at sort of various dysfunctions that are happening on the left and other dysfunctions that are happening on the right.

I think where it gets tricky though, is sometimes people have an expectation that it's like it needs to be 50/50, right? Like, if we're know, making criticisms about our political system, we should make sure that 50% of our criticisms are pointed at the left and 50% are pointed at the right, cuz that's what's fair, because on paper we want to reconcile progressive and conservative views, hopefully at sort of the later worldcentric stages.

And I totally agree with that, on paper. I think the issue we run into is, when we sort of leave the paper and head into reality and we see that, no, there are some very different kinds of dysfunctions on the left and on the right. And today we're gonna be talking about some of those dysfunctions that we see happening on the right, which isn't to say we're not gonna, know, bring up criticisms of the left at all, but, you know, some of the main topics we're gonna be going through in today's show are, are really taking a hard look at, some of the challenging stories that we've been seeing emerging from the political right these days. So I just wanted to make that clear. You know, neither Mark or I wanna sound like Rachel Maddow or, you know what I mean? This isn't MSNBC, this is Integral Life. I think we've got some interesting, integral ways to look at what's happening in the world around us. It can be really hard to frame these discussions properly and to frame them integrally in a way that is satisfying to people in our audience who may be of either political persuasion or neither political persuasion.

[00:03:08] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah. I mean, you know, at the end of the day I consider, know, what we're doing in service of upping the game of consciousness. And whatever we can do to kind of support the evolution of consciousness, which points in the direction of integration of multiple perspectives, transpersonal understanding. You know, I see those as part of our ultimate service. So, you know, these are some of the issues of our day. And you know, I think when I'll be talking today, I think you'll probably be hearing me talk more about kind of stages of consciousness, look at some of this stuff, as opposed to kind of left/right stuff, because some of it is problematic on both sides, as we'll talk about. But I appreciate you bringing it up, you know, the issues we're looking at today have to do with President Trump being indicted and some of the other charges, looking at the Supreme Court, the central focus that started was with Clarence Thomas, and we've got Fox News and one of the largest settlements in the history,

[00:04:16] **Corey deVos:** And Tucker Carlson.

[00:04:17] **Mark Fischler:** And, Tucker Carlson. And then we got some abortion rulings that, I think we gotta bring some light to. So yeah, there's a lot to talk about.

[00:04:28] **Corey deVos:** That's right. We're also gonna talk about Tennessee.

[00:04:31] **Mark Fischler:** Tennessee expulsions.

[00:04:32] **Corey deVos:** We're gonna talk about Montana.

[00:04:34] **Mark Fischler:** Montana.

[00:04:35] **Corey deVos:** Yep. So let's get into it, and let's, start with sort of the elephant in the room, if you will.

[00:04:40] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah.

[00:04:41] **Corey deVos:** Which is Donald Trump.

[00:04:44] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah.

[00:04:44] **Corey deVos:** So Mark, why don't you give us a little bit of rundown of what, Trump's legal woes look like these days?

[00:04:51] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah. So maybe if we just kind of talk about 'em one by one, and maybe that might be... I would like to like start by focusing on the Manhattan one, then I'll run through the other ones. But I'd like a back and forth on the Manhattan one. So in early April, Trump was charged with, 34 counts, felony counts of falsifying business records. all of them tied to hush money payments to porn actress Stormy Daniels, otherwise her real name's Stephanie Clifford.

So what happened was Trump is alleged to have, used his fixer, Michael Cohen, to pay off this porn star right before the 2016 election to suppress her story and not have it come out to impact the campaign. After Trump became president, he reimbursed Cohen bit by bit, which is where all the 34 charges come from, that's where the fraud kicks in. So his campaign, they called it "legal expenses" citing, you know, some kind of retainer agreement between Cohen and Trump. Yet there was no expenses and there was no real retainer agreement.

So this is usually a misdemeanor though, these kinds of charges. But what they're doing, Alvin Bragg is doing, is it can become a felony if his intent to defraud was in service of another crime. And the other crime has not been actually stated yet, which is

unbelievable to me that they haven't done that. But it looks like, it could be a violation of state election laws, and that that's probably what's gonna turn it into a felony. If he was convicted of this, it would be a Class E felony, which is the lowest category for felony crimes in New York. And the expectation is he would be given probation and not anything serious. So in effect, he's charged with like making a donation to his own campaign, which is legal, but not declaring it, which is not legal. So the strength of the case, it's the abundance of evidence that showed that he endorsed the scheme to pay off folks who can embarrass him. The weak part of the case I think is a lot. There's a real question if New York state law is preempted by federal election law, and Fed law trumps New York state law. And if that's the case, then turning this into a felony is all for not. So, you know, my concern, I'm wondering about you here, but, you know, charging a president with a crime is serious business. And it's not something that prosecutors should shy away from. but you know, when it comes to a president, you wanna make sure that it's absolutely crystal clear. And here the law just isn't clear. This feels more like a technicality than, a serious, serious crime. and I think we're gonna talk about some of the other charges that he's facing that seem more serious in that sense.

[00:08:20] **Corey deVos:** Right.

[00:08:21] **Mark Fischler:** Yes, this can undermine a democracy, but gosh, there are people that wrote articles that, you know, Michael Cohen, who pled guilty, you know, gonna be the main witness, they were arguing in the National Review that the crime he... the federal election law that he pled guilty to, he may not have even really violated, and that he should never have even, you know, gone to jail for that. So having stuff that murky and, you know, sending a president down that road, I think is problematic and makes it look it's a witch hunt and plays into Trump's hands of that, you know, woe is me and, the system is rigged.

[00:09:04] **Corey deVos:** Deep State is keeping me down. That's right.

No, mark. I totally agree. I think, you know, I think viewers of our program know that I am not a very big fan of Donald Trump. And I've talked many times about sort of the regressive effect, the incredibly regressive effect that I think he has had on our culture, on our politics, on our overall sort of informational terrains, right? I think that, uh, you know, Donald Trump has been a wrecking ball that just kind of came plowing through American society, and we're still trying to figure out how to put those pieces back

together again. So I am definitely not a fan of Donald Trump. And what I noticed therefore, is when this news came out, I had a number of reactions sort of up and down my own kind of values stack, right? Like, yeah, there was that red piece of me that's like, oh, vengeance, vindication, fucking bring them down, whatever, you know, whatever it takes. that was a very temporary emotional state, I think, because then heart and head immediately kick in, right?

And basically Mark my heart in my head, agree with everything that you just said. That like, you know, I think there is any number of reasons why Donald Trump needs to be held accountable for real crimes, right? For real crimes. I mean, the call to Georgia and sort of, you know, a lot of things that were surrounding his fake elector scheme with, January 6th, and, you know, maybe even, the documents that he was keeping at Mar-a-Lago, I mean, all of these seem a lot more severe, right, than paying off a porn star.

Now granted, if any other politician was caught paying off a porn star that he had an affair with shortly after his wife gave birth to his child, it would destroy that person's career just immediately. Doesn't seem to affect Donald Trump, doesn't seem to affect the loyalty that his supporters have in him, so we can just sort of laugh at how kind of ridiculous the story is.

But man, I just so wish this wasn't the lead story here, that this wasn't the first set of charges that actually landed on him. Because I agree with you, this completely plays into his story. And in fact, I think maybe even sort of proves his story, that this is all about vindication. This really is about sort of an activist DA who's looking to make a name for himself and take down Trump and damage his chances for 2024 and all of that. And I just think that, you know, not that I think that the left has this sort of organized... you know, they're not playing chess in an organized way at all, it's sort of a constant tug of war between a half dozen to a dozen different coalitions. But this, it makes it seem like this is sort of one of those deep state operations that are just trying to kind of muddy the water around Trump.

it's not a good look, it feels like a frivolous crime, at least to begin with. Like I understand that Jimmy Hoffa was taken down because of taxes and not... you know what I mean? Like, I get that sort of reference. But like, let's try the big charges first. Let's try the actual meaningful charges that I think do affect everyday Americans. This story doesn't affect us. I mean, this is, again, it comes down to Donald Trump's personal affair with a

porn star. And, yeah, it was skeezy for him to pay to cover it up. That's not good. I'm not saying we should tolerate that. I think we need serious campaign finance reform in order to better safeguard our system against stuff like that. But without that kind of systemic fix, this just feels petty.

[00:12:41] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah, I mean, you know what's curious is that the previous district, Manhattan attorney had people on the case, was looking into it, after it, and then Brad got elected and he did away with the case. He was like, "no, not interested". and Trump was actually singing his praises last year. And then something happened, and he got a relook at the issue, had a new team that dug in on it, he got convinced that this was the way to go. And I don't know, you know, I don't think it's exactly like, you know, a Democrat trying to get famous necessarily, you know, I don't know what went into his thinking fully as to why it was a no and now it's a yes. But nevertheless, you know, the Bill Clinton affair, some folks were outraged with his behavior of lying to cover up for an affair, that he had. And you know, this is similar. It's got some real similarities.

[00:13:54] **Corey deVos:** Yeah, it is.

[00:13:55] **Mark Fischler:** So I think you know, if we're gonna be consistent here, then if you were outraged at Bill Clinton's behavior, then you should be outraged with Trump. And if you weren't feeling like Clinton should have been the focus of Ken Starr's Wrath, who I actually met once, then you shouldn't be okay with Trump being treated this way either. uh, so I, I kinda

[00:14:26] **Corey deVos:** I can go with that. I can go with that. Mark. I do think there's a Green layer that we might wanna pay attention to, as well, maybe a healthy green layer that sort of, I think marks a bit of a difference between the Trump case and the Clinton case, which is that Clinton was Lewinsky's superior.

And that creates a power differential that Green in particular is very, very sensitive to. To the point where, you know, Green oftentimes allows for zero consent when it comes to those kinds of power imbalances. You cannot consent when you are in, sort of a power hierarchy like that. So that would be maybe one detail that separates the Clinton case from the Trump case. What do you think?

[00:15:06] **Mark Fischler:** The prosecution of Bill Clinton didn't ride on it being an intern, or it not being. It was that he lied about an affair.

[00:15:15] **Corey deVos:** Agreed. Agreed.

[00:15:17] **Mark Fischler:** And so I think what you're describing is the act of what he did and the dastardly nature of an act of utilizing your power over another. That's unbecoming and not cool and disgusting. But in terms of the prosecution, I wouldn't say that power differential was the factor. Ken Starr and Brett Kavanaugh and all the folks that went after Clinton, you know, found him to be an awful human and they were gonna do whatever they could. And are we seeing the same thing on the other side with Donald Trump?

But there are other charges, So you mentioned a few and...

[00:16:01] **Corey deVos:** so let's move on. And one of them already started.

[00:16:03] **Mark Fischler:** There's a rape case right now, a magazine columnist, and that's actually happening in Manhattan. I don't think Trump is attending, he doesn't have to, but a magazine columnist, E.Jean Carroll, sued Donald Trump for rape and defamation, and she said she was violently attacked by Trump in a changing room at Bergdorfs, which is I guess a garment clothing store, I think fancy, in Manhattan. And this happened in the 1990s. And she kept quiet about it. And I think she wrote a book in 2019, and I'm not sure if it's in the book itself or if during her promotion of the book, she talked about the rape. But nevertheless, Donald Trump denied it and said that she was just being a scumbag and trying to up her sales of her book by making up a story about me. And so she said that that has hurt her reputation, and so she's suing him for the assault. And obviously I think it's way past the statute of limitations for an adult.

[00:17:22] **Corey deVos:** Right.

[00:17:23] **Mark Fischler:** And I don't even know...

[00:17:23] **Corey deVos:** So this is just a civil case, not a criminal case.

[00:17:26] **Mark Fischler:** I don't think she has the exact date, and I don't know enough civil law to know how that plays out. So, she said his comments insulted and defamed her, and so she's in court. And so she was on the stand. She described the rape and she was cross-examined for a long time by Trump's attorney, who tried to sow doubt, around issues like no scream, no telling of others, all kinds of stuff.

[00:17:54] **Corey deVos:** Yeah, it was, it was, yeah.

[00:17:56] **Mark Fischler:** The judge didn't let him get too far into that, but that was certainly some of the implications.

[00:18:01] **Corey deVos:** A lot of the cliches that you see in these kinds of rape cases.

[00:18:05] **Mark Fischler:** Exactly. Yeah.

[00:18:07] **Corey deVos:** You know, a lot of, blame the victim type type rhetoric. Yeah. again, this is really, this is, this is a tricky one to talk about, right? I mean, we're talking about one of the most disgusting forms of violence that we can inflict on each other. And, you know, there is no single right response to that kind of trauma when it happens to you, which is why they were trying to get her on the, you know, "why didn't you scream?" Well, you know, some people fight, some people flight, some people freeze. I mean, there's any number of ways that we deal with trauma in the moment and afterwards. You know, so I have total sensitivity to any woman who has been through the experiences that Trump is being accused of right now.

It gets difficult when... I mean, I think it really does get difficult when we're talking about like 25 years of time passing between the incident and it hitting the legal system. That feels, you know, not that I think there's any statute of limitations of the heart, right? I mean, that trauma, if this actually did happen, if the allegations are true, this trauma's gonna be with that woman for the rest of her life. And that doesn't necessarily go away after five years or 10 years, or 25 years or 50 years, right? So I'm very sensitive to that. But when it comes to that window of action and accountability, I think this is again, one of those stories where it's... it doesn't look strong, right? I mean, I think Trump's

probably gonna lose the case, but I don't think it's gonna impact him politically at all. I don't think it's gonna move the needle on people's perceptions of him. I mean, people have already made up their minds about, you know, Donald Trump, whether he is, you know, I mean, they've made up their minds about this case before the case even started, right? So I don't think it's gonna really move the needle there.

And again, I wish it wasn't one of the first cases to come out, as much as I want, again, if the allegations are true, I want accountability.

[00:20:00] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah, I can remember, I mean, just to relate on the distance thing, I remember I had a case when I was a public defender where, my client was accused of being a habitual offender and a police officer said he saw my client at a gas station pumping gas and getting into a car and driving off, and didn't stop them at the time, and didn't actually arrest them for seven or eight weeks. And that was certainly something that I utilized at the trial. We got a not guilty verdict that, gosh, you had a lot of time to prosecute that. Now that's, you know, that's different as you described though, of someone who's been victimized, in terms of a traumatic act and how you deal with it, and when you deal with it, are all things that we as a society need to become more sensitive to, and emotionally tuned into, so that we provide, you know, the support that human beings need.

I mean, I think about officers who experienced traumatic stuff. I have a good friend of mine who walked in and didn't know, but it was his uncle that was shot in the chest, and he was the first on the scene for a shooting. And, you know, the chief of police in that person's town the next day was saying, "you good to go? You good to go?" Like to get back on the streets. And you know, that trauma haunts that person forever, as you described. So this may be an opportunity for us as a society to become more sensitive and more aware of how trauma can get compartmentalized, and how we need to do better at servicing it at the time, and dealing with it. Because if this act did happen and he violently raped her, that's a criminal, terrible, terrible criminal act that people do go to jail for and do need, you know, serious time to reflect and try to change the way that you look at other human beings, not as objects, but seeing their intrinsic worth as beings. And so, yeah, you know, my heart goes out.

[00:22:25] **Corey deVos:** Yeah, Mark. Well said. there's an integral challenge here too. There's an integral challenge here too, which I think everything you just said is true and

we need to, remain tender to the fact that that trauma, it exists and it's far more frequent than, you know, the number of women in this society who have dealt with sexual abuse, rape, any number of forms of abuse. I mean, it's, it's disgusting and it's actually nauseating once you actually start learning the numbers. I mean, it's far more common than I think we get. And, so I think the integral challenge is to hold that, to hold the sensitivity of that, and to like really open your heart to the fact that we are just awash in this kind of trauma, that our women are dealing with this kind of trauma and it's way more common than maybe we think it is.

And, while holding that with the fact that, when it comes to public allegations of sexual abuse and rape and things like that, there is a very real automatic presumption of guilt. Right? It triggers in sort of the average person a presumption of guilt. And this is why these charges can be so, so difficult, because false allegations also do exist. I was falsely accused when I was 20 years old. I've talked about it before in this show. It was one of the most devastating and helpless feelings I ever had, because no one wants to believe you if you are a guy who is being falsely accused of something, even if you have the evidence that nothing happened, as I did. It was an absolutely terrible... and thank God the girl who accused me, later fessed up and, you know, basically she had cheated on her boyfriend with me and didn't want her boyfriend to know, so she made up the story about me, and then eventually, I guess, felt guilty about it and confessed it, and that's how that got resolved for me. But that was terrifying. It was terrifying. I saw my entire future flashing before my eyes, right? And it's like I could feel the pressure of everyone's gaze when, it was just this assumption. And I went from being people's friends to suddenly this sort of, you know, disgusting piece of crap. How could he ever do something? I could barely like, talk to girls when I was 20 years old, let alone imagine doing something like that. So it was, it was, it was terribly devastating.

So I have a personal experience on the other side of that track, that's even kind of scary to talk about publicly, right? Because even now as I'm talking about it, I'm afraid of people watching and being like, "oh, that happened to you? You probably did it, dude." You know what I mean? Like, there's, there's that piece, there's that trauma piece that's with me too. So I'm very sensitive to the fact that when we hear of these cases, we have a gut reaction to them because how could we not, they are the most disgusting violations imaginable, right? So we have a gut response to it.

But that gut response can oftentimes distort, I think, our clear thinking about this. And when it comes to the Donald Trump case, again, this is where it sort of, you know, 25

years, 25 years is a long time, to find accountability for a story like this. So it's a really sort of devastating and personally challenging case, I think.

You know, and this is also Donald Trump, who, you know, "I'll grab 'em by the..." You know, I mean, it seems to fit his overall character profile, but again, I don't wanna make those kinds of conclusions because there's a part of me that maybe wants him to be guilty of this, which you really have to check in because if you want him to be guilty of this, that means you also want someone to have sort of been traumatized by this. And that becomes a dangerous game of the heart, I think, when we start sort of wishing for things to be true.

[00:26:07] **Mark Fischler:** I mean, I think the best thing we can do is stay curious about the facts, and stay open to where the facts lead, and see how the jury interprets those facts. And that will certainly tell us more about it. And it's tough, you know, I've been a professor at the university where I've had, you know, unfortunately even recently, more than one student, female, who's been sexually assaulted. And it's been an honor to try to support them. But devastating that we have to, and it's common, it's so unfortunate.

[00:26:52] **Corey deVos:** I mean, we both have daughters, right? We we both have daughters, and and we're seeing this world that we're raising them in. So of course this is gonna land, I think in a... You know, not just having daughters, we have wives, we have mothers, we have female friends. We have, I mean, you know, and an assault on one woman feels in a very real way, like an assault on all women. So I'm absolutely with you there..

[00:27:14] **Mark Fischler:** Well we're all interconnected.

[00:27:14] **Corey deVos:** Um, in of.. That's That's right. And this trauma does get sort of distributed in a lot of ways, either generationally, or otherwise. So I'm with you there in the sensitivity and I'm also there with you in terms of just creating a little bit of space of mind, to have enough curiosity to actually follow evidence rather than sort of your own kind of hunches, "well, Trump seems like the kind of guy to..." Well, that's, you know, maybe fair enough? But that's not, grounds to, I think, indict someone for this level of criminality.

[00:27:44] **Mark Fischler:** Absolutely not.

[00:27:45] **Corey deVos:** so I wanna see, know, I'm, I'm really curious to see what comes out of this case.

[00:27:49] **Mark Fischler:** And then also the news this week was Mike Pence had to appear before a grand jury that's been convened by the special counsel Jack Smith, who is investigating Donald Trump's role in efforts to overturn the 2020 election. So the backdrop of that is, special Counsel Smith was appointed by the Justice Department in November of 2022 to oversee two different investigations. And you've, you've mentioned both of them.

So one is, he's investigating whether any person or entity unlawfully interfered with the transfer of power following the 2020 presidential election, or the certification of the electoral college, which happened on January 6th. And then the second thing he's investigating, it's an ongoing investigation involving classified documents and other presidential records as well as possible obstruction of that investigation. So Jack Smith is investigating, Mike Pence was called before the Grand Jury. I'm assuming answering questions on both those matters, probably more with number one than number two.

So what do we know about the potential interference with the election and transfer of power? Well we had that January 6th committee, and they had, you know, four areas where they thought the president could be charged. So I'm gonna bring up those four things, because I'm assuming Jack Smith is deciding whether or not the committee got it right and the president ought to be charged.

The reason why they appointed a special counsel, and the Department of Justice isn't doing it necessarily themselves, is because Trump declared he was running for president, and the Department of Justice, Merrick Garland, the head, was appointed or nominated by Biden, and so he wanted to make it a little less, having a partisan flavor by getting a longtime prosecutor in charge.

But the four potential charges, and then, you know, have at it Corey. Obstruction of an official proceeding, conspiracy to defraud the United States, conspiracy to make false statements, and then inciting or aiding an insurrection. So that has to do with those

charges.

And then the second one would be a violation of the Presidential Records Act of 1978, which was kind of put in after Nixon's bad behavior and, you know, trying to get rid of stuff and all of that. So you're not supposed to do that as president. and so that's why they went into Mar-a-Lago with a search warrant, and took a whole lot of documents that apparently Mr. Trump shouldn't have kept. So are the facts.

[00:30:53] **Corey deVos:** Not a good look.

[00:30:54] **Mark Fischler:** and, uh, know, what are your thoughts?

[00:30:57] **Corey deVos:** Well, first off, I think that this is the big case, particularly the charges around January 6th, Mike Pence testifying... I wish this was the first splash that we got, instead of Stormy Daniels. Because I think that this is the one that actually does affect all Americans, all citizens, everyone who's a member of this system is affected by this story. And I think that there are any number of people who caution us about, you know, holding Trump accountable for that magnitude crime and what that's going to do to us culturally. Could this spark a civil war? How dangerous is it gonna be sort of socially, culturally, if Donald Trump is found guilty on those charges?

And, you know, my response to that is like, you know, fair enough. And there almost certainly will be sort of flashes of violence if that is what comes to pass. But to me, the far more dangerous possibility is not holding him accountable for this, and therefore just saying that, you know, our system is ripe for the taking. Right? Anyone can come along and do the same thing all over again, except this time succeed. Right? Someone more competent comes in and actually is able to like, "no, we're, we're gonna ignore those slates of electors. We're gonna do our false electors instead, even though, you know, courts threw out all the evidence and all that, that's just because they're part of the deep state..." I mean, there's any number of conspiracy narratives you can spin up that will create this perception of plausible deniability that'll allow you to suspend democracy and, undermine a, federal election. I think that is by far the most, troubling... of all these charges that Donald Trump is facing, this is the one that is the most troubling in terms of the, you dysfunction in the system that it would cause, the rot in the system it would cause, if we let it pass, if we didn't hold that to account.

You know, I think it's notable that January 6th was the first non-peaceful transfer of power in modern American history, and that was always sort of a crowned jewel of the American identity, right? Like, yeah, our left and our right, they really, in our two party system, they really go at each other. But at the end of the day, we have an election and we respect the results of that election, and we find a way to continue enfold together.

And this was the first time in my lifetime that I have seen a non peaceful transfer of power. And to me it's just, it's a spear in the heart of "American exceptionalism", whatever that means to you. It means maybe something a little bit different to me than it does to, you know, some of our conservative friends, for example. But there is something truly unique, exceptional, if you will, about the American experiment. And for me, it's the fact that the American identity is predominantly an identity that is based on nospheric symbolic principles, and not on physical characteristics, right? Like ethnicity or geography or any of that. You know, the fabric of sort of American symbolism is such that if you carve out this precious American symbol, which is a peaceful transfer of power, you are doing damage, I think, to the heart of democracy itself, to the spirit of democracy itself.

so this to me is the big charge. it's the one where I really, really do want Trump, insofar as he is, guilty of conspiring to, overthrow a, federal election, I think he needs to be held accountable for that.

[00:34:25] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah. Yeah, well said Corey. I think that from a developmental perspective, this is kind of red run amuck, ruthless, kind of stuff that doesn't respect truth, doesn't care about truth, doesn't care about facts, and will do whatever it can to maintain power, and is hungry for that power. And you know, we have worked hard to develop a system that is, you know, it's a republic, but democratic principles that play out.

And I consider those people in Georgia and Michigan and Colorado and Nevada and Arizona heroes that followed the rule of law, and didn't let their partisan desire for a certain result overtake them. And so, you part of this, prosecution is to honor those who honor the rule of law. And to make a clear statement that, in honor of what you did, we're gonna hold people accountable that tried to undermine that, tried to undermine our democratic principles. And, you know, we just haven't had something so blatantly obvious. I mean in many ways, you know, you think about Watergate and stealing the

notes, the game plan for a woefully inept Democratic party that was about to get their asses kicked anyway.

And then you think about overturning a presidential election with a fake slate of electors, all this crap. I mean, whoa. Like it is a big deal. It is serious. And of course other folks on the other side or that are partisan on this, are gonna say it's a political issue, and it's Democrats trying to... It's really not, though, because so many of the people that stood up and honored the rule of law were Republicans. And it wasn't just Democrats. It was people that put down their political persuasion to honor a process. And so, yeah, I want, that process that was honored... a way to honor that is to hold people accountable that tried to undermine that.

So I don't know all the facts, and so I'm curious, and you know, as a former public defender, defense attorney, you know, the prosecutor gets it right a lot, but not always. So, you know, maybe this will have to go to to play out. But I'm appreciating the thoughtfulness of it, and I believe this prosecutor is gonna do what they think is the right thing. But it seems to me there's a good amount of evidence that points in the direction that there were folks that deliberately were trying to undermine the election.

And I know later we're gonna talk about Fox News, but that's kind of indicative of that, actually, what happened to Fox.

[00:37:41] **Corey deVos:** Right. Yep. I mean, they had a spreadsheet, right? I mean, on January 5th, they were looking at... or not a spreadsheet, I'm sorry, a PowerPoint. On January 5th, they were looking at a PowerPoint with the plan all laid out. And here's, you know, the alternate set of electors that we're gonna send, and we're gonna have Mike Pence send the vote back to the states on January 6th.

And, know, fortunately Pence didn't go along with that. I mean, Pence is not... Pence and I do not share a lot of political common ground, but we did here, I think, were it counts. He did not go along with that plot to undermine the results of a federal election. And let me just say the fact that, you know, they got a vice president to sit down for seven hours with the DOJ to essentially testify against his former boss, the President of the United States. This is a big deal. I mean, this is a big deal. This is uncharted territory our justice system.

[00:38:36] **Mark Fischler:** I don't think he wanted to, I but he did. He had to do it, you know?

[00:38:42] **Corey deVos:** Yep. Well, and Trump tried to get him off, I mean, there was all these late minute sort of efforts to, you know, executive privilege sort of his way out of this, so Mike Pence wouldn't have to show up at the DOJ in the first place. He lost those cases and, Pence had to testify, so, you know. And Pence himself, to his sort of quasi-credit, has been public about this, about what Trump asked him to do, why that was wrong, why he chose not to go along with it. And, you know, so bravo to you, Mike Pence, for not going along with that plot, because the dystopian American society that would follow the public hijacking of a federal election, I think, would be severe.

And Mark, I'm really glad that you framed this in terms of, you know, this particular story is a flare up of red in a lot of ways, and sort of insulated by Amber, right? I mean, we're seeing this sort of internal war in the GOP right now, I think between some of the Amber extremists and some of the Orange moderates, right? I think we're starting to see that war. I mean, there's a lot of people, you know, in the House, for example, conservatives in the House, who are going after conservatives in the Senate. They're going after Mitch McConnell. You know, not for the same reasons that we would go after Mitch McConnell. They're going after Mitch McConnell because he's not extreme enough, which I think is a very different problem than we see with good old Mitch.

But we are in fact seeing this flareup, and it seems to be a flareup that's taking place on every developmental stage. We're seeing a Red flareup right now. We're seeing an Amber flareup, huge, which we're gonna get to in a little bit with some of the culture war stuff that we're seeing. We're seeing an Orange flare up, and just in terms of the massive wealth of inequality that we're seeing, how "mean orange meme" as it's sometimes called, is just ripping off the everyman, sustaining this just absolutely ridiculous wealth inequality that we're faced with right now, not just as a nation but as a globe. So Orange is all lit up. And then Green has just completely lost its mind. I mean, and to be fair, a lot of what we're calling "Green" when it comes to sort of the extremism we're seeing on the left, isn't really green. It's sort of Red and Amber using green language to sort of justify their own brand of absolutism, which is only feeding the fire.

So we as Integralists, I think, are seeing this entire spiral of development basically disintegrating, right? I mean all of these stages, these developmental stages, are pulling

away from each other, and they're sort of calcifying themselves, and they're sort of finding new ways to exert their power directly and oftentimes brutally. And as a result, we see the culture war just continuing to heat up and heat up, to the point where I don't think we're in a cold civil war anymore. I think that we're, at the very least, in a "warm" civil war, that, you know, could very well go hot, if this sort of escalation of just first tier insanity continues.

And, you know, I think that this has us, and a lot of sort of integral folk like us who like to use the integral framework in order to just make sense of this big complicated reality that we're living in, I think it makes a lot of us very, very concerned.

And at the same time, maybe a little bit hopeful? Like it kind of feels like these power structures need to collapse in order for something more integral to come up, for people to feel enough pain to even care about integral solutions in the first place. So I, you know, I still have that sort of thread of optimism in all of this, that sort of, through this friction, the heat that's generated in this friction will actually allow something new to emerge.

But yeah, what do you think about all this Mark? What do you think about this full spiral flare up, this full spiral hemorrhoid that we're dealing with right now in politics, in culture, in economics, everywhere we look?

[00:42:41] **Mark Fischler:** Well, that's a fantastically deep question. I think I probably come down that I don't see any other way at the moment for integral solutions, an integral state of mind, an integral center of gravity, a Teal/Turquoise kind of center of gravity without the collapse in many ways of the other approaches. And it seems that for kind of a collapse to happen, the extreme edges, the mean edges, the unhealthy edges of every natural stage of development has to be flared up for folks to have the ability to reflect and see, why that doesn't work, and, you know, moving towards a deeper, understanding of, things and people, our interrelationship with the earth, and everything in our systems. So, I have another friend who speaks like you, that he's hopeful, but he thinks it has to get a little worse before...

[00:43:52] **Corey deVos:** That's right. It gets worse before it gets better. Yep.

[00:43:55] **Mark Fischler:** it's gonna get better. And so, you know, we have to see the acute problems. And, you know, it's happening.

You know, we can finish up one more piece of the... just quickly talk about Atlanta, and then we can talk about, we could go to Tennessee, or we could talk about, you know, if you want to talk culture war, we could talk about the Supreme Court ethics. But let's just finish with Atlanta quickly, just because that speaks to some of those things that you were speaking of.

So there's a district attorney, Fanny Willis of Fulton County, Georgia. She put together a special grand jury that lasted for about seven months. And they came out and had recommended some certain people get charged, and I think one of the people that served on the grand jury went on TV and kind of bragged and said, "oh yeah, Trump's one of 'em." But she still needs to convene another grand jury, a regular grand jury, to make the indictments. But a lot of it is centered around, trying to pressure Georgia officials to change votes, get a slate of electors, and even, as we know, there's a recording of President Trump on the phone with the Georgia Secretary of State, Brad Rasperger, saying "find me 11,800 votes, you better f'ing find me those votes." And which is clearly like, "Cheat! Do something!" You know, again, you can't do those things. We have to be better than that.

So apparently she's going to decide by July to September during that grand jury session, what she's gonna do. So, you know, crimes like election interference, crimes related to making false statements, influencing witnesses, even kind of a RICO, you know, racketeering influence, corrupt organization stuff. They're looking at that too. So, um, you know, I think that plays to the serious stuff that you were concerned about, and that, you know, ought to be getting central play right now, as opposed to paying off a porn star for an illicit relationship. So yeah, so that's the only other piece going on. I think we kind of discussed those different aspects.

[00:46:25] **Corey deVos:** Is that, enough?

[00:46:27] **Mark Fischler:** I know, I think we only went for an hour, so..

[00:46:31] **Corey deVos:** Yeah, that's right.

Yeah,

[00:46:32] **Mark Fischler:** Where do you go next?

[00:46:33] **Corey deVos:** We started this off and we're like, you know, think Trump is the least interesting part of all this, let's just spend 15 minutes on him and just get get part outta the way, and then we can move on to the juice. And here we are, an hour into our program.

This is the Trump effect right here, guys. This is the Trump effect. You can't, not talk about 'em.

So yeah, let's jump into some of the culture war stuff. Because, you know, part of, I think what we're seeing, you and I talked a couple days ago, part of what we're seeing with this full spiral flare up that I was just describing is how every one of these power blocks is sort of constricting and extending right now. So we are seeing the exertion of power, I think, in a really, again, escalating way. for example, states like Tennessee as sort of a, ground zero for this new emergence of an ultra MAGA type of conservatism.

And as a result, we are seeing things like, you know, the story that we saw, what was it, two weeks ago? Just two weeks ago in Tennessee, which we'll get into in just a minute. Well, let's get into it now. Where Justin Jones and Justin Pearson, who were, you know, two black representatives in the, in the Tennessee State government kicked out. Their seat was taken from them, because they participated in a protest, which was a disruptive but peaceful protest. And, you know, one of the things that's driving me nuts, because we also saw this in the Montana case, where Zoey Zephyr was banned from the house floor.

She still gets to vote fortunately, but she was banned from being able to speak on the House floor, for saying that, those who vote to ban gender affirming care will see "blood on your hands". And apparently that just total lack of decorum, you know, who are we, we we're Trump's GOP. Where's the decorum that we expect in politics these days?

I mean, it's kind of ridiculous that they used something like that in order to justify expelling Zoey from the floor. I think the common thread that we're seeing in Tennessee and Montana, Mark, and we'll get into some, you know, some of these specific, the issues around racism and transgenderism in just a moment. But I think one of the issues that we're seeing is that both of them used an interesting word to defend their decision to take power away from these people. And that word they're using is "insurrection". They're saying Zoey participated in an insurrection. They're saying the two Justins participated in an insurrection, which to me feels like a deliberate attempt to water down this word "insurrection" after, you know, the well known January 6th events. So I, you know, I believe this is a part of that sort of big Amber push right now to put more heat into its culture war, and to extend power, in a sort of new way, in a, in a very bold way that we haven't seen, from this movement in, you know, several decades.

[00:49:36] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah, yeah. So maybe if we like, I mean, you did kind of give the facts, but if we kind of really look at the facts, I think it can juxtapose the extreme nature of it, right? You know, so you have a school shooting in Nashville at a Christian school that kills six people. Three adults, three children. And then you have these three Democratic lawmakers who took to the floor of a Republican super majority controlled Tennessee house, to rally for stricter gun control. And they have in the audience, you know, a bunch of folks who are disruptive, being loud. And the Justins grabbed a bullhorn and they totally disrupted the debate while rallying the protestors in the audience. They totally shut down the discussion that was having on the floor. And so in response to that, they moved to expel them. And the two Justins were expelled and Gloria Johnson was not. She missed by one vote, and you know, it's, not lost. It certainly wasn't lost on Gloria, that, you know, why did you barely not get it? And she said, "well, I'm obviously white." And so there's that racial, flavor to it. You know, they argued that it wasn't that, it was because she didn't have a bullhorn in her hand, even though she was fully a part of all of that. And as you said, there was no property damage. They called the police, they dispersed, once the police were called. So it feels really undemocratic, retributive, and really partisan.

You know, for example, in Tennessee, the Republicans in Tennessee refused to take action against a member of their own caucus, who was credibly been accused in the past of sexual misconduct with teenage girls, and they didn't kick them out. They've only kicked out two other people in the history of Tennessee has ever been expelled, like these two men were. One was for bribery and the other was for sexual harassment. And so protesting on floor of the House is not unprecedented. In 2016, the Democrats did it

in Washington DC, they had a sit-in at the Capitol led by John Lewis, the great civil rights fighter, that they were demanding a vote on gun control that wasn't being allowed by the Republican majority. And they, you know, did a sit-in for 26 hours. Nobody expelled for that. And the Republicans in 2008, the Republican minority refused to leave the floor of the US House when summer recess was called to protest the speaker's refusal to schedule a vote on offshore drilling, and they protested for 35 days. And, you know, we didn't do anything about it. So it's obviously extreme. And I think this is what happens when, know, and what happened with Zoey is crazy. I mean, she said they threw her out because she said "you're gonna have blood on your hands". And now she's been silenced and has to vote from outside the chambers. And you know, it's like "blood on your hands"? How many people have used that saying, how many Republicans have used that saying for anything anyone's done against Donald Trump?

[00:53:30] **Corey deVos:** Didn't Marjorie Taylor Green just call Joe Biden a pedophile on the public record like two weeks ago? I mean, it's, the hypocrisy is crazy. But the thing is, nobody in politics cares about hypocrisy anymore. You know, hypocrisy sort of goes over our confirmation bias. The ends justify the means, guys, don't care if my guy says what he means. I just care about the fact that we're gonna get the judges, that we're gonna get the rulings, that we're gonna get the policies that we're looking for. We're not necessarily looking for, you know, high quality character in our politicians these days. We just want someone who's gonna get the job done.

[00:54:03] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah, yeah. I mean the way that I look at it, you're asking from my perspective on this, is that, you know, I'm seeing that we're creating pockets and swaths of like-minded people who are unable to tolerate multiple perspectives when those perspectives force us to contemplate, reflect, dialogue. What Zoe was asking in saying, "the blood on your hands" is, "think through what's going to happen to other human beings." And those people's response was, "No, we're not. We're throwing you out." Right? "And you Justins forcing us to have to listen to people that want us to do gun control and all of that, no, we're not gonna have to take that level of pressure."

So, you know, we're seeing this kind of Amber, which values rules, clear decorum, discipline, and that was some of the stuff that the Republicans were saying about the Justins was, well, you know, like, put a bill up and do it the right way, don't have this loud, confrontational stuff, follow the rules, follow the game, et cetera. Well, you stack the game in certain ways so that the rules don't always work for everybody, as we've seen. And so, you know, we're in a position where folks are disengaging from each

other, and not contemplating. That's what I'm really, really worrying about. We're seeing deliberate efforts like in Montana where people are moving there to create these super majorities in the state. I mean, Montana, not long ago, was a purple state, you know, with a healthy mix, but it's gone extreme. It's gone extreme. We've seen it in the state of New Hampshire where a group calling themselves the "Free Staters" were deliberately moving from around the country into New Hampshire cuz they thought that, you know, we were more like-minded to allow their extreme, extreme version of libertarianism to kind of play through. It hasn't played out well as I think they thought, but they've done some kind of wild things that has gotten some folks' attention.

So this to me is not good. This to me is what I'm most scared about, because when we disengage with each other, when we can't speak to each other and have a true dialectic and conversation where we both can learn something, you know, that's what a dialectic is, is that you come to a different conclusion through questions and processing to see something that we all hadn't seen before. And if you and I can't speak to each other and we create these pockets where we don't ever have to speak to each other, we create super majorities where I can shut you down and expel you and do unprecedented stuff, that's when our democracy to me really starts to fall apart. And so, you know, my principle that I've introduced here of Integral Democratic Inclusivity, we have no chance of that, because we're not inclusive, and we're not truly democratic anymore. And so we don't see the other as a being. We see them as an object.

[00:57:31] **Corey deVos:** that's all really well said. And I totally agree, Mark, that we are producing fewer people who are capable of enfolding multiple perspectives, right, or even just simply being willing to hear other perspectives, whether or not they, you know, are trying to agree or disagree with them, but simply being able to hear multiple perspectives. When you start losing the capacity to do that amongst sort of the, the silent majority in the country, then you allow the extremists to take over. And you allow the extremists to, in turn, bend people's perceptions in particular ways, using particular narratives of the other in order to advance their own political power.

And unfortunately, the worst part of this, I think, is that this is all taking place on a media, technology, social media in particular, that is almost designed to have this exact effect, right? There are so many perverse incentives when it comes to the sorting algorithms of social media itself, and how it thrives off of engagement. And the best way to drive engagement is to either put people in constant conflict with each other or put people into these epistemic bubbles where they're only surrounded by other people who

agree with them. Right? Both of these lead to just absolutely the disaster that we see culturally today. This culture that we have today is what 15 years of social media looks like.

And I think that, you know, to bring it back to sort of the Zooey discussion and transgenderism in general, you know, again, I think we should wrap an entire show around this at some point, Mark, and maybe even put out an invitation for any of our integral transgendered friends to come join us. But I think this is an extremely complicated problem that is exacerbated in many ways by sort of the social media platforms that the discourse is taking place on in the very first place.

I mean, I do think in a very real way, we are living in a social media induced era of dysmorphia. And again, this dysmorphia, I think is predominantly caused by the prevalence of social media and the disembodied effect it has on young people. I mean, I think, for example of, you know, apps like, TikTok and Instagram where they have these, these filters, right? I've got a 10 year old daughter and this stuff freaks me out. Where, you know, they have these filters where you look at them and then you press a button and it gives you like a more idealized, more beautiful version of yourself. Developing girls had enough of a hard time when it came to comparing themselves to other people, right? And now they're being forced to compare themselves to an unachievable idealization of themselves, right? Here's an AI image of your own face, except we've made these little tweaks to make you even more beautiful. And I think about just the terrible psychological and emotional. and, you know, self-esteem effects that this is having on little girls, and just the amount of, again, pure dysmorphia that it's injecting into the system. And I think that this dysmorphia is creating a notable increase in the number of people who are selecting non-conventional identities.

Which of course is, I think, is totally fair enough. Every generation gets to define these things for themselves, right? I mean, they get to define their own sexual politics. They get to define their own identities, their own sense of fashion, morals, selfhood, et cetera. It's in the rights of every generation to define these things for themselves, and sometimes to push against the definitions that they've inherited from the previous, generation.

However, and I think a lot of people on the left will agree, if a newly congealing identity, right, say like at 13 years old, 14 years old, et cetera, if this newly congealing identity is

emerging within a broken system, or a dysfunctional system, then there's a very strong chance that that identity's gonna take on similar dysfunctional features.

We see this in progressive talk all the time where it's like, "oh, well we live in a systemically racist system, racism is embedded into the system, and therefore it's generating racist people who are incapable of seeing their own racism because it's been so normalized by the system." So the left will sort of go along with that argument. I'm not so sure how willing they are to go along with this argument though, that social media itself has dysfunctions built into the system that are then internalized by the kids who are growing up with those systems.

Because all of that said, I think that this is pointing to again, sort of this, what can feel like a contradiction, where it's okay to be concerned about the increasing levels of dysmorphia that we're seeing in our society, it's okay to be concerned about that, while also respecting the dignity and the rights of the people who feel afflicted by this dysmorphia. Right? I think we want, all of us, want to be as accepting and loving, as we possibly can towards people who are experiencing, their own identity in a way that is, you know, different than how we experienced it.

And I think that we also need to accept that it's often the case, I think we have a lot of, of statistics demonstrating this, in extreme cases of dysmorphia, the only effective treatment is often providing something like gender reaffirming care. So when Zooey says "you're gonna have blood on your hands", what she's talking about is when we're able to bring people who are afflicted with this kind of dysmorphia, who are having, for example, suicidal ideation as a result of it, either because they feel so uncomfortable in their own skin, or they feel so uncomfortable in their surrounding society, right, because society treats them in a particular way, that can drive a lot of them to suicide. And suicide rates in the transgendered community is tragically high, just absolutely tragically high. And we have shown that, at least for adults, one of the best ways of lowering that suicidal ideation is by offering this kind of gender, affirming, procedures.

So that's what Zooey was talking about here. And you know, I think that's fair enough because I think that we want to have two conversations. We want to have a conversation about what is it systemically that's causing all of this dysmorphia in the first place. That's one question. And then the other question is, how can we best take care of kids who did grow up with this and are facing this kind of dysmorphia? What can we do

to extend love and care and support to them, so that they have the maximum chance of finding happiness in their lives? And you know, this is where the left and the right, they hit this impasse, right? I mean, the right will tell you, yeah, we agree with you. We wanna figure out what's causing this demo dysmorphia, and then we wanna just call it a mental illness and shame it out of society.

And then the left says, well no, there's nothing... You know, I think the left finds itself in a trap here where, for example, they say, you know, our relationship with identity should not be normative. We need to be fully accepting of neurodiversity. And you know, trans identities are just an example of that neurodiversity. And therefore we need to be a hundred percent accepting of trans people and shame people who aren't, just like we shame, you know, racists and homophobes. And actually, you know, I sort of agree with that as far as it goes. I think that. You know, we all want to maximize our freedom of expression, our freedom to wear whatever clothes you want. You're a boy who wants to wear a dress. I mean, clothing is such a social construct. We can see right through it. I don't care if a boy wears a dress. I don't, I certainly don't feel threatened by that. Right? I think that we want to overall maximize people's opportunity for self-expression, including sexual self-expression, identity, self-expression, et cetera. Find all these different avenues and combinations for self-expression. I think all that's a very good thing.

But I think the left then dips into any number of illiberal tactics in order to enforce this, in ways that really aren't necessary when it came to addressing previously marginalized groups such as ethnic groups or homosexuals. You know, when it comes to the transgendered issue, we're not just asking people to be accepting, we're asking people to change their language, for example. So there's an extra sort of effort here where it's like "you need to do your best to not offend me." Which I think can get sort of illiberal.

So it's a massively complicated problem. I think it's okay for us to look in two places at the same time, both at "let's solve the problems that are creating this dysmorphia to begin with" and "let's extend our fullest love and compassion and support to the people who are afflicted with this." Which means basically allowing some degree of gender affirming care.

That the last piece I'll put in here, which I agree with everyone just is tremendously complicated, is when we're talking about this in regard to adolescents. Because we

know that adolescent development is complicated. It's tricky. These kids on, you know, the best case scenario is these kids don't know who they are from one day to the next because things are changing so fast.

I mean, they biologically are not the same individual that they were a year ago, let alone, you know, neurologically or what have you. So there are so many changes that are happening in such a sort of condensed amount of time that I understand the caution when it comes to kids forming identities around gender and how confusing that can be.

And I can understand the drive to, you know, let's wait until you're 18 before we make some of these decisions. I mean, really the adult brain isn't fully developed until we're 27. So maybe we should wait until we're 27 before we make decisions like these. I mean, obviously you can kind of, you know, push that horizon back as long as you want. But at the same time, when I take the perspective of a parent, like if my daughter came to me and, you know, told me she was having, issues with her own gender identity, and God forbid, told me that she was, you know, considering, you know, suicide for example, because she was just so uncomfortable and so unhappy, of course I would want to deliver her whatever care she needed that would, you know, minimize the odds of her, ending her own life.

Again, it's such a, it's tricky, complicated and complex territory of the heart, where we need to be big-hearted about this, while also taking a very, very careful look at what is it about how society is self-organizing right now that is afflicting so many kids in this generation with any number of dysmorphic conditions. This definitely is the era of dysmorphia, and, I continue to think that social media technology in general is sort of the primary source of all of this. And I'm hoping, I'm hoping, that as technology continues to advance, things like artificial intelligence are going to put a different kind of pressure on how we self-organize as a society. And I'm hoping that that helps liberate, or at least gives us an opportunity to correct our steering, when it comes to these big systemic issues. Because we're feeling the pain of it right now. Our kids are feeling the pain of it, anxiety levels, depression levels, sky high. Suicide rates, sky high right now. It is not fun growing up in this country right now. And we're seeing that, I think, in the hearts and the minds of our kids.

So that was sort of a, sorry for extended soapbox there, but that's just sort of my, current state of thinking when it comes to this issue.

And, you know, the final piece I'll just drop on top is that the more extreme Green gets in trying to push this into society, the more extreme Amber gets. And the more extreme Amber gets, the more extreme Green gets. So sort of in this, you know, escalation right now. This we're headed towards some kind of mutually assured destruction here, where extreme Amber is just creating extreme Green, which is creating extreme Amber, and they just keep on one upping themselves. And it's getting ugly, it's getting really, really ugly. And kids, women, you know, people with various kinds of identity, LGBTQ people, are feeling a lot of pain right now as a result.

[01:10:28] **Mark Fischler:** Well, that was powerful. Thank you so much for those deep insights, on the issue and the causes and how the different developmental perspectives are exacerbating the problems. Which really calls for, you know, integral solutions, integral discussions. I'll just briefly say, I mean, just some interesting things here like, the Montana governor, who just signed the legislation, right away signed it, but has a son who is non-binary, and who went and met with his dad and pleaded with him not to sign it, and tried to educate him, you know, on the issue. Apparently that didn't work out. At least maybe politically, maybe it did personally. And yeah, we have, the surgeon general has called it, an "epidemic for young girls". Teenagers. And Jonathan Haidt, the great psychologist who's done a lot of really good things, directly relates this all to social media. I subscribe to his SubStack stuff and he's a good read. He never brings development into it, but he's aware of it, and I've had an exchange with him. But he knows...

[01:11:57] **Corey deVos:** Mark he's one of my favorite, non-AQAL integral minds. I mean, I think he's clearly flying at an integral altitude, even if, you know, he doesn't need the map. I mean, not everyone at the integral altitude needs the map necessarily, but I do think the map would help him.

[01:12:13] **Mark Fischler:** I think so too. I think just owning development... he knows development, but it's just not mainstream, so he won't use it. And, uh, so he's pretty devoted to that. But anyway, he finds the direct causation with social media platforms and expressions as you have so eloquently described. So yeah, I mean, it goes back to what I was saying, is that we're not speaking to each other. You know, the way that

these things get overcome generally is through exposure, and through conversation, and seeing the humanity of a person of African American descent, and seeing how they're no different, and you know, hopefully moving the direction of things like deracialization, like Greg Thomas talks about. Meeting a gay person, oh, and seeing how they're not so different, or any different in terms of their wants, needs, relationship issues, you know, all that kind of stuff. You know, the more we expose each other to multiple perspectives and multiple ways of existence, the more we're able to accept.

So when we go into these pockets, right, and create these super majorities, wherever it is, whether it's a super democratic majority where Green can, you know, kind of go on its crazy way, or Amber goes on its crazy way. I think you're right, it's mutual destruction when they both go extreme and so unhealthy.

So, you know, we need to create more moments where people are exposed to different perspectives and different ways of living so that we can start to do it really the right way, right? Like having the honest conversation about, well, when is the right time you know, change beyond your name, but your body, you know? Because there's some stuff that, you know, is argued at least for people that wanna change that, you know, you gotta get in there before the hormones fully take over for them to have a better process. And, you know, there's a lot of medical information on that. So, you know, I don't know. I mean, I've had exposure in my life through some students and through one of my best friends, you know, who has a daughter now, and went through that process. So I, you know, I don't have any deep answers other than I don't like the way we're going about it. And I think a lot of the things that you said are right on. And there needs to be a way that we do go about this so that we can honor all sentient beings. And that's the bottom line. we're not doing a good job of it. And when the left screams and yells and shames folks at this stage of the process, when there's a lot of unanswered questions, a lack of clarity, then we're not doing justice to their concerns on the other side. And we need to do better to honor that, because it's not all crazy. There's certain things that make sense, or at least that we need to get deeper answers on before we lay out that this is the absolute answer on all of this.

[01:15:36] **Corey deVos:** That's right. That's right. No, the left often suffers from what I call a "developmental privilege". The left is super good these days at noticing all these different kinds of privilege that others, but certainly not them, but others are dealing with, right? Like, oh, you have racial privilege, or you have economic privilege. There's a dozen different kinds of privilege that they'll level at people. What the left cannot see is

their own developmental privilege, which is something that allows them to see things like privilege in the first place. They see this as like, you know, not the result of a fairly sophisticated capacity to take multiple perspectives, in this case a perspective on a system, being able to see a system from the outside as an object, right, which is actually a high Green, maybe even Teal sort of capacity to be able to see a system as an object. You know, Green is really good at seeing systems from within, whereas Teal begins to see them from without, which is why Teal can come up with things like developmental sequences and all of that.

So Green is not good at seeing its own developmental privilege, which is what gives it the position to, you know, to see things like privilege in the first place. For those on the left who are actually at the Green stages, there are many on the left who are at the Amber stage, right, who never grew into Green, but have coalesced at Amber around sort of Green slogans. And I think as we talked about many times in this show, that is much of the woke movement. That's a pretty good description of the woke movement, where you're taking these, you know, sort of fairly sophisticated Green, high Green observations, and you are turning them into absolutes and you're enforcing them as absolutes. And there's sort of this regression down to Amber.

My concern, Mark, my concern is that I think it's entirely possible that our academic institutions are not producing as many genuinely Green individuals as they were 20 years ago. And if that's true, that's gonna have some long term effects in our society. You know, we're used to seeing progress as this slow sort of movement. You know, Ken calls it the "pig in the python", right? The pig usually only moves in one direction, but if we're not producing as many, you know, actual bonafide green altitude thinkers, well, it's gonna start regurgitating a little bit. The pig's gonna come, you know, back out the python's mouth again. and that's not good. We wanna see development continuing to push forward, but when you have these systemic and institutional problems, you can actually, you know, do damage to that ongoing development.

The last thing I wanna say, because I just gave a, what I feel like is probably a fairly strong hypothesis about social media creating, and I do believe all of this is true, about how social media is creating this sort of dysmorphic age. But the other piece I wanna add in that maybe falsifies, you know, some of what I was just saying, is there's also the possibility that we're seeing something like the left-handed dynamic, which is, you know, in the early 20th century, all of a sudden we started mass producing tools for left-handed people. And at the time it was something like three to five percent of people

identified as being left-handed, because they were left-handers living in a right-handed world. Right. The only tools available to people were predominantly, it was normative for them to be right-handed tools, because the majority of people are right-handed.

As soon as we started mass producing left-handed tools, we actually saw the rate of self-identified left-handedness increase, and pretty abruptly, it was a pretty abrupt jump. Like within 15 or 20 years, all of a sudden we had like, you know, seven times more left-handed people running around. I don't think people were super concerned about this. I don't think people were like, oh, you know, the education systems are turning our kids left-handed. Right? I don't think there was any of that sort of kind of panic that we see around, trans and gay issues today. But it was a real phenomenon, and I think it is possible that like, now that we have a society that is beginning to learn how to be a little bit more accepting of these identities for one; two, now that we actually have interventions in the upper right quadrant to transform a body, which did not exist 50 years ago, right? We can now transform a body. It is now in many ways easier, if you're dealing with a dysmorphic person, it is now easier to transform the body to fit the mind, than it is to transform the mind to fit the body. So we have this new opportunity, this new technological possibility that suddenly exists now, that never existed in history. Transgendered people have existed all through history, but it's entirely possible that we're seeing an increased rate of transgender identities because it's an identity that can actually find expression now, right? Technologically we can actually do something, we have pills, we have medicines, we have surgeries, we have any number of actual upper right quadrant physical interventions that can help, you know, again, transform a body to make it better fit the mind.

So it's entirely possible that, just like the left-handed effect, we're seeing a big increase of transgendered identities, but then it's gonna hit a plateau. Because it's actually finding it's real normal, right? Its normalcy has always been suppressed because the opportunities for that kind of expression have always been suppressed. We saw the same thing in the nineties and the early zeros as gay lifestyles started getting more accepted in mainstream America, we saw this sudden uptick of kids who are identified as gay. And that also is likely, I think, a product of sort of the left-handed effect. And that increase, that spike doesn't go on forever, it just hits its plateau and then it normalizes and it stays normal for generations. So that's just another piece I wanted to throw on the table, in terms of why we might be seeing this sudden increase of I would say non-conventional identities.

[01:21:53] **Mark Fischler:** I was silently thinking of that possibility. I didn't know about the left-hand thing, but it makes total sense to me, and I think that's a great hypothesis. And I'd like to see how it plays out, but it makes all kinds of natural sense to me, so thank you, sir. Thank you.

So where do we want to go? We could... oh actually we haven't talked. You wanna talk? Let's talk about the Supreme Court. I think something that actually is in a way a little less partisan, even though it's gonna start partisan. I don't know if people are aware, but ProPublica, which is kind of an investigative organization, publication, they did an extensive report on Clarence Thomas, Justice Clarence Thomas, who is now I think the most senior member of the court, who has been accepting lavish gifts from a conservative billionaire, Harlan Crow for over 20 years. And their relationship only started after Clarence became a Supreme Court justice. Stuff like a \$500,000 cruise in Indonesia on a fully staffed super yacht. Summers at his private resort in the Adirondacks. And Crow actually also bought Clarence Thomas's mom's house in Savannah, Georgia, where he grew up, for a higher price than what it was worth. And he lets his mom still live there. And all of this, by the way, was not disclosed, to the public, and Clarence has argued that he had no obligation, or, you know, that other Justices had told him, I'm guessing liberal justices, progressive justices, said that you don't have to do that. I'm gonna give some examples of some liberal justices doing this too.

But at the same time, Justice Neil Gorsuch, from Colorado, your state, forgot to report that he sold a log cabin that wasn't sold for two years, to the head of a massive law firm that has had business before the court, on 22 occasions since Gorsuch sold that cabin. So, you know, as I said, this happens on the left and the right with the Supreme Court Justices, but Justice Scalia, who died in 2016 actually on one of those lavish trips at a hunting lodge in Texas owned by John Poindexter, I think. But he took 258 subsidized trips, that's what we believe, while on the court. And, like I said, he died on a subsidized trip.

Justice Breyer, who just retired from the Supreme Court, who I think has one of the more thoughtful kind of approaches to decision making, he took at least 225 subsidized trips, from about 2004 to 2018. Places like Europe, Japan, India, Hawaii, one trip to Nantucket with David Rubenstein, a private equity mogul.

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg got a private tour of Israel that was paid for by an Israeli billionaire who has had business before the court.

So the Senate Judiciary Committee asked the Chief Justice to appear, and he declined. "I don't have to do that". And you know, so what do we know? We know that, you know, no executive branch member or Congress are permitted to accept a single free cruise or a flight without disclosing it. all that stuff has to be disclosed. And that lower federal court judges are subject to gift limits and full disclosure as well. And Chief Justice Roberts says we don't have to play by those rules. And, and so obviously why is this problematic? Right? Well, you know, it leaves you with the strong impression that American justice can be bought, that it's not on the level. And you know, frankly, the polling numbers reflect that. The public just lacks confidence in the court as a neutral arbiter. You know, when Thomas goes on these trips to the Adirondacks at Harlan Crow's place, the head of the Federalist Society, which is the arm that develops the right wing justices to serve on the court, you know, he's interacting with these people. And obviously whoever Breyer has to interact with, it's the same. Now these judges can say, you know, we're not influenced and, blah, blah, blah...

[01:26:51] **Corey deVos:** "Trust us."

[01:26:51] **Mark Fischler:** But gosh, you know, I mean, Harlan Crow has given tons of money to Ginni Thomas's causes. And you know, Clarence Thomas was one of the only judges that, I think he was the only judge that voted that something that the president requested, he didn't have to do. And Thomas will, say that's just, you know, that's how much I believe in executive privilege. But it leaves you with that impression. And, you know, I brought it up to my students, without naming justices, I said, well, just what would it be like if, as me as your professor, one of you in class had a bunch of money and you decided to take me to a Miami Dolphins game in Miami? Cuz you know, I love the Dolphins. And then you took me to Celtics playoff games, and you took me to what I told you were my favorite restaurants in New England. And you did all that, and you did that for my family, and at the end of the day, you know, you hand me your papers, I grade them, and I give you an A. And then you as class members, I say to you, you know, "Hey, he or she earned it. They earned it." I was like, how are you gonna feel? And their universal response was, "well, I mean, as much as we'd like to trust you, Mr. Fishler, kind of hard to believe that you wouldn't be influenced."

[01:28:19] **Corey deVos:** Yeah. Yeah.

[01:28:21] **Mark Fischler:** by that. So, you know, I think it's a big deal. The Supreme Court has now agreed to be bound by new accounting rules that would require disclosure of what Thomas has been doing. except there's really no teeth to it. they don't have to...

[01:28:38] **Corey deVos:** yeah, I was gonna say...

[01:28:39] **Mark Fischler:** They don't have to actually share, like how much it would cost. Like they just have to share that they went on the trip. And you know, frankly, it creates this really different picture of Clarence Thomas that I think he's tried to put out to the public through his book and how he gets in his RV and he drives around the country and he lives out of the RV, and they park in Walmart parking lots, and they hang out and they, you know, stay at KOAs. And, know, that's a very different Clarence Thomas picture than the one whose best buddy is a billionaire who collects, interesting items like, you know, Hitler's Mein Kampf book, and, you know, different things like that.

There's a Sheldon Whitehouse, a Senator from Rhode Island, he's the chair of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, and he would like them to adopt rules like Congress, and also with rules on recusal, and making statements on when they need to recuse themselves. Elena Kagan, who's a progressive, she didn't recuse herself on a case that she should have, and they just said that was a minor mistake. But we need to be clear about that. I mean, Congress can't even accept a gift of more than a hundred dollars in a year, I think, from somebody.

And so, you know, I think those things are systemic exterior answers to the problem and maybe would change behavior. But it's deeper than that to me. what I see is folks that have a high cognitive, rational kind of understanding, but are certainly not, their center of gravity is not coming from, you know, a, kind of Teal, you know, a higher level of consciousness. So to me, like Robert Keegan talks about what I think what we consider kind of like Turquoise and Teal, Kegan describes as a self-transforming stage. And at that self-transforming stage, they see how systems and individuals interact with each other. They can start to take a deeper view. They can start to, you know, they recognize the importance of moral development and the treatment of others, and what actions look

like terms of individually and within systems.

And so, you know, to me, if you had Justices that were coming from a Teal/Turquoise perspective or center of gravity, they would never go on these trips. They would never have the sense, because they would understand the implications of what that would look like and the ability for them to hold their integrity and do their jobs in a way that is just, it wouldn't even be on the radar to do those kinds of lavish things, and to think that you're privileged enough because of your position that you actually deserve that. You know, I mean, I think about, I mean, I don't know a lot about this pope, but I know that he was incredibly uncomfortable at first having to live in the palace and chose to live in an apartment. And one of his first acts was to clean the feet of an impoverished individual that was living outside of the Vatican. To me, you know, I think about Dr. King, who towards the end of his life moved to Chicago to live in a tenement, to bring greater awareness to troubles in the north for African Americans. He left because some issues exacerbated in the south, but that kind of consciousness, you know, you think of Gandhi. And so it's not like we don't have examples of this, and it doesn't mean that you can't have expensive taste or have a flare. But to think that you're privileged and are okay to take all these trips, is a serious problem.

And then so again, it leaves me sad that we don't have folks that are at a higher stage of consciousness that would start to embody and model this kind of stuff. Which leaves me also thinking that maybe more people at that center of gravity need to get into politics, need to get and become judges and, get into these positions of power.

You know, I spent some time last week with this New Hampshire Supreme Court Justice, one of my best friends, his father was a New Hampshire Supreme Court Justice. And God, the humility that these individuals have, and the way that they go out of their way to not feel privileged and better, I mean, this justice, Hans Marconi, she spent an hour and a half with my daughter this summer, and just making her feel welcome, spending time at the court. And so I invited her to my university to give a talk, and it was so humble, and she spent so much time with our students, down to earth, you know, and we're gonna be one of the first schools now to actually have an undergraduate that does an internship at the New Hampshire Supreme Court. And that's based on a person who's got a deep sense of being grounded and, et cetera. And so anyway, that's my riff on the Supreme Court, and I'm interested to hear what you have to say.

[01:34:25] **Corey deVos:** I think it's a great riff. I agree with virtually everything you just said, Mark. The idea that we have, you know, one of three major branches of government is composed of lifetime appointments that have no oversight. Is this royalty? Right? I mean, is this a theocracy we're talking about here? It's absurd to me, and it was absurd to me that all nine of them unanimously came forward and said, "we don't need oversight. We don't need that regulation stuff. No, that's, that's only gonna cause issues and it's just gonna slow us down." And I'm just like, this is supposed to be a modern Orange plus country that we live in, and yet we have, again, one out of three major branches has no oversight.

And this seems, Mark, to be the common theme that's threading through just about everything we've talked about today, the necessity of minimally Orange oversight. And we've talked about this before when it comes to policing, right? We're getting sick and tired of all of these government agencies and institutions saying things like, "we've investigated ourselves and found nothing wrong." Right? Every one of these institutions needs to be plugged into, again, a minimally Orange standard, a minimally worldcentric standard of law and governance. And they need to be held accountable to that. I don't care if you're a Clarence Thomas, you know, Sotomayor, Donald Trump, Joe Biden, Ted Cruz, I don't care who you are. You have to be held to account. It's the only way that our system has any chance, not just, you know, the system itself being able to function, right? It can only function if it has basic accountability, but the only way we can trust a system enough to let it function in the first place is to have this kind of accountability and oversight.

Because guess what, guys? Democratic institutions, it's kind of like Zeus. They only exist insofar as you believe in them, right? And the minute we stop believing in the core principles, the animating principles of things like democracy in the first place, it goes away. It evaporates. And in fact, every generation, I think, is a struggle to rebuild civilization, to perpetuate civilization against the forces of this social entropy, right?

And when you start taking these things for granted, when you start taking sort of the stability of our infrastructure, when you start taking sort of the, the hard won rights, that took generations to emerge in the first place. Right? If you, if you take that for granted for just a minute, the natural erosion of social entropy will very well take them away.

And we're starting to see exactly that in, you know, not only many places around the world, but many states in this country, right? We're starting to see this backslide, this regressive backslide as sort of extreme Amber reasserts itself and reasserts its power. And if that extreme Amber is not plugged into a strong system of Orange accountability, with teeth, right, with teeth, then it's a free for all. I mean, it literally becomes a free for all where either the loudest person, the most confident person with the biggest reality distortion field, or the most, you know, financially resourced person, wins the day. And only these structures and mechanisms of actual accountability can prevent that from happening.

So, I mean, Jesus man, we're just in the midst of it.

[01:38:23] **Mark Fischler:** Yeah. Yeah, we are. I think that was awesome, what you just said. I mean, it just kind of reinforces the earlier discussion about the backslide, and we just, we can't have it. I'm just trying to think about some of the answers, you know, you mentioned about we're not graduating folks moving to green, and you know, I worry about, if I take a more actually Amber position, or I don't know, Orange, somewhere in there, about like civics education, you know, a deep understanding of not just the system, but why we have the system, and the hard fought battles to create a society that, you know, is the oldest democracy in the world, with all of our warts and all of its problems. But gosh, that's so damn important.

You know we're thinking of taking a trip south this summer, and we're gonna take, you know, Aurora to Gettysburg, Philadelphia, to, you know, experience where the Constitution was created. And then, you know, go down south and experience some of the Civil War stuff, and then, you know, finish in Washington DC and see the White House and the Supreme Court and all of those places. And because I really want Aurora to have you know, a deep abiding appreciation for the hard won battles to live in a democratic republic, and why that matters, and, what's necessary to civically participate in that. And so, I think that's just really important. And I wonder just about our educational system and the emphasis, because I think, you know, they, they may share facts, but it's the moral, it's the moral, the morality behind it, the interior subjective wise I think we need to do a better job

of emphasizing so that people understand why this is important. Uh, you know, I, I'm looking in to find out when they're gonna study the Civil War, and it sounds like, at least

in our grade school system, barely touched on, um, In eighth grade and then expecting it in high school. And you know, I'm just thinking like Joey, that's just not enough. You know, like, it, it

be a subject matter that we need to really deep dive into, uh, to understand, you know, what makes Lincoln our greatest president and what was at stake and what, you know, what were his hurdles and what were the things he came up short on. But gosh, we need a deep dive to understand, you know, why he emphasized the Declaration of Independence over the Constitution at that point in history the philosophical basis for us. You know, he starts his speech four score in seven years ago. He didn't talk about the, you know, September 17th, 1787 when the Constitution was made.

He was going to our declaration he gave his Gettysburg address. So anyway, those were some thoughts to riff off of what you were saying. And where I'm seeing is maybe some of the holes that we're gonna have to fix if we're going to get people to at least a healthy green stage at the college level.

[01:42:02] **Corey deVos:** Well, let me just say, mark, I'm psyched that you guys are going to the south. I'm psyched that you're taking your daughter to the south because it gets to something that you mentioned earlier, which is simply the need to be able to engage all different kinds of people from all different kinds of walks of life.

And that, you know, and I, and I think that, you know, my, my, my wife just got back from, uh, a week long work trip in Nashville, Nashville, Tennessee, and this was, um, , you know, before sort of the tragedies of Nashville, um, occurred. This was a couple months ago, and, uh, she had just such a wonderful time and the people were so warm and the food was so good, and the music was so rich and, you know, so I think that this is a big part of it is, is actually reaching out and befriending our fellow Americans and understanding that aside from our political differences, right?

We have so much more in common than not. And the biggest thing that is holding us back from each other is the fact that we have been trained over the last 15 years to make this political lens like the forefront of our entire personality, right? We push everything and everyone through that political lens and that tells us what we can trust, what we can't trust, what we can like, what we can't, like, um, who we can talk to, who

we can't talk to, what we can believe, what we can't believe, et cetera.

It's all getting mediated for us by this largely algorithmically driven political filter that has become so primary for us, both on the left and on the right. I would even argue for most of us up here in integral up here, quote unquote, um, you know, the political perspective has just become so pronounced, so paramount and so sort of singular that.

We can't see each other anymore until we're willing to set that lens aside, right? And actually have a more human interaction with each other, which I think you are giving your daughter the opportunity to simply by going, you know, down south where, you know, into a lot of these states where politically we are probably like, whoa guys, this is getting a little bit nuts, right?

But these states are populated by actual human beings with real hearts and real brains and real stories and life experiences and wisdoms and, you know, and, and faults and failures and all of that, right? All of that is there too. And so I love the fact that, that, um, you guys are gonna be taking that trip and you're gonna be meeting fellow Americans who, um, you know, we share this beautiful nation and this beautiful world with, um, and I think everyone is gonna be enriched by that, by that interaction.

We're going to Europe. We're getting out this country. We're going to Europe. My first time leaving the country, uh, we're taking our daughter on a trip. We're starting off in Italy. We're going to Rome, we're going to Florence, we're going to Venice. Then we're going, I think on Father's Day. How cool is this on Father's Day?

We're gonna be in a castle in Switzerland, which just makes me very, very happy. Then we're, going A nice 10 day trip. I'm really, I'm really looking forward to it.

[01:45:07] **Mark Fischler:** That's great. we'll have to swap stories, only because I've spent a fair amount of time, minus Switzerland, although Switzerland a long time ago. But the other places we've hit up in the last big sabbatical in 2015, we spent a bunch of months over there. And so, love that. And I need to hear about your wife's trip to Nashville, as we're gonna go through Nashville as part of our journey.

But you know, I think ultimately, Corey, I think about when I was a public defender, and what ultimately really changed me and helped my spiritual growth as a human was, you know, listening to their stories, I understood at the end of the day why they were in the position that they were in. And can we do that as a society? I mean, that's really it. Because ultimately, if I sit down with a southerner with a different perspective than me, I know for a fact if I sit down and I listen to their whole story, it'll all make sense to me. It'll all make sense to me why they've arrived to that decision. And that includes Marjorie Taylor Green that includes everybody.

And so, you know, maybe we should end on a challenge for each other that we all really need take it as a serious goal that we need to get to know others that think differently than us, listen to them, and try to understand them, so that we stay curious and we stay with our hearts open to others, because of our ultimate oneness, our ultimate interconnection as cosmopolitan citizens of the world.

[01:46:58] **Corey deVos:** That's beautiful. I love that challenge. If I can add just a little layer to it, I would add that like, if you're the type of person who enjoys conversations like these, and you're the type of person who values something like a developmental map, and you see yourself somewhere in that developmental map, maybe you think you're Green, maybe you think you're Teal or Turquoise, whatever it is, I think a big part of what you just said, mark, is that it is imperative to the people at later stages to be more inclusive of people at earlier stages.

And this isn't a judgment thing. This isn't a superior or inferior thing, right? Because there are people who are at those earlier stages who could do things that you could never do up there at your lofty... you know? All it means is like, here's the types of complexity I'm comfortable with. That's basically all it means. And it is imperative on the people who are in later stages, because they can take more perspectives, to consistently take the perspective of anyone that they happen to be talking to at any given time. I feel like this is the integral imperative. Find a way to resonate. Because that stage, whatever it is that you're talking to, is still alive in you, and it's still vibrant and it's still beautiful and it's still wise. And in fact, there are wisdoms that exist at each of these stages that gets lost when our view switches from one stage to the next.

So it, it's an opportunity to recontact the fullest possible spectrum of what makes us human. And it has the nice benefit of actually, you're gonna create some surprising

friendships. You're gonna have some laughs that, you know, you never thought you'd be having. And your overall appreciation and enjoyment of life is gonna be radically expanded and improved, because you have the capacity to take a nearly infinite number of perspectives on any occasion that, you know, happens to present itself to you.

So blessings to you on your trip, man. I think it's gonna be, I think it's gonna be awesome for you and for your family.

[01:49:09] **Mark Fischler:** Thank you! And same to you, and blessings to everybody out there. If you think about what, you know, Ken's adage, right? Like, everybody's got a partial piece of the truth, if we can embody that, that will allow us to have those conversations, and live a more meaningful life, a more full life, when we stay with that curiosity about all beings. And so, let's get after it. There's so much at stake. We need every single one of you at your best to address the serious problems of our day. And what I'm feeling, brother.

[01:49:46] **Corey deVos:** Well said, man. All right. Well, hey dude, it's great to be back with you, to get into the pocket again, I'm hoping we can do this again next month. And then, you know, here's a question for our audience: what do you guys want to hear us talking about? Let us know, you know, either when we post this on Integral Life, there's gonna be a comment thread right down there, pointing down to the bottom of the webpage that this will be embedded on, click into the comment forum and leave a comment. Let us know what you wanna discuss, what is pressing and present for you, that you would like us to take a look at from, you know, the perspective of integral justice, integral politics, et cetera. In the meantime, Mark, I love you so much, buddy, and it's so awesome to be here with you, thank you as always, for your heart and for your mind, and for your spirit. All right, brother, we'll talk soon.