

This is the transcript of a talk entitled “Esoteric Politics”, presented by Stanton K. Stevens at Quest Bookshop in Seattle, Washington on March 19, 2017. Please visit his website, <https://onepurelove.com> for the handout associated with this talk and more information, including a video of this talk and other talks.

SUMMARY –

In our times, humanity continues to work on the difficult problems of choosing leaders, and what kind of government and state can be trusted with power over citizens. There are great difficulties that democracy has not solved. And there are new problems, including corruption of the press, such as networks like Fox news that have decided that they can make more money telling people what they want to hear than by presenting objective news. The forces of enriched greed are at work on many fronts. America and other countries are being put through the test: can they see through the lies and false promises of populists whose real goal is dictatorship? The rights of individuals must be protected, yet people always have the choice of surrendering them, out of lack of appreciation for the value of those rights and how hard they are to regain.

An understanding of the law of sowing and reaping would be of benefit for both leaders and populace. Few understand that justice is inevitable. Few understand that their personal choices are what determine their happiness or sorrow in future lives. There are many areas where just seeing things as they are would help, rather than living in a fairy tale of blind devotion to one’s country as if it can do no wrong.

Esoterics considers the function of an ideal state to be the protection of the rights of the individual from powerful groups, corporations, majorities, minorities, and from the state itself. Government can ensure that business competes on a level playing field, and do not destroy the environment or the lives of individuals in the process. Esoterics says that greater power must always come coupled with greater responsibility. Those who we entrust political power must be capable public servants, putting the general need ahead of their own personal glory, ahead of the needs of their personalities. They have the difficult task of governing an emotionally focused humanity, that is often manipulated through its worst nature: hatred, anger, vengeance, fear of those who are different. Too often, we see politicians using these factors to try to gain power. They are assisted by rich individuals who feel that they must keep humanity divided and fearful for them to preserve their power and wealth.

We have come a long way from the tyranny of priesthoods, and people are educated to the degree where it is possible for them to choose good over evil. Now the great propaganda wars have begun, and we will see if humanity can keep its head. Great leaders have saved us before: Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt. This time we will all have to step up.

==--==--==--==--==--==--==--==--==--==--==--==--==--==--==--==

FULL TRANSCRIPT

Thank you very much for the introduction, and thanks for the chance to speak. Thank you for coming. It's really an honor and a privilege to me to speak. I take great delight in sharing what I find looking through the esoteric books and what a topic! It's been such an adventure to dig into the books and look into what somebody like Henry Laurency says about politics. I also draw from Alice Bailey and

Theosophy. A lot of what I'm talking about has to be about what going on right now, it's just right in our faces and I have to comment on it. I'll also be talking about the esoteric side of it that you are not going to hear in other places.

I hope you find it interesting and that maybe it puts a balance on how caught up we get in the current side of things. Esoteric stuff has a much broader spectrum. What this comes down to always, when we talk about Esoterics, is consciousness. I like to start my talks with a little exercise involving consciousness that is helpful for me, and a lot of other people have said the same. Evolution of consciousness is what Laurency says is the meaning of life. We are trying to grow our consciousness, expand it, be more aware, to wake up basically. That's a stage of consciousness, just to wake up to what really is.

Let's take a moment to take note of our consciousness. The attention that we are paying to things comes from somewhere. That's us paying attention. See if you can look at the source of that consciousness and see where attention is coming from. The I in I am is like the eye that looks out, it's always looking out. But take a moment to look in at consciousness itself. It's a unique ability that we've acquired over eons and it's what it means to be human, actually, it's to be conscious of consciousness. Animals are not conscious of their consciousness, but we are.

Well, they say that you shouldn't bring up religion or politics if you want to maintain harmony. But I've already talked about religion so now I'm going to talk about politics. I don't know what the ideal political system is. I don't have the answers for our current situation. When it comes to the mysteries of life that I like to talk about here, I'm a student, I'm learning. But that's why I have something here.

I've committed myself to getting answers, finding out what's going on. And I've managed to penetrate into a few areas that have given me some more information to share with you. Finding Laurency, finding Theosophy, is to find a very special, unique source of information that few people really get a chance to take advantage of, and I'm going to be sharing that today.

Now, this talk more than others, I'll be bringing in some of my own opinions. I can't help but be an observer of everything that's going on and have opinions about it. I'll try to make it clear when it's my opinion versus Laurency's, where I'll say Esoteric says, Laurency says. I'm going to read more quotes from Laurency than I usually do, so you get the real stuff. The handout is full of Laurency's quotes. I hope you got that.

Laurency says that it's best to work from the ideal to the particular, from the general to the details, rather than try to look at all the details and assemble the meaning of life out of a bunch of small pieces. It's better to start with the big picture and see if you can construct a whole system out of it. Well, let's start with the ideal of politics. Before we dig into politics, let's look at ideal politics. What would it be like to have an ideal political system? What goes into the ideal government?

Audience member: Everyone has a voice.

Consensus is the first thing I managed to think of on that. Everybody having a voice, everybody getting to choose whether or not they are going to go along with what everybody else says. Maybe they disagree. Consensus doesn't mean everybody agrees, but it means they decide, "Okay, I'll go along with what everybody else decides. Now that they've put my two cents in and it's been heard and considered." That's the requirement, everybody has got to be able to put in their part so a consensus

can be built. Ideally, the state is not forcing its will on anyone, and that's what you'd get with consensus. People would be choosing to participate in what the state is doing.

Let me read a quote from Laurency about the task of the state. "The task of the state is also to work for political unity on the basis of free conviction, since the will to unity alone can bring about an enduring solution of the political, social, and politico-economical problems. Unity, solidarity with the community at large, the co-operation and mutual assistance of all, is the only rational and in the long run tenable ground. That path of hatred and division which mankind has pursued with so desperately meagre results should have a sufficiently illuminative and sufficiently deterrent effect. We should be able to learn at least something from history. "

Well, let's do that, let's learn something from history this time. An entire talk could be based on almost any paragraph from Laurency. He's making very profound statements again and again; I really encourage you to read for yourself. His writings have been quite a revelation to me and I'm giving you my interpretation. I'd love to hear your interpretation of what he says. Consensus is hard to reach when even the idea of facts is in question, so consensus is a tough one. Let's move on to more of what an ideal government is like, the best possible leaders, what would they be like?

We don't spend enough thinking about what we really want. We look at what's out there and say, "Oh, my gosh," when we could take a little time to say, "What would we really like to have?" We are not going to have it unless we take a moment to say, "What do we want? What would we like to see?" What our leaders would be: of course, compassionate, it's a beautiful quality of leaders.

Audience member: Broad-minded.

Broad-minded, open-minded, tolerant, not serving only themselves obviously. We want leaders who are unselfish, who serve the good of all. They are certainly not trying to serve their ambition or their legacy or their cronies or their egos. We want people who have virtues that they've taken to the point where they apply them in their public service, to model for everybody how people can be.

They are honest, they are tolerant, patient, their uprightness, their diligence, and their intelligence are all evident. Their desire is to promote unity, not division for any reason, not division for their own party's gain. No, they want unity for everyone's advantage. They do it all with contagious enthusiasm, I'd like to see that, somebody like that, what a leader we would have there.

Another quality to see: That person would be an obvious choice over fear-mongers, hucksters, demagogues, the people that are trying to manipulate through the lower nature of people. A leader like that would be the obvious choice, it would truly be nice to have that choice of a leader like that. When it comes down to choosing leaders it's one of the biggest challenges of all in any political system. That's an unsolved mystery, how do you choose leaders when you don't have somebody standing up who is so excellent that they are obviously the right choice? How do you work with un-ideal leaders?

Well, choosing leaders is obviously something that's been given a lot of consideration over time and many different governmental systems have been built up about that process. There is democracy, monarchy, communism, fascism, dictatorships, anarchy, theocracies. There are always those who want to lead but among them are people who would try to enslave all of humanity and others who are incompetent. Many of them would destroy humanity just as thoroughly as somebody who intended to,

by simply being unable to do the job well. Choosing leaders is a huge unsolved problem. Maybe we'll get a little more insight into that as we go.

The next thing an ideal government is about is what it should be doing. What should an ideal government do? It obviously ought to be protecting the rights of the individual from the powerful groups, the more powerful majorities, the corporations. Protecting the individual from the government itself is actually the government's job. The use of laws to assure rights for people, that's a really important part of the government's function. I'll talk more about human rights later, about these powerful forces that come into play when you look at how government interacts with the modern world.

Another concept about ideal government is that it's an extension of the goodwill of people. That as a whole, we'd like to help the people who are disabled, who have severe handicaps, reasons they're not going to be able to participate in the money game. That's a pretty tough game these days, the money game. Trying to make enough money to somehow function in this world.

It's a fantastic thing if there is some goodwill functioning through the government, but as we can see these days, the government is not necessarily doing the greatest job with that and doesn't do it very reliably. And when leadership changes, and that kind of support comes and goes for people, it's tremendously disruptive for the lives of the elderly, for instance, or people who are affected by the whims of government.

When Laurency talks about the ideal government, he's talking about "the state." Then you get into all the old discussions of communism and everything, "the state", but it's the same idea of a structure chosen by the people to perform certain functions on behalf of the people. That's the basic definition of government and we're supposed to choose them, they're supposed to represent us. We're going to take a look at how well that's functioning right now and what options we have, but certainly, that's the ideal, the unity of all, exclusion of none, is the ideal.

Laurency says that something that we can demand of the state is legal protection. There's no point in setting up a government or a state if we can't get legal protection from it, from, like I mentioned, the powerful interests and from criminals. Legal protection is a good minimum. Of the systems I've mentioned, so many of them have actually taken place at different times. What Esoterics says, is that the one time or other many of these different systems were appropriate for the people that used them. The different kinds of societies and different evolutionary levels of people's cultures require different kinds of governments and different epochs of world history. That there's no "one size fits all."

That's a very important thing to say: that the idea of world government, where one kind of government is imposed on every society and culture, would be a big mistake according to Esoterics. Esoterics, Laurency, Bailey - They're not a fan of one world government because that steps so easily in the wrong direction. All the different governments that we have, we see them evolving in one direction or they change, but that kind of government would attract the possibility of tremendous tyranny.

When we look at all these systems, they'd all work pretty well if we had ideal people in them. That's one of the problems of government too. If people were all willing to work on behalf of everyone else in general, putting the social goals ahead of personal goals, the ideals of communism and socialism and democracy would all work. Obviously, that's where some improvement is needed. If we're going to

improve government at all, we've got to look at the overall raising of the level of people's quality of thinking, of the emotional level from repellent to attractive. That's a process that has been going on for a long time. A process for us to work directly on, obviously.

Let's look at some of these systems of government. I'll start with the oldest: theocracy, where a priesthood says that God made them the leaders. This has been around a long time. Religion is based on belief and belief is an emotional thing. Reason is actually quite antagonistic to belief. Reason steps in and says, "There are shades of gray." and "No, the sun doesn't rotate around the Earth." and says those things that make religious believers awfully uncomfortable. We end up with a system that doesn't have a whole lot of reason in it and that's why theocracy is probably the worst system of all.

When you look at the history, though, we were only quite recently freed from theocratic control. The church in Europe set up emperors and took them down, up until into the 1800s. It wasn't until about 1880 when it finally became legally not feasible anymore to sue somebody for heresy, to charge them with heresy, and that's the result of the efforts of so many martyrs. And Galileo, starting in the 1600s, taking science, addressing religion from the aspect of science and starting to point out the big problems with religious dogmas. Then came the "Age of Enlightenment" as it's called, the philosophers, finally enough chunks were taken out of religion's power that a new kind of government was possible that wasn't based on religion or at least wasn't controlled by it. Politicians have stepped into that void. It's a relatively recent thing, but politicians stepped in the void left behind by the religious control.

We see still theocracies in the Middle East undergoing the horrible death rows of theocracy, and we hope that those things will end soon. Interestingly enough, what Esoterics says is that this religious era we went through, that the Piscean Age is another name for it. We went through this era where religion actually was meant to be a controlling factor and we picked up some qualities out of it. Humanity became idealistic as a result of these efforts.

That's a quality that was undeveloped but is now much more developed. People are willing to actually die for an ideal now and that wasn't the case before. That's a wonderful thing, but there's always a dark side to these things; fanaticism and people willing to be martyrs to something they don't really understand. It is the dark side that we have to overcome with the lingering bits of religious leadership. As I said, religious dogma is a poor foundation for government. It doesn't respect reason and it's really pretty much a dictatorship by the priesthood.

This is an interesting time when we see religion start to reenter public discussion in government. That would sure set us back if we ended up with the state trying to set up Christian schools, for instance. Let's talk about another kind of government. Socialism: defined as basically a bureaucratic solution where the government has most of the control over things rather than business, rather than religion. At least there's an improvement there.

Communism, socialism, both have this idealized version, but let me read a few quotes from Laurency on that, and you can see where he stands. We can't really debate these very much. I don't have time for that, but there is certainly food for thought. All the quotes that I mention are in the handout, and you can get more context, because all of his books are online. Take a sentence out of any of these quotes and Google it, and you will find Laurency's chapter from a book online very easily.

Says Laurency, "The free social system will in the end prove to be the incomparably superior one. State capitalism--" which is his definition of socialism, "Will never be able to compete with private capitalism in efficacy and productivity. The state is suited, not to run business, nor to be a distributor or manager, but just to be an efficient auditor." This is a very interesting statement. "One of its foremost tasks is to ensure that no class interest may have the opportunity of encroaching on the other ones." The state has got its hands full just doing that. Meanwhile, free enterprise can set up all kinds of things to address whatever needs that it thinks it can fill for people, but as long as the government is making sure that it is auditing, ensuring that no class interest dominates another, no corporation overrules the rights of an individual, then everybody can play fair in a free market system. That's what he's saying.

"The question which social system is the most expensive and thus brings about the heaviest burden for everybody, is not as difficult to answer as is generally believed. A greater population of public servants is immensely burdensome. Compared with that, the cost of private capitalism is negligible." We know there's a cost to private capitalism, but the idea of a bureaucracy that all innovation must be funneled through, I think that's what he's pointing at. It's a tremendous problem. A huge population of public servants on the tax payroll is obviously a huge burden, too.

He says, "Private capital is the greatest factor of increasing production." "The only way of raising a standard of living is to increase production, not to confiscate the private capital, which makes initiatives possible." Without the kind of system we have, we wouldn't have a Bill Gates or a Steve Jobs, or a Jeff Bezos or an Elon Musk, they wouldn't be funded by a government bureaucracy that would tie them up in red tape until they were dead. I've worked for enough big corporations; I've seen how big organizations like that simply don't want anybody to come up with a new idea. It's too disruptive.

Laurency says, "Enforced equalization of property results but in a temporary rise in the standard of certain groups. Trying to raise the general standard of living in a more rapid tempo than that of production is like living beyond one's means." He's talking here about taking the wealth and redistributing it to everybody. It doesn't take much thought to see that that would simply be a temporary situation. Soon enough the wealth would be back into generally the same hands. There are people who are very good at setting up industry and business with a lot of energy and effort and they're going to gradually re-accumulate their capital.

The Bible says there will be poor always. I think it's a reasonable corollary to say there will be rich always too, and we need to work out a system that allows people to actually have wealth, work for it, and then use that capital to fund a Steve Jobs. Here's another quote from Laurency, "Socialists and communists are blinded by an ideal theory. They have never understood that ideals can be realized only when mankind, or at any event, a decisive minority, has reached the stage of ideality, become ideal men. The condition of this is that the unselfish common spirit has become normative for thought and action. This spirit means that you do not demand more from life than what is necessary to fulfill your duties, that you are glad to forego everything that is not necessary to life. At mankind's present stage of development, where the spirit of both individual and collective self-sacrifice is lacking, socialist and communist systems must demonstrate their untenability. For instance, communist regimes must introduce private profit for industrialists and workers in order to raise the standard of living for the people."

He goes on to say, "What was the outcome of ideal communism in the Soviet Union? The prohibition of all other thoughts than those decreed by the temporary rulers. An efficient spy and police tyranny.

Concentration camps where millions of people perished every year. An upper class whose members did not have fixed salaries, but just requisitioned whatever they wanted. A working class of slaves. What an ideal society!" Laurency says. He can be a sarcastic sometimes.

He says, "Communism has made a system of lies, deceit, murder, and slavery and is the supreme triumph of satanism. It is the best demonstration of the fact that socialism must lead to an unprecedented tyranny." He doesn't pull his punches when he's talking about these things. Power in the hands of the few is what that boils down to in all of those systems and can they really run things well enough?

Can a handful of people, a group of people run entire nations? We're asking an awful lot of those people, even if they are sincere and well educated and have studied government and politics. We're asking them to really be pretty remarkable. We'll talk a little bit more about the potential of that ever happening.

All right, well, let's move on to democracy. Now we're not actually in a democracy. We're in a republic. We elect representatives democratically, sort of, and they go off to Washington or to the state government and they represent us. We're generally democratic in our ideals here. Laurency has got a lot of harsh things to say about democracy. As I read these things, I don't want you to think that he's condemning democracy entirely. He hasn't proposed a better system for people at the level we're at right now. Like Churchill said, "Democracy is the worst system ever invented, except for all the rest." That's probably where we're at with democracy.

Democracy, and this gets into Esoterics a little bit: "Democracy proclaims all men are 'equal', are at the same stage of development, are equally competent to comprehend and understand reality. This belief in equality of this sort is the gravest of all human errors. Those who are the most ignorant of life and the least understanding thereby believe they are able to judge everything. That folly could be called the ineradicable part of the ideology of democracy."

That's not ideology; it's idiocy. I-D-I is kind of like idiocy, the way he spells it. "It is a serious error to confuse universal brotherhood with democracy. Universal brotherhood concerns the mutual relations of individuals. Democracy is a political system that puts power into the hands of life-ignorant leaders, it is a system that inevitably entails demagoguery."

Definition of demagoguery: "the art and practice of gaining power and popularity by arousing the emotions, passions, and prejudices of the people." Politicians - we're going to have a whole section of politicians here in a moment. We have to note that we have a lot of responsibility for government as it is. We only vote for politicians that promise us everything, that promise us the moon. Politicians that spoke realistically would never get elected. That's where we're at. We have to take things from where humanity is at right now, where Americans are at.

America's challenge, I'm paraphrasing from Laurency, is that unity and freedom must be two sides of the same coin. Freedom entails responsibility in regard to unity. It is not the arbitrary right to do or say whatever we want. Power and responsibility being coupled together; additional rights have their responsibilities. The things we demand of the government: The government can make demands of us, too, if we are demanding of it. That's a relatively straightforward equation.

When talking about the abuse of freedom, Laurency says "Abuse of the freedom of the press and the exploitation of the undiscerning and gullible might be considered one of the still unsolved problems of democracy. The spreading of false statements, distortion of facts, misrepresentation of the opinions of dissidents, casting of suspicion on the motives of others, vilification of undesirable persons, refusal to comply with just demands for correction, should be prohibited, also for the press. Here is an important task for an ombudsman of the freedom of the press, one invested with extensive powers, as well as duties, to start prosecutions. The demands for correction raised by individual citizens could thereby be dispensed with." That's something to think about. I have a whole section of the press and we can talk about that more when I get there. I'm going to read that quote again later, but I just put it out there for food for thought. Laurency is not just trashing things when he's criticizing. He's actually promoting an idea here that's pretty good.

Well, Rousseau said, "The best natural constitution is the wise ruling the ignorant. Democracy is a form of government suited not to men but to a race of gods. There has never been and will never be a real democracy." That doesn't mean we can't improve the democracy we have, though. But democracy when the voters are at a general level of repellent emotionality... one way to see the level is to look at the entertainment that people are enjoying the most. It's the violent revenge fantasies and the horror, and the pornography. This is the dominant form of entertainment for everybody right now. It tells you a lot about where people, in general, are at.

Well, a politician needs their votes. He's got to appeal to that kind of thinking and that kind of emotionality and he's got to condemn criminals. Compassion is not well understood by the average citizen. They want to put those criminals to death and they want them to suffer in jail and rot and there's not a lot of incentive for reform for a politician. And so we get politicians that are tough on crime because it gets them votes. This is an ugly side, to me, of democracy.

Plato said, "And so tyranny naturally arises out of democracy, and the most aggravated form of tyranny and slavery out of the most extreme form of liberty." That's kind of a puzzling statement. Dictatorships arising out of democracy. I think what he's saying here is that if we squander our freedom in squabbling and become irreconcilably divided, the government is paralyzed. We've started to see that. That's been going on for a while now. If the government is paralyzed, we have set the stage for dictatorship because things need to be done. You simply can't have a completely frozen government. Eventually, the people say, "Well, somebody's got to do something." And that is the end of democracy because somebody is put in charge to do something, and it's not good. Let me talk about dictatorship since we've moved to the topic of that form of government.

Laurency says, "There are more rational ways in which to achieve unity than through dictatorship, which, constantly in fear of non-existent dangers, brutally watches over its own security, and which, moreover, does what a small, temporary power clique arbitrarily sees fit. Freedom is easily lost and is very hard to regain." I think it's becoming clear when you look at this that dictatorship is a very real possibility and we have a lot to lose. "Under dictatorship, the people are ruled through violence, under democracy through promises." I guess I'd rather have the promises. "Just as dictatorship is a problem of power, democracy is a problem of freedom."

Here's another quote from Laurency. "Democracy presupposes a general interest in political issues along with strong instincts of freedom and a will to solidarity. Dictatorship seems to be justified for primitive nations with an anti-social instinct among the majority or for nations that are incapable of self-rule on

account of insuperable tendencies to division.” We’re warned here. We're warned very clearly that our split in this country is more dangerous than we realize.

Another quote from Laurency, “The conflict between dictatorship and democracy, (true freedom is only possible under the laws of life), makes people start thinking. For the first time in human history the majority is able to tell the difference between right and wrong, between spiritual freedom and enslaving physical conditions of existence”.

He is offering us hope here, too, saying that we are at a point where we know enough right from wrong, we ought to be able to choose better than dictatorship. We really ought to be able to support a free system. Laurency is looking at a picture that is much bigger than the last 10,000 years of history, of which we don’t even have 10,000 years of real recorded history at all.

We don't have much to judge on basically, but humanity according to Esoterics has been around for a million-plus years. I don't have the exact figures, but this is a really recent incarnation of humanity itself. There was complete destruction of the old civilization only about 11,000 years ago; we've rebuilt civilization. Now, we're not new, and we've been reincarnating in all those old civilizations. We've been in Golden Ages and dictatorships and horrible evil situations and beautiful situations. We have some experience under our belts, but we're all at different levels. Laurency says it takes over 100,000 incarnations to get through the human kingdom, and if someone has had 20,000 or 40,000 more incarnations than someone else, there's a justification for when Laurency says that equality is a tricky topic.

What is another 40,000 of incarnation is going to do for somebody? You're going to have skills and talents. It doesn't mean that the older brother is superior to the younger brother. We all should have the same rights under law, under any kind of legitimate system, including the laws of life that are beyond any human law.

The age of souls - we start out, according to Laurency, in a barbarian kind of state where there's no respect for law, there's no respect for the security other people, we learn this through our interactions with other people, and gradually, slowly, barbarians don't think a whole lot, but gradually get the idea that, “If we had a few rules, my family might be safe, that would be good,” and that's when barbarians are ready to move to the civilizational level.

Most of our incarnations actually are barbarian level, then they're civilizational, then they're cultural. This is not restricted to any particular race or group of people, it's within all the different races, all the different ethnic groups, the countries, there's no one country that's all barbarians. It's evenly mixed out throughout.

The thing we're striving for now, our culture... culture is not quite the right word for where we are. That's actually the level we're trying to reach, the cultural level where emotions have been raised from the repellent lower level emotions of aggression and jealousy and envy and greed, they're raised up to the higher emotional levels of admiration and aesthetic appreciation and affection, and love can really operate.

The sense of unity is present in these higher emotional levels. That, obviously, is a requirement for these political systems to work. We're not there. We're in the civilizational level where people obey laws somewhat grudgingly. Civilization is where we're still at a repellent emotional level in general. 85% of

people are barbarian or civilizational level, says Laurency. We know if we obey that red light, we might not get killed, so we obey some laws, we obey some rules, there's enough common sense out there to have agreement that we can have some safety, and that's about as far as we've gotten on the whole. We're trying to reach the cultural level, and once we do, everything will change. When a certain majority I guess, or maybe even a strong enough minority of people have reached a level of cultural unity thinking, of working for the whole, then things will change rapidly.

It has been the job of religion actually to bring that about, and I think the world wars, et cetera, are demonstrations of the failure of that effort, and when you have religions backing slavery and other things, then you know that religions have failed.

There have been, according to Laurency, over the millions of years, we're going back to Atlantean times, to Lemurian time, these previous incarnations of humanity. There have been Golden Ages where everything worked in beautiful harmony, people incarnated together and knew exactly where they fit into things, where there was leadership, and I'm going to talk more about that later, but leadership that is much better than we can find among humans. You can't make sense of this whole situation without reincarnation. And to think that we can judge history from the really dark era that we've been through of people taking the lowest road whenever possible over the last 11,000 years.

This has been a situation that we've created as humanity. We've chosen to have the leadership that is not particularly helpful and is going to actually help work off the cause and effect, the karma that we created in our previous cultures. When we've got barbarians running amok, they're serving a purpose. It's actually like that the last 10,000 years that's been most of history. Civilization is a relatively recent development, and the barbarians running amok has actually balanced things out for everybody and debts have been paid. We actually paid most of that off, so hopefully, we're primed for some better situation.

Here's a quote from Laurency, "At the stage of civilization, dictatorships and democracies succeed one another." As I said, he's drawing on a much larger history than we have got in recorded history. "The continual social changes are due to the fact that the human intellect is unable to solve social problems permanently, that men lack the will to unity, that men are never content with their conditions, that they always blame society for their own shortcomings, that social envy creates eternal discontent, that ignorance always believes that society can raise the standard of living for everybody without further ado, that power-thirsty demagogues always succeed in making the credulous believe in their false promises of paradise. Dictators believe that people will let themselves be enslaved indefinitely. Democrats believe in the equality of all, that education can abolish the inequalities of nature. " Which, as we discussed, is not very likely.

"Anarchists believe that men are angels who are corrupted by being brought up to lead orderly lives, etc., that if the state and the laws are abolished, then man will be perfect. Fantasts believe in the ideal state, that societies can be constructed and the established order of things can be safely overthrown. All are believers, and with belief you can prove everything." That's Laurency stepping back and looking at all the government systems.

He says that political unity is the task of the state. Here's another quote from him. "'Divide and rule' was the motto of short-sighted politics, rating power higher than unity. Such politics would be impossible if

political parties collaborated instead of opposing each other. The party institution means division and antagonism, poisons public spirit, and counteracts political unity directly and indirectly."

I don't think we've had better proof of that than what's just happened. It's pretty obvious now how ugly a party system can be. Laurency says, "If the will to unity cannot grow strong enough in a nation to overcome egoistic class politics, then values are easily destroyed which it would have been possible to save with goodwill. ... There exist possibilities of disregarding whatever separates, of choosing such individuals as are able to animate discussions and decisions with the spirit of unity. There exist relatively simple resources for making political fighting organizations as well as class parties superfluous by means of wise legislation and by government power as a watchful assistant." That's very encouraging. I think that's the kind of guidance needed for activism now.

As we mentioned, for any of these systems, they're not too bad if we have ideal people and that's where the real work is. Ideal people are going to put unity above beliefs, are not going to hold grudges, we've got plenty of grudges being held out there right now, are able to forgive. This is a personal philosophy of life as well as what is needed for the country to come back together. Ideal people listen, recognize that they have a lot to learn. Humility is a virtue that is appreciated by ideal people. If people don't exploit systems, and instead actually try to make them work, then there is hope for them.

Whether individuals are ideal or not, whether we're dealing with barbarians or civilizational levels, as I was talking about, they still have the right and everybody has the same right, according to Laurency, "To think and form one's own views and do as one pleases, as long as it does not infringe on the equal right of others." You can derive the whole system of the rights of people from that statement. We all have a right to do what we came here to do. Anybody that interferes with that is basically setting themselves up to have the same experience, if you trust the law of cause and effect, of sowing and reaping, of karma, as explained in previous talks how that works. But if you are going to the trouble of depriving people of their liberty or trying to mislead them, you're setting yourself up for the same experience.

The state is no ideal decider of what is right. It does more horrible things than most of the people in the state would ever conceive of doing. This is a classic political thinking situation where the state represents some ideal of right behavior, and it's been disproven again and again by observing.

Let me read Laurency again. "The state (society, the community, the people) has no greater right than the individual. State, collective, religion, morality, science, etc., are no authorities of superior right. The state exists in order to defend the right of the individual. The individual has no right to have a disposal of the individual. The individual can only demand legal protection from the state." That's an important statement. "The state has no ideal right to outlaw anything but violations of the equal right of all. The individual has no duty to sacrifice himself for the community when so commanded. The individual has a right to decide for himself what he will regard as useful or conducive to happiness."

Back to the discussion of ideal government; an ideal government, of course, respects that statement. All of these statements would be practically the constitution of an ideal government. Respecting and protecting the rights of the individuals from more powerful interests, from more powerful majorities, collectives, corporations, from the government itself. From that statement, conscription - the draft is a violation of the right of an individual. Moralistic law that punishes marijuana users or homosexuals violate the rights of individuals. The bad laws that people generally disobey create an attitude of contempt for the government. There are so many laws out there made by moralists, they're basically

trying to get their judgment complexes expressed into society. Politicians are far too scared to take a stand on these things.

It's interesting that democracy become a little bit more democratic lately in this country. When the politicians are not going to do anything about marijuana, they put an initiative out and everybody votes on it. This is obviously "we should do this" and it's democratically decided, and the persecution of marijuana users is brought to an end in Washington State and gradually other states, but that persecution is a horrible thing. We're still at the point where a thousand people a day are arrested in this country for marijuana, and we can't expect any help from the federal government on that one, it appears.

When we talk about individual rights in the face of what nations do, what the state does: all the powerful nations abused their power. That's been our history. It's been our country's history. I hope there's no one here who hasn't taken off the rosy glasses at some time and seen, read some Howard Zinn or some Noam Chomsky. You might have not liked their attitude or their interpretation of other things, but they're referring to actual historical events that you can verify, where we've gone into countries, destroyed a legitimately-elected democracy, set up a brutal dictator because we want a little more stability in the region so that our sugarcane crops were not endangered.

Our corporations maintain their right to crush the local businesses. Our military has been sent out again and again on missions of, basically, conquest. Hawaii was a conquest. They simply seized it from the actual monarchy that was there. Iran, the Philippines, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Cuba, we've done so many awful things all over the world. We have to recognize that we're not going to fix anything here without recognizing what we really are as a country, and there are so many beautiful good things about this country. I don't want to disregard those things.

Corporate greed, compromised government, compromised by the corporations, it's pretty much been the way it's been for a long, long time. One more interesting observation here that Arkansas is trying to ban Howard Zinn's books in the schools. They would rather enforce the darkness about America's past than teach what's actually going on.

We've actually had some good people like Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy. Well, these were actually good people, but the stuff went on anyway, which is a little scary, like they didn't have control. They couldn't say no. I don't know what force there was on them. Why didn't they? Or maybe I have to take off my rosy glasses and they were bad people too. I don't know. Here's a quote. "Corrupt politicians make the other 10% look bad," Henry Kissinger.

The amazing things politicians do. I remember living in California when Gray Davis pioneered the art of buying your vote with your own money. The rebate; here's your tax rebate, trying to convince everyone, "Vote for me. I'm giving you money". Well, it's your own money. Then George Bush followed up to imitate it.

Oh, corruption, politician and corruption. Corruption would be our Exxon Secretary of State throwing out the sanctions against the Russians to complete the giant Exxon deals that with Russia that he was trying to put together before he was Secretary of State. It hasn't happened. I'm not accusing him. Let's see if it does.

When politicians demand and decide what people think, it's a big problem, but they openly talk about how people must be convinced via propaganda. It's actually a science: how to convince the masses. Demagoguery that I talked about earlier, appealing to people's passions and anger and lower nature to get power and control is basically a science taught in schools and used by our politicians.

Here's another interesting way we're manipulated through terms like, "We have got to stop all the power of the special interests." Of course, the "national interests" are very important. Well, the special interests are women, children, the elderly, the employed, the unemployed, the Native Americans, it's every group, the special interests are us.

The power of the special interest is what we are fighting for, that special interests are not crushed by everything else. The national interests, "national interests", that's the term that's used to say we must protect our vital national interest in, well, I don't know, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, where we have to go squash somebody, in order to protect our corporations; and that's not a vital national interest, that is a special, special interest of a very small set of people with a great deal of power.

Back to the thing that just is the way it is in the United States: these people are elected because they made better promises than anybody else. We vote for them, and I say "we" because we need to take responsibility for what all of us do as voters in this country. We elect people based on their promises. Those promises are lies, but why aren't we more upset about lies? It seems like a government official can lie and then somebody points it out and he gets a Pinocchio nose in a newspaper article and then the whole topic goes away. Why isn't it a bigger deal?

It's actually considered a kind of an evidence for truth if enough people believe the lie. I studied this with fine books by Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn, and others. Cognitive dissonance, I never really understood that concept until I read about it recently. The belief in one thing and doing another, it's another name for hypocrisy, right?

But this cognitive dissonance puts pressure on people. It's a very uncomfortable sensation and I think our leaders struggle with that cognitive dissonance to the point where they know they've done something they don't really believe in, but it's going to get them what they want and it's much easier for them to simply adjust their beliefs and I think they do it unconsciously.

It's a shift until gradually they believe in what they're doing; that this ethnic group must be suppressed because really they are really awful. Somehow the beliefs get multiplied in the direction that gives them what they want and then they can be sincere. They're so much more powerful when they're sincere. It really works in their favor to change their belief system, and they're not going to change what they've already done, the things that have created the dissonance in the first place. The alternative is to say, "I really blew it. I shouldn't have done that. I'm changing everything. I have a new attitude about life."

That just doesn't happen, so they just changed their belief systems. I think we're seeing that all the time. They're rationalizing with rational lies. There are lies out there that are manufactured for profit now. If they get enough clicks then the people who manufactured the lies are considered upstanding citizens who are raising money and a good income for their family. That seems to be the only criteria people are considered on these days. If you can manufacture a good lie, well, good on you.

Lies are used heavily lately. In the last political campaigns, they were everywhere. They're used for attack on individuals, used as distractions. Maybe it'll take us a while before we realize it's a lie. We all

get distracted and kerfuffle about it and then we come back and onto next lie. They're used simply to reinforce the egos of politicians. Lies that the politicians themselves would rather believe. They're so effective because people spread them immediately.

People aren't discriminating about lies. We're such suckers for lies in general, everybody, and let me encourage you, don't repost lies. If you're going to post something on Facebook, do some fact-checking. Don't just blindly put it up because sometimes those lies are very sugarcoated. They're packaged very well. It sounds like something that the person you don't like really probably did, but check it out because you are supporting them when you post a lie about them and they point to it and say "fake news", then who's to believe what. We're going to talk about the press in a second. I've got to mention this quote by Mark Twain, "Politicians and diapers should be changed frequently and for the same reason."

Okay. If we don't want to be lied to, don't lie. If we ourselves are lying, what can we expect? We'll be lied to. It takes personal integrity to protect yourself from lies. Asking for the truth requires us to stop lying or be hypocrites ourselves.

I'm not saying that you're liars, but let me say this, we do lie to ourselves, don't we? Here's some possible lies we've been telling ourselves. "It doesn't affect me, the situation right now. They won't let him do anything too stupid. He only said those things to get elected. All of the feedback has changed his point of view." I'll just put that out there quickly. "Everything would've been fine under Clinton. Nothing I can do about it. It's too late to do anything." None of that is true.

Private power and privilege is our next topic; that equals corruption. Quoting Laurency, "Power abolishes freedom, arbitrary power abolishes or restricts arbitrarily the freedom of others, anyone who strives after power over others for another reason than to liberate others is an enemy of others. No nation has any right but arbitrary right to rule other nations and anyone who seeks to dominate the world is an enemy of mankind." That also goes for any nation.

Look what's going on right now, the financial industry, \$1.2 billion in 2016, on campaign contributions and more than \$800 million, in other ways they contributed rather than direct contributions and more that can't be tracked because it went through private foundations. These businesses aren't stupid. They're getting something for their money. They're not going to put \$1 billion out there and get nothing.

Private power over government is one of the ugliest things going on right now. The Koch brothers, they created a Senator for themselves. They picked out a local politician and dumped money and press and propaganda into this person's life until they'd made a Senator out of her. Now they own a Senator. They didn't just buy her, they made her. They also are founders of anti-climate change Universities, the Koch brothers, to protect their oil interests, their CO2 producing investments. Universities that are very slick.

I've run into these and you really have to look deep to track back who actually funds these things but it's disgusting. The ruling that corporation should have the free speech rights of an individual is pure insanity. It's more power for soulless corporations. By the way, we're really getting into my opinions now, you may have noticed, I'm not quoting Laurency when I say that. I've tried to make it clear when I am quoting Laurency, but here's an opinion that I hope you agree with, a politician in service of the oil industry in charge of the EPA is corruption.

Our universities, our scientists, our research centers, they know full well that increasing carbon dioxide correlates to a temperature rise. You can read it in the historical record of the planet. When the carbon

dioxide is high, the temperature is high, the heat bounces off the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, it's understood. It's not a theory that has no basis and it's accepted by everybody but the scientists who have prostituted their minds to the oil industry. Yet that's who our government is taking its advice from, those scientists.

The last time the carbon dioxide levels were as high as they are now, the sea levels were a hundred feet higher. This barely came up in the presidential campaign. Climate change, a much bigger topic than Hillary's emails, don't you think? I'm going to get incensed about this one in particular, I have a scientific background and it really bothers me to see this kind of stuff reverting back to 300 years ago when people could just say, "Oh, science doesn't matter."

We're saturating our environment with pollutants by the way, including hormone mimics, could be responsible for the overweight children and the increasing infertility and all kinds of health problems. Yet in the new budget that just came out, the endocrine disruptor screening program that checks pesticides and chemicals for that was just axed, part of the EPA.

That program looked for environmental contaminants, for their potential effect on estrogen, androgen and thyroid hormone systems and it's not like it's looking for something that hasn't been found, that is happening. There are flame retardants saturating the entire globe. Every one of us has a good high concentration of them and those flame retardants are hormone mimics, don't we care about our unhealthy overweight children? For crying out loud, the kids are now, one in three is overweight, one in five is obese.

The sugar industry co-opted the research back in the '60s to place all the blame on fats. I don't know why the fat industry didn't react, but the sugar industry derailed the discussion about sugar for 50 years. This is horrible abuse of science and of course, the government went right along with that, didn't examine that. These industries do the research that exonerates themselves. Coca-Cola right now has an initiative to convince people that physical activity is the main problem with weight gain, not diet.

Whose job is it to protect us from predatory corporations that would poison us for profit? I don't think we can expect much from our current government in that department. There is such complacency in Washington, they somehow think the endless arguing is fine and maybe they believe that if they don't do anything, the world is safer but the fact is that government is needed. They actually do need to be doing things.

I have to find the Republicans particularly guilty of obstructionism. If Obama came up with anything, it must fail, that was their whole attitude then, so shortsighted, but now the Democrats are considering the same thing, you can give it to both parties on that one. Look how ineffective our government has been for so long. Locked in conflict, out of touch with everybody, intimidated or bought by the corporations.

We're the only country in the world that bases our measurement system on the length of a dead king's foot. The rest of the world uses the metric system for crying out loud. It makes much more sense and it's organized by 10. It's silly. It's just so amazing that we can't even get off the metric system, that we make pennies that cost more than a penny to make that are so worthless and no one would pick them up off the ground. The government can't fix that? What CAN it fix?

Vast amounts of money from corporations, is really what is going on right now. We have the military-industrial complex, Eisenhower warned about, oh my gosh, this 50 something billion we're taking out of all the social services going into the military and what do we get for that? Do we really need the biggest military in the world? Bigger by a factor of, I should've looked it up, five, I don't know, many times more than any other military. The next three or four biggest militaries combined, ours is bigger than that. What the heck are we trying to defend ourselves from? It's an obsolete idea anyway.

Everybody knows that a war-- is probably a good thing we owe China a trillion dollars because if China wanted to, they could turn us off. I work in the high-tech industry. I worked for a company that was hacked by China. We can't keep them out. Nobody can, and nobody can keep us out either. If there's going to be a war, it's not going to be guns and bullets. It's going to be, pfft, the power's off, the computers are off, the internet is off, all the electrical systems are down and we're just going to be in the dark.

Of course, we would do exactly the same thing to China and we would both sit there in the dark wondering why did we do such a stupid thing? War is probably not that likely at this point. I hope that at least we can hope for. China will never get paid if they pulled that off. Now let me say one more thing, that is certainly my opinion, but is well supported. Our government right now is a laughing stock, that sounds like opinion, but just turn the TV on and watch John Oliver or Seth Meyers or Stephen Colbert have a heyday. All of these comedians, there's just so much material being generated for them continually by our government. Laughingstock is an accurate term.

The thin skin of our president attacking anyone who criticizes him, it's such childish behavior and of course, they have a heyday with that. What kind of election system do we have anyway, where we give the victory to the second runner up? Look what happened last time we did that, GW Bush got the victory. He was the second runner up in the popular vote, and look what he did.

Look what didn't get discussed in the last campaign, the incredibly awful nightmare of the Iraq war that has been swept under the rug, but that's where that trillion dollars went on the national credit card that is China, a trillion dollars that was dumped into death and weapons, flushed away. What if that had gone into our infrastructure? If we're going to borrow something, let's make something good out of it.

That was thrown away and of course, it's pumped into corporations, Halliburton, Cheney's corporations. It's just billions and billions. We're the biggest weapons exporter in the world, about half of the weapons in the world are exported by this country. What kind of country are we? We really have to think about that. Let's look at the election in terms of Iraq. If one candidate found that he had to lie, to be elected, to lie about and say never supported it, the other one had to defend her vote for it. What a couple of great choices there.

We've got the blood of 100,000 or more on our hands from the war in Iraq. Let's just be honest. Let's go Noam Chomsky and Howard Zinn on this and point out what's really going on. Isn't that going to come home to roost? Of course, it will. Why do people hate us? We wonder. I'm sorry, it's all too clear. And then how is that topped off? How is the Iraq war topped off by Donald Trump? He says, "We should have kept the oil", we failed to plunder successfully when we conducted this illegal war. That's his attitude about it. Sorry, if I sound like I'm getting upset about it, but it's awful.

We've got a short time and so much to discuss. I'm going to have to skip a bunch of good stuff. Boy, there is going to be a part two to this talk. Look at business, business right now, I work for a high-tech company and they have to be very flexible. They look at the changing market, the changing desires of people and the competitors, and all these other force factors that come into play. And they adapt and our stock is high now because we're flexible. The government quit doing that. I don't know how long ago. Any business that quits adapting to the rapidly changing times is doomed to fail. Governments fail too. Buddha was asked, "How do I do good?" His reply was, "Stop doing evil, then work on doing good."

I'm going to talk about the press now. It really is actually like an arm of government. I think that it's so important right now. Without the press, there really isn't any obstacle to a tyrant taking over. There's nobody calling them out on their statements or their lies or their agenda.

Without the press... A government that actually has the same party controlling the executive office and the Congress and appointing Supreme Court justices, there's an awful a lot of power concentrated there, and the press is the balance to that. We have a president who has attacked the press like no other. He literally points to the press, throughout his campaign, he points to the press section that was right there in the room and says, look at those bloodsuckers, they are your problem. They are the problem with this country.

A very effective strategy apparently, he turns his speeches into theater that way. It got him a lot of attention and the press, despite being demonized by him, gave him \$1 billion, is the estimate, in free media. Now, the media has been in a crisis mode for a while, ever since the internet came along, but they're all saying thank goodness for Trump and I wonder where the cognitive dissonance kicks in for them because they're making more money than ever. The ones that oppose them are making equally large additional amounts of money as the ones that support him. Everybody's now paying more attention.

Corporate news is a \$1 billion business. It has its blind side, too, it doesn't want to offend its sponsors. Trump actually had a point about how they're really not covering the news a lot of the times. Look at how things have changed for the press. In 1968, everyone listened to Walter Cronkite, a guy hired by Edward R. Murrow, the only person brave enough to stand up to Joseph McCarthy.

When Cronkite went to Vietnam that year, he looked around, he came back and said, on the news on live TV, said, "We're not going to win this war. The best we can hope for is a stalemate and to walk away honorably." President Johnson was watching that broadcast and turned to his press secretary and said, "If I've lost Cronkite, I've lost the country." Maybe that was the peak of the press's power, or maybe a little later in '72, when the press took down a president. Check out the movie, it's incredible: "All the President's Men."

I watched it recently and it's such an interesting window into the past, where they're saying "Pull over, I've got to go make a phone call!" They're hopping out to find a phone booth, and they're looking, thumbing through phone books to try to find somebody in the US, all the phone books in the library. And they're going to the news room, type-type-type-zip "Here's your release!" It's a completely different world, but the press had power to do that back then. It doesn't anymore. The press has changed tremendously.

They can call out whoever they want on whatever they want and people say, "Oh, well. I don't know what's true." That's a serious change. The press used to all say the same thing, all the different networks. It was just competition as to who was going to say it first, not who can tell a different story that contradicts the other one. That was a big problem if that ever happened.

In 1996, a new thing happened that's really been interesting. Rupert Murdoch had an idea that has earned him a vast fortune. Create a news outlet that was for a targeted group. NBC, CBS, they are for everybody. Fox News was for a targeted group, the things they wanted to hear. And of course this conservative targeted group ate it up, because it's what they wanted to hear! It completely sabotaged conventional journalism. It was absolutely irresponsible to start telling the stories that favored one particular point of view.

Some wonder if Rupert Murdoch was like a Randolph Hearst who's trying to control the government with his opinions. I think actually it was to support his beliefs as long as you make the assumption that his belief was he wanted to make a lot of money. That's what worked. It worked for him and he didn't have the scruples to know how wrong it was. Then the Internet stepped in to contribute even more to the same cycle of how your own views can be reinforced ad infinitum.

Fox News repeating back to you what you want to hear, you go look on the Internet, it's all been targeted at you by intelligent search engines, search tools and recording tools that have looked at what you like and give you more of it. People are now more isolated in their bubble than they ever have been. We see this division that's formed of people who believe this and people who believe that and they're completely different interpretations of reality.

We don't have the consistency anymore that the news media of the '60s and '70s had. Murdoch is like the teenagers in Macedonia who manufactured fake stories and got rich on the clicks. These kids made thousands of dollars on clicks on their stories that they would post on Facebook or other things with titles like, "Just in, Obama illegally transferred DOJ money to Clinton campaign."

Everybody wanted to believe it, right? The ones who wanted to believe it clicked on it, the money rolls in for these lies. "Breaking, Obama confirms the refusal to leave the White House. He will stay in power." You can bet a lot of people reposted that one. We're so undiscerning in this country. Why don't we worry that this is a lie? There was a story posted out there that Hillary Clinton was part of a child sex ring operating in the back of a fast-food restaurant and a man showed up with a gun to liberate the kids in the fast-food restaurant.

This is so irresponsible to put these lies out there, people believe them. It's not so hard to debunk these things. You can go on the Internet, you've got Snopes, you've got FactCheck.com, you've got sincere objective reporters and they're not just saying, "That's not true." They're saying, "This is not true because look in this newspaper article. Look what he actually said. Here's the recording." You can go on the Internet to find out what's really true. It's worth the effort.

The press is in a complete crossroads right now. Are the non-Fox News' going to start to skew the other direction or maybe they have? Some of them probably have started. That will destroy all credibility for the press. Some press has got to stick to the objective truth. That's a big concern. The press has responsibility.

I'm going to repeat this quote from Laurency about the press. "Abuse of the freedom of the press and the exploitation of the undiscerning and gullible might be considered one of the still unsolved problems of democracy. The spreading of false statements, distortion of facts, misrepresentation of the opinions of dissidents, casting of suspicion on the motives of others, vilification of undesirable persons, refusal to comply with just demands for correction, should be prohibited, also for the press. Here is an important task for an ombudsman of the freedom of the press, one invested with extensive powers, as well as duties, to start prosecutions. The demands for correction raised by individual citizens could thereby be dispensed with"

I think he's really got something there. I think this is a case of somebody's got to be overseeing and saying, "That's a lie and there are consequences for lying to the public." Where aren't there any now? There need to be some. Skipping pages of good stuff here. This is not a time to sleep really. And wouldn't we have gone back to sleep if Hillary Clinton had won? It really was a vote for the status quo to vote for Hillary. That's why nobody voted for her, not enough people did. She wasn't really going to change anything. The vote was against her. People were voting against in so many different ways and what we ended up with is somebody as president who represents the energy of against. This is not a system that's going to survive when it's all based on, "No. Not that, not that, not that." We need to find a way to be supporting something together.

This negative side of America has risen into view. That's how things get healed. They have to be visible. Even in ourselves, if we've got negative beliefs that are coloring our actions, they've got to become known to us before we can do anything about them. That's one of the reasons this is a huge opportunity. We really have the option here of saying, "Look at all this. This is not what we want." We don't have that until that's visible to everybody. We can throw it off like an old coat and say, "That's not what America is. That's not who we are." The real America is motivated by love and compassion and truth and the real America cares what the CIA and the secret agencies are doing. We got insight like we never get from Snowden. Thank you, Edward Snowden.

The CIA pulls off these coups in other countries and then 20 years later we find out about it, we say, "What?" They say, "We don't do that anymore", but of course they do. Just like bringing the bad side of America to light, we need to bring everything to light. What does this country do? It needs to be out there in the light. That's something we can fight for.

The net results of our current election can be a net gain for us because of all the waking up that happens and all the activism that is stimulated by it. We may have to find other ways to do the things the Federal government is now going to refuse to do, but it's in such deep debt as it is. It's not surprising. One way or another it's going to probably be stopping many of the functions it's been serving right now anyway. It just simply will no longer be able to afford to after a while.

Maybe our states and our communities are going to have to pick up the difference. That might be something constructive we can work on. The federal government doesn't do it reliably anyway. The pendulum swings from the ones that care about the poor to the ones that don't, back to the ones that do. The poor, the elderly, this is not a stable situation for them when the funding is yanked and restored and yanked and restored.

We have good people in government or the whole thing would have fallen apart a long time ago. There are good people working in all different areas. That's something to recognize. What we have in this

country, the freedom we have to even protest right now is the result of sacrifices made by reformers and protestors and people who upset the norm, who died organizing unions, who risked their lives for everyone. It's now for us to do the same.

I thank everyone who's been working on this and has taken the risks to stand up and fight for the rights of the individual. It's got to continue. If you're going to point out that the emperor has no clothes on, you'll be attacked until everybody starts laughing, but somebody's got to point it out, get people laughing. At least now it's not in vogue to accuse people being communists anymore. At least we're safe from that.

We can use what there is. There is the option of putting pressure on politicians. Local politicians especially feel it, but at the higher levels as well. I don't know what the president is going to feel but we can do a lot of things. I can say for myself I'm committing to... Well, the science thing bothers me obviously more than a lot of the other things. All of it bothers me, but I understand this one. I can tell whether I need to fact-check this one and how to fact-check it.

The CO2, the poisoning of the people by corporations and feeding everybody toxic material. I'm going to be sending three postcards a week and making three phone calls a week even if it's just to assuage my conscience, I feel like I'll be doing something. Think if that's multiplied 10,000 times. That is a lot for the government to deal with. They're going to worry about their votes if they hear enough of that kind of thing.

Let's work together. Organize with your neighbors and friends and write postcards together. Don't get sucked to hate spirals. The flame wars on the Internet are not serving anybody. All these poor middle-aged guys who are like me but they're sitting there trying to rid the world of "libtards". They're just out there wasting their time. They should just go fishing like they used to before the internet came along. It's so sad.

Laurency says that the great failures of government are not so much the undiscerning masses that don't think or choose not to think, it's the people who could've done something, who actually see what's going on, who didn't stand up to do something. It's our turn. It's time for us to do something. Keep our minds open, we have to bridge gaps, don't believe that we understand it completely or our opinions will be reinforced again and again, and we'll stay locked into a bubble. There are hate-filled people out there you're not going to have a good discussion with, but if somebody's trying to be reasonable, go with them and encourage that discussion and hear what they have to say. It's really clear from Esoterics that the human spirit, in the long run, cannot be kept down. Every tyranny, every dictatorship is overthrown eventually.

The struggle for freedom, the struggle for truth, we came here to do this. We were born choosing this time. We knew this would be a time of chaos. We came in for a number of reasons because maybe our loved ones came in, too. We want to protect them from the chaos, but this is not an accident that we're dealing with this here. We're here for a reason. When we're back next time, the kind of world we're born into is going to have a lot to do with the kind of world we try to make this one into.

If we are participating in the lies and the craziness, we'll be born into a world where nobody knows what's true. That's a scary world. If we are participating in trying to wake everybody up and say, "Let's work towards unity. Let's work towards actual caring about each other," then we'll be born into a world

where-- Into a time in the future that marches far ahead into a golden age. We could be born into one of the golden ages where that is what's going on.

We can't expect everything to change right now. One of the best things we can do is preserve the good that is. The world is not really ready for a brand new system that fixes everything. We preserve the good that is, so that, gradually, we can make our way to something better, so new leaders can step up. Don't get discouraged in the chaos, don't get apathetic, encourage others not to be apathetic, do something and you'll feel a lot better about it. Every little bit we do is good for us.

We've had great souls that helped us through a national crisis like Washington or Lincoln or Roosevelt. We wouldn't even have social security without Roosevelt. Is there a great soul to help us now? This time, why don't we be the great souls? How about all of us step up this time instead of waiting for someone else to save us? Thank you.