

Integral Evolution: An Interview with David Loye

Russ Volckmann

David Loye is one of those people that the longer you get to know them the more you begin to discover a bit of their depth and breadth of perspective and creativity in the world. His publications speak for themselves. His network with leading scientists and thinkers around the world is equally impressive.

*Actually, my first contact was with David's wife, Riane Eisler, author of the *Chalice and the Blade* (among other books written with and without David). Despite the fact that they live over the hill from me, I did not meet her face to face right away. Rather, I interviewed her over the telephone for the *Integral Leadership Review*, which I publish and edit. When I first approached her about doing the interview she suggested that I should interview David, but I did not know David Loye's work at all. In that interview I discovered more about Riane's work and the extent of their partnership. In fact, they are prime movers of a partnership approach to leadership that they promote through a nonprofit center and in a Master's program at the California Institute of Integral Studies in San Francisco.*

*My conversation with Riane piqued my curiosity about David's work and I bought one of his books, *Darwin's Lost Theory of Love*. Here I found evidence of the extraordinary scope and depth of David's work that made him a natural candidate for an interview. The only question was would I use it in *Integral Leadership Review* or in *Integral Review*: such is the quality of his interests and intellect.*

Before doing the interview, I borrowed a copy of one of David's earlier books. When I went to their house to pick it up I met them both. They are quite a team and I recommend their work to all.

—Russ Volckmann

Russ: David, welcome to Integral Review.

David: Thank you for having me.

Russ: I know you have a background in psychology. I'd like to hear a little bit about the nature of your background and then explore where you've gone from there.

David: Well, I started by going to the New School for Social Research during the evenings and got my masters and finally my doctorate. Then I had a brief time at Princeton as a visiting lecturer, after which I went on to UCLA School of Medicine as a research psychologist in the Neuropsychiatric Institute. I have a doctorate in Social Psychology, but my master's was in pre-clinical. That's roughly my background. I wound up primarily as a research psychologist.



Russ: *And during what years did you do your degree at the New School?*

David: Oh, gosh, that was back in the Stone Age.

(laughter)

David: It must have been in the fifties.

Russ: *That preceded a lot of the work that was being done around more humanistic approaches to psychology.*

David: Yes, my grounding was primarily in Freud and Jung, but most importantly Lewinian Field Theory.

Russ: *Kurt Lewin's work.*

David: Yes. Kurt Lewin's work was the most formative thing for me. His work underlies not only social psychology but leadership training, as well.

Russ: *In what ways was his work influential on you?*

David: He was the first really true systems psychologist. There is no other psychology to match it. That's the reason it's been so influential. It wasn't hooked into just Gestalt or Freud or anything. It was a fluid, highly visual-oriented psychology that could be applied to all kinds of social, political and economic problems, problems in marriage and so on. He was a great innovator in action research, which has always been my passion.

Russ: *That underlies the field of organization development where I spent 22 years of my life, and apparently it related to work that you did as well. In what way were you involved in action research?*

David: My early work was in the study of right/left, liberal/conservative differences. I did a lot of experiments. One of my basic books in that area is called *The Leadership Passion: The Psychology of Ideology*. That was very definitely action-oriented. Ever since, practically everything I've written, I've wound up laying the groundwork for whatever the area was that I was looking at by pulling together what attracted me to the works of others. Ever since, I've always written a closing chapter or appendices or something that applies it directly, as Lewin did, to solving all kinds of social and economic and political problems.

Russ: *So this was an interest of yours as far back as the fifties.*

David: Oh sure. My first book actually was *The Healing of a Nation*. It was heavily action-oriented. It won top national awards and including one that earlier had been won by Gunnar Myrdal for research on racism and how to eliminate it. It was the Anisfield-Wolfe award.

Russ: *What was the thesis of The Healing of a Nation?*

David: *The Healing of a Nation* didn't come out until 1971, at the climatic years for the whole civil rights push. It preceded the anti-war movement that came along later. It was the heyday for doing something about race.

Russ: *My senior paper in college in the early 1960s was about the impact of Gandhi's philosophy of Satyagraha on the civil rights movement in the U.S. We have some commonality there. And what would you say were the major theses or suggestion to come out of your book?*

David: I dedicated the book to Kurt Lewin and to the great black sociologist W.E.B. DuBois. I did two things in it. One, I took the perspectives of DuBois and Lewin and suggested what in terms of their work could make a difference in ending racism in America. The significance of that book within my total output from then on was in the title, *The Healing of a Nation*. The perspective is that we are a sick nation. We must take a social-psychiatric perspective on the healing of the nation. In it, I wrote my first "Program for a President" in which I took Lewin's work and fitted it in with my previous experience with television of how to actually fairly quickly move us ahead on the whole thing of racial differences.

Russ: *As we're both aware in the current political campaign, the whole issue of racism has been brought to the forefront once again. What were your recommendations and how have you seen them play out?*

David: My recommendations were primarily to launch what amounts to an electronic version of what became known as the Town Hall meeting, which was also hot back then. In politics it was later brought up by Ross Perot, but he didn't do much with it. Actually, no one has done much with it. Howard Dean picked up on part of the idea by launching the first really sophisticated use of the Internet, which Obama,, of course has perfected beautifully. That is the approach I was suggesting back in the early days of television.

Russ: *Of course John McCain has advocated the use of Town Hall meetings in the presidential campaign—*

David: Yes, but his Town Hall is just the old style. He's not using the power of technology and communication to link a whole nation together.

Russ: *Your recommendation preceded even the extraordinary communication capability of the Internet today.*

David: I had never thought of it that way. That's true. Oddly enough, back in that time, I sent the book to then-Vice President Mondale and he actually read it, which seldom happens when you send books to well-known figures. He wrote back that it was an interesting idea for that time, but politically unfeasible. And he was right. I later heard from Lyndon

Johnson, after he was president. He had read the book. I had complimented Johnson for everything he was doing to advance the racial picture and he was very grateful.

Russ: *How wonderful! What intrigues me about this early work is not only did you have an interest in action research methods and social psychology, which is already a field that bridges multiple disciplines from an academic point of view, but it also sounds like you were interested in politics and sociology and a variety of the social sciences. Is that accurate?*

David: Yes, that's why I finally found a home in systems science. But then in my own estimation, I went beyond what we think of as traditional systems science, which is fundamentally rather static. In other words, it's a reading of a problem from the perspective of all sciences—natural and social—and that's its great strength. It takes what is now fragmented and tries to put it all together in a total perspective. But what really liberated and excited me was to move on into what I'm now trying to define in my writing as evolutionary systems science where in addition to having the perspective of all the natural and social sciences, we bring that perspective to focus on a problem. We are seeing the problem in terms of past, present and future. We are seeing this movement from where it began, where it is currently and where it's going. This was very Lewinian-oriented and is to me the great excitement of the whole field is evolutionary systems science, which I got involved in with the General Evolution Research Group.

Russ: *It sounds like you were part of a larger movement that involved people from multiple disciplines in looking at evolution and its implications.*

David: Back in the days when Chaos Theory was just getting off the ground, it became the great strange attractor that pulled a number of us together. I wound up out at a secret meeting in Budapest. Ervin Laszlo, who went on to become maybe one of the best systems scientists in the world, had this vision of moving beyond the old Darwinian survival of the fittest-type theory and using chaos theory to move from chaos to order. So we met secretly in Budapest—scientists from behind the Iron Curtain and from the U.S. and Western Europe.

In the early days our General Evolution Research Group included people like Francisco Varela, Ralph Abraham and a number of well-known people in Hungary and Finland. Then later on Karl Pribram became a member. Riane Eisler was there with me, originally, and became a co-founder of the group. That was one of the most exciting and formative influential periods in my life, because I was able to work with top notch people in different fields: biology, psychology, sociology, political science, history and management science—there was a heavy orientation towards management science.

Russ: *As well as physics and biology it sounds like.*

David: Yes, absolutely. There's nothing like the subtle influence of all these different perspectives. You're hit with papers by these various people and you can't ignore all of them.

(laughter)

David: You're forced to read enough that your own mind's understanding begins to expand. Then, of course, in talking to them you're forced to be able to refer to Lovelock with knowledge. Prigogine was an honorary member of the group. You're also forced to read their works in order to converse with your associates in an intellectual way. It was a wonderful learning experience.

Russ: *In recent years, Basarab Nicolescu initiated an international movement. He is a Romanian physicist based in Paris. The movement is about what he calls "transdisciplinarity," and he and some colleagues wrote a manifesto about this. They are trying to promote the spread of transdisciplinary educational programs in universities around the world. He makes a distinction between interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary. Interdisciplinary is essentially where people come and talk about a problem from each of their points of view. A multidisciplinary approach would be where you have multiple disciplines doing this, but a transdisciplinary approach is one where you in effect transcend the perspective of any one discipline and come up with a higher level perspective of the issue you're addressing.*

Does that sound like your work?

David: Yes, and it also sounds like the orientation of the leaders of what became evolutionary systems science from the beginning. They didn't call it transdisciplinary, but that's where they wound up. The great ones of the field literally transcended the disciplines and came up with the larger perspective. Maslow tended to do that within psychology and helped to launch humanistic psychology.

Russ: *Is that where you gained your interest in evolutionary theory and the work of Darwin?*

David: Yes, because the way I discovered the theory of Darwin was...well, I was learning all this fresh stuff about evolution that I had not known before. Back then, when discussing evolutionary theory, I would just routinely pop in a few references to some secondary source on Darwin. The deeper I got into it, however, I kept thinking, "Well here are these people who are damning Darwin for this 'survival of the fittest' stuff, and now selfish genes—the later generation of so-called 'Darwinians'—and are coming out with this highly selfishness-oriented 'survival of the fittest' theory." I thought, "What did Darwin really say?"

I discovered to my astonishment that the bulk of the people working in the field of evolution had only read Darwin from secondary sources. They were simply aping what they were told beginning early in the 20th century was Darwin. But the neo-Darwinians took Darwin and reduced him. It was a neo-Darwinian reduction that took hold of science and also strengthened that whole disastrous "survival of the fittest" orientation in society, particularly in politics and economics, with this diminished picture of Darwin. I discovered that what Darwin was actually saying is that it's natural selection and

variation—he didn't say "random variation"—working and he apologized for using the phrase "survival of the fittest" which he got from Wallace.

Russ: *Essentially at that point in his work, he was talking about sub-human species, was he not?*

David: Yes, primarily he was talking about what set the whole thing in motion prior to human development. In the opening of the *Descent of Man* he tells us he's now moving on to look at human evolution. What happens at our level?

What they ignored is that in *Descent of Man* he writes only twice about survival of the fittest and apologizes once for using the phrase. But he writes 95 times about love and 92 times about moral sensitivity. What he is saying is that at the human level, the prime drivers are moral sensitivity. I dug further into it and discovered that not only did he flesh out a later theory of exactly how moral evolution developed stage by stage, but that was all ignored. I've never seen it tracked in the way Darwin intended except in my own work. It was just astounding.

Russ: *So in his later work, Darwin is saying that evolution is more than just about biology; it is also about psychology. Is that a fair statement?*

David: That's part of it. In his later years, it was psychology that primarily fascinated him.

Russ: *And it's from the psychology that we relate the moral and ethical development of human beings.*

David: Only in part. The great strength of Darwin is he articulates the whole growth and development rooted first in biology. He points out in *Origin of Species* that there are two ways that evolution happens. Organisms either developed by killing one another or by cooperating and working together. In the later book, as well as his early notebooks, he developed the idea of the development of the moral sense out of biology, which we now know as his definition of certain stages. It starts with the first appearance of sexual instincts, then parental instincts, then social instincts over millions of years at the mammalian stage. It then moves on to the evolution of emotion and reasoning, which evolved in higher mammals and humans. He roots it in the whole movement—biology in cultural evolution includes psychology as a field that could begin to understand what was going on more intimately.

Russ: *Then it would be fair to say that the evolutionary perspective, including that of moral development, involves a biology, the conscious and unconscious aspects of psychology, as well as the life conditions that people are engaged with in terms of social evolution, is that correct?*

David: Yes, yes! One of the stock phrases today in the social and natural sciences is the idea of self-organizing processes. This was Prigogine; this was Varela and Maturana and a good friend of mine, Vilmos Csanyi, who's a leading Hungarian biologist. The emphasis

on self-organizing processes was in Darwin originally and ignored. He emphasized repeatedly that the organism has this capacity for choice. It isn't simply that the organism is shaped by external forces like natural selection. This process outside the organism selects out of variation in what it's going to allow to prevail. But he also is emphasizing that the organism selects its own destiny out of the platter offered to the organism. This was totally ignored, literally, by everyone I know. That's one of the things I really bear down on in my work.

Russ: *You've written quite a bit about this. The book I'm most familiar with is Darwin's Lost Theory of Love. You've also published other works such as Darwin's Lost Theory, Darwin in Love and more recently Bankrolling Evolution and Measuring Evolution. So this whole idea of evolution has continued to be central in your work.*

David: To me, it's absolutely essential. In a sense, what we're going through is science trying to grow up to reach the level of positive spirituality at its best.

Russ: *That's a fascinating concept.*

David: Take Jesus or any of the great spiritual visionaries. They had an intuitive feeling for transdisciplinary systems of science. They had an intuitive grasp of the process of evolution. In the case of Buddhism and Hinduism, they go beyond and embrace the entire life/death span within a larger picture of reincarnation and karma. That's the direction in which science is now moving. It's trying to substantiate this larger picture of life, of death and of life embracing death and moving on through time.

It's a magnificent perspective to get into. The more you get into it, the more you see that we are still in a baby step phase in mainstream science. For instance, my close friend Ervin Lazlo has been writing for years now about the Akashic field and all the sciences supporting the theory of an Akashic field—holographic brain theory and all sorts of different theories and evidence supporting the idea. He's now got a new book coming out in January called *The Akashic Experience* in which I've got a piece on my own investigation of a past life. It's out on the fringe with people who are not afraid to explore the paranormal that science is moving. And, as I say, science is beginning to reconnect with and try to catch up with the non-scientifically verified, non-scientifically grounded, but intuitive vision of the great Avatar.

Russ: *Ken Wilber talks about the traditional sciences with the insistence on measurability or observability as "scientific reductionism." Interestingly enough, it's out in the world of science that new ground has been breaking over the last few decades that charges us to be looking at life and experience in the world and the universe from a far greater and more complex perspective. I'm reminded of David Baum's notion of the implicate order. Lazlo's Akashic field is another example. So are Ralph Abraham's work with self-organizing systems and other applications of chaos and complexity theory. All of these point to a movement that I think is about what you're describing.*

David: And one of the central points is a matter of passion with me, because I have a long background in measurement. Wilber can knock measurement, but that's because Wilber had no training in scientific measurement. He never had to learn statistics or run an experiment. He worked entirely out of books and the power of cognition. The great power of science from the very beginning with Galileo has been the power of measurement as a means of verification. I've developed a number of measures. Currently, I have a measure that pulls all this together—the whole evolutionary system, including the science perspective and an understanding of evolution in terms of 15 basic indicators of evolution. I developed an instrument I call the Global Sounding. I explain it in *Bankrolling Evolution* and in *Measuring Evolution*, a guide for using it. Once again, within my perspective, it's action research. This instrument has a way of putting all of this to use. It can be applied to any program, any project, and assist us to reach a decision on whether that program or project will advance us, check us in place, or drive us backward in evolution.

Russ: *Ken Wilber's background was in science before he went off on his more esoteric directions, and I would think that what he would say is not that measurability is not important, it's just not the only thing.*

David: I had in mind the traditional grounding in science involving experiments, statistics, mathematics, which I would be surprised to learn he really had. This is not the discount the fact his is a brilliant exploration pushing science in vital new directions.

Russ: *What you've done with the Global Sounding is at least come up with some indicators that we can look at and assess what's going on in terms of levels of evolution. Can you give an example of the indicators and what you mean by "self-actualizing?"*

David: I take 15 indicators and the science supporting each one of these indicators. I start with cosmic evolution, chemical evolution and then biological evolution on the natural scientific level. There's a transition—the evolution of the brain is the step beyond that. Then you enter the range of cultural evolution with psychology, sociology, political science, economics and technology. The great power of this instrument is that I added an indicator for moral evolution, which to me is critical—spiritual evolution, evolution of consciousness and evolutionary action at the top. In other words, what is the purpose of gaining a doctorate or going to school or writing books if you're not going to put it to use in trying to make life better? So that's the orientation.

Russ: *You're suggesting that the evolution of the brain is being studied in terms of historical evolution as well as in the lifetime of an individual?*

David: Yes. I formed the Darwin Project with a founding council of over 50 leading American, European and Asian scientists. Among the founders were Paul MacLean and Karl Pribram, the two greatest living brain scientists. MacLean's work definitely tracks evolution in all the subspecies, stage by stage, to the human. Then, in the human the whole development of this can be found in MacLean's book, *The Triune Brain*. It's also in Karl Pribram's writings to a certain extent.

Russ: *Then is it fair to say that for individuals there are stages of development in one's lifetime?*

David: Oh, yes. I particularly write about the stages in moral development. Piaget did magnificent work. Kohlberg took a crack at it and advanced it in many ways, but blocked it in others. Then Gilligan came along and advanced out of the Kohlberg bind on sex and gender.

Russ: *Have you looked at Robert Kegan's work or Jane Loevinger's work?*

David: Minimally. I'm mainly grounded in Erikson.

Russ: *Is this because ultimately it's more about the development of the moral and the spiritual and consciousness aspects that intrigue you?*

David: Yes, it very definitely is. You can't know everything or try to know everything, so I'm focused on moral development.

Russ: *Are there stages that you see that are useful to think about in moral development?*

David: Yes, and I'm trying to think how you'd characterize that. I've written about this in a book of mine called the *River and the Star*, which is actually the first book for my seven-book "Moral Transformation Cycle." The first book is *River and the Star: The Lost Story of the Great Explorers of the Better World*. It's possibly the best thing I've ever written. It's out there with all the online booksellers worldwide. I write about Piaget, for example. Today, we've focused on the cognitive development he wrote about and forgotten about the moral development work that came earlier, but it was the most brilliant of all.

Russ: *Interesting. So Piaget is another example of someone who has written about moral development—not just Darwin—and that portion of their work is being ignored.*

David: Yes, and that's what I'm addressing in the *River and the Star*. I start with Immanuel Kant. Who really pays any attention to him except for dull philosophers these days? But he was a fireball! I move on to Herbert Spencer. Everyone writes him off as this right-wing ideologue. Well, he had some very important things to say about moral development. Marx and Engels—they're the demons, you know—but they significantly advanced our understanding of moral development. I go into Freud and Emile Durkheim, who is one of the towering figures in the study of moral development, then on to Piaget and into the work of many people who I've worked with or knew, like Ashley Montague and Milton Rokeach. I used to work with Milton and it's a magnificent story. And I include all of that work, except for the most recent, Carol Gilligan's, because she's still living and tied to the Women's Movement. Hardly anybody pays any attention to it anymore so I'm determined to shove it at them.

(laughter)

Russ: *And you really do. In Bankrolling Evolution, if I can quote in the last chapter you say that there is a list of suggestions “...for healing through progressive political action, progressive money, progressive science, progressive education, progressive entertainment, progressive morality and progressive spirituality. To this pharmacopeia, we must add the case made in this book for the inevitability controversial but now essential development and use of a new psychiatry and management science of evolution.” Tell us about that if you will.*

David: That’s quite a mouthful.

Russ: *I know!*

(laughter)

David: I got into the psychiatry of evolution during *The Healing of a Nation*. We had to move beyond simply a psychotherapist with an individual or group or family as her client and look at the whole nation. In that book, I get into pointing out the pathology that we have tolerated, enabled and followed in the case of Bush. Here’s a psychological basket case when you know his make up in psychiatric terms, which I include in that book. I also probe the pathology of his enablers and followers of which so much emerged during the McCain-Palin campaign for the presidency. I show how what we endured during the eight years of the Bush administration was the eruption of the pathology of the third generation of the people originally studied by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik and Levinson and Neville Sanford in the famous authoritarian personality study.

Russ: *Yes, it came out of World War II.*

David: Right, the Bush years’ disaster also reflected the findings of Stanley Milgram on obedience to authority—

Russ: *These are the Stanford studies you’re talking about.*

David: Yes. The Bush years also reflected the studies of Solomon Ashe on conformity. Of course it wasn’t simply Milgram and Ashe. There were hundreds of psychologists and sociologists exploring this widespread social sickness. They were warning that, as a country, we had to do something about this, because we had, in my terms, this sick subpopulation, originally called “the lunatic fringe of the right wing,” which became strengthened through the coup of the past 30 years that took over the country, culminating in the Bush-Cheney disaster.

The point I’m getting at is we can’t afford this sort of thing any longer. We have to institute a new healing-oriented approach to the sickness of the nation, America, that involves healing the rest of the world. This is one reason I’m pushing Obama: because Obama by nature is a healer. Biden is also a healer by nature. It’s healers versus dividers at this point. That’s what I’m getting at. We have to launch a new science that is sensitive to the emergence of pathological leadership, pathological enablership and pathological

followership and that warns and educates the nation against ever again being suckered into the snare of these people. We have to strengthen and more greatly empower the progressive vision. This is the need I write of in *Bankrolling Evolution* and *Measuring Evolution* for a psychiatry of evolution.

Russ: *You also write about a management science of evolution, which parallels this in the areas of business and organizations.*

David: Exactly. You can have a psychiatry of evolution and you'd have this vast exercise involving a bunch of very bright academically-trained people who are not forced by interest or circumstance or tradition to get down there in the trenches and work to make things better. They're also people who have been oriented for at least a century now in the healing of the individual, the group, the family, etc. The idea of sending them out to heal a whole nation—why, that's just screwy to them. But it's not to the management science orientation.

The beauty of the whole field of management and organization science is that it's action-oriented. Take the problem and bring together whatever's needed to solve that problem and you get paid for it. The academics get paid for teaching whatever limited understanding they have to a fresh crop of little people who are yearning for a larger picture. What they get too often is a succession of tame disciples imprisoned within barriers to the larger vision. To me, you have to have both.

Russ: *Management science then is the part that corresponds to action, which has such preeminence in your work.*

David: Yes.

Russ: *In terms of the future—both in the way we are developing and evolving and thinking about thriving, if you will, in the universe—what do you see as being the greatest indicators of potential success?*

David: The greatest indicators of potential success are the ones we have to hang onto these days, because we can work our rear ends off and still go down the drain—

Russ: *I know. I'm looking for a little hope here.*

(laughter)

David: To me the hope is all these bright people coming into the picture. My wife, Riane, is now doing coursework with students at California Institute for Integral Studies and I see them. The kind of people that are being attracted to CIIS and in pockets to universities all over the world are young people who come in and they see that the elders are in that secure position of knowing that they won't be around when the world goes down the drain. But the young ones say, "Hey, if I'm gonna have a good quality of life, I need to do something about this!"

The older generation is just not doing it. And that's our hope—and it's not just the young ones. That's why what is going on at CIIS and at other places so greatly interests me. The pattern is for people to be involved who've been in business or in all kinds of activities during the years when they had to make a living and raise a family are now middle-aged. They've gone through a divorce, the kids are grown and gone, and they have the freedom at last to change. What they want to do is go back to school, get their degrees in order to jump in with the younger generation and work like hell to save our species and the planet from eventually going down the drain under all these challenges.

Russ: *If the hope is that more and more people, young and old, are turning to try to find more of what I call holistic or progressive solutions to the problems we're facing in the world, what are the things that you think would be most important for us to be focusing on in terms of our development as a culture, as a people?*

David: To me, the name of the game is moral evolution. I can track every problem we face today and at the root is a lack of moral strength. It used to be called character. It's a grounded sense of right vs. wrong. Some people may think that's right-wing. Part of the problem is the conservatives have seized up the word "moral" and are trying to club everyone else with it by saying they are moral and the rest are Satan's spawn.

I'm talking about progressive morality, progressive moral sensitivity, progressive moral evolution, not check-us-in-place or drive us backward morality. We need to get this into the schools. Kohlberg tried to do this. You run up against the separation of church and state requirement of the Constitution, which is essential. But we've got to get progressive moral education into homes and schools K-12 into the collegiate years.

It's not there now, except in pockets—theological seminaries or special courses—it's very rare in college. Where the courses exist, they are in the evangelical, right-wing colleges. What galls me is the people who have been the ruination of this nation have had this tremendous training in regressive morality. It's mirrored in the Islamic world of these radical, right-wing schools. They have this generation after generation repeated grounding in the regressive code of morality. We have to develop a comparable system for this type of thing in the progressive schools.

I cover this problem and solutions from I believe A to Z in the six books of my "Darwin Anniversary Cycle" and the seven books of my "Moral Transformation Cycle," most particularly in the "Glacier and the Flame" trilogy. There I differentiate dominator moral insensitivity and dominator morality from partnership moral sensitivity and partnership morality in relation to Riane Eisler's fundamental work on domination and partnership systems. That is what we have to get across. Today, we live in this hybrid world where we're hit with both versions; we're muddled and mixed up. You go to church on Sunday, you tithe and go there on the holidays. But in the meantime, the other six days of the week, the orientation is screw your neighbor. Instead of "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," it has become, "Do unto others before they can do it unto you." That's the regressive dominator morality.

Russ: *David, there are so many different avenues we could explore and one of the things I deeply appreciate is your ability to reach out and hold multiple perspectives.*

David: Thank you. In the book, *Measuring Evolution*, in terms of action-orientation, I take the Global Sounding measure and show how it can be used in specific scenarios relating to business, government, politics, foundations. Leadership in all of these areas is confronted with mountains of projects and programs clamoring for money—how do you differentiate between those likely to advance human evolution versus merely check us in place, which can be disastrous these days, or those likely to actively drive us backward in evolution? The Global Sounding allows you to carefully calibrate the differences between two good projects as well as the good and the bad.

I've also developed the Global Sounding Moral Code. I've taken each of the 15 indicators and translated them into a scientific global ethic to provide a code for how to advance yourself, advance the world and advance your children, morally.

Russ: *What is the article that you're including in Laszlo's new book in dealing with a regression into a past life.*

David: It's an article called "Return to Amalfi." I've written a book with the same title, which I'm rewriting into a second edition now. I tell of my first visit to Amalfi in Southern Italy in order to investigate whether I lived there 300 years ago as an Italian spice merchant. It checked out. I'm convinced.

Russ: *Where did you get the idea that you had lived there in an earlier life?*

David: I went through a past life regression—you know, we psychologists can do these weird things.

(laughter)

David: I got curious about past life regression and the one that intrigued me the most is I'm a spice merchant in the year 1611 in Amalfi, Italy. One of the things that grabbed me about it is, if I'm just making this up, why didn't I make myself up as Michelangelo or somebody more famous? Why would I pick the life of an obscure spice merchant in Amalfi, Italy? I went there and found that, by gosh, an awful lot of it rather hauntingly checked out.

Russ: *Can you give an example?*

David: In the session, I saw this town on the side of a mountain with a succession of green plateaus and red tile roofs going down to the ocean. I had been to Italy before, but had never seen anything like that, because I was in Northern Italy. I asked an Italian friend about it and he said that would be Amalfi. I went there and that was it. In my visioning, I also saw the harbor where the dock was that went out into the bay. I went there and it was the same exact thing. I found confirmation of the stones underfoot; the gradation that I

saw originally was there. All of these things were substantiated by certain things that have happened in history. It was a revealing experience.

I discovered through going there and doing some historical research that I could even develop a sophisticated psychological portrait of the situation of that spice merchant in 1611 and why he felt so strongly about certain things. He hated the church and doctors and the upper class. I found the reasons in history for exactly the emotions and the actions of this particular spice merchant in Amalfi at that time.

Russ: *So you actually ended up encountering the dominator model in that past life?*

David: Yes, and I was able to relate it to Riane's work in *The Chalice and the Blade* and the books on the historical and pre-historical picture of the clash between the partnership and the dominator ways of life.

Russ: *How has that experience impacted your work today?*

David: Well it has convinced me beyond a doubt that in gross, simple scientific terms, we've been taught for about a century now that everything we are consists of the influence of genes and of environment. I now know we are the product of genes, environment and past life.

Russ: *That's fascinating and I'm looking forward to reading the book. By the way, Ervin Lazlo is on our board for Integral Review and I'm sure he'll be interested in reading this interview and the kind things you have to say about him.*

David: Yes, I hope he will.

Russ: *Well, thank you very much.*

Note: Following is an appendix with a sample of Loye's Global Sounding.
Copyright © David Loye. Reprinted with permission of the author.