THE DALE I KNEW, WHAT WOULD HE DO TODAY

- AFTER TRUMP AND BREXIT?

OCT. 2017

The Dale I married was self-assured, honest, curious and profoundly fond of his country.

This guaranteed that I could realize my own development, could trust him, could enjoy much newness with him, and learn to care more deeply for my country, and for our adopted country, Denmark.

Over the course of our marriage, the Dale I lived with for 50 years grew in many ways.

- He learned to pay attention to those around him and be concerned for how they understood his interaction with them.

- He gradually realized, wistfully, that his stance as a member of the labor class was changing to a place in the elite of the educated class. He no longer needed his youthful arrogance. But it also meant that he no longer could claim populist credibility.

- After his heart attack at age 50, he came to realize that anger was not a necessary reaction. It also was not good for one's heart ... or wife. Life became much happier.

- He came to respect women in person, beyond and more deeply than the liberal's required intellectual position of equality for women. He learned to listen to them in conversation with respect. (This was hard for him, but he achieved it.)

- He came to value the young: his students, his children, his grandchildren ... realizing the unbearably stunning rich human capital they represent.

- He rethought his conviction that his comparative advantage was to specialize in moving the leading edge of thought forward.

- When he won the prize, he fretted about the clamor for him to speak to general audiences. When would he do his work? Then he realized what a platform he commanded for teaching non-economists how to think.

- In a short time, he transformed his speaking style remarkably, while still managing to continue his creative work.

How then, would he be thinking today, in the aftermath of votes for Brexit and Donald Trump? It has been 4 years since the last of the thoughts we heard from him.

The ideas of Sam Francis in the early 1990's, as recalled by David Brooks, provide an outline for this imaginative journey.

- Sam worked on the presidential campaign of Pat Buchanan, his mentor.

- He cites three reasons Buchanan can win the Republican primary in 1992: Economics, Culture and Politics.

1. Economics: globalization is screwing middle America

- The service economy is ruining small farms and taking jobs from the working class.

- Hypertaxation and reliance on trade and services is shrinking manufacturing. All those jobs are going out of the US.

2. Culture: pro-business economic conservatives think GDP growth will solve everything

- DC Republicans are infected with the values of educated elites. Democrats embody these values.

- This results in the managed destruction of Middle American norms and institutions.

3. Politics: left and right no longer holds

- It is religious vs. secular, nationalist vs globalist, white vs. non-white: ruling class vs. middle America.

- Middle America is stuck without a party: neither pro-corporate Republicans nor liberal Democratic radicals and moderates speak to them.

- A nationalist reaction, says Harris, is inevitable, probably in populist form.

- Buchanan must make use of these problems. Indeed, if he doesn't get the nomination, someone in the future will, using these very concepts.

Where did Dale stand on these issues in the 90's?

- In economics, of course, he was way ahead of the pack. He pointed out the income gap as it grew over the decades. He taught me about the 1% and the 1/10 of the 1% well before the press mentioned it. He knew it couldn't last. He wondered that the public didn't realize this. He feared the cost when they truly understood.

- In his last big invited lecture, in Moscow, May 2013, Dale showed a bar graph with laboring jobs on one end and professionals on the other. Both ends had recovered from the crisis, but not the middle. The vast middle (clerks, receptionists, factory workers, middles of every enterprise) were in negative territory. These jobs had not recovered.

This was a new chasm to inhibit communication between the successful people and the others. The old stepping stone jobs whereby people moved upward no longer existed. They were not coming back, due to technology and globalism. Dale found this worrisome.

- The culture problems were different. This is the territory he was conflicted about. The class of people he had come from were struggling. He, however, was flourishing. It hurt to look

there. So, like the bulk of economists, he pointed out the banishing of hunger on a world scale, as well as the lifting up of a couple billion people as a result of globalism.

Let the displaced Americans get some re-training. Let there be a universal income. He looked past the personal misery this imposed.

- Regarding politics, he, like many neo-liberals, saw flaws in Obama's leadership, but realized that this was better than most others would do. He worried about the disgruntled people and saw that they had no place to go, politically.

- He agreed with the Keynesian notion of supporting the banks in such a crisis as 2008. He reminded us often of the Great Depression and how failed banks resulted in a longer than necessary recovery. He praised Obama's instincts for large government spending, even if he fell short of the ideal.

- I don't think Dale had imbibed how powerfully the moneyed world had taken control of government. We didn't know then about the Mercers, about the full sway of Big Pharma and the most recent awareness of the military industrial complex' overreaches. We didn't realize how much of congress persons' time is absorbed in money raising.... 6-8 hours a day at secret phone banks near, but not in the Capitol.

How would Dale address these matters today?

- The Dale I knew was honorable, responsible, creative and very proud of his country, even when it did dumb things. I believe he would be exceedingly absorbed in analysis and efforts to pick up the pieces of our civilization quickly and smartly.

- How he would approach this is less clear. Of course, he would use economic understandings to suggest policy and regulatory restorative methods.

- I think he would finally deal with the abandonment of his beloved American working people by the smart intellectuals and the power brokers. I think he would realize the responsibility the people on top have for those who are struggling. He would have assumed responsibility for addressing this national failure of solidarity.

- I think he would have re-evaluated the idea that American suffering is much less than that of the poor worldwide ... That may be so, but it is no less painful. I know he understood the value of the community of the whole. He lamented often the wrongness of hateful divisions. The notion of building walls to keep the poor from taking one's ill-gotten riches was anathema to Dale. I think he would have striven to restore self-respect to everyone in our fair country, while continuing to encourage development, nationally and globally.

- Politically, I have no idea of his solutions. I see a need for brand new creative kinds of leadership in a world facilitated and challenged by increasingly speedy technological devices. I think he would have taken his time to come up with ideas we haven't thought of. I suspect they would include lessening the obscene wage disparity in the US and the overweening control by a

few oligarchs. They would increase fairness, while enabling and encouraging creativity at every level.

An article by Sheri Berman in the NYT claims the death of the European Left. I discover how much of Dale's worldview (and mine) was informed by our time in Europe.

- Sheri decries the demise of compromise between center left and center right parties, as has held since WWII. During this era, capitalism was kept subservient to goals of social stability and solidarity. This no longer holds, she argues.

- Today's Europe has two camps, epitomized by Tony Blair's unrestricted global capitalism and Jeffrey Corbyn's bitter retreat from capitalism to socialism.

- The failure to address concerns of cultural change stems from either non-understanding, relying on growth to erase problems or globalization as the new way (with national identity seen as passé.)

Dale, and by osmosis ... I, are guilty on both the growth idea and the embrace of globalism. Dale, because he saw it as the future of an economically healthy globe. I, because it is just and acknowledges the close connection of all humans.

Sheri sees the situation as dire, likely leading to the demise of democracy. She sees the leading edge as wrong.

From my perspective, as a teacher and student of evolutionary spirituality, globalism is the next step of society's development. Dale and I both embraced this for good reason. We each, however, failed to care enough about health of the whole community. Evolution, in every aspect, from the big bang through species development to complex societies, demands that the leaders involve all the members. When they don't, there is an explosion, sometimes an apocalypse, that results in a total reset. I see Brexit and Trump as first stages of this.

A difference between the US and Europe is our two stories of success.

We Americans strive for Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness ... all about the individual. Europeans hold the Common Good as the purpose of their lives. Perhaps this accounts for the slower progress of their populist movements as seen in France, Germany and, it seems, Denmark.

Finally, I, and assuredly Dale, do not see the leading edge as wrong, merely imperfect. I believe that creative solutions can redress the failings of our progress. They can bring large segments of our populations into the forward-moving new ways of producing and tending to our world. They can welcome these neighbors into a society for all, not an exclusive club. I see this creativity as vital for raising up the struggling and for maintaining the momentum we have nourished to date. Perhaps the Dale T. Mortensen Centre can contribute the imagination that will rebalance our experiment of Western Civilization.