



The Emerging Paradigm

Recorded on 25th February, 2019, in Byron Bay, Australia.

Future Sense is a podcast edited from the radio show of the same name, broadcast on BayFM in Byron Bay, Australia, at www.bayfm.org. Hosted by Nyck Jeanes and well-known international futurist, Steve McDonald, Future Sense provides a fresh, deep analysis of global trends and emerging technologies.

How can we identify the layers of growth personally, socially and globally? What are the signs missed, the truths being denied? Science, history, politics, psychology, ancient civilisations, alien contact, the new psychedelic revolution, cryptocurrency and other disruptive and distributed technologies and much more.

This is Future Sense.

Nyck: Here we are this morning on Future Sense, and we're going to tackle some new—or different—or another approach to the complexity of change that's occurring on the planet. What are we going to look at this morning?

Steve: I thought we'd have a look at the emerging paradigm at the moment and just feel into perhaps the next decade or so, and some of the things that we can expect to see. How the change—this big global shift that's going on—is going to progress as we see the ongoing collapse of our social systems which have come from an age before the internet and the Scientific-Industrial era, and how the growing global complexity is slowly making those systems less efficient, so they're burning themselves out.

We're seeing the rise of something very new in this sixth layer of consciousness according to Clare Graves's model: the Humanistic-Relativistic paradigm. So let's unpack some of the themes and changes that are happening and some of the influences that are affecting the way that the world is changing, society's changing, and indeed, we are changing ourselves as individuals.

Nyck: Indeed. And of course, as that change is coming upon us—moving through society, culture, the world, everything—there is, of course, an enormous amount of resistance to change, as there always is. We'll be looking at many of those resistance elements that we see all over the newspapers and in most of our socio-cultural space now.

Steve: That's right, all sorts of tension. You've got pushback from the old system that doesn't want to lose control; you've got the desire of the people who are moving into this new way of thinking, the new value set, who want to get rid of the old systems; and of course, you've got these parallel changes that are taking place around us in our environment with things like species extinction, climate change, and even our solar system's transit into new parts of the galaxy. All of those things are interconnected and overlapping.

Nyck: And acknowledging, of course, that in the space of this kind of change, there is a lot of confusion, there's a lot of overwhelm that can come to many people. I've experienced that over this weekend.

I was talking to Steve before we started the day about the many things that we're researching—that I'm researching—and the connections that are occurring in me and then the bigger picture beyond that. Occasionally, sometimes there's just too much that is factored in or feels like it's part of the equation, and I think a lot of people are experiencing that in one way or the other, too.

Steve: I think so, too, and it's great to explore that, Nyck. I think it's really valuable for you to talk about your personal experiences because as you say, a lot of people are going through it. These are things that are brought up by the increasing complexity of life in general, the different things that we have to consider, the things that we're aware of and the things that we're trying to make sense of in new ways. We're moving from our older linear but multiplistic way of assessing things, and thinking about them logically and sorting out what's best for me in the future, beyond that, into this more complex, network-centric way of perceiving and trying to make sense of the world, where we're drawing the dots between all of these things and creating this network within our minds and then looking for a new way of working out what's best for us. In the emerging paradigm, that really comes down to having a trusted network of peers and then bouncing things off our peers and coming to some sort of consensus around how things should be.

Nyck: And that desire, that need for connection which of course has always been there in humanity naturally—we're a socio-centric species to a large degree—but nevertheless, there seems to be a very strong desire now for connection, both internally, as you're saying, with the networks within one's own being, but also externally in your social cultural setting, and trying to find those places where you do feel like you're settled into a tribe, so to speak.

Steve: Absolutely, and that, itself, is a reflection of this large long-term pattern that we see as we move between paradigms throughout our history. We swing between an individual focus where we're looking for individual freedom and to express ourselves and to change the world around us to fit with what we want or what we need; and then when the pendulum swings back the other way, it's the opposite. We look for a community when we're feeling too alone and we want to connect. We want to rebuild community and we want to adjust

ourselves to fit with the community's needs and the way the community works. In terms of the dominant global paradigm, that pendulum is swinging back towards community right now.

Nyck: And of course, I've personally experienced, and I'm sure many of you out there have experienced, both: the desire for the personal, for the individual expression, and the desire very strongly to be settled in a community, into a tribe like that. And both can be existent at the same time too, can't they?

Steve: Absolutely, because these value systems are nested inside one another, so as we grow through them as individuals, we grow through an individual value set, then a communal value set, and another individual value set, and the old value sets don't go away. They're nested inside of us and they're there to be referenced and to be rolled out when our life conditions demand. So, as we develop further and as our species evolves, we're adding more and more layers which increases the complexity, and each time a new layer is added, we know we have to readjust our way of operating, our way of interpreting reality, our way of living, to make account for the fact that we've got an extra value set layered over the top now of all these other ones that have been there.

Nyck: This idea, of course, is perhaps a little bit difficult or hasn't been thought through enough by enough people, the notion that we're not about discarding the past, that making previous iterations of human consciousness and experience and awareness wrong, doesn't actually get us to the full growth that we're capable of. We actually do need to somehow transcend what's come before but also include it. I think this is one of the most difficult things for many people to get a hold of inside themselves.

Steve: Yes, and it's not common at the moment because that understanding—that way of making sense of it all—really comes with the transition into Second Tier consciousness which we discussed on the last show, and so only a very small percentage of people on the planet have made that transition so far.

With regard to personal experiences in the First Tier of consciousness—that is the first six layers that Clare Graves's model describes—when we emerge into a new value set, we do want to discard the old values. They don't seem to work anymore. So we want to get rid of them and we want to live this new way. That's the personal experience that people have.

Nyck: And of course, at an extreme, we make them wrong, we go to battle with them, we try and defeat them and push them down and destroy them somehow.

Steve: Culture wars.

Nyck: And I guess on this program, we're suggesting that that's not the optimal way for our future to emerge here.

Steve: Well, it's not the optimal way unless it actually is the optimal way, and this is the paradox, because our value sets are an adaptation to our life conditions. When our life conditions are 'just so', a particular value set and will also be exactly right, yeah? And we don't get visibility of these layers of values really, until we pop into the Second Tier of consciousness.

We can talk about them; you get to listen to us talk about them, and you can write it down on paper, but the actual direct experience of feeling it, seeing it, interpreting it, and making sense of it doesn't fall into place until you transition into the Second Tier. So it's kind of problematic and paradoxical and it seems confusing, until it's not.

Nyck: Thank you very much. Beautiful.

Nyck: So we're talking today about the change in Clare W. Graves's work from the Multiplistic to the Relativistic segments of his model—the layers, particularly Layers 5 and 6. 5 is the one which most of the world has been in for most of the last few hundred years. Now, let's talk first about the slingshot effect and remind our listeners about that part of this equation in this model.

Steve: It's a very important part of the discussion because it's something that's not widely understood which is the path or trajectory of change. When we go through a paradigm shift, we go through this period of regression which involves a regressive search to find values that will work in the face of the complexity of the current times.

We have been living life, as you said, according to Layer 5 in Graves's model which is best known as the Modern Scientific-Industrial paradigm. That's been fine for a few hundred years, but now we're finding that the systems that were designed during that time seem to be breaking down. It's very, very obvious, of course, in our political systems where we're finding that the leaders who are rising to the top of our governments—particularly our national and state governments—don't seem to be cutting it, and we the people don't seem to have enough influence in order to change things that we see need to be changed within those systems. And that's just one example. There are many, many different other social systems, particularly economic systems also which are obviously feeling the strain and starting to fail, and when we're faced with that, because, in that moment, we don't have any visibility into what our future values will be, the only thing that we can really do is to look backwards and say, 'okay, well, maybe there's a set of values somewhere in our past which is going to work better in this situation.'

So we look back to the last way that we used to live, and in this case, at a global level, this is the Authoritarian-Agricultural era values which were much more rigid. They always had a very clear set of rules to live life by, whether those rules were some sort of large scale, socially agreed set of rules or a set of religious rules—usually some kind of simple set of rules—and if you follow the rules then everything would be fine and you would eventually be rewarded for doing that. In a religious system, of course, the reward was offered in the afterlife. You followed God's rules and then you would be rewarded when you go to Heaven or wherever you go.

So we're seeing a lot of that come up; we're seeing a lot of these old values getting thrown up by our political leaders and other social leaders. The interesting thing about it is that evolution has brought us to this point where we follow this trajectory and we go back to old values in times when change is needed and those old values never solve our problems. But what they do, is that they create more tension for change. They pull the elastic band tighter on that slingshot and when we reach the tipping point, then we have much more motivation to move forward and create change because things become so bad that it actually triggers our action.

Nyck: So more and more people are feeling this tension and our feeling is this dissatisfaction with this movement back to these older values in response to very difficult and overwhelming circumstances, and very complex problems on the planet of all sorts, and in doing so, people start to go, 'well, there's got to be some other way'. Revolution may occur, anarchy can occur, all sorts of responses from humans who collectively come together and go, 'well, this is not good enough', and we're seeing this in many movements around the world.

Steve: We are, and typically historically, these paradigm shifts have been called revolutions. We can look back to the Scientific Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and, you know, those things weren't without some kind of pain. Of course, a revolution involves having to bust out of some kind of restrictive situation that you find yourself in and there's inevitable conflict between those who still hold the old values and those who hold the new values.

And yet, just in the last couple of days, I was listening to a conversation where somebody was saying words to the effect of 'we have to fight' this old system. Even though the emerging value set, which is this Layer 6 Humanistic-Relativistic set of values, is essentially nonviolent—is the most peaceful way of being human that's emerged—we're still hearing this language of 'we have to fight the system'.

Nyck: It's interesting when you mention the word revolution, because, of course, in the context of today, that word revolution is often turned around and called re-love-ution, which is very much the Green [Layer 6] value isn't it? Trying to install that, 'yes, revolution, but actually through love'. How do you do that without fighting and battling in the old way? I think that's a conundrum that many people are facing right now.

Steve: It is. It reminds me of John Lennon's song, *Revolution*. He was a great advocate of peaceful revolution, of course.

Nyck: Yes, we were just watching a documentary the other day that a mutual friend, Russell, gave us about John Lennon from that era when he was involved with all the activists in New York in the early 70s when he moved to America. Clearly, he was way ahead of his time, if, at the same time, quite naive also. I mean, he made some friends who basically used him for their very revolutionary and an aggressive political purposes, but that was the era that was all about that.

Steve: It was. It's a peculiar circumstance around the emergence of Layer 6, though, because Layer 6 is very permissive. It believes in freedom of speech, freedom of access, and in the process of doing that, particularly—and I'm not sure whether this is going to be as strong in the future emergence of 6, but up until now and in its early stages where there wasn't a lot of Layer 6 thinking around and no good social systems to support it like, for example, the Internet, which is a wonderful scaffolding for supporting this emergence of community—Layer 6 typically creates a very permissive environment and it will create life conditions around itself that allows everybody to have access and freedom. And of course, you get other value sets coming in, like, for example, exploitative 'I' focused value sets which will then take advantage of that and sometimes to the detriment of those Layer 6 values.

Nyck: It's Pandora's Box, isn't it? Everybody is free to express exactly what they want to do. Well, that's great on one level, but as you're saying, it can lead to what we've seen. What we're seeing is incredible exploitation of that space, that freedom to have freedom of speech, and so we've got the reaction to that sort of political correctness which is very strong now, and a virtue signalling: this notion that 'the virtues should be this. This is the right virtues.'

Steve: That's right, and the tricky thing is that during the First Tier of consciousness—so in Layers 1 through 6—whenever we're living out whatever our dominant values are, we tend to make the assumption that everybody else holds these values as well. And that's the great risk for the emergence of Layer 6, is this assumption that everybody's going to agree with my values because they're right.

Nyck: Which is contradictory to what 6 is actually trying to emerge into.

Steve: It's problematic, absolutely. Very interesting, and it all adds to the evolutionary tension, of course, which is actually what drives us forward.

This is a very important discussion for us to be having at this point in history because due to the lack of visibility of this trajectory of change and the lack of understanding—we don't get taught this at school—we, up until now, have been carried along by the turbulent currents of change, and we get swirled around and pulled under. It has been a turbulent ride historically, but we are at the point now in history where, as a species, we have access to good research, like, for example, Graves's research that shows us where the currents are and where the traps lie in the river as we progress through change. So if we can promote an understanding with that and start to make sense of the large-scale change and look for these patterns, it means that we can start to navigate change as a species as well as individuals in a far more effective and less turbulent way.

Nyck: And with that, we are, aren't we, becoming more capable of facing, and starting to make sense of, the complexities within. We must do that.

Steve: We are, yes, and we're also heading for a major, major shift with this big leap from First Tier to Second Tier consciousness. We can anticipate, knowing how these dynamics work, that we're going to need a very big elastic band and it's going to have to have a lot of tension on it to actually shift consciousness that much, and so right now we can start to anticipate that. We're still just on the edges and just moving into this global paradigm shift, changing from 5 to 6, and so that has to play out. But parallel to that, we've still got other changes taking place.

Graves found in his research, some people that are already shifted into 7 in the Second Tier, and even 8, back in the 1950s and 1960s. So, those changes are still going on in the background, it's just that the percentage of people going through those changes isn't enough for us to really notice it much yet.

Nyck: What would you say on the percentages? And of course, it's a very difficult thing to ascertain, but what kind of percentage of people do you think on the planet now currently would be moving into Layer 6, into the 'Green' part of the model?

Steve: It's very difficult to put a figure on it. The only real measure that I've seen that's to some extent useful is the market research by Nielsen, the big American survey company. I remember reading the most recent reports that I've really had a look at in any detail from about 2012-2013, I think, and they were talking about up to 40 per cent of the US population who were interested in eco-friendly products, and generally the things that they were describing were describing the Green value set.

Nyck: Sustainability, renewability equality.

Steve: Yes, so you've got to factor in who's actually responding to the Nielsen survey, and that's not going to be the whole of society, right? It's going to be a select set of consumers, particularly people with money, so it's probably not 40 per cent of the entire American population. It's probably much less than that because there would be a certain percentage of the population that just doesn't move in circles that respond to Nielsen surveys. So it's probably overall quite less than 40 per cent, but it's still a very significant amount. Significant enough for Nielsen to say: 'Hey, companies, take notice of this market segment. It's growing fast and it's quite large.'

Nyck: And many companies are doing just that in one way or the other, although often responding really from the multiplicity from Layer 5. This is where we see things like 'greenwash', I guess.

Steve: Yes, exactly. But that's the interesting thing about Layer 5, is it will exploit whatever it can exploit, and so it's still a quite an effective signalling system. If Layer 5 thinks that this is worth taking notice of, then it's a good sign that it's there and it's present.

It's been interesting for me since I came across Graves's work in 2003 to watch over that time how marketing signals have changed—how did the themes that are being used in ads have shifted. Many, many years ago, I started to see billboards coming out suggesting that people who were interested in eco-friendly products were worth advertising to because there was enough of them there. So it's a rapidly growing value set, globally. Very difficult to put a figure on it, but when I look at the sources that I tend to check regularly in terms of providing some useful indications of the change process, and the timeline upon which this global shift from 5 to 6 is playing out, I'm getting an indication that around about 2032 is going to be a significant tipping point, and that that may be when we see a significant collapse of the dominance of Layer 5 and the emergence of Layer 6 as a more influential point.

But I don't think it's going to be any single tipping point. It's going to be a series of tipping points which act as milestones on this progress. It's very hard for me to say exactly when 6 is going to be a dominant paradigm. In fact, I'm leaning now towards thinking that we're not going to see the kind of global stability that we've had under the Modern Scientific era during the transition period, because historically these paradigm shifts get shorter and shorter in their duration. This is for a number of reasons, one of which is that the speed of communication has a direct impact on the speed of change globally, and as our communication has got faster and faster and faster, the time it takes for things to change has got shorter and shorter and shorter. So indications are that the dominance of Layer 6, this Humanistic, Network-centric way of being human, could only be maybe two decades before we shift again into Second Tier, and then it's just a whole new ballgame after that.

Nyck: And so it's more of a transition than previous layers have been which have been fully embedded into societies and cultures throughout the planet and driven the planetary direction. But now Layer 6 may be a sort of stop along the way—a very important stop, of

course—as we flatten the hierarchies, then we come to see that network place to start to think much bigger and in a systems-oriented way.

Steve: That's right. It's got to provide enough stability for us to make this 'big leap' as it's metaphorically been called by Graves and others. So there's got to be enough stability there that we can make this big leap into Second Tier, but it will be a very fast process.

Nyck: We're talking today, I guess about collapse and renewal, which is always happening, and we're certainly seeing that at the moment—the many areas of human endeavour and society, culture, that are seeing elements of collapse or already collapsing, or already have collapsed, and the potential renewal within that. One of the results of that, of course, is what can be termed “Culture Wars”.

Steve: That's right. That term's being thrown around at the moment here in Australia, where in the state that we live in, New South Wales, there's a big crackdown by a rather authoritarian government on music festivals. The context of the crackdown is around the use of illicit drugs, but the real substance of the crackdown is a clash of values.

Nyck: Because they're not all about alcohol, are they?

Steve: No, that's right. So for the older value set, alcohol is an accepted drug, and even though it's actually statistically one of the most harmful drugs in society in terms of its harm to people who use it and the people around them, their bias is, 'this is what we've grown up with, this is our accepted drug, and your drugs are not acceptable simply because they're not acceptable. That's all'. The science tells us the exact opposite, that many of the drugs that are classed as illicit in our country and many countries around the world are actually a lot safer than, and a lot more beneficial than, the accepted drugs such as alcohol and tobacco.

Nyck: In the proper set and setting, of course.

Steve: In in a proper set and setting, and under a properly regulated system. The problem at the moment is that because they're subject to prohibition, they're manufactured by criminals, the people who use them don't necessarily know what they're getting, and there's no purity control, there's no instructions on how to use them like you would get with the pharmaceutical drugs. All of these things are very, very problematic and increase the harm unnecessarily. But when it comes down to it, the clash is essentially a values clash that, 'in our values set, in our generation, this was acceptable. This is what we use. You have to be like us', and because they haven't been able to control the supply and the use of illicit drugs,

they're now turning to the music festivals and saying, 'well, if you were to have your music festival, you've got to pay the Police hundreds of thousands of dollars so that we can send lots of Police to a music festival and try and enforce our values on you in the process.' (see <https://www.sbs.com.au/news/nsw-music-festival-cancelled-amid-war-on-festivals-say-organisers>)

Nyck: I'm trying to set up an interview with Peter Noble of the [Byron Bay] Blues Festival about this, because he's come out very strongly saying 'you move the Blues Festival elsewhere to do so.'

Steve: That's very interesting, and I've heard in the media that the government's response has been, 'oh, no, not your festival', because of course, Blues Fest caters to a different cross-section of society than the kind of music festivals that are being targeted which are much more electronic music and the younger generation, whereas Blues Fest is very broad spectrum.

Nyck: I think they've named 14 festivals in New South Wales which fit into this category of 'dangerous festivals'.

Steve: That's right, and I'm not sure that they've made much of an attempt at all to really define what their criteria are. It's really just a values judgment by the government saying, 'no, this is what we're used to, we don't want what you're used to, and you have to be like us.'

Nyck: We should mention just quickly, in terms of politics with this, the New South Wales Labor Party and the Greens are supporting this. They've announced a \$35 million budget to support Australian music and music festivals, including one million dollars for community radio which we're hoping to secure a little bit of if they get elected, so just to say that it's not part of both sides of politics in terms of major parties.

Steve: No, and that's probably smart politics on the part of the Greens. And also, you know, it's not all bad news either, because there has been word that the ACT government have now approved another pill testing trial, which is one way of getting around this whole issue and trying to make the use of prohibited drugs safer because they can't stop people using them. They can't stop the supply, they've been trying for decades and decades and decades to do that. And we've got to face facts, too, that the origin of prohibition really came, in large part at least, from the 1960s and 70s experience in the USA, where people who were using these drugs started to protest against the Vietnam War and the government didn't want people protesting against the Vietnam War.

Nyck: Richard Nixon's got a lot to answer for.

Steve: He has, and because of the other issues within American society around race issues and those sorts of things, the introduction of prohibition gave law enforcement the ability to enter into someone's premises without a warrant if there was suspicion of drugs on the premises. So that gave a lot more freedom of action to the government and their law enforcement agencies.

Steve: Culture wars! If we look at these Layers or value sets that Clare Graves has in his model, we can see that what we call 'culture wars' is really a war between the different value sets, and that also applies to the term 'generation gap' that we've often heard used over the years: 'It's the generation gap, it's the old versus the new.' But in fact, what it really comes down to is the different value sets as people are developing, growing through these layers of consciousness and different value sets emerge, whether they be biased towards individual living or communal living alternatively, as we go up.

As an example, we see this most obviously in the family dynamic, when kids are growing up and are growing into their teenage years and they move into that rebellious 'I' Egocentric value set which is 3 on Graves's model. They're protesting against their earlier Layer 2 values, and obviously there's a clash there. Then beyond that, we grow from that Egocentric into the Authoritarian we-oriented value set where we look for some set of rules to live life by and we tend to become rather fanatical about those rules. It's a rather rigid adherence to the rules, and then that rigid Authoritarian values set had clashes with the rebellious 'I' value set. Then of course, moving into Layer 5 which is the enterprising or Scientific-Industrial value set—an I-oriented set again—it clashes with the old 'we' Authoritarian values which tend to be rigid and therefore bureaucratic. The enterprising wants to be flexible and have freedom of movement in its exploitative, enterprising way of living and so they clash there, and through the Modern Scientific-Industrial era, there's been a big consistent push to try and stamp out bureaucracy: 'Get rid of these rigid rule sets. We need the freedom to do what we need to do.'

Nyck: No government. That's the extreme of the libertarian movement in the US and we see a similar sort of thing here.

Steve: Yeah, and of course, we've got a new culture war emerging now with this emerging Green or Layer 6 set of values which is very humanistic, focusing on the human experience and the values associated with that and wanting to allow that to be what it wants to be. It's very network-centric which has more freedom of movement in a network sense than the old Multiplistic Scientific-Industrial value set does, but in a very different way with different motivations. We're seeing this push for human freedom clashing with the older Scientific-Industrial values.

Nyck: We have a chart here, and talking about it now, it may be good to go through that just briefly—the relationship between Multiplistic and Relativistic. Multiplistic Layer 5 is driven by personal ambition and Relativistic Layer 6 by human connection; and where knowledge is power in the Multiplistic, knowledge is shared in the Relativistic.

Steve: Yes, big difference there, and that's one of the things that we're seeing a lot of conflict around at the moment. The restriction of power has really been beneficial for the old paradigm. In fact, if you take that restriction of power away, they lose their power, so they're massively trying to hold onto that with all of the surveillance state stuff, you know: 'if I know more about you than you think I know, then I'm going to have power over you.'

Nyck: And the same with fake news, I guess, because if you can perpetrate fake news out there, then you're not sharing the right power. No one actually knows what it is.

Steve: Exactly. It's a restriction of the truth in order to have power over.

I often compare that whole mindset to a poker game. It's a really good analogy. You can't show your cards in a hand of poker, otherwise you lose your power and the game actually collapses. And that's one of the key dynamics which is collapsing the Scientific-Industrial paradigm: the connectedness of our modern technology is basically making everything visible where it wasn't visible before and it's undermining the power of the whole paradigm.

Nyck: Some of the other points regarding the movement from the Multiplistic Layer 5 to the Relativistic Layer 6: we shift from the competitive in Layer 5 to the co-operative in Layer 6. That's pretty obvious. Layer 5 wants short term rewards—we see this, of course, everywhere in our society now—while the Relativistic wants sustainability and long-term stability which is a wonderful goal but probably unlikely to happen very shortly.

Steve: A great example of that is, if we look at our economic systems, under the old paradigm, it's: 'okay, you don't have the money? That's fine. We'll give you credit and you can have it now anyway.' And of course, we've found over time, that simply isn't sustainable. And so this is part of the push by the emerging paradigm: 'look, these things are not sustainable. We have to change things that aren't sustainable.'

Nyck: I heard a report the other day about some of these short-term lenders that charge ridiculous interest rates: 20, 25 percent a week or a month or something like that. I think they're called 'payday loans' in America where basically if you don't have enough money, they lend you 500 bucks for a week or two and you pay back 800 or something like that. But now they've jumped another level where they're actually loaning \$5,000 to people who

simply cannot, will not, and are totally incapable of actually paying that money back within a reasonable timeframe.

Steve: Yes, exactly, and this dynamic, of course, was the major cause of the Global Financial Crisis that we had not all that long ago. It's a general pattern. If you look at the way that the Modern Scientific-Industrial mind works, you get these rhythms of boom and bust in society which people have just come to accept is normal, but it's only normal within that Scientific-Industrial way of thinking.

Nyck: Well, it's a constructed way for a small percentage of people to win, essentially.

Steve: Yes, it is, and it comes down to this tendency or even compulsion to push things to their limits, to find where the limit is because you want to maximise everything. The key driver is about success—personal success—and in order to succeed, I have to push everything as far as I can, and the only way that you find out how far you can push things is to push them until they break and then back off and then start again. That's what creates this boom and bust pattern that we see in the stock markets and many other aspects of Modern Scientific-Industrial living.

Nyck: Another couple of points, here: Layer 5 climbs hierarchies; Layer 6 flattens hierarchies. Now, this is also very interesting, isn't it?

Steve: It's a big one.

Nyck: Yes, it has a lot of inferences for the future.

Steve: That's right. It's really a reaction to the impact of Layer 5 in that we've seen the centralisation of power and the construction of hierarchies within society, and the outcome of that has been this massive imbalance between the successful, which is a small percentage, and the unsuccessful in the race to succeed.

Nyck: And we are seeing, of course, that some of those hierarchies are being seen for what they are. This has, of course, given a hierarchy a bad name for fairly good reason in terms of this structure.

We're seeing the Banking Royal Commission in Australia as a good example of this. The whole Royal Commission into the institutional response to child sexual abuse is another one, where we're seeing that the Catholic Church and many other institutions looking after our

young people have been criminal in their activities from the top down. And there are many other examples. Slowly but surely these hierarchies are being revealed for what they are.

Steve: They are. One of the dangers in that shift is throwing the baby out with the bathwater, though, because what where we're looking at from the Modern Scientific-Industrial era are dominant hierarchies where there's been exploitation. That desire to exploit is a natural aspect of the Scientific-Industrial mindset, and of course, it's been damaging, and we see the damage.

But, of course, there is such a thing as a nurturing hierarchy. A good example of that is a feminine example where you've got a mother and child, which is clearly a hierarchy but it's a nurturing hierarchy. So, in the shift between 5 and 6, we need to be careful that while we rebalance things so that we don't have these imbalanced dominant hierarchies within society, we don't lose the nurturing hierarchies.

Nyck: Beautiful.

Another point is that Layer 5 does what's necessary—this is a big one, we see this everywhere—whereas Layer 6 is looking to serve the greater good. With that, 5 uses nature as a resource—we all know that pretty well—and 6, of course, is attempting, profoundly and deeply, to reconnect with nature in various ways.

Steve: That's right, and it's interesting to look at how you get these knock-on effects. As we shift from one paradigm into the next, a lot of the next paradigm is about rejection of what seemed to go wrong with the previous paradigm. So, looking back to Layer 4, the Authoritarian-Agricultural mindset, it was very rigid in its way of thinking because it had this rigid set of rules that had to be followed and the ethics were very, very clear. When that collapsed, in terms of its global dominance, what happened was that people looked at that rigidity and said, 'no, we've got to get away from that rigidity. We have to have much more freedom.' This was also connected with the shift in understanding of the fact that we can actually discover information ourselves. In the old Agricultural-Authoritarian mindset, it was very religious in its way.

Nyck: Yes, a couple of thousand years ago, someone came down from a mountain with a bunch of tablets and that's the rules. That's it.

Steve: That's right, and Graves called it "Authoritarian" because there's always a higher authority that lays down the rules. Of course, as we moved into the Modern Scientific-Industrial era, with the Scientific Revolution came this realisation that we can figure things out for ourselves. We don't actually have to rely on some higher authority to tell us what is. So with that came the desire to want to write our own ruleset and write our own values.

What that eventually became as it played out through time is: what's ethical in the Modern Scientific-Industrial mind is whatever's necessary to be successful.

Nyck: It's important to note here, too, as you're speaking, that the difference between when we use the word 'values' and the words 'ethics' or 'morals' is quite significant here; they're not the same thing.

Steve: No, they're not the same thing. 'Values', in the context of developmental psychology, means the things that we place value on, and the things that are primary drivers for our behaviour. Whereas 'ethics', generally, is a socially accepted norm.

Nyck: Constructed norm within particular societies.

Steve: Exactly, and because it is socially constructed, you tend to see those things play out more in the we-oriented paradigms: the early Tribal, or what plays out currently as 'family values' [Layer 2], or the Authoritarian-Agricultural, social, we-oriented rule set [Layer 4], and now, once again, we're emerging into another 'we' community-oriented rule set, which is the sixth layer, so again, we're seeing a return to the importance of ethics that kind of went by the wayside during the Modern Scientific-Industrial era. Just as societies were deconstructed, families were deconstructed in that individually-oriented era. The destruction of the nuclear family was famously discussed.

Nyck: Yes, well, I think the average marriage in Australia lasts seven years now and of course, when I was 30, 40 years younger, the average marriage probably lasted a quarter of a century here, if not longer. That's a huge change in a generation or two.

Steve: That's right, and in terms of social organisation, power was centralised, so a lot of the activity and the power in a city went into the Central Business District rather than being out in the suburbs. So we're seeing a reversal of that trend now with the decentralisation of power, once again, through the rebuilding of local communities. There's a strong desire to want to try and recreate this sense of a village, where you know everybody, you know the people who are selling you stuff, so they're not going to rip you off. You can trust them. You get your food grown locally, you know that it's been looked after, that it hasn't got poisons on it and that kind of thing. There's a big, strong trend there.

There's an interesting little precinct that's emerged here in Byron Bay called *Habitat*, out on the edge of the Industrial Estate there, where they've essentially created a little village that's got accommodation on site, it's got local shops, it's got a local eatery and that kind of thing. I think we're going to see more of that.

Nyck: We're talking right now about 'culture wars' and how that factors into the collapse and renewal of different Layers as we move from one to the other, particularly from 5 to 6 in Clare W. Graves's work.

Steve: Yes, I was giving some examples of how the successive value sets as we evolve or develop through these Layers, tend to reject the previous values. We have these culture clashes which are often called 'generation gap' issues. It's not always 'I versus we' or 'we versus I' in terms of the community-oriented or individually-oriented value set. Sometimes it can be 'we versus we'.

A great example of that from our times is the clash of different religions, where the set of fundamentalist beliefs are used as a justification for warfare. But often those things are appropriated by other value systems as well. So, you might get a Layer 3, I-oriented person who grabs hold of the Layer 4 excuses: 'But this is the way it should be and therefore that gives me justification to go and fight.' So it's complex, but certainly you do get the pure clashes between different religious beliefs, and they're both we-oriented value systems. Similarly, you can get clashes between 'I versus I' oriented value systems as well, so it's complex.

Nyck: Learn to love the complexity, folks.

Steve: You mentioned the simultaneous collapse and renewal and that's going to be a feature of the next few decades as we're seeing the old systems collapse at the same time as the emergence of these new, more complex values which are built around new, more complex social structures and more efficient technology that's constructed in network-centric ways. I think we had a question come in, Nyck, on the text line about the parallels with the climate issue.

Nyck: Yes, a simple question about how this change factors into the climate change issues and the climate crisis.

Steve: We're doing our best on this program to talk from a Second Tier perspective, with an understanding that everything is connected in some way. So nothing really stands in isolation; we live in a world made up of complex systems which themselves are connected in a system-to-system way, a systemic way. So the perspective that we're attempting to provide on this programme is a systemic perspective where we're looking at complex systems and we're looking at how these complex systems interact with each other and together make up a systemic reality without boundaries, really.

There are a number of things that are undergoing significant and chaotic change at the moment. One of them is that we're going through what looks like another major species

extinction on the planet. It's the sixth that we've managed to document, or at least understand from the evidence that remains. What's happened in the previous five extinctions is that there's been a renewal of life after the extinction, so there's been a major die off with the loss of some species and then consequently, there's been a rapid expansion once again of life on the planet. So this seems to be a very complex system which is playing itself out in a regular way.

Right at the moment there's a tendency, because of the prominence of Layer 6 values, to blame human activity on this particular mass extinction—and no doubt we play a part because we're a part of the complex system and we have an impact on the planet—but I think it's taking it a little bit too far to say that we've caused it because this is simply a regular process which happens on the planet. And of course, it impacts us, and it's adding to this evolutionary tension which is shifting our own consciousness just as climate change is. Once again, if we look back through history, we can see that the planet goes through regular changes of climate patterns. Often when we go through an ice age, it's effectively like changing the water in a fish tank. So you get the freezing up of a whole bunch of water, the changing of climate patterns on the planet, and then after an ice age, typically what you get is an explosion of new species—marine species—which comes out of the southern hemisphere, out of the Antarctic.

Nyck: Which is extraordinary, isn't it, that life is generated from the Antarctic originally?

Steve: It is extraordinary, and I think that's only a relatively recent scientific understanding. We made the assumption before, that because the tropics were warm and the waters were warm that they would be more abundant in terms of species, but in fact it looks like the Antarctic waters are more abundant.

Nyck: Someone said to me recently that if you live in the tropics, you're not likely to go to war. It's too easy living there. And this is a similar thing. Not much change needs to happen if you live in a very comfortable tropical environment, generally speaking. In the past, anyway.

Steve: And that's a wonderful example of life conditions which are really the driver of change for us. Our consciousness adapts to the life conditions. When we can cope and things are comfortable, we don't need to change. When things become uncomfortable and we feel like we can't cope, that's when our consciousness will shift and adapt to new levels of values. And so, on top of the species extinction and the climate change that's happening—and for those of you who haven't heard us talk before about climate change, we often talk on this show about the long-term trend towards a mini ice age which is connected with the grand solar minimum, which is a period that's commencing really around 2020 and running through about 2055, where the sun will go to an extreme low level of activity.

Nyck: There's lots of evidence. We've been through this many, many times before and it's quite clear that these rhythms do occur and have instigated climate change of ice ages before, and other climate rhythms.

Steve: That's right. And connected with that also, if we want to take a really large perspective, is NASA's Voyager 1 and Voyager 2 exploratory spacecraft which have been sent out to the boundaries of our solar system. So, you can imagine our solar system as a dynamic system that's spiralling through the galaxy and being led by the motion of our local star, our sun, with the planets spiralling around the sun as we travel quite quickly through one of the spiral arms of our galaxy. The information that we're getting back from the lead Voyager spacecraft is that the interstellar space—so that spacecraft has actually reached the bow wave of our solar system; our sun has a solar wind which comes off it, of course, and as we're punching through the galaxy, that creates like a bow wave, just like a ship moving through the water, and beyond that bow wave is interstellar space where there's interstellar weather and different movements of energy—so we are getting information showing that we seem to be around about the edge of a local cloud which we've been flying through, and we're moving into either a gap between clouds or another cloud which is in close vicinity to the solar system at the moment.

What that means is that we're going to be subject to a different quality of interstellar weather. One of the main issues around that is the impact of cosmic radiation on our solar system and our planet and there are scientific connections there to cloud formation on the planet. The more impact we have of cosmic radiation, the more cloud-seeding happens from the ionised particles that are connected with the cosmic rays, and of course, that has a cooling effect on the planet, which links back to our climate cycles and the coming mini ice age, which we believe the scientific evidence is pointing to, contrary to the common global warming discussion that is happening.

Nyck: Although, as we said, the term 'global warming', as you probably know out there, folks, if you're plugged into everything, is a term that's not being used as much. The term 'climate change' is being used, which is certainly true. There is certainly climate change, but which direction that climate change is going and where, is not a linear, all-encompassing factor on the planet.

Steve: No, if we look at all of these systems that we're talking about, they are complex adaptive systems, and complex adaptive systems don't change in linear ways. They typically take a spiralling progression, so when the complex system goes through change, it doesn't just change to being warm and then continuing to get warmer for the next umpteen years. It actually cycles through being warm and cold in terms of the climate pattern.

Nyck: And I just want to mention that there's someone I've been looking at recently, a young doctor from America called Zach Bush, M.D. This notion that we're trying to save the

planet has always troubled me a little bit, and I think a lot of people are moving away from that. Yes, there is a sixth extinction arguably in place, and certainly we are part of that. We may well be one of the species that becomes extinct if we don't get our act together here, for sure. But one of the things that Zach Bush said was that it's not about the planet. If all the people in New York City left tomorrow, within two weeks, we would see nature move back in. Within two months, two years, 20 years, we would see complete transformation and nature would regenerate and produce new species to accommodate and to adapt to the system that was new without us here (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X3aOQ0N74PI>). That's undeniably the case.

My view is the planet itself will be fine. Our position on the planet is really at play here and how we actually deal with being on this planet now moving into the future, now that we have this global perspective.

Steve: Yes, and one of the key things that came out of Clare Graves's research is that human consciousness is adaptive to the complexity of our life conditions. So what we're seeing at the moment is this synchronistic alignment of change within a whole series of systems within our life conditions, from the largest scale that we are connected with—the movement of our solar system through the galaxy changing that impact of cosmic weather on our solar system and on our planet—the consequential change in the climate system on our planet, and shifts in species and the way that species are adapting to those changes on the planet. They are all part of ongoing cycles of collapse and renewal, which are just the rhythm of life, basically.

Nyck: I also mentioned to you off air that one of the things that Zach Bush, this young doctor, was also talking about was the influence of glyphosate, which of course is known as Roundup. It's still sold in Bunnings here, I noticed. His hypothesis, very briefly, is that America has basically poisoned itself with glyphosate over the last 50 years or so. We're seeing a huge expansion of mental health issues in America and he claims that one in three babies born within the next generation will be on the autism spectrum. It's not the only factor, of course, but considering that this substance is now in the food chain everywhere, and now that China is using a huge amount of glyphosate themselves, his theory is that we're actually driving ourselves mad. It's similar to the Romans with lead in their water pipes.

Steve: Interesting parallel.

Nyck: It's an interesting parallel, indeed. And I think there's a lot of meat on that particular bone—sorry vegans. But what do you think about that in terms of how we're influencing the play? Because maybe that's a much more ... maybe we're actually poisoning ourselves. That may be the real issue here.

Steve: Yes, and I think this is all part of the evolutionary tension which is providing momentum for change. Absolutely. The realisation. And this is the way that paradigms play

out, again, in this pattern of expansion and contraction, expansion and contraction. As we move to a new way of living, it expands out of the collapse of the previous way of living, and brings us to a point of fullness, just in the same way that the seasons go through: winter, spring, summer, autumn, winter. It's the same kind of a cycle of expansion and contraction.

Nyck: Another text here, and thanks for this text. There are some interesting pieces in here. He or she says, "I believe there is an expansion of what is a narrow band of naturally occurring growth in mutual telepathic empathy. Capitalistic, arseholistic ..." and we looked that word up, it basically means 'arseholes'. "Capitalistic, arseholistic individuals lack, generally speaking, empathy as they once again, generally speaking, are me, me, me." That was in reference to the song I played before from the Beatles, *I, Me, Mine*. "Life, I believe, most probably will be segmented by multiple levels of emotional type people sharing telepathic empathy to drive these arseholistic people to a compliant level for the good of all on what is now a very unbalanced world universe."

Steve: I think that's a very interesting text. Thank you for that. There's a lot of things that we can unpack from that. One is the obvious acceptance of a new set of values that are emerging, a new way of being human which includes the expansion of our sensory perception. Although there's still not a lot of good science around this, I think if we look at the progression through these value systems, we'll find that our sensory perception, our capacity to perceive and make sense of complexity, expands as we move through them. I guess you can see that when you look at the development of a person from childhood through to an adult. When they mature, they become more aware of emotions and if they have a healthy developmental process, they become more able to manage the complexity of interactions with other people through relationships and those sorts of things. So what we're seeing at a species level is, as we move into this sixth layer, we are actually developing expanded sensory perception. Emotional intelligence, in particular, seems to be prominent in this sixth layer where we're able to receive more, and some people are reporting this essentially telepathic capacity to be able to sense what's going on for another person without having to verbalise it. I think that's really interesting. Also in the text, there was the clear rejection of the old paradigm using that amazing new word, probably out of the Urban Dictionary.

Nyck: Arseholistic!

Steve: That's it, and that is also a very prominent aspect of this paradigm shift: this strong rejection of the old way as being inadequate, no longer any good, we should chuck it out and rehash the whole way that we live. We're going to see much more of this, and it's one of the things that is going to create a lot of turbulence during this global shift from the Modern Scientific-Industrial into what's next. There will be a strong rejection of the old way and it's already playing itself out very strongly. We've seen things like the 1 percent versus the 99 per cent movement in the US.

Nyck: And recently, the Yellow Jacket movement in France, for example. There's also a bit of this sort of thing here, too.

Steve: All of that kind of stuff. And we can expect to see more of that. In fact, on some of the sources that I follow, particularly Martin Armstrong, who's an economic forecaster, are predicting a lot of social violence over the next few years.

Martin Armstrong's an interesting character. A lot of what he's publishing—his predictions—are not actually coming from him personally. They're coming from a computer algorithm which he's constructed and which has been very useful and accurate for predicting market movements over the years.

Nyck: Which he ended up in jail for some years ago because the government didn't like the fact that he could predict things so well using his algorithms.

Steve: That's right. They accused him of fraud, but he was never convicted. He was only convicted of contempt of court because he refused to hand over his software. He's noticed over the years that his computer software reports cycles that actually align with things like the solar activity cycles, which is very interesting, so that's some verification of the usefulness of his work. But what he's suggesting is that confidence in government took a downturn, according to his computer program, in late 2017. And that's certainly been evident. We look around the world and everybody's having less confidence in the capacity of our political leaders and our government.

Nyck: It's been building for a while, that one, but I think clearly in the last couple of years, really, there was a milestone. Something's actually happened to many people. They've gone: 'I don't trust these institutions anymore.'

Steve: No, that's right, and with the federal elections coming up in 2020 in US and all of the issues around the 2016 elections—the manipulation of social media through Cambridge Analytica, all of that kind of stuff—is going to mean that by the time the 2020 elections come around, people are going to have even less confidence in the democratic process, and his computer program is suggesting that there'll be a surge in violence following the US elections because people won't accept the outcome regardless of what that outcome might be.

I think that that kind of dynamic is not necessarily restricted to the US. This is a general indicator of the evolutionary tension around this shift that we're going through, and we're likely to see things get worse in that respect before they start to get better again. I do think we're very lucky here in Australia that we have a relatively stable society here and probably won't feel the pain as much as other countries.

Nyck: We'll take a little break here. When we come back, we have another couple of texts, and we can talk perhaps about some of the key relativistic themes that are emerging in this next paradigm.

Nyck: Another text; an interesting one: "I would say that extra-sensory perception," says the writer, "is intrinsic to Level 2 ...", I guess we mean Tier 2, "... so it's not a new thing."

Steve: I think that might mean Level 2, which is the Traditional-Tribal layer.

Nyck: "Cycling around in a more complex form," she said.

Steve: Yeah, absolutely true. As we move through these alternating value sets, which are individualistic and alternatively communal, during the individual-oriented value sets—and the Modern Scientific-Industrial has been one of those—our focus is on the world outside of us and we want to change the world to fit with what we need. So, it tends to be more materialistic and externally focused, whereas in the communal we-oriented value sets—and they have been the Traditional Tribal [Layer 2], the Agricultural-Authoritarian [Layer 4], and now the emerging sixth Layer: Humanitarian Network-centric—the focus is internal. So we look to the inside of ourselves and ask ourselves 'how should I adapt to the world?' Rather than 'how should I change the world to fit me?', which is the opposite, right? So, in this internal searching, we become more aware of our internal capacities, so I would say that the awareness of and reliance on that kind of non-verbal communication certainly is more prominent during the we-oriented systems which we're moving back into at the moment. So I think there's definitely truth in that, and the listener has also said quite rightly that these are gradually growing in their complexity and capacity as we go up the scale, so what's emerging now will be more complex and more complete than the earliest stage; the earlier layer.

Nyck: I'm thinking as you're speaking, particularly about the differences between Layers 4 and 6, which is the emerging Green layer, about this turning inward. In Layer 4, the Authoritarian layer, we turn inwards, but in some sense it's more about reference to the rules and ethics of the values of the Godhead, for example. There we're looking at how can I become more like, you know, Jesus, for example.

Steve: Yeah, that's right: 'How can I change myself to fit with this rule set?'

Nyck: Whereas in 6, I think we're seeing a lot of quite deep psychological work that people are venturing into themselves, one way or the other, and often, you know, it may be a bit of a delusion—it's a tricky space to enter, of course; you need guidance, you need 'set and setting' again—but it is that self-exploration of 'how can I actually change myself to fit into this global perspective now; into the planetary tribe?'

Steve: Yes, that's right, and there's a lot more freedom now than there was in the fourth layer. The fourth was very rigid and it was tied to a particular authoritarian way, and we had the freedom given to us by this Modern Scientific-Industrial. We busted out of that. We freed ourselves from the bonds of that rigid religious kind of thinking, and now, because these systems are all layered on top of each other, we're layering another we-oriented system on top of the freedom that we got out of the Modern Scientific-Industrial revolution, right? So we're doing the same again, but we're doing it in a much more complex and a much more free way where, for example, we're free to investigate multiple different spiritual paths and even to start to think about: 'how are these connected? Let's have a look at Buddhism and Christianity and something else—Taoism, Islam or something—and just find what is common across these different belief systems and then weave our own understanding based on that.'

Nyck: And of course, people like Osho—Bhagwan Shri Rajneesh—was very good at integrating Western psychology and Eastern mysticism, for example.

Steve: That's right. I've read a couple of Osho's books and I've seen very, very clearly, Second Tier conscious capacity within his writings there, and his capacity to integrate these things, bringing together things which are traditionally quite separate and very hard to integrate socially. He brought them together and wove them together and managed risk around that.

Nyck: Yes and interesting too, because he created formal structures—communities, practices—which I guess are very much Layer 6, Green, to help facilitate these emergent capacities in people.

Steve: He did do that. What he'd created was a very integrated and complex system, and when he got sick and was no longer actively involved, it fell apart because there was no-one with that advanced capacity to manage it.

Nyck: I'm sure there are plenty of Sannyasins out there that would disagree that it fell apart, but that aside ...

Steve: Well, yes, I don't mean it fell apart completely. Obviously, it didn't disappear, but there was a great amount of chaos which emerged out of his absence.

Nyck: We're nearly at the end of the show, and we really want to touch on some of the relativistic themes of this emerging Layer 6, the Green layer.

Steve: Yes, some of the things that are in play during this big shift that we're going through which includes, first of all, the challenge of an increasing diversity of values on the planet. Each time a new paradigm emerges, it adds one more set of values that we have to try and manage, because the more people we've got on the planet who are living from different value sets, the more complexity it creates in trying to, for example, please a community, and those sorts of things. So, we're adding a sixth now on top of the previous five, and that in itself is creating more challenges for us. Eventually, it's kind of like 'the last straw' that's going to create so much evolutionary tension, it's going to tip us into Second Tier. It has to play out over the next couple of decades, but this sixth layer is going to be the last straw—it's like the cherry on top of the cake that makes it all collapse—and something new and vastly more capable is going to emerge. So that's interesting.

On top of that, we've got disruptive technologies. So, ticking away in the background, we've got this smaller percentage of Second Tier consciousness which is already existing on the planet and is starting to produce some exponential technologies which increase our capacity to do things exponentially. Those things are real wild cards and there's a bunch of them, there's just not one or two.

Nyck: Yes, we've talked about blockchain, for example, and the Internet of Things.

Steve: Yes, the Internet of Things, robotics, potential free energy devices—massively disruptive—autonomous machines such as vehicles and aircraft and even weapons, 3D-printing ...

Nyck: Yes, it's not all good folks, of course. We're in early stages of this evolutionary development.

Steve: That's right. The perceived good and bad comes from our own value sets and also our own capacity as humans to manage how we use the technology.

... 3D-printing, which is going to massively disrupt manufacturing industries and also shipping and transport industries, quantum computing—God, who knows where that's going to take us?—revolutions in biotech like CRISPR technology and all that kind of stuff, and the continued development of artificial intelligence and enhanced intelligence, like augmented intelligence.

Nyck: And I can almost hear many of you out there going, 'oh no, oh no, not that, not that.' And fair enough, because these technologies are truly disruptive and a level that we've never seen before on this planet.

Steve: They are. So some of the things that the sixth layer is going to bring include a way of reorganising our social structures, which is going to be able to cope with greater complexity, and that is, of course, the network-centric way where we build a trusted social network around ourselves, immerse us in that, and then we use the enhanced intelligence of the network—so we're moving beyond just our individual intelligence and tapping into the intelligence of the network around us and all of the trusted people—to help us solve more complex problems. That is going to bring relief to many of the issues that have been created out of the Modern Scientific-Industrial way of living.

Interestingly, we're also going to see, if we look at the nature of Layer 6, it is somewhat paradoxical in that it is very open-hearted and accepting and permissive in the way that it likes to organise itself, but it also has boundaries. It's not a completely open kind of way of living, although it will tell you that it is. But it has boundaries around itself and it wants to primarily hang out with like-minded people, which is a natural human thing.

Nyck: As you're saying that, I'm thinking also that it has, so to speak, boundary issues. The issues about boundary and consent are very big at this time in many different fields of endeavour and human experience.

Steve: Yes, that's true. That's another emerging trend. So what I'm predicting that we are going to see—and this is also tied in with the diversity of values of having six different value sets operating on scale on the planet—is the growth of like-minded communities where people with a particular value set will gather together and essentially attempt to create a utopian type of community. We're going to see more of that.

Nyck: This is not what you're talking about, but it's another expression of it: a report on the ABC and other places about doomsday preppers heading underground as bunker economy enters mainstream society (<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-02-21/doomsday-preppers-head-underground-bunker-economy-mainstream/10815984>). There are a lot of people, particularly in the US, libertarian-focused people who are putting themselves underground, so that's an interesting tribal collection, isn't it?

Steve: It is interesting. And that's an example of the regression. So it's looking after yourself, right? That's an I-oriented thing. It's about looking backwards: 'How can I find a set of values that's going to help me cope with this increasing complexity because the current values

aren't working. I'm actually so scared, I'm going to have to just look after myself and build a bunker and go hide in that until something changes.'

Nyck: One of the guys in this story says something that to me is a very telling thing: 'I'm doing this because I don't know what's true anymore', and that's not an uncommon theme, I think, for many people on the planet right now.

Steve: No, you're right. This is another symptom of the collapse of a value set. So when, as individuals, we go through this change, what happens is we find that the values we've been living life by—which were like our anchor points, right?—they don't bloody-well work anymore. 'Things aren't working, I'm not coping, and therefore, these things that I've relied on as my anchor points—the things that I value—actually, I have to cut loose from those', and that's a very, very scary thing to do; and inevitably you start to cut loose from them before you really find out where your next anchor points are. So it's kind of like climbing up a mountain. You put those little things into the rocks and anchor yourself down but you get to the point where you can't actually go anywhere without getting rid of all your anchor points and climbing without being anchored for a while.

That's typically the experience as we go through the change process during a transformational shift of values. We find ourselves in the middle of the change process, cut loose with nothing to guide ourselves by, and it's during that time where altered state experiences in their capacity for insights become very important to support our movement through the change process so that we can start to get a glimpse of what's next, where we should be headed, how we should start moving forward in order to find and grab hold of what those next values are going to be.

A couple of other things we can expect to see growing during this transition time are the use of trusted social networks—very, very important—and you can see at the moment the pushback against networks that can't be trusted, like Facebook, for example. Sure, it's a social network, but can it be trusted? No.

Nyck: Front page of the *Sydney Morning Herald* this morning, in fact, a story about Facebook's slow demise. It's good for finding people, though, in hindsight.

Steve: I know, and this is the tricky thing. It has its uses, but primarily what's driving Facebook—the deep values behind the system—are driven by push marketing, which is a Scientific-Industrial value set, and people are rejecting that because it's not honest.

Nyck: It's not trusted.

Steve: It can't be trusted, exactly, and so Facebook's on a very dangerous trajectory of eventual collapse at the moment for that reason because it's working in conflict with the emerging values.

Decentralisation is another big theme, the decentralisation of power. The re-localisation of social structures, rebuilding local villages. We've been there before, we've done it in other times, and we're revisiting that again but in more complex and capable ways.

Nyck: And as global citizens we are having a global perspective of doing that; why we're doing that.

Steve: Exactly, yes, which is amazing.

Sustainable ways of living is obviously a very clear trend. Things that are planet friendly that are not just not exploiting the earth but that are they actually regenerative and restorative to the ecosystems that have obviously been damaged from the past era.

Yes, so I think that's not a bad summary.

Nyck: It's pretty good summary.

We do have a slightly left-of-field comment here. It's a tricky topic, and we don't really have time to explore it and explode it in a big way, and you may not like the answer to this either. Someone has written and said: "Please comment on 5G electromagnetic radiation."

Steve: Yes, well, what can we say? I don't think we're going to understand the implications of it until it starts to get rolled out on scale. I mean, I know many people who have concerns about it, about some apparent issues that are arising on a small scale where it's being trialled.

Nyck: Certainly with wildlife and other species on the planet, there seems to be very clear research. I've had it on my other show—on *North Coast Positive*—some guys from up in Wilsons Creek who are objecting to a 5G tower up there. They're very smart. Steve from up there sat here with a raft of surveys and research papers regarding the impact of 5G on wildlife, for example, so I think there are some clear problems there.

Steve: I think it's smart to be concerned about and I think it should be monitored very, very closely. One of the major reasons for concern is that the rollout of 5G is driven by the old paradigm. So it's driven by that pushy, exploitative mindset, which is really running to an extreme at the moment. I've said before on the programme that you could liken the Scientific-Industrial way of living to the way that a combustion engine operates. As an engine gets older, the moving parts in the engine, like the pistons, they start to wear down from

friction. As they wear down, initially the engine will operate more efficiently because the friction in the engine is being reduced so the engine will actually produce more power than it normally would as it gets older, to a point where the friction starts to break down the seal and the engine loses compression, and then the engine will die very quickly.

We should expect the Scientific-Industrial paradigm to operate the same way. So we're going to see it accelerate and accelerate and accelerate right to the point where it loses compression and collapses. I think that collapse, when it comes, will be a fairly quick process, and these technologies that are being rolled out like 5G, they're part of that process. So we can expect them to get pushed on quickly. We probably won't feel like we've had enough time to understand the dangers until they're already here, and this is all adding to the evolutionary tension, which is going to make humanity stand up and say, 'no, things have to be different.'

Nyck: Excellent. That's it for the show. Thanks, Steve.

Steve: Wonderful. Thanks for that.

Nyck: Be back next week. See you then.

You've been listening to Future Sense, a podcast edited from the radio show of the same name, broadcast on BayFM in Byron Bay, Australia, at www.bayfm.org. Future Sense is available on iTunes and SoundCloud.

The future is here now, it's just not evenly distributed.

