



30. Coded for Collapse

Recorded on 3rd June, 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? Political 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: Good morning to you. You are now tuned to *Future Sense*, here on BayFM 999, and good morning to my co-host, Steve McDonald.

Steve: Good morning, Nyck.

Nyck: Lovely to see you here again, as always. What are we doing today?

Steve: Well, we're talking about change again. I thought today we'd have a look at the collapse of Modern thinking.

Nyck: Oh, I can't think about that.

Steve: It's easy to be overwhelmed, isn't it, by all the challenges we seem to be facing; the scale of those things? If we can understand the drivers of this collapse process, then they point to the solutions for some of the biggest problems that we can perceive at the moment.

Nyck: Right. The collapse of Modern thinking. Quickly, before we play a track and start contemplating that folks, of course, you can be part of the conversation at any time by texting us on 0437 341119.

I used to remember all numbers. I could remember hundreds of phone numbers and all sorts of other numbers like that, but not so much anymore—the collapse of Modern thinking.

Steve: There's only ten of them really, like 1 through 9.

Nyck: Bugger. Alright then.

We're also going to be touching a little bit into 5G. 5G clearly is a big and contentious issue around this area, and in fact, around the world. There are many countries that are looking at it very carefully; there are some countries that have said no for now, other countries that have adopted it, there is much research ... or is there? How much can we identify the truth in what is claimed? We're going to try and sort through some of that and some of the larger perspectives in the *Future Sense* way with regard to 5G today.

Steve: Yes, we'll do that in the second half of the show. It's a great example of how the Modern paradigm is collapsing, and in the process of that collapse is creating problems for itself.

Nyck: Fantastic. Well, not so fantastic. Well it is, it's necessary, change. Change is coming, change is what it's all about. As people used to say years ago, change is the only constant in the universe.

Nyck: You are on *Future Sense* here with myself, Nyck Jeanes, and Steve McDonald, and we're going to start, in the first half of the show, talking about the collapse of Modern thinking. That big phrase encompasses a lot.

Steve: It does, absolutely. In case our listeners haven't been watching the news, our Modern way of living has begun to collapse. The Scientific-Industrial paradigm, which has been dominant for the last odd 300 years or so—and they have been odd—is starting to fall apart, and the reason is that it's not coping with the complexity. The world is becoming a more complex place and the paradigm itself has driven that increase of complexity by creating all of this technology which has connected us all together. News travels much faster, which means that change happens much faster. There are so many connected factors that we are basically starting to lose track and we're losing the capacity to take note of and process all of the details, and so all the systems that we built before the internet existed are straining at the seams, and that's pretty damn obvious. You only have to look at things like our political system, our

economic systems, our medical systems, just about any social system—you name it, actually—and you can see that they're straining at the seams in some way.

The good news is that the tension that we're beginning to feel, and in some places around the world, that tension is starting to bubble over into civil unrest—France, I guess, has been a canary in the coal mine most recently.

Nyck: As it often is. That was the case in the late 60s, of course, also.

Steve: Yes, and even back—when was the French Revolution?

Nyck: Late 18th century.

Steve: Yes, that was back in the early emergence of the current predominant paradigm, perhaps the time where we had an overlap between the previous Agricultural paradigm and the emerging Modern paradigm.

Nyck: That was the time of the American Revolution, too.

Steve: Absolutely, and that's a really good example, because when you look at the two sides in the American Civil War, they were really representing the old paradigm and the new paradigm—the old paradigm in the South, with slavery and that kind of stuff, and the new paradigm in the north, bringing a different kind of slavery, which is paid slavery.

Nyck: Yes, that's right, and of course it's contested space, because nothing's black or white, nothing is clear, because a lot of those northerners at that time—I can't remember the names; I think Lincoln and the others—they were all slave owners anyway, so it's not an either/or situation. It's a transition that occurs to a better values system that takes some time to embed itself, to become the dominant system within a cultural society.

Steve: Yes, so just as back then we saw the Agricultural paradigm being overtaken, superseded by this Modern Scientific-Industrial way of being human, at this moment in history, we are seeing the Modern Scientific-Industrial beginning to be superseded by something new, and that something new is yet to really have a decent name coined to describe it. Some people are calling it Postmodern, simply because it follows the Modern and some people would argue that the Postmodern has been and gone, but

essentially what we're seeing is the emergence of a new, more complex way of being human that's very humanistic in its outlook. In fact, a lot of people are calling it the Anthropocentric era because we're interpreting everything that's happening through human experience and human values, and it's very much also riding on the back of the technology that's been produced by the Modern paradigm. It's very network-centric and very connected in that sense.

Nyck: Indeed. Modern thinking—perhaps we should tease out exactly what you mean and what we mean by Modern thinking. You've alluded to it there, but certainly the Industrial Revolution, if not a bit before, and that transition era, it's created a different kind of thinking, which you could say is scientism.

Steve: I would say scientific. Scientism is a more recent development on that, I think, which is part of the regression of values.

Nyck: Part of the collapse, in fact.

Steve: Yes, it's part of the collapse process. What we're really talking about here, and what I'm referencing, are deep drivers which sit in our subconscious.

It's useful to think about these paradigms using a computer analogy, because if you sit back and look at the larger picture, it's like humans are coded to behave in certain ways in each paradigm—it's like it's written into to our code—and if we use a computer analogy, we could say that each paradigm is like an operating system. We develop and load up a new operating system which gives rise to a paradigm and it's that deep operating system which is really not visible. It's something that we can't necessarily be conscious of, but it bubbles up and then drives our thinking and our behaviour and our values, our motivations, our compulsions as well. We've called this the collapse of Modern thinking, but in reality, it's actually a transition from this deep code which was driving our Modern way of being human to what's next.

Nyck: A new operating system, literally; a new code.

Steve: Absolutely, it's being loaded at the moment. If human existence was a computer, we'd have that little thing, the spinning beachball, or on the Windows system, the little loading thing—in progress right now—because the old system hasn't been entirely deleted yet. In fact, the old systems never get deleted in human operating systems. They stay there and the new code is nested over the outside of them. What it creates is a very flexible, dynamic arrangement where, depending on what our life conditions

demand of us, we can swap backwards and forwards between the current or the previous paradigms; the previous operating systems.

Nyck: Which is a great ability, to be able to do that. That's a useful ability.

Steve: It is very useful.

Nyck: I'm also thinking, as we are moving beyond the Modern thinking paradigm, what we're seeing, I think, is paradoxically an expression of part of that thinking, which is sort of impatience and results-driven, like "Now! Let's get some results now." We're not thinking about seven generations ahead, or perhaps even the next electoral cycle, which is pretty minimal, but we're seeing a response to the issues, from what I can see, in terms of this collapse of Modern thinking, where people are very impatient to see this collapse. In some ways that it's a bit of a sort of even adolescent response to many of the issues, which can often be ill-informed or not informed enough, desperately trying to break down the old system, against the old system. But it's very early days, so mistakes are made and things tumble forward in a way, without being concisely driven, I feel.

Steve: Yes, and change between paradigms is pretty much always like that. Obviously it's shaped by the current life conditions and our current technology and our ways of living, but essentially it's a subconscious process. At this stage in human development, in the evolution of humanity, we're just getting to the point where we can become more aware of these dynamics, and particularly from a Second Tier consciousness perspective, we can start to look at what's actually driving our behaviour from a sort of a witnessing perspective. But for most people, they're still caught up in the process and so they're not able to sit back and look at what's going on. They're just buffeted by the turbulence of the actual change itself.

Another interesting thing to keep in mind, too, is that in the first six paradigms of human consciousness—I'll run through them, from Hunter-Gatherer, through the Traditional-Tribal way of living, and then through our Martial phase where we live according to power and conquering territory and those sorts of things, and then through the Agricultural phase, and then the Modern Scientific-Industrial, which is the fifth—through each one of those, we really are just going with the natural flow of life and we're not necessarily conscious of the fact that we're participating in a particular dynamic that's unfolding. It's only really now, as a small percentage of humanity gets into the Second Tier, that we can start to see the underlying drivers and we can see why behaviour happens in a certain way during periods of change; why these things roll out as paradigms collapse and new paradigms emerge. There's an overlap of the old and the new and it can be a very chaotic time.

Nyck: And it's important, as you're listening to that folks, how you relate to that, because for me it's been a really good understanding of signposts—a grokking, if you will—to know that this is where we are at. We're in a transition and it is confusing, it is overwhelming, or it can be. There's a lot of information out there that you have to tease through to find what's relevant and true for you, for us as an individual and as a society at large, but to be a bit kinder to oneself about the process that we're in here, because it isn't an easy time and it's not going to get easier.

Steve: No, it's always good to cut yourself a bit of slack when you go through change, really not to be too hard on yourself.

One of the interesting dynamics that we get when we go through these paradigm shifts is that in the first six layers, within the First Tier of human consciousness, there is an alternation between left-brain and right-brain dominance in each paradigm. The first iteration of being human, the Hunter-Gatherer layer, was a left-brain-dominated—you might call it a me-oriented paradigm—and then the next one, which was Traditional Tribalism, was a right-brain-dominated, a we-oriented paradigm. It's like this pendulum swings backwards and forwards as we go through the paradigms, with a bias to left-brain or right-brain, which means a bias to individuality or community. How that shows up is that in the individual systems we want to change the outside world to suit us, and in the communal systems we want to change ourselves to fit with what we see is demanded of us by the world.

We're moving from an individual paradigm in this Scientific-Industrial, the Modern, to a communal paradigm—this emerging paradigm now—and that brings a shift from wanting to dominate and change the outside world that we saw in the Modern Scientific-Industrial era, to a realisation that we need to change ourselves in this emerging era. I think that's pretty clear and pretty strong for a lot of people at the moment.

Nyck: Yes. It's interesting, I've just been reminded of something that was posted by our good friend, Julia, this morning. A simple little statement that comes from a website called *Empaths, Old Souls and Introverts*—we might talk about empaths in this discussion somewhere, because it seems to be part of the new emerging modes of thinking.

Steve: It definitely it is, yes.

Nyck: It's a very simple phrase that I really like: "You know you have mastered a social lesson when the circumstance has not changed but the way you respond has. This is true energy self mastery", and I think that's the process that many people in this transition are going through right now.

Steve: Yes, absolutely.

Just to go back quickly to this big picture viewpoint, what we see in the individual me-oriented paradigms, and what we just saw in the Modern Scientific-Industrial era, is the human desire to grow externally, so to literally grow civilisations, literally grow businesses—this has been a big driver—to invent new things, to explore spatially and spread ourselves out around the planet, and to change the outside world to shape it and use it to fit with us. Then, as we move into the communal paradigm, we see that shifting to the need to create stability. The communal paradigms are where take what we've done in the previous paradigm, we need to solve problems that have been created by the previous paradigm in order to create stability and make our way of living sustainable, and to relearn and practise once again what it is to live in community, and that's a very, very strong theme that's happening in the change at the moment. Also, we're drawn to explore our inner space, which is nicely represented in that piece that you just read out there—our direction, where our attention is directed inwards rather than outwards to the material world.

Nyck: Yes, very good. I guess it will be really great to tease out some of the things that can be recognised in that process in your own individual thinking. I've just been forwarded something, and we might look at this. We do things pretty live here because it's part of, in a way, the new way of thinking you could say, too.

Steve: Absolutely in the moment we are.

Nyck: In the moment we are, intuitive and following what comes towards us as seems relevant and meaningful and even synchronistic at times. This is about the notion that there is a whole new language evolving within the new paradigm, a new way of expressing ourselves, even.

Steve: Absolutely, and this is what a paradigm shift is, right? We look back to the previous one where we came from the Agricultural way of living in the Middle Ages, through to the Scientific-Industrial as it emerged, and some really, really significant things changed. One of the most significant, perhaps, was this idea in the Agricultural era that Earth was at the centre of everything—an earth-centrism where everything rotated around us and we were stationary in the centre of the known universe. We're getting a similar dynamic emerging in the new paradigm now. That was a we-oriented paradigm and we've got a new we-oriented paradigm emerging now, and as you just said, it's an anthropocentric viewpoint which is a particular bias, just as the earth-centrism was a particular bias.

Nyck: And it's also globally enriched in the sense that, with the overview effect, we now have a much bigger conception of what that actually is for us, what it actually means for us to be the centre on a globe that we're all situated on, in a universe which we don't understand much of, but we understand a lot more than we did, even 20 years ago.

Steve: Yes, that's a very good point. It's very valuable just to consider all of the good things that came out of the Scientific-Industrial era. There is a very strong tendency at the moment, and it's a natural evolutionary dynamic, to want to throw it all in the trash because it all seems wrong.

Nyck: Take a breath, folks, take a breath.

Steve: But in fact, the only reason that we're arriving at this new paradigm that's emerging now is because of what happened during the Scientific-Industrial era, and in particular, our technology that we developed that allowed us to fly to the moon and get that overview effect, for example. It made us realise that, wow, we're actually just a community here on this little blue dot flying through space. There's also our internet—our connected social technology—which is allowing change to happen faster. It's also connecting us together and helping us realise what's happening on the other side of the world, it's helping us get a handle on these large problems that are emerging that are challenging us at a global level, and we wouldn't know all these things if it actually wasn't for the technology that was developed during that era.

So everything is nested inside everything else here and none of it should be thrown out. Certainly there are problems that need to be solved, but it's all part of the emerging process.

Nyck: Indeed.

Nyck: 99.9, you're tuned to *Future Sense* with myself, Nyck Jeanes, and Steve McDonald here, and we're talking today about, first up, the collapse of Modern thinking and some of the indications. What is Modern thinking exactly? And how can it be seen to be changing and transforming at this time?

Steve: What I've done Nyck, is I've made a list of what could be lines of code in the human operating system for the Modern way of being human, or Layer 5 in Graves's model. I'm just going to go through those. Each one of them describes the behaviour of us when we are living through this operating system which we call the Modern

Scientific-Industrial way. It also points to problems that have been created by each line of code, and corrective factors, so I guess its usefulness lies in understanding why things are the way they are and giving us some clues as to what needs to be corrected. In this time of mass media and social media and the difficulty of knowing what's right and what's wrong out there in the media world, it's useful to understand these key drivers because they point to what is really causing the issues that we're facing at the moment and how they might be corrected.

The first one of those lines of code is that this Modern way of being human is an 'express self' system. In other words, self is prioritised over others. This reflects this left-brain/right-brain bias that changes as we go through each paradigm, and we just happen to have finished, we're coming out the back end, of an 'express self' paradigm. What that means is that community is degraded, and if you think about the last 300 years, you can see that on every scale this has happened, really, even down to the family unit, where what we have been calling the nuclear family hasn't worked. It's been exploded by this paradigm.

Nyck: The average marriage in Australia, I think, is seven years now. The average relationship is probably less than that. It's a big change from a generation or two generations ago, for sure.

Steve: That's right, and the process of centralisation of power, which is a very individualistically-minded thing, has also degraded community at every level because what used to happen in local communities now happens a long way away and then comes to us on a boat or a ship or a plane in terms of business and manufacturing and those sorts of things.

That points to the corrective factor there as the pendulum swings back the other way, which is about sacrificing self to some extent and putting community over self and rebuilding community at all levels. That doesn't mean rebuilding it the way that it used to be back in the Middle Ages, although the first tendency when we go through these sorts of changes is to think back to those old times, make a regressive values search and remind ourselves 'how did we live in community the last time this happened?' It's useful to do that, but we also need to understand that we're not actually recreating the Middle Ages, although you would be forgiven for thinking that that's actually happening at the moment because of the regressive values search that's underway, but it's a matter of referencing those old times and then, with the benefit of all of our modern knowledge and technology, figuring out 'how do we do this differently this time around?' How do we do it in a way that's in line with the current world?

Nyck: I woke up in the middle of last night at some point, thinking about music with regard to the layers or the windows of Graves's work, and I'm thinking as you speak—I

won't go into a whole rave about because it was a middle of the night kind of small revelation or something—but as you're saying, with this regressive, going back to resonances of previous iterations of ourselves, the emergence into 'Green' Layer 6 of Graves's work involves that tendency to move back or fall back to Layers 2 or 4, which is almost like a harmony in music, I guess.

Steve: It is, absolutely.

Nyck: And that's where you can sort of make sense of it in a way: 'Oh, yeah, I'm just sort of harmonising with the music of that theme in human experience that has some value, but I can't just go back to that song. I actually have to take that, perhaps that harmonic note, and bring that into the song of the now', so to speak.

Steve: It'll be something new. The reason that we can't simply go back and recreate it is that those things won't work now because the world is a more complex place, and what we designed in the last communal paradigm fitted the life conditions back then, which were relatively simple. Now, the complexities would overwhelm, and will overwhelm, those old systems.

The next line of code is that we seek to change the outside world in this Modern paradigm to suit us. The obvious thing that happens then is that we neglect our inner world. The shift that's going on at the moment is turning us around to take notice of our inner world again and often go through a big healing process.

Nyck: And, of course, you can see that this has shown up in so many different ways. A couple of examples that occur to me as Steve says that, is how in this era, in our lifetimes, in this period of modernism that we've been in, our tendency is to not worry, for example, about what we put in our bodies. That's changing now. We managed, clearly, to poison ourselves with various things, known or unknown, for quite a long time.

Steve: Inadvertently.

Nyck: Inadvertently, usually, although there are people who like to poison themselves for something else.

Steve: That's true.

Nyck: But that idea that it doesn't really matter what I take in, that's okay, because it's on the shelf and no-one's going to prove that that substance over there is bad for me. This is a big change that's going on now. Thus, I guess, at the other extreme, are things like veganism, which is such a strong thing in the zeitgeist, a meme in culture now.

Steve: Yes, absolutely.

Another line of code from the Modern era: 'be driven to achieve personal success' and the most obvious measure of success during the Modern paradigm has been money, of course. The outcome of that is that a very small percentage of people have been very successful and this is where we get this idea of the 1% in the 99%--the 1% have got all the money and the 99% have got not much.

Nyck: And what you're saying, just as an aside again, is that's a kind of structural result—it's a result of the structure itself.

Steve: Yes, totally. This might be too obvious, but think of the board game *Monopoly*, right? An inevitable outcome of the board game of *Monopoly* is that somebody gets a monopoly and they win the game, and it's the same here. You follow a certain set of rules, which we're saying here is like a computer code, and you get a pretty predictable outcome.

Nyck: Although, of course, in this paradigm, you can also bend the rules if those sets of rules don't get you the desired result.

Steve: You can, that's right, that's very, very true.

Nyck: I've been watching the show *Billions* quite a lot on *Stan*. I've just watched a lot of it in the last week or so. If you haven't checked that out to folks, it's a very good example of this level of thinking, I guess, at the top end.

Steve: It is, yes, it's peak Layer 5. That driver of personal success is shifting with the paradigm change to a driver which is all around deep human connection, and that is serving to rebalance and redistribute resources also. You could say that the corrective factor around this success driver is moving from that chasing-the-money game to connecting with other people and sharing.

Nyck: I think it's become impossible not to seek that for many, many people because they simply can't play in the money game on the planet enough now. The discrepancy between the rich and poor, as you were saying, is so extreme that I guess in some ways the driver is that, 'well, I can't get the money that I once imagined that I could have, or the job, the security, the safety, so what is it that I actually want now?' and tuning in, perhaps, to a deeper sense of themselves, as we were saying—that turning inwards again.

Steve: It is, and from an economic point of view, it's interesting also to look at the cryptocurrency phenomenon, because that is massively redistributing wealth by basically standing up a new system, which is, I think, eventually going to make the old economic system obsolete.

Another line of code is instructing us in the Modern way of being human to specialise, so to go deep in a narrow field. That's been really beneficial because we've deepened our knowledge in amazing ways in terms of all of the different disciplines of life, in medical science, science or whatever. I guess the ultimate outcome of that is by going deep in a narrow field, we eventually forget the connections between the fields, so we lose sight of the whole system. This is why, with the emerging paradigm, we're moving to systems thinking; we're starting to connect the dots between everything. As I often mention on this show, a great example of this particular specialisation phenomenon is our medical industry and how doctors have specialised very, very deeply, into developing amazing knowledge about one isolated system within the human body, to the point where if you ask them about something else, they don't know; they say, 'sorry, you've got to go and see a different doctor.' So we lose sight there of the whole body as a system.

Nyck: It's fascinating, isn't it, because we've gone to such an extreme that way—that specialisation has literally created medical marvels, as you say, and the same in other disciplines too; incredible abilities and things that have come online have helped and saved and accelerated people's life conditions around the planet—but at the same time, that loss of the holistic, the loss of seeing the forest for the trees, is really endemic in society, in modern society, certainly.

Steve: Yes, and in this First Tier of human consciousness, as we're swinging through these paradigms, going left and right, left and right, me-focus/we focus, this happens every time. Every time we go in one direction, it's marvellous and it broadens our knowledge and we think we've fixed everything, and then as the pendulum swings further, we realise, no, hang on a minute, we've gone too far this way, we've got to get back the other way again, so it's a consistent dynamic. It will change, though. After this emerging paradigm is overtaken and we make this quantum leap into Second Tier, we

start to get an integration of the brain hemispheres and so we will move beyond this. It's not going to go on forever.

Nyck: And at the risk of being paradoxically ironic here, you could reduce it just to that left/right-brain equation. That we have favoured the left-brain now for quite a long time is clear, and the right-brain now has to find an ascendancy and a place of balance with the left. As you say, as we move into that Second Tier, that's part of that equation; that's how it's going in terms of the brain chemistry, very simply put.

Steve: Yes, it is, and this is a fractal design so these lines of code apply to us as individuals and we have to change these things inside ourselves, and it also applies to everything at scale—our family, our village, our larger communities, the whole world, the whole of humanity.

Another line of code: be materialistic.

Nyck: No! Don't want to!

Steve: Focus on the outside world and material things, and if you can't measure it with a ruler or some sort of an instrument, then it doesn't exist. Of course, the obvious eventual outcome of that is we realise that we've actually neglected some things which are very much a part of our reality, yet can't be measured with a ruler or a meter.

Nyck: Love, empathy, synchronicity.

Steve: Absolutely.

Nyck: Prophecy, intuition, etc, etc.

Steve: So again, an indication to a solution there is we need to rethink and start to refocus ourselves on those things that we've neglected.

Another line of code: think short-term, so a long time is three to five years, basically. We see that in the way that we've designed our modern world—for example, our time between elections and political systems, or our corporate strategic plans, which rarely go beyond those sorts of timeframes. The consequence is that in the short term, it can be quite good because people are working hard and fast to get things done, but we miss the longer-term implications of the things that we do, and for that reason, things

can creep up on us. Because we're only looking a short distance ahead, after a longer time, say 50 years or 100 years, suddenly these big problems emerge that we didn't anticipate because we weren't thinking far enough ahead.

In every communal system, the thinking is always long-term. If you consider our traditional tribal societies, goodness me, they were thinking in like thousands or tens of thousands of years in some cases.

Nyck: The old adage, of course, with American indigenous people, is seven generations ahead. Certainly if we would see seven generations ahead from here, that would be very useful but we're probably starting to have to look a lot further than that, even.

Steve: Yes, exactly, so there's another signpost for us there: think longer-term.

Another line of code: seek short-term rewards, and this is very much linked to the previous line of code also. So we're always looking for that quick fix. You can think back to the old Agricultural paradigm and see how things were still driven by that in many ways. Even in the early part of last century, people were still kind of locked into this idea of working long-term. They'd get a good job, do it for 40 years, get your gold watch.

Nyck: Protestant work ethic.

Steve: Yes, exactly, and it's also tied to religious beliefs which came out of that Agricultural era—the idea that you live a good life and you follow God's rules and then you'll be rewarded after you die. Of course, that was one of the drivers of change in the previous paradigm shift. People got tired of waiting and they really wanted it all and they wanted it now, to quote Queen.

Nyck: Oooh, yeah, I like that.

Steve: So again, there's another signpost there: we need to start thinking about giving up some of our short-term rewards for the sake of longer-term achievement.

Nyck: We're talking here about the collapse of the Modern paradigm way of thinking.

Steve: We are, and we're imagining that this way of being human that we've been living life by during the Modern Scientific-Industrial era is like a computer code. We're looking at okay, if it was a computer code, what would the lines of code be instructing us to do?

We're about halfway through the list here and the next line of code is: be highly rational. It's been a very, very rational time and I guess that has been a characteristic of the whole scientific push—let's be very, very rational about things and think about how things work and what the truth is as discoverable through science. That has been, of course, to the detriment of our other senses in some respects, like our emotions, our intuition and those sorts of things. It's fed into the materialism, which is one of the other lines of code, and it's also, I guess, given rise to what can be seen in hindsight as a shallow way of interacting with reality; it discounts certain things that aren't rational.

Nyck: For example, the value of Nature itself, and factoring that into an accounting equation for the Earth.

Steve: Yes, absolutely. The signpost there, in terms of change, is to go beyond the rational mind and to recover all of the pre-rational stuff that we used to live by—our basic urges and instincts, and to acknowledge our fears and our superstitions and those sorts of things—to reappraise those things and find, how are they useful parts of our being and how do they contribute to us being able to cope more with the complex world that we're living in? One of the things that's driving the change is that we're finding that this highly rational, materialistic way of being human really can't cope with the current complexity. It's breaking down. It's collapsing.

Nyck: Well, actually, that's a great segue. We have a great text here that's very relevant to just what you said then. He says, or she says: "These codes that you're talking about are magnetising for people, which makes the corrections required uneasy for large groups to adopt. I see many individuals embracing the paradigm shift but struggling to find a unified group yet. I think we need to start one in the Byron Shire."

Steve: Aha, there you go. Very, very true. Essentially, as we're saying, you consider this like a code that we live life by, and it's driven by our life conditions. Part of the issue that we've got at the moment is that we're living within systems, within social systems, that are designed by this way of thinking and so it's very hard for us to step outside those systems. For example, simply the fact that you've got to go to work and earn money in order to be in these systems, right?

Nyck: Apparently.

Steve: And some people have managed to step outside that system, but most haven't at this point.

Nyck: Just on the same point, too, another great text here regarding timeframes and how we don't plan for the future as we were talking about in the break then. It's a little story, very brief: "An English manor house, maybe 200 years old. All the original window frames need replacing. The joiner discovered the timber needed was very rare and hard to source until the old gardener pointed to a copse of that very timber that had been planted by the original carpenters for this very need. A true story. Cheers, Tony." Thanks, Tony. Great.

Steve: Wow. That's great. A very good example.

The next line of code is to collect all of the available data, to analyse it and use it to determine the best option or the best path or the best choice in life.

Nyck: Or the best way to manipulate that data to get the result desired.

Steve: Yes, it could be. The issue that's arising now is that, as a result of the technology which was created during the paradigm, we've now got too much data. There's so much data that you can't analyse it all anymore and so that's undercutting the whole operating system. The operating system is driven by this line of code, together with all the others, and when you're driven to analyse all the data, my God, you do a *Google* search and you could look at that one *Google* search response for the rest of your life and still not analyse all data.

Nyck: And I guess this is where AI and machine learning also comes in, which is already exactly what *Google* is, and all those platforms run by that, but I guess that's where we're going. So, are we going to allow machine learning to determine what is relevant to us, particularly? This can be very good at doing that, but it can also be manipulated and all sorts of things can happen in that space, and we're still, as I said earlier, in a very adolescent relationship to these technologies, I think.

Steve: Yes, we are, and what you said is a very good example of how we're trying to solve these problems created by the old way of thinking using the old way of thinking. Of course, it was Einstein who famously said 'you can't solve problems by the same level of thinking that created it', right? So a lot of the things that we're running off with at the moment like AI, I think you'll find that they'll be reconsidered and redesigned once the new paradigm really kicks in. At the moment, the whole idea of just creating something

that can super-analyse the data—it is useful, there's no doubt about it—but our priorities are going to change in the future once the new paradigm really picks up momentum and starts to become dominant globally.

And as I said before, the old things don't get thrown out, and it's important. The desire during the change period, which is right now, is often to throw out the baby with the bathwater—let's just get rid of all this technology—but in fact, that's not the optimum outcome. The optimum outcome is that we realise and address the issues that have been created and we find solutions to those, but we continue to use everything that's going to be useful into the future.

The next line of code: to be competitive, and in the process of being competitive, push everything to the limit until things break. It's written into the code. You look at all of the patterns that we have in our social systems—things like our economic system are a great example—it's characterised by boom and bust, and so many things are. We're pushing so many things to the limit till they break, and we back off and we start again and we do the same thing over again.

Nyck: Yes, which is also, I think, a definition of craziness, isn't it? Doing the same thing over and over again without getting a different result? But also, as you say that, I'm thinking too of health—it's either health or not. You're healthy and suddenly you're not and there's this whole suite of analytics and so forth that come into that space, but there's no sort of ...

Steve: There's no sustainability.

Nyck: There's no sustainability. There's no easy understanding of the scale, of the pendulum between health and 'not health', so to speak, and where you might be along that continuum; how we actually manage prevention rather than curing something that's got out of hand and so on and so forth. All these are examples of systems that did very well for a long time, have done very well, and yet they're now challenged to meet the needs of this era, of this time.

Steve: Yes. For the purposes of an individually-oriented era which is changing the world, these processes were very useful. There was a famous business consultant, whose name I can't remember, but one of his catch cries was "fail forward fast". You come up with a new idea, you push it out into operation as fast as you can until it fails, and then you improve it; you fix the problems and continue to push it again. That is a useful way to make rapid progress given the life conditions of that particular era.

Nyck: Well, also, I guess that happens especially in the world wars of the last century, which are very much embedded in that era of time, and how those world wars accelerated the technology in exactly that way.

Steve: Yes, that's very true.

Nyck: So we have to deal with this crisis of a world war, these forces that are coming at us, so we have to actually throw everything at it, we have to just make it happen. Mistakes will be made, but we have to do it forward and fast and do it and go for it, and obviously very successfully at that time.

Steve: That's right. The longer-term outcome, though, is instability when you've got boom and bust happening all the time, and over time that just grows and grows and grows.

Nyck: And also instability, I would suggest, by the enormous amount of money that is spent in the militaries around the world.

Steve: Yes, absolutely. I guess this little line of code is a good microcosm of the macrocosm, too, because the whole system is collapsing now. Within the system, this tendency to push things until they break, push things until they break, the whole system has done that to itself so the whole system is in the process of collapsing now.

The signpost there in terms of change is really towards sustainability and backing off on the pushing, and looking longer-term and creating sustainable systems that will work longer-term.

Nyck: I guess the question is—and this is not a topic of today's discussion but we have touched on this before—how do you seek to make change from a different paradigm rather than resisting and making 'the other', the previous generation, wrong? As much as many evil things, you could argue, have been done in the last paradigm, and many evil people, perhaps, still exist on the planet who control things—and that's probably true—but actually to come from a different place in response to change now is a bit of the trick in the game, is a bit of a paradox. How do people actually operate from this new level but actually try and make changes of the old level? It's a process.

Steve: It's the only way the change process will play out.

The next line of code is: break the rules. So in our community-oriented, we-oriented systems like the previous Agricultural and the previous Tribal-Traditional, they were the systems that constructed ethical standards and rules sets, because when you live in a community, you need those—you need agreed ethics, you need standards, you need boundaries and those sorts of things when you live in close proximity in large groups. Then, in the individual systems, we break out of those. Part of the dynamic in a communal system is, just like in the individual systems, they solve the problems that were created by the previous way of living and then over time they create new problems. In a communal we-oriented system, typically the problems are about being suffocated and contained because of the structures that get created, right? So then the natural tendency is to break out, break the rules: let's see what happens if we break these rules.

Nyck: It's very interesting. It's sort of appropriate—I've had this in front of me for a while—a piece that came across from Ron Paul in America, talking about Julian Assange. There's a quote and I can't see where he gets it from—it's not his—and I think it's really appropriate for what you're saying about breaking the rules. He says: "Truth is treason in an empire of lies." Have you ever heard that expression before?

Steve: Truth is treason ...

Nyck: Truth is treason in an empire of lies, so when you try to tell truth against what is really an empire of lies on the planet in so many ways now, basically you're treasonous. Julian Assange is now the premium example of this in the world.

Steve: What makes that true is that the nature of truth changes in each paradigm. In the Agricultural paradigm, truth was handed down by a higher authority—it wasn't something that you could find yourself—but in the Scientific-Industrial era, truth became something that you could find yourself through a process of science; experimentation.

Nyck: But now what we find out about some of the big issues in the world can be labelled treason against the project of and the breaking of the laws of those who are in control of the previous system, or the system that is still in control.

Steve: Yes, and truth is changing again with this current paradigm shift. Truth is becoming relative. So what is true for you might not be true for me.

The next line of code here is: do whatever is needed to achieve success, success being the ultimate driver. This is very connected to breaking the rules: 'whatever it takes' is the mantra—whatever it takes—and that 'whatever it takes' is a creeping thing over time, so what it took last week might be smaller, narrower, less significant than what it takes this week and so that just grows and grows and grows and grows until it gets out of control. You could arguably say it's out of control, right?

Nyck: Yes, well, I think we saw it in a smallish—not too small—way in the recent election in the last couple of weeks. Clearly there was a distortion of 'we would do whatever it takes' from certain elements in the political debate, and shifting people's views by using fear and uncertainty and lack of security.

Steve: Yes, absolutely. A lot of the problems that we're facing now have not necessarily come from any one of these lines of code; any one of these instructions on how to live in a Modern way. It's when they're all combined and they interact with each other, so when you combine this tendency to break the rules and do whatever it takes with the insensitivity or the lack of attention that gets paid to emotional responses, people's personal experiences—their inner world—then, of course, it starts to snowball into very significant problems. The outcome of this kind of behaviour—breaking the rules and doing whatever it takes to achieve that success—is that a lot of people feel like they're being tricked, they're being cheated, they're being used for other peoples' purposes, they're being alienated, conflict is being created, and again, that's an unsustainable pattern.

So the signpost there is to develop a new set of ethics for the new paradigm, because being a communally-oriented system, it's a time for structuring ethics once again.

Nyck: Mmm. It's making me think of today's news story of Peter Dutton, who has already, as Home Affairs Minister still, attacked Kristina Keneally, who's been announced by Albanese as the Shadow Minister for Home Affairs, and therefore for border security and so forth. There was an attack by him on her, on her soft approach to boat people and all of that thing, and her attempt a few years ago to get up a Royal Commission into the treatment of children in these refugee places. That's a compassionate and genuine attempt to make some sort of change there but he's used that now as a negative—that she's weak on this. It really struck me, that big difference there between some form of attempt at compassion towards children who are locked up, for God's sake, and this cold, dark, efficacious methodology of someone like Peter Dutton.

Steve: Yes, it's a classic dumbing down strategy that's used in politics where instead of actually addressing the problem itself, you point to the person and try and make the person seem untrustworthy.

Nyck: *Ad hominem* is the phrase from Latin.

Steve: Yes, exactly. It's a very, very common strategy that lets somebody off the hook from actually having to give a real answer, basically. They just try and erase the problem altogether by saying, well, the person who raised this problem can't be trusted, they haven't got the skill, or whatever.

I think we've covered the key lines of code that appear in this operating system, this Modern Scientific-Industrial operating system, and as I started to say before, in combination, they really whip up quite a soup. It's not just each individual ingredient or line of code, it's actually the overall thing that it makes, and we're living in it right now.

Nyck: But it's not a bone broth, folks. I don't think it's a particularly healthy soup.

Steve: It's not chicken soup.

Nyck: It's not chicken soup for the soul.

Steve: I'm sure we're going to a vegan soup anyway, but we end up with what we've got now—so basically, a world where the systems that were designed a long time ago, really many of them designed even before the Scientific-Industrial era in order to serve people, have been tweaked, reoriented to serve individual success. Some of the systems, which are kind of misnamed now, like our health care system (and you name it), they're actually turned into kind of like banking systems or systems that produce money for the 1%. I mean, gosh, we could talk for many episodes about the examples of that, but a simple one is, take the pharmaceutical industry, which now exists to make money. That is the driving purpose, and so the driving purpose is not actually to make you better.

Nyck: And once upon a time, to be fair—I'm giving them a bit of kudos probably—once upon a time in the establishment of the pharmaceutical industry, perhaps they really did care back then.

Steve: Yes, I think we probably need to go back before the establishment of the Scientific-Industrial era industry, because I'm pretty sure that was actually engineered from the start as a money making enterprise, but if you go back before that to what preceded the Modern big pharma companies, back to when people produced stuff to heal people, it *was* to heal people, it wasn't to make money.

Nyck: While I'm hearing and listening to and interchanging into acting, I'm feeling the response of many people out there—maybe not all of you; I'm not assuming that you feel the same way—but I think the key here is this absolute disjunct between where many of us are at, especially in a region like this, and this Modern thinking, which is not working anymore. You can feel that collapse inside yourself and it is unsafe and insecure because it means a lot of things potentially that could be destabilising, but we encourage you on this show to take it on, so to speak, in a different way and to find those who resonate with you, to find those tribes and communities and connections; those networks that actually can support you in the establishment of a different way of thinking.

Steve: Exactly. The way that new paradigms emerge, and particularly this emerging paradigm, is that they start in little bubbles. Those little bubbles grow and then the connections between the bubbles are drawn. This is a very network-centric paradigm that we're moving into so that's very much the way that the current emerging paradigm will become the dominant paradigm over time.

Nyck: Very good.

Nyck: 99.9, you're on *Future Sense* with myself, Nyck Jeanes, and Steve McDonald. We've been talking today about the collapse of Modern thinking. We are going to be talking a little bit about 5G for those of you who might be hanging on the line to hear that, because it's very much up in the consciousness around here at the moment, that's for sure. We will get to that because they're all related, of course. We just have a little bit more to complete on this.

Steve: Yes, I've got a summary of the outcomes of living according to this Modern Scientific-Industrial code. These are things that are driving the collapse as the pendulum swing reaches extreme individual expression, and thereby feeding the change: loneliness and alienation, which has come from being very individual; disconnection, pretty much of everything, really—disconnection from other people, disconnection from the natural world, disconnection from the parts of the whole system; burn out,

exhaustion, which comes from that strive-drive way of living, and both people and resources run out of steam and it's just not sustainable; data overwhelm—detailed analysis is no longer possible, therefore, we need to shift to a networked whole-systems approach; and minority success leads to majority unhappiness, basically.

Nyck: That's a good way of putting it.

Steve: All key drivers of change.

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.