



Six conditions required for transformational change

Recorded on 10th 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? 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: You may know that two days ago was the 70th anniversary of the book *1984* being released—it's rather relevant in terms of everything we're doing—and you may also know that sales of the book surged in 2013 after Edward Snowden's revelations about state-sponsored mass surveillance, and again following Donald Trump's inauguration as US president in 2017. Rather interesting! There's much to learn from that book from 70 years ago, and there are things we haven't learnt yet (see: <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-06-09/george-orwells-1984-novel-turning-70-but-feeling-more-relevant/11130212>).

Steve: Yes, and what an amazing insight to be able to put that into writing all those years ago; to see it coming. What an amazing foresight.

Nyck: Beyond prophetic in a way, and it's important to know that through arts and culture, the way we can express ourselves when it comes down to things that are close to the bone of reality, writers can predict without knowing it—can see, can know, can write about, can create art about—things that are coming. And we should pay more attention, I think, to those expositions that people bring forward.

Steve: I was reading an article about the anniversary just recently, saying that he didn't write it as a prediction. He said it wasn't predictive; just a warning about what might happen.

Nyck: His son said: "You will always have man trying to control man, and that's essentially what he was warning us about."

Steve: Yes.

We're going to talk now about six conditions required for transformational change. We're living in a time where transformational change is indicated. It's slowly becoming clearer and clearer that we cannot continue to live the way that we have lived with the values and the behaviours that have been dominant globally. Things must change and they must not change in a small way, but in a transformational way. The more we understand change itself and how the process works and the signs that we can look for to understand where we are within the process, then the better we can put that knowledge into practice and the easier it can be to navigate change. Whether we're talking about personal change or operating as a change agent and trying to support change in the wider world, the same principles and these same conditions apply.

This is from the work of Dr. Clare W Graves, and it came out of nine years of field research and an awful lot of data analysis, not simply by him, but from a team of seven other people that he had looking for patterns within the data that he collected. It's important to understand that this is a hard scientific study—as hard as psychology can get, I guess—in terms of looking at evidence and simply pointing out patterns within the evidence rather than dreaming up fantastical ideas. Graves, at one point during a public talk—I think it was when he was announcing his model, his theory that he put together—said that he didn't stand on Mount Sinai and receive this information from Jehovah. It came from hard evidence that he collected.

Nyck: For years and years and years, in fact.

Steve: Exactly.

So, the six conditions. These conditions themselves will vary depending on your starting point. Whatever your current worldview is and what you're changing from and to will make subtle differences in how these conditions apply, but they are essentially common conditions that you can find in any change process that involves human beings.

The first one is that there needs to be the potential for change. The potential must exist. In other words, is the change within reach? Is it something that's possible or are we asking somebody to change too much, too quickly?

Nyck: So it means that something has to be in the person in order to change. You can't force a person to change who just doesn't resonate with a potential.

Steve: Yes. To give an extreme example, let's take the example of a small child, say, a child who's just 18 months old, and we want to make them do something which is just beyond the reach of a small child, for example, operate a complex piece of machinery. The potential isn't there within that person to do that. That's an extreme example but I think that helps people understand the general idea. The potential has to be there. It has to be possible. Otherwise, of course, you're asking people to do the impossible. So the potential has to be present, first and foremost.

As we go through these conditions, you can think of them in relation to yourself and any change process that you might be going through at the moment, but also think about the wider world. Think about the biggest issues that we're facing as a species, things like climate change, the transformation of the way that we govern ourselves, the transformation of our social systems like our economic systems and those sorts of things. Is the potential there to change? That also speaks to whether the change is possible in the short-term or whether it needs to be a much, much a longer-term process with waypoints in between. Rather than just changing from this to that, does it need to be a process that drags out over a decade or two in order to make it possible?

So, is the potential there?

The second condition is that the basic problems of life must be solved. So when we have to go through a change process, we need excess capacity and energy available for the change process itself, including, most importantly, time to stop and think about the change. It reminds me of the old saying: 'you can't drain the swamp when you've got alligators snapping at your heels.' That's the polite version.

Nyck: It's important to recognise, too, that we actually have solved a lot of problems in this era that were created by the previous era. Many, many people have been brought out of poverty around the world, for example, and there are many more examples. Our technology itself has solved a lot of problems, has created a lot of freedom or possibilities for many people—people who didn't have access to the system as a whole. So, solutions have been provided for many problems, but now we've created a whole raft of new ones which can't be solved in the same way.

Steve: We have, and we need to have our basic needs met to have the energy to go through a change process. So whether we're thinking about ourselves or whether we're thinking about acting as a change agent within society, we need to look at the life conditions and make an assessment: 'Okay, do we have the basic things under control here?' If I'm worrying 90% of the time about where my next dollar is going to come from or whether I can afford to put food on the table, I'm not going to be thinking about wider issues. I'm not going to be thinking about the problems faced by my local community or the world as a whole, because right now most of my attention is going into putting bread on the table so I can eat. As a change agent, when we're looking to change, we need to pay attention to people's life conditions. There's no point in urging somebody who's in that circumstance that I just described to start thinking about recycling their trash and those sorts of things, because they

just haven't got the capacity there to actually think about those things. There are much more urgent issues that need tending to.

Nyck: We saw this in the recent federal election. In the inner cities of most cities, people tended to vote along the lines of Labor or Green, particularly with regards to climate instability—climate change being a major factor there—because in some ways, those elites, if you will, or if not elites, certainly people who are in the cities who probably have a pretty good life—solid job and perhaps a little bit more security and safety in some ways—are able to think about these things; able to vote that way. Whereas in Queensland and other places—in the rural places—it's all about simply survival now. It's about jobs, and they don't really have time to think in the same way as you're saying about the bigger issues of the planet. It's not relevant to them in their life conditions in this moment.

Steve: No, and for those people who are comfortable enough to have all of their basic needs met, and they have the headspace to be thinking about these larger problems and how we tackle them, it highlights the importance of bringing everybody with us during the change process. There's no point in a small percentage of people leaving the rest of humanity behind because it's not going to solve the problems on a large scale. Certainly, it does speak to the fact that those people who do have their basic problems under control are in a much better place to understand and tackle these larger issues and then develop strategies, but those strategies have to consider all life conditions for all people and how we build a whole systems-change strategy here which is going to take care of that and allow people to be gradually lifted up out of those more difficult conditions into a more comfortable space.

Nyck: Take a breath, folks. That's a big point. That's a very big point. If you've got small children out there, you probably think we need change now because my kids, in 10 or even 20 years are going to be facing some really big things. And you're right. But at the same time, we need a much more considered response as best we can within how we're situated.

Steve: And that's going to come from understanding the change process and educating people about the change process.

The third condition is one that we've been talking about in the first half of this show, which is that there must be a feeling of dissonance. There must be a feeling for an individual that 'something's not right in my world.' Ideally, when we have that feeling that something's not right, if we understand the change process, we can immediately link it to the need for change.

When we go through the trajectory of change, it takes us from a point of stability through that dissonance and often down into a place of chaos where we are being tumbled by the change process—tossed around and experiencing chaos; things are falling apart. That is the trajectory of revolutionary change, where basically, reality gives us a kick up the backside and says, 'hey, you didn't take notice of the early signs, so here's a kick up the backside to

actually make it happen.' We can avoid the chaos if we're conscious enough of the change process and we know that as soon as we feel that dissonance, as soon as we feel that something's not right, then we pay attention. We know that something has to change and we look for what that is. We look for potential changes within our field.

That's a very important difference between conscious and unconscious change. If we're unconscious of the change process, we wake up one morning, something doesn't feel right, and so we start to think back to the way things used to be when we did feel right and we go down that regressive value search trying to find an answer. Then that creates the tension. It drags us into the chaos and we go through the very, very difficult change process. But if we know straight away, 'okay, this feeling of dissonance is actually a sign for me that something's not right. I've fallen out of tune with the environment, with my life condition somehow and I need to retune', and often that can simply come from stopping and being still and literally re-tuning at an energetic level to gain an insight as to how things can change.

So this is what you call a bifurcation point, this feeling of dissonance. It can go one of two ways.

Nyck: Bifurcation, folks. That means forking. Forking, with an 'o'.

Steve: Exactly. You can go from the dissonance down into the chaos or you can go along the evolutionary change path where you take notice of the dissonance, you know that it means something needs to change, and so you pay attention and be conscious of participating in that change process and tuning into whatever needs to change.

Nyck: And that's been very much a project, I guess you could say, on the positive side of the New Age and self-development work, that many people in this era—especially since the 60s or so, in the first iteration of this new moment that we're entering now—started to look at themselves and started to find ways to work on that dissonance within themselves. 'How can I change myself inside in order to make a better world?'

Steve: Exactly.

The fourth condition for successful transformational change is gaining insights into what's next for you or what's next for the social group that you might be working within as a change agent. In a transformational sense, what this really means is movement of your consciousness into a more complex layer on the aspect of human consciousness. That's very difficult initially when you're starting the change process, because by definition you can't see that; you don't have access to it. It's something that you have to literally change into in the same way that a caterpillar changes into a butterfly. And I'm sure the caterpillar doesn't see the butterfly coming when that process begins.

Nyck: Nor does the frog in the boiling water.

Steve: No, that's right. The frog in the boiling water is a very interesting case because that little parable or story has evolved to show people how sometimes change can happen in the most subtle ways and sometimes you don't experience that dissonance until the last minute. Things slowly change and sure, you'll feel things changing, but you don't pay much attention. You don't think about where it's going and then all of a sudden, you're boiled.

Nyck: Would you say that's because you're not acting, then, but rather you're responding when you eventually wake up and realise what is happening? Is that revolutionary or is it a speed up of the evolutionary change?

Steve: Well, it becomes revolutionary in the moment where the boiling begins. Literally, the liquid goes from just being warm to actually boiling, so that that's a revolutionary transformation in itself. The story is about not paying attention to the early signs, which comes back to the feeling of dissonance; not knowing that when things start to feel warmer, it's actually 'okay, I need to pay attention here to what's actually going on. If I don't pay attention, if I just keep sitting here in the water, then the revolution is going to be upon me and then it's going to be a very, very quick process.'

Nyck: And obviously, a lot of people are quite happy in our societies to deny the dissonance, to not look at the dissonance, to not allow themselves to feel the dissonance, and to carry on regardless, and then wonder why the world is collapsing around them. Things are not working out and it might be popping up in all sorts of ways, in all sorts of manifestations, but people just don't want to go there, don't want to see it, don't want to receive it.

Steve: Yes, very true.

So in terms of gaining insights, there are change models now. Clare Graves's model that we talk about on this show is just one of many, many different models, and I've lost count of how many other developmental psychology studies there are now which really fit with Clare Graves's findings. I mean, we're talking about human nature, and human nature is at the core of every one of these models, so they're all going to be similar in some ways. It's just that Graves's tends to be a fairly complex and insightful model, which is why we talk about it instead of some of the other ones out there. But there are many others out there and they all tell basically the same story in different ways; or different parts of the same story. By studying those, if we educated people formally about these change models, then we would have a more widespread understanding of how people change, how we change as individuals, the signs that we can look for, and the insights that come from the models themselves which can indicate to us, they can be signposts to us as to where we're headed.

One of the most simple patterns in the change process, looking at human consciousness, is this pendulum swing that occurs from a focus on individuality to a focus on community; the focus on being an individual in the world and being focused on changing the world around you to suit yourself as opposed to the opposite side of the pendulum swing which is a focus on being part of a community and adapting yourself to fit with what the world needs from you. That's a very simple but very useful indicator.

When we start to feel ourselves in a dissonant place, we get a sense that, 'okay, I seem to be approaching some sort of significant change here, or going through one'. At that point we can ask ourselves, 'how have I been living in the years prior to this? Have I been living with a focus on changing the world around me as an individual acting in the world? Or have I been living in community, absorbed in community, and had an inner focus on changing myself internally?' The answer to that question will give you an insight into where you're headed next, because it's going to be the opposite to where you've been.

Nyck: Right. And of course, you may be doing both, however, there's a weight to one, isn't there?

Steve: There'll be one that's dominant.

Nyck: There'll be a dominance. You seek out the dominant one.

Steve: Yes, there'll be a dominant theme. And you're quite right, people are complex and different aspects of their lives will fall into those two different categories. But there will be one dominant system, which is overriding; which is your dominant way of being in the world. When we look at the globe now and we look at human society, we can see that there are people living according to both of those ways in many, many different ways around the world, but the overall dominant global paradigm has been one of individuality for the last 300-odd years.

Nyck: Absolutely.

Steve: And it's also been one of changing the world to suit us.

Nyck: We're talking today about cognitive dissonance and the many issues and challenges on the planet: how we feel about it, what we can do about it, and the prerequisites for real change to occur.

Steve: So far we've covered three of six conditions that are required for effective transformational change to take place. They are, firstly, the potential for change. So there has to be potential within the person or within the system to affect the change that's necessary. The second thing is that the basic problems of life need to be solved. So if people are fully consumed attending to basic survival issues, for example, they don't have the time to even contemplate more sophisticated change. We have to take care of the basic things first. And the third condition is that there must be a feeling of dissonance. In other words, a feeling that something isn't right. This is the evolutionary tension that we often talk about, a feeling that's something in my world must change or has to change. And then fourthly, there needs to be some insight into how that change can take place. What's next for you or what's next for the group that you might be trying to help change? How can I be different? How can I act differently in the world? What's possible?

So we might at this point just look at some examples from everyday life of these four conditions, and I think we'll pick probably the most difficult topic that we could pick of all topics.

Nyck: Uh-oh!

Steve: That is climate change. Let's just have a look at why, given that back in 2006, Al Gore really did change the world in many ways by releasing his movie, his first movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*. And I understand that he's got a sequel coming, or is it really been released? I'm not sure.

Nyck: That, I don't know. But I think he's actually in Australia at the moment.

Steve: He is, quite right.

Actually, it was released, *The Inconvenient Sequel: Truth to Power*, was released on 28 July 2017.

I was working as a as a change agent, a change consultant, and dealing mostly in the corporate world at the time the original movie came out. I can remember feeling like there was a lot of positive change happening as a result of that movie. Probably the most simple thing was that the movie was prompting people to think globally rather than locally and just to stop and consider how we are being and how we are behaving as a species on this planet, what we're polluting the environment with, how we're making our energy, and how we're relating to nature in general. How do we regard nature? What is our relationship with nature? Do we see ourselves as a part of nature, or is nature something separate from us, and are we doing something to it that we shouldn't be doing? All those sorts of questions were raised and I think at the time it was good timing and it was a very thoughtful event that prompted a lot of change in a lot of people.

Why is it then, that here in 2019, people are still having this same argument? Most governments in the world haven't taken any significant action towards the kinds of things that were indicated in the film, and on Twitter, one of the latest hashtags is #climatebrawl.

Nyck: Oh, really?

Steve: Yes. It's one of the latest hashtags where people are openly in conflict about whether 'this' is happening with the climate or whether 'that' is happening with the climate. So why is that so? Let's look back at those first four conditions that we've spoken about and just see how they apply to this particular issue.

First and foremost, for anything to change, whether it be an individual or a large-scale system or a whole species, there needs to be potential for the change to occur, and that potential in terms of human behaviour—human nature—applies very much to whatever the dominant value system is; whatever the world view is that a person is living from.

In Clare Graves's model there's a spectrum of eight different worldviews and it's an open-ended system, so there would be more than eight, but that was all that he saw when he did his research. They range from very, very simple worldviews to very, very complex worldviews. They're driven by the life conditions that you're surrounded by, so it's not really about whether you're a good person or a bad person, or good at this or bad at that, it's about the complexity of your life conditions and what they're demanding of your level of consciousness. The more complex the problems are that you face, the more complex worldview that you may grow into and operate from.

As our world views expand up this spectrum of complexity, our scope of interest expands and our perspective on things changes. It's really only when we reach around about Layer 5 that we really have a fully global perspective on things. So anyone who's living from a layer of consciousness lower than that is more focused on rather immediate issues in their life.

Nyck: And that has been the way, really, for a couple of hundred thousand years. I have an article in front of me here from PBS in America, entitled *How Your Brain Stops You from Taking Climate Change Seriously* (<https://www.pbs.org/newshour/science/how-your-brain-stops-you-from-taking-climate-change-seriously>). A simple quote to begin with here: "Part of the reason it takes us so long to act is because the human brain has spent nearly 200,000 years focused on the present", as you're saying, in the early stages of consciousness and evolution, just having to deal with the Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: how we are going to eat, how we are going to survive, etc. etc. to stay warm?

So it's a big jump for the brain itself, for many people to make the leap to start projecting seven generations in the future, for example, as the American Indians and others used to do.

Steve: It is, and this is why, if you're an activist standing in the street and you're trying to sell subscriptions to whatever it might be—to support climate change or looking after animals or

whatever—you approach people and some people are just so immersed in their most immediate issues. Life might not be comfortable at all for them, so the last thing they want to do is to talk to you about buying a prescription to save panda bears in Asia or something like that. Their more immediate issues are far more important to them, to the point sometimes of people feeling like they're not surviving adequately. And so there is no potential for those folks to change sufficiently to embrace these larger issues until their most basic needs are met.

Nyck: So in those people, potential doesn't even exist right there, but in others, of course, it does exist. That's the key here, is that for some people the potential—that first condition—will exist as they're faced with these challenges, and for some people, they will not be ready to respond to those.

Steve: That's right, and the dissonance won't occur in somebody who is living from a value set or a worldview that's focused on smaller-scale issues, either. I guess national governments are one example of this. One of the reasons why national governments haven't put a priority on acting globally is because they're all about acting nationally. That's what they've been designed to do; the systems that they run are all designed around the principle that 'our government is all about our country'.

Nyck: 'The national interest' as John Howard put on the agenda; that phrase which took over for all those years of the Howard Government.

Steve: Exactly, and that's what we need to pay attention to, first and foremost. So if you're asking us to do something that's going to damage our national interest, for example, degrade our industrialisation or something like that, then it just doesn't fit, so there's an absence of dissonance there. They're not going to feel that something's not right and the country needs to change when you're asking them to change in a way that's actually going to damage the country. It's *creating* a dissonance in that respect to them, and so this is another reason why action hasn't happened on a global scale, because we really haven't developed into any significant kind of global culture where we all feel that we're a part of something and we're all acting together for that thing, being the planet.

Nyck: And again, we want that revolution rather than evolution. We want the speedy we want the now. We're so focused on what's going on today and tomorrow and not really very far in the future, that it's very hard to actually think that way for many people. So 'stay where you are until something else shifts', is, I guess, what's going to happen there.

Steve: Yes, and this is why my focus in my work has been for many, many years on understanding human consciousness and how human consciousness transforms, because it's

only when consciousness itself transforms that people's perspectives expand and their values shift. So the process of getting more people to understand and act in favour of global-scale issues is also a process of helping people expand their consciousness. In fact, the consciousness expansion drives all of the other things: the values, the interest, the motivations, the actions.

Nyck: And this same article talks on the reverse of that: "Our minds, regardless of one's political or socio-economic status, are constantly looking for ways to tell ourselves that 'business as usual' is okay. News of disappearing glaciers fails to inspire serious change because of this cognitive shield. Indeed, certain efforts to educate only harden partisanship on the issue." That's a big one.

Steve: It is a big one, and you know, something else that creates dissonance and puts barriers in place to change is the fact that pretty much all of the dire predictions that have been made by Al Gore, and everybody else who was acting in concert with him around this issue when it became such a global issue, have been wrong. And *that* creates dissonance in people: 'okay, well, I'm interested in looking after the world and looking after humanity, but you're giving me information that's clearly wrong here.'

Nyck: Yes, it's interesting. A report just two days ago from America states that the National Park Service removed all the signs that used to say "Glaciers gone by 2020" at the Glacier National Park in Montana after larger than average snowfall over several winters (<https://weather.com/science/environment/video/greenland-glacier-reverses-course-scientists-stunned>). And of course, many people think the glaciers are melting, that all the ice is melting, but it's much more complex than that and it's not just all in one direction. This is a major key thing that we have to become more cognizant of as we go forward.

Steve: It is. Absolutely. The other thing that's happening at the moment is that as we are already entering into this global paradigm shift—and part of that process is regressing back to older values, which is really a result of not understanding the change process, but being tumbled around by it—then our cognitive processes are being simplified with the regression in values.

At the Modern Scientific-Industrial layer of consciousness, we have a pretty complex cognitive capacity where we can look at many, many different options and analyse data and choose the best option. It's actually quite a complex way of thinking—complex enough to get us to the moon and back—but what's happened with the regression in values is that we've shifted back into a very black-and-white linear cognitive process where, rather than looking at the detail and analysing the detail of an issue and looking for different options within an issue, we've regressed back to what is essentially a kind of old-fashioned religious mindset, where something is regarded as 'right' and anything that doesn't fit with that something is regarded as 'wrong' and actually shouldn't be regarded at all. We've seen this process play

out in our scientific world where people who come up with evidence that might point to greater complexity within the operation of the climate system, rather than just a very simple linear warming process, are being heavily criticised and attacked, and their science has been suppressed. There have been lots and lots of examples where science that doesn't fit with this 'one right way of thinking about things' hasn't been allowed to be published in various journals. There are lots of examples of that.

Nyck: Yes, an example we came across is a financial one—and I do want to mitigate the directness of this by pointing that out, because economics is one aspect that needs to be looked at of course, and it's a major one—is a little story from an article in the *Business Financial Post*: "Roger Pielke Jr. is a scientist at University of Colorado in Boulder, who up until a few years ago did world-leading research on climate change and extreme weather. He found convincing evidence that climate change was not leading to higher rates of weather-related damages worldwide ..."—that's the economic moment there—"... once you correct for increasing population and wealth. He also helped convene major academic panels to survey the evidence and communicate the near-unanimous scientific consensus on this topic to policymakers", according to this article. "For his efforts, Pielke was subjected to a vicious, well-funded smear campaign backed by, among others, the Obama White House and leading Democratic congressmen, culminating in his decision in 2015 to quit the field of climate change and extreme weather research."

Now, we'll post all these links, by the way, on our Facebook page and on Twitter and everywhere else that we can, so you can check them out for yourself and do your own research (<https://financialpost.com/opinion/ross-mckitrick-this-scientist-proved-climate-change-isnt-causing-extreme-weather-so-politicians-attacked/wcm/de817ee4-10e5-4324-a85e-59325af951c9/>). We always say that on this programme, because we're not telling you that this is the truth, but this is another angle that perhaps has been denied and just trying to avoid the complexity of the situation that we're actually in.

Steve: One of the things that's indicated—that's really, really clear—is first and foremost that climate is a significant threat and climate change is a significant threat. I think that one of the things we need to be aware of is this tendency to regress back to older values and simpler ways of thinking where we just want to shut down anybody who's not actually fitting with our view.

Nyck: 'Are you with us or against us?' as George W. Bush famously said back then.

Steve: Exactly. As we've often said on this show, the very best thing we can do at this time in history is remain open-minded and remain open to all of the evidence, and considering all the evidence even though it may not be clear and it may or may not be a simple decision. The climate system is not a simple system. It's a very, very complex system that we simply don't understand well enough yet and we need to be open to new understandings. Shutting

ourselves down is actually one of the worst things that we can do because it makes it much more likely that we will be subjected to a revolutionary change that we just don't see coming.

Nyck: Yes. There are so many factors that feed into this, of course. I just want to draw attention to an article just the other about the clearing of Brazilian rainforest (<https://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2019/06/06/in-brazil-bolsonaros-deforestation-might-as-well-be-chinas/#74e8371453fa>): 740 square kilometres of rainforest cleared in 30 days by the Balsonaro government, which is looking like a seriously difficult problem on the planet—that loss of rainforest in a very significant, large, populated and magnificent country of the Amazon—and the poisons we put in the environment, the poisons in our food, all of these issues. We need to look at the whole picture of how we relate to the planet in order to really face the challenges that we have right now.

Steve: And be as open-minded as we can.

Nyck: And be as open-minded as we can.

Steve: So we're talking about six conditions required for transformational change. We've covered four so far. And they are: they must be the potential for change existing in the person or the system. The second thing is that the basic problems must already be solved, so if people are up to their neck in basic issues, they haven't got time to think and give energy to change. The third one is there must be a feeling of dissonance in the person, so they must be feeling that something's not right and therefore there's some energy accumulating that's going to drive change there. And the fourth point is that we must have access to insights about how things can be different; how a system can change, or how we can change; how we can live life differently.

The next condition is about barriers to change. So any barriers to change must be addressed, which can mean that we must receive properly timed and administered assistance, or perhaps non-interference, from people who might be the actual barriers. It's good to think about this barriers-for-change issue in terms of change that's been trying to happen in the world for many years but hasn't happened yet.

The reason that that change hasn't happened—whether it's changing yourself or changing some global system—is because one of these six conditions or a number of these six conditions haven't been adequately met yet. This removal of barriers applies, for example, when people push back on change. If you're trying to urge somebody to change—say you're trying to get a government to change and be kinder to the environment, for example—but they're pushing back, then you know that the pushback is a signpost to one or more of these conditions not being met. There is a barrier there of some sort. So we can assist the change

process by understanding why that barrier exists—considering everything, including timing and all the other factors that that apply to these particular barriers—and from that, be guided as to whether now is the time to act and try and push this change through. Maybe now is not the time to act and more time is required for something else to happen to actually remove those barriers before the change can flow forward.

Nyck: Yeah. I mean, I don't know what happened, for example, up in the Galilee Basin around the Adani coal mine and other coal mines there with regards to Bob Brown's Adani convoy going up there; the possible influence it may have had on some of the election results in terms of that convoy going into those mining towns, those small towns, which are clearly very focused on survival and their jobs and security and all that, and right or wrong, trying to tell them how to be. I'm not saying that's the truth, but it is an example of coming into someone else's home in a sense and saying 'you need to be like this now.'

Steve: Exactly. I think it's fair to say that the coal industry generally is under a lot of pressure at the moment because of the climate change discussion, and if you're working in the coal industry, then that pressure trickles down to you and the security of your job, you know, putting food on the table. So that's a pretty basic problem that you need to pay attention to. Therefore, those people are not going to really accept the need for change unless the change is crafted in a way that attends to their basic needs. So if there is a comprehensive plan to give them some other work or employ them in some other way that's going to satisfy them and that they're happy with, then that would remove that particular barrier, for example. So this is where is the removal of barriers is a very, very important issue and one that most people just don't think about. People will push against those barriers and push and push and push, but not actually think about why the barriers are there in the first place or understand how they might be changed.

Nyck: And of course, pushing can be counterproductive. That's the bottom line here.

Steve: Absolutely it can be, and I think that's a good example that you just gave there, Nyck, where there was a big push back in the voting booth.

The sixth point out of our six conditions required for transformational change is an opportunity to integrate the change. This is applied to when people have been through that most critical part of the change process and they've actually had some insights, they've removed the barriers and they have really made some change, and now they need time and energy to integrate the change into constructing or living out a new way of being—applying the changes to their everyday living, figuring out how that's going to work—and that requires time.

I think one of the classic examples of this in this sort of change management industry is, you know, taking people out of their normal life conditions to a retreat, putting them through some amazing transformational process—and I know that you've had a lot of experience in

this kind of thing, Nyck, through *Path of Love*—and then, of course, people may have a really transformational change, but then when that short intervention ends, they go back to the same old life conditions. So often people can just get dragged back down to whatever they were at before they started, simply because they're immersed back in the same old life conditions with the same old challenges and they have to attend to the same old issues.

So let me just run through those six things again, in summary:

1. There needs to be potential within the person, or within the system, for the change to occur. It needs to be within reach and not something that's impossible.
2. The second point is that the basic problems need to be solved. So if there are more fundamental issues that are unresolved, people are not going to pay attention to changing more complex things. They just can't because they're busy.
3. The third thing is that there's got to be a feeling of dissonance. So people need to feel that tension, that something needs to change.
4. Next, they need to have some insight into how it can change, how it's possible, and how it might be after the change occurs.
5. They need to see the light at the end of the tunnel; at the least, any barriers to change need to be removed. So if there are clearly things that are interfering with any attempt to change, or they might be absolute blocks, or people are being dragged back down, or there's pushback and those sorts of things, those barriers need to be looked at. They need to be understood and addressed.
6. And then the sixth point is that once people have actually made some change, then they need to have an opportunity to integrate that into their own being and into their everyday life. How are they now in the world? How do they act? How do they behave? How is it going to work? How are they going to continue into the future being this new person?

Nyck: We'll have to leave it there for today. Thanks so much for joining us here on Future Sense.

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.

