



## Polarisation & Revolution Part 2

Recorded on 26<sup>th</sup> August, 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](http://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:** We're going to be talking a little bit about what we can do, how we respond to the challenges in times of evolution.

**Steve:** Yes, so for the second half of the show we will zero in a bit and talk personally about how to navigate these energies.

It's fair to say that when we regress to older values sets, we are essentially dumbed down. The trajectory of evolutionary change is all about increasing complexity and increasing our capacity to cope with that extra complexity, and when we go backwards during this time of the slingshot effect, we are dumbing our own processes down because we're moving back to simpler values that are based on quite rigid concepts. Very commonly at the moment, that, in practice, means moving from a Scientific-Industrial approach and values set, which is quite flexible and experimental; it looks for different options and chooses the best option, so it can be quite a sophisticated way of operating. The regression backwards from that is to the rigid Authoritarian value set where there are very strict guidelines to be followed and really no choices. You either follow the guidelines that are laid down by the higher authority or there's trouble; there's some sort of consequence that probably isn't nice.

We can see that rigid authoritarianism emerging now in global affairs and in politics. I think the trade war between the US and China is a really good example at the moment. We can see how that's going backwards, which is very interesting. It's also a sign of the complex nature of the issues that are motivating the two countries. It's not as simple as it seems on the surface, for sure. Ultimately, this is a struggle for global dominance.

**Nyck:** Yes, it's about power; it's not about money so much. Same thing really, but yes.

**Steve:** Yes. What we can be thankful about is that it hasn't erupted into open conflict, and let's hope that it doesn't do that. However, the regression towards more rigid authoritarianism does increase the risk of conflict, but when we shut down and when we become rigid in our demands, and when we're not flexible enough to shift and change to find a compromise, that is really, really building tension for change very, very significantly. It's just a matter, with all of these things, whether they be personal challenges or global challenges at the moment, of how far the elastic band on that slingshot needs to be pulled back in order to get a decent trajectory once we reach the tipping point. It depends on your starting point in the change process.

We need to talk in generalisations on this show because we're talking about the whole world. I mean, the whole world's not all the same. There are different circumstances, but you've got to start somewhere to have a discussion about it. But it's also true that many countries haven't really progressed to living in a modern scientific-industrial way and are still locked into fairly rigid authoritarian kind of regimes, and some countries are even still in martially-oriented regimes, which is Layer 3 on Graves's scale. Each one of these different circumstances will be having its own regression process. So if a country has been an Authoritarian country routinely over the last few decades, then we can expect it to be regressing to a Martial power-oriented approach, which can often result in raw violence.

**Nyck:** Which is exactly what I guess everybody is fearful of in in Hong Kong with the Chinese, and they're already starting to fire live ammunition into the air as warning shots, or using water cannons in the last series of demonstrations there. So we're seeing that militant response arising further in China, which I guess is what you're saying: that China itself, being an authoritarian state which has moved very fast into the Postmodern stage, you could say, in terms of its economics and the way that it's entered the world marketplace as a very big player, is still back in that previous authoritarian regime, largely, and therefore also likely to use militant power as we saw in Tiananmen Square all those years ago, to repress anything that doesn't fit that paradigm.

**Steve:** It's quite a mixed bag. It's hard to put a single label on China's system. The old Communist Party system is quite an Authoritarian Layer 4 kind of approach where it's a communal ruling system. Typically, in the individually-oriented value sets, you'll have a single ruler who can be like a tyrant or a president—or a tyrannical president—and typically in the communal systems, you'll have a ruling party or a ruling family. If you think back to the Agricultural era, in the time of royal families, it was a group—it's a communal ruling party. The slingshot will get pulled back as far as it needs to go, so there's nothing limiting that. Even though the United States has been a Modern Scientific-Industrial dominated country, there's nothing saying that it's slingshot won't get pulled back to that raw, violent Layer 3 approach if sufficient tension is required for the change to occur.

**Nyck:** Well, I guess we saw that in the early 2000s after 9/11, essentially; we saw that retrogression back to that very knee-jerk militaristic reaction too.

**Steve:** We did. The use of real violence is not uncommon on a global scale, and that really is a measure of our evolution as a species: how willing are we to kill each other to try and solve our problems? For those of us who have the benefit of living in first world countries that are firmly entrenched in that Modern Scientific-Industrial set of life conditions, it's interesting to reflect on the global situation where it's not uncommon for countries to still be using raw violence and warfare; killing each other to solve their problems. And just think about your own neighbourhood where you live: when was the last time that with two of your neighbours, one of them had to kill the other one to resolve the problem? It's just not normal.

**Nyck:** It's not normal. It does still happen here, of course. We're not saying these things don't happen, but they are isolated and not normal. They're outside of the parameters of society, for sure.

**Steve:** It's not common, and we are evolving to the point where, at a global scale, it won't be common anymore for that kind of warfare to occur. That's one of the things that we need to be thankful of. I can say that confidently because of the map that we have of the evolution of human values, and all of these indicators that we're seeing as the patterns play out, which give us little milestones to show that we are actually in an evolutionary progression here; and despite the fact that things do look really bad, if you have a map and an understanding of these change patterns, then it's much easier to be optimistic about the future.

**Nyck:** Well, yes. It's also good to know where you are. I remember a teacher back in the past saying it's all very well to have a map, but you do need to know where you are because you can say, 'I want to get to that place on the map', but if you don't know where you're leaving from, then you can't get there.

**Steve:** That's exactly right. And once again, this is where the value of these kinds of developmental psychology models comes in, so we can understand and get a sense of where we're at personally—where our society is at—and therefore understand if we regress, what that looks like, and also if we progress, what that's going to look like as well. Then we can choose what we put our energy into. Do we put our energy into forcing a regression, or do we put our energy into building what's coming next?

**Nyck:** This text might be appropriate at this time, thanks to Sandy. She says, "I really think we've already started practicing to change the codes. For example, gratitude for everything. If we practice gratitude, we are present. Our heart can embrace empathy and humility. We can practice letting go of engaging fear of the future or anger for the past. Quite exciting."

**Steve:** Absolutely, and that depth of compassion is absolutely a characteristic of the emerging value set, for sure.

**Nyck:** Yes, indeed. Let's focus on the positive; let's focus on what we can do, how we can build resilience, how we can build community, how we can work together to change the world because things are getting tense, as we're talking about. Things are not going to get easier soon, and we need to find ways to be resilient and to build our collective strength together in this new time.

**Steve:** That's right, and if you're committed to supporting change and you can see the direction that we're headed in, which is towards a new emerging, communally-oriented way of living, then there's no need to actually regress. There's no need to allow yourself to get pulled backwards into these more rigid ways of thinking and being. It's important to allow other people to do that, because if they're doing it, then obviously they need to do it, right? And the reason they need to do it is so that they can experience the reality that those older, more rigid approaches don't work, even more so than the Modern Scientific-Industrial ways.

**Nyck:** That's probably a hard thing for some people to hear.

**Steve:** It is, I'm sure. I have no doubt about that, but we need to understand that in terms of these change dynamics, we're not all starting from the same place. I often talk about the progression of humanity through the evolutionary process as being like a conga line. Some people are up the front of the conga line and some people are in the middle and some people are down the back. Everyone's starting from a different place in this dance. People will do what they need to do and they'll either be unconsciously pulled backwards in this regressive search, or, if you're listening to this show, it's quite possible that you are one of the pathfinders and you have a very key role to play in modelling the new values early so that other people can see how you live and can see that what you're doing works.

**Nyck:** And that's really the key, isn't it? How we live and what works; to be seen in that and to give that without proselytising, without trying to sell anything, without trying to change anything or trying to make someone do something that you think is the right thing. Be who you are. Be the change you want to see in the world, as they say.

**Steve:** Absolutely, and inevitably, that in itself will also lead to some polarisation. We need to just accept that during this time of change, we're going to get little bubbles of the new emergent values cropping up, and we're certainly living in one of those right here in Byron Shire. That's to be expected, and we need to plan for that and manage it as best we can; to use these little bubbles, not as places of opposition, not as places that might generate

conflict, but as places that can model new ways and develop new answers to the problems that we're facing.

Our immediate task over the next few years is to build a resilient, sustainable communities that can thrive while our centralised control structures continue to collapse, and they are collapsing. We're going to see, over the next 10 years in particular, some serious collapse of old structures, even possibly to the point of the collapse of entire nation states. We're certainly getting very early signs of economic collapse, but at the same time, as these things are happening, parts of the new world are emerging. We're seeing new technologies like block chain and cryptocurrency, for example; a very good example of technology that's come from these new and more complex ways of thinking that will resolve the problems of our current centralised systems and are not necessarily in direct conflict with them.

As Richard Buckminster Fuller famously said: "You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete", and that's possible in many cases. There are some conditions that make that kind of approach difficult, particularly if, for example, you're living in an authoritarian country where it's very difficult to build a new system, because anything that crops up that looks different is going to encounter an attempt to stomp it down. So this is not a magic pill as such, but if possible, if you can build a new system that simply works better, then basic things like market forces will drive the change, and there's no need for direct conflict. That's the kind of thing that we need to be doing; that we need to be focusing on.

**Nyck:** I like to use a metaphor that many people here will certainly relate to. I can see that collapse of the old paradigm, if we just let it be—even though there are other circumstances involved here—it becomes like compost for the new, in a way. I think that's a good way of looking at it. Instead of trying to get rid of it—shovel it out into some other paddock somewhere—let it do its thing; let it play itself out; let it decay and fall apart and go to ground, so to speak, and become compost for the new as those new shoots are starting to arise through that.

**Steve:** Yes, and that's all part of understanding natural patterns, and these patterns are everywhere. It doesn't matter what you look at, you're going to find these natural patterns of change playing out.

**Nyck:** Absolutely. Beautiful.

**Steve:** What I might mention is that, coming from a Taoist martial arts background and in fact, with a military background—I've also been studying Western martial arts for many years, so it's been a central theme in my life for a long time—Taoism, being a two and a half thousand year old, quite sophisticated Indigenous study of nature and natural process of change with roots in shamanism and alchemy, has got a lot to offer in helping us with the kind of pattern recognition that we need to grasp hold of to navigate these times of change

more effectively. In the Taoist philosophy, the highest expression of martial art is to avoid conflict entirely, to actually use your skill to see the signs of polarisation occurring and skilfully work with those of opposing energies to alchemise them into a new harmony.

Going back to that tai chi symbol of the yin and the yang dynamic, as each of those two energies plays itself out, when it reaches a peak, it gives birth to the other. So if you understand that, when you see one energy emerging, then you can predict and know that as it reaches its pinnacle it's actually going to give birth to the opposite, and so through patience and careful application of energy, then you can nurture whatever it is and allow it to blossom into something that might be its opposite.

**Nyck:** And it does require patience because it's not going to happen overnight, although it's happening much faster than we think with these changes. That's part of the reason why we can feel overwhelmed at times and confused by the amount of information; the amount of complexity that's in our reality.

**Steve:** That's true, and like everything, change starts at home. So if we focus on our own personal change journey and we nurture our own energies to give birth to peace within, then we're in a much better place to take that out into the wider world and to model these new values which are entirely peacefully-oriented, really.

The emerging communal values that we're talking about are, it's true to say, the most peaceful expression of human being that we've seen so far. That's very, very clear. Interestingly, this whole idea of conflict is such an interesting discussion when we start to look at the emerging value sets. What we are seeing is that whereas the previous layers and paradigms throughout human history have been riddled with conflict in various ways, and they've moved from open, raw conflict in the third layer, through to structured, dutiful, purposeful conflict in the fourth Agricultural-Authoritarian era, to conflict as a business model and a way of using people who are inclined to engage in conflict to make money in the Modern Scientific-Industrial era, we're now moving away from the urge to want to harm another human being entirely. However, what we are moving to—and this is again, a transient aspect which we will move beyond—but it is more likely that people who are in this emerging value set will harm *themselves*. We're seeing this unfolding through depression and those sorts of things, where often people are taken to a place of wanting to harm themselves.

**Nyck:** Very high suicide rates, a lot of drug addiction: alcohol and other legal drugs; mostly legal drugs, in fact.

**Steve:** Yes, and from a relatively enlightened perspective, we can look back in history and see that through all the harm that we've done to other people on the planet through conflict and abuse, essentially we've been harming ourselves because ultimately we are all one—part of this one consciousness—and it's simply that we don't recognise it.

In the past and in less or lower states of awareness, we don't recognise that another person is actually us, and therefore, in harming another person, we're harming ourselves and we're slowly coming home to that. Part of that journey home is the letting go of wanting to harm another person, but we haven't quite let go of the tendency to harm *ourselves* in Layer 6; in this Relativistic Postmodern era. That's, I guess, a final step of healing that needs to take place and that we need to encourage and nurture as Layer 6 lays the foundation for the Momentous Leap, and that's its primary role in the big scheme of things.

In Layer 6, we are obviously very, very drawn to healing ourselves and often to healing ourselves in a community setting, because it is a community value set, and part of that is healing that within us which might draw us to want to cause harm in any way.

**Nyck:** Yes, because we're not necessarily talking about suicide and physical harm like I mentioned earlier, but that, too, is there.

**Steve:** Yes.

**Nyck:** But the emotional self-harm that comes from dropping and falling into those old patterns of oneself, whatever they may be—into your wounds—it's not that if they naturally arise. If you're seeking to heal these wounds one way or the other, if you're finding modalities to do that, that's a good thing. But generally speaking, we have a tendency at this time—certainly I can feel it in my own life—to drop back into those earlier emotional reactions and responses to things we don't like; things that are troubling us; things that trigger us. All these things are good and necessary to flush out, but to get lost in that space is again just a way of self-harm.

**Steve:** It is, and if we're talking about navigating this massive, massive change process as effectively as we can and as smoothly as we can, then we want to use our energy very carefully. It's a fine line between, for example, protesting, standing up for what we value and making that known, and just tipping over into unhealthy moralising and judgment, and wasting energy on criticising, perhaps people who are just in a different place in the in their own change journey. That energy could be spent much more effectively, actually building the new world and putting ourselves in the best place we can to contribute to building what's next.

**Nyck:** It seems to be a trend, I think, arising here. Clearly, this is a bubble. Clearly, this is a bit of a cutting edge locality, this region for this new emerging system that we're talking about here—the Green Layer [Layer 6] of the Green paradigm—and we have to be extremely vigilant in approaching this because of these dangers of dropping into judgment, dropping into making the other wrong, dropping into excessive confusion or overwhelm in yourself and responding to that either, as we're talking about, by various forms of addictions, perhaps

of self-harm, or just emotionally beating yourself up one way or the other, not being enough.

**Steve:** That's right, and I don't want to overly push this because obviously, depending on your life conditions, we can get into places where we're not capable of consciously dealing with the challenges that we face, and we need to be compassionate towards people who find themselves in those places and provide what support and healing we can.

From a martial arts perspective, particularly a Taoist martial arts perspective, the idea is to let energy do what it wants to do, so to physically oppose force is a waste of energy. The idea is to just be agile and move and allow the energy to go where it wants to go—and just make sure it doesn't impact you, of course—and let it expend itself. This is what we need to do with the old paradigm. We need to, as best we can, allow that old paradigm to expend its energy and step out of the way as best we can. As its energy is expended, then it will become less and less impactful and that's when we can step in and have our own impact, by building new structures; building new systems that make the old systems obsolete.

**Nyck:** That's very good.

Referring to Hong Kong again, of course, it's a very good example of exactly one aspect of this. One way of looking at this is what's going on there.

**Steve:** Absolutely, and it's a fine line. I mean, the mass protests—as we saw with Gandhi in India—can be extremely effective, but it's also a fine line between that and tipping over into violence, and tipping over into things that are wasting energy and being destructive. So it does require leadership.

One of the tendencies of this emerging paradigm is to pull down hierarchies, and if we're going to pull down hierarchies, we need to work with a dynamic leadership because where there's no leadership—and I think you showed me an article this morning, Nyck, where somebody was trumpeting the idea of leaderless revolution—if there's no leadership, then it creates a vacuum and someone will step into that vacuum. Too many times we see, in chaotic situations like this during times of change, somebody with ill-intent stepping into a leadership vacuum and then things going terribly, terribly awry, and that's not what we need. So what we need to do is, certainly not replicate the old dominant hierarchies that we've had in the old system, but we need to learn to share leadership; to be dynamic with leadership and to allow those who have the skills to operate in these new ways to step up at the right time and provide guidance.

**Nyck:** Not to be afraid of leadership. It's almost like a fear of leadership can arise.

**Steve:** Yes, and that's natural because we've come from a time where leadership has turned into a horribly dominant thing that has benefited 1% of the population to the detriment of



the 99%, and we don't want to replicate that. But we also don't want to create a leadership vacuum where we've got large groups wandering aimlessly without any constructive action going on; and we don't want to create a vacuum where people with ill-intent can step in, because that's when we see things like Hitler recurring. We don't want that.

---

**Nyck:** Thank you for the texts on the text line. A couple of things here: "Beautiful, exciting, good news show again, brothers Steve and Nyck. When understanding and proactive care supersedes demonisation and passive un-care then we will be evolving. Passively stepping out of responsibility is not evolvment."

Someone else has said: "Whilst I see the value to the cult of gratitude", one of the listeners mentioned gratitude a little earlier, "I feel that it may be a plot by the elite to make us happy with our lot. We should never stop fighting for what is right." A couple of other texts along those lines about fighting some of the bigger battles that are out there; that are perceived, anyways, to be out there.

**Steve:** It really comes down to what's naturally next for you as an individual, or for the society or country or whatever group that you're talking about, and no two situations are the same. I think we gave an example before of Gandhi's peaceful protests, which eventually led to the independence of India from the British Commonwealth; and what's happening in Hong Kong with China is not exactly the same; and certainly what's happening between Israel and Palestine is a much, much more complex, difficult and different situation. So the same solutions are not going to apply across the board. This is part of the dumbing down of our values at the moment: the falling back to what are essentially inadequate, less complex and overly simple solutions, like 'we should just fight for this'. Those things just don't cut it anymore. They're not bad or unnatural; they are a natural dynamic during this change process, that depending on where you're coming from in your situation, and how you feel, you will regress to a certain level of values, which is normal and it's going to create the suitable tension for your own progression forward. The same thing applies at scale, of course.

What we have now, at this time in history, is the opportunity to actually consciously craft solutions for some of these challenging and very, very complex situations that we're facing, without being torn by our own emotional urges and instincts. When we feel like we just want to fight, then what that says is that we have regressed to a pre-rational way of being human, and when you're in a pre-rational way of being human, you are beyond logic and you can't consider the facts and you can't make a plan; a logical plan. You just react and often that leads to violence.

If you are regressing from the Scientific-Industrial, Modern kind of value set to the Authoritarian value set, even though it's a rigidification of your approach, you're still operating from the rational mind, so logic still has some sway, which means that you can approach the problems differently. The only road to being able to apply these quite complex and highly considered and sophisticated solutions is really to cross the river into Second Tier

consciousness where we're no longer stuck in our rational mind; where we're no longer stuck in our pre-rational emotions and instincts, and we have access to see and understand the different value sets that are at play in each of these situations, and craft solutions that are going to feed the natural evolution of the individual or the group that we're dealing with. That's really what we need to get to.

**Nyck:** Yes! is the only word I can say to that, and we hope you do too, folks, although if it's not your reality, that's also absolutely fine, is what we're saying. We're certainly not telling people how they should be.

**Steve:** No, and in this approach that we're talking about, there is no bad way; there is no wrong way to be. It's simply a matter of where you're at and what works; what works for you and what works for the social group that we're talking about.

**Nyck:** And in the end, all parts are equally valuable in their expression and in their evolution as they move forward.

**Steve:** Exactly, and there is an important role for—I think many of the people who listen to our show are pathfinders and they're attracted to what we're talking about because they see that, okay, this is actually the way that we're headed, and it's a really important time for people who feel that they do understand how we're moving to a different value set and that the most immediate destination is to rebuild community, and to build resilient communities that can thrive and continue to build the new world in the face of the collapse of our old system.

**Nyck:** Yes, and we're ideally situated in this region, one of the few places in the world, arguably, that we are so fortunate to have the freedom, the environment, still a relatively hospitable climate; we can grow everything here; we have a strong community base anyway for a long time. We really have everything here but we do need to be concerted about it. We do need to start to focus. We do need to start to take action to actually, as you're saying, build things; not just to complain about or to talk about stuff, but to actually to do something.

**Steve:** Yes, and in the face of the polarisation that's growing.

To talk briefly about the revolution dynamic, in the truest sense of the word, a revolution is explosive and it destroys boundaries, barriers, and obviously might have collateral damage as well. That revolution dynamic is typical of an unconscious response to change where you get the slingshot effect happening, the tension builds and builds and builds, and the only way that people can see to get out of the tension is to actually revolt. Of course, where there have been many, many situations where that's occurred in history, a conscious approach in

that same situation is with a deep understanding of the change dynamics. To be able to map the direction that the energy wants to go, then you can make small, conscious steps in the direction of wholeness, and the same degree of change can occur without the sudden explosive effect occurring. That's really what we ultimately ought to be aiming for now, is to bring about these changes in the gentlest, smoothest, least turbulent way that we can, and in the process of making the change, cause little or no damage to the people involved.

**Nyck:** Indeed.

Thanks for all of the texts flooding in. We won't be able to address them all; we're nearly out of time, but a text here: "Are the people up there so evolved? A whole town losing their shit over a metallic sculpture on a roundabout?" It's a good point, and I actually totally agree with you about that one.

**Steve:** Yes, as we said, we make a lot of generalisations on this show, and we can tell you for a fact that no, we're not all that evolved up here at all.

Let's wrap up with a couple of examples from current affairs of where people are building the new world with minimal fuss and not in a way that's necessarily damaging, or with as little damage as possible to existing structures. I think some of the stuff that Elon Musk is doing with Tesla and the release of electric vehicles, and also SpaceX and space travel in general, are good examples. There's no doubt that these things impact existing industries, and perhaps it would be better if we could more consciously manage the impact on the existing industries.

The introduction of electric vehicles is obviously going to impact the mainstream motor vehicle industry, without a doubt. If we had the capacity—if we had the structures in place and the consciousness to do it—then we ought to take those things into account rather than just letting the electric vehicles loose and not having any impact or control of people that might lose their jobs or factories that might close down as a result. Ultimately, that's what we want government to be able to do, or some sort of governing structure, and when I say government or governing structure, I'm not talking about the governments that we have right now.

I think that our process of government needs to change and the consciousness that we express in the action of government needs to evolve. But ideally we would anticipate these things; we would realise that, 'okay, if we do this, then that's going to happen. Therefore, let's take action to minimise any damage; any inconvenience that might occur from the changes.' This is all part of having a deeper understanding of change dynamics, understanding the patterns of change, understanding the consequences that we might generate when we bring changes into society. That is the future. That's the future of humanity, is to be more conscious about those things.

Another example I mentioned earlier was in the economic arena: block chain technology and cryptocurrency, which really was designed quite consciously to try and avoid the corruption and unbalanced nature of our old economic system, where a small number of people tend to

collect most of the money. These things, I think, are quite well thought out. Again, we don't have an overarching system of managing the change. They're just being released into society, and it's kind of like letting some wild animals run loose and wait to see what happens.

**Nyck:** And of course, there's been a lot of pushback, which, as you're saying, is a natural thing. Something new has come online; something new that can transform, that can decentralise that particular economic system in the world. It is new; it's early days. There's lots of development to come about and we're seeing reaction against it and trying to shut it down in various places, or to manage it or to regulate it or to control it. And this is all part of the natural process, too, isn't it?

**Steve:** It is part of the natural process of pushback that we're going to get from the old paradigm; the old systems that want to stay as they are. They're resisting change, obviously. Anywhere where someone or a community of individuals is comfortable and they don't see the reason to change, they're going to obviously resist change. That's just a normal human dynamic.

But on the other side of the coin, an example of what is destructive change that's taking place at the moment is the conflict—the trade war and other aspects of conflict—that is happening between China and the USA. It is essentially a struggle for global dominance, where the USA has been the superpower and they see their position weakening, certainly not simply because of China—although they might they might be inclined to blame China for the weakening—but there are many, many reasons why the USA's power is declining at the moment. I guess the central aspect of that is an increase in complexity and the fact that the USA's power structures and social systems have been designed to cope with the complexity of the Modern era, and now we're moving beyond that to greater complexity and they aren't able to change quickly enough.

**Nyck:** I think the same could be said on one level down to do with Brexit, with the UK and Europe and the battle there, really for power too, and how that's to be restructured—that movement back of the UK to an isolationist perspective to a degree. So we're seeing a similar kind of pattern. They're not the same, but a similar sort of thing running there.

**Steve:** Yes, it's an interesting dynamic there where the European Union itself has been an early experiment in communal values and communal living, which was a little bit ahead of its time and consequently got pulled back in the same way that we saw that big rise in communal values during the 1960s and 70s through the various social revolutions that took place there. They were a little ahead of their time, and so just like a wave running up the beach as the tide comes in, it ran backwards again for a while, and we're going to see things running backwards for a while yet. The high tide mark for the new paradigm is a little way off yet.

**Nyck:** But we are moving forward, folks, and certainly on this show, we're encouraging you just to see it as you can—in your own way, in your own life, in your own reality, as best you can. What place are you at and how can you move towards a greater part of yourself; to recognise your consciousness as being a key part of the evolution of this planet, in fact, at this time? That's a big statement, but I believe that.

**Steve:** Absolutely. The better we can understand these patterns of change—how they work—and start to embody that understanding, and then spread the word to each other and eventually start to influence our various aspects of society that have more power to influence the change; to help them understand these dynamics as well so we can work with the change dynamic instead of just getting tripped up by it unexpectedly.

*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](http://www.bayfm.org). Future Sense is available on iTunes and SoundCloud.*

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