



60. Challenges Ahead, Part 1

Recorded on 23rd September, 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: You're now tuned to *Future Sense* with myself, Nyck Jeanes, and my co-host Steve McDonald. Welcome back, Steve. You weren't here last week, but here you are.

Steve: Good morning, Nyck. It's lovely to be back again. I was busy in Melbourne last week.

Nyck: You were, with the last showing of the *From Shock to Awe* film, which we've talked about quite a lot, folks, and many of you have seen it or know about it.

Steve: That's right. We have got a wonderful response all around the country from audiences, doing *From Shock to Awe*, and I think it's going to have a big impact, this movie. It's being released publicly on the Web on the 22nd of October so you'll be able to find it on *iTunes* and I think *Amazon* and perhaps some other platforms as well.

Nyck: Fantastic. And on today's show, what are we talking about Mr McDonald?

Steve: Today, we are talking about challenges ahead. We going to look out across the next decade or so, and, based on what we know now about the changing patterns of human consciousness, where our values are at the moment and what our values are shifting to; and also evidence from the real world right now around early stage changes across the spectrum, including environmental changes and behavioural changes and

those sorts of things. I guess the big message is that there are some very, very large challenges coming down the track and we really need to start thinking about them and planning for them and preparing for them now in order to ride out this enormous wave of change that's coming.

Nyck: Yes, and as we know in the world, pretty much there is a general sense, I guess, of what I've quoted a number of times with the acronym VUKA: Vulnerability, Uncertainty, Complexity and Ambiguity. That's a force that is pretty hard to cope with, but pretty much describes the way that I think probably most people in the world are, to one degree or another, feeling in particular realms or spheres of their personal existence; of their worldviews.

Steve: That's right. We have entered into a major transformational change process, and that applies both at a personal level and at a global level. So let's have a talk about what might happen over the next 10 years—and this is not pure speculation. We're working on research-based understandings of how human consciousness is shifting, and what it's pointing to at the moment is that we are in a change of our dominant global paradigm. We have been living for the past 300 years or so under a paradigm based around the Scientific-Industrial, you might even say Corporate-Militaristic way of being human, which is an individually-oriented operating system. Sometimes we call the individual systems I-me-mine, just based around that Beatles song.

Nyck: That's a Beatles song, yes, which we have played.

Steve: And alternatively we shift from those kind of paradigms to paradigms that are themed around community, which we often call we-us-our. At a global level, what we're seeing is that the dominant paradigm is shifting from I-me-mine to we-us-our, which is from the modern Scientific-Industrial to what you might call Postmodern—simply because it is coming after the Modern era—Relativistic, community-centred way of being human, which is very much about deep human connection. It's very network-centric and highly influenced by our connective technology, which has come out of the Modern paradigm.

The way that these things play out is that each paradigm solves the problems of the previous paradigm when it first emerges, then it comes to full blossoming and then, in the later stages, it starts to create so much complexity that it actually kind of undercuts itself and makes space for the next paradigm to emerge at a more complex level.

Nyck: So while on one hand a paradigm solves the problems of the previous paradigm of human consciousness and evolution oeuvre of human endeavour on the planet, at

the later stages of each paradigm, it starts to produce a whole new raft of problems, even though it solved previous problems, and those problems that are created in the new paradigm become very difficult to solve within that same thinking and way that has created the problems.

Steve: Yes, and I guess if you wanted to think about that in a really simple way, it is kind of like the engine driving the evolutionary process. So if you believe in evolution and the fact that we're moving from less complex existence to a more complex existence in all respects, then there needs to be some kind of impetus to create that movement. This impetus comes from this pulsing change process, which at certain times creates tension, and the tension provides the potential for movement. It's like pulling back the elastic band on a slingshot and then, at certain points, that tension is released and gives us the momentum to move into a different way of being human. Then the whole process repeats.

Nyck: It's interesting with tension because, of course, our natural tendency as human beings, I guess, is to resolve tension, whereas in some ways you kind of need to sit with the tension for long enough until the propulsion actually occurs naturally.

Steve: Yes, it depends on the context within which you think about tension. I mean, often people relate tension to feeling tense, I guess, which is an uncomfortable thing, but if you think about times when you've been bored and had nothing to do, where there's absolutely no tension whatsoever, that can be equally annoying.

Nyck: That becomes a tension in itself: 'I have no tension!'

Steve: That's right, so everything has a place and a time.

Nyck: What you're talking about here is developmental psychology, essentially, isn't it?

Steve: Yes. Developmental psychology emerged roughly about a century ago—this idea, based on research, that human values and worldviews can change and they do change—and even though this is about a century old, it really is in a similar category to quantum mechanics, where it's still considered an outlier in terms of the mainstream understanding of human psychology and human nature. If you listen to the mainstream media and movies, and really, most dialogue within society, people talk about humans as if there is one human nature: 'humans do this, humans do that, that's human nature.'

Nyck: And 'history repeats itself' with generally the same old thing we've done for thousands of years.

Steve: Exactly, and in the same way that quantum mechanics is kind of like too much of a brain stretch for most people to get their head around at the moment, so is developmental psychology. So even when I talk to many psychologists and ask them about their training and whether they studied developmental psychology, most of them say to me, 'oh, yeah, I think we touched on that somewhere', but they're not actually including that in their day-to-day work; they're not considering, 'Okay, is this person going through a worldview shift and whereabouts on the spectrum—what are they shifting from and to?' and considering those sorts of things. We still treat human psychology as if it's one thing rather than a staged arrangement of layers that we move through—both backwards and forwards, I might say.

It's a dynamic process; it's driven by the complexity of our life conditions, so human nature and the human psyche is highly adaptive and it tends to seek to fit with its surroundings and fit with the people that it's immersed in—in groups, for example; in society—and even for those people who have a deep understanding of developmental psychology, you still feel this pull to conform, this pull to adapt if you find yourself in a different set of life conditions. It's a natural and, for most people, a mostly unconscious process, that we change our worldviews, we change our values to fit with whatever's going on around us. This is a survival instinct, of course; it's part of our own evolutionary process. It's what allows us to cope with change.

Nyck: Just on worldviews, I have a little piece here from a website called *Thinking with David*. It's a young man called David Smart—he's a bit of a theorist in this area—and he talks about worldviews here: "Your worldview is biological, psychological and sociological. As you go about life, you come into contact with various bits of information from your environment (family, friends, society) which then coalesce to form an overarching worldview. Worldviews act like magnets. They attract bits of information in alignment with our existing worldview and repel the bits that aren't. This is why worldviews, once solidified, are quite difficult to change. Organisms take great care in crafting a stable worldview which becomes part of their identity, and will go to great lengths to protect homeostasis. Any disrupting forces to a static worldview is either ignored, shunned or demonized. It is common for the host to label these incongruent memes as evil, harmful, dangerous, silly, repulsive or disgusting. It is only when this organism reaches a transformational dilemma that it might consider change and open up to these worldviews" (<https://thinkingwithdavid.com/spiral-dynamics/>). That's pretty strong and very accurate.

Steve: Yes, that's quite valuable, and of course, that applies to the First Tier of human consciousness according to Clare Graves's model. The first six layers of consciousness

all exhibit that kind of behaviour, where when we're in a dominant worldview, then we tend to naturally reject anything other than that, and any other way of seeing the world, and usually regard it as wrong.

Nyck: And it's very understandable, that's what we're saying. It's very understandable that one does that from whatever worldview that you have—that you resist change up to a certain point until life conditions shift in some way or other, and that could be any sort of way, actually.

Steve: That's right—until that worldview no longer works. Of course, there's a good reason for us wanting to reject different worldviews if our current one is working for us. That only makes sense.

We might take a break and then I'll come back and just talk about some historical examples of changing values and worldviews, just to put a bit more context around this.

Nyck: We're talking today about some of the challenges—the paradigm shift challenges—that are upon us here on this planet as we speak, in this era and this time.

Steve: Yes, some of the things which are showing up on the radar—and this is certainly not an exhaustive list—but clearly our social systems which were designed during the last year are starting to fail. I think everybody can see that. Probably one of the most prominent examples is politics, remembering that the idea of a 'nation' really emerged with the Scientific-Industrial era—prior to that, we had kingdoms—and nation states brought democracy, like free-market democracy, which we have now. It's becoming really clear that that particular institution and all of the associated social systems—like our economic system, our health systems, those sorts of things—really aren't coping with the extra complexity that we're facing right now.

There's been a funny satirical article going around on social media over the last week or so saying that circuses are really having trouble finding clowns to recruit at the moment because they're all going into politics.

Nyck: I like it. You had to get that in, didn't you?

Steve: I did, I did. And of course, the Scientific-Industrial era itself has brought quite a toll on our natural environment. Its tendency to use and exploit resources without thinking about the long-term impact of that kind of behaviour, of course, has created a

big mess. Mass production of stuff, invention of plastic and those sorts of things is, of course, creating enormous ecological pressures, polluting the oceans, getting into our actual systems—microplastics and all that kind of stuff creating health issues—the use of chemicals for large-scale cropping and those sorts of things, which again are getting into the natural systems, disrupting the ecology of the planet, including us.

Nyck: Very much in the oceans, too. I was just talking to a well-known person, Richard Jones, yesterday about the oceans, and the runoff, of course, from agricultural chemicals is one of the serious pollutants in the oceans that we know about and still haven't done enough about. As you said, there are so many complex things that impact the general environment everywhere now. That's just one part of it.

Steve: Exactly, and things that we know to some extent that are coming down the track—like, for example, climate change—it's clear that our climate isn't the same as it used to be. The cycles are changing and there is, I guess, a growing sense of alarm that we are running out of time to address our influence on climate, obviously—of course, we had the much-publicised climate action strike last week. We're looking at all sorts of impacts from climate change over the next 10 years, including both food and water shortages.

Nyck: Obviously, we're here in this beautiful region where we have so much water. Nevertheless, we're also in a stage where we are all aware that we're not getting enough rain right now, and we're pretty lucky here.

Steve: That's right, and as you say, these things are compounding. The combined effect of changes in various areas is leading to things like population migration, and a big part of that over the last couple of decades has been driven by conflict, particularly in Europe where we've had so much conflict in the Middle East, and people, for various reasons, choosing to up stakes and move.

Nyck: You had Germany taking, I think, 1,000,000 refugees a couple of years ago, and that's backfired a little bit on them. It's maybe just a bit too much for their infrastructure to cope with, and particularly their cultural infrastructure, because it's very challenging when a whole raft of people are coming from a completely different ideology and culture—a different worldview as we're talking about—and impacting another country. That's a strong thing. You have to be prepared for that.

Steve: Absolutely, you do. One of the main challenges there is just coping with different values sets. I might come back to that discussion in a moment just to talk about how our values have changed historically when we look back at previous paradigms.

Just to finish this short list: disruptive technology, of course, as well, and perhaps that's the most obvious example of the old paradigm creating something that actually disrupts itself. New technologies which are threatening to collapse our manufacturing industry, for example, with the emergence of robotics and things like 3D printing, which can happen locally—all of the structures that we built during the modern paradigm around manufacturing and supply are now threatened by the same paradigm's inventions.

Nyck: Which means jobs and old structures of the business, the industries that you and your family were in, in small towns across the so-called democratic world; all the countries in our world—many places, many small towns and even larger cities, particularly the US, under huge pressure from the loss of jobs from disruptive technology, among other things, but certainly that.

Steve: That's right, and hand-in-hand with that goes disruption to supply chains. All of those transport chains which at the moment carry stuff all over the world—to a ridiculous extent, really, when you think about it—all of those things are now facing collapse due to disruptive technology.

Of course, none of this is inherently good or bad. You really have to look at each individual context to figure out, OK, what is this actually doing for these people in this particular location? A lot of this technology is going to have wonderful outcomes into the future, but the period of change is really what we need to be focused on now, and trying to manage this change so that it causes a minimum amount of disruption. It's going to be disrupted, there's no doubt about that, but there is the opportunity for us to look at and anticipate the kind of changes which are about to occur on a global scale, and to manage that as best we can so that as few people as possible are disadvantaged.

Nyck: Yes, I mean, this old paradigm that is, as we're suggesting, passing away, which has been in existence certainly since the Scientific-Industrial Revolution if not a bit earlier, that brought us all this technology. Also, as you're speaking, I'm thinking about colonialism, of course. Once we started to circumnavigate the globe—and I think 500 years just went by with the original Portuguese circumnavigating the world back then, which to me was the very beginning of that notion of global commerce, global identity and these kind of things—as that has occurred and the colonising powers that we know, of course, the English in particular, but also the Spanish, the Portuguese and so on and so on, went around the world and raped and pillaged their way to great success. That was part of the paradigm of the time, and in a way, it looks like they're still doing the

same thing in a much more sophisticated way now but it's very obvious to most people that that's happening—that people's resources, people's livelihoods, refugees forced to be refugees by forces beyond their control, of other stronger powers out there—all of that is now becoming quite obvious. It's been a long story, a long narrative, hasn't it, for the last few hundred years, that evolution on the planet of the global economy, the global way of doing things, which has actually only benefited, now, a handful of people really? Well, that's where it's going to.

Steve: Yes. It's interesting to look back over—not just the last paradigm shift, but the couple before that—and just look at how our underlying framework for making sense of reality has shifted each time and how that has given rise to new values and new worldviews; effectively new ways of being human. Of course, we've been immersed in that process like a fish in water, really without any visibility of the process itself, and it's only now where a certain percentage of humanity is starting to shift into Second Tier consciousness that we have the capacity to actually see the process itself and therefore to make decisions and plans and take action around managing our experience of the process, whereas previously it was just kind of like we were in a fast-flowing river and just getting tumbled by the river as it fell over waterfalls and swirled around rocks and those sorts of things, really with no choice but to go with the particular flow. Now we have the opportunity to see the flow patterns and actually craft a very, very different experience for ourselves.

Looking back at the last few major transformational changes in human nature, we went from living life as if it's a battle and you've got to fight others to survive—in Graves's model he said this was the third stage of human existence, which he named Egocentric; it was a my-me-mine system—and of course, as that played out, we eventually got to the point of needing to be saved from that. We couldn't live life anymore following that particular worldview—we needed to be saved from it—and so we looked for some higher authority that could give us guidance and a list of rules to follow to deliver more orderly life. That shift there was the shift between that Egocentric into the Authoritarian-Agricultural era where everything became much more structured.

Nyck: Authoritarianism, but nevertheless a communal authoritarianism, so people came underneath, as you said, the precepts.

Steve: Whatever the authority was.

Nyck: The commandments, the priest or the Lord of the Manor who controlled the expanding agricultural estates.

Steve: That's right. There was always some higher authority that provided that structure. That, right there, really represents a complete shift in our framework for making sense of our reality, and that gives rise to a new set of values and a new way of seeing the world. And then, of course, that Agricultural era turned into the Scientific-Industrial era, and we went from following the guidance of a higher authority to feeling like we actually had the power to discover our own truth, to make our own rules, and through a process of observation and experimentation, to discover the truth in the world. That, of course, gave rise to the scientific method and brought this desire—or perhaps was driven by this desire—to want to change the external world to suit ourselves rather than having to sit inside this authoritative structure. That, now, has brought us to this next transition phase and one of the most common, I guess, irritations or tensions at the end of the Scientific-Industrial era is a feeling of loneliness and burnout, like we've worked so damn hard in this rat race to try and be successful, and for most of us, that hasn't worked—think of the 1% and the 99%. The process had the effect of separating us into the small number of people who were highly successful and made a lot of money, and the rest. Now, we've had enough of that and the tension has built and built and built, and now this pressure is starting to express itself through calls for change and through the shifting of people's underlying framework for making sense of how life is and how life should be.

Nyck: Yes, it's great. An example that's come in the news just in the last couple days, is the \$22 million that went to the executive of—who was the executive?

Nyck: *General Motors.*

Steve: *General Motors*, of course. The GM, she took \$22 million while eliminating 15,000 jobs or something.

Steve: That's right, yes.

Nyck: It's a really good example of late-stage Layer 5.

Steve: I forget the exact figure, but I think it said it was \$22 million, or something like 790 times the average wage.

Nyck: And that disparity, I mean, all of us—we're all in this now; we all hate this so much. As you said, 99% of us do not have that sort of income by any stretch of the

imagination. That small percentage do, so it's just showing that the paradigm doesn't work anymore and we need a new structure.

Steve: That's right, and this is part of the natural evolutionary progression whereby the complexity slowly ramps up as we move through these paradigms, and it's that shifting complexity which creates extra, more complex challenges for us that motivates us, initially to feel like something's not right and we're uncomfortable with something—something needs to change, but we're not sure what that might be at the early stages of the change process—and a very, very clear message emerges that the old values don't work anymore. These values are not suitable to live by anymore and we need to find new values.

The difficulty in the transition process is that we inevitably move from that place of being comfortable in the old values to feeling like, OK, this is really not working anymore, but we don't know what the next step is, typically—we haven't got those new values yet. We're searching for them, we feel the natural draw to move back into community from the individual era that we've just been through, and you can see that happening now. I think perhaps the climate change issue is the strongest example of that pull towards community, where people are banding together and saying something needs to change. You can even see, if you look at the kind of protests that are going on around the world with the climate change movement at the moment—*Extinction Rebellion* being one of the most notable formal groups around that—is that there's a lot of protest and a lot of expression of unhappiness and the desire for change, but really not much is going on around clear guidelines or clear action for change at this point. It's an expression of discomfort of the perceived need for change.

Nyck: Well, yes, I mean, *Extinction Rebellion* do have, I think, four (I don't have it in front of me) but four precepts which are political or policy statements—the end of coal and this and that—but they're very overarching; they're very big goals. They're good goals ultimately, but they're not actually saying clearly, easily, how we're going to move country-by-country, place-by-place, towards those goals.

Steve: No, there's a disconnect between the idea and the actual mechanics of the outcome.

Nyck: Which is okay, because, of course, that's initially how things happen.

Steve: It's normal. It's normal for this stage in the change process, absolutely. It always happens that way, regardless of which transformation you look at, back throughout history, for sure.

We're now moving into another we-us-our, communal-based way of being human and it's centred around deep human connection—this desire for the human connection. It seeks to dissolve the boundaries that have made us feel separate from each other in the past—like race, like nationality and religion and those sorts of things—and, of course, seeks to address the problems that have been created by the previous era, which is most exhibited by the climate movement at the moment.

Nyck: Yes, and just on that before we take a break—the paradigm shift. Interesting. For those who don't know—because I didn't actually know where the term came from—it's a relatively recent term. It was a concept identified by the American physicist and philosopher Thomas Kuhn about the fundamental change in the basic concepts and experimental practices of a scientific discipline. Kuhn presented his notion of a paradigm shift in his influential book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 1962. Even though Kuhn restricted the use of the term to natural sciences, the concept of a paradigm shift has also been used in numerous non-scientific contexts to describe a profound change in a fundamental model or perception of events—in a worldview, essentially. There's a process that occurs, as we're talking about here, for that to happen.

Steve: Absolutely. And again, as I was saying earlier on, it's interesting just to reflect on where we're at in terms of even understanding about changing worldviews. It's still early stages for most of humanity to even come to grips with this fact that our values and our worldviews views do change in response to environmental changes.

Nyck: Indeed.

You are on *Future Sense* with Steve McDonald and Nyck Jeanes, here on *BayFM* 99.9.

Nyck: You're on *BayFM*, on *Future Sense* with myself Nyck Jeanes and Steve McDonald over on the other side there.

Steve: And don't be alarmed by Nyck saying that I'm on the other side. I'm actually on the same team I just sit on the other side of the desk here in the studio, that's all it is.

Nyck: By the way, before we move on, thanks for your texts. We have a couple of texts in. One just mentions, and we may not talk about this right now, although, funnily enough, as you sent this text in, we were talking about this very thing as happens. You say: "Amen, Steve. So happy to hear your big picture articulation again. What's your

view on the Dong and the Disco Dong controversy?" And he says: "I say our Lighthouse Lingam", much better, "shined a light upon our cultural unconsciousness as yet still not seen and spoken of." Yeah.

Steve: Yes, for those who might be listening to the podcast later, this is a local scandal here in Byron Bay, based on a piece of art which was erected by our local council.

Nyck: Erected?

Steve: Exactly! It was a big metal lighthouse structure made out of tiny, tiny birds to make the shape of the lighthouse.

Nyck: 6000 of them.

Steve: A lovely idea, but there wasn't really sufficient community consultation. If you live in this area, you know Byron Bay is a very earthy kind of eco-conscious area, and so if you were going to build a piece of art here, you might choose to build it out of wood or stone or something like that, but probably not metal.

Nyck: Well, it was actually aluminium. It wasn't even metal. I mean, I don't think you can class aluminium exactly as a metal.

Steve: I think it is a metal.

Nyck: It probably is, but it's not a particularly great environmental substance itself.

Steve: No, and there was something elemental about it that just didn't fit, you know?—I made that pun—and of course, it created a big values clash here locally. I think there was certainly a very righteous community movement saying that this doesn't really fit here, and in many senses, it didn't really fit. The biggest concern I had about the whole process is for the artist himself. I mean, if you put yourself in the shoes of an artist who's bid for a contract to win this grant, to build this thing, which he clearly designed specifically for Byron Bay, and then to have it put up and have it rejected by the local community must have been a very, very difficult process. I can only feel compassion for that person's experience, even to the point where I understand that there was abuse—someone shouted at him as he was putting it up, which is really, really sad.

Nyck: Well, it's gone now because those who lobbied to have it taken down have succeeded. So it is gone, and probably it's a good thing that it's gone. I didn't love it, but as with you, I really felt for the artist. Art is a dangerous area always, because no-one's ever going to like every piece of art—there's always going to be contestation around art. That's part of the purpose and process of art, in fact. However, there's a lot of things here, but the Disco Dong, the Lighthouse Lingam, if you will, is gone now, so there you go. I don't know if anything else is going to go there. Probably just some green stuff would be good.

Steve: A big nice tree could be good, like a big fig tree or something like that.

Nyck: Yeah, a fig tree.

Steve: I can see that for sure.

Nyck: Or an olive tree for an olive branch.

Steve: Yes.

So just to wind up this particular part of the show on challenges ahead, I want to point out that the emerging paradigm, Layer 6 in Graves's model—this relativistic, humanistic, network-centric way of being human, which seeks deep connection—is a 'change self' system, it's not a 'change the world' system. As we move through the paradigms, whether we're growing as individuals or growing as a species, we move between a focus on individuality and a focus on community. When we're focused on our individual needs, then we're looking to change the world to fit with our needs; when we're focused on community, we're looking to change ourselves to adapt to what the world needs from us. Layer 6 is an adaptation, 'change self' system; it's not a 'change the world' system. It's speaking a lot about changing the world and calling for change, but it is, by its nature, not a system that will actually achieve that change, and that's something that we really need to understand.

If we look at the time frames of the emergence of human paradigms, those timeframes are getting shorter and shorter and shorter, which means that each new paradigm is the shortest paradigm ever when it emerges. We've gone from an Agricultural era or paradigm that lasted thousands of years, to a Scientific-Industrial paradigm that lasted hundreds of years, and so now we're looking at this Humanistic paradigm that will last decades, and it could even be as short as one to two decades. We don't know exactly—of course, it's got to play out—but we need to understand that this is really a transitional era. It's a stepping stone which is taking us to a much larger shift, which, of course, is the shift from First Tier consciousness into Second Tier consciousness.

Nyck: And it's great because as you're speaking, I'm thinking that people listening to this might think that that in some way there's something wrong with the emerging layer. No, it's a layer that is creating the basis—the network foundation—for a greater leap, for a greater evolution that is necessary to really solve the world's challenges as we now see them.

Steve: That's right. Everything it's doing is natural and it's part of an evolutionary dynamic. It absolutely has to happen.

To just expand on some of the detail or the underlying purpose of Layer 6 from what we understand from the research that's been done on human paradigms, obviously it's on the receiving end of the mounting pressure globally—environmental damage in particular—created by the Scientific-Industrial era, so it's wearing all of those outcomes and looking to resolve the problems that have clearly emerged from the previous paradigm. At a subconscious level, it is preparing humanity for the Second Tier transition. This is essentially the end of an entire chapter in human history that's taking us on a quantum leap into something particularly different, which some people are even suggesting is the emergence of a new species of humanity. I'm still keeping an open mind about. You can see why, with such a massive change coming, that many people are thinking that this is the end times and people are thinking, okay, we're done, the species is extinct, the planet is going to die, those sorts of things. You can see at a subconscious level, the dynamic is there to bring those sorts of thoughts and concepts.

It's strongly motivated to heal—both healing ourselves and healing the planet—you can feel that. In places like this area where we're speaking from, where Layer 6 has been in place quite strongly for quite some time, that's very, very evident on a day-to-day basis—that there is strong motivation to heal. Subconsciously, what it's doing is it's creating a solid platform for this leap into Second Tier. We cannot leap off a platform that's wobbly, so we have to stop and shore up ourselves as best we can in order to be able to make this huge transition in Second Tier consciousness.

Ultimately, this particular paradigm—this emergent paradigm—is about changing ourselves, not the outer world. The ultimate result of living according to this emerging paradigm is going to be outer chaos, and it's that outer chaos which will create the evolutionary tension to drive the big leap into Second Tier and bring the emergence of the seventh layer—this integrated Second Tier multidimensional way of being human. It's really important to understand that, and when you think about the emerging paradigm in that context, you can look at what's going on in the world and you can see those dynamics. You can see there's a lot of noise being made, there really aren't any practical projects which are solving the problems right now.

Nyck: Not enough of them.

Steve: It's not the role of this particular value set, this particular worldview, which is going to be very, very short-lived.

Nyck: Hmm. Yes. There's lots of keys there. And just quoting, along with what you're saying there, from David Smart's website that I quoted from before, he talks about the transformational dilemma of this Green layer, this layer that we are now emerging into, particularly in regions like this: "It is often overly idealistic. It aims at peaceful coexistence, but is often driven by fear and anger. Caring and sharing doesn't solve the world's problems." That's a tough one to hear. "It struggles to carry out tangible, practical, real world solutions, which leads us to the biggest shift in worldviews thus far", which is what Steve's talking about.

So it's setting that template, it's setting that foundation mainly, as you said, by that turn inward to: 'How can I change myself? How can I better heal myself? How can I actually be part of the community and do my part?' That's a healthy and good thing to have, as we haven't obviously had much self-reflection in the last few hundred years, if you will—as a big generalisation—and it's certainly changing now.

Steve: Yes, exactly.

I might just quickly read from Clare Graves's notes on this particular emerging paradigm where he says that: "It objects strongly to authority's lead or pressure, and professes revulsion against uniformity and homogenisation; follows the crowds' or peers' lead or pressure, since the emphasis is placed upon getting along, accepting the authority of the group or the majority, and seeking status from others." Think about Facebook. "Thinking shows an almost radical, almost compulsive emphasis on seeing everything from a relativistic, subjective frame." Subjective is a really important word there, because when you look at what's going on and all of the noise that's being made around the world, it's extremely subjective; it's extremely about 'I feel this way.'

Nyck: It's emotional and that is not a judgement to say that. This is part of the process that we need to go through—to feel this.

Steve: It is. It's an absolutely constructive process that's taking us somewhere and it's a necessary step, but that subjective frame is very, very prominent. It's very much about 'I'm feeling this way and you should feel this way, too.' You hear that kind of language.

Nyck: You're either with us or against us.

Steve: Back to Graves: "Seeing everything from a relativistic, subjective frame of reference as it revolts against notions of quantity, and is rigidly against rigidity, and judgemental about judgmentalism."

Nyck: Rigidly against rigidity and judgemental about judgmentalism.

Steve: And again, if you look, you can see that. "It thinks in terms of goals which relate to all humankind rather than just to self", and of course, this is one of the critical aspects. What it is doing is it's changing us to look at the larger picture and think about all of humankind instead of ourselves, as we have been doing in the previous paradigm.

From Graves' again: "This other-directed individual believes it will find salvation in belonging and in participating with others in what they want me to do (or the person to do)." I think it's really important, in order to make sense of what's going on in the world at the moment, to understand that this emergent paradigm—this revolution, if you like—that we're seeing globally at the moment, is a stepping stone. It's not the final solution that's going to resolve all of these compounding challenges that we're facing globally, but what it's doing is it's laying a platform, a foundation, for us to make an enormous leap in our capacity in order to be able to tackle these large challenges.

Nyck: I think, as someone who's a bit older than a lot of people these days—I find myself quite an elderly person compared to many that I'm involved with—but as such, what I've come to personally, in my own subjective wisdom around this is, to some degree or other, I haven't seen the forest for the trees. In my long time being sort of relatively alternative and socially and environmentally conscious and politically progressive—or imagining myself in those ways, one way or the other—what I haven't seen is the long game. I've seen it through my own purview, my own subjective situation as one life over 20 or 30 or 40 or 50, 60 something years now, but now I've drawn back to a much bigger picture and understood that the changes that are occurring, that must occur, and that will occur on this planet—and they are occurring faster than most of us imagine or think about—are still probably going to be not fully fledged, not fully expressed on this planet until after I'm gone. And that's actually OK. But finally, I can see it that way. I can see the long story and not be so impatient about change. Yes, it's okay to be impatient because there's an emotional reaction that maybe stimulates you; maybe gets you together with a bunch of people to at least bring out these feelings and to discover yourself and to start to move.

Steve: What we might do now is we might just wrap that bit up, and we'll come back in the final part of the show and talk about what we can do globally to fit in with the emerging themes of this new paradigm and to help lay that solid foundation for the big changes that are coming, not too far away.

Nyck: Yes. On *BayFM*, you are 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.