



65. Our oldest value systems, Part 2

Recorded on 7th October, 2019 in Byron Bay, Australia.
With Special Guest, Mitch Schultz.

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: On BayFM, we're here with Steve McDonald, Nyck Jeanes, and our good friend and close ally, Mitch Schultz.

Steve: My goodness, we are too, look!

So we're talking our way through the foundational value systems today—Layers 1, 2 and 3 in the pre-rational zone—the oldest human value systems and the oldest ways of being human that we're aware of. We just spoke about survival, and interestingly, the link between our transition into Second Tier consciousness—this massive shift in human consciousness which is already underway and in its very early stages—which is underpinned by survival, so a repeating theme that comes from the survival issues at Hunter-Gatherer when we first became human; and then the emerging theme, which is around survival of our species and how that is a subject of great fear and growing fear on the planet at the moment. That is a sign, a signal, that this transition into Second Tier is well on its way, even though it's a relatively small percentage of people at this stage.

One of the things about us moving into and living according to these Second Tier values is letting go of our fear of not surviving, and part of that is our emerging multidimensional awareness and moving to a place where we will not just accept, but we're fully confident in the fact that we are multidimensional beings and death is not actually what we think it is, and therefore it's not something to be feared. That's part of how we're changing as humans, and letting go of that fear as we move into Second Tier, of course, radically changes human behaviour because so much of what we do and

have done right through this First Tier of existence has been driven by fear in some way—some kind of fear.

Nyck: And of course, it's being used grossly, literally grossly on the planet in so many political ways to generate compliance, one way or the other.

Steve: It's a go to, and the reason it is to go to like that is because it's such a powerful thing for us.

Nyck: Yes.

Steve: The second layer of value systems, the second layer of consciousness, is original Tribal existence—animistic spirituality—and it is our foundation; a foundational way of being communal, so it was the very first time that we came together and lived in communities. As we go through this big shift that we're in right now from Modern [Layer 5] to Postmodern or Relativistic [Layer 6], we're moving from the individually-oriented modern world into a new version of being communal, which is the sixth layer, and the natural tendency when we go through a transformation like this is that we find ourselves a little lost because we realise those old values don't work anymore and we need to let go of those. They've been like our anchor points for making sense of reality and we know that we got to move and we start to let go of those anchor points, but then we find ourselves drifting in the space in between and we're not quite sure what the next value set is going to look like—it's under construction—and so the natural thing for us to do is to look backwards in time. We go on a regressive search and we look back to our previous ways of being communal, and they are, of course, the original tribal existence—and we've seen an enormous increase in interest around that particular topic in recent years—and also the fourth value system, which was the agricultural way of being communal and that's what gave rise to our kind of black-and-white, rigid, authoritarian thinking. We're seeing a big rise in that at the moment as well.

Nyck: 'Are you with us or against us?' thinking.

Steve: Exactly, so we're seeing an increase of interest and an emergence of these older values sets right now and that's to be expected. It's quite predictable for a transition like this, that that would happen, and that explains the kind of extreme fundamentalist behaviour that we're seeing in politics and also the great interest in rediscovering and nurturing original tribal ways.

Nyck: Yes, and rediscovering indigenous everything, plus the sort of new tribalism which is represented by many of the festivals and, of course, the psychedelic revolution, which we've talked about quite often on this show.

Mitch: Very much so. Just the amount of people going down to the Amazon and reconnecting with the tribal aspects there and the medicines, and then pulling that back into this modern state of Burning Man and different festivals that are playing out. This is why I've always loved what you guys are doing here by putting this context around this. I hope I'm not jumping the gun here, so to speak, but I'm very excited about the development and starting to put together a documentary series on what you guys are doing here, because this is the kind of stuff—it's the retelling of these stories in a more complex way.

Nyck: Oh, that's great way of putting it.

Steve: Don't you worry about jumping the gun. We have no gun policy in Australia here.

Nyck: No gun policy here in Byron Bay.

Mitch: I'm going back home. I have to start getting ready.

Nyck: Oh, Jesus. Yeah.

Steve: And it also speaks to the power of these foundational layers on the value spiral when we look at things like the regressive switch back to the rediscovery of plant medicines and altered state work around those plant medicines, and the absolutely profound impact that that has had globally, which is mostly unseen because a lot of it's happening underground, right?

Nyck: We've seen just a few days ago, on Saturday, an article on the *ABC*, and there's many of them, about one aspect of the new Psychedelic Revolution—the medicines. There was a piece in the *ABC* on Saturday about Amanda Fielding, who you guys know quite well, or know of quite well—I think you probably know her personally or have met her.

Steve: Yes, she was at a plant medicine conference that Mitch and I went to in London in 2017.

Nyck: She's about 76 and she's like the dame or the doyenne of the psychedelic society, so to speak, in England.

Mitch: She's pushed a lot of stuff forward.

Nyck: Yes, and I'm sure all of you out there, even if you're not that interested yet—or wherever you stand in this field—you would have no doubt seen stories about the psychedelic revolution here and there and everywhere, including, of course, cannabis and medicinal cannabis. There's a new movie coming out this week that I should mention just now, called *Green Light*, which is showing at the Palace Cinemas from Thursday night, I do believe. That's a good little film. We've seen that.

Steve: That's an Australian documentary about medical cannabis.

Nyck: Yes, it is.

Mitch: Those guys are doing some great work.

Nyck: Yes. So all of that is reaching into the zeitgeist, isn't it, in quite a powerful way. I mean, as I said, even if you're not particularly interested in it, it's there, it's present. You don't have to do much searching to find articles in *The Guardian*, *The New York Times*, all over the place; all over the world.

Steve: Absolutely it is, yes. And I found out this week that my appointment to go and speak to the Governor-General of Australia has been confirmed for the 19th of November and I'll be talking to him about psychedelic medicines.

Nyck: Because he was in the military with you.

Steve: That's right. They say it's not what you know, it's who you know, and of course, General David Hurley was my commanding officer when I served on the humanitarian mission in Somalia in Africa back in 1993.

Nyck: This is big stuff. You approached him because you do know him as your commanding officer.

Steve: That's right. I was a direct report to him, so he was my boss and we had a lot of contact. In fact, he sent me to Somalia. I was the first person to go from our infantry battalion. He chose me to go over and make preparations for the arrival of everybody else, so I was talking to him by satellite phone from Africa and trying to let him know what was going on there—as best you can over a satellite phone. And then I've had contact with him at reunions over the years and I have been talking to him periodically about research into things like MDMA therapy to treat PTSD, and he has expressed a genuine interest in the past. In fact, at one reunion, which would have been maybe 2013, I think, I had a chat to him about that and he was about to go over to speak to the US military. He was a General in the Army at the time and he said to me, 'okay, well, I'll talk to the Americans about this when I go over', and when he got to the Pentagon, he did. He had a chat to them about it, to his credit, and the American military said, 'look, the research is a bit early at the moment for us to do anything about it, but we're monitoring it'. So that was good. It's been an ongoing discussion I've been having with him.

Nyck: So you have an audience next month, which is fantastic, to talk about this area of research with him. As we've talked about on this show—and you know too, of course, Mitch—that in the US, MDMA for PTSD in particular is at stage 3 for FDA approval, which means it's likely to be legal for that kind of monitored and properly administered application for PTSD within a year or two.

Mitch: 2021. That's what they're looking at.

Steve: And of course, that military story sort of ties back into the tribal foundations because you do get that tribal kind of thing in the Army—it's like a family. The second layer, the Tribal layer, relates also, at an individual level, to family life and being part of a closely relating unit, and that's a very strong theme in military service. A lot of people talk about the army mafia out there. It's a thing, but it's like any significant organisation that people identify strongly with—you carry that connection on into life and you can always ring up an old tribal friend from previous organisations and get a favour done or something, often.

Mitch: Well, it's one of the fascinating things about the idea of the tribal, that it's not the traditional indigenous, solely, right? So we're looking at the military, we're looking at the Mafia family—this new *Netflix* documentary—and sports teams. The complexity of how we understand tribal is completely beyond what most people would think of it.

Steve: That's right, and this is a very important aspect of what we talk about on this show and on the podcast, is that these are value systems that don't necessarily relate to any particular time in history, although we can trace back their origins. They are ever-present and they play themselves out in modern times and modern contexts.

Nyck: Fantastic.

You are tuned to *Future Sense* and as we say, you can text in and say hello and bring attention to anything that you wish, and contribute to the conversation.

Nyck: You're here on *Future Sense* on your local community radio station, *BayFM*, and this show podcast all around the world. Thanks for listening to you guys out there. You can actually listen to his live on www.bayfm.org also, anywhere in the world, and probably you are listening somewhere out there. The podcast goes to some 50 countries now, I think we heard.

Steve: Well, the stats that we get only cover 50 countries, so it's probably more than 50 countries. We're getting out there.

Nyck: We're talking particularly about tribalism at the moment and we've got a fair bit to unpack there. There's so much to it.

Steve: There's a lot. We're talking this morning about the three oldest value systems that humanity has: the survival Hunter-Gatherer values [Layer 1]; original Tribal values or family values [Layer 2]; and then power-oriented, Egocentric behaviour and values [Layer 3]. We're looking at Tribal, and at this time where humanity is going through a big shift of values from the modern Scientific-Industrial era into what's next, a regressive search is part of the transition process. When we let go of the values we have been living by, we need to find a new set of values, and often—usually—what we do is we look back to previous sets of values which might be useful, and Tribal is the oldest way that we have of being communal. We're moving into a new communal system now and the original tribal ways of living are informing our change and how we might shape our new communal values as we move forward.

This is showing up in so many different parts of society. We started to talk before the break about some of the examples like the psychedelic renaissance and people revisiting tribal communities in South America and drinking ayahuasca and that kind of thing. We're seeing it in art and other cultural things where people are getting themselves tattooed, like Mitch Schultz, here. Tell us about that, Mitch.

Mitch: Well, yeah, part of my tribe.

Steve: When did you have your first tattoo?

Mitch: My first tattoo. I think I was 17.

Nyck: I thought you were going to say 7 then. That's a bit worrying.

Mitch: My dad was not happy, and just recently, I started being able to talk about that. Yeah, that family tribe was not happy about the other tribe that I was getting into.

Steve: That old story I heard about you being tattooed with the mark of the beast just after you were born, that's not true, right?

Mitch: That's not. That is it fake news, as they say.

Nyck: My youngest son, Jacob, says don't get a tattoo, Dad, because when you get old—which I kind of am already—it's going to be all saggy. He had me convinced for a few years.

Steve: Dad, tuck your tattoo in, will you!

And of course, the family way of living and that family way of relating that comes with this tribal values set—the second layer of human values—is very evident in society and particularly modern society, because there's a shadow relationship between the modern Layer 5 values, which are very success-oriented, and the values that have created the modern world and given us corporate structures and modern science and all those sorts of things. There is a tendency within there, which is often unacknowledged and often subconscious, to band together in little tribes within our organisations. That's becoming more evident because as we improve our communication technology, we've got transparency like we've never had before into organisations and things, and we're discovering all these little tribes within the organisations, often called factions or sects or something like that.

Mitch: Which stories are going to resonate with my family, right? Which stories correlate with the person next to me that's going to understand where I'm coming from?

Steve: Exactly. We watched a documentary recently called *The Family*, didn't we, Nyck?

Nyck: We did, which you can get on *Netflix*. A journalist, Jeff Sharlet, details his days living in *Ivanwald*, which is a centre, a home; it's a men's residence—only men—where he discovers the family's allegiance to Jesus and to power. It's a very compelling documentary, several parts to it, and we recommend it. We all watched it. In a sense, it's quite troubling that such a powerful Christian-led—and particularly focused on Jesus being absolute king and the last word—and the power behind much of the politicians in the US and other countries in a very complex and quite troubling way, really.

Steve: Yes, and we saw within that documentary, that it was a great example of this second layer Tribal values set—but also the third layer, power-oriented values set coming out as well—and in a very, as you would expect, pre-rational way. This was a religious context, right? So it was a Christian organisation, *The Family*—a Christian Association—and they were throwing out the vast majority of written scripture.

Mitch: Not just the Old Testament, but all of the New Testament, except for, what, four books?

Steve: That's right, and you hear people say in this movie, 'it's okay if you sin and break the rules because you're one of the chosen people.'

Nyck: In fact, you can do anything under that protection, so to speak, of your allegiance to Jesus. Very troubling.

Steve: This is a classic display of these pre-rational values sets in the modern day. The story told in this documentary is that this organisation has been considerably influential, particularly in American and in international politics, right?

Nyck: Absolutely. It's quite troubling. You mentioned the truncation, so to speak, of the *Bible* or the sacred texts, and the man whose name controlled the family has just recently died—a couple of years ago—Doug Coe. Check him out. A fascinating and almost invisible character, but obviously, clearly, extremely powerful in American politics and American everything. He made a little black book of those four books or whatever it is, which is just entitled *Jesus* and that's the only thing that they have to have allegiance to, is what's in that book. Forget the rest.

Steve: It's a small book, too.

Nyck: It's a very small book; very short.

Mitch: I see that as a way to control the narrative—or not control the narrative, but to find a new story, right? What was working and what can we use now that still will fit with this modern paradigm? It's just kind of that reconstitution of what those value sets are and how they're redistributed, so to speak.

Nyck: It's also interesting, though, because it's such a simplification of the narrative, you could argue, against the *Bible* story or the *Torah* and all that—the Judaic religion, the Judeo-Christian religions—and the very substantial texts. Whether you like them or not, they're substantial texts, and what it's come down to in the 21st century for this group of very powerful people is a tiny little book. That's their narrative. That's all they need.

Steve: And the opening for that has come from the fact that the modern era really destroyed the nuclear family, when you think about that, because all of the individually-oriented eras—so we're talking [Layer] 3, which is the Egocentric, power-oriented value set; [Layer] 5, the Modern—they stretch, exploit, adapt or even discard the ethical frameworks which are constructed in the communal systems. Our first ethical framework would have come in the Tribal system [Layer 2]; the second one in the Agricultural era [Layer 4]. Out of that Agricultural era, we saw class-based societies, we saw very strict, rigid arrangements around marriage and relating with people, even to the point where you would only relate with people in your social class and you couldn't actually go outside that. Then in the Modern era, the role, really, of these individual-oriented systems is to bust out of that and make room for something new, and in the process, we have really moved away from the family structure. I think everybody would acknowledge that the old tradition of marriage ain't what it used to be.

Nyck: Well, the average marriage in Australia, I think, is now about 11 or 12 years, and when I grew up, it would have been 25 plus—30, 40, a whole lifetime. It's now down to about 11 or 12 and probably the same in the States I would image.

Steve: That dismantling of the family structure, of course, has left an opening for somebody to step into, and this is why organisations like *The Family* are able to do this. They actually offer people what's missing, which is this feeling of being part of a close-knit family-type organisation, and all the advantages and nice experiences that can come from that. Except this is also involving the third layer, the power-oriented, exploitative, egocentric, so it's done in a manipulative way.

Nyck: And it's also about money. These big churches like the Pentecostal churches, the fundamentalist churches—and *The Family* could be aligned pretty much to that; it's a fundamentalist expression of Christian religion—they're actually quite celebratory about success, about money. If you don't have money, it's your problem. It's like, Jesus didn't give it to you. I know I'm simplifying a lot here, but really, it's given that stamp and I think that's true of things like *Hillsong*, which our Prime Minister is currently somewhat involved in. It's a fascinating thing that these connections have been made and that, in terms of money and Layer 5, you could say, which has been dominant for the last couple hundred years—that paradigm, the materialistic paradigm, simply put—is imprinted onto these tribal layers under these groups and these families. It's OK, and in fact, if you do have money, it's God-given. If you don't, too bad. So therefore, there's not much compassion there, really. They could claim compassion, but if you're not part of the crew, part of the team, part of the family, you don't benefit from that compassion.

Steve: That's right. If we look at all of these value systems, we'll find that as you move from the foundational ones through greater complexity, our scope of interest, our capacity to sense other people's feelings, and all of those sorts of things, they grow consistently as we move through to the more complex layers. At these foundational layers, they certainly are present, but they're present in very raw and limited forms. It always fascinates me to see examples of people in the current day who've grown up in modern society and yet they're living very much guided by these foundational—limited in many ways in today's complex world—value systems. It's fascinating.

Mitch: That's what I'm always interested by, and we were talking about *Netflix*, but looking at the diversity of the narratives on *Netflix* and trying to rediscover what some of our archetypes and our heroes and our mythologies are, because the simpler aspects of some of our original narratives are no longer working, so there's this exploration I see out there, trying to find this next level of complexity to say, well, how can we understand a family value system in a modern world?

Steve: Exactly. Very, very interesting.

Nyck: Very good. We'll take another break here on *Future Sense*.

Nyck: You are here on *Future Sense* and with myself, Nyck Jeanes, Steve McDonald, and our special guest, the Texan Elf, Mitch Shultz, who's about to fly free from this magnificent country again. But he'll be back very soon.

Steve: That's right. Heading off to the airport later today.

We're talking our way through the oldest foundational value systems that humanity has—our basic survival values, our original tribal values, and our power-oriented values. Just before we finish up on the tribal stuff and move on to the third layer, I wanted to point out that in these communal systems—the original Tribal Layer 2 being the first communal system that humanity developed—there is a boundary and that is particularly noticeable at this oldest version of tribalism: if you are not one of the tribe, then you are excluded from certain things. In extreme cases—and this is not all that uncommon in the oldest tribal societies—if you weren't part of the tribe, you weren't even regarded as being fully human, and so you could be readily killed without the kind of concern that you would have if you killed somebody of your own tribe. Of course, we see this play out in the modern day—the tribalism that comes with the Modern era—where you're one of the in-crowd or you're not, and if you're not one of the in-crowd, then there's a whole bunch of things that you can't be eligible for.

Nyck: Or you may just be eliminated. I'm thinking, as you speak of Khashoggi, who was eliminated by Saudis in some way or other, which we don't really know. He seems to have disappeared; not part of the team anymore. Not part of the crew, not part of the tribe.

Steve: Apparently.

Mitch: Or how that might be playing out with, quote unquote, "civil war mentality" back in the United States, and the President and others talking about that with this new impeachment. The tribal boundaries are being set, I feel at this point—they're being drawn—and it's alarming to watch that unfold, seeing tribalism play out on a different level.

Steve: Yes, you picked up something in the media today about that, didn't you?

Mitch: Yes, just that that level of tribalism is still very much a part of our DNA and is playing out a new level of complexity in modern-day politics, and with people right next door to you.

Nyck: Trump has literally tweeted overnight, or in the last day or so, that should the impeachment process continue, that it's likely to cause a civil war. That's something that no US president has ever said, I'm sure.

Steve: The original American Civil War, of course, was essentially a war between the fourth and fifth layer value sets, the fourth being the second iteration of communal ways of being human—it had its own boundaries—whereas in the original Tribal Layer 2, the boundaries are very much around the tribe and your local extended family.

Nyck: Your physical boundaries, in a sense?

Steve: Yes. At Layer 4, which was evident in the Agricultural era, the boundary was around your ethnic group or your associated belief system—people within the belief system—which could be a religion. If you were a fellow Muslim, for example, then you're inside the boundary, but if you're not a Muslim, you're outside the boundary. You can see the same dynamics, the same kind of themes playing out, but at a more complex level and on a larger scale. That conflict in the American Civil War was really between people who had emerged into Layer 5 and were seeing life from a more Modern perspective—part of which was that they didn't see that the use of slavery was right—and then the Layer 4 folks were still in that ethnocentric kind of place where slavery was quite acceptable to that set of values. Interesting stuff.

The other interesting extension of this Layer 2 Tribal way of being human is looking at its harmonic echo in the Second Tier, which is Layer 8, which was the most complex system that Graves found in his field research. He only had six people who showed up there, so he really didn't capture a lot of data on it, but what we're looking at here is a Second Tier iteration of original tribalism that will be at a global level. So we're talking about recognition, acceptance and living out, as fact, all humans being part of one tribe which belongs to planet Earth. The really interesting thing about that is that if you look back to this Layer 2 original tribalism, the tribe was almost defined by other tribes—you can only really recognise yourself as a tribal subset within a collection of tribes—and so if you then extend that to global existence as the human tribe on planet Earth, there's an implication there that there must be other tribes, right?

Mitch: Going to the galactic community, right?

Steve: Exactly. So there's really a strong suggestion there that by the time we see this Layer 8 value set play out at a global level, we ought to be in contact with other tribes outside planet Earth.

Nyck: That sounds exciting.

Mitch: And then what does the egocentric layer look like? Because there wasn't any data with Graves's research into what would be Layer 9, I would assume, but hooking out into this new individual focus and getting off-planet.

Steve: Exactly. It certainly implies those themes, and we'll talk about that egocentric stuff in a minute before we finish the show. It's very interesting, and I'm speaking from a kind of mainstream representative perspective here, but there are plenty of people on the planet right now who claim to be in contact with extraterrestrial intelligence.

Nyck: Well, you found a piece that we were talking about earlier this morning, about—who was that who had recently come out in the U.S. government and started to say that what will be revealed will surprise you, or something to that effect?

Mitch: That was a NASA scientist. It was kind of doublespeak, saying, 'we've already found it, but we'll let you know soon.'

Steve: That's right. This was an article talking about life on Mars and I think it was indicating microscopic life or something like that, but the way it was announced by NASA, if you read between the lines, was basically, 'OK, we've already found this, but we haven't announced it yet. You've got to get ready for the announcement.'

Nyck: We do have a text here which is relevant to our talking about tribalism: "Don't you think the more evolved we become, the less we should be concerned about our ancestry? After all, aren't we all one from the same source?" That's from Trace from Tasmania who listens regularly. Hello Trace, thanks for listening.

Steve: That's a really good point, Trace, thanks for that. As we evolve, it's more about transcending and including rather than rejecting, so it's not so much that we're going to reject and not look at our ancestry, but we're going to recognise that we all have a common ancestry.

Mitch: That was one of the things about the Pink Floyd or the Roger Waters piece last night and the combativeness of the pigs.

Steve: Very classic Layer 6.

Mitch: We have to understand that we're all humans and as much as we may not like or align with other people's values sets, they still are very much a part of humanity.

Nyck: As Roger Waters says at the end, it's not 'us and them', it's actually that we are all 'us'.

Mitch: Just us.

Steve: Yes, it's very interesting, and as I was saying, each one of these communal systems has a boundary around it, but the boundary becomes wider and becomes more inclusive as we go up the spiral. At Layer 4, it might be everybody from my belief system, which could be people all over the world who are seen as part of the in-crowd; and then at Layer 6, which is the emerging Relativistic-Humanistic layer, what we see as we see people talking as if all of humanity is included, but if you listen carefully to what they're saying, there's always an 'other'. It's like everybody should be loved and everybody should be included; everybody should have access to everything ... and we've got to really fight against these pigs. So it's quite paradoxical.

Nyck: In the Orwellian sense, obviously, Roger Waters and 'us and them' is reflective of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*.

Steve: That's right, exactly.

Let's get onto Egocentric and talk about ourselves, shall we, before we have to wrap the show up. The third layer in this pre-rational zone is the Egocentric layer. It was called Egocentric by Clare Graves and it's very much about personal freedom. As we evolve up through these layers, each next layer is a response to the problems created by the previous layer, and so Egocentric is all about busting out of the restrictions and limitations that are placed on us in a Tribal setting where there are costumes and taboos and all sorts of things. There's a kind of a fixed hierarchy that we can't do much about, and the classic story to describe, historically, the emergence of this Egocentric third layer is the young man who grows up and starts to believe that he's smarter and stronger than the Chief who's in charge of the tribe, and so he uses his own personal power to take over, basically, to break out of the tribal boundaries. As these individual systems do, they kind of stretch, extend, adapt, dismantle the ethical frameworks that are created in the communal systems. Think of, historically, the extreme case of Genghis Khan. The movie *Mongol* gives a wonderful depiction of him growing up in a very traditional tribal society that is continually being raided by these Layer 3 power-oriented folks who are just using power to take what they want and do what they want,

and then he decides to fight back. He becomes one of these raiders and then conquers most of the known world as a result.

Nyck: And of course, we're seeing now, Donald Trump, the President of the United States, displaying very much this Layer in his behaviour, I would suggest. Would you agree with that?

Steve: From time to time, yes. I wouldn't say that he was dominated by it. I'd say a lot of the time he's operating out of the fourth layer where he has his own very, very clear ideas of what's right and what's not right—and he does actually, believe it or not, display some discipline in sticking to what he thinks is right around that—but he does from time to time, fall back into the third layer and you hear him say things like, 'well, I'm the President, I can do whatever I want.'

Nyck: Looking at the descriptions of the systems, "spontaneous and colorful" certainly applies to him; and "express the self impulsively and forgetting others", so there's clearly those moments where he slips back into that.

Steve: Yes, and it gets a bad rap, this third layer, because of its power orientation and its tendency to do what it wants, regardless of how it impacts other people, but it's also about any aspect of personal freedom which is expressed in the moment. That can be pleasurable behaviour; it can be fun, spontaneous behaviour. This particular value set actually informs a lot of the comedy that we've seen over the last few decades, where you see people get up there and they'll say whatever they want to say—they don't care about offending people—and they're often using power-oriented funny stories as part of their comedy routine where there's always a loser, right? It's funny talking about the loser and what the loser did and what happened to the loser.

Nyck: Fascinating. Fantastic stuff.

Steve: It is very interesting.

Mitch: Thinking back to my teenage years, it pretty much fits in with that—that expression of self getting out of the family and being able to assert that power, as you mentioned. It was always at the expense of others.

Steve: Exactly, and it's fair to say that people who are operating purely from this third layer, in that pre-rational zone, have no real tendency to consider the impact of their behaviour on other people, and no real capacity to really tap into how someone else is feeling, so they can behave in quite a merciless and cruel way. Graves was quite specific about that in his research notes.

And so when you look at manifestations of this particular value set in modern society, you could look at things like, for example, the cartels in Mexico and the cruel, merciless behaviour that they exhibit where they just clearly aren't concerned about the impact of their behaviour on other people, to the point of killing people, obviously.

The other interesting thing about this third layer is that as we're emerging now beyond the Modern era and into this Relativistic-Postmodern era, one of the big themes, of course, is liberation and freedom and human rights and giving everybody the right to speak and do whatever they want, and those sorts of things. It's very loose in many cases, and we saw great examples of that looseness back in the 60s when we had that wave come through rebellion where people were just doing whatever they wanted to do: free love and all that kind of stuff. What that does is it that permissiveness creates an environment where this third Egocentric layer can step in and do whatever it wants. It's almost an excuse—it's a free pass for them to do and say whatever they want—and so when we see reports in the media of things like the *Extinction Rebellion* protests or rebellion in Hong Kong and all those sorts of things, one of the ways that we can distinguish between Layer 3 and Layer 6 behaviour is that 6 is inherently peaceful. If someone is operating with Layer 6 as their dominant value system, we shouldn't see them harming another human being, because peaceful behaviour is paramount there. So violence being exhibited in these riots and things is most likely coming from Layer 3, where they see an opportunity to join in what they see as a gang and then to do whatever they like to express their anger and rage, to the point of throwing petrol bombs and bricks and stuff—the kind of stuff that has been happening in Hong Kong.

Nyck: Or can it also be an expression where the Layer 6, Postmodern layer is trying to be expressed by these people, but they're not getting much success, so the frustration builds and they slip back, in a way, to that reactionary posture (talking about the shadow)?

Steve: The shadow of 6, exactly. It can be that; it can be a regression.

Mitch: Which is probably one of the reasons that 6 does not last long on the planet, at least as a dominant paradigm.

Steve: Yes, as a communally-oriented paradigm, it's not in its nature to make significant change because it's a conformist paradigm, and so it will very much rejig our values, it

will bring us a new set of human values that puts value on all the things that *Extinction Rebellion* is talking about—the environment, blah, blah, blah; stopping our damaging behaviours out of the Scientific-Industrial era—but then creating the new structures and actually changing the physical world is going to be done by an individually-oriented system. So really, it's up to the first individual system to Second Tier, which is that Yellow-coded [Layer 7] system in *Spiral Dynamics*, to actually create those physical, material changes.

Nyck: Another text just came in. I think it's from Dudley; thanks Dudley, another one of our long-term listeners: "Hmmm, not so sure re the Hong Kong activism. Second Tier can choose the appropriate use of all levels below, including violent protests. And yes, it may be used by those not at level 2. Great show brothers." Interesting question.

Steve: Yes, I would challenge that. I mean it's true that everybody has free choice and no doubt there may be circumstances where somebody who's capable of Second Tier living might choose violence, but I believe it would be most likely in a defensive situation. If you think about the big picture strategy of what's going on in Hong Kong and the threat of China openly using violence against the citizens of Hong Kong, I think trying to escalate that situation into violence is something that a Second Tier individual would be very unlikely to do because there's too much to lose. It just doesn't make sense at all. The best outcome that can happen in that situation is a peaceful resolution and so everything I know about Second Tier intelligence tells me that Second Tier, if it is involved in any way in that particular thing, would be looking for that particular outcome, remembering that Second Tier respects all life and wants the best outcomes for all life. The idea of an enemy to Second Tier is just incongruous, really. Every human is a human being and every human deserves to be treated as a human being, so being violent in a voluntary way against another human just doesn't make sense to Second Tier intelligence.

Nyck: To achieve something, as he's suggesting, possibly in relation to an outcome.

Steve: Yes, I can understand it happening in a defensive situation where it's your life or the other life, but even choosing to do that would be a terribly difficult thing for Second Tier individual to do.

Nyck: Interesting. I was just wondering, you mentioned Donald Trump before, briefly, and all this discussion in a piece that's just been published this morning from *The Daily Beast*: "If Trump's rage brings civil war," which we mentioned earlier, "where will the

military stand?" (<https://www.thedailybeast.com/if-trumps-rage-brings-civil-war-where-will-the-military-stand>)

Steve: That's a really good question.

Nyck: It's a very good question, isn't it? What do you reckon?

Steve: I think one of the advantages of the military in that situation is if this is attempted to be instigated from a pre-rational point, the military is operating from a more complex place up the value spiral there—from 4 and 5 and beyond in some cases—so as we've seen through the Trump administration doing what it's been doing, often we've seen military people step up and say some really sensible things and hose down stupid ideas. So I would hope that the military would be a stabilising participant in trying to limit or stop that from happening.

Nyck: I guess he's suggesting, obviously, that if he gets impeached in some way or other—if there's a result that is negative for the Trump—that his vast number of quite angry and passionate, if you will, supporters may well revolt.

Steve: I think it's quite possible and a number of commentators have flagged the possibility of civil war in the US over the next ten years. I think it's quite possible, given the divisions within the United States on racial lines and values lines generally.

Mitch: And that's why you guys are setting up the American refugee camp.

Steve: That's right. We'll be starting a fundraising programme soon to buy teepees.

Nyck: Well, you've bought in early, which gives you precedence and gives you a special position, and thanks for your deposit. We're very happy to welcome you.

Steve: You may end up being the first commandant of the refugee camp.

Nyck: Schultz! That's true. Love it.

Well, I think we'll leave it there. Sounds like an appropriately silly place to leave it on this holiday Monday. Thanks for joining us here on *Future Sense*. We'll be with you next Monday morning.

Steve: Take care.

Nyck: Thank you very much. Bye.

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.