



3. Evolutionary Tension: New Problems, Old Thinking

Recorded on 10th December, 2018 in Byron Bay, Australia.

Future Sense is a podcast edited from the radio show of the same name, broadcast on BayFM in Byron Bay, Australia, at www.bayfm.org. Hosted by Nyck Jeanes and well-known international futurist, Steve McDonald, Future Sense provides a fresh, deep analysis of global trends and emerging technologies. How can we identify the layers of growth personally, socially and globally? What are the signs missed; the truths being denied? Political science, history, politics, psychology, ancient civilisations, alien contact, the new psychedelic revolution, cryptocurrency and other disruptive and distributed technologies, and much more.

This is Future Sense.

Nyck: Good morning to you. I hope you've had a great weekend. It's been a busy time, and for many of us, perhaps, there's a lot of themes in our lives and the perception of politics, culture, society that are carrying on and plugging you in in some way, or you're watching from a distance and shaking your head in disbelief. Certainly I'm a bit like that at times. It's quite incredible what is going on, and we seek, on this show, to focus through the eyes of the notion of the future—where we're moving to, how are we best serving ourselves and serving the planet and serving our society—and looking consciously and with awareness at the way to stimulate and accelerate and change on the planet, and growth, essentially. There are many themes here, of course, and currently in this country and around the world, there are many issues—many hot button issues—going on; many things flaring up. Look at what's going on in Paris and France, for example; and the whole thing with the Trump administration in America. It seems like there's going to be a lot of revelations coming out there soon, and of course, in this country, we've just seen our government, including the Labor Party, support the bill—what's it called?

Steve: People have been calling it generally the anti-encryption bill.

Nyck: Oh yes, there's another new name for it but I didn't want to say that on air.

Steve: Slightly a misnomer because it's not actually breaking encryption, but it's finding ways to get around it.

Nyck: So before we go into some of those topics, especially the anti-encryption bill, many themes, as I said, are going on. How do we look at this from the big picture? How can we take a step back for a moment before we go in deep into some of these issues that are currently on the planet?

Steve: I think one useful way is just to bear in mind that we are in the midst of this transition from the Modern paradigm to the next paradigm, which we might call Relativistic or Postmodern, and with every shift like this, there are some fundamental themes in terms of how we think, how we organise ourselves and how we structure society and organisations. We can look at the specific themes that come with this new paradigm—for example, the decentralisation of power within network-centric ways of living is a theme, and that implies connecting all the dots; connecting everybody that's concerned with any particular issue that we might need to address. Open and transparent communication is another theme, and with that comes honesty and integrity, of course. What we're seeing is that the absence of these things is actually causing issues now.

You can look at pretty much any of these big stories that are in the news at the moment and see, okay, there seems to be an imbalance in each of these situations where people aren't talking to each other enough—people aren't connecting the dots enough between all of the relevant issues. There's an absence of honesty and transparency often, and this is showing up in our domestic politics and international affairs, and the themes that come with the new paradigm offer us solutions. This is why there is a paradigm shift under way, because the tension created by the old system's inability to cope with the additional complexity is bringing a new way of doing things which is really resulting from a shift in human consciousness. It's always good to just come back and understand that that is the actual trigger for the change—the a shift in human consciousness, a shift in how we perceive reality, how we perceive what needs to be done.

Nyck: Just on that point, of course, how many people, I wonder—in this community, in Australia, in the world generally speaking, and of course, it's different in different countries—are aware of, conscious of, relate to, believe in the notion that there is a shift in consciousness itself? For many people, that notion is not a familiar idea.

Steve: You're right, and even the idea of evolution. I think, generally, people seem to think—and it's certainly the impression I got growing up through my formal education—that evolution was something that happened a long time ago and it's not really going on at the moment. We're kind of waiting for something new to happen, but nothing much is going on, which is very naive, really. It's an ongoing process. It's always happening, even though sometimes we can't see it, and I think science has been slow to really pick up on evolution in the present time. We hear little bits and pieces about it through

science occasionally, and certainly I think part of the reason that science hasn't been big on it is that a lot of the evolution that has been going on that we talk about on this show has been psychological evolution—evolution in the way that we perceive reality in our underlying frameworks for making sense.

Nyck: Which is arguably not a pure science and thus is disregarded, or at least put to the side somewhat: well that's interesting, but it doesn't really apply to the scientific model.

Steve: That's right. No, we don't have very many machines with needles and dials and numbers on them that can track that kind of thing so it doesn't fit with the materialist mindset.

Nyck: It's so interesting, this notion of evolution itself, and consciousness evolution—because the word consciousness, of course, is very contested—it's a favourite word of mine, but it's a word science has had difficulty with up until recently, you could argue.

Steve: It's a very broad term, too. People talk about consciousness in many, many different ways and there are many facets to it, so it's always good to be as specific as possible if we're going to talk about that.

Nyck: But this idea that human nature is just human nature, I think this is one of the places where, in our discourses, we get stuck—in the notion that things don't evolve: 'Oh, humans are like that. That's how we are.'

Steve: Well, that's right, yes, and this comes from the First Tier perspective where whatever value system we're immersed in seems like the only value system to us. We don't have that visibility of the multiple layers of consciousness, which really only comes—I mean, you can teach the theory of it to somebody who's coming from a First Tier mindset; you can teach them the theory just like you can teach any kind of theory that has multiple aspects to it—but to really get it, you need to be starting to poke into the Second Tier and starting to get that understanding of the multi-dimensionality.

Nyck: Which is an experimental thing, isn't it? And as we talk about these tiers, folks, if you don't know what we are referring to, we're talking to the model of psychological development by Clare W. Graves.

Steve: And tiers is spelt t-i-e-r-s.

Nyck: That's right, although there are plenty of tears that need to be cried on this planet at the moment, for many, many things. At once it's a very sad place, and also very beautiful, and that paradox of being is also part of the equation right now, that so many people are having wonderful experiences in a world where so many of us have so much, and pretty well most people on the planet have more than they used to have—many don't, but many do—and yet we're not happy, we're not satisfied (most of us), we're confused, we're dislocated somewhat, we are struggling with the networks of our being, you could argue, and the networks that we now rely on for much of our interaction—social media and the likes—and yet there's all the contested space between 'who am I?' and 'who am I within the whole?'

Steve: That's right, and when we're in transition, we have to navigate this place of not really knowing what our values are, so that adds to the tension at the time. Many people are going through this transition themselves at a personal level and their values are shifting, and in that space, there's a bit of a no-man's land in between the old values and the new values where you kind of cut yourself adrift from the old values but you haven't quite got hold of what your new values are yet, so it's a place of enquiry, a place of uncertainty.

Nyck: And I suppose with a lot of that confusion, what happens is projection outwards onto various elements in society that don't seem to be resonating with or reflecting where one is at in themselves—what a person is needing, what a person is thinking or feeling about life, the universe and everything, their own personal lives, their situations—and seeing a lack of response, of genuine response with integrity and authenticity as you said before, from our politicians, from our business leaders, the banking royal commission is an obvious example recently, etc., etc.. And so the anger and repression that people are feeling is projected outward so often because they don't know where else to place that energy.

Steve: Yes, that's true, and one of the general themes around this transition beyond the Modern paradigm is one of being tired and exhausted. The Modern Scientific-Industrial mindset is mainly focused on personal success, and the concept that sits behind that is that personal success is a direct result of the amount of time and effort that you put in. So if we're not succeeding, then we're not working long enough, we're not putting the time in or we're not trying hard enough, and consequently, this eventually leads to burnout. When we've got that mindset: 'I'm not succeeding, I just need to try harder, I've got to spend more time', eventually that leads to the classic burnout, which then often

results in a sea change or a tree change where people just want to cut loose from where they have been, get out of the madness, escape the rat race and those kinds of things.

Nyck: Part of it to me brings up this thing I've been saying recently, that we're kind of addicted, I think, to causation—the notion that one thing leads to the other. Like you're saying there, if you work harder, you'll make more money, you'll be more successful—there is a direct causal link—but of course, that's just one way of seeing it, and that really is, I guess, a First Tier way of seeing how things work in our reality.

Steve: Certainly. The whole linear thing really emerges with the fourth layer where, as we've spoken about on the show before, we get the frontal lobe development kicking in, the cause-and-effect understanding: 'if I do that, then this happens'.

Nyck: Which has led to a lot of very good science, but it's as an incomplete picture.

Steve: Well, yes. In each one of the value systems, the perspective is incomplete, so it's all part of adding to the compiled picture of the world that we have with each new layer. The linear thinking from the Agricultural fourth layer—the Authoritarian way of doing things—then breaks out into multiplicity in the Modern mindset, where instead of just having one right way of doing things and being totally linear and black-and-white, then we have multiple options and we can explore each option and test each option; experiment to find which is the best option for us. That brings great flexibility and increased capacity to cope with complexity, but we're moving beyond that now.

One of the reasons is that we're getting flooded with information from our connectivity—our communications technology—so we're no longer able to look at all the options and assess each one, we just don't have the time. There are millions of options now—too much information—so the next step in moving to the sixth layer is to form networks, use our networks, consult our peers, so we're actually multiplying our own brain power through the network. Instead of having to overtax our brain to look at all of these options, which there are just too many of now, then we ask all of our peers and say, 'what do you guys think?' and we come up with a group solution. That transition that we're in right now at a global level—and many, many people are going through it personally—offers the solutions for many of the great challenges that we're facing in society at the moment.

Nyck: When you talk about this flood of information that we have in our reality, the add-on here in the last couple of years—not that it's new, it's always been there—is the notion of 'fake news', that sort of label—the reliability of information, the truth of information, the relative truth of information, too. The only way we can really determine

that is, I guess, by dialogue with our peers: 'So what do you think of this? Is this true? How do you feel about that? Where does that come from? Do you connect with that; make sense of all that?'

Steve: Even the definition of 'true' is changing, right?

Nyck: Oh, I love it.

Steve: As I often say, whose truth are we talking about here? The scientific way of thinking is that we can experiment and test to find the truth. Previously, in the fourth layer, which is the Authoritarian-Agricultural way of thinking, the truth came from God.

Nyck: It was given to us.

Steve: It came from a higher authority—it might not have always been God—but we didn't have access to that knowledge; we had to consult a higher authority to get the knowledge. That was the mindset, and anybody who thought that they had the knowledge was a heretic and sometimes they were burnt as a result, right? Anybody who stood up and said, 'hey, look, I've been working this out, and now I figured that the Earth is not flat, it rotates around the Sun', then 'uh, whoa, that didn't come from God.'

Nyck: Burn him; burn her, more to the point.

Steve: And that actually happened. Then, when we became Modern and Scientific, then we actually started to believe, 'no, no, we can figure things out, we can actually do science we can find out what's true.' Then that gets tricky and shifts again with the transition to the sixth layer where all of a sudden we start to realise that, 'wait, it looks true from this angle, but if we go around and stand over there and look back at it the other way, it actually looks different', so the truth shifts depending on your perspective.

Nyck: Yes, because of course, in the fifth layer, I guess truth is an aspect that serves your particular version; that serves the result that you're trying to achieve.

Steve: Well, that's right. Usually, science comes up with a hypothesis first and then tests it through experimentation to find the truth, but simply the formation of the hypothesis, of course, has an influence on how you go about testing and doing the science, right? So

you're shaping the outcome by forming the hypothesis, and as we know, often, when you go looking for something, you can pretty much be sure you'll find it.

Nyck: We're talking a little bit this morning about all the change that is occurring on the planet—that shift in Clare W. Graves's model from Layer 5 into Layer 6—from the Multiplistic to the Relativistic expression of human beings. We're seeing the struggle of that change showing up in so many different places in the world: in politics and culture and the like.

One of those, of course, is the anti-encryption bill that's just been passed in our federal parliament in the last couple of days, at the end of the year sitting season.

Steve: What an interesting thing that is. It brings up so many different issues. Of course, we've got this regressive values search going on as well, because we're in the transition phase between two paradigms, so it's not just the challenge of moving from the Modern Scientific-Industrial way of thinking to the Relativistic, but it's also the challenge of a lot of our leaders slipping backwards into rigid linear thinking, or even worse, into just pure power-based behaviours, which we see a bit.

Nyck: Yes, we certainly do. And it seems this legislation, folks—and I know many of you, especially listening to this station, would be pretty up to speed with this legislation which does a number of things—but it requires smartphone makers and software developers to provide a backdoor into encryption services for Australian police and security agencies. This is something that, other than probably in countries like China and a couple of others—Russia, you could argue—has never really been done before.

Steve: Let's not forget the USA.

Nyck: Ah, well, the USA. Oh, no, the USA is pure and perfect, and they don't do things like that at all. They are the guardians of democracy across the planet.

Steve: Was that guy's name—Snowden?

Nyck: Oh, I forgot about him.

Steve: Yes, really interesting. Where do we start? There are so many different issues that we can unpack around this. One of them is just the fact that this was a publicly tabled and discussed bill, which I find very, very interesting. Historically, these sorts of decisions around intelligence gathering have been made behind closed doors and not discussed publicly, so I think it's very interesting, just the fact that they've decided to put this on the table and discuss it in parliament.

Nyck: Well, it seems pretty obvious to me that it's all about politics. An election is coming up next year and the Coalition, in particular, likes to be seen to be tough on terrorism, tough on crime and the like; and the Labor Party sort of surrendered and went along with this legislation at the last minute, on, I think Thursday last week. They have got a lot of the same thing going on, fearing a backlash I suspect, in a significant portion of the community looking at Labor as being soft on these supposedly anti-terrorism legislations.

Steve: Yes, it would be interesting to find out why it was pushed into a public discussion. From the point of view of the intelligence agencies, really the worst thing for them is to have it out in the open—their strategy, their operating methods. They don't really want to advertise those, and by putting this out and saying, 'well, here's what we're going to do, folks—we're going to build back doors into these apps', it really lets the cat out of the bag from an Intelligence point of view.

Nyck: And all the tech people, experts that I've heard speak on this, among many other considerations, one of the obvious considerations is if there is a back door in various applications—WhatsApp, for example, is one of the ones that they're targeting as supposedly a platform that terrorists and child pornographers and the like use, and I'm sure that's true—but if there is a back door, that back door then can be used and accessed and manipulated by the very forces that they are trying to keep an eye on.

Steve: That's right, and that's happened in recent times. There have been a number of leaks of tools used by the NSA, for example, which have then escaped into the general hacker population and been used against the very people who designed them, most likely. Yes, lots of inconsistencies around the whole thing.

In terms of the impact of this bill—and I understand basically that they've rubber stamped it but said that they need to do some refining before it is put into practice—that in itself means that they haven't really fulfilled this Christmas wish that the government had to have it in place before Christmas. The public comment—at least, what I saw in the media—was a comment by Duncan Lewis who heads up ASIO, who came out and said, 'well, if this was available to us, we'd use it immediately', but I just noticed that the tone of his comment really didn't match the tone of, for example, the

Prime Minister who was saying 'this is urgent, we're all in danger', you know, 'our Christmas trees are going to get blown up by terrorists unless we have this in place before Christmas'. There seemed to be a mismatch there, which points to the fact that this really was a political stunt by Morrison. I don't know whether it was to distract people from the internal issues that he's having in his own party.

Nyck: No doubt. As far as I can see, whenever the issues of terrorism or crime are raised in a sort of shrill voice in any way whatsoever by any side of politics, anywhere, it's to do with a failing poll numbers, essentially, and I think that's probably a pretty direct causative relationship there.

Steve: Yes, I think so, and this speaks to these general themes that we started the show with, of looking at the need for transparency. I mean, transparency is here whether we like it or not, and that's come because of our communications technology. It's very, very hard to keep it secret now. Go back 20, 30 years and this whole idea of corporate image was well accepted and in practice—organisations were able to hire professionals to manage their public image quite successfully.

Nyck: Yes, well, corporations were actually respected, whether they deserved it or not, but they were generally respected.

Steve: And no matter what was going on behind the scenes, usually the general public didn't get to see what was happening behind the scenes. But now, because of the fact that everybody has access to social media and it's so easy to broadcast to the world, that idea of being able to manage a public image and have it separate to the reality of what's going on inside has just basically broken down completely. So we now need to have a balance between internal dynamics and external dynamics—what we're showing to the world with our chosen public face needs to actually match what's going on inside the organisation and inside ourselves.

Nyck: Ooooh, and that's the key, isn't it, really? Because our institutions, our governments, companies that represent us and produce and provide for us, are all, in one sense, externalisations of our own inner battle and inner process that we're going through.

Steve: Yes, and consequently, this is why our politicians are looking so ... what's the word?

Nyck: Frazzled, fraught, effed up.

Steve: Dishonest.

Nyck: They're not very impressive.

Steve: You know, lacking integrity and substance—it's because we can see what's going on inside their political parties, for example. I mean, look at the issues that the Libs [Liberal party] are having inside their organisation. They're ripping themselves apart, really, and Scott Morrison's trying to stand up in public and look like everything's okay: 'this place isn't on fire, it's all fine and we're being tough and we've got this, we've got everything in hand', when in fact, they haven't.

Nyck: There's a wonderful new Russell Brand video out on *Netflix* called *Rebirth*. I think it's very, very clever; it's very good. There's a point in there where he talks about politics and he talks about when a new administration is voted in somewhere—he was talking about Britain but it applies everywhere—and a new prime minister or the prime minister who's won the election comes out and says, 'we're going to look after all of you, we're going to keep our borders safe, we're going to do this and do that', all the stuff they purport to say—and Russell Brand goes on to say, 'we all know it's bullshit. Everybody knows that now but we just sort of go, oh yeah.' If we really believed it we'd all be saying 'oh great, he said we can all be looked after. Fantastic! We're going to have tax relief and oh my God, our borders are safe.' And then he said, wouldn't it be great if one leader just came out after winning an election and said, 'we're going to continue as we normally do. We're going to be kowtowing to big business, we're going to be taking donations here and there, we're going to be manipulating what we do in order to satisfy our own salaries and justify our positions and our belief systems, our religion, da da da'. Wouldn't it be refreshing if at least they came out from Number 10 Downing Street or from Parliament House in Canberra just said 'we're full of shit, and here we go.'

Steve: Yes. It would be even better if they came out and said, 'this is the way things have been and we know that it's not right and we're going to fix it.'

Nyck: That would be ideal. We're not going to see that anytime soon, but you never know.

Steve: We are going to see it. This is the way things are headed.

Nyck: That's right. We do like to be positive in this show, folks. We like to inform you; we're here to hopefully give you some useful information, interesting discourse and dialogue about how we're going on this planet—not to scare you, to frighten you, to make you feel like everything's screwed up, but actually to say 'here are the issues, and things are changing for the better.' You may not be able to see them right now, it may look completely confusing, paradoxical, but actually we are moving forward. We are moving into a new world, really—ultimately. That's our, I don't know about belief, but ... you know, 'have your beliefs but don't believe in them.'

Steve: That's our public image that we're portraying.

Nyck: It's our public image.

Thanks for your texts. The first text this morning was from Sandy. She said: "It's an oxymoron, intelligence gathering." Thanks.

Steve: Well, on that note, one of the hilarious things is that, so obviously, many of our politicians have got no idea about the technology—they just do not understand what they're even talking about. I think the funniest thing in recent times when the Attorney General came out and started talking about metadata and it became very, very obvious that he didn't even know what it was. He was just reading from some script, and I guarantee that most of the politicians in parliament probably had no idea about the technology behind what they were discussing. It really just comes down to a shouting match, often. I don't know if you ever tune in to the ABC broadcast of parliament. God! I can never really listen to it.

Nyck: Oh no, 30 seconds is enough.

Steve: You could go and stick your head in a kindergarten classroom and you'll hear something very, very similar, basically.

Nyck: Exactly. Australian politicians also have a wonderful habit of leaving the chamber on important social, moral issues, and staying in the chamber for things like we're now discussing—pay rises for MPs. They're all in the chamber for that.

Steve: What a surprise. The dynamic of power plays—competition rather than collaboration—is very much old paradigm and still very much present in our political system. We would be wise to actually take notice of the breakdown of its capacity to cope at the present time—to pay attention to that and to start to think as a society

about how we shift towards these new paradigm themes: how do we move to a motivation of seeking harmony and balance rather than seeking 'power over' within our politics, for example?

Nyck: The letting go of the notion of competition is a really big one, isn't it? Because it appears clearly in our societies now: you win a competition of one sort or the other, small or very large, business or just in the playground, and you are the winner. It comes with certain benefits and kudos and friendship, perhaps—all sorts of benefits that appear to accrue from being competitive and winning because being competitive and losing, well you don't get that stuff.

Steve: No, and it's driven by our values. Whatever our core values are, wherever they sit on that spectrum of consciousness, is going to shape our behaviour, so we've designed a political system which operates very much around this competition, and usually between just two major parties. In the past, in a less complex society, that worked quite well, where you could have a couple of people debating and arguing about what's best, and whoever won or put forward the best argument would usually get their way. That's fine when you've only got a couple of choices but when you've got so many choices that you can't count them all, it breaks down; it doesn't work.

Nyck: And it's also fine, I guess, in a pre-social media world, a pre-internet world, where those discussions on a certain level may be occurring, and the result happens, and then a certain number of people within a geophysical radius know about that, it sort of leaks out and eventually people discuss that and perhaps that things change; but now a decision is made in a competitive way—someone wins, someone has a point of view—and out it goes, bang, to everywhere and immediately a flood of responses, positive, negative and everything in between come in, so it becomes much more complex much quicker.

Steve: Yes, and often, arguments that are put forward in hope of winning a debate are very, very quickly cut down by somebody who knows what's actually going on. They'll tweet that and it'll go viral, and the argument is suddenly hollow, just like this argument that they put forward that they really need to get this legislation through before Christmas because of the terrible, terrible security threat, at the same time as the border force budget is being cut.

Nyck: I don't even know how they can—I tried to search for that before. I couldn't actually find a direct piece about the border force budget. I think they're managing what's going out a little bit.

Steve: I'm sure they are trying manage it.

Nyck: It's ridiculous that they pushed through this legislation, dubious at the best—its nature, its application and what's going to happen from this legislation itself—and meanwhile, for the very people who supposedly protect our borders and do other stuff like that, the budget is being cut massively and a whole bunch of jobs are going.

Steve: Yes. Quite clearly there's a lack of integrity.

Nyck: 'Please explain' as somebody famous once said.

Steve: This argument is not one based on integrity, obviously. I did find an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* from 7th December (<https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/leaks-show-border-force-slashing-airport-staff-at-christmas-as-budget-cuts-bite-20181206-p50km9.html>) saying that: "The Australian Border Force is quietly slashing staff numbers at airports over the busy Christmas period and is believed to have suspended a fleet of boats supposed to protect the nation's northern waters in cost-cutting moves that insiders say threaten national security." At the very same time, the Prime Minister is standing up in parliament and saying, 'unless we get this bill through, we're not going to be safe at Christmas time', so I'm afraid it just doesn't stack up.

Nyck: And Labor really has succumbed, as we said earlier, to this, without securing amendments and setting aside reservations. I'm not sure how that actually works with the legislation that's actually got through and become law, but somehow or other, they've managed to keep some reservations that they can revisit and make some amendments to this legislation next year. I'm not sure how that actually works.

Interestingly, on Friday, Shadow Digital Economy Minister, Ed Husic, called the bill's judicial oversight "tissue tough"—that's not very tough—saying: "There will be people who wonder why we did what we did", vote with the government. Yeah, der! (<https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/bill-shorten-under-internal-pressure-to-force-major-changes-to-rushed-encryption-laws-20181207-p50kvp.html>)

Steve: Absolutely, and again, you've got to ask yourself, why did Labor roll over on that? Quite likely it was a politically motivated move designed, I guess, in the assumption that it would shore up support for them as being seen to co-operate on an issue of security.

Nyck: The Labor party are leading 55 to 45 over the Coalition in the latest poll in *The Australian*, so obviously set at this time, anyway. As they say, a week in politics is a very long time, but at this point in time, you would think that the Coalition is definitely on the way out. But the question will be, does the Labor Party offer anything substantially more progressive than the Liberals? I think they probably do, but how much, is questionable?

Steve: Yes, and this is still the same old, same old, right? It's 'okay, let's swap this one for that one and then that won't work so we'll swap it back again.'

Nyck: Part of the same paradigm, yes.

Nyck: We've been talking particularly about the anti-encryption bill that has just passed with the support of Labor. We've been talking about, in a sense, the dying of that old layer of consciousness which is still very dominant on the planet, and it occurs to me and occurs to us that that old thinking that used to solve—did solve—many of the problems that came from previous iterations of the consciousness evolution, if you will, on this planet, is now actually creating more problems than it solves. I guess this is how it actually pans out when a mode of being starts to pass away but still clings to its old ways.

Steve: It is, and this anti-encryption bill is a particularly good example. That's why we're kind of milking it on the show today, because there are so many different facets to it that just beautifully represent the challenges of a paradigm shift and the challenges of changing our thinking and changing the ways that we solve our problems. As you were saying, one of the aspects of the paradigm shift is that the old way of thinking, which was really, really useful when it first emerged—it solved our previous problems and in the case of this Modern Scientific-Industrial paradigm, it allowed us to be quite successful in many, many different things, including designing amazing technology, which has connected us all together and made the world more complex—it gets to the point where the old way of thinking that produced that stuff doesn't work anymore because we're too connected. We were just discussing in the break how these useful ways that emerge when a new paradigm arrives, they evolve, they change, and their effectiveness shifts during the time of the paradigm, and as the paradigm itself creates more complexity, then eventually it'll get to the point where it supersedes itself, or, I guess, makes its own process redundant.

Nyck: Yes, it makes its own process redundant, that is a good way of putting it. And of course, if you're in power, if you think you've got the solutions, if you've had the solutions before and you start to realise that you're becoming redundant, well, the thing you do is to hang on tightly to the old way.

Steve: Well, the funniest thing is that what happens is that you try harder, you keep using the same processes—the same problem-solving processes, the same thinking—but you try harder and harder and harder to solve these problems, which are getting harder to solve, of course.

Nyck: They clearly haven't read Einstein.

Steve: And what eventually starts to happen is that your own process of thinking about the problem and attempting to solve it actually creates more problems instead of fixing the problems, which is just hilarious, and this is exactly what's happened with this anti-encryption bill. The implications, the impact of this legislation, is widespread, apart from the political issues. One of the challenges that we face at the moment is, of course, our political parties are struggling because they're based around old thinking and old structures; old ways of doing things. They are having more and more trouble internally, trying to resolve their own issues, and as that happens, then they're focusing more of their attention on fixing their own internal issues and no-one's actually driving the bus. There are so many strategic implications to this new legislation that they've just passed in parliament, it's going to create a world of hurt, basically, for the government. It has huge implications for the IT industry in Australia.

Nyck: Yes, and it's been spoken. You would have already read in the mainstream press or *Radio National*, for example—I've certainly heard pieces on those international IT companies like *Amazon*, *Apple* and *Atlassian*, which is Australian, *Microsoft* and many others may well leave Australia for this, and that would be a first, that's for sure. But it's not just that, is it? It's all about other things.

Steve: All sorts of things. Look at what is happening with the Chinese firm, *Huawei*, at the moment. They have been accused of being forced by the Chinese government to build in surveillance capacities—back doors in their hardware—which is causing them issues. I mean, Australia—and this is another hilarious part of this whole anti-encryption bill—we just decided not to allow *Huawei* to compete for introducing new communications technology here in Australia and yet within a week or so, we've gone out and we've basically passed legislation ...

Nyck: To do the same thing for other companies.

Steve: Exactly. We criticise the Chinese Communist Party for manipulating companies from China and making them do their spying for them, and here we are saying publicly that, 'oh, yes, we're going to do that.'

Nyck: Yeah, but the Chinese are wrong. They're the baddies, so it's justified that we can do this sort of thing.

Steve: Of course. Ours is about security, right? I was listening just recently on the radio to somebody who made a fairly extensive study—in other words, actually read the full bill which was passed through parliament—and some of the detail in there is very, very scary. They are talking about using this backdoor capacity, not just for issues of national security, but for basically small crimes.

Nyck: Petty crime. I think the Labor Party managed to get something to the effect that crimes of more than three years jail time would come under the auspices of this legislation. I think originally, though, they tried to pass it for basically anything, but I'm not sure. The details are very complex.

Steve: I forget the exact detail, too, but basically the example that was given in the radio show I was listening to was that the guy down the street who's downloading torrents of movies and that kind of thing illegally would be liable to be the target of this kind of surveillance.

Nyck: Because that person is dangerous to the national security, clearly.

Steve: Yes, and if we look at the recent report, which I think we mentioned on the show last week, of the huge number of requests—I think it topped 350,000 requests that had been made by different government agencies to access people's data for administrative issues, really—it's way, way out of control, and this legislation is just going to make it worse. But it goes beyond this. Issues, for example, of foreign policy—we've got all sorts of international organisations coming out now and criticising our government for what they've done.

Nyck: Foreign investment, therefore, in Australia.

Steve: Which foreign investor is going to put money into an Australian IT company now? No-one's going to do it. It's going to have a massive impact on the industry, and even domestic business will be going overseas. Anybody in Australia who's going to put together a Web platform or something like that would be crazy to go ahead and build it here in Australia because the legislation says that the government can force a company to put a back door in something and then it'll be illegal for anybody to mention the fact that that had happened, so you just wouldn't know, and therefore, it's undermining confidence in government if that needed doing, although I think it's already pretty well undermined. It's basically a massive strategic error and it's a big signpost that our government is mainly focused on playing party politics and power issues and trying to resolve and shore up their own internal situation as well, and not thinking about the strategy; not thinking about: how does this impact Australians? How does this actually serve Australians? Remembering that that's what the government is there to do, is to actually serve our society.

It raises that huge issue, particularly around issues of public privacy and public safety: at what point does the government actually stop doing what's best for Australia and start serving its own issues? Where do you draw that line? It's a big deal, and Australia would be very wise to actually sit up and take notice right now because this is the early part of a trend that's only going to grow as we progress through this paradigm shift. Our old ways of organising ourselves, our old ways of thinking about problems, and our old ways of trying to solve challenges, are actually creating more problems than they solve at this point in time, and that's going to get worse. I'd hate to think that we would start to experience the kind of issues, for example, that are showing up in France at the moment.

Nyck: Yes, I was just going to mention France as well.

Steve: Those sorts of things are inevitable if this issue isn't jumped on early, so yes, it's a big deal.

Nyck: Just jumping to France, it's interesting that in the latest series of protests over the weekend, Saturday in Paris curiously saw not that many people. I think the number I heard was about 8,000 people in the streets, and yet most of the major tourist destinations—the Eiffel Tower, the Louvre—were closed down for the day. The disruption was severe and the characteristics of the protestors was different in that instead of a lot of farmers coming in protesting the fuel tax and other issues—living standard issues in France; this compacting of people's ability to actually make choices purely because their life conditions are being diminished or certainly haven't grown significantly for a time—but instead of those sort of people coming back into Paris, the second round of protests saw a whole bunch of extreme-left and extreme-right

protesters joined in the same sort of battle. That's a curious characteristic of this, isn't it?

Steve: It is curious, but we know from Clare Graves's work that once you create a set of life conditions that is conducive to this emerging paradigm—in other words, once you provide a greater degree of visibility of what's going on; a greater capacity for people to hear about what's going on and express their own opinions—then that additional freedom of information and freedom of action creates a set of life conditions that is ripe for some of these earlier layers of consciousness to get out and express themselves in ways that they haven't done before. If we look at organisations and societies which are a bit ahead of the pack at the moment and have organised themselves around the new emerging paradigm, where there's really more freedom to do things and also more acceptance of diverse opinions, it also creates an environment where people who have more radical opinions and who might be likely to take violent action, for example, are more able to express themselves. That's one of the issues around the emerging paradigm that we need to be aware of, also.

Nyck: It seems to me that that's therefore a passing phase, but it's not a very comfortable passing phase—that notion that suddenly that freedom of life conditions for people to actually think about, understand, know, connect with, make the connections, sort through the news, the fake news, and have a response to it—a response that they may not have been able to make in their lives before—suddenly they're doing that. That's in one sense, a very good thing, but as you're saying, it also makes a very unstable, or more unstable world.

Steve: That's exactly right, and we see this here in our region—Byron Bay being a little bit ahead of the pack in terms of thinking according to the new paradigm values—is that we tolerate diverse opinions and sometimes we see reactions to those opinions that are surprisingly strong.

Nyck: Vehement.

Steve: Yes, but once you create a society with social structures and accessibility that is more open and more free, then you've got to expect that. You've got to expect to get those edgy things showing up, and sometimes those edgy things can even be threatening, so that's an important aspect of the new paradigm that we would do well to pay attention to.

Nyck: Because there are that many disgruntled people on the planet for one reason or the other, I think. To me, that's what's going on.

Steve: There are and this is also why this new paradigm is going to be short-lived, because it's going to resolve a lot of the issues that have been created by the previous Modern Scientific-Industrial paradigm, however, it's also adding to the complexity and it's not going to be sustainable. If we look at the time frames of all of the layers of consciousness and how long they've taken to play out and then be transcended through history, we can see that the time frames get shorter and shorter and shorter and shorter. From the original Hunter-Gatherer basic survival mindset ...

Nyck: Thousands and thousands of years.

Steve: 150,000 years or something like that, 200,000 years maybe, and now the Scientific-Industrial paradigm has been dominant for about 300 years and it's failing. If we look at that pattern, then we can reasonably assume that the emerging Relativistic paradigm will probably only be dominant or highly influential for a couple of decades before it needs to be superseded because of the additional complexity and the complex issues that are going to arise out of that way of being human—that way of living—and this is like the cherry on top of the cake that gives rise to the big leap in consciousness.

Nyck: Hallelujah.

Steve: It's the last little twist of the corkscrew that makes the cork pop.

Nyck: So be patient, but don't sit around and do nothing, either. There are things to do, to take note of, things to educate yourself about, there are things to use your unique and particular gift and ability in this lifetime to contribute to global transformation, so don't be overwhelmed. I'm telling you what to do. Don't do anything that I tell you to do, but seek to make sense of it. I'm trying to.

Nyck: We've been talking a lot about the anti-encryption bill that's just passed and some of the major issues that are there, and looking at that and the issues around it as a good example of one of the issues, problems, challenges that we face as we move from one expression of evolution, so to speak, to another—slowly but surely, but faster than we think.

Other issues are big, and I just want to mention, too, we've talked quite a lot about the use of substances on this show, both for medicinal reasons and also the response of governments to the quote-unquote, "illegal drug taking", in particular at dance parties. You'd be aware that a young man of 19 died on Sunday and three others also, I think, are in a critical condition after what's called the *Knockout Games of Destiny Dance Party* at *Sydney Olympic Park* on Saturday night. The question of pill testing is the big one on the table and again, the New South Wales government is not considering pill testing. It seems unconscionable to me.

Steve: It's really sad, actually, to see the New South Wales Premier responding in this way once again. If we analyse her logic or decision-making process, it looks to me that she has a very fixed mindset around this. It's not even really a Modern Scientific-Industrial way of thinking that she's displaying, it's prior to that, where she's taking quite a righteous stance and just saying that 'drugs are bad, this isn't right, therefore we're not going to look at any options', which is a very rigid kind of linear mindset, and also, to some extent, closed to options. I guess that Layer 4 Authoritarian, rigid way of thinking is generally not looking for options anyway because it's convinced that it knows what is right and so it generally doesn't look for evidence, it doesn't make considered decisions, it just simply follows what it believes to be right. It's a terrible, terrible shame to see somebody in a position of being Premier of New South Wales displaying this very, very old and ineffective thinking at the expense of young lives.

Nyck: She claims that pill testing is faulty because it doesn't take into account people's different physical attributes.

Steve: And that raises a very interesting question. Is she getting advice on that? Is this just something that she's made up her own mind about or is she getting advice on that? And if she is getting advice, then her advisers ought to be changed because there's plenty of evidence from overseas' experience that pill testing creates a safer play space. It reduces harm, there's no doubt about that whatsoever, and she's contradicting what we know to be proven experience overseas.

Nyck: Yes, indeed. One of her justifications is that she doesn't want to normalise drug taking—illegal drug taking—and it's interesting, isn't it? Normalise illegal drug taking. What about the normalising of drug taking that is legal? That's another question.

Steve: The issue is that illegal drug taking is normal.

Nyck: That's what I was getting to, precisely that. At this particular festival, they charged several people. With 200 searchers, they found 62 people with drugs anyway, so nearly a third of the people who they searched had drugs. So it is normal, and we're not condoning that, of course, here on this show, but let's actually face the fact that people do and will take these drugs. How can we make it safer for them to do so if they're going to do it anyway?

Steve: Yes, and we know how we can make it safer. We can make it safer through pill testing and there are people in Australia who have the expertise to do that. The money is there to do the pill testing if it's permitted and yet rigid mindsets like the Premier's, unfortunately, are preventing it from happening at the expense of young lives.

Nyck: And ultimately, decriminalisation would probably be a safer option overall. It's a delicate topic—it certainly is, no question about that—and we shouldn't say it should be one way or the other, but the reality is the business of drugs is a big business. If it is an illegal business, then there's more money, more danger, more criminal activity involved in the production and dispensation of drugs at these festivals, and you do not know what is in these things; you cannot know. So it just seems to be very common sense that at least pill testing is a step in the right direction to deal with the issue. Lots of stuff going on.

Coming back to Australia, you brought my attention to an interesting irony. We were talking about terrorism before and of course the Home Affairs Minister, the infamous Peter Dutton, has been so tough on asylum seekers since he's been in this government.

Steve: Or has he?

Nyck: Or has he? Because that's the question here. It has been brought to our attention that there's actually been more protection visa applications under Peter Dutton's watch than at any other time.

Steve: It's a record. 27,931 protection visa applications were made in the latest financial year.

Nyck: And this is by plane arrivals, so this is supposedly, in terms of this government, a more legal way to enter the country than by boats. It's certainly a safer way, that's for sure, you could argue, but nevertheless, there are people who arrive here under a tourism visa or perhaps without papers and taking their chances, and there's been more than any other time, so you've got to wonder about that.

Steve: Yes, and again, this kind of thing is predictable. Anyone who knows that game *Whack-A-Mole* would know that if you plug one of the holes, then it pops up through another hole. The government have come down very, very hard on boat arrivals and while they've been so fixated on looking at the boat arrivals, they have all been coming by plane.

Nyck: Former Immigration Department Deputy Secretary, Abul Rizvi, predicts this latest record will be broken in this current financial year, blaming the surge on the "chaos" in Mr Dutton's Home Affairs Department. "Most of the new wave of protection visa applicants are arriving on visitor visas and then lodging appeals as asylum seekers" (<https://thenewdaily.com.au/news/national/2018/12/09/record-number-asylum-seekers-peter-dutton/>). So they're not being put off trying to get to Australia, and Australia having, after all, been built on immigration from the very first day that we founded white settlement here—let's face it, we are all immigrants, full stop. And people are going to keep on coming here, that's that. How does this apply in terms of changing and the evolution of consciousness here—this movement of people, the reactionary stance of many governments are taking towards refugees in the world, the 'other'? How does this factor in and what's the change that's going to happen here as we go forward, do you predict? What do you see happening?

Steve: I think the population mobility at the moment is obviously tied to life conditions—people don't leave their homes unless they have a good reason to do so. We've seen a massive wave of population migration as a result of the conflicts in the Middle East, and I guess that's another example of old paradigm strategies attempting to solve one problem but creating more problems than they actually solve, for example. The conflicts in the Middle East have been driven by probably a number of different agendas, but certainly power within the region, and control of oil resources, I think, have been primary ones; and also feeding the beast—the military industrial complex—which has to have conflict to continue its business model, and so it's always good to have a nice little war going somewhere to keep that money rolling in. And even better if you can be selling your bombs to both sides of the conflict, which is a fairly recent development over the last few decades. But your bottom line is life conditions. If people's life conditions are such that they can't tolerate staying where they normally live—and most people most people want to stay living where they've grown up—it's simply a matter of life conditions.

In terms of immediate fixes, we should look to the emerging paradigm themes that we've been talking about before—connectivity and balance and social rights, social justice, those sorts of things; making sure people have the essentials that they need to live comfortably—to stem the migration. But, of course, that that also means bringing peace, which is another emerging theme in the sixth layer, the new paradigm that we're seeing showing up at the moment. It's very much about peace and harmony and seeking peace and harmony, and that will, in the short term, resolve a lot of these

issues. One of the ways that they've used in the European Union to try and deal with the population influx is to spread the load around, which is an emerging paradigm strategy—to spread it around, create a network and then use the resources within the network to address the issue rather than just trying to do it from one standpoint.

Nyck: Very good. Just a little bit more from this particular article, which comes from <https://thenewdaily.com.au>. The former Immigration Deputy Secretary is also quoted as saying that: "the big increase in protection visa applications over the past two years under Peter Dutton has mainly come from citizens of China, Malaysia and India. The department eventually finds most of the applications to be unmeritorious, but the processing and appeals process has become so slow that the individuals can be exploited here for three years on low wages or as sex workers before a final determination is reached. This surge requires a significant degree of organisation," the former Secretary said. "The smugglers must be aware of the paralysis in the Home Affairs Department due to a massive application backlog and must be savvily navigating this extremely complex application process", he wrote. Of course, meanwhile, which we've already mentioned today, "Home Affairs is reducing frontline staff like border staff and IT contractors."

Steve: And again, that's a perfect example of how old thinking and old systems are actually creating more problems than they solve—the paperwork backlog—and in the meantime, while the paperwork is not being done, all of these other problems have been created, and so it's more tension, more fuel for the change process.

Nyck: In last few minutes of the show, we thought we'd just take a jump to a completely different angle of what's going on in the future. We like to talk a little bit about astrology and deeper astrology. A lot of you out there are probably very akin to this, and many people, probably not, and that's perfectly okay, but we're just going to talk a little bit about the new moon. Oh, what were you going to say then, Steve?

Steve: I just want to say that what you said just prompted me to think of myself years ago when I didn't know much about astrology and I just read the columns in the newspaper, you know? And often they weren't right—I'd read my stars for the day and they didn't turn out the way they said they would in the newspaper.

Nyck: One twelfth of the world's population is like this today.

Steve: Exactly, it's just rubbish. It was only when I really got access to understanding the deeper issues and the deeper processes around proper astrology that I started to pay attention to it. So I think your comment is quite valid, and for anybody out there listening who does think astrology is rubbish, then you're probably like I was years ago and just reading the newspaper columns.

Nyck: I like to call it a trans-rational science. Of course, it's not a science in the traditional way; it's not a causative science: because the moon is here or that's there—it doesn't cause things to happen. To me it's like a reflection of things and a very useful one. It's quite profound if you can understand the deeper geometry and the transits and the movement of the planets in relationship to your own chart and to the charts of each other, in fact. It's pretty interesting.

And thanks for your comments, too: "Another informative, enlightening, inspiring start to the week with Future Sense. Mind-Expanding." Thank you very much. You get the special gold award today.

Steve: Absolutely.

Nyck: Appreciate that.

But let's look at the astrology, because there was a new moon on Friday and of course, we're still under the effect of that to some degree now—a new moon to 15 degrees Sagittarius. This particular new moon is also strongly influenced by the alignment of Mars and Neptune at 13 degrees Pisces, which makes, in astrology, a square aspect. A square aspect is a challenging aspect where those forces are energies sort of contesting each other to some degree, so that testing square aspect between the new moon and Mars-Neptune brings out the worst of this alignment. I think that's a rather interesting thing. The author here says it has "a rather sinister influence here, the major themes being anger, fear, deception, confusion, immorality and perversion" (<https://astrologyking.com/new-moon-december-2018/>).

Steve: And of course, we've seen all of those in politics over the last few days.

Nyck: Yes. Yes. On the grand world stage, on the national stage, and even right here in Byron Bay, you could argue, too. Have a good look for them in your own life. I guess that's a key, too.

Steve: It says here that at 16 degrees Sagittarius, a fixed star in the Hercules constellation—where is the name of that fixed star, Nyck? It's there somewhere, isn't it?

Nyck: You mentioned that to me before.

Steve: I did.

Nyck: Whoever sees it first wins the next coffee.

Steve: Quickly, quickly, we're looking. There it is. It's called Rasalgethi.

Nyck: Sounds a bit foreign to me, mate. I don't know about that; not so sure about that, mate.

Steve: Yeah, get rid of that one.

Anyway, back to the story. He says that this fixed star will cause irritation from women and a ruthless drive to gain power. So that is a theme that's probably been playing out in various ways over the last few days for some people.

Nyck: Indeed.

Steve: And the keys to avoiding loss and disappointment from this particular configuration of the new moon are honesty and integrity. There you go.

Nyck: And it does say the effect of December 7th's new moon will last four weeks, up to the solar eclipse on the 5th of January. The best time for making a fresh start and for beginning new projects is during the first two weeks of this new moon cycle—that's now and it goes through to the full moon on the 22nd of this month.

Mars conjunct Neptune is a very strong. For those who know a bit about astrology—and there are certainly better people than myself and Steve out there, but we have a fairly good, sketchy knowledge of the deep astrology—Mars conjunct Neptune in Pisces is a very difficult conjunction, and it adds, according to this writer, "a sinister, underhand influence to the aggression, sexuality and nastiness of Mars in hard aspect." Yes, and as you was talking about, the star in the Hercules constellation joins that star, which "acts like Mars on steroids", Mars being essentially the God of War and reflective of our physical abilities, of our drive, of our ambition, of our sportiness, literally of the way we use our bodies, and much more than that, too.

Steve: Here's some good advice here. It says: "The actions of others are likely to make you angry, mean and vengeful" under this particular constellation. "The best option", the author says, "would be to ignore any provocation. If you must react, then do so in a straightforward, direct and honest way. Don't leave anything to the imagination." Good advice.

Nyck: Very interesting. And of course, Neptune is in this equation too. Neptune is representative, you could say, of dreams, of aspirations, of delusion also, of illusion, of deeper understandings—Piscean understandings—of great spiritual notions too, so both of those things—secrets and so forth—so there's a deceptive influence to this as well. It has the potential, this new moon, "to make you feel insecure, guilty and apologetic." Interesting. "Seeing only the best in people increases the chance of becoming disillusioned or worse." That's interesting too; and: "To counter the deceptive influence of this new moon, you must be above board in all your dealings. This is not the best time for high stress, competitive things like business dealings or negotiations. Predators will easily hone in on your soft side, and you could be at greater risk of being taken advantage of."

Steve: Interesting. There is an upside, though. He says that this new moon "will stimulate creativity and imagination. So it's a good moon for art, music, sculpture, dance and drama", for example.

Nyck: So if you're feeling reactive to something in your life; if you're feeling like you want to get some justice somewhere ...

Steve: Transform it into interpretive dance.

Nyck: Transform it into an interpretive dance. I think there's a wonderful interpretive dance workshop coming up on this next Sunday, as a matter of fact, not to promote anything directly, but there's something there. But just around your own house, put on some great music and let yourself go in that sort of physical way; work it all out and perhaps just withdraw just slightly from that desire or that impulse to react and respond in kind to someone who may have been unkind to you, so to speak.

Wonderful stuff. I think that's about it for the show.

Steve: I think it is.

Nyck: Thanks for joining us here on *Future Sense*.

Steve: It's been fun.

Nyck: It's been fun. It's been glorious.

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.