



53. Emerging Values and the Wisdom of Crowds

Recorded on 19th August, 2019 in Byron Bay, Australia.

Future Sense is a podcast edited from the radio show of the same name, broadcast on BayFM in Byron Bay, Australia, at www.bayfm.org. 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: We're looking at the value systems inherent in change, and we're going to look a bit more deeply at exactly how those changes configure and what you watch out for, I guess, in yourself, because as I read this list that Steve has that we're going to discuss now, I see how important simply having awareness can be—that you become aware of these elements, these parts of yourself or where you are perhaps retrogressing back to older parts of yourself—just to notice that in yourself. You don't necessarily have to change anything, just that simple awareness can do the job in and of itself, often.

Steve: I think it's important to remember that we are in this backsliding, regressive values search at the moment and this is a normal change dynamic in a complex system because the change trajectory is never linear in a complex system. What you'll find is that as the system senses from its environment that change is required, it will then start to oscillate.

I guess an example of this is the climate change that we're going through at the moment. Even though the most common meme out there is the linear global warming story, that actually runs absolutely counter to what we really know about changing complex systems. When the complex systems go through change, we get what's actually happening on the planet, and if you look at the weather reports and take notice of what's happening with the weather, you'll find that we're getting extremes of both hot and cold. Right at the moment here in Australia, we're having extraordinarily heavy snowfalls and it just doesn't fit with this idea that things are just going in a straight line towards being hotter everywhere on the planet. That's never been the case in history. Even when we go through hot periods and cold periods, overall, there are always

differences in different hemispheres, simply because of the seasons, right? It's never summer in both hemispheres at the same time. So if you look at the reality of things, you'll find that in a complex system, you'll get these spikes in both directions and it doesn't matter whether we're talking about the climate or whether we're talking about human behaviour. The same thing applies.

Nyck: As you're speaking, I'm thinking about my own emotional, psychic, psychological space in response to life on Earth at this time, because you'll find that you are expressing both the hot and the cold, so to speak, of exactly that, of oneself.

Steve: Yes, and typically what happens when a human goes through a transformational change—and that means a change of worldview, a change of our fundamental way of making sense of reality—we come to the end of usefulness of our old value system and we get the message really clear that it doesn't work to live life that way anymore. We can't see into the future, but if we actually understand the change dynamic, we can start to say to ourselves, 'okay, I'm at that point in the change process where my old way of living doesn't work anymore', and typically what happens is we look backwards to try and remember a time when our value system did work better. It's not the most immediate value system that we're leaving, but it's usually a previous value system, and so we go on this regressive search—and this is a subconscious process—we start to live life in the old ways just to see if that would work.

That's happening widespread right across the world at the moment. You can see that we're regressing to fundamentalist attitudes—we're seeing the rise of extreme left and extreme right behaviour, very black-and-white—and these are actually old values that belong in the Agricultural era, prior to the Scientific-Industrial era. That's a normal thing, and I guess evolution has designed the change process that way, because when there's an extreme difference between how things are and how they need to be, that's when we're most motivated for change. I talk about this as being like pulling back the elastic band on a slingshot—it's a slingshot effect—so you've got to pull that elastic band in the opposite direction to create the tension on it, to then propel you forward, and this regressive search does exactly that from a human behavioural point of view. If you can understand that, 'okay, I'm moving from what has been an individual way of living to a communal way of living', then you can actually use that as a compass, and it's quite possible to reduce the regression and smooth the transition by simply focusing on flipping things 180.

Nyck: Which is actually a lot of fun because it brings a sense of humour to life, actually.

Steve: And ultimately what it means is working with paradox—the paradox of knowing that doing the opposite is going to bring a different result. Again, this is beautifully

documented in the tai chi symbol from Taoism, where you've got the yin and the yang, the black and the white, and as each one reaches its pinnacle, the seed of the other emerges. So by thinking about that and knowing that, 'okay, I'm in this extreme way of living individually now, if I just give start watering this little seed of community orientation, then that's going to take me where I need to go'. Some of the ways that that's playing out in this current global paradigm shift is it's taking us from a push dynamic to a pull dynamic.

Nyck: Push to pull. I like this very much. In fact, folks, today we're not pushing you to subscribe to the radio station, for example. We're gently ...

Steve: Pulling you in.

Nyck: Because you want to be part of the community.

Steve: That's right, the attraction.

Nyck: That's it. Causing attraction. It's a magnet.

Steve: The law of attraction, as they say.

Another way that push dynamic plays out most obviously is in advertising. It's like pushing it in your face: do this, do this, do this, and how many people are you meeting today that are really, really sick of that kind of stuff being pushed in your face? Everywhere you go, there's a goddamn billboard or there's something. You're trying to read a website and they're popping up something in your face saying, 'buy this, do that' and the tension that we're all feeling around that is a sign that this is old paradigm stuff that we actually need to get beyond.

Nyck: Funny, we actually have a Prime Minister who comes from marketing, in fact, and from advertising. There you go.

Steve: Well, there you go.

Another dynamic is that we're moving from the diversity of individuality back to the conformity of community. It doesn't matter whether it's diversity or conformity, if there's too much of it, then it doesn't feel right. When the paradigm is established and we're in the middle phase of it, we feel this lovely balance that everything's good

because we've got a mix of those things. Of course, we're trending towards community and conformity, but there will come a time—and we need to understand that and expect it—that there will come a time when again, in the future, we've got too much community, too much conformity, not enough diversity and we need to flip it again.

Nyck: And that's not to say that diversity in any way is a bad thing, of course. Diversity is a wonderful development and it's been an incredible thing that people have been able to be in this last era that we're talking about—this last period of the value system we've done over the last, say, 300 years or so. That diversity, that individuality has grown to such a degree that many amazing things have occurred. For me personally, you can look at the creative nature of humanity in this period. It has produced some incredible things, and yet it's also produced a whole bunch of new issues. So it's not about diversity being wrong, but diversity can go too far, too. We can focus too much, for example, on—and it's a bit of a contentious area—the whole political correctness frame, when something has to be so PC to keep and establish the diversity, that it actually loses the truth in what's really required for people to live together and come together to solve the problems, in fact.

Steve: Yes, and in this time of change, at this time in history where we're feeling a pull to rebalance things because we're at the tail end of an individual era where things have run to an extreme—they're too individual—we're feeling this strong pull to rebalance things. I guess a simple example of diversity is a masculine/feminine mix. Say you're putting together a team and you want a diversity within the team of both masculine and feminine members, and depending on what the team's job is—role is—then you might want to sway the balance one way or the other to greatest effect. But you can't say that it's wrong to have masculine members or it's wrong to have feminine members. That's crazy. You actually want that mix and the mix will never stay static.

Nyck: It will be different in different forms and different structures.

Steve: Exactly. It's understanding that we need to value everything here and then move beyond acceptance/rejectance to a more sophisticated understanding of blending and balancing. That's what this emerging paradigm is taking us to.

Nyck: Did you use the word rejectance then? That's a good word.

Steve: Yeah, kind of like deliverance.

Some of the other themes that are playing out in this shift—and if you are facing problems in life, in work, you might want to just reflect on the direction these things are taking us, because you might find that there are solutions to the problems that are arising for you in some of these simple understandings—are that we're moving from push to pull, we're moving from diversity/individuality to community/conformity, we're moving from competition to co-operation, we're moving from dominance to nurturing; and there is a masculine/feminine theme in this paradigm shift as well, because the individually-oriented paradigms are essentially masculine-themed and it's that masculine agency of wanting to change the world versus the feminine nurturing and holding and birthing process, and we're moving to that feminine way of being as a general theme at the moment. Next, from the accumulation of assets to the rebalancing of resources.

Nyck: Which we're seeing in so many different ways—that conversation occurring—and as I read that part, I think of the conversation around, for example, the universal basic income that's come online in recent times, which is a different way of approaching the way we distribute resources into a community, into a society. It's still a fair way off, those kind of structures, but they're now being talked about; they're part of the discourse.

Steve: Yes, and within that, there's this move from ownership to sharing as well, as part of that same sort of dynamic, and a movement from short-term thinking and short-term rewards to long-term thinking and sustainable harvest.

Nyck: Sustainable harvest. That's a lovely term.

Steve: A movement from climbing hierarchies to flattening hierarchies.

Nyck: And that's a tricky one. Let's expand on that one little bit. That's rather important, because we know that in many communitarian value systems, the idea of a hierarchy is problematic—that there's somebody in charge, that somebody is above you, so to speak. It's got a bad rap, for some good reason, down through time.

Steve: There's a trap in this one, and the trap is avoided by shifting our understanding of leadership. These themes that I'm describing, these are like subconscious drivers that are just playing themselves out—often people aren't even conscious of the fact that they're playing a role in the emergence of these themes—and the general instinct is to pull down these hierarchies and we want to pull them down because they've been dominant. They haven't been nurturing hierarchies; they've been dominant hierarchies

that are trying to push us around, make us do things that we don't want to do, make us buy things we don't want to buy, and it's run to an extreme. So the natural thing is, 'okay, we want to stop that', and, of course, there's no argument there. As we flatten the hierarchies, there is a danger of losing the leadership process entirely, and sometimes that happens. As this is playing out, people flatten the hierarchy and then all of a sudden, no-one's in charge.

What we need to do is to understand how to move to a more dynamic model of leadership, so we understand who is in the group that we have, and perhaps everybody's on a level playing field, but the truth is that different people within the group have different levels of experience and different skills, and so the true wisdom of crowds in that case would come from allowing leadership to emerge where it's naturally appropriate. So if a problem arises that the group needs to address, then we allow whoever is within the group to step forward and share their experience and to share their skills.

Nyck: Pass around a talking stick, so to speak.

Steve: Yes, exactly. It's about moving from a dominant model of leadership to a model of shared leadership and that's where the flattened hierarchy can work best—it will work best. Where it goes wrong, of course, is where no-one's in charge and any effort by anybody to put forward a different viewpoint is squashed down, and that's where you lose the wisdom of the crowd.

Nyck: And in some sense, I think that is possibly the big discussion that happened in the 'we are the 99%', the *Occupy* movement to a degree, because it didn't have a political direction—not that that was necessarily the right way to go, either—but there didn't seem to be a leadership that emerged from that properly, so somehow or other, it just collapsed; and it was a very powerful movement there, in that moment in time.

Steve: Yes, and it played important role in the rise of the public voice, and this is the way that evolution happens. It's a bit like the tide coming in on the beach—the wave will come up a little bit further each time and then it'll recede again. It's not like the first wave that comes in goes all the way up to the high tide mark. It just doesn't work like that. That would be a linear change process and that doesn't happen in complex systems. You get the gradual shift and the regression, the gradual shift forward and the regression.

Nyck: Unless it's a tidal wave, of course, and that's a different kind of thing going on there.

Steve: Even so, even a tidal wave is just a larger pattern.

Nyck: Of drawing back and flowing forward.

Steve: You don't get ten tidal waves happening in a row. That would be, again, a linear process and complex systems don't change that way. So we ought to expect, as this shift progresses—this paradigm shift that we're going through globally—a little bit of progress and then a little bit of regression, a little bit of progress, a little regression, and then eventually we'll get to the high tide mark and there'll be a level of stability for a while.

Another theme that we're seeing in the values shift is around morality. Morality is a really interesting topic, because our strong moral codes generally tend to come out of the conformative times—the conformity within the communal paradigms—and in between, when we go through these individual paradigms, we break out and we get diversity of values; we don't have the same conformity. The really strong moral codes come out of the communal systems. I think a lot of people in society are feeling now like society has lost its moral compass, and that is because we had these strong morals back in the Agricultural era—there was a strict list of what's right and what's wrong and a tendency to urge people to live righteously—and then, with the emergence of the individual, Scientific-Industrial, all about diversity again. And this is how evolution works. If you've got too much of one thing, you can't progress; you end up slowing down and ...

Nyck: Break out of that.

Steve: Break out of that and let the pendulum swing back in the other direction in order to progress.

Nyck: And we certainly enjoy the play with the individual-themed meme, so to speak.

Steve: We do.

Nyck: We've loved to explore beyond the moral and ethical codes and push the boundaries in all sorts of ways, and in many ways it's been a very good thing. But it's also led, again, to too much of that.

Steve: Yes, and when we go through this momentous leap—when we have this big quantum shift at the end of this first chapter of human evolution—we're going to move

to a place where we're conscious of these dynamics and we'll use them as appropriate. We'll have the integrated brain operation and we can roll out whatever approach we need to suit whatever the problem is that we need to solve.

Nyck: Isn't that exciting, folks? I think that's really exciting, thinking about that.

Steve: It is, rather. So we've gone through a period of morality becoming 'doing whatever it takes' in the Scientific-Industrial era. It's like, 'okay, pretty much throw out all the rules and we just do whatever we need to do in order to succeed', and for many people, that now looks like a very immoral, corrupt way of living—and it essentially is because it's run to an extreme. We're shifting back now to the development of a new moral code for the emerging Layer 6, Relativistic-Postmodern era.

Nyck: And it's why you'll find many people who have been part of that structure—corporate people, for example, people who've been in power, people who have been at the top of the hierarchy somewhere—starting to actually question themselves about the way that they've lived their lives, because in some way or other in their lives—maybe in their family, maybe their personal relationships and some other aspect of their lives—no matter how successful they've been at sort of milking the system, if you will, there is a disturbance arising, I think, in a lot of people. They're starting to consider how they've been and to look for different ways of venturing into themselves and finding a way to meet with others and to connect with others and to create a different structure, a different network.

Steve: That's right, and in the early stage of change, some of the efforts to try and bring in a new moral code can look very naive and very desperate—and they essentially are because it's like a child learning to walk. The first moments of that are clumsy—there's a bit of walking and a bit of stumbling and a bit of smashing your face on the ground and that kind of stuff, and that's the way it is—and we really are, from a global perspective, in that phase of the rebuilding of the moral code that we can all share and are happy to conform to. We're looking everywhere in a somewhat desperate way to try and find that code, and I think the emergence of Greta, who's the sort of schoolkid spokesman for the new ecological morals for the world, is a great example of that. This is a natural evolutionary dynamic so there's nothing wrong with it, but we need to recognise that 'okay, this is baby steps; this is the emergence of our desperate search for what's next and we're going to grab onto whatever looks like it might be what's next', and she's definitely an early stage example of that. It's a stumbling, crawling, walking a bit, falling on your face kind of example, but nonetheless, it's progress so we shouldn't rush to criticise.

Nyck: No. It was a little disturbing, I found, to find Greta on the front cover of *GQ* magazine all dressed up and made up and looking like she has a 'you're either with us or against us' kind of attitude. Nevertheless, what you're saying is a really good way of looking it; the same, I think, for *Extinction Rebellion*, that movement as a whole.

Steve: Yes. Fundamentally, these things are taking us in the right direction and we need to understand the value of that, but we also need to take a mature look with an understanding of how change plays out, and realise that, okay, this is actually not the final outcome of the mature emergence of a new value system. It's an early stage, clumsy attempt and we need to understand it; we need to accept that it's valuable because it's the compass starting to point in the right direction, but it's not the Olympic running champion, it's actually the early stumbling version.

Nyck: And it's very easy to be seduced by the possibility that it IS the answer. I think that's one of the things that is going on a lot.

Steve: It is, because you're in this place of realising that our old values don't work and we don't know what the new ones are, so then there's a desperation that emerges. The only real antidote to that desperation is to understand the map and the change process—the change dynamic—and realise that, okay, we're in the early stages here.

A simple example might be a group of people who come together to make a plan. If you've got a group of people that have never made a plan in a group before, it's going to be a really clumsy process because they've got to work out who knows, within this group, what they're talking about and who doesn't know what they're talking about; who's got some experience, who hasn't. And so you go through this crazy sort of storming process early on before you actually figure out the dynamics of the group and then you can settle down to developing a plan using the experience of relevant people within the group. Whereas if you take a group of people who have worked as professional planners for 30 years, they're going to have an extremely different dynamic and they're going to get straight into realising whether they know what they need to know or not, and they'll create a plan much more quickly. That's just not where we're at at the moment at a global level—we're in the early stage. We don't actually know what's going on, we're not quite sure where we're headed, and we're trying to do the best we can in a difficult situation.

Nyck: Yes, which means that some plans and some things that are put into action are not necessarily the best, but they are, as you're saying, they're young, adolescent—they're childlike.

Steve: They're formative.

Nyck: Formative, that's a good word.

Steve: It's good to understand that.

Nyck: Here on *BayFM*, on *Future Sense*, this is Nyck and Steve. We've been talking about community today. The theme is celebrating the difference. We like to celebrate, though, what we share as a community here, and we've been talking a bit about that today.

Steve: We have indeed, and just to wrap up, let's think about the road ahead. For those of us who feel drawn to understand the bigger picture in terms of the global-scale shift—and perhaps even just the scale of community shift within whatever area of the planet we happen to be residing in—and also feel drawn to play an appropriate role in supporting the change, I think the best thing we can do is to be as informed as possible. Using that analogy of the child learning to walk—and that's really relevant to the emergence of this new paradigm, because we are moving into a new way of being human that we had never experienced before and we need to learn how to walk in that new paradigm and how to leave out the values associated with it, and really how to bed down those values within our local community—sticking with that analogy of the young child learning to walk, how do we avoid the faceplant?

For those of you that might not be familiar with that slang term, 'faceplant' is a slang term for falling on your face, and bearing in mind that we can apply an adult learning process, for those of us who are adults, and who are in a position to both feel drawn and to want to support this large-scale shift in some way, that comes down to our capacity to apply our lifelong learnings to a completely different context. This essentially is a form of pattern recognition, so it's not looking literally at the detail of what you might have learnt in the past, but the patterns that you've seen—the patterns that you've recognised when you come to do something new—and often those patterns that you see in old activities can also be seen in different activities, just playing themselves out in a different way. Understanding how we learn, understanding the change process and the fact that when we do go through a change process and we're learning something new, we're not necessarily going to go from novice to expert in a straight line—we're going to go from novice through a bit of a roller coaster ride of figuring out, okay, what patterns apply in this new activity and how do I apply them? How do I apply them in a communal context instead of an individual context with the emergence of this communal paradigm?

One of the relevant pieces of learning around this is what we know as the *Wisdom of Crowds*. There was a wonderful book published in 2004 by James Surowiecki and this is extremely relevant to us (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Wisdom_of_Crowds). There were three simple things that James documented in his book that were essential ingredients in the Wisdom of Crowds and applying it. The first one is "independence of decision". This is paradoxical, right? It sounds like the opposite of what you might expect, but when you bring a group of people together, if everybody blindly accepts some kind of meme that's being pushed on the group, then you lose the independence of decision. The wisdom emerges when everybody goes through their own independent decision-making process and then they come together and find that they've all come to the same result from different angles. That's when the wisdom is really playing itself out, and that's what we might call synchronicity. This is a key process that I use as a futurist when I'm trying to figure out what the hell's going on around and about. I look for a completely independent sources that have gone through completely independent decision-making processes, but come to the same conclusion.

Nyck: And not influenced, for example, by the same corporate or governmental or other influential bodies that might be influencing the way that decisions are made.

Steve: That's right. The second key ingredient in the Wisdom of Crowds is "diversity of information", which comes from that independent decision-making process, and so you don't necessarily want sources that have made the same decisions from the same information, you want to look at people that are actually using completely different information. One way that I apply this is a futurist is, for example, I look at economic forecasters like Martin Armstrong—and none of the sources that I use are necessarily 100% perfect; they all have their own flaws and biases.

Nyck: Hey, it's economics.

Steve: Exactly, but what an economic forecaster like Armstrong is doing, is he's using a computerised process that's based on historical patterns, and in his particular case, he's realised since he did the computer programming that the cycles which the computer was spitting out happened to be in alignment, for example, with the solar cycles. Those sorts of things—those correlations—are really important.

Nyck: And they are a bit of a stretch for many people but I guess, on this show, we like to encourage you to look at things this way a bit more—to be open to seeing things this way—the independence of other people's decisions, the diversity of information that's out there, the way that they may correlate, the way that they may influence each other, that there may be factors that influence each other.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Steve: That's right, and with my knowledge of Clare Graves's work, of course, I go through my own process of decision-making from understanding the patterns that Graves identified in his research and then trying to apply those to what I see in the wider world. So I'll come to my own conclusion about what I think is going on and what the key drivers are, and then I always try and use at least three completely independent and diverse sources—and some of those are pretty out of the box. One of them, for example, is the channelled messages from Kryon that we sometimes talk about on the show, which is not something that most mainstream people are really going to take notice of, but because of my knowledge of Graves's work and the fact that Graves's research has helped me understand how people operating from different levels of consciousness—different layers of consciousness—structure their language, I can then look at a source and look at the way that they're structuring their language, the underlying framework of reality which is embedded in the language, and then I can tell how complex the thinking has been behind the decision-making process.

Nyck: Because it's not a conscious thing, is it, when someone is speaking?

Steve: No, it's absolutely subconscious and it's shaped by our underlying framework for making sense of reality, which relates to the layers of consciousness in Graves's model. I've looked at Kryon many times and analysed the language, and it tells me that his messages are based on a very complex decision-making process, not a simple one. So I might take an economic forecast and I'll take what I've figured from Graves's stuff, and I'll take Kryon, and then ideally I'll have more sources as well, and then, where they all overlap, where you get that synchronicity and all of their compasses are pointing in the same direction, then you know, okay, there's something going on here. It might not be an absolute revelation but it's our best way of navigating through the change process.

Nyck: And not everything has to match up, so to speak, but where they interface, the places where they lock in together, there's a key there; there's something that's speaking to us there.

Steve: Exactly. What I'm talking about, or have been talking about just now, is the third pillar in this Wisdom of Crowds, which is the "decentralisation of organisation", so pulling from absolutely diverse sources where they've made their own decisions completely independently from a diversity of information and then seeing the synchronicity that emerges from that. That's our absolute best navigation system for going through this very, very complex change.

Nyck: Yes. I'd imagine in some ways—we already mentioned the Hong Kong situation—that the very large crowds that are in the streets of Hong Kong continuing now for

weeks and weeks and weeks—and we're seeing a big one right now—that there are so many people, it's unlikely that there's a central organisation there. It's more likely that there are a number of different bodies that are organising different parts. They may be related to each other, and they probably are. They're smart people, they're very well connected, of course, so they're probably doing it in some sort of co-ordinated fashion, but I doubt whether there's a real central place of it. There may be, but I don't think so.

Steve: No, I think it's often comforting for people to think that someone's in charge in situations like that, but it's pretty much never the case. If there's one thing I learnt from my time in the military and interfacing with senior levels of government around national strategy and military strategy and those sorts of things, is that the general impression I got was that no one really knew what was going on.

Nyck: Ah, doesn't it make you feel comforted and safe? More so than buying more military hardware and sticking it somewhere that shouldn't be stuck in an old frame, as we were talking about earlier today.

Very good, just that part, too, to start thinking about how we can position ourselves as a country. When you were talking about that—because we've got a couple of minutes left; I'm just filling in space a little bit here—but you talked earlier about the nature of positioning ourselves with regard to China and the Pacific region and the Middle East, and the call from America for more troops representation or naval support in the Persian Gulf and the like. I thought of New Zealand and how New Zealand somehow or other is beginning to stand up in this different way through the leadership that is there—Jacinda Ardern, who is clearly a leader in a different kind of way than previous leaders or current leaders that we have around the world. Somehow New Zealand has always been a little bit on the cutting edge of that, and perhaps it's easier for them—they're a smaller country and they're not that influential—but they're bold enough, they're courageous enough to go, 'no, we're going to do this a little bit differently.'

Steve: Yes. This is an unlikely example, but look at what Trump has done around potential conflict since he's been in power. He has run completely opposite to the war hawks within the US administration who are trying to encourage conflict, really, and he's said, 'no, I'm just going to go and talk to these folks'. That really is a communal approach. It's like, 'let's actually get together and talk about this and see if we can find some commonality, some common aims'. I think it's probably fair to say that most people don't want war apart from those people who stand to benefit, particularly financially, from it. I think Trump, for all his flaws and naivety at times, has done an amazing job of simply going and talking to people and defusing things that could have emerged into actual physical conflict.

Nyck: 'Oh yeah, Kim Jong-un, we're great mates, yeah, we're good.' It's paradoxical, folks, and we're certainly not making Trump right, but we're also not making him wrong because this is what we have at the moment, and it's part of the change process, in fact—this repositioning, this reconfiguration of how we present ourselves and express ourselves in the world.

Steve: Yes, and the Second Tier approach. If we can operate from the other side of this quantum leap in human capacity, a Second Tier approach in its early stages really focuses on what works. It doesn't have a built-in bias towards an individual approach or a communal approach, it simply looks for what will work in this particular situation.

Nyck: Or one's individual preferences, because it's easy to have a preference about how we think things should change: 'I believe it should be this way or that way', but the truth is we surrender to what actually works; what does the job.

That's it for *Future Sense* for this week. Thanks for joining us here on *BayFM*. Tune in to the edited versions of this show, podcast via www.futuresense.it. You can go through that portal or just to *iTunes* or some other platform. On *Twitter*, @futuresenseshow, and you can also listen to the full show with all the music and everything else on *BayFM*'s website, www.bayfm.org.

Thank you for joining us.

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.