



## 190304\_14\_Change and Conflict\_Transcript.mp3

Recorded on 4<sup>th</sup> March, 2019 in Byron Bay, Australia.

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

*This is Future Sense.*

**Nyck:** You are now tuned to *Future Sense* here on *BayFM* with myself, Nyck Jeanes and my co-host over the other side of the space control here, Steve McDonald. Good morning, Steve.

**Steve:** Good morning, Nyck.

**Nyck:** How are we doing today?

**Steve:** Good. Good.

**Nyck:** Oh, my goodness, so much going on. There's so much to talk about. It's always interesting for us to try and bring it down to a sort of measurable show that we can try and bring you.

**Steve:** I know, that's the thing. There's so much we could talk about.

**Nyck:** So many things we could talk about and offer to expand and to add to the debate about many issues to do with the future as it unfolds—where we're going, the sense of future that we all hold ourselves, and the cultural and collective futures that we possibly may give investment to; the various ways we see things—quite extraordinary. Of course,

that creates a lot of conflict between people and between nations, between communities in the world. We see at the moment, of course, the major conflicts on the planet which continue. We've seen the flare up between India and Pakistan in the last week, we've seen the ongoing crisis in Venezuela, which is a very complex story there; we're seeing the issue with, of course, North Korea and South Korea—interestingly that South Korea and the USA have decided all of a sudden after the truncated summit between Kim Jong-un and Donald Trump a few days ago that was withdrawn from, suddenly South Korea and the US have backed off their very large war games through a much smaller exposition of their military power. What's that about?

**Steve:** Interesting, yes. A few things going on underneath the surface, I think.

**Nyck:** Indeed, and we'll talk a little bit about that, perhaps, in terms of conflict. We're going to be looking at the aspect of conflict itself, and just how are we going to do that a little bit, Steve? Can you flesh that out a little bit this morning?

**Steve:** Sure, well, much conflict is about clashing values, and of course Clare Graves's understanding of human nature is very much about understanding values and how values change and how they interact, so we'll take a look through his lens of human conflict and also, in the process of doing that, look at the change dynamic: how things change, why things change, what drives change, and the human experience of that.

---

**Nyck:** You are tuned now to *Future Sense* here with Nyck and Steve on your own and only radio station, *BayFM 99.9*. Before we move on to talking particularly about con..., con..., conflict—I can't even say the word 'conflict', errr, I can't even say it—a couple of things that are happening right now. You may have already heard that the very first private ship to dock with the Space Station has just done so—*The Dragon*. Everyone before that was owned by a nation, not a corporation, and this of course is a *SpaceX* venture, which is *Tesla* and Elon Musk. The US hasn't yet been able to get its astronauts to space since the Space Shuttle, which is pretty amazing, without buying rides off Russia, apparently, but this time it's a corporation—Elon Musk's *SpaceX* Corporation—which has managed to dock with the space station. Interesting stuff.

**Steve:** Yes. Just to clarify, as I understand it, I don't think *SpaceX* has anything to do with *Tesla*, they're two separate organisations that are both, of course, involved with Elon Musk.

**Nyck:** OK, well that's a big connecting factor—everybody knows Elon Musk—but I guess that's my little bit of ignorance there about the connection between them. Interesting. How do you see this? Because that sort of the corporate—the private—going into space and spending that money to do this with the idea of taking people into space once they manage to come back through the atmosphere, apparently quite a hot entry, and whether that actually works or not. There's a dummy on board, there's no humans on board the *SpaceX* docker.

**Steve:** Yes, it's very interesting. It fits with a trend that I'm seeing and that is a trend beyond the nation state being the ultimate organising body within a particular area. Nation states, of course, were created with the rise of the Modern Scientific-Industrial era and we should expect that the idea of the nation state to change radically somehow with this paradigm shift that we're just starting to go through now into the sixth layer. It is interesting but not unexpected that we see things like that, which are quite extraordinary when you think about it, being taken over by other organisations other than the nation state.

**Nyck:** It's also interesting in terms of the context of a lot of today's show with regards conflict, that it is an area of exploration—space exploration—where an unusual amount of co-operation has occurred between states such as Russia and the US and China and other states—India and the like. It has transcended a lot of the normal levels of conflict back here on the planet, it would seem.

**Steve:** It has to some extent, yes, although I think there's been a lot of secretive military action in space that hasn't been generally reported—certainly some that I've heard about—even to the point of the possibility of weapons having been launched from space without general public knowledge. As we often say, the Modern Scientific-Industrial era pushes things to the limits and as it transitions out of dominance, we can expect it to go out with a rush. So just like a combustion engine that slowly wears down over time, initially when it starts to wear down, the engine runs faster because the friction between the parts is wearing down, but eventually they'll wear down to the point where the engine loses compression and basically fails fairly quickly. I would expect to see the Modern Scientific-Industrial era's dominance go out in the same way, so it'll keep pushing everything to the limit right up to the point where it doesn't work anymore, and I think an example of that is just the fairly recent push overtly by the United States to militarise space with the creation of a Space Command.

**Nyck:** Yes. It's a little bit of a leap and we will probably come back to that—the issue with North Korea and South Korea and the summit that just occurred with Trump and Kim Jong-un which ended belatedly, as we heard; but suddenly the war games, the huge

war games that often feature a quarter of a million South Korean and US troops have been rolled back significantly at this time. That's a curious result, given that the summit was stopped unusually, and some people say because of the influence, particularly of John Bolton on American policy.

**Steve:** Yes, I would expect so. Looking at John Bolton's history, he's been a real anti-North Korea advocate and he seems to have a general interest. If you look at his history, his political history in particular, in promoting conflict in some ways, I wouldn't be surprised if he threw a spanner in the works there. And there's an interesting mix of values between the North Korean leader and Trump and Bolton, of course.

**Nyck:** Yes, Bolton is involved apparently in the sort of Libya model, of denuclearising and supposedly democratising Libya, but of course that ended up with Gaddafi being removed and killed in 2011 by US-backed operations, so I guess people don't easily trust America's game here very well, and fair enough.

**Steve:** No, often with those sorts of things, there are hidden agendas which just aren't made public, and often the excuses that are put out into the media are a cover story, I guess.

**Nyck:** And I guess that sort of cover story and those things that are held back and kept secret are just part of the trope of a certain expression of consciousness in regards to conflict—how it manages conflict. It doesn't come out and be honest about its approach, it actually hides and obfuscates and manipulates and manufactures consent.

**Steve:** Often that's the case, particularly with Layer 5, the Scientific-Industrial mindset. It's very much about the public image. If you think back to the 80s in particular, the idea of a corporate public image was a very big thing and a lot of people made their profession out of crafting those images and controlling the image so that the public perception of what was going on within an organisation was very much designed and presented the way that the people running the organisation wanted it to be seen.

**Nyck:** It's astounding these days in commercial media how advertising is almost the most advanced technological and creative exposition on film that exists, doing exactly that, managing the perception of a company, of a corporation and their products and their practices.

On a completely different topic before we launch into the big one for today, I'm really interested to see Martha Stewart. Many of you would know who Martha Stewart is—an

American retail executive, a businesswoman, a television personality, a former model, and runs a thing called *Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia Inc.* She currently has a show on television apparently, a cooking show with Snoop Dogg, but Martha Stewart is teaming up with the world's largest cannabis company called *Canopy Growth Corporation* in an advisory role to help develop a broad new line of products for both people and animals. "I'm looking forward to working with the Canopy Growth team", said the 77 year old Stewart. "I'm especially looking forward to collaborating and developing products that can help people and their treasured animal companions." And as I said, "Stewart co-hosts a cooking show with rapper and giant pothead Snoop Dogg, and knows how to roll a joint" (<https://www.thelibertybeacon.com/this-buds-for-you-and-we-dont-mean-beer-video/>). Interestingly, *Canopy* is based in Smiths Falls, Canada. It's not an American company, it's a Canadian operation, that "is conducting several clinical trials exploring how cannabis compounds can improve human and animal health", so quite a wonderful and forward-thinking thing there and part of the movement, of course, in new medicines—medicinal components of psychoactive substances that exist in the world. We talk about that quite often here.

**Steve:** Yes, Canada's forging ahead, of course. While the US has certainly been a global leader in terms of the acceptance of cannabis as a medicine and for recreational use, Canada has, of course, leapt in and made it legal recreationally.

**Nyck:** And we should bring your attention to the 2019 *UIC*, which stands for *United In Compassion Medicinal Cannabis Symposium*, which is coming up on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th of March, which we will be present at in various ways—here from *Future Sense* and some others.

**Steve:** Yes, I'm going to go along to that. It's being held at Tweed Heads and there is information on the <https://unitedincompassion.com.au> website if anyone's interested in finding more information. The day before symposium begins, there's a one-day educational session from Dr David Caldicott, who is, of course, a well-known media figure and advocate for pill testing and drug law reform, and he'll be teaching that. It's designed for health care professionals, so I know we've got plenty of health care professionals in our region here. Anyone who's interested in doing that one-day programme with Dr David Caldicott up at Tweed Heads, it's only \$100 for the day, which I think is very reasonable and it should be quite insightful.

**Nyck:** Very good. And then the conference is Friday, Saturday, Sunday. I'm surprised that not many people it seems, that I'm aware of, know that much about this conference, which is coming up in just under three weeks' time.

**Steve:** That's right. In fact, I hadn't heard of it myself. I don't follow the medical cannabis area that closely, but a friend from Nimbin tipped me off recently that it was coming up.

**Nyck:** Where else?

So today, as we said, we're going to be talking, particularly—although we will bring some other factors into it and possibly bring some other news to you, because we've got lots of things in front of us here later in the show—but human conflict. Of course, even with regards to the marijuana issue, I guess—medicinal cannabis and the change in marijuana laws around the world that are slowly moving through—conflict is about change, either resisting it or forcing it, and that's a pretty straightforward definition of conflict, really, isn't it?

**Steve:** It is, I think, and this is from the human perspective, of course. I mean, change is a very natural thing and nature is changing all the time. We're looking here in particular at human behaviour and human values, and humans generally tend not to like change. Once things are stable and everything's working, then people often will make great efforts to keep things stable, simply because, I guess, change is very much related to and impacting on our human values. Once we know what we want and know what we like and know what pleases us and helps us to live and cope, then we like to stick with that rather than choosing something different, which is, of course, choosing the unknown to a certain extent.

**Nyck:** And I guess in our history we've got, almost genetically, this notion that change actually is so disruptive and uncomfortable that we avoid it, even though usually, it seems that the result longer-term is the positive expansion of human consciousness and value systems and beingness on this planet. But initially, when that rush of change comes into culture or into personal life, it's not an easy place to sit inside yourself.

**Steve:** No, that's true and we seem to have this dark obsession with unexpected, radical, traumatic change when it comes to our media. In this media era that we're living through, most of our news programmes are about traumatic change, so there is this strange fascination with that.

**Nyck:** Yes. To start with, though, there's a difference, of course, between what is called translational change—minor change—and transformational or more major changes. Can you flesh that out a little bit?

**Steve:** Sure, so in a world of change management, which I worked in for quite a while, these words are used to describe minor change in major change. Translational change, where for example, like literally if you are translating a word from one language to another language, you're not changing the meaning of the word, so translational change is relatively minor change where you're not changing the underlying substance of whatever it is, you just changing the surface level. Transformational change transforms the nature of whatever it is.

**Nyck:** The form.

**Steve:** Exactly. To use a computer analogy, which is quite common in the change arena, translational change might be tidying up your Desktop or you have a Windows machine defragging your hard drive—apparently they still do that on Windows machines—so you're reorganising things within an underlying system but not changing the underlying system; whereas if you are upgrading your operating system, then that would be transformational change because you're impacting the entire system and the basis of how it operates.

**Nyck:** Yes, very good. In Graves's work that we refer to often here—and if you're a first time listener or a rare listener, then you may not be familiar with Clare W. Graves. You can go to our podcasts and go back over the many shows where we talk often from that perspective of Clare W. Graves's work, if it interests you; and just while we're on that topic, on *iTunes* and other podcast platforms you can search *Future Sense*. We talk a lot from that perspective of Clare W. Graves, who was a developmental psychologist from the 50s, 60s, 70s and into the early 80s in America, and a model that we find to be very useful in looking at many aspects of human endeavour and transformational potential on the planet—evolution, if you will. We're looking at the sequence of change in that model. How does it work? How does change come upon people in the first place? Because, as you said, you get settled in where you are in that place that feels comfortable—your society, your culture, your religion, perhaps, your belief systems, sharing your value systems—and yet something happens along the way that impels change in people and then in society.

**Steve:** Yes, and Graves tied this to what he called 'life conditions', which is really an all-encompassing word that means everything that has an impact on you, from physical life conditions to psychological life conditions, so all of your own psychological history and anything that you know is stored in there and still impacts your behaviour, all of these things can have the result of triggering a change process in us. Of course, we live in an environment, in a universe, that is constantly changing, and so it's necessary for us to, periodically at least, change in a transformational way so that we are able to cope with

life and the complexity of the problems that are thrown at us. As our universe is slowly becoming more complex, then living within it means that our consciousness needs to be more complex also, and so there's this interesting dance. Graves represented it as a spiralling double helix shape between the life conditions that we're living within and the adaptive tendency of human consciousness, and he said that the life conditions are essentially the driver, in that when our consciousness and its coping capacity matches the complexity of our life conditions, things are stable for us; there's no need for change, but as soon as our life conditions change—and they can change, of course, towards greater complexity, or sometimes there'll be a regression also and they will change to the greater simplicity—then our consciousness will naturally adapt to that. It's an inbuilt aspect of human nature that we are adaptive in that way, and our mind and our body is adaptive in that way also.

It's very interesting to think about it that way, and it provides a wonderful alternative avenue for approaching change, and that is, instead of wanting to change a person, we can actually look at that person's life conditions and understand that that person is who they are and they are expressing what they're expressing because of their adaptation to a certain set of life conditions. And so by addressing their life conditions, we can trigger a change process in a much more harmonious and smooth way rather than directly approaching a person and trying to force somebody to change.

**Nyck:** Yes, as we've said before, in a sense it's 'walking in another's moccasins' to some degree, that aspect of being able to see how another person actually is and lives and where they're coming from within that structure of value systems; and if they're comfortable there, you can't force change on them, but you can inspire, as you're saying, ways for people to rethink if things aren't working out for them. Because that's the key, isn't it? When there's already a disruption in the being on some level, something that's not happy, not settled, not satisfied, not fulfilled in some way or other, even though they may have been for all their lives, and they've come to a point in their lives that's not working any more and they need to start thinking about how they view life.

**Steve:** Yes, so we talk about evolutionary tension; there needs to be some kind of tension to motivate us to change. It doesn't always need to be a negative tension—it might be a very positive tension, for example, an aspiration that really excites us and motivates us to change our world or change ourselves—and as we go up through the spiral of human values, through these different layers which each have their own set of values, we've got this alternating pattern between wanting to change the world in the individually-oriented layers, and wanting to change ourselves to fit with the world in the communally-oriented layers, and so depending on which layer is dominant for us, or any individual, at any particular time, then the individual will be likely to either want to try and change the world around them to fit with the way that they want it to be, or conversely, to want to change themselves to adapt to what's happening around them.



**Nyck:** Yes, and of course, it's a very personal thing. I mean, it may be a community thing or communal or family thing or even a national thing eventually, but essentially the drivers for evolutionary change are not the same for everybody, are they? So you can't sort of impose something to push people into change just because you think that's the right way. It might be for you and your friend over here and someone on the other side of the world there, but it's not necessarily the driver that's going to move somebody else to change.

**Steve:** No, that's right, and so part of taking this integrative approach to human nature that Clare Graves wonderfully explored for us is coming to an understanding that there's no such thing as one human nature that applies to all humans. Everybody has layers and layers of different values which are expressed, often, according to their dominant layer which is the most complex layer that they've grown into, but we're also very changeable and each individual can shift from one layer of values to another, either regressing to more simple values or growing to more complex values. So it's a very, very complex picture, and what it tells us is that there is no one-size-fits-all for human nature or human beings. Secondly, even for an individual, their nature can change from one moment to the next depending on their life conditions and depending on which set of values they're expressing in the moment, so we really need to delve deeper and understand each individual person and their individual set of life conditions—their unique set of life conditions. Because we are each unique—no two people are the same—even if we're living in the same physical life conditions, our psychological life conditions can be radically different simply because of our make-up.

**Nyck:** Do you agree, folks out there, that it's becoming even more complex to really take all of these factors into the complexity of our life on this planet right now? To me, that's a very exciting thing and, in my experience only, I'm observing many people more and more open for no particular reason, perhaps, or maybe they're driven by something—something very small as Steve is saying—internally or perhaps by some external factor in their life that's come into their presence, into their awareness, but there seems to be an opening towards the acceptance of a more complex system in which we are living.

**Steve:** Interesting. Just to grab something that you said there, you said "no particular reason". That's a very interesting statement because there will always be a reason for change. There's always some evolutionary tension, but sometimes we're not conscious of it, and so we say, 'well, for no apparent reason; I can't see why this is happening', and so it's important to understand that and realise that for a lot of people, they're not conscious of what's driving them to change. In fact, sometimes they're even not really conscious of the process that they're involved in, and certainly there's no general understanding out there of the dynamic of change and the sequence that we go

through, except for people who've studied human nature or change—they might know about that, but most people don't. It's not something that we get taught in school. It should be.

**Nyck:** Absolutely, and in fact, in a way of course, we have this idea still, I think in culture that, for example, history repeats itself, which is a very stark kind of concept of history. We can say, yes, things return in certain ways—wars occur, conflict occurs, for example—but is it the same as it was 200 years ago or 500 years ago? No! We do things differently every time; we are in some way evolving, even in our worst aspects, in the worst things that we do to each other on this planet, somehow or other, perhaps we are evolving to a conscious understanding of how that is and the effects of these things and how they play out in the bigger scheme of things over longer periods of time and the like.

**Steve:** The idea of change being a cycle is a very 2D conception, and part of our transformation as a species into Second Tier consciousness in this increasing dimensional awareness is teasing ideas like that out into greater dimensions, like a three-dimensional spiral. If you look at it from above, it still looks like a circle, but if you get the side angle then you can see that there's a spiralling progression going on there. The concepts that we're building upon are sound to the extent of our ability to comprehend these things from past value systems, and we're teasing out extra detail and discovering the richness of some of these processes that wasn't apparent to us before.

**Nyck:** Beautiful. You're tuned to *Future Sense* here on *BayFM* with Steve McDonald and Nyck Jeanes, and thanks for a couple of texts. With regards to our little brief cannabis chat—medicinal cannabis and the *Medicinal Cannabis Conference* on the 22nd, 23rd, 24th of March coming up, this listener says: "I was wondering if you could have a chat also about DMT one day. A very interesting subject and very relevant to Graves's model." DMT, of course, is dimethyltryptamine, a natural substance found in many, many, many plants, in fact, in the human being as well, so, yes, we occasionally talk about that; we will no doubt come back to that at some point.

---

**Nyck:** You're tuned to *Future Sense* here with Nyck Jeanes and Steve McDonald, and this morning we're focusing particularly on the nature of conflict and how conflict operates in the different layers of evolution, in different value systems that are operating on the planet, and of course, those value systems that range widely from one to the other. People are clearly not all in the same place on the planet, which is exactly why there is conflict at times, indeed.

The sequence of change, Steve, and how it operates in terms of Clare W. Graves's system, can you flesh that out a little bit for us?

**Steve:** Yes, so a very sort of simplistic and easy to understand sequence. There are many, many different bodies of work out there that describe the human change process, the process of transformation from one thing to another thing, and some of them are very, very detailed. One of the more, perhaps most detailed ones, would be the Chinese *I-Ching*, the *Book of Changes*.

**Nyck:** Ah, yes indeed.

**Steve:** It has the 64 changes which equate to Nassim Hamein's 64 tetrahedron grid as the underlying structure of spacetime. The science around this is very immature, but the connection between Hamein's geometry and the Chinese *I-Ching* is quite astounding. Each one of the *I-Ching* characters has six lines in it, and each three-dimensional tetrahedron has six lines in it also, and depending on where the tetrahedron is positioned in the grid relative to your perspective on the grid, you'll see some of the lines as unbroken on the outside of the shape and then the lines behind will be obscured and some of the will appear as broken as they do in the *I-Ching* symbology, so very, very interesting. What it points to, of course, is the fact that the nature of change and the experience of change itself seems to be embedded in the fabric of spacetime—it's all made of change, which is very interesting. Anyway, that's the complex version. Here's the simple version.

**Nyck:** Yes, and hopefully folks, you're still with us on that. Nassim Hamein, by the way is ... how would you describe him?

**Steve:** Well, he's an American revolutionary physicist, I guess. He doesn't have a background in physics, which is really interesting. He has a quite an unusual background. He's come from a very outdoors-oriented career but has had this fascination with change and the nature of reality all his life. He, at times, has admitted to extraterrestrial contact as a child, although I don't think he's all that open about that, and he teamed up in more recent years with a very experienced physicist whose name just escapes me at the moment, and the two of them have published some academic papers, and he certainly speaks at conferences and those sorts of things. Some of his work is amazingly ground-breaking and it's connecting dots between things which were previously thought to be unrelated.

**Nyck:** Which is what we're very interested in here on this particular show—connecting dots between things that are formerly unrelated or appear to be unrelated—so we're doing that, whether you take all of this in or not, the very grounded stuff we offer and some of the far-out stuff, because for us, it's very interesting to encompass and see how these things connect and relate to each other.

**Steve:** Yes, and if people want to find out more about Nassim Hamein, he's all over *YouTube*. He has an organisation called the *Resonance Foundation*, and the website is <https://www.resonancescience.org> if you want to check him out further. He's got lots of educational material that you can sign up for also.

So let's take a simple look at change—how change unfolds for us as humans. To take a complete view of it, we will start from a place of stability—and by stability, I mean a place where everything seems to be working fine and we're able to cope with whatever life throws at us in terms of problems; we've got the capacity to solve those problems.

**Nyck:** Hands up out there who actually feels that right now in their life.

**Steve:** Oh, I can see one down the back.

**Nyck:** Thank you very much. And who doesn't? Thank you very much.

**Steve:** So starting from stability, when our life conditions change, the first indication that we'll get is some level of stress, and usually we don't know what's causing it when we first feel it. Unless we've studied the change process and we understand that something needs to change as soon as we feel stressful, normally we will look for a reason: 'Why don't I feel right this morning? I got out of bed and for some reason things just don't seem to be right'. There's a level of stress there, and we usually can't identify where it's coming from. So something has changed in our life conditions, whether it be our physical, external life conditions; our internal life conditions—the way we feel, the way we're thinking about things ...

**Nyck:** Might even be a dream you had while you were asleep.

**Steve:** It could well have been a dream. In fact, it might all be a dream. Anyway, that's another story.

From stability, we wake up one morning and suddenly we feel some stress, and the first motivation we usually have as human beings when we feel that stress is to think back to

a time when we weren't stressed. In terms of transformational change—so if we're going through a major, major change that's changing our underlying operating system—we will desperately look for some way of resolving this stress which is growing, and that takes us to looking back or thinking back to a time when things were good. So we'll think back to, 'okay, I can remember back then when everything was cool, I was happy, I didn't have any worries; maybe if I go back to living that way, then things will be fine.'

**Nyck:** It's like a retrogressive translational change to go back, isn't it? Like the mind, in some way, thinks it's easy to go back a little bit and to just translate back to what I know rather than ...

**Steve:** Yes, it's kind of translational in the respect that we're trying to swap something out for another thing just to see if it'll change without us going through any radical change, so we just swap over to this other value set which is embedded in us—bearing in mind that these value sets evolve, they develop like layers on top of each other, and so as we grow through a set of values, at a certain age or in certain life conditions, we don't lose those values but we can transcend them; we can go beyond them to live according to new and more complex values, and so we always have access to go backwards to more simple values sets. Often that's usually what we do as a first reaction to feeling that stress of change—something's not right, let's go back to living this way—and we hear this language all the time from our politicians, our leaders: 'Let's get back to whatever'.

**Nyck:** Make America great again.

**Steve:** Exactly, just like the good old days. And of course, what that does by going back to a simpler value set, is it actually creates more evolutionary tension, and this is why we've evolved this way, because by doing this, we accelerate the change which is necessary. If we didn't do that, then we wouldn't be building the tension very quickly and we'd wallow in the change process for much longer, which is not an efficient thing from an evolutionary perspective.

**Nyck:** It's such an important point, just this simple figure, I think. If there's one thing that we could impart to you, it's really this point about how we actually evolve—that we actually do need the tension, as uncomfortable as it is, as difficult as it is for many, and especially when certain people or certain collectives move back into, for example, a religious position or similar and operate from that place, especially in government, for example—and there's plenty of examples of that going on, even our own government

right in this time—but it's a big thing to consider that we need to move back in order to create the tension to sling ourselves forward.

**Steve:** Yes, and this is embedded in our language. The old saying, 'you've got to take one step back to go two forward' has obviously a kernel of truth in it. And in the context of the current paradigm shift that we're going through, at a global level, the dominant paradigm has been this Scientific-Industrial mindset which has been dominant for some hundreds of years, and we're moving beyond that at the moment, but in the process of change, we're initially regressing to old value sets. So we are seeing the re-emergence of the fourth layer, which incorporates rigid Agricultural kind of life conditions, imposing an authoritarian worldview, which comes from a time when we lived in a class-based society and you had to be born into a particular class and there was no flexibility to change your life path in many respects. We're seeing that rigid black-or-white kind of thinking coming out in politics in particular; and even further, sometimes—a further regression back to Layer 3, which is really just about the wielding of pure power without regard for others. Both of those old values are showing their face at the moment and this is building the evolutionary tension for the change, just like pulling back an elastic band on a slingshot.

**Nyck:** Yes, it's amazing, that retrogressive move back to a sense of righteousness, perhaps, in terms of your location and belief systems and value system.

**Steve:** Absolutely.

**Nyck:** And then, I guess if that righteousness is challenged, then there is the possibility of regressing slightly further back to getting quite angry and militaristic about that: 'it's my way, this is the way it is, and you're not seeing it.'

**Steve:** 'If you don't agree with me, I will smash you down.'

**Nyck:** And I think that sort of notion of value signalling comes from that these days, of what's politically correct. It's great that we can have freedom of speech in most of our democracy, relatively speaking, and yet that really means freedom of speech ultimately, not that if it fits into my particular value system, that's great; if it doesn't fit into my value system, it's not alright. It's curiously ironic, all of that.

**Steve:** Yes, it's very interesting. The first sequence in the change process is going from stability into stress and this regressive search for a set of values that will help us cope.

Of course, going back to older and more simple values actually makes us cope less effectively because we're facing more complex problems which is driving the change in the first place, and so we fall from that stress into a place of crisis or chaos. It's in that place where everything falls apart, everything becomes untangled and loose, and that looseness is what then creates the opportunity, the space for change to occur. It's very difficult to change something that's rigid, so for a complex system in particular to change, then it has to loosen up, it has to let go of and morph out of the patterns of change that it was operating on, and it's the looseness, the freedom that's created by this collapse, this apparent chaos, which then provides the opportunity, the space for things to be reformed in a different way—re-formation.

**Nyck:** Of course, along the way, though, that retrogressive step sees certain figures come forward—the rejection of other values, for example; and another example that you mentioned is compulsive behaviours, as you talked about before. In that slingshot, things would draw back to and try to find refuge in previous iterations of ourselves where we felt safe and think that the answers may be there. In doing so, we also start to manifest certain behaviours in our way of being, too, yeah?

**Steve:** We do. Because we're falling back to older value sets, we're placing value on different things and so we're going to pursue different things and hang on to different things and hold different perspectives for sure, and that rejection of other value systems is an inherent aspect of the First Tier of six value systems that Clare Graves describes in his model. So it doesn't matter which values set we're living according to, there's a natural tendency for us to assume that our values are right simply because they work for us, and anyone who holds a different set of values is different at best, and often we'll just see them as wrong—they don't know how to live properly.

To continue through the change process, we've gone through stress and fallen down into chaos and crisis, and it's in that place where our operating system starts to fall apart to the point where it has the space to reorganise itself—so regression and reorganisation—and in that space of chaos, you could think of it as like the alchemist's furnace where everything is heated up to the point where it's open and begins to change.

**Nyck:** *Calcinatio*, it's called in Jung's figure of that.

**Steve:** Yes, and eventually from that heating up and in the process of things falling apart, we then shift our perspective to the point where we can get insights. Often this will come through an altered state, and this is why altered states are such an important aspect of our lives, and it's why people are always seeking for altered states different ways. Of course, every night we go to sleep, which is an altered state of consciousness,

and often we can get those insights through our dreams during sleep. Often, when we're going through change, we will seek out altered states when we're awake also, and that can come through lots of different things: change of routine, exercise, perhaps we have a particular discipline like meditation ...

**Nyck:** Meditation, mindfulness practice, which, of course, has grown hugely in Western civilisations in the last generation or so.

**Steve:** Exactly, and all these things are wonderful ways to gain insights—new perspectives—on how things might be in the future. Of course, there is the opportunity also to alter our consciousness through the ingestion of something, whether it be alcohol or some other drugs.

**Nyck:** Sacred plants of one sort or another.

**Steve:** Yes, and there are lots of long-term traditions around that.

**Nyck:** And indeed, our general way of nurturing ourselves—the food, the consciousness on the planet generally of what we eat and how we eat and where it comes from and the poisons and practices of agriculture on the planet for a long time—the awareness of that coming, not just for pure health, but also to create a foundation for clarity in the being in a sense. I think that's a motivation for a lot of people these days.

**Steve:** Absolutely. I think it is a growing movement of people who are realising that we're constantly moderating our state of being through what we ingest—food and drink.

So, in this place of chaos that we've fallen down into, eventually we're going to have the insight and a breakthrough, and that will bring a new perspective on how things might be, and in a transformational change, that new perspective will be more complex—it will take into account more factors and connections between all those factors in the case of the transition to Layer 6, which is the big thing that's happening at the moment. Once that happens, it's like seeing the light; it's like we've been lost in the darkness and all of a sudden the lights come on and we can see the light and we have direction, we have a sense of purpose in that we need to move towards that which we've seen—that insight, that vision—our new perspective all of a sudden gives us an anchor, something to move towards and hang onto in a space of what has been total disconnection and looseness in this chaotic place where we've lost the anchors of our old values that used to shore us up in life, that we always made reference to, to gain stability again. They've



fallen away, we've lost them, and now, through the darkness, we've come to a new perspective that gives us something to work towards. We haven't yet anchored in those new values, but at least we know which way to head to find them.

**Nyck:** And the result for most people of not yet anchoring in those values—and we're talking very generally because, as we said earlier, people are in different parts of growth, different value systems across the planet and in their own communities, within families, everywhere—but the general trend that we're seeing is this movement towards Layer 6, and that moment where things open up, which is sort of between the old values which you let go and the new values which you can see in some visionary way ahead of you, there is a space of quite difficult confusion, overwhelm and other things that are occurring in people's consciousness and psychology now, in response to that figure—in the limbo, I would say.

**Steve:** Yes. This place of chaos happens in between each value set, so whether you're going from 1 or 2, or 2 to 3, or 3 to 4, etc, you're going to go through this. Some people have written about it from a spiritual perspective and called it 'the dark night of the soul'—this idea of being in the darkness and not being able to see, not knowing which way to head, not knowing what you can hang onto. It's a constant within transformational change through all of these systems. There's a particularly large change process in between First Tier and Second Tier, so going beyond 6 to 7, because it's such a radical change and it involves shifting from a place of being dominated by the rational mind to this deeply intuitive trans-rational way of operating, and that in itself is quite an extended and difficult journey compared to the other transitions just because of the depth of change that has to go on there.

**Nyck:** Who's feeling it out there, folks? I'm interested in this. Of course, you can't really tell us exactly, but if you do want to text in 0437 341119 at any time, I'm interested in your perspective. Do you feel this? Do you feel this complex change in you, and if so, how?

**Steve:** Let's just complete this change sequence. We've gone now from stability into stress and regression from that place of stress, we've fallen further into crisis and chaos and a kind of systems collapse, which is the darkness—not knowing what to hang onto or where to head—and then through our own internal process, alchemical process, we've had the breakthrough, we've had to crack which has let the light in, some insights, a new perspective, and that then commences the process of reorganising our own operating system, and it also energises us because we have a direction and a vision of which way we need to go in order to nail down this new operating system, whatever it is. Once we see that light, we start to become energised again, which is quite different

than in the chaotic phase when we tend to lack energy and we can even fall into depression sometimes if we get stuck in that place. But once we have the vision, the insight, we have energy to move and we feel energised, and sometimes people can be radically energised in this phase and become evangelical before they've even quite got hold of the new values. They just say, 'well, this happened to me and this is how I got out of it and you should do it, too.'

**Nyck:** I'm a bit like that. It's my Aries moon, Aries ascendent—I'm a bit impulsive, childlike, jump in boots and all, forget to fully do my research at times.

**Steve:** Yes, we've all been through it in our own ways during our transformational changes.

Then what follows is a period of integration where we're learning about the nature of this new perspective, we're starting to nail down these particular value sets that come with it, so we've got anchor points once again, and eventually over time with proper integration, we will reach a new point of stability where we know what our values are, we know who we are, we know how we see the world, and again we're able to cope with whatever the world throws at us.

It's important to point out that this new stability is on a different level than the old stability. We've come in a cycle, but the cycle has been a spiral which has taken us around in full circle, but also up a level, so we're at a new level of stability with greater capacity in our consciousness.

**Nyck:** Yes, and it's important to say that the levels that we're talking about, it's not a judgement between one or the other. Each level has its own integrity within its own value system for those who are situated there at the particular time that they are; and it is important in the evolution of everything, that that process, that spiral process, actually is occurring. It's like a flowering, it's an unfolding, you could say, of human consciousness, somehow.

---

**Nyck:** You're tuned to *Future Sense* here, and we are talking about value systems, particularly with regards to conflict, and we are coming to expressing a bit of how that works in each layer, but let's keep going through with the actual process of change that occurs and why conflict arises from the clash of value systems essentially.

**Steve:** Yes, we've just talked through the dynamic of change, the sequence, how it unfolds for us from stability through stress and crisis and then insight and

breakthrough, renewal, and then new stability completes that cycle for us. In a transformational change, that process takes us from one values set to another, more complex values set through a process of growth. There's been some research around the time it takes for people to grow from one values set to the next and the research that I'm aware of was on regular meditators who were practising altered states which would give them an advantage—having an altered state practice, without a doubt, gives you an advantage because of the reflection that takes place during the altered state and the opportunity for quietening the mind and receiving insights—and they found that for regular meditators, you were looking at a period of around about four years to develop from one values set to the next, more complex values set.

**Nyck:** Oh, okay, that's interesting.

**Steve:** It's very much tied to life conditions, obviously, so how generic that result is it's hard to say, but it's a rough guide for somebody out there who's working on themselves and wondering how long it might take.

So let's talk about value systems in general, and when we're living from one of these value systems—in other words, it's our dominant operating system—how we perceive other values sets.

In the First Tier of consciousness, which is the first six layers in Clare Graves's model, we always feel as though our values are correct—they are the correct way of living, the right ethics, etc., everything that comes with a set of values. When we bump into somebody who has a different values set and that difference becomes apparent through interaction somehow, then we'll often feel like we're right and they're wrong—that's a very common thing—and sometimes there will be this imperative that arises in us to want to change the other person to fit with our values: 'you should really see the world this way, and these things are important, not the things that you say.' This, of course, is the root of all human conflict on the planet—this rejection of other values sets, and the inability to live with somebody who has a different set of values and the difficulties that arise around that.

In a moment, we'll look through the first six layers of value systems and talk about the very specific things that will trigger somebody to fight in a physical sense around those differences.

**Nyck:** It's a very tricky thing, I think, to acknowledge that human nature does have a very hard time opening to other sets of values when in this space, and to recognise that it's quite a difficult psychological process because one feels safe in your value system, whatever that might be, and it's very easy to look at another person's value system and say, 'well, they're wrong because they have an attitude towards this or they think that way about that'. They might be racist, or the things that I certainly can't abide—racism is

a good example—and yet clearly those people who are still very racist are coming from an earlier value system, born out of their trajectory, their history, their epigenetics, their culture, wherever it may have come from, and in the context of that, it's not wrong in and of itself. It's not the best way, arguably, to be on this planet—certainly not—but it's an evolution and there needs to be, in some sense, the ability to stand in another person's shoes, as we've talked about before, to actually try and see another person's value system from within and to understand it enough to make some sort of connection beyond the conflict that can arise in those situations. But very difficult, understandably, for most people on the planet right now to take that expanded view of other value systems.

**Steve:** Yes, and what you describe just at the end there is very specific to the transition from Layer 5 to Layer 6—this joining of the dots, creating this network-centric perspective on the world and also very much focused on the human experience of living in that world and how we connect with each other.

It's also important to just grasp the fact that these values are born out of a deep, hidden subconscious operating system, sometimes called a framework, for making sense of reality, so they're not surface-level ideas that pop up. We're not talking about somebody who likes horse racing and they're trying to convince you to like horse racing—it's not a logical process. We're talking about very, very deep drivers which drive our most basic behaviours and our most basic way of giving value to things and appreciating the value of things. So it is a very deep thing and it is important to remember that we're talking about a deep subconscious process, not just the surface-level idea of changing somebody's mind about something which is different again. You can take any particular topic, whether it be horse racing or going to church or whatever, and you can find different people from different value systems who actually like those things, but from completely different angles because of completely different base-level values—subconscious values. Somebody might, for example, like going to the races because of the social aspect and they get an opportunity to dress up and meet new people.

**Nyck:** You should have seen the hat that Steve just put on then. Quite astounding. Melbourne Cup, here I come.

**Steve:** It was the fascinator that did it—and other people will go to the races for completely different ideas: just to make money, or because they love to be around horses, all sorts of different reasons.

**Nyck:** My sister's a horse person. She creates alternative organic horse feed and nutrients for horses. A very good business, very solid, and she's into horse racing

because of a lot of her clients, but I know she's not really into horse racing—she just loves horses.

**Steve:** Yes, that's right. My dad was a horse racing fanatic, of course, and I got exposed to that when I was a kid.

**Nyck:** He liked the races. He liked the betting, though, didn't he?

**Steve:** He loved horses as well. When he was very young, he worked as an apprentice jockey in stables for a while until he had a bad fall and his mum didn't want him to do it anymore, or something like that. He probably grew too big anyway.

**Nyck:** And then there's many people who do not like such things as horse racing or greyhound racing for all the animal rights reasons, and they are some very good reasons too; solid reasons. I can support that myself.

**Steve:** That's right. In fact, my dad was a Queenslander and had never been to the Melbourne Cup, and years ago when I was living in Melbourne, I thought, here's an opportunity, so I got him down in Melbourne and we went to the Melbourne Cup and it was a great day out, but actually, on that day, they had to shoot a horse right in front of the stands.

**Nyck:** Not unusual.

**Steve:** So that was a blatant example of that. It was actually the first and only time I'd ever seen it in real life.

**Nyck:** How did you feel about that?

**Steve:** It was a bit disturbing. They put up a barrier, like a wall-thing around the horse so nobody could see what was going on, but the loud crack of the firearm going off told the tale of what they were actually doing there. It was a horse that had fallen during a race and broken its leg and obviously it was too bad to be fixed. So, yes, a sad part of the sport there. Anyway, just to make the point that people from completely different value sets can still like the same thing, but for the very, very different reasons, so it's just a little aspect of complexity of how this model works.

With each value set in the First Tier, the first six set of operating systems, there's always a compulsive behaviour that's attached to a particular set of values as well, and often this will be the thing that triggers the rejection in another person—your compulsion to really sell them on this particular aspect of what you value. It might be something simple like pushing them to try harder, or just talking too much because you want to really dive deeply into who they are and connect at that deep level from the sixth layer, but there will be a compulsive behaviour of some sort, and often that can be the sore point of like, 'oh, just back off, this is too much.'

**Nyck:** I guess, in the realm of politics, this is where it comes to the fore very strongly and with a lot of conflict potential, just by the very nature of the beast being a competitive frame of human endeavour.

**Steve:** Absolutely, and particularly it becomes problematic with the fifth Modern Scientific-Industrial mindset where the values are not always what they seem to be. There's this public image idea, which is the outer layer that you project, and then behind that, you've got your hand of cards you don't want to show.

**Nyck:** A good example of this would be the concept of greenwash—companies claiming to be green when in actual fact it's just another mode of operation to make profit, essentially.

**Steve:** Yes, that's right, and that exploitative aspect of Layer 5 is very problematic in the present time so we might actually come back to that before the end of the show and talk briefly about that, but let's just have a look at the first six layers or value systems and talk about what they'll fight for.

At the first layer, which is basic Hunter-Gatherer survival-type living—very, very instinctive, operating off your instincts and basic urges, no real complex mental concepts in operation here—but the obvious thing that people will fight for in that that layer of values is self-preservation when their survival is threatened, and it's very much a survival value set at Layer 1 and nothing much more.

**Nyck:** And of course you see it in babies and small children who cry out for their needs immediately, as it happens right now: I need to be fed now, I need to be held now, something now.

**Steve:** Exactly, and if you misinterpret what they want, then they'll fight to reject whatever it is that you're trying to push on them. It's like, 'no, I've got a sore ear, don't do that to me', but they can't communicate that so they resort to the physical action.

Layer 2, which is the Traditional-Tribal layer, historically when we first came together from hunter-gatherers into larger groups and lived as tribes, or in early childhood where you're more than an infant but you're a toddler and you start to think about things and you start to understand the relationships within the family unit—who does what and all that kind of stuff. In the traditional historical sense, the land was sacred, and still is for those people who are living and engaging these kinds of values, and it's often very difficult for present-day people to understand the importance of that, but the land was an integral part of the religious life, if you want to call it religious or spiritual.

**Nyck:** Or the cosmology of the people.

**Steve:** Cosmology, yes. And so there was this extremely strong connection to the land, and one of the few things that people in that way of living will fight for is if you transgress the sacred land—you walk on the sacred land without permission, you invade their land—they will generally try and rectify that because they see it as a great trespass, literally. Because that's seen as a wrong, then they will generally seek some kind of retribution or rectification of that which sometimes can involve an agreed exchange between opposing groups in a tribal sense. It's interesting if you read about some of the stories of tribal conflict from those days, that often there was quite a ritual and a process around that; the conflict was almost a sacred process itself. It wasn't just all-out massacring, generally, it was a meeting place where something was exchanged. Sometimes there was violence that occurred, but it was very specific and ritualised as a kind of rectification of a wrong.

**Nyck:** Yes, good point. That's great.

**Steve:** Moving on to Layer 3, which is what Graves called Egocentric—kind of a martial way of living where might is right and we move from the traditional way where you're living according to tribal customs within a very fixed setting on sacred land to a much wilder way of living where the use of raw power is seen as the appropriate way to live, and this came historically when we busted out of our tribal lands. I've been looking for examples of when this occurred historically and it's difficult to find them because this happened at a time before our current recorded history when, as a species, we busted out of tribalism and into this more mobile kind of martial way of living where we would invade other people's lands and appropriate their resources and those sorts of things.

**Nyck:** You use the example of people like Genghis Khan.

**Steve:** Genghis Khan is the classic example. He had such a massive impact on the world, conquering all of that land mass.

**Nyck:** And to whom many of us are actually related because of him spreading his seed so far and wide.

**Steve:** Exactly. And so power is the ultimate determiner of who's right and who's wrong. People who are living from that value set will actually fight for the fun of fighting because they're motivated to be powerful and be on top of other people.

**Nyck:** It's very *Game of Thrones*, all of that, and the phrase that I'm reading in part of Graves's thinking is "lack of consequence awareness", the lack of awareness about the consequences of your actions.

**Steve:** That's right, and at this stage, talking historically with the development of our species, this emerged before the development of the frontal lobes in the brain, which are really our moderating system that allow us to rationalise and moderate those more primal instincts that we have. Layer 3 is still part-and-parcel of life in the present day and we see it expressed in sport most commonly, and occasionally in the wild argument or fight that people will get into when they've lost control—the rational control of themselves. Certainly in sport, if you look at conflict sports like boxing, mixed martial arts, those sorts of things, you'll see people there who just love fighting and they're passionate about it. They're doing it within a rule set usually, so it's kind of an advanced Layer 3, where there's a bit of Layer 4—there's a rule set, there are things that you can't do and people agree to abide by those rules, but within the rules set, they will express the wildness of conflict. So it's really still very much part-and-parcel of life, and of course you've got wars and international conflict where we see it being expressed in that way on a large scale.

In Layer 4, which is the Authoritarian mindset, this is where the frontal lobes have kicked in—the rational mind is in charge now, and we can rationalise things. We can think about cause-and-effect, which allows us to make plans for the future; it allows us to moderate our behaviour so we can realise rationally, 'OK, I really would like to punch this guy in the head but if I do that, then it's going to mess up my arrangement to marry his sister and therefore I'm not going to do it.'



**Nyck:** And thus the judicial systems arise in this frame too, don't they—to mitigate, to help resolve those particular conflicts when you know that if I do 'this', then there's 'this' consequence here, and having to actually find a judgemental balance.

**Steve:** Yes, absolutely, and that idea of a balance of some sort is common to the communal systems, so 2, 4 and 6. In 2, the Traditional-Tribal, there's this balance with nature that we manage, and in Layer 4, it's very much a matter of justice—balancing out wrongdoings.

**Nyck:** Or controlling your evil deeds, supposedly, as it's expressed here, but looking at some of the institutions, they haven't done a very good job of that. Hello, George Pell—oh, sorry.

**Steve:** Let's not go there just now.

This system, Layer 4, will fight ideologically, so often, because it's an authoritarian system, it looks for a higher authority to follow, a higher authority that dispenses a set of rules to live by, and then that becomes a dogma and it's this set of values that our major religions were born out of with their various sets of rules on how to live righteously, and it's that righteousness, that ideology, that dogmatic adherence to a set of rules that they will fight for. That's seen as a duty—it's their duty to defend that—and of course, one of the classic examples historically were the Crusades, the religious crusades, which occurred in the Middle East.

**Nyck:** And I guess commensurate with that, or correlated with that too, things like witch burnings—another state or another part of that suppression of the female, suppression of the wild and suppression of the natural connection that originally came from an earlier time, perhaps, that we're rediscovering, too; that notion that if you go outside of the frame of religions and what has been dispensed from above, that you are somehow evil and have to be punished in the system.

**Steve:** Yes, another great example of conflict coming out of a clash of values.

Then Layer 5, the Modern Scientific-Industrial. The key driver here is personal success, and the nature of organisation within Layer 5 is one of separation and individuation.

**Nyck:** Compartmentalisation.

**Steve:** Compartmentalisation, exactly, so often the people who are making the strategic decisions are not in touch with the end result of their decisions and it's that separation, that standing apart from, that allows people to endorse and seek out physical conflict for economic gain, in particular. Of course, that's become a well-established business model in the world now where there's quite an industry, the military-industrial complex as it's called, built around making money out of warfare.

**Nyck:** Yes, well I think many people supported Barack Obama in many ways, as I did at the time—a much better president, arguably than many other presidents, that's an arguable fact—but the fact is also that President Obama sent more drones, more technology to kill more people and more collateral damage than any other previous American president. So that's a tough example of that materialist view of things and how to gain control and power, no doubt for particular economic or power reasons within the region.

**Steve:** It is a good example, and also the way that his public image was crafted. Right to the end, he was seen as this smiling, friendly next-door neighbour kind of president who would do the right thing, and yet all of this other stuff went on, a lot of it behind the scenes.

**Nyck:** Exactly.

Let's take a little break before we come into Green where we are now, if that's OK. And I just want to quickly address a couple of your relevant texts that have dropped in here. One person has written and said: "You just shed light on the 12-step programme process. You two change-makers rock." Thank you. That's interesting, how that relates; maybe we can comment on that, too.

Someone else wrote in response to when I asked how you were feeling out there with regards to what we're talking about, one person said: "Yes, I've been feeling a lot of fear and depression, as have many of my friends in terms of environment, runaway climate change seems to have begun, craziness of political leaders not changing course from raping and pillaging earth, rising inequity, rise of fascism, artificial intelligence, etc.", and it's interesting how many people are afraid of that; "feeling more connected to the suffering of the planet", she says, "I do pray we will make the transition you speak of. My optimism is waning." Well, don't let it wane because it's just the process. To me, in my experience, that's a fairly common position of many people in this region—this kind of sadness, this longing for change, and desperation and feeling that it's not happening quick enough; things are not changing fast enough.

**Steve:** Yes, I think it's very common, and really the person is describing their own passage through that sequence of change that we discussed before, where all of a

sudden we realise that the values we've been living by don't seem to be cutting it anymore, for us personally or out there in the world. They don't seem to be solving the problems, the problems are continuing to mount, problems are becoming more complex and we need a new way of solving these problems that we can't see yet, and that's the most difficult thing.

Going through this change process is a little bit like walking into a fog. Before you walk into the fog, you can see everything, you're oriented, you know where you are and whether you're about to trip over or not, but then you go into the fog and all of a sudden your visibility is reduced—you can't see anywhere near as far into the future as you used to be able to and you become disoriented. You don't even know which way to head at some point, and it's only when the fog breaks and you get that insight, that visibility of what might be next, that the reorientation process begins again. It's important to understand that that is the change process—that's how it works—and you can take comfort from understanding where you are in that change process, and even if you are in the middle of the fog, feeling totally lost, don't know what you value anymore, don't know what you should do, just understand that that means you're right there in that chaotic crisis, imminent breakthrough territory.

There are things that you can do to support your progression through that by some kind of regular practice, some kind of practice that's going to allow you to access insights and new perspectives. Changing your life conditions is also key. Step outside the box, go do something that you don't normally do, go meet some people you don't normally talk to. All of those sorts of things are steps that you can take when you're in that chaotic zone to help you progress further through the change process.

**Nyck:** Beautiful. And just before we do take a break, I thought I would read this little poem that many of you may be familiar with, which to me is very applicable to Layer 5, which Steve has been talking about—the materialistic layer—and the selfish economic and power gain that layer of value systems basically finds most important. This is a little poem from, I think, the 16th and 17th century, arguably the sort of time when that layer was emerging on the planet, and it goes like this:

*The law locks up the man or woman  
Who steals the goose off the common  
But leaves the greater villain loose  
Who steals the common from the goose.*

*The law demands that we atone  
When we take things we do not own  
But leaves the lords and ladies fine  
Who takes things that are yours and mine.*

*The poor and wretched don't escape  
If they conspire the law to break;*

*This must be so but they endure  
Those who conspire to make the law.*

*The law locks up the man or woman  
Who steals the goose from off the common  
And geese will still a common lack  
Till they go and steal it back.*

---

**Nyck:** You are here on *Future Sense* with Steve McDonald and myself, Nyck Jeanes.

A couple of more texts, just quickly. Someone has written and said: "Been away and glad to hear *BayFM* again. We mustn't lose sight of the leaders such as Obama, that they are actually puppets owned by those who bankroll them towards that leadership position. Thanks fellas for another information packed session." And yes, I mean, clearly our leaders in the frame, in the value systems from which they arose, to one degree or other are compromised, probably across the board, no matter which political strain they actually operate from. And the other question, thanks for that, is: "Could the concept of God's will be valuable in understanding the deeper, evolving, adaptive complexity of life on Earth and beyond?" It's a big question.

**Steve:** It's an interesting question and I think if we take that concept, it certainly can, but many people wouldn't express it that way. Some people might call it the evolutionary impulse or some other name rather than "God's will" which implies a religious connection, but nonetheless, if we look past the language to the idea that there is a will and a direction that evolution is taking, then absolutely, we can say that that is a driver—the deepest driver that we might be aware of, perhaps, if we can tap into that.

I have a background in Taoism, the Chinese philosophy, and that's very much about understanding the nature of reality and how it works, and it does very much say that there is "a way". The Tao means "the way". There is a way that we can follow and if we pay attention and tap into that way, we can move with it and life becomes effortless, relatively.

**Nyck:** Yes, and as you mentioned the *I-Ching* before, I guess the *I-Ching* is an expression through that general Taoist and Chinese philosophy foundation of exactly that—that somehow it's actually a structured geometric complexity of beingness that you can actually have access to through these modes of prognostication, if you will.

**Steve:** Yes, absolutely, it was seen that way. These books were written a long time ago and so there's been a very, very deep observation of the nature of reality—the way that it unfolds—that's led to the documentation of things like the *Book of Changes*, which can

be connected so favourably with the absolute leading-edge physics in terms of understanding the structure of spacetime, so there's very, very deep insight there.

**Nyck:** Absolutely. And a last one just came in too: "I only tuned in at 10:20. Yet again, both you guys have discussed the subject with viewpoints of many with polite yet direct accuracy of each viewpoint to stimulate thoughts on colliding those points of view, allowing respect of other people's points of view." I think we understand. Thank you for that.

**Steve:** Thank you. Beautiful.

**Nyck:** We've only got a few minutes left. We're just looking at the expressions of how conflict operates in the different value systems.

**Steve:** Yes, and particularly what might drive each particular value system in the first tier of six layers to physical conflict. We've covered from 1 through 5 which just leaves us to look at Layer 6, and Layer 6 is very interesting because it seems to be the first value system that is emerging for humanity which really questions the value of fighting and the purpose of fighting at all. Its key driver is to achieve deep connection with other human beings and that in itself tends to run in contrast to the idea of conflict. How can you achieve or pursue deep connection with a human being if you are in physical conflict with them? Graves wrote that he sees this sixth layer as the most peaceful version of humanity that has ever walked the Earth and I certainly endorse that. You only need to look at all of the social justice movements, the civil rights movements, the anti-war movement from the 1960s, and all of these things which are symptoms of the emergence of this new way of being human, which certainly seem to pursue the idea of peace.

It's important to understand that even if somebody is operating from Layer 6 as their dominant layer of values, given a sudden and somewhat radical change in life conditions, they can regress to previous value systems, so this is not to say that an individual who seems to be mostly operating at Layer 6 might not resort to physical violence—anyone can regress given the right life conditions and the right triggers for them personally. That's just something to bear in mind.

It all comes back to really paying attention to our life conditions.

**Nyck:** Yes, and I guess what occurs for me regarding what you just said is paying as much attention, conscious attention—this is where practices of meditation, mindfulness and similar things are very valuable—in being aware of how you perhaps slip back when your value system is challenged, when you feel unsafe or insecure in the place that you

are in, and something in your reality occurs and you find yourself, for example, becoming a bit more aggressive than you may naturally be. To be aware of that and to be conscious of that, to me that's a kind of first step in negotiating the space in a very conflicted world right now of true conflict resolution and non-violent communication, which we acknowledge are the sort of practices that have emerged out of Layer 6 as well.

**Steve:** Yes, absolutely. We might just finish off the show revisiting this issue of exploitation by Layer 5, which is very, very topical at the moment. It's something that is being uncovered gradually, globally, and I'm sure there's an astrological link to the Pluto stuff that's going on.

**Nyck:** Yes, Pluto in Capricorn. Good point.

**Steve:** The revelation of deep dark truths and what we're seeing is the uncovering of previously shielded value sets and behaviours which have been brought to the surface primarily by our increasing communications technology and the fact that everybody now has access to publishing on the internet. When I say everybody, that's a generalisation, but most people have access to a device on the planet these days and are able to put stuff on the internet and so it's very, very hard for people to hide things. Of course you mentioned before the issue around George Pell and sexual abuse, which has become a massive issue for the Catholic Church at the moment and it's just an example of something that's been going on behind the scenes. There's been a public image that's been projected which has sought to hide and obscure what's actually going on.

**Nyck:** And a public image that claims moral authority.

**Steve:** Yes, and all of a sudden it's all coming out in the open. We're seeing this, not just in religion, but across all disciplines of life—politics and economics and everything—all of these underlying hidden agendas are being brought to the surface. That's something that's going to continue, in my view. For maybe another decade or even two we're going to see in particular over the next ... let me see, probably, what are we now, 2019? I think for the next five to seven years in particular, we're going to see a lot of this—more than we expect to see—and it's something to be aware of just to keep on top of things. Just keep in mind the possibility that people are not always telling the truth, they're not always projecting an image which truly reflects their values or what they're up to behind the scenes, and this is part of the dismantling of the collapse of the Modern Scientific-Industrial paradigm, which has been the dominant global paradigm for the past few hundred years.

**Nyck:** As you're speaking, two words merge in my conscious. The word 'revelation' and the word 'revolution'. Revelations are occurring at a faster pace at the moment and the tendency is to want to have revolution, in a sort of an old frame of that word, one could say. It's all semantics but I felt then as you were speaking, that being aware of the revelations doesn't necessarily have to lead to what we've conceived of in the past as a revolution—like overthrowing in any sort of violent or anti- way, even though some aspects of that must happen, will happen, can happen—but somehow a conscious awareness of what is being revealed can lead us to other ways of approaching the issues that we have on the planet and the challenges and how to actually solve them now.

**Steve:** Yes, absolutely. There is such a thing as a peaceful revolution. Probably Gandhi is one of the standouts historically who demonstrated that peaceful activism can work.

**Nyck:** We've seen the word revolution turned to re-love-ution.

**Steve:** Yes, that's right. It's an interesting word, revolution. It comes from revolve, right?, which is turning full circle, and if you can imagine that you're standing on the edge of a record as it's turning around, as it turns you're taking a different perspective. So you're coming full circle through different perspectives and back—and the record is a two dimensional example so it's not the best—but in a spiralling sense, when you come back to full circle, you're actually at a higher perspective, in other words, able to see more complexity than you could before.

**Nyck:** Indeed. We've got to leave it there this week, but next week we're going to flesh out some of what we see coming in the next 20 or 30 years, from our perspective.

**Steve:** Yes, we might have a look at some predictive milestones next week.

I just want to mention a conflict resolution resource, a wonderful one that I have been using for years and years and years. It's the *Conflict Resolution Network*, an Australian organisation which I understand was started with some funding from the *United Nations*. Their website is <https://www.crnhq.org> and they have a whole conflict resolution manual in there which is full of some amazing tools if you ever have to take part in some kind of mediation or conflict resolution.

**Nyck:** Fantastic. Thanks for joining us today here on *Future Sense*. That's it from us, from Nyck Jeanes and from Steve McDonald. We'll be with you next week.

*You've been listening to Future Sense, a podcast edited from the radio show of the same name broadcast on BayFM in Byron Bay, Australia, at [www.bayfm.org](http://www.bayfm.org). Future Sense is available on iTunes and SoundCloud.*

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