The Great Simplification

Nate Hagens (00:00:02):

You are listening to the Great Simplification with Nate Hagens. That's me. On this show, we try to explore and simplify what's happening with energy, the economy, the environment, and our society. Together with scientists, experts, and leaders, this show is about understanding the bird's eye view of how everything fits together, where we go from here, and what we can do about it as a society and as individuals.

(00:00:33):

Today's guest is Nora Bateson. Nora is an award-winning filmmaker, writer, and educator, and is the president of the International Bateson Institute based in Sweden. The followers of this podcast know I am keenly interested in systems and how we can understand the human ecosystem. Nora's work goes beyond the physical descriptions of the science underpinning our predicament to the nuance and perception of the complexity that we live within so that in addition to knowing facts, we can improve our interaction with others and with the world. I hope you enjoy my conversation with my friend and colleague, Nora Bateson.

(00:01:29):

Let's start with the importance of systems, thinking in systems, seeing the world in systems. What does it mean to see things through a systems and complexity lens in order to understand how the parts integrate and shape how things work?

Nora Bateson (00:01:48):

Oh, I just love that we're starting here. This is good, because it's really far too easy to throw around the vocabulary of things like systems or complexity. In fact, those words are used too frequently in ways that don't really get to what I think they mean to me. I'll just say that. So, especially, living systems become viable not really because of their parts, but because of the relationship between them. So, it's important to recognize that our whole culture really in every possible way we identify the nouns, the parts, the bits. We name the parts. We define. We measure. We can describe the parts, and we're much less adept at actually describing the relationships between the parts, if you will.

Nate Hagens (00:02:58):

Why do you think that is? First of all, why do you think that is?

Nora Bateson (00:03:03):

I think first of all, part of it is that it has been several hundred years at least of mechanistic and more instrumental thinking. The industrial mind is a mind that is looking at the components and how the components fit together to make a product. We talk about function. How does it function? Function is something that is produced by parts being in some sort of process together. So, it's a habitual, and deep down, it's a presupposition that if the parts are working well together, whatever it is will work. Now, this is true when you're talking about a pickup truck, and it's not nearly as true when you're talking about a family, okay?

(00:03:58):

When you're talking about a family, you can't just replace a part. You can't say, "This kid doesn't work right. Let's get a new one. This partner isn't functioning properly. I need a new one." In the same way, what you're doing is you're looking at relational processes that are constantly compensating and responding in multiple directions, so your relationship with your children, and your partner, and your parents, and your job, and your own health, and your idea of success, and your... In all these different directions, you are constantly making responses, and so are they.

Nate Hagens (00:04:44):

Are there two things going on here? One is that we, in modern world, have parsed all the complexity and nuance of our evolutionary existence into a single metric, which is a dollar or the kroner or the euro or whatever. So, the way we make a living defines our values, and so we've parsed all these very disparate and soft connections between things and relationships and the processes into a single variable, which is our cultural goal, which is profits and the dollar. Then there's the second component that you just said is we have nouns and words, but I think they're related, because we are optimizing for what our culture chooses, which is profits. Ecology or the study of relationships isn't rewarded in our current culture, so it's been suppressed. Does that make sense?

Nora Bateson (00:05:49):

It's not only not rewarded. It's hardly even perceivable. It's really at the level of perception. I think that's where I feel my work has been most focused is toward how

might we actually begin to enhance our ability, which we definitely have of perception of relational process. Now, it's not that we don't see relationships. We do. The question is which relationships? So, it's tricky actually because on the one hand, why would Prada, for example, have any value if you weren't able to perceive it in relation to other things in our cultural spectrum of products? So, we're looking at things through a relational lens, but which relationships? It's a strange irony that we live in a context that seems to be allergic to context.

Nate Hagens (00:07:06):

Can you explain that?

Nora Bateson (00:07:09):

It's not easy to... In order to succeed in the world in which we are living... When I say we, I could mean western culture, but unfortunately I think this is pretty much everywhere at this point. So, it's difficult to succeed if one doesn't learn how to be in their world in the way in which the world wants you to be. What that means is we got to succeed at school. We have to do well. We have to understand the importance of the role of the teacher in algebra class, the depths of the ways in which we are learning to cut out those perceptions that would give us the systemic view. It starts very young in learning how to talk, learning how to identify things, learning what's good, what's bad, what's approved, what's not approved.

(00:08:14):

In those processes all the way through school, one of the things that's happening is that the world is being compartmentalized. It's being chopped into bits, and named and labeled from your psychiatric evaluation to your grade, to your gender, to your nationality, to your blood type, to your... In all these different ways, we have chopped things apart. Inherently, there's nothing really wrong with chopping things apart. It's just that we don't put them back together again. So in growing up and learning to be a participant in the world in which we live, one of the key things that we have to do is to learn not to see those systemic processes that would give us a very different insight on life if they were prioritized.

Nate Hagens (00:09:18):

Let me go down a little rabbit hole here. In our ancestral time, 300,000 years, as a species, we could label the things around us. Our lives were complex, but in the natural world and in the social interactions of the people we lived with, now the world is so horribly complex on multiple different levels. Is labeling things the way that you just described, is that a way that we can cope and reduce uncertainty? Because if we didn't label things, it would just be this maelstrom of inputs that we wouldn't have the ability to process. This gets to another aspect of your work. You and I agree that humans need to better embrace uncertainty, because uncertainty is going to be the name of the game, but humans inherently abhor uncertainty because uncertainty feels crappy. It feels like anxiety and a boost in cortisol, et cetera.

(00:10:28):

I think people, when they hear the story about limits to growth and some of the things that you and I work on, the common reaction on all my YouTube channels and other presentations and discussions is binary. Half the people are like, "This is delusional. Technology will solve it. The market will always come up with an innovation, or we're screwed. There's nothing we can do." Both of those poles obviate the need for any personal response, and so they make people feel confident or certain of a certain path, but you're talking about uncertainty. That was a big mouthful there, but do you have any opinion on what I just laid out?

Nora Bateson (00:11:15):

It's a tricky one because the certainty that you gain is paid for by the consequences of not having understood the systemic process. So like I said, there's nothing wrong with naming and labeling. What there is a problem with is that we forget that we made the name that that isn't actually the edge of the system. So, a system can be defined as something that is made possible through the interaction of multiple processes. Your body is a system. Your family is a system. A society is a system. A forest is a system. In particular, I'm talking about living systems here. The mistake that we make is thinking that we can fix the system by fixing the parts like we would a pickup truck.

(00:12:17):

When something goes wrong, you can fix it by fixing the parts, and you can't do that. The consequences of that take much more time, and get things much more muddled up than might have been possible had there been a greater perception of the system

from the beginning. But in order to do that, you're going to have to blur the edges. So, I start to see Nate not just as the outline of you in your skin, in your name, in your profession, but as also trillions of organisms, as your culture, your world of ideas, your family, your... There's a lot of complexity that is the complexity of you or me as... So in order to respond to you in a way that isn't super costly in terms of damage to you and your family or your system, I need to have some humility toward the ambiguity of what I can see. So, the problem with the ambiguity is actually the humility that it requires.

Nate Hagens (00:13:41):

Could I paraphrase that by saying we need to understand systems and the parts and the processes of living systems to better understand our challenges and the path that lays ahead? But on another meta level, we have to have the psychological wisdom to realize that these are just models, and these are just nouns that we've ascribed to it, and there's a wider boundary perspective laid on top of that that we have to be humble about, because we don't fully understand it and et cetera.

Nora Bateson (00:14:15):

Exactly. I mean-

Nate Hagens (00:14:16):

That makes sense to me.

Nora Bateson (00:14:18):

That makes sense. I'll give you an example that I have given before, which is it's easy to look at a problem, and not realize that that problem is actually produced in the relationships. So, we have, for example, a lot of single moms that don't have homes in the city of Seattle, and they live in their cars with their kids. So, the social services are not able to really give them a lot of the help that they need because they can't. So when the women come in, they get diagnosed with depression, and they go out with pills for depression.

Nate Hagens (00:15:07):

The reality is they don't have money or heat to stay warm.

Nora Bateson (00:15:10):

Exactly, and they don't have... They might have a job. They might still be working, living in their cars, but they don't have... The problem is not that the women are depressed. Even though they might, you could probably click the boxes that would identify them as having depression. Obviously, that's not really the issue. So, if you can't respond systemically, then what happens? Well then, these people, they get given these drugs that then make it even more difficult for them to be emotional contact with their kids. So, the children then suffer and start misbehaving in school and so on and so forth, and so you get another problem, which is that the child is misbehaving, and there's no way to actually track that back into...

(00:16:06):

The causality is not linear, and so it's very difficult without being able to perceive and to really work on that perception systemically, how to respond to the situation in a way that is going to create healing and learning and vitality and life. Unfortunately, this is what we are seeing in many directions right now of if you have a problem, you start to try to fix it in whatever context you first see it in, and not recognizing that problem is located across and through multiple contextual parts of our lives. This is true from poverty to education issues, to climate issues, to gender issues, to food production, economics, et cetera. They can't be extracted from each other.

Nate Hagens (00:17:04):

Well, this gets back to what I said before. Our system optimizes for profits tethered to energy, tethered to hydrocarbons, which are finite and polluting, but that's what we're focused on. So this contextual looking at the broader system, which involves especially our environment, other humans, other generations, other species, other boundaries of analysis isn't recognized or rewarded by our current cultural value system. Could that ever happen? Does it start with education? How do we get more systems thinkers to look at when some woman comes in to the hospital in Seattle, looks at the broader context of what's going on, and embraces and responds in that way?

Nora Bateson (00:17:58):

I think that we can't depend on the individuals for this. This is a shared learning, a shared cultural approach. I sometimes say we're holding each other hostage. So, if I

were that social worker in Seattle, I would have a real problem on my hands, because that social worker can't change the economics of the city of Seattle, right? What are they supposed to do?

Nate Hagens (00:18:31):

Well, all of us are hostage to this system in that way.

Nora Bateson (00:18:34):

Exactly.

Nate Hagens (00:18:36):

So your grandfather, William Bateson, coined the word genetics as far as I'm aware. Your dad was a famous anthropologist ecologist, Gregory Bateson. I have several of his books downstairs. So growing up, Nora, in a science-heavy family, what do you think is the role of science generally in our current and upcoming cultural challenges?

Nora Bateson (00:19:02):

To explore, to be curious, to be humble, and to imagine, and actually I think to invite curiosity. I think one of the things that we've lost with the idea of the expert knows all, which is that serves in a way, but is the curiosity of what it means to be human. How do we figure out how to live in our world in a way that is less damaging to each other and the environment? I think that science, what's great about science is that it's rigorous, and it asks questions, and then more questions come. The scientists are always wrong eventually. That's part of the deal. You discover something, and then you discover something else. It keeps moving.

(00:20:06):

That ongoing discovery is an attitude that comes with a lot of rigor and exploration. But I think that if I were to give criticism there, I would give the same criticism that I think my grandfather and definitely my father gave, which is that science has become too compartmentalized just like everything else. You can't actually-

Nate Hagens (00:20:32):

Siloed.

Nora Bateson (00:20:35):

Siloed, however you want to call that, but breaking things into parts and studying the parts does not show you how life is produced in the whole. You can study all the organisms in the meadow, but what you'll never see is how they are in relationship to each other, and what is happening in those communications between butterflies and earthworms and grasses and insects and mosses and bacteria in the soil and so on. So, each one of those organisms is fantastic to study, but they are all completely interdependent. In order for that life of the meadow to continue, those relationships are needing to change. They have to shift. They have to respond. They have to calibrate to each other's responses.

(00:21:32):

So again, we're looking at this habit in the culture of wanting something that's freeze-framed information, instead of allowing it to keep moving, keep changing, keep growing, keep responding, because that's what life does.

Nate Hagens (00:21:49):

It's no surprise that we're friends. I don't know if you ever read my superorganism paper, but in the introduction, it says, "This paper provides a brief overview of the relationships in human systems. A coherent description of the global economy requires a systems view describing the parts, the processes, how the parts and processes interact, and what these interactions imply about our future possibilities."

Nora Bateson (00:22:17):

No wonder we get along.

Nate Hagens (00:22:22):

Well, this is what I'm trying to do is we don't know. I'm much more confident, much more confident about what won't happen in the future, and have very small idea about what will. These conversations with cultural and thought leaders like yourself are meant to educate and inform about what's going on, because I do think science has a critical role. We have to understand that energy is the currency of life, and that without energy, your heater doesn't work, and you're in a very cold downstairs right

now. Energy is central to human history and human futures. We are evolved organisms trying to get the emotional states of our successful ancestors.

(00:23:07):

We are having a massive impact on earth's ecosystems, et cetera. I mean, we have to look at how all this fits together in order to know what a desirable future might look like, and how we get there. So, I think science has a critical role as opposed to... Right now, the main two religious beliefs in our culture outside of actual religion are technology and economic theory that we will grow for centuries. It'll just look different than today, and so I think science is important to couch our reality in a biophysical view, but I think you are right that science tends to be overly hubristic and siloed. So, we live in a sea of complexity, and there's islands of expertise, and very few people are flying up high enough to look at how the pieces fit together, because that's not what our culture rewards.

(00:24:16):

But hopefully conversations like this, I mean, it's starting. Systems, complexity, ecology, overshoot even, these terms are making a comeback, because people are starved for an explanation and a destination of what's happening and where we're going.

Nora Bateson (00:24:37):

Let's hope so.

Nate Hagens (00:24:40):

We'll get to that. So getting to your work, Nora, so can you explain what is warm data? Where did the name come from, and what does gathering warm data look like?

Nora Bateson (00:24:53):

Warm data, the name came from a phrase my father used to use when he would talk about warm ideas. A warm idea was an idea that was actually not isolated from its relational process. So he asked the question, "What is the pattern that connects?" That's a warm idea.

Nate Hagens (00:25:19):

What would be a cold idea?

Nora Bateson (00:25:21):

A cold idea would be a compartmentalized deliverable definition that isolates something from its nest of relational process. So, a cold idea is one that separates, and when that separation happens, it actually leads to more separation, which is different than when you are looking at... A warm idea is going to invite you into exploring relational process, and that just leads you to more relational process. So, it's a study of relationships that lead to more relationships instead of divisions that lead to more divisions.

Nate Hagens (00:26:06):

How do you use that in your work? You run something called Warm Data Labs.

Nora Bateson (00:26:12):

Yeah, so I started to... After years of trying to teach systems and complexity as a way of thinking, a way of looking at the world, and it was me in front of a group of people talking blah, blah, blah, and here's this part, and here's this part, and let me illustrate how they're connected. Truthfully, Nate, I wasn't getting anywhere. There were folks in the room who already understood that, and for them, they got it, and that they already had it. But for the folks who weren't really inclined toward taking that leap of jumping out of this hard and fast parts that are in mechanistic holes and into this wild living system, I wasn't getting anywhere, and I started to feel actually anxious, because I felt like we don't have a lot of time.

(00:27:06):

There's not really enough time to get eight billion people to be able to suddenly do systems thinking. Just as I say that, I want you to know that I recognize that most cultures in the world, in Asia and in Africa, in India have other forms, and certainly in ancient cultures. The systems were implicit. They were always looking at things in relationship. So, it's not something new. It's just something that has gotten overrun by industrialism, because industrialism worked.

Nate Hagens (00:27:44):

Industrialism out-competed relationships in warm data.

Nora Bateson (00:27:47):

Exactly. It just overtook it. If you're dealing with warm data, you're going to take the time. You're going to be looking for ways of responding that connect to more than one context, like the single mom in the car. This is about economy. This is about emotion. This is about the kids. It's about an education system. It's about the culture, right? So, I started these warm data labs, and it was just an invention of I wonder what would happen if I just let people go through an hour of conversation with each other in which they were asked a question like, "What is health? What is health in a changing world?"

(00:28:33):

Then people will be... There'll be lots of contexts like little stations. You could have a family context. What's health in a changing world through the context of family? They have conversations. They talk about stuff. They tell stories, and then people move, and they move to different contexts. One might move to economy, and they talk about what's health in a changing world through the context of economy. Then they move whenever they want, and they go somewhere else. It could be what's health in a changing world through the context of technology, or culture, or education, or ecology? Every time they move, they take that conversation they had a minute ago with them, and so the conversations start to make this kind of what's called a Murray Phenomenon, where there's one conversation overlaps and interlaces with another in a way that we don't really very often get a chance to do.

(00:29:38):

Usually if you get into a conversation or a debate with people, you are down a rabbit hole. We're talking about energy, and we're talking about money, and that's all we're talking about. The family and the culture and the history and technology and all these other contexts get thrown in as, "Well, you're not thinking about this, or you're not thinking about that," but the actual exploration isn't given time to what I would call inter-steep. So with the warm data labs, what I'm seeing is that within about an hour, a group of people has a sense of complexity and systemic thinking. They might not have the vocabulary of the complexity discipline or systemic theory. But better than that, they have actually perceived that systemic process and that complexity through their own lives and the memories, the details of their own lives.

(00:30:40):

That was the part for me where I realized, "Oh, this is significant," because no longer are we talking about having somebody look at the perfect map on a board, on a whiteboard or the perfect model. It's not a model, because it's actually completely different for each person. When people come out of the Warm Data Lab, they all had very different conversations, and what it has connected for them in their lives, their memories, their understanding of who they are in the world is very different. It's completely unique to each person. Of course, it should be so obvious. If you're going to teach complexity, the complexity itself has to be in each person, and it takes complexity to perceive complexity. So, your particular Nate-ness needs to actually be what is perceiving this wild world we're living in, not some top-down model of it.

(00:31:48):

That was interesting. So, that's what the warm data labs do. Why I love them is because I never know what's going to happen. I never know what conversations are going to come out. I never know what people are going to leave with. Sometimes they leave, and they quit smoking. Sometimes they leave, and they call a friend they haven't talked to in 12 years. Sometimes they leave, and they go into their next conversation, and wow, they can see things they never saw before, but it's always after the lab. So, it's like a second order process, something that happens after.

Nate Hagens (00:32:25):

That makes sense to me, because as a college teacher and as a public speaker, I have countless... Of course, we all have an understanding of the world, and all of our understandings are different. I naturally implicitly, wrongly, assume that other people will react to the facts and inferences that I'm giving them the same way that I do. I have found that that's absolutely wrong. So, you have to change how you-

Nora Bateson (00:32:54):

Fascinating.

Nate Hagens (00:32:54):

... present to different audiences. As a teacher, I've learned that. So, how can we use warm data or this idea? It sounds to me that as societies... I don't know much about

Sweden, but in the United States with social media and politics right now, the polarization is off the charts. It sounds like warm data processes is a little bit of an antidote to that polarization. Well, how could we use this better if something like this were to scale?

Nora Bateson (00:33:27):

Nate, I'm just waiting for the day when somebody actually gets that because the… There's nothing that actually can be done in the world right now with the level of division between people in communities. The way I see it, no matter what happens in the next 10, 20 years, we're going to need to be in communication with each other.

Nate Hagens (00:33:51):

Absolutely.

Nora Bateson (00:33:51):

We need each other.

Nate Hagens (00:33:52):

Absolutely.

Nora Bateson (00:33:54):

Right now, we're not in a position where we can need each other, because people are busy hating each other. It's a fate worse than death to get caught with three hours of being in relationship with your neighbor who has diametrically opposed political outlooks to you. I mean, I could see that I have this dream of doing just as an experiment. What happens if we do warm data in 10,000 communities? Just what happens? The way that they overlap, and what will they be able to do that we never thought of because they think of it themselves. In places where I have done…at communities where warm data has been used, the responses and the learning that happens so quickly on the ground produces interest in doing projects like this refugee camp in Uganda started to make a permaculture garden, and then they started to make tools.

(00:35:04):

Then they started to think about women's health and how they were going to... Then they started to do intergenerational teaching.

Nate Hagens (00:35:11):

As a byproduct of your Warm Data Lab.

Nora Bateson (00:35:14):

Exactly. So if you came in there from above, and said, "These are the sustainable development goals. You must respect to the ecology. Here's how you do a permaculture garden." They would've rebelled against that.

Nate Hagens (00:35:28):

So, it's got to be really open-ended.

Nora Bateson (00:35:31):

Right. Then in other communities, they didn't start with a permaculture garden. They started with wanting to have a community center where they could spend more time together, and to begin to help each other's kids with homework, and help each other's elders with food delivery, but the same process produces very different things in different places, because you know what? That's complexity. That's how it should be.

Nate Hagens (00:35:59):

So, there is no top-down solution. There could be a top-down story that then creates emergent solutions and or emergent conversations that lead to all the things you just said, which is another core part of your work. Maybe you could define emergence and why emergence is so relevant today, one of my favorite topics as well.

Nora Bateson (00:36:21):

I mean, emergence is what we're talking about. It's basically consequences of things that have been brewing. So, you have these situations, and they get into various configurations, and then there's consequences, and they are emergent. So, things happen, but knowing what's going to happen is nearly impossible, because you can't actually see all the ways in which these relational processes are going to come together. So, you get surprised by emergence, and some of those surprises are like life.

A forest is in an ongoing state of emergence. It's constantly responding from the trees to the ferns, to the forest floor, to all the beasties and birds, everyone is responding, and creating an emergent ongoing process of life that's different yesterday than it was today.

(00:37:23):

In order to continue, things have to discontinue, so emergence offers this wildness of life. Now, that's the romantic version. Emergence is also the root word in emergency, and emergence is not always pretty. You can see the opiate crisis as an emergent situation that has been brewing through the conditions of all sorts of things from economics to relationship to pain, to the cartels, to notions of what it means to be healthy and happy and successful, and how people are responding to that, to the increase in use of Adderall in universities and high schools to sports injuries, and so on and so forth. So, you get these conditions, and then you get emergence that comes out of it.

Nate Hagens (00:38:30):

So, is education a way to change the odds that future emergence might be on the positive side as opposed to the negative side? I noted in a recent paper you wrote, you used the concept of the word pre-emergence. Can you tell what that means?

Nora Bateson (00:38:51):

I think for me, this pre-emergence is what I'm really interested in, because by the time something has emerged, it's been cooking for a while. So, pointing to things that are emerging, and saying, "Look, this is emerging and that is emerging," is late to the story. What I think is interesting right now is to ask the question, "What about these past couple years of being in pandemic world, what is submerging in us? What habits have changed that we're not noticing? What ways of being, what sorts of things have shifted that we may not be paying attention to, but then those things will later turn up as emergent situations in other ways?

(00:39:48):

I think that's a question that gets right at the heart of… Well, it's two things, isn't it? It's what's in the presuppositions? What are we assuming is true? Therefore, our actions

become a direct a product. Our decisions, our way of approaching a problem is already prescripted in our assumptions about what's happening.

Nate Hagens (00:40:17):

Isn't that what you and I are trying to do with our work is pre-emergence in our conversations and our discussions with people is to change the initial conditions of emergence that will occur in the future?

Nora Bateson (00:40:30):

Precisely, but we're not with a whole lot of company, because most folks are looking at the problems, and saying, "Hey, we have a problem with education. Let's fix the problem in education," but the problem in education systems is not in education systems.

Nate Hagens (00:40:47):

What is it?

Nora Bateson (00:40:49):

It's in culture. It's in economics. It's in what the older generation expects of the younger generation.

Nate Hagens (00:40:55):

So, the education system is downstream of our cultural values and goals, and so we just can't change that without changing the rest of it.

Nora Bateson (00:41:03):

You could actually point to any part of this, and say, "It's downstream." So, this is why for me, it keeps coming back to this notion of what got into the water with industrialism.

Nate Hagens (00:41:20):

Energy surplus is my answer.

Nora Bateson (00:41:22):

Energy surplus is a drug that we got really high on, and it actually infiltrated absolutely everything from language to education. I mean, the education system is like a little factory.

Nate Hagens (00:41:36):

It is. It's a miniature superorganism, and my hope... I do not think we will change en masse until we have to. That will happen when our energy surplus shrinks, and it will still be quite large. So, all of what I'm trying to do is do pre-emergence towards that situation with individuals and groups of individuals and communities, and maybe change the thinking and the action towards that moment, which I'm referring to the name of this podcast. I call it the Great Simplification. Our system is stuck, and it's tethered to growth, tethered to monetary creation, tethered to energy, and with lots of negative downstream consequences.

(00:42:22):

So another part of your work is you've often referenced how a system gets unstuck. So, how does your work at the Bateson Institute... To offer any examples or ideas in this realm, how would a system become unstuck, and how would our current system become unstuck? Just a little easy question for you, Nora.

Nora Bateson (00:42:44):

Well, I want to take a tiny re-step on it, okay? So, we entered this, we being the researchers in the Bateson Institute, this question, and it is a compelling question. We thought, "This is the one. We need to ask this question, because we ares stuck. Every time we try to work on something, it's stuck." So then being a group of people who were pretty used to thinking in terms of systems, we started to ask the question, "Well, wait a minute. Actually, what is a stuck system? Can a system be stuck?" The more we asked the question, the more we realized that in order to hold something stuck that is in a living process, there has to be a lot of compensation around the edges. So even though it may look like something is stuck in order to keep it that way, it's taking a lot of change, so it takes a lot of change to keep something stuck.

Nate Hagens (00:43:46):

Can you give an example of that?

Nora Bateson (00:43:48):

Well, I mean, let's look at the economic system. In order to keep an ongoing gradient of an increasing GDP, there is all sorts of change all over the place.

Nate Hagens (00:44:00):

We're doing artificial suppression of interest rates, too big to fail guarantees, quantitative easing. We're changing the rules on what's included in GDP all to maintain this system, and the requirements of growth, like you just said, is so powerful that it's suppressing any alternative paths of wisdom or constraint.

Nora Bateson (00:44:24):

Not to mention all of the ecosystems, the forests, the natural living systems that are in wild-

Nate Hagens (00:44:32):

Those aren't even factored in.

Nora Bateson (00:44:33):

Right, and the people whose lives are in wild upheaval.

Nate Hagens (00:44:39):

That's not stuck. It's super stuck.

Nora Bateson (00:44:42):

Right. So, what we started to realize is it takes a lot of change to keep something stuck, and so we wanted to look at the best kind of stuck system we could find. The example that we chose to study was paralysis, and because a paralysis is actually a living system that's stuck, right? It would appear to be stuck. So, we went, and we were working with this really incredible clinic in Italy, and long story short, what we realized is we were asking the wrong question. The question we thought was how do systems get unstuck? What we realized was that watching what was happening with the body but becoming unstuck, these people coming out of paralysis, was that the real question was how do systems learn?

(00:45:45):

That when there is systemic learning, the stuckness, it just vaporizes. It's just not really the issue anymore, and so that became another whole trajectory of exploration of what does it mean to actually look at systemic learning? What am I even talking about? We're so used to think of learning being in the individual or in the individual part, right? I mean, we do it all the time. I think about if you're learning to play violin, where's the learning? Is it in your muscle? Is it in your intellect? Is it emotional? Is it your communication with the music? Is it your relationship to your teacher? Is it in the history of the formation of the instrument?

(00:46:36):

Is it in the genre of the music itself? Is it... Where's the learning? Of course, you know, I know, we know it's in the way those things come together, and so that's an example of the way in which we are learning to be in our world right now. How are we learning to be in our world? One of the things that we started off with just 40 minutes ago, half an hour ago, was what is the child learning in algebra class? What are we learning about what it takes to be successful, to be loved, to be likable, to be productive, to be respected? Ultimately, as living organisms, the most important thing is to be in relationship, so we're learning how to be in relationship in ways that actually undermine relationship.

(00:47:38):

I realized that this was a really interesting thing, and I actually made a word because I felt like the world of systems needed to have a way to talk specifically about this kind of systemic learning. So, I made up a word, and it's impossible to say, but it's actually a really great word. It's sym for learning, and the Greek for learning is mathisi. So, it's symmathesy, symmathesy. Symmathesy is transcontextual mutual learning, so all of the organisms in any kind of an ecosystem, like a family for example, or a forest, have to mutually learn and be an ongoing mutual learning of how to be together.

Nate Hagens (00:48:26):

I love that you create words like that. That was in your book that I read, but let me ask you a really hard question that just came to mind. The fourth law of thermodynamics unofficially is the maximum power principle that organisms and ecosystems

self-organized to maximize access to an energy gradient. So I think in nature, systems learn in the way that you're saying. In order to get energy per unit time, an oak tree could have a million leaves on it, but then a lot of them would be shaded, and wouldn't optimize, or they could have one leaf. That one leaf would be super efficient at getting energy from the sun, but it wouldn't be enough to power the tree. So, the amount of leaves it has is intermediate to maximize the daily take of sun for photosynthesis.

(00:49:21):

Human systems are exactly biological systems, so our metabolism has been growing similar to organisms. Kleiber's law is a organism's energy use is its size to the two-thirds power. Our global economy is almost exactly that, so the question with learning then and systems and humans and relationships, ultimately, the million dual question or whatever is how can human systems learn knowing everything that we've learned these past couple hundred years in the industrial revolution, 10,000 years in the agricultural revolution, 300,000 years as a species, with all the access to the science and the wider boundary, warmer thinking in between the lubrication between the silos that you are advocating for...

(00:50:24):

How can we use that, a, to learn how to navigate less energy surplus, and b, and ultimately more importantly, how can we learn to have a culture that isn't stuck on optimizing profits, turning billions of barrels of ancient sunlight into microliters of dopamine with nothing much else to show for it? How can this learning apply to that problem? That, I don't expect you to have an answer because that is a gargantuan question, but do you have any thoughts on that?

Nora Bateson (00:50:58):

Well, I guess we touched on it a minute ago that in order to continue, things have to discontinue. So for me, it's about this word "optimizing," and "efficiency" and "product."

Nate Hagens (00:51:16):

I use those three words a lot, but I don't like them.

Nora Bateson (00:51:21):

No, but I think it's good to use them, and because they are actually at the forefront of these presuppositions that we live within. I see it all the time that there is a need to optimize, that we have to... You have to become a better person, and embark on all sorts of personal development to optimize who you are. To be a better person, you have to opt... But this concept is caught in a linearity that is really a problem. I guess the question for me is at what point do we start to realize that optimization or efficiency is not possible in linear process? So, it may appear so in the short term, but if there's a path up the hill, and it goes straight up the hill, and there's another one that goes around the hill and up the other side, and you think, "I just want to go straight up the hill," but that path is completely covered in dog shit, and if you get to the top of the hill, you're going to be totally covered in dog shit. So, which path are you going to take?

Nate Hagens (00:52:38):

Well, it depends on if I live in a culture where time is money. If I have a little dog shit, and I get there faster, then I might be able to use my time more efficiently to make more money. But unfortunately, our culture saves time, and then goes on Instagram, or plays Candy Crush or something else with the extra time.

Nora Bateson (00:52:58):

Exactly. So, it's that just kind of like, "At what point will we be able to see the cost," I guess is my point.

Nate Hagens (00:53:06):

Well, we're seeing a lot of the cost now, I fear. There's a bill coming due for our culture that has not been paid, and we've been kicking the can for 50 years, which is the work that we do. So, I have a lot of questions left. We are having a beautiful conversation. Let me get to one of your core phrases. I believe your father invented this term. I'm not sure, but what is schismogenesis, and how is that relevant to our current cultural situation?

Nora Bateson (00:53:36):

Schismogenesis, schismo is to break, and genesis is to make, to become, to birth. So, schismogenesis is an important study of how systems fall apart. We've been talking

mostly about how systems come together, but I think at the edge of our conversation this whole time has been the threat of system collapse, system breakdown, system destruction. My dad talked about two different kinds of schismogenesis. What's important about schismogenesis is it's a way of looking at patterns of relational process that lead to things falling apart. It's always in relationship. Even when we're breaking relationship, we do it with relationship. So, what are those kinds of relationships that break relationship?

(00:54:47):

I think this is a very important question right now, because it's what we're seeing all around is things coming to pieces. So, let me give a brief description. This is not easy stuff, so I'll just try to take it easy on it, but there's two kinds that my dad talked about. One was complimentary, and complimentary is where you have a relationship that is compliment. So one party, it might be more dominant. One party might be more submissive. One party might be authoritative. One party might be more demure. One party's more... That kind of relationship could be parent-teacher, could be employer-employee, could be in a marriage, could be parent-child, could be all sorts of relationships, person and dog, and that you could perceive that because of an understanding of the way in which the relationship is different, it's very creative.

(00:55:54):

All sorts of great things can happen in that relationship. But over time, the one that is more authoritative or dominating or influential becomes more so, and the one that is more submissive or more demure or more compromising becomes more so. Pretty soon, the gap between them grows to the point that there's actually no more relationship.

Nate Hagens (00:56:20):

So, a positive feedback loop squeezes out the lesser of the two, so to speak.

Nora Bateson (00:56:27):

Well, it squeezes out the actual relationship itself. The second version is symmetrical schismogenesis. Symmetrical is where the parties are at the same... They're more equal, and they're in competition. So, you would get symmetrical schismogenesis in... You can have it in a marriage, so you get a new book deal, and your partner needs to get a new job. Then they get a new job, and so you have to get a TV show, and then you get

into a competition. It could be an arms race. It could be a sibling rivalry. So, you get into a symmetrical schismogenesis, and that, again, can be very creative. All sorts of good stuff can come out of that.

Nate Hagens (00:57:20):

So, the first kind was called what?

Nora Bateson (00:57:23):

Complimentary.

Nate Hagens (00:57:24):

So, complimentary schismogenesis results in the relationship actually disappearing, but symmetrical, actually, is a positive feedback on the relationship itself. So, the relationship has an arms race, and there's creativity could be good or could be bad, but the two still coexist.

Nora Bateson (00:57:45):

Yeah, it might start off good. Then over time, there's nothing left but the competition. All the other aspects of the relationship that made it juicy and wonderful and fun and playful get lost, and you just get caught in the competition, in the one upping, and then you lose everything else that you have to be in relationship about. So again, it gets lost. The third kind is really interesting. This was developed by a Finnish group, not my dad. I mean, it's called systems holdback. Systems holdback is where I don't put into the relationship what I could put into the relationship, because I know that you are not putting into the relationship what you could put into the relationship.

(00:58:37):

You don't put in what you could, because you know that I'm not. So eventually, you get the relationship becomes devitalized. There's nothing there. There's there to make relationship with, because we're holding back everything. This again, you might see with employers and employees. You could see it in a marriage. You could see it in a friendship. You could see it in all sorts of ways. I want to be clear that all three of these forms of schismogenesis can absolutely coexist in the same relationship.

Nate Hagens (00:59:13):

So, how is the term schismogenesis relevant to our current cultural situation?

Nora Bateson (00:59:20):

The possibility of recognizing these types of patterns of relationships that are actually devitalizing relationship itself are critical, because they give us a way to recognize when we're destroying the possibility for further life. I think that's absolutely essential to be able to notice those patterns that undermine. So, the thing about all of these forms of schismogenesis is that do systems end, or do they break and then reform? Maybe that breaking is necessary. Maybe that divorce that comes from the competitive relationship ends up in a friendship and another marriage to someone else that's actually beautiful, that there was learning that came from the breaking of the system, so far be it from me to say that schismogenesis is in the end bad, because I can't actually say that, but I will say that it's important to recognize those patterns, because they are a possibility for learning and for perceiving.

(01:00:42):

Again, we're talking about perceiving relational process. We just don't have very many ways of learning about that. Now, you're going to hit me with a zinger question. I feel it coming.

Nate Hagens (01:00:56):

Zinger question, given the diverse and, one could argue, schismed online and real world tribes and different demographics in the world, how do we breathe life into an ecology of conversation that helps these challenges that we're talking about?

Nora Bateson (01:01:16):

Warmly. Nate, I think you're doing it here. The ecology of conversation or of communication is a term that I use a lot. For me, it's about paying attention. What is it that you are putting into an existing context? So, how do my words or my gestures, my way of being, how does... What does it bring into the existing communication in terms of possibility? So, we're living in a world that is spending really a lot of flexibility unnecessarily. We're spending the flexibility of our relationships on the possibility of being right or having the correct political stance, or having this one-upmanship.

(01:02:19):

I mean, the internet is just a big giant mess of one upping and holding back and also dominating, so all three forms of schismogenesis are readily visible there. The only way to really deal with that is to come in from another context with another tone, and open a new realm of possibility that hasn't been shut out.

Nate Hagens (01:02:48):

That makes sense to me. You recently wrote, "Perhaps no stable solutions exist in entropic contexts except flexibility." So, that's what you were saying there, right?

Nora Bateson (01:03:01):

Yeah. In the piece that you were referring to that's dealing with pre-emergence, there's one little sentence in there that I would bring up here, which is the question of how do we nourish flexibility that we don't even know we're going to need?

Nate Hagens (01:03:19):

That's what I'm trying to do with my students, because we are captured by this economic system that is not our fault. It's no one's fault, and it's emergent institution series of relationships that happened before we were born that we've arrived to. So, hopefully that will change, but how do young people especially become flexible to respond to a variety of future events, I think, is really important. You were going to say something about that?

Nora Bateson (01:03:50):

Yeah, I mean, I'm with you. I just think that we don't know what it is that we're coming into, only that so many of the ways in which we have learned to be in our world are not useful, so just to say that learning to be competitive, learning to be domineering, learning to be in relationship in a way that is about winning and optimizing.

Nate Hagens (01:04:14):

Which has been what young people have been taught generally since I was born in this culture-

Nora Bateson (01:04:20):

Exactly.

Nate Hagens (01:04:20):

... which is an anomaly of human and biological history on the planet. I mean, we are living in this moonshot of consumption on the backs of energy surplus. Let me read you a quote written by you, and then ask you a question. You recently wrote, "The unseen realm is vital, non-trivial and sacred, and it is real. I'm increasingly..." I being you. "I'm increasingly finding that the most fecund realms of change, learning and evolution are beyond the organism's current capacity to perceive. The flexibility that lurks below conscious perception is like the soil beneath the forest teeming with relational processes. While most attention is caught up in what can be perceived, there is a wildness in the implicit correlations, connections, and coalescing impressions."

(01:05:21):

So Nora, if you were to speculate, and perhaps based on your hands-on experience in the warm data labs and all your work, what type of things are lurking now beneath our conscious perception that might lead to a massive change in the coming years and decades relative to our cultural situation?

Nora Bateson (01:05:42):

Change. So, there's things that are lurking in our unseen realms that will lead to dangerous change, what I would call more insidious problems. There are also things lurking down there that are inherently organized and moving toward vitality and relationship. So both are there, but what I want to point to here is that you can't come at this head on, and think you're going to fix it. You can't tell somebody that they have to love you. You can't tell someone not to love you.

Nate Hagens (01:06:22):

I've tried both of those. You're right. They don't work.

Nora Bateson (01:06:24):

It doesn't work. I mean, you can't make somebody respect somebody else. You can't make someone not be racist. You can't move people around in that way. At the same time, I think what is fascinating is that while all of the organisms in an ecosystem are

doing something, they have a role. Somehow, evolution happens. Somehow, change actually happens. Those things that are most familiar to us get roped into those familiar behaviors. So, this is one of the things that I'm looking at all over the place is that wonderful people with the best possible intentions to make change are perpetuating all the problems that we have, and actually speeding them up.

Nate Hagens (01:07:22):

Can you give a little example of that?

Nora Bateson (01:07:24):

Well, I'm seeing this certainly, well, actually with some of the response to climate change, which is so blind to what is happening at the cultural level that it's creating revolution, nothing short actually of revolution. If you start to tell people they can't have their job or be successful or buy a new car or a new iPhone, they're not going to think, "Oh, well, that's good for the ecology." They're going to think, "Screw you."

Nate Hagens (01:07:53):

So, it's a siloed approach to climate change or compartmentalized.

Nora Bateson (01:07:58):

It's compartmentalized, and they don't mean to do that. This is just in the presuppositions. It's in the assumption that the climate problem is a climate problem. That assumption is not enough, so it's possible that that deep humanity in us... I mean, this is what I see in my warm data work is that when people drop into just their human beingness, they are able to exchange stories, and learn from each other in ways I never dreamed, even when they come in from opposing political sides of the fence.

Nate Hagens (01:08:40):

that's what we need to scale is those conversations in a safe, respectful way. I've tried it in my community, and I've been successful in talking to groups that care about climate change or farmers or students, but it's really hard to get them all together, which is why I think your warm data idea, if it were potentially scalable, could be huge because we are going to need other people again. We've been so rich on the backs of our fossil armies that we haven't needed the social networks that our ancestors did,

and we're going to need them huge, and so being able to have this wider boundary and deeper psychological level above the systems knowledge, like you say, I think is really imperative.

Nora Bateson (01:09:36):

I do too. I just can't even tell you how imperative I think it is. Having seen it so many times, hundreds of times, I'm so frustrated that I can't figure out who to bring it before to say, "Look, this is really important. Please, let's get this out there."

Nate Hagens (01:09:57):

If there are some pro-social higher level wisdom philanthropists listening to this podcast, do you have a plan in mind that if it were executable, you could implement it, and have resources to scale these conversations? Because one of the things I'm trying to do is develop just... I have all kinds of videos and stories about how the whole macro situation fits together, how we're headed for probably wider financial, at least, poverty, and how we're going to have to have more community when the Great Simplification intensifies. I want to make a two-hour video series that people in a community could watch together, and just discuss, "What does this mean? What should we do?"

(01:10:44):

I don't we're ever going to make major physical changes to our economic system ahead of time, but we can make relational changes, and build our social networks. That itself would act as a foundation, and Blake agrees with me.

Nora Bateson (01:11:01):

Blake agrees.

Nate Hagens (01:11:02):

Do you have a blueprint and a plan that could scale to get these conversations going?

Nora Bateson (01:11:08):

I do have a plan, and I have trained 700 hosts around the world.

Nate Hagens (01:11:15):

Wow.

Nora Bateson (01:11:15):

They are in Africa. They're in India. They're in South America. They're in Asia. They're in Europe. They're in the States, Canada. They're all over the world now. I realized that in order to do this, I needed to have the people ready who could hold it, because anyone can attend a warm data lab, but not everyone can host one. I mean, that's a really good beginning. Then we actually created an online version, and the online version is so wonderful. I had my doubts, but in the pandemic, we had to go online, and I think we've done hundreds of them. We've worked with thousands of people now around the world.

(01:12:02):

It's called people need people. So, I think that relates right to what you're saying, that we need each other, and in order to be able to be together, we have to, and I mean we as in we, the eight billion of us, we have to be able to perceive the conditions and the complexity that we live within. It can't be framed as complexity. It has to be framed as just life, because it is just life.

Nate Hagens (01:12:32):

So on the complexity question, this is something I struggle with. Do common people like artists, farmers, teachers, builders, do they need to understand complexity in systems, or do they just need to be inspired, and have relationships with each other and given direction, hope, and courage in some broader contexts?

Nora Bateson (01:12:55):

I would say that people actually already do understand complexity. They just don't know that they do. So, what they need is permission, and they need to feel the excitement of what happens when they start to ask a question through multiple contexts, and have these conversations with people, and get all these different impressions, and they start to mix together, and, woo, people get ideas. They get insights. They suddenly understand some aspect of their life that has been troubling them or holding them back. I see it all the time, but one thing I want to say is that

there's absolutely no doubt that people who are living in the most comfort have the most difficulty.

Nate Hagens (01:13:47):

Because they don't feel the emotional need to go and do these things.

Nora Bateson (01:13:51):

Well, I think they think that their comfort was produced by linear means, and so the ability to perceive that there are existing systemic conditions that helped produce that comfort is less likely than those people who are living and struggling, and they realize that their struggle is not because of one cause. It's multi-causal. So, they're one step ahead, because the second they look at, "Well, is the problem education?" Yes. "Is it the healthcare?" Yes. "Is it the economy?" Yes. "Is it the culture?" Yes. "Is it the technology?" Yes. "Is it the family?" Yes. "Is it the religion?" Yes.

(01:14:35):

So, immediately, it becomes visible that this... It's fantastic because one of the things that happens is that people who have really experienced a lot of trauma recognize that that trauma is not necessarily just an event inside them as an individual, but they start to see it in the systemics of their world. That's a completely different relationship with that event, with that pain. So, there's a lot of healing that takes place in that, and possible responses.

Nate Hagens (01:15:08):

That makes sense to me. So, here are some questions that I've been asking all my guests. What are you most worried about. Given all the things that you and I delve into on our daily email list, what are you most worried about in the coming decade or so?

Nora Bateson (01:15:25):

I think the thing I'm most worried about is the divisiveness, people who could care about each other being divided. I don't see how we can do anything when we're dealing with that.

Nate Hagens (01:15:37):

I agree with you, which is why I helped Daniel Schmachtenberger and Tristan with the social media efforts, because if we can't have a conversation, how can we solve the economic, environmental, climate energy problems? I'm very worried about that. You're right. What are you most hopeful about in the coming decade or so?

Nora Bateson (01:15:57):

I am most hopeful about the weird, the unexpected, the things that we have that are already coming, and we're already here, and we're not even seeing them, the things that don't look anything like we thought they would, but somehow are shifters.

Nate Hagens (01:16:16):

You're most hopeful about emergence.

Nora Bateson (01:16:18):

Yeah, and particularly as weird as possible, I'm down with weird emergence, because it needs to be almost unrecognizable. The changes we're going into are not going to be plannable. They should be almost unrecognizable to us. So, that means that there's possibility in the weird, in the thing that is a little bit incoherent, at least a little bit.

Nate Hagens (01:16:45):

I like that. I feel that. I don't know what it looks like, but I guess that's the point. I don't know what it looks like. Nora, what do you care most about in this world, or what is most important to you?

Nora Bateson (01:16:59):

I mean, my kids. When I say my kids though, that includes the world that my kids are coming into, and the relationships that they have with other people. When I was raising my kids, they're in their 20s now. I really tried, Nate. I really gave them as much as I could of ways of asking questions, and doing systems thinking, and being flexible. I really gave them so much of what we've been talking about in this conversation, and I had an oversight. My oversight was that I forgot that the other people that they were going to be in relationship with, that they would fall in love

with, that would be their best friends, that would be the people they cared about, weren't going to have those skills or abilities.

(01:18:03):

One of the things that happened was that they became… They found themselves in roles of being the helper, the healer, the rock, the support. I didn't recognize. When they were so little, I was thinking, "As individuals, they need this to go through the world." I was like packing their backpack with systems and complexity skills, and I really learned a lot watching them have to negotiate, and to be in the territory of their peers who didn't have that, and who were in a lot of pain. So, that's something. When I say that my kids are the most important thing to me, I also mean and the world they live in.

Nate Hagens (01:18:58):

Thank you for sharing that. I don't have kids, but I have cultural kids, the 270 students or so that have gone through my reality 101 course. I also feel… I understand what you said, because they're burdened with all the knowledge of my course that their peers don't have, and that does cast a ripple in the pond of their lives. I do deeply care about them and their futures. So, how do you… In all the times that we've spoken and interacted, you're always the same. You're warm and bubbly and calm and confident. How do you stay that way in the face of the challenges that we're looking at as a culture, and what do you do personally to manage this challenging time?

Nora Bateson (01:19:46):

Well, first of all, I dip down underwater. There are moments of despair. I don't know how I could have warm blood in my veins and not do that, and I've had to face some pretty heavy loss. I walk my dogs. I make dinner. I care for my family. I guess for me, what I have the most connection to as a lifeline is just… I don't know how else to describe it, but just the fact that life keeps on making life, and it just does. Meadows just keep making meadows. Even when human beings screw up, life continues, and it's incredible and beautiful and humbling. So, I like to keep learning, keep reading. I spend as much time as I can in natural circumstances, and sometimes like everybody else, I just look at the whole world, and I think, "That's just disgusting."

(01:21:00):

I just have a big fat Netflix binge, and watch some show from beginning to end. Then I like to paint, and talk to you and be around people that I'm learning something from. I think the most... My dad used to say that the best way to deal with a loss of morale or depression or pain is actually by learning something really hard, to push yourself to really read some biology from the 19th century that is really complicated or philosophy, or to be in a culture you don't understand, and try to learn a new language, or just try to learn something so that all that you know is moving through that other new lens, and shifting.

Nate Hagens (01:22:00):

That's profound. In my own life, I've always been curious about things, and if I count my 20 or 30 closest friends and colleagues, they're all lifelong learners. We know a lot about the natural world and the human ecosystem, but there's so much to learn, especially between the compartmentalized disciplines as you say. This has been great, Nora. I think we have a lot more to talk about, so you may have to come back for a round two. Are there any other words of wisdom, advice, or warmth for our listeners that you have in closing?

Nora Bateson (01:22:37):

One thing that I'm really interested in in the energy question, on the surface, it's a question of redundancy. Essentially, the way that the grid is set up is set up to maximize the experience of individuated life.

Nate Hagens (01:22:55):

Right. If I want to bake a Turkey at three in the morning, I can do that if I'm not sleeping-

Nora Bateson (01:23:01):

That's right.

Nate Hagens (01:23:02):

... but why does society need everyone to have that ability?

Nora Bateson (01:23:04):

Exactly. So, this is one of the presuppositions that's sitting in the energy question.

Nate Hagens (01:23:14):

Is everyone should have 24/7 to access to energy all the time. It's a given. That's how our society is organized.

Nora Bateson (01:23:21):

That's because we've been separated from each other. So when we start to think about ways to approach this, I have a friend who is building laundromats, and his approach is people need to do la... They need to talk to each other, and they talk to each other in the laundromat. So, I'm going to build laundromats, because that's where people talk to each other.

Nate Hagens (01:23:48):

Yeah. Well, it's like a soup kitchen or whatever. You have to center a basic need, and make sure that there's a community around it.

Nora Bateson (01:23:56):

Every single one of our basic needs should have a community around it.

Nate Hagens (01:24:01):

Oh, I love that. Thank you so much, Nora.

Nora Bateson (01:24:04):

Thank you so much, Nate. It's been great to be with you.

Nate Hagens (01:24:08):

If you enjoyed or learned from this episode of the Great Simplification, please subscribe to us on your favorite podcast platform, and visit the greatsimplification.com for more information on future releases.