

Change Shock Management:

A DIFFICULT ASPECT THAT HAS ARISEN IN OUR GLOBAL- evolutionary process is the advent of a tendency toward emotional, mental and information overwhelm. Once we become overwhelmed we may have no more “cognitive bandwidth” with which to manage necessary decision-making processes in our daily life. We may also be unable to acquire or conceptualize the new information necessary to effectively manage change.

Managing our consciousness bandwidth, and what influences it is part of managing Change Shock and its associated stress. When we run out of bandwidth, we become unable to accurately see our current situation clearly, which can be paralyzing, and renders us unable to live in the now, and to function individually in a self-sovereign manner. All of us have a differing tolerance for change, and a differing capacity for constructive and sustainable adaptation to change. A key process of managing change is understanding that whenever we change any element of our world it creates ripple effects of change out into the rest of the world. An example is the massive world changes that have come with the infusion of cellphones. Precise and proactive definition of the most wise, positive and constructive methods and processes of change we choose to effect in every area of our lives, prior to making changes, will reduce change-shock and the detrimental associated ripple effects of change.

This situation of being shocked by rapid change can occur from too much information being thrust upon us too quickly or by our seeing too many things change around us too quickly. Shock also happens when our interpretive and decision-making models, strategies and capabilities do not meet the needs of our changing life circumstances. (In effect, we become lost in a fear reaction to unmanageable change). This can also be the result of being simultaneously assailed by too many intense personal, career, social, religious, emotional or spiritual pressures. Additionally, it can occur when we suddenly find that our traditional or most cherished beliefs, values and priorities are invalid, false or non-applicable to our current life situation. One other way this shock can begin is when we are forced by circumstances or even by our own experiential learning process to let go of cherished beliefs, relationships and ways of seeing ourselves and the world, and are then required to rapidly adopt new and untested ones. It could be said that all new learning requires **unlearning** what we previously thought or believed we knew to be true—this can be a shocking experience if we do not have graceful, seamless and consistent ways to acquire, integrate and apply our new insights.

Clarity is a challenge when we receive too much contradictory information, which leads to confusion related to our own or other’s beliefs, motivations or values. In effect, as life becomes more complex, many of us are becoming less able to effectively manage our lives in the midst of rapid and complex changes. The constant inflow of new information now available to human beings is often in conflict with what we have previously recorded in our memories as beliefs, (i.e. old information). This process is occurring in all individuals in the world as we are simultaneously driven by social, economic, technological and environmental developments, circumstances and pressures to make ever more complex and impacting life choices daily. It is useful to understand that human beings tend to base their decision-making on what they “have recorded as beliefs” rather than on information they perceive in the present moment. Again, a belief is just a recording in our memory of what we assume to be true in any given moment. Therefore, our decisions and our decision-making strategies are often made based upon outdated information, (i.e. recorded beliefs).

There is currently no defined teachable standard, complete, precise and refined language and model of change and transformation. Nor is there a defined set of concepts designed to support attaining optimal transformational efficiency in all areas of one’s life. Such a language is sorely needed to facilitate transformation. The creation of this transformational language could reduce confusion and conflict, and provide consistent clarity, and thereby enhance cooperation and teamwork in solving complex problems.

One fledgling attempt in this direction was the creation of the new and relatively unused language of Esperanto. This new language, was designed to be used by all of humanity, and to help all peoples communicate in a manner that was not associated with any particular nation or culture. Its intention was to build bridges of shared communication between disparate peoples and cultures. Still Esperanto is not specifically designed to

be a language of managed global economic, cultural and technological change nor of facilitation of global transformation.

Adoption of such a developed language of change could enhance global transformation, and entrain the global populations in developing and engaging in a process of optimized global transformation, in all cultural venues. We could also benefit from, and reduce social, organizational and individual stress by developing and teaching a standardized model and language of interpersonal and social situational definition, and interactive logic, and decision-making. These developments can reduce the effects of the “Tower of Babel Syndrome” we are currently experiencing globally, which include rampant miscommunication, misunderstanding and conflict. These effects are often associated with rapid, extreme and widespread social transformation and change, including within organizations. Introducing such new systems of thought may not be easy. (For example see the history of the attempted implementation of the metric system vs. standard measurement conflicts in the United States). Social traditions and ways of thinking and communicating have inertia, and tend to resist transformation and development of new standards and ways of doing things.

There is a reactive dynamic of ongoing stress, associated grief, and change-related loss that many people are experiencing these days. This ongoing feeling of being overwhelmed by change, feeling we are losing our past, and its effects on each of us could be termed aspects of Change Shock. In our present world, we are being driven to make our decisions at an unprecedented rate of speed so that we do not, as individuals, fall behind the demands of our careers, life situations or social responsibilities. Falling behind can be felt to be, and perceived to be, failing socially.

Some examples of this dynamic can be seen when we are unable to take advantage of an opportunity in our career or when we are faced with not having managed a situation in the way that someone or some organization may have expected us to. Change Shock can result in our being rendered incapable of effectively participating in various business or social environments or even in personal relationships. We tend to face more rapid and extreme social or organizational penalties or limitations if we are not able to effectively manage all aspects of our lives.

Participation, Competition and Accountability in a Changing World:

We are experiencing new and increasing levels of sophisticated corporate and business competition. As we become more sophisticated in our methods of technological and organizational development there is ever more that must be known, learned, understood, managed, responded to and dealt with on a daily basis. We are required by the social, economic or business environment to successfully manage all of this, if we wish to be able to continue to effectively participate and compete. I am not suggesting that competition is our best way forward, only practically acknowledging that it is the current process by which we are choosing to evolve our world. I do suggest that we can outgrow this tendency to our overall betterment.

Technology itself is part of this developing issue. The more technology we have and use, the more we tend to believe we need, even if this is not true. We are now finding that we need ever more technology to manage our existing technology. There is an old saying that “when someone learns to use a hammer they start to see everything thing as a nail”. Meaning in this case that once they develop technology they then seek to solve all problems via technology, even if this solution is not a “true, good or best fit” for the problem.

An example of this situation is the event that occurred May 6, 2010 in the stock market, on this date when the sophisticated high-speed computer systems which manage the rapid and complex buying and selling of stocks made an instant decision based upon an accidental, inaccurate entry by a stock trader. This in turn caused a mass of unwanted cascading sales. The reason was a simple data entry error by a middle level employee which then created chaos. Simply put, the result was that the system “ran amok” and temporarily rendered the value of the stock of perfectly viable companies to that of junk stock. The system error was caught, yet only after it created a significant issue. The result was that it was then determined that we need an even more sophisticated

computer system to manage the already extremely advanced stock market computer systems, to keep us safe from further problems.

With increased communications, faster technology, and more complex coordinated group actions and interactions, we are required to make more decisions, and take more actions, and effect more areas of our lives and our environment faster than ever before. Then either we, or someone else, are required to manage the down-line effects and consequences of our day-to-day choices within the systems we create. Thus, more is happening faster, and this dynamic in turn creates even more domino effects of our actions, which must then be managed to retain interpersonal, organizational, national and global systemic stability.

Increased complexity of organizations, as well as increased size and compartmentalization of organizations, has led to situations where low-level management, or non-management employees, have a less clear and less precise grasp on what is going on in the executive management levels of the larger organization. Strangely enough the opposite is also true, in that executives often do not know many basic details of how their organization's function. Combined with this situation are the developments of newer and more effective techniques organizations use for both covertly motivating and/or manipulating their personnel.

Organizational motivation and manipulation techniques may include:

- ❖ Lack of information, limiting and controlling information, false promises, spin or misinformation and flat out lying.
- ❖ Organizational cultural entrainment of individual employees in regard to corporate perspectives, goals, values and ideals.
- ❖ Firing and discrediting whistle-blowers and/or other forms of intimidation.
- ❖ Application of Neurolinguistic Programming (NLP) to manipulate staff and customers.
- ❖ Managers being trained in increasingly sophisticated interpersonal methods of manipulation and organizational cultural manipulation (in days gone by this would have been called black magic).

Organizations also work to influence global public perceptions of their brand images and products, and these efforts can also influence their staff. This can be accomplished by hiring marketing and public relations firms to create false or misleading public corporate images, which do not in any way reflect the organization's true intentions or executive culture. This manipulative practice is of course utilized by governments too, including some brutal dictatorships.

The process of "Cause Marketing" between not-for-profit and for-profit organizations can be used to manipulate how certain brands are seen and valued by the public. "Co-branding" can be used by multiple organizations to associate the power of certain products and well-known brands with other products and brands, thus creating a magnifying association and subconscious influence in the mind of the public. In these ways corporations, can subtly yet powerfully distort how they are publicly presented, how their products are perceived, and how their communications subconsciously influence our buying decisions.

Organizational transparency and integrity, whether we are speaking of corporations or governments, is becoming ever more important if we as employees or citizens want to truly understand who and what we are supporting through our efforts. Transparency reduces corruption. This transparency is in many organizations rapidly decreasing and is being replaced with the appearance of transparency, whether by clever misinformation or manipulation of perception. Though many organizations may "buy a public image" of positivity and caring through marketing efforts, underneath they can be just the opposite.

In our world, what we feed, either financially or economically tends to grow, so I suggest discernment in deciding which organizations we choose to feed. People should not be punished for telling the truth about organizations, this includes governments. None of us deserves to have our opinions skillfully created "for us" by subconscious manipulation or lack of information. This developing situation must be counterbalanced via highly developed discernment on the part of employees of these organizations. This is occurring to a degree.

For example, employees who once prided themselves on their loyalty to organizations have found that this blind loyalty can blind them to the choices and activities of organizations, and this can be true even of soldiers in the military and of government employees. For examples the NSA. Yet our capacity to discern truth from manufactured image and inaccurate information needs to improve.

We are now producing and storing more global information faster than in any previous time in human history and this trend will only continue. With new information, challenges arise when we strive to assimilate a deluge of new concepts, new ideas, new perspectives, arrive at new and potentially more astute decisions, new actions and create new and more complex life management methods and strategies. All of this eventually leads to heightened sophistication of the individual and of organizations, as well as potentially better self-management and organizational management practices. Yet this dynamic also tends to lead to increased stress, anxiety, and unknown or unforeseen and potentially negative situations or results.

Neither technology nor information is inherently negative, nor are the methods we have developed to manage them. Yet if we do not make wise long-term choices in regard to the development and usage of technology in our lives, it can in a way take over our lives. Then instead of making us safer and happier and our lives easier, technology can subtly decrease the quality of our lives through financial cost, emotional stress, confusion, complexity and overwork.

For some, especially those in technological fields, keeping up with world developments and technological developments has become a constant merry-go-round that turns faster and faster. For example, consider an article titled “Top Secret America,” written by Pulitzer Prize winning journalist Dana Priest and William M. Arkin. In this article (which took two years to research), the researchers found that America’s anti-terrorist response has created a vast and redundant development of multiple intelligence agencies. These agencies are now so large, unwieldy, complex and secret (even from each other) that they are becoming useless as information sources and unmanageable, as each is “too secret” and self-protective to talk to the other.

These developments have cost hundreds of billions of dollars and will likely continue to absorb many of America’s resources. This is just one example of unwise and fear-based reactive institutional development and decision-making on a large scale. It could be argued that America’s knee-jerk reactive fear of terrorists is more economically diminishing and disempowering to America than any actual terrorist attack could be. More world challenges of all kinds create a driving need for more adjustments, actions, decisions, developments and solutions, as well as the development of new systems to navigate and negotiate these situations. It is imperative that we understand this evolving cycle and what influences it. This is necessary to be able to manage it wisely, and not to have the process of developing safety producing systems drive us rather than us directing the process of their development.

Increasing global populations require more maintenance activities and resources to sustain them—more food, more energy, more education, more governance, more health care, and even more entertainment. Every time there is a new innovation or technology developed that people want or need in one area, other groups begin to demand it, which continues to drive the “technology development machine”. This process in turn diminishes and damages our natural resources. Our world’s population is projected to increase from our current approximately 7.5 billion people to over 9 billion by 2050, and the implications of this escalating increase in resource usage are worthy of contemplation and preparation.

Right now, we have 60 million displaced people in the world and this number is projected to escalate significantly as global political and ecological problems escalate, including global warming and rising sea levels. That said, despite the size and profound nature of this problem, we have no single international organization tasked with managing the needs of these people who are experiencing such plight. Our seeming inability as nations, and **as a species**, to work together to create such organizations is troubling and an even greater problem that we must resolve if we want our species to continue.

Even in this dire situation, with so many lives at risk, fear driven international competition and nationalism is trumping the mass suffering and escalating loss of life. In our current mode of human social existence there is no way to arrive at, and decisively act upon, the requirement of international accountability for these people's wellbeing. We cannot make this decision as a world because from the personal survival focused point of viewpoint of each of our individual psyche's, and nationalistic consensus consciousness's we cannot see that these troubled lives are literally equal in value to our own.

In effect, many of us see the stability of our families, personal wellbeing, and the stability of our own nations, as more important than the lives of 65 million people. At what point does the equation fundamentally shift? How many lives must be sacrificed, and how much suffering must occur for the citizens of every country (not just the leaders of these countries) to fundamentally change their perspectives and take constructive effective compassionate action for the long term? For this shift in consciousness to occur individuals around the world must change their way of looking at life and of valuing other human beings and the world we live in. As populations continue to grow, these questions and issues will become ever more urgent and important to address.