



## 138. Reflections on US Politics

Recorded on 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2021, in Byron Bay, Australia.

*You're listening to the Future Sense podcast. You can find us online at [www.futuresense.it](http://www.futuresense.it)*

**Steve:** Welcome to Episode 138 of *Future Sense*. I'm your host Steve McDonald, and in this episode, I'll be talking about the recent US Presidential Election; and also some relevant history that puts it in perspective.

Just before I begin, though, I want to mention a warning that I gave back in Episode 135 in late October last year about possible economic disruption and civil unrest, particularly around the time of the US election (<https://www.futuresense.it/135-us-election-and-impending-economic-disruption/>). We've certainly seen some unrest so far. The markets have been rather choppy and the crypto market has been absolutely booming, with Bitcoin hitting an all-time high. I do believe, though, that there is still some financial disruption to come and also quite likely some unrest, most obviously in the USA and probably around the inauguration time of 20th January, I would say, or soon afterwards. So I just want to say that those probabilities are still there and advise you to be alert and consider your local conditions wherever you are in the world and whether you need to hold some extra cash or supplies on hand just in case.

To understand what's going on in the USA, I'd like to begin by looking at the key layers of consciousness that are at play and their value systems. This will help us understand what to look for and to make sense of recent events. If you're not familiar with the value systems—the layers of consciousness that I talk about—there is a table on the Resources page of the podcast website which will give you a simple overview of those layers of consciousness so you can follow along (<https://www.futuresense.it/resources/>).

Now, globally, we are navigating the end of the Scientific-Industrial era, which is Layer 5 in the Clare Graves model, and the emergence of a new way of being human, which is Layer 6, and that is inherently more peaceful and focused on human connection. The change process that we're going through has a well-established trajectory based on Clare Graves research, and lots of other bodies of research, and it's the same pattern at both a personal level and at scale. It takes us from stability in the old value system, which in this case is the Scientific-Industrial value set (Layer 5), into turbulence as things start to get a little bit choppy—the old values don't solve our problems as well as they used to—and then eventually we descend into a place of chaos where nothing seems to be working for us. It's in that chaos that the pressure creates transformational change and there's a breakthrough. We come out the other side of that, there's a renewal process as we've seen the light, we kind of know the way ahead, and then we go through an integration process, which brings us to new stability in

the new value system. We're all going through that at a personal level—or we have been through it or we're about to go through it—and at a global level, collectively, we're very much in that process right now.

It's fair to say that the turbulence began in the 1960s when we saw that upsurge of Layer 6 values—a lot of civil unrest, riots and protests and things, particularly in the USA—and now it seems that we're starting to enter the chaos phase. In the chaos phase, it seems like no value set—neither the old or any emerging new value set—seems to solve our problems. We can feel a bit like a ship without a rudder, at the mercy of events. As it progresses, the old value system, the Layer 5 values, actually seem to cause more problems than they solve, and until the Layer 6 values—the new value set—become clear to us and really emerge and become integrated, they don't have enough support to really solve our problems either, so there is this tricky space in between, which can be a very uncomfortable place to be. It kind of feels like that's what we're just beginning to enter into at a global level now.

My guess is the chaos phase at a global level could last for around about 15 years from now. What that means is that we need to get used to feeling this way and we need to adapt ourselves to cope with disruptive change.

The US election is, of course, of global significance as part of this Layer 5 to Layer 6 transition, due to the USA's position as a superpower, and a superpower in decline, for that matter. There is a mad grab for power and influence that's underway at a global level, and this goes beyond nation states which are losing influence and control at the moment, and it involves global alliances of rich and influential people and global organisations whose power is beginning to eclipse that of existing governments. The power that big tech is wielding in the US right now is a great example, such as blocking the US president's public communication channels and feeding the polarisation of the general public.

What we're really seeing here are efforts to solve new and very complex problems, but with solutions from old value systems, and we can expect these efforts to fail, simply because the old solutions are no longer adequate to solve these new, more complex problems. This is quite a normal change trajectory. It's what I call a 'slingshot', where we realise that our regular values just don't cut it anymore and we start to reach back in this regressive search to older value sets to try and see if they'll work for us this time around. In this case, those old value sets are the Layer 4, Authoritarian values where everything's black and white and you decide which is the 'right' path and that's the only option; and sometimes people are even reaching back further to Layer 3, which is about the use of raw power and really giving up a rational approach and just trying to solve the problems with power.

The tension created by the failure of these older values to solve new problems is what actually powers our transformation, in this case to a newer, more complex and more capable layer of consciousness at Layer 6. Overall, the global situation is an extremely complex one, and I'll dive deeper into that and talk about some of the other global players in another episode soon, but today we're focusing on the USA and recent events.

It's really important to understand Layer 5 values and the associated behaviours, and so I'm just going to run through those now from a theoretical point of view, and I'm sure they'll be useful—you'll be able to relate the theory as I talk about it to what you're seeing in the real world. First, it's important to understand that we're in late-stage Layer 5, which equates to

the Scientific-Industrial era that has been running for roughly around about 300 years. In the early stage of any value systems emergence, it's a very constructive thing. It solves the old problems created by the old value system, everything's wonderful and new again, it's a very creative and expansive time, and then it kind of plays itself out like a bell curve. The usefulness of a layer of consciousness and its values will reach a peak at the top of the bell curve and then slowly decline and go into a deconstructive phase, and eventually get to the point where those values actually create more problems than they solve. This is where the tension is created to bring the emergence of the new value set, which then eclipses the old value set.

Layer 5 is an individually focussed value system—I-me-mine—and it's driven by personal success. The key driver is, 'I, as an individual, want to do whatever it takes to succeed in life.' It takes a very strategic approach to achieving its goals; and I want to give you an example of strategic advice from the classic book by Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*. Sun Tzu says: "Make a noise in the east and attack from the west", and we can see from that, that the ideas of deception and surprise are key strategic principles. These are played out not just in the military arena, but also in the marketing industry, of course, where often you'll end up buying something and it wasn't quite what you expected to get and you get surprised.

To Layer 5, information is power, and this gives rise to the idea of secrets being a great tool for maintaining power. So if I know something that you don't, then I can have power over you.

From a moral perspective, the morals of Layer 5 are very flexible. They will do whatever it takes to get the prize, so long as they don't offend anybody who is critical to their support. Public image is managed very carefully.

In terms of the sorts of structures and systems that Layer 5 values creates, because of the individual-themed nature of this value system—this layer of consciousness—the structures tend to disconnect people rather than bring people together. Because of the drive for success, we often see a lot of exploitation and a tendency to push things to their limits in order to get as much as possible out of whatever it is to make the prize as big as possible.

An example I often use to convey the concept of Layer 5 values is a poker game where the cards are held close to your chest, they're held secret, and only played when the opportunity arises to win over somebody else. In fact, if the cards are revealed during the game, it really blows the whole game; there's no point in playing at all. So you can see then how a society structured around Layer 5 values, as most of our societies are today, is very likely to include processes for keeping secrets, and organisations whose job it is to carefully manage information in terms of how it's revealed and who has what information within society.

Remembering how the life of a value system plays out in this bell curve shape, in the first half, everything is very constructive and useful, and then as the value system declines or the society declines, then its attributes such as secrecy start to become detrimental and cause problems. The pressure created by those problems will cause a person to look backwards to old value sets, so we get this values regression, and from Layer 5, the regression is typically initially to Layer 4, which brings rigidity—Layer 4 being a very black-and-white value set where there are only two choices and one's right and the other's wrong. So the finesse that comes from being able to assess multiple options and choose the best in Layer 5 gets

reduced back to: 'Well, there's only really one option now.' The regression to Layer 4 also means that this capacity to mask information behind a veil is also lost, so things start becoming very blatant and we start to be able to see a person's motivations very, very clearly because they're only expressing one choice and one truth. Then, if there's enough pressure, we may see a further regression to Layer 3 where rational thinking is completely lost, the pre-rational drivers take over, and often people resort to the expression of pure power and, in some cases, raw violence in order to solve their problems.

Keeping all of that in mind, let's take a look at how these dynamics are playing out in the USA right now. It's important to learn from the US example to understand how this kind of collapse process can unfold, because we're all going to be impacted by this dynamic over the coming decade at some point.

It's fair to say that the American government has known for a long time about the risk of social unrest to national security, and it has been researching how to deal with that through the Pentagon, and also training people in how to keep the general population under control should public order break down. The activism of the 1960s, of course, was a big wake-up call and led to the introduction of a whole bunch of controlling legislation, including what came to be known as the *War on Drugs*, which allowed law enforcement to enter a home without a warrant.

Since then, there's been a slow regression towards authoritarianism. The attacks on 9/11 justified the introduction of more controlling legislation. We saw a huge ramp-up in public surveillance, of course, and the capacity to detain citizens without charges on suspicion of terror. Something important also happened in 2012 when the Obama administration amended the *National Defence Authorisation Act* to legalise the use of information operations—that is, using propaganda and professional military grade deception on the American public (<https://www.businessinsider.com.au/ndaa-legalizes-propaganda-2012-5?r=US&IR=T>). This really was a massive blow to democracy, and I don't think it attracted the kind of attention that it should have at the time. The legislation allowed all of the intelligence resources that were being used to monitor and manipulate foreign countries to be legally repurposed for domestic counter-terrorism use—'legally' being the key word here. These operations also usually include counterintelligence efforts, so it's not just about deceiving governments and the general public, but also about deceiving foreign intelligence professionals to hide their tracks. There can be many, many layers of deception; it becomes very, very complex.

We should note that very recently, President-elect Biden called the Washington, D.C. protesters who breached the Capitol building, "domestic terrorists", and that enables this legislation to apply because it's then seen as part of the *War on Terror*.

You might recall the *Cambridge Analytica* scandal of the 2016 election. That kind of military grade psychological manipulation is a commercial offshoot of what we're talking about here: military information operations. I have a copy of the US military *Unconventional Warfare* manual which I found online (<https://fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm3-05-130.pdf>), and here's what it says about dealing with the general population. It advises to take into account the general population of a country and any opportunities to "infiltrate civil institutions and manipulate popular grievances and overt political activities to support objectives". What I'm

going to do now is give you a couple of examples from history where this is played out, just so you can appreciate the possibility of what could be going on within the USA right now.

A few years back, I attended the South by Southwest (SXSW) conference in Austin, Texas, and went to a talk by Eric Schmidt and Jared Cohen from Google. Jared had previously served with the US State Department, which is the department that oversees the CIA, before moving to work at Google, and I understand that there's a lot of exchange that goes on between Google and the State Department. Jared spoke about the Arab Spring Revolutions in the Middle East and how he had travelled there on behalf of Google to enhance the Internet coverage in support of the uprisings. That's a really good example of working with popular grievances in a country, to achieve the USA's strategic objectives in this case, by making it a little easier for people to organise themselves against their government—and I'm sure at the time, Google didn't announce that they were going there to support the uprising, so that is an example of an information operation where they would have been a cover story that obscured what was really going on.

Another example I have here is from the war in Afghanistan, and this is from a leaked internal US Army report by Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Davis on the use of information operations in the Afghanistan war. The report is called *Dereliction of Duty II: Senior Military Leaders' Loss of Integrity Wounds Afghan War Effort*, and in the report, it says that during the war, "Senior ranking US military leaders have so distorted the truth when communicating with the US Congress and American people in regards to conditions on the ground in Afghanistan that the truth has become unrecognizable. This deception has damaged America's credibility among both our allies and enemies, severely limiting our ability to reach a political solution to the war in Afghanistan. If the public had access to these classified reports, they would see the dramatic gulf between what is often said in public by our senior leaders and what is actually true behind the scenes." Historically, both conventional and unconventional US interventions in foreign countries, when they've been successful in the short term—and many haven't—they have usually been unsustainable. This is classic Layer 5 method of operating, seeking short-term rewards and with no real concern for sustainability.

I know there's been a lot of background information and a lot of theories so far in this episode, and I hope you've managed to hang in there, but it's essential, really, to understand that this is the political climate that Donald Trump stepped into.

No doubt Trump's election was somewhat unexpected by the US political establishment, which was in the process of trying to counter this growing risk of social unrest in the USA through various surveillance and other control measures. Trump was an outsider, not being a professional politician, and to a government that was working hard to keep things together and plan for growing unrest, he was a wildcard that potentially threatened the integrity and the future of the USA. In fact, Trump was openly saying that he wanted to "clean up the swamp", as in reform US politics and the administration. In the light of all of this, allegations that the Obama administration was spying on Trump and his senior staff prior to the 2016 election using their domestically repurposed intelligence resources, actually do make sense.

After Obama's two terms in office, no doubt the Democrats were heavily invested in their preparations to maintain stability within the US. It's easy to see how political polarisation within the administration emerged out of that, and subsequent hostility towards Trump from

within his own administration seeing him as an outsider. Once he was in power, the Democrats did everything they could to get him out of office throughout his term, but none of their efforts had enough substance to succeed. He was definitely seen as a virus by the political establishment, and you could see their reaction is a kind of immune response. Agencies within Trump's own administration were investigating him, looking to bring charges against him, and his continual firing of key officials within the administration was quite likely an attempt to stamp out the bias against him.

One of Trump's significant impacts was slowing down the military-industrial war machine. Quite unusually for a president, he didn't enter into any new conflicts, which no doubt meant hugely reduced profits for that particular industry. There were plenty of reasons for wanting him gone.

Last year, I spoke about a number of voting security issues before the election. Trump himself had anticipated foreign interference in the election and issued Executive Order 13848 in September 2018, allowing certain sanctions to be imposed in the event that interference was proven.

The vulnerability of the Dominion Voting machines was also well known before the election. Snowden had tweeted about this in 2019 and referenced an opinion piece by the *New York Times* which showed an American cyber-security expert hacking into a machine and how easy it was (<https://www.nytimes.com/video/opinion/100000005790489/i-hacked-an-election-so-can-the-russians.html>).

We knew there were problems with postal voting, and different ID requirements and different laws across various states; and the pandemic meant that there was a much greater reliance on postal ballots for this election. Before Election Day, the FBI was investigating ballot harvesting, and I just heard today, actually, that somebody was charged in Texas for ballot harvesting.

Now, there's actually a large amount of material in the public domain right now indicating that this was, in fact, probably the most corrupt election in US history, as had been predicted, and there have been widespread attempts to block legal challenges and investigations. If you've been listening to the mainstream media reports, you've likely missed out on hearing about most of this due to very blatant media bias against Trump. A significant part of the problem has been the fact that many media outlets simply copy and paste news reports these days, drawing on agencies without doing any journalistic work or fact checking of their own. The biased media coverage is very easily spotted when you look at the language. For example, this phrase was very commonly used: "Trump falsely claims xyz without evidence", when in fact there was plenty of potential evidence, but the courts were refusing to allow it to be presented for consideration.

The polarisation of the media and the courts of law means that we have a long list of claims of election fraud, but we're unable to verify them, which, of course, is greatly advantageous to the Democrats in this case. Issues that have been raised—but of course, we don't know if they're true or not—are: that some States did not follow their own legislation in handling and counting ballots; that the Dominion Voting machines automatically switched some votes from Trump to Biden—and we do know that these machines are capable of being programmed to switch votes, which is concerning in itself; and there are also claims the

machines were online when they shouldn't have been, and that they were accessed from overseas. There are claims of evidence of this being controlled from a base in Italy. There are Republican observers who claim that they were prevented from doing their job of witnessing the counting process; there was certainly a co-ordinated halt to vote counting across multiple key cities which saw the observers sent away before a flood of Biden votes suddenly arrived to tip the scales in these states, and I think that is pretty well-established; some statisticians have looked at the voting figures claim that there are highly irregular patterns in the way that the votes came in with very unnatural looking vote dumps of mostly Biden votes, and that these came after the halting of vote counting across those key states; and there are claims that if all of these irregularities were taken into account, the difference would be enough to give Trump victory.

Some things we do know for sure are that numerous legal cases alleging voting fraud across multiple states have been dismissed by multiple courts, mostly on the grounds of standing or jurisdiction before any evidence could be presented or considered. And we have to ask: Why? and why is that such a consistent pattern? What is the likelihood of every court refusing to hear evidence in these cases? We also know that the Senior Counsel of the United States refused to hear a case put forward by Texas against alleged voting fraud in Pennsylvania, and again, why would that be refused? It's such an important issue.

We also know there was a notable absence of action by federal agencies, including the FBI, Department of Justice, and the CIA in the face of all of these claims of alleged fraud or interference, both domestic and allegedly from overseas; and we also know for sure that mainstream media outlets began calling victories unusually early on the election night. We know the media is highly controlled—you may have seen videos that have been circulating for quite some time now showing dozens of channels where the news anchors are repeating exactly the same script, and what we've seen in the case of this election is a similarly scripted bias against Trump. It's also a fact that after the election, the US Director of National Intelligence, John Ratcliffe, reported publicly to the President that there was definitely foreign interference in the election. This contradicted a previous statement by the head of the Cyber Security and Infrastructure Security Agency who denied that had been any interference. So, again, you've got to ask, why that contradiction, and why, in the face of this announcement by the Director of National Intelligence, was nothing done?

What should have happened is, according to Trump's 2008 Executive Order, the various security agencies should have submitted reports to the President within 28 days, but they simply didn't do it—they did not comply with the President's order—and yet, in the meantime, the media and the Democratic Party have kept up the same mantra without variation. The consistency of that is a key indicator that something is being scripted.

There were also some strange events at the Trump rally in Washington, D.C. on the 6th of January that suggested some deception was going on. In one piece of footage, I saw police quite casually opening up barriers to allow the crowd in to access the Capitol building, and also at times standing by and watching people within the Capitol building without attempting to control them. Since then, Washington Police have reported that some police have been suspended as a result of their actions on the day. You could put that down to

simply political polarisation, but the very calm manner in which they were acting and controlling themselves suggests something more than that.

If you saw the mainstream media reports, you probably saw footage of the painted man with a furry hat and horns. His name is Jacob Chansley. Up until that day, he was listed online as an actor—a paid actor for hire—and he had also been photographed previously at a *Black Lives Matter* rally, which is a strange place for a Trump supporter to be. So you've got to ask, what was he doing and why was he there? And why was his ad as an actor for hire taken down immediately that it started to appear in social media reports? Was the whole breach of the Capitol building simply a deception to make Trump look bad and to provide an excuse to take further action against him? There's really no proof of that at the moment, but what I can say is that these are the kind of tactics that countries use when they engage in deception operations, information operations and unconventional warfare. As I record this, reports are emerging of a police investigation into possible inside assistance provided to the crowd from people who worked inside the Capitol building, so I think there's more to come on that issue.

Vice President Pence has signalled that he won't support attempts to remove Trump from power before the inauguration of President-elect, Joe Biden (<https://www.newsmax.com/politics/gen-gov-northam-pol/2021/01/11/id/1005175/>), however, again, as I'm recording, there has been a vote in the House of Representatives to impeach Trump for a second time, no doubt to keep pressure on him and possibly to stop him from running for office again in the future. If the legal system operates as it should, though, even if the Senate supports this move to impeach him, the case against him seems very weak and artificially constructed, and I think it's unlikely to stand just like the previous attempt.

In terms of what happens next, you might recall that last year I reported Kryon had predicted a second major event after the elections, and that that event would have a very significant impact on how things play out. That's yet to happen, so we need to watch for that. In the meantime, it's healthy to remain alert and sceptical, I think, about what's being said by authority in the media—without going overboard, of course, about potential conspiracies, but understanding that this is the nature of Layer 5: to hold secrets and to undertake behind-the-scenes manipulation in order to achieve its goals.

The stakes are very high, of course—nothing less than control of the world is up for grabs at the moment as the USA's power declines—and the likelihood of very sophisticated deceptions on a large scale is very high because people will do whatever it takes in order to win that prize according to the old Layer 5 values.

The media agency, *Reuters*, published some survey results on the 13th of January (<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-global-trust-idUSKBN29I0NL>), and I'd like to read some of this article to you very quickly. From London, it says: "Trust in governments, business chiefs and media is crumbling amid a perceived mishandling by leaders of the coronavirus pandemic and a widespread feeling among ordinary citizens that they are being misled, a global survey has found. The Edelman Trust Barometer, which for two decades has polled thousands of people on their trust in core institutions, found 57% of people believe government leaders, business chiefs and journalists are spreading falsehoods

or exaggerations ... Breaking out responses according to a person's media habits and voting patterns, the survey found a greater hesitancy on vaccines amongst those who rely mostly on social media, and underlined the polarization of politics in the United States."

"The violent storming of the US Capitol last week and the fact that only one third of people are willing to get a COVID vaccine crystallized the dangers of misinformation", said Richard Edelman, whose *Edelman Communications Group* produces the survey. The figure cited by Edelman referred to the fact that an average of only 33% of respondents in 27 countries covered by the survey said that they would take the vaccine as soon as possible. A further 31% said they would take it within a year, and there were 33,000 people who responded to that survey across those 27 countries, so it's fair to say that people are feeling something isn't quite right.

Indications are that this year, 2021, is going to be one of revelations as the truth comes out about what's been going on behind the scenes. The transparency created by our increasingly connected technology makes it very, very hard for the old paradigm to cloak its actions anymore. It's important to remember, though, that at the end of the day, everyone is doing their best to solve our problems from their particular perspective, according to their dominant value system. Some solutions are more capable than others, of course, and for the whole of humanity, this is a trial-and-error process that's leading us closer to achieving stable and sustainable global coordination in the future.

The tensions that are building are absolutely necessary to drive this global shift, which will ultimately bring us a better world, and although it may not be obvious, we are actually making progress. Learning to read the value systems and looking beyond the surface level themes and personalities can help us to make better choices and to track the progress of this consciousness shift.

Remember that all of the parties and different organisations involved are fragmented to some extent with conflicting internal agendas, so they're no longer a useful way to label people or to make sense of motivations. We really need to look to the value systems. The Layer 5-Layer 6 consciousness shift has its own momentum, and regardless of who is in power, it will continue to unfold. The best that we can do is to work with its natural energy flows and understand the direction that things are headed in.

I estimate that we have perhaps another 12 years or so of rapid and disruptive change before we reach a significant turning point around 2032; and then maybe up to two decades from now before we achieve some kind of sustainable global stability. What we need to do, in line with the emerging Layer 6 value system, is create resilient, self-sufficient local communities so we can weather these massive changes ahead while using leading edge technologies to good effect, including for staying connected with other like-minded communities and sharing ideas and resources. This global paradigm shift is bringing a completely different way of living and a different way of being human, and we need to rebuild our societies from a grass roots level with a foundation of integrity and trust.

Take care and thanks for listening to *Future Sense*.

*You've been listening to the Future Sense podcast brought to you by the non-profit Agency for Advanced Development of Integrative Intelligence, part of the AADII Mesh Foundation. You can find us online at [www.future sense.it](http://www.future sense.it) where you can subscribe for free, and also link to our social media accounts on Twitter and Facebook.*