



99. Political and Economic Trends

Recorded on 10th February, 2020, in Byron Bay Australia.

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

This is Future Sense.

Nyck: You are now tuned to *Future Sense* with myself and Steve McDonald, my co-host; and our friend Mitch Shultz, who's here for the last hour. Good morning, Steve, and good morning, Mitch. Lovely to see you both here on this wet day. We all got out of our almost-flooded-in areas; I was flooded in a couple of times over the weekend.

Steve: Big storms overnight, kept me awake for a while.

Nyck: What's going on today on the show?

Steve: Politics, the flu and some good news, too. That's today.

Nyck: He's a poet and he doesn't know it. Well, we'll come back to that very shortly. Yes, lots of indications all across the world—of change, of evolution, of challenges as well.

Steve: Exactly. It was a wet weekend, and Mitch and I watched movies, so we'll talk about some movies as well.

Nyck: You are tuned to *Future Sense*, here on BayFM, and also available at www.futuresense.it, the edited podcast, about a couple of days after each show, usually in

two or three segments, and you can get that on all your platforms, but the easiest way is through our website.

We're talking a little bit, to begin with, about politics on the planet, of which there is much going on.

Steve: There certainly is much going on. Earlier in January—January the 18th, actually—we had a turning point from Martin Armstrong's computer model's *Economic Confidence Graph* that he has put together, which interestingly, he found over time, sometimes comes in sync with the solar cycles, and that's happening this year. He talks a lot about history, Martin Armstrong, and as he quite rightly points out, when the weather changes, human activity changes. When it's cold, things tend to quieten down, people stay indoors; when it's warm, people get outside, cause trouble, have revolutions and those sorts of things.

Nyck: Yes, although you don't see a lot of revolutions from the Caribbean countries, so sometimes, maybe a bit too much sun and sea is ...

Steve: Could be something to do with their religion, too.

Nyck: What's their religion?

Steve: Yeah man!

So, the 18th, he said, was a turning point on his model, and we found out just recently—Martin posted on this during the week—that on that day, President Trump replied in writing to his instructions for the impeachment process. Clearly that was an important event which is now shaping economic confidence, and with this new cycle, that turning point brought a predicted inflationary period; and it's inflationary, Martin Armstrong says, because of scarcity—so we're looking at the scarcity of commodities. Certainly one of the things that we're seeing already is shortages of various foodstuffs, and also with the whole coronavirus response as well, trade is being massively disrupted in and out of China, which no doubt will be causing scarcity of things.

Nyck: I think there's something like 400 million Chinese now in some form of isolation, aren't there?

Steve: Yes, apparently, according to media reports. I think I saw just recently that they've now shut down the city of Chengdu, which, when I visited there—I think it was 2005 when I went to Chengdu—and they had a population back then of about 12 million, so it's probably bigger than that now. It's a pretty big city.

There are some crazy reports coming through. I'm seeing pictures on *Twitter* of lines of trucks driving down streets within the cities with great big fogging machines spreading something—some kind of disinfectant or something, I'm guessing, but who knows.

Nyck: Just spraying the population, possibly. One could be cynical about it, but they do do things like that. I mean, they spray for mosquitoes in areas of various countries in the world so I guess it's possible they're doing something like that.

Steve: They do indeed, even here in Australia they do that. They used to, at least, anyway.

Anyway, back to the economics. Over the long term, Martin Armstrong's model is predicting that we're currently in a period of rising private influence, and that certainly seems to fit with reality when we look at the gradually increasing control over government of private interests—what we often call 'corporate capture' on this show—and that, according to Martin's graph, is going to peak in 2032, and that will be the end of a long-term inflationary period. Within these cycles, there are many, many sub-cycles, so you've got things going up and down, up and down within the longer wave, and we've just turned a point from a deflationary period into an inflationary period, as I said, in January. But the longer wave is a steady inflationary climb to 2032 and then a very, very sudden deflation, and, according to his computer, a return to public influence rather than private influence.

It's a bit confusing using these terms, as we were saying off-air—using terms like 'left-wing', 'right-wing' in politics, and 'public' and 'private'—because they don't necessarily mean what they used to mean; and with the rise of private influence, you might interpret that as meaning that privately we have more influence. But that's the reverse of what it is, because it's a government having more influence over private individuals, yet a very, very small percentage of private interests and influence is driving what the government is doing.

Nyck: Yes, engineering the agenda, supposedly giving us more private freedom to be ourselves, but actually the effect is the opposite.

Steve: Exactly, so it is quite confusing to talk about. We can expect this return to public influence, which is due to tip over in 2032, to be a sudden decentralisation of power, I think. I see that people are going back to grassroots organisations, and we're seeing that trend already with the values shift—a trend away from centralised power and a tendency for people to take over things that they can to have more control over their local life conditions.

Nyck: All the more reason to work on that local resilience that we talk about often on this show, too.

Steve: Yes, and quite necessary when you look at the state of our politics globally at the moment and how there's so much in-fighting and distraction away from the public good—the greater good. We really need to take more notice of what's happening locally and build resilient communities so we can have more influence over that. That certainly showed with things like the fires—the crisis that we had here in Australia around fires—and now we're having a flood crisis just a few weeks later. The weather is certainly up and down as well.

Over the long term, we're certainly seeing a loss of confidence in government. Again, going back to Martin's model, there was a tipping point in late 2015 which indicated the bottoming-out of confidence in government, and that was seen before President Trump was elected, which was a kind of a rebellious act, I think, by the public in the US.

Nyck: Yes. I mean, you could certainly see it that way, as a sort of populist movement, which it certainly was. There was already in response, that early breakdown of everything, of the confidence in economics, generally speaking, but a kind of retrograde step, arguably—it depends on which side of politics you are—sort of going backward, regressively, trying to find a way to make America great again and so forth, rather than actually seeing the crisis as an opportunity for moving forward in a different way.

Mitch: It will be interesting to see what that pendulum swing brings later this year with the election.

Nyck: Indeed.

Steve: Very interesting, yes. And we've seen a similar sentiment here in Australia where there had been protest votes where people don't want to vote for either of the major parties, and so they vote for minor parties just to kind of register their protest. Again, it's another sign that this whole political system that is quite prevalent globally is just reaching its use by date.

Mitch: It's a little antiquated at this point, isn't it? I think everybody's got to get to that point: 'we've had enough, thank you, and we will find something new.'

Nyck: Interesting, too, there's great distortions in the political process, too. I'm thinking now of Clive Palmer's influence on the Australian election. AU\$60 million he spent. He didn't win any seats, but clearly influenced voters on the edge somewhere, just that bit over the edge towards more conservative right-wing and probably, quite inarguably, influenced the result of the election towards the Morrison government, too. So that sort of over-influence of corporations and lobbyists and so forth is becoming clear to most people, I think.

Steve: Absolutely, and we had the whole Kevin Rudd thing, too, with the influence of the mining companies, I think, with AU\$6 million they poured into advertisements against his position as leader of the party there.

Interestingly, Martin Armstrong has written this week that the fact that the impeachment process was served on Trump and he had to respond on that turning point date, the 18th of January, Martin Armstrong is interpreting that as marking the decline and fall of the United States, which is a pretty extreme statement for him to make, but he has been predicting for some time growing instability in the US, and the potential of the actual collapse of the United States sometime in the future. I don't think he's predicting that any time soon, but certainly he's predicting that the process has begun.

Nyck: Indeed. I don't know if we want to bring that in right now at this point, but as you said with the weather, we've also seen one of these movies which are relevant to this discussion, in fact.

Steve: Yes, it's always interesting to look at what Hollywood is putting out—the themes that are coming out in movies, particularly successful movies—and movies that people are spending a lot of money on. We watched a couple over the weekend. I wasn't all that keen on watching the *Joker* movie, Mitch, but I'm glad that we did because it was very interesting to watch.

Mitch: After reading a lot of different reports, I wasn't sure I was up for the depressed nature of what had been coming across, but great filmmaking, if you want to just look at it from a filmmaking perspective, and amazing acting, but definitely not the movie I think America needs right now—or the rest of the world, for that matter.

Steve: I guess we don't want to spoil it for anybody that wants to watch the movie, that hasn't seen it, but certainly I found it to be a little slow; and yet I think the slow pace of the movie was meant to kind of emphasise the depressing nature of the story. Without giving too much away, it follows the emergence of the Joker character who starts as a clown working on 42nd Street in the New York city district there.

Nyck: With some mental health issues, so he has an issue, which is an interesting one, where he bursts into uncontained laughter/crying at the drop of an emotional hat, so to speak.

Steve: Exactly. He's on medication for that and then there's a cutback in healthcare by government, so he can't get his meds as easily; he loses his counsellor.

Mitch: The filmmakers definitely have their thumb on the pulse; they're really hitting on some hot button topics.

Nyck: Sounds very familiar, exactly.

Steve: And then law and order problems in that district, and kind of a vigilante vibe emerged, and then eventually, it kind of descends towards the end of the movie into serious civil unrest. It's kind of scary.

Mitch: The thing I did like about it in the pacing, I think you're right—it was really about bringing on that depressed mood and that sense of being in the character's state of mind—but what was fascinating, too, was that in comparison to the traditional Hollywood, big action films, in many ways, they pulled that back considerably. So if you're looking for that kind of movie, you're not going to get it here.

Steve: That's very true, and there's a real blurred line, too, between the 'good' and 'evil'. Often in these movies, it's very, very clear cut, and certainly in the earlier *Batman* series' or movies, it was very clear cut who's the good guy and who's the bad guy, but not so clear anymore. There are certainly points within the movie where the viewer can feel sympathetic, and empathise with the Joker's situation: the fact that he can't get proper health care, the fact that he's on the street without a job at times, that sort of thing.

Nyck: How do you configure the fact that he is the angry clown? The clown figure itself, in our culture, is a pretty potent one for all sorts of reasons, both in advertising and in children's upbringing—clowns come to parties, clowns are featured here and there. I mean, it's an odd thing, the whole circus thing. Is the clown a happy person, a happy-sad man, or does he represent something kind of dark and more evil? I haven't seen the full movie, but it seems like that's interwoven together—these two parts of the clown—like, who is this person, this sort of passive-aggressive, manic-depressive, these kind of polarity elements of human beings that arguably are arising more and more at the moment?

Mitch: Well, I think a lot of people can empathise with the clown in many ways. I think a lot of times we have to go out and we have to put that smiley face on, and we have to act like, 'everything is good, everything is great, everything is awesome.'

Steve: Your makeup's a little crooked, actually, I have to tell you, this morning.

Mitch: Is it the tear that's dropping?

Steve: But yeah, look, there's a lot to unwrap from that. If you think about the jester—the court jester from history ...

Nyck: The Fool in the tarot.

Steve: This person has special permission, before the authority figures, to speak the truth and to get away with it. Often that was the only way that the King or the Queen could find out about the truth, was a court jester would make a joke about it.

Nyck: He or she was like the oracle, in a sense, in the court.

Steve: Exactly, and you think about that position and how it's descended into what's presented in the movie where that character, the Jester, has lost public respect, and not just that, but he's persecuted. I guess that implies he's kind of falling out with authority, or a failure of authority to recognise the wisdom and the gifts that that particular character brings—the archetypal character. So it's really interesting.

The whole movie just screams loudly of a regression—the regression of society, the falling apart of our social structure, the fact that the people who are in power can no longer be trusted, the absence of justice—all of these sorts of things really scream out of the movie. Given some of the predictions—again, just going back to Martin Armstrong's computer model—of things like civil unrest around the election results in November and those sorts of things, it's kind of scary and potentially prophetic to some extent.

Nyck: I'm thinking also of *Extinction Rebellion* and similar recent groups that have arisen, which are very theatrical also in the way that they do what they do, in the outfits, the costumes that they may wear at certain protests, and the behaviour and all of that. In a way, the theatre becomes both a foil for, and a disguise also, I guess, for some people needing to be a bit more anonymous in the world where you can't easily trust the authorities—the police, the government, certainly—so you need to find a posture where you are actually presenting your political opinion from a safe perspective or a safer perspective somehow.

Steve: And I think that what's happened with government surveillance, too, has made people a lot less safe about expressing their opinions as well, which is just like a lid on a pressure cooker.

Nyck: Very true. Wonderful. We'll take a break here on *Future Sense*.

Nyck: And we're here with our special guest, Mitch Shultz, the Texan Elf, who will be flying back to Texas tomorrow, back to the US of A, which we are talking about a little bit at the moment—the decay that is clearly happening and perhaps the end of the empire that we're seeing; the beginning of that end.

Steve: It seems to be a long-term thing. The signs are certainly there. We've been talking about international politics in general in the USA, and this trend of increasing self-interest and corporate capture that we're seeing in politics globally—and we're certainly seeing it here in Australia as well. We have a scandal being drummed up by the media at the moment here around government grants going to politically-biased recipients.

Nyck: Sports grants.

Steve: Yes, and someone dug up a story from, I think it was from late last year, about the Prime Minister's church getting a \$110,000 grant to improve security at their church, which was from some grant scheme which was designed to increase the safety of children or something like that, I think it was. Anyway, it's not a good look at all.

Back to Martin Armstrong. He's writing in a post just from the last few days, and I'll read part of what he's written here, he says (talking about US politics, of course): "The Democrats have refused to accept Trump as president from day one and this posture has been so destructive to the nation as a whole that our forecast for the 2020 election being violent and insane is probably going down as one of our major political forecasts, along with Brexit and the Trump election in 2016." He's talking there about past successes of his computer algorithm at predicting these outcomes: it predicted that Brexit would go ahead, predicted that Trump would be elected, and he's predicting, unfortunately, violence around the results of the 2020 elections in the US. I think one of the main issues there is that people won't believe the results of the election.

Nyck: One way or the other.

Steve: Given all of the reporting that's about the manipulation of the process. And what happened in ... where was it, Iowa?

Nyck: The caucuses.

Mitch: Oh, the whole caucus thing was a mess.

Nyck: Can you explain a bit about that?

Mitch: From what I from what I know of this, there was an app created by *Shadow Inc*, which—you can't write this stuff.

Steve: Sounds legit.

Mitch: Sounds legit, right? But there were some major issues in the reporting from all the different areas around Iowa, and there was no consensus on all this stuff coming in, and so they were supposed to have the results that night, it didn't happen right away, it didn't happen the next day, and they were still counting, and now they're looking at doing a whole re-canvassing of the entire situation because of the technology. So this is definitely not going to help the confidence in the election. People are already doubting it.

Nyck: You think it's some sort of weak attempt by the Democrat machine to emulate the Republicans in the way they manipulate and screw things up?

Mitch: What's going to be interesting, I think, is ... so Bernie Sanders seems to be the front-runner right now.

Nyck: Yes, interesting.

Mitch: After getting pushed out in 2016 by the Clintons and the Democratic Party, some of this unrest might just be coming from the Left mainly against itself, because if his supporters feel like they're getting pushed out again, I don't see that ending very well.

Nyck: Because there's a lot of young people who support Sanders, too, so they're going to tend to be activists in some way or other, or potentially to get out in the streets more than many of the other Democrat supporters out there.

Mitch: Well, the other interesting thing with Bernie is he's really talking about the personal and the private getting back to the grass roots. One of his biggest things lately is talking about the energy sector getting taken over by the people. I can't see that happening, but that would be quite fascinating if something like that pops, because he's talking and pushing that, and I think that's what's pulling a lot of people towards him.

Steve: What you're talking about, too, it also points to the confusion with the terminology. In the past, we talked about the Left, and often the Extreme Left was associated with the communist parties around the world and socialism and those sorts of things. What's happened is, because of the values regression in part, everybody's going back to older values and often those older values are of the Agricultural era—Authoritarian extremist values where everything becomes black and white. The extreme version of that is like the Nazi party, right? and I don't think anybody would call the Nazi party left-wing; they're often quoted as an example of right-wing, and so within both sides of politics, we're seeing this tendency towards right-wing extremism, even in the Left. I suspect—well, I know for sure—that obviously one of the driving influences in the United States is the Military-Industrial Complex. I mean, you look at the amount of money that gets spent on that by the government and the amount of influence that they have around the world. It's a big deal within the US.

Nyck: And it doesn't matter whether you're Left or Right, Democrat or Republican, you are hooked into that structure one way or the other.

Steve: Exactly, and part of the issue at the moment is that Trump is clearly anti-war. In fact, I picked up an article during the week from www.sarahwestall.com about how Trump used an encrypted Swiss fax machine to defuse the Iran crisis, which is really interesting (<https://sarahwestall.com/how-trump-used-an-encrypted-swiss-fax-machine-to-defuse-the-iran-crisis/>).

Mitch: A fax machine? Do people still use those? What is a fax machine?

Nyck: You're a little too young. We'll explain to you after the show. Not for elves to play with.

Steve: So in summary, what they're saying is that at the height of that little affray that happened with Iran, where the missiles got fired and everything else, it could have easily spilt over into a major conflict if somebody wanted that, but apparently Trump jumped on a back channel, which happened to be a fax machine and wrote a message saying, "please don't escalate".

Nyck: And they didn't.

Steve: And they didn't, and it worked, and I think that's quite remarkable. Again, this is not something that gets reported by the mainstream press, but I do believe this is a reliable report. It's clear and it's not just this; there have been a number of incidents that have shown

Trump's true colours when it comes to war. He's downplayed conflict on a number of occasions, particularly with North Korea, and with John Bolton at the time being Secretary of State and pushing for war. Trump opposed that and I think Bolton's going to come out and criticise Trump in a book pretty soon.

Nyck: He is. I think it's just been released, in fact.

Steve: So that's really interesting, and I think that is probably one of the major undercurrents that is not being reported in the media—this issue of the military-industrial complex wanting to do its thing, Trump's holding it back at the moment, and it kind of looks like the Democrats would possibly be more inclined to support returning to that permanent war strategy.

Nyck: Of course, Obama dropped more bombs than any US president in recent history, for example, so they say. Also, as we said off-air before, too, Bernie Sanders, if he does get the nomination, is also very reticent compared to most of those more hawkish Democrats like the Clintons and so forth.

Steve: That's right, exactly. That's what I was working towards. It makes for a difficult choice for the Democrats.

Mitch: The Democratic lead does not want Bernie Sanders in play, and I think that's pretty obvious. Even Kerry recently talked about joining the race—John Kerry coming out of nowhere talking about joining the race to make sure Bernie Sanders doesn't get the nomination. So that should say a lot.

Steve: One more final word from Martin Armstrong for this show. I'm just going to quote again from one of his recent posts. He's saying: "This is what I mean the government has ceased to function. There is NO GOING BACK. We have crossed the point of no return!!!!!" and there's about five exclamation marks after that. So he seems quite convinced that this has been a critical turning point—the whole impeachment process and its failure, as everyone expected, because the numbers just weren't there—and he was writing in that particular post that I'm quoting from just about abuse of the political system.

This is a general theme, as I mentioned before: politics becoming all about self-interest and corporate capture. So whether it's the self-interest of the politicians—well, it usually is—aligned with the corporate influence, which is paying the politicians to be self-interested, it's a problem worldwide. What we really need to look at is some kind of a safety valve within our democratic process, and unfortunately, because of the nature of the Layer 5 consciousness that's been shaping our political system for the last few hundred years, the tendency has been to reinforce their position, reinforce their power and make it harder for

them to get put out of power, and what that's done is it's reduced public influence; it's dumbed down the system to the point where we have two bad choices, and no choice that's seen as reasonable by a good number of people. We've lost any kind of safety valve, as we used to have, where somebody can step in and say, 'hang on a minute, this is not reasonable, we need to just reset the system and have another election.'

Nyck: Well, this, of course, was the ideal of the upper houses of our parliaments, both in Britain, here, and the US in various forms—the Senates or whatever you want to call the upper house—which have ceased to function in that particular way, pretty much, too.

Steve: Indeed. It's certainly alarming in terms of the predictions for US politics, and I think we need to watch very closely and learn and act on whatever lessons come out of that this year.

Mitch: Are you guys still considering the refugee camp for Americans here?

Steve: Yes, we're thinking about buying some teepees.

Mitch: Perfect! Whatever!

Nyck: You remember *Hogan's Heroes*?

Mitch: Oh, yeah.

Nyck: So you could be Schultz. You are a Schultz!

Oh dear, you're tuned to BayFM.

We've also all watched, as part of this equation, if I may bring this in now, the Netflix documentary called *13th* about the 13th Amendment. It was a 2016 doco which didn't win, but was nominated for an Academy Award for Best Documentary that year; it won a couple of other big awards. Fantastic film and really, I just had to slow down and watch it bit-by-bit over three days and go back and consider it. It really moved me—it brought me to tears in places—stuff that most of us know about: the plight of the African-Americans from slave trade to where they are now; and not just, but particularly the building of America, just to put it in one sentence, on the backs of essentially the slavery—the slave trade and the iterations of the slave trade down through time—on the African-American people in the US. Very worth having a look at and seeing from the inside there, the incredible decay that this articulates about the American culture and society.

Steve: Just stepping back for a moment and looking at the bigger picture, if we look at the values transition from the Agricultural era through to the Scientific-Industrial era, during the Agricultural era, as a general statement, old-fashioned slavery was accepted and permitted within that system. If you think about the way that societies were structured in the Agricultural era, where you had very class-based societies and you were born into a class and you couldn't get out of it. If you were born into the serf class, for example, in an agricultural society, you couldn't work your way out of, it was just bad luck; you just had to do the work.

Extreme cases of that became, you know, examples like the US and slavery as it was prior to the Civil War. Then, moving into the Scientific-Industrial era, we still have a kind of slavery, but it's just in different form and people get paid, but we have what they call sweatshops, where there are large factories, people are essentially a slave to their work, they don't get much time outside of work—they go there, they don't get paid much, but they see it as an essential way of surviving in life—so it's not like things have shifted entirely away from slavery, it's just slavery in a new form. But watching that *13th* movie, I found quite shocking, because it did speak about how laws and society has been restructured to really just carry on, in many ways, the old-fashioned slavery.

Mitch: Well, it just gets to that point, too, that you brought up many times, I'm sure, on the show, that these layers of consciousness don't just disappear once we transfer through as a society; that they stay intact and they're still having influence—maybe not as much or at least not as much out in the open. Many people are aware of what happened with slavery in America, but the filmmakers and the interviewees in this documentary did such a good job of connecting dots that carried all the way through to today, of what is still being practised and in place in America.

Nyck: Well, the 13th Amendment itself says this: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for some crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States". So this 13th Amendment basically made the modern form of slavery that you guys are just talking about there, legal, essentially—that if you can't keep them slaves, then find a way to put them in jail and then use them as slaves that way. 40% of the of the incarcerated in the US are African-Americans, 25% of all incarcerated people in the world are in the United States, and the United States is 5% of the world's population, so that's incredible.

Mitch: One of the biggest things that stuck out was the numbers. In 1970 or '71, there were roughly 300,000 people incarcerated in the United States, and by 2000 or late '90s, we had over 2,000,000 incarcerated. If that just doesn't show you what was going on behind the scenes ...

Nyck: One of the great things about this movie is it reveals how many things—amazing things—are made by the incarcerated people, either for nothing or for very, very, very low pay in the prison system. *Victoria's Secret* pops into my head—my goodness.

Mitch: Gosh, what's that all about?

Nyck: I know! Really! And many other famous big brands—quality stuff, really good stuff—that is made by prisoners for next to nothing.

Steve: Using prison labour, yes. That shocked me. I mean, I had heard it was going on, but I didn't realise it was so widespread.

Nyck: And in fact, Trump's State of the Union address, in a way, by omission, spoke exactly to that project, didn't it?

Mitch: Yes, it just cut out a whole swath of people that were part of ...

Nyck: Native Americans, enslaved non-white immigrants.

Mitch: That's right. He was speaking to his base and we'll see where it goes.

Steve: Exactly.

The other movie we watched over the weekend was *American Factory*, which again, was a very interesting documentary.

Mitch: Yes, so for those who haven't seen *American Factory*, there was a GM plant that closed in Ohio. I think 2,000 people, maybe even more, lost their jobs in this town, and then a Chinese billionaire came in, reopened the plant and started creating auto glass. He hired a bunch of people but brought in Chinese workers as well, and the conflict of the value systems was one of the most fascinating parts of the film for me to watch. There was almost a military-style approach to the workers from China, and most of the Americans just bitching about, 'well, I want this, I want this, I want this', and not having the same sort of output that the Chinese workers were having; and wanting to unionise and pull everybody together and fight back against the powers. A very interesting documentary.

Steve: Very interesting. And although it wasn't mentioned in that movie, of course, there's a lot of American manufacturing that happens in China now. A lot of companies are using Chinese factories because it's cheaper, I guess. So this was kind of the flip of that, where China is looking to own and operate factories inside the US, and I guess it's a natural response to what happened with the US getting stuff made in China; and just the frustration of the owner, of the organisation, the company, trying to deal with American workers who were just so different than Chinese workers; and as you say, the clear values shift. I guess for me, the biggest example of that was just the self-sacrifice demonstrated by Chinese workers who seemed very, very happy to work as hard as they could, work long hours and to sacrifice their own needs to nationalism—to the country. There was a lot of nationalism within the workplace, and also to the company, as well.

Nyck: Is that a strong example of Chinese being in Layer 4, particularly—in that Blue layer?

Steve: Certainly, yes—self-sacrifice in general. I saw in the movie that there was a lot of Layer 2 as well—a lot of emphasis on family life and the family—although the Layer 4 values and the self-sacrifice associated with that seem to overrule the family needs, because a lot of the workers that were interviewed were saying that they work weekends, they don't get to see their family, they live out of town, their families live away from where they're working and so they only get to go and see their family once every month or two or something like that, so they're certainly putting the company and national interest over themselves and their families in those terms. Of course, the opposite side of the spiral was evident in the US, where it was more an individual value set that was playing out in self-interest. People were saying: 'Why can't I get this? Why can't I get that? Why do I have to do that at work?' and these sorts of things, so a very, very interesting contrast.

Nyck: A couple of texts have come in that are relevant: "Hi, boys, I have a Facebook friend ...", boys! Thank you very much for that. "Hi, boys, I have a Facebook friend in America who loves Trump. She's a simple lass, but she reckons that Trump has been great for them. She lost her job under Obama, and her husband lost his business and then couldn't get a pension. She says that Trump looks after the little people. She reckons that the Medicare system drove people to drugs. What do you reckon?" Interesting that one, isn't it?

Steve: It's very interesting. We don't have any set political views on this show—we like to look at both sides of the fence—but I can certainly see reasons why people would support Trump. Again, from a big picture point of view, when we look at the values shift that's happening globally, Trump is essentially helping to dismantle the old values—the old Scientific-Industrial values—and he's quite actively doing that, and I am pretty sure he's well aware that he's doing it as well. Certainly, I've seen people say that they spoke to Trump years before he became President and he used to talk about dismantling the establishment.

Mitch: Human evolution has brought that man here at this particular point in time?

Nyck: Well, you need a clown. You need a joker. You've got a joker there, you've got one here.

Another text before we take a break, which makes a good point: "Hi, once slave owners provided the slaves food, clothing and accommodation. Now us slaves provide our own food, clothing and accommodation etc."

Steve: It's kind of true.

Mitch: Yeah. So the system's even more complex than it was.

Nyck: Indeed.

You are tuned to *Future Sense* here on BayFM, and by podcast via www.futuresense.it all over the world, or you might be listening and streaming at www.BayFM.org later on after the show is finished today. You can do all of those things here with Nyck Jeanes, Steve McDonald and our special guest, Mitch Schultz, the Texan Elf. Last show for a while here, but not for too long.

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

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