



49. The Confidence Crisis, Part 2

Recorded on 5th August, 2019 in Byron Bay, Australia.

Future Sense is a podcast edited from the radio show of the same name, broadcast on BayFM in Byron Bay, Australia, at www.bayfm.org. 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: It's just gone 10:00 here on *BayFM*; well, 10:06, actually. Six minutes is a lot of time. A lot of things can happen in six minutes, that's for sure. What's happened in the last six minutes for you? It's a good question, really. Do we know where we are? Sometimes I think part of the issue here is there seems to be so little time, and yet also, I think we've got more time than we think. Let's hope so, because we've got many things to tackle on this planet.

Steve: We certainly move between different perceptions of time as we go from one paradigm to the next. Typically, the individually-oriented paradigms are always about short-term thinking, because we want it now, right? The community-oriented paradigms always take a longer-term perspective. We know, of course, that our Traditional-Tribal societies thought in terms of tens of thousands of years really, and some of the stories that were told have amazingly been kept the same over extraordinary periods of time, telling history, in some cases, of astrological events which we can prove scientifically occurred like 30,000 years ago—these same stories were told in oral traditions and the details preserved through incredible amounts of time, which is quite extraordinary.

As we move into this Layer 6 Relativistic, communally-oriented paradigm again, we are changing our perception of time and we're starting to think in longer terms. Of course, one of the ways that's playing out is with concern about the planet, the environment, sustainability and our impact on the planet and those sorts of things.

Nyck: Of course, as you said, many indigenous peoples look seven generations or so ahead, including also the Chinese, so I guess they're very much still firmly, or partly, in that Blue [Layer 4] area of paradigm themselves.

Steve: And there is that leaning that I've mentioned before where the western part of the planet is very much individual versus the more communal orientation of the eastern part of the planet. It's going to be really interesting to see how that changes as we go through this paradigm shift—and if it changes—or whether it's a built-in leaning that exists there.

We're talking about the crisis in confidence and it's something that's been building for a long time. It looks like we are moving into some serious milestones or trigger events next year in 2020, and as best as we can make out right now, the themes look to be around economics early in the year and then politics later in the year, with two events indicated by numerous sources. One event seems to be situated in January where we've got the economic confidence model of Martin Armstrong indicating some kind of a turning point around January 18-19.

Martin Armstrong, if you haven't heard us talk about him before, is an economic forecaster based in the USA. Interesting fellow, and when we talk about our information sources, we don't mean to claim them as flawless or underpin everything that they say. We just draw on a number of different models that people have, and often we try and find three completely different sources that are unrelated, which might be pointing towards the same thing to give us a kind of triangulation and a suggestion that, OK, perhaps there's something worthwhile looking at here, and that's certainly the case for January 2020, where Martin Armstrong's economic confidence model, which is basically a cycle that he's developed as part of a fairly comprehensive computer programme, correlates with shifts in economic markets. What Martin realised over many, many years of playing with his computer programme is that it also syncs with solar cycles, which is very, very interesting, and so what's indicated there is a turning point around January 18-19 where there'll be some kind of a shift in confidence in economic markets, and then he's saying that we're moving into an inflationary period after that. At least part of that inflationary impetus is to do with shortages of commodities.

Nyck: One of the things we also look at, for those interested in astrology—in the long cycles of astrology—we've been very much looking at these big cycles with the outer planets that are coming forward in the next 20 years or so, in fact, but certainly early January next year. January the 12th, and through the dates that Steve just mentioned a week or so later, is the point where Saturn and Pluto conjunct at 22 degrees Capricorn; very tight conjunct with other planets, with the Sun, Mercury and so forth—and this is a very powerful cycle. Of course, this happens every 30 or so years; or actually a bit longer—I think it's 37 years that Saturn conjoins Pluto, so it happens regularly, but the last time it happened actually, it would have been the early 80s, which actually coincides

with the Reagan/Thatcher eras and a sort of moving back to a more conservative approach in order to stay off, I suppose, at that time, the movements of revolution that had occurred in the 60s and 70s, perhaps—you could argue that. It's certainly an interesting point next year, astrologically, for those who are interested in that. Some of you think it's all bunk and maybe that's true, but it's certainly an interesting coincidence there of cycles that we're observing.

Steve: That was Saturn-Pluto you just spoke about, right?

Nyck: Yes.

Steve: That was, and correct me if I'm wrong here, but isn't this also a similar alignment that happened on 9/11?

Nyck: I'll check that for you very shortly. Let's come back to that.

Steve: Cool. That would be great.

The other big indicator next year is a suggestion of disruption around the US elections, which are scheduled for November and very much tied into the crisis in confidence as well. I think, if you follow current affairs at all, you're probably very much aware of the decline in confidence in government and the appearance that we seem to be attracting people into politics and into our governments in general who maybe aren't well suited to actually do the job for various reasons. I think that's part of the way that our political systems and democratic systems have evolved over time, and I think it's reasonable to say that many people would decline or avoid a career in politics because they see it as probably not the best way to succeed in the modern world.

Nyck: Well, anybody smart would probably not be going to politics at this stage unless you had such a strong moral sense in a way that you really felt you could cut through the B.S. that's going on there, because it doesn't seem to be the best way to actually get change, which puts us all in a bit of a difficult bind, I would suggest.

Steve: Isn't it interesting? I mean, as I said at the start of the show, the election of Donald Trump in 2016, I think was a key milestone in this decline of confidence, and actually a signal because Trump really hasn't come from the professional political class, has he?

Nyck: Well, he claims to be outside of that class, but that's a moot point, or not a moot point—it's arguable.

Steve: But he's certainly an outsider. He doesn't fit with the mould and it was a break away from what we've been used to. I think that was a big signal from the US public that some change was needed. We weren't just going to have the same old, same old again—we needed to do something different outside the box—and certainly Trump has proven to be outside the box. I don't think anybody's going to argue about that.

Nyck: And then we've got Boris Johnson in the UK, arguably cut from the same kind of cloth. We'll see where that goes.

Steve: Very, very true. Did you just check that?

Nyck: I did. In fact, Saturn and Pluto were in opposition on 9/11 or around 9/11. That's a more contentious, even more dangerous astrological combustion point than now. Saturn-Pluto conjunct, I would say is somehow a completion of, and a new beginning, too, because in my particular astrological theory—bear with me for a minute, folks—the era that we are now in: Saturn, Pluto and Jupiter also moving through Capricorn, it's like a dance moving through Capricorn into Aquarius later, at the end of next year. Actually that's when Saturn and Jupiter first going to go into Aquarius. This whole dance, one could argue astrologically, is a very big movement—a tectonic movement in world consciousness and world events. Tectonic. Big change is the potential here.

Steve: Interesting. So in the case of 9/11, that was—literally—an explosive change to structures, right? Quite literally.

Nyck: That's right. Good interpretation. I like that.

Steve: So, how does the shift from opposition to conjunction tweak that influence, in your opinion?

Nyck: Well, the potential in Capricorn is for a new structure to be built, but first of all, as we've seen and as we're talking about today, the revelations of what's actually going on behind the scenes—who are the power forces? How have they been operating? Where's the criminal activity? (yes, there's tons of it); where's the stuff that's just not owned, not shown to us? Where are the cards that have been hidden?—all these things have been

revealed as Saturn moves across there. It's almost like now's the time to build a new structure out of the collapse of the old; and yes, some of what is old must still be adopted and brought in—as we often say, transcend and include. We need to transcend the old system, but we also need to find how to include what is still useful there, because there is plenty that is useful—it's built our society as we are now. So I think it's a great opportunity for change through Capricorn and it's going to be not what you think, as we've seen already. No matter what you think about this, I think that's probably not the best way to make a judgement about it, which is curious because we also have to be discerning at this time, to know what action do we actually take to make a real difference?

Steve: Do you know what the zone of influence is around that particular conjunction? How early should we start seeing the clearing of things?

Nyck: Well, we're seeing it now. I mean, astrologically, folks, Saturn is still in the middle of Sagittarius. It's going to start moving very fast going to Capricorn. It will catch up with Jupiter, it will catch up with Pluto and this dance will occur, so we're not quite in that yet. Pluto is stationary at about 21 degrees Capricorn so it's not really going anywhere. It's sort of hanging there waiting for this activation, I would say, but it's not a comfortable activation, Saturn moving across there, and Jupiter will help to expand the potential for a more positive change that can come through that—that's what it will reflect. By the way, folks, when I'm talking about astrology, I'm not talking about causative effects; I'm not saying because Saturn goes there that something's going to happen. They're more like reflections of what is already entrained—the energies that are in us, the energies that are in the world in operation at the moment.

Steve: And there are certainly plenty of indicators pointing towards what Martin Armstrong is predicting as an economic hard landing in January, with things like *Deutsche Bank* in crisis and its connections to many, many other banks around the world, so if and when it goes down, then that could have a massive ripple effect out across many financial institutions globally.

Nyck: And of course, we're seeing a lot of the movements with the play of interest rates in this country now. The Australian dollar has dropped, interest rates are where they are, and we're not seeing an economy that is living boldly and with confidence here in this country, despite what our current government, and just re-elected government, might be saying about that. The truth is, we're not in a very comfortable position at all. China, of course, under the battle with America over tariffs—we've been influenced by that as well. So all of these big players are moving big chess pieces around the world at

the moment, and we are, relatively speaking, a very small country in regard to this and again, we are in the force of the gales of these changes that are occurring on the planet.

Steve: We are indeed, and if this does turn out to be another global financial crisis—and we don't know that, of course, but it's one of the possibilities—then it looks like Australia is less well prepared than we were for the last crisis.

Nyck: Yes, well, the last time, of course, Labor was in power and they made a very good choice to manage that response to the GFC, apparently very well. I don't know whether the Coalition actually has the capacity to do that, because I think they're quite blind to the real forces that are going on, it would seem. It's hard to generalise about that, but when you look at what the Coalition presents to us as the governing party in this country, there don't seem to be a lot of solutions on the table. In fact, they're not doing very much at all, and you have to wonder whether there's some sort of deeper understanding of the forces that are at play, because you have the US election, as you've already mentioned, next year. It's not far off. They're going to start battling it very soon now, the choice will come for the Democrat contender, and that's a big play there. I doubt whether Trump is going to lose the next election, or if he does, whether he'll actually leave the White House. You could have a huge crisis there.

Steve: Absolutely—a crisis in the system itself. People just don't trust what the outcome of the election will be, I don't think.

Nyck: You are here on *BayFM*, on *Future Sense* with Steve McDonald and myself, Nyck Jeanes, and we have been talking about the crisis in confidence, which just has so many flavours to. Thanks for some of your texts. One text, going back a little bit says: "Dear Steve, nothing is absolute."

Steve: I love that. Thank you so much for that text.

Nyck: Yes, thanks a lot Deborah.

Steve: That's just such an absolute statement, isn't it? Nothing is absolute. Full stop.

Nyck: Full stop.

Steve: Of course, everything is paradoxical, that's the truth.

Nyck: Just before we go on, I just want to say while I'm thinking of it, a dear friend, Stephen Booth, who was on the show last week and will be back again, it's his birthday today.

Steve: It is. Happy birthday, Steve.

Nyck: Happy birthday to you. And I also just want give a loving shout out, a loving feeling to our dear friend, Wayne Armitage.

Steve: Yes, dear brother Wayne. He's well known to everyone, I'm sure, in Byron Bay who's been here for a while now, and particularly the indigenous community, and lots of love to his family as Wayne's very, very gracefully navigating a serious illness right at the moment.

Nyck: Absolutely. Very good indeed. I guess, in a way, in a strange segue, it is about navigating the illness and the sickness of this globe, of this world, of our communities that we live in across the planet. I think there are so many of us who are tuned to this show, who are tuned to this station, who live in this region, whose prime concern is that—is the global situation. For many people, it's the climate situation, for others, it's social justice, it's the lack of transparency in politics we've been talking about, and so on and so on—the decline in confidence in all of our institutions across the board.

Steve: Absolutely, and so often at the moment, that is being defined as a sickness. What it essentially is, of course, is a values clash. The things that were held as valuable by the old paradigm are no longer held valuable, and in fact, are the opposite in many cases to what the new paradigm is seeking or prefers, and I think you just nailed quite a bunch of them there. Some of the other differences are: competition versus cooperation, pyramid schemes versus sharing networks, hoarding of resources rather than the balanced distribution of resources across society, and from an ethical standpoint, doing whatever it takes to be successful versus sustainable ethics, which we know will allow us to be ethical and moral and abundant over the long term.

Nyck: And key concepts like compassion and kindness. I think the word kindness is very interesting. It's come, certainly to my reality, in the last few years, but I think, generally speaking, it's the word that while it doesn't have a lot of weight to it in terms of a word—to be kind, yeah, whatever—but actually it's kind of an essential rising feeling, I

think, in many people: how do we actually be kind to each other in the face of this? Because we're biting at each other now, quite often, in the same side of politics, against each other in this way, that probably isn't very helpful.

Steve: And I think that's an example of the backslide to old black-and-white rigid kind of stance of the Agricultural era—it's either my way or the highway, right or wrong. That's part of us navigating the change; it's a necessary backslide because it creates the tension that's going to drive further change, and the more conscious we are of that backslide happening, then the more graceful we can be about not falling into that trap of being overrun by the rigid thinking.

Nyck: Yes, indeed.

Steve: So there is indeed a global crisis in confidence and it's happening right across the board. We have been locked into politics for much of this show and this podcast episode, and just before we break away from that, I want to point out three stories that are in the local news here last week, which I just could not help but see a connection between. Again, thank you *ABC News*, for publishing these stories on their website.

The first story was that we shouldn't forget to be afraid of al-Qaeda because they are very, very scary. That was the first story. I think the headline was something like al-Qaeda was forgotten, but the terror group is more dangerous than ever (<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-07-31/al-qaeda-was-forgotten-but-the-terror-group-is-more-dangerous/11365230>), and in case you didn't notice, folks, when you were shopping or going about your business, don't forget: very, very scary—be afraid. So that was the first story.

The second story was 'oh, and by the way, the government wants to extend the terrorism laws', and the story that was posted about that was from an expert who was explaining just how lazy the government's effort to do that was—it was very, very slipshod—and it was just like an incidental thing: 'oh, yeah, by the way, these are up for renewal, we put a sunset clause on them, but we'll just, you know, roll them over again' (<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-07-31/terrorism-laws-extension-bid-by-coalition-lazy-expert-says/11367708>). And let's all remember that more people have died from falling out of bed during the time those laws have been in place than from terror.

Nyck: Well, certainly we know that more people have died from right-wing extremist shooters in America in the last couple of years, and certainly even since 9/11, than have died from Islamic terrorism. Full stop.

Steve: Yes, so maybe you can see the connection between those two stories there. If not, then send us a text and we will help you out.

Then the third story, which happened the same day—this was in the headlines as well—was 'and oh, by the way, Australia selling a lot of weapons in the Middle East' (<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-07-31/australian-company-eos-denies-weapons-used-in-yemen-war/11368322>). We're sending off all these weapons to the United Arab Emirates, and it kind of looks like some of them are heading to Yemen also. The company that's doing that, of course, came out in reply and said, 'oh, no, no, we're sure they're not going there.' Okay, well, follow the money, folks.

And then in today's news, as you mentioned earlier, Nyck, was Australia considering a request to provide military support to the whole anti-Iran thing in the Middle East, and here we go again. You know, didn't we learn last time?

Nyck: A relevant text, I think, just came in from David. Thanks to David, whichever David you are: "The 21st century value change I see coming is the realisation that proactive caring is not optional. Only then will the 2032 end of wars become reality, marriage wars included, I pray. Love to you brothers." That's a nice, neat text and some good points there.

Steve: Absolutely. I'm curious to know where you got the 2032 date for the end of wars.

Nyck: Probably because we talk about it.

Steve: Well we certainly see that as a tipping point for sure, and it may well be true.

Let's break away from politics for a moment and let's talk about science. The crisis of confidence extends to every aspect of society, including science. You may also have noticed, if you follow the news, that there's an awful lot of public debate going on about science at the moment, particularly climate science. It's kind of slid backwards with this values regression that's going on right across society, from being a scientific debate, in which case it would have been firmly planted in the Scientific-Industrial way of talking about things, to kind of absolutist black-and-white series of ultimatums that are being thrown from one side of the debate at the other side. It's also a very linear kind of an argument, and that is linear thinking—that old, less complex Agricultural era kind of thinking where everything was done according to a set of rules, which often came from God, and so there really was no argument to be had. You either accepted it is right or you were cast out as a sinner. And you know what that's like, Nyck Jeanes.

Nyck: What, me? Sinner? No. I don't believe in punishment, particularly, so ...

Steve: Anyway, back to the crisis in confidence in science. Science has also been subject to this backslide. Also, it's hurting—it's wincing from the late-stage effects of capitalism and the corporate capture of everything, and so the things that the corporations want to prove, that they want to be seen as credible, then they throw lots and lots of money at the research in those particular fields, which, of course, skews the research towards the outcomes that the corporates want to have in order to be able to sell their products. We've seen probably no better example of that than the pharmaceutical industry over the years, and a lot of those stories are coming out now. I'm thinking of the big OxyContin case in the US.

Nyck: It's very interesting, as you're speaking, because I can't read the exact statistic I heard just the other day on another great station, *Radio National*, that something like 70 percent—I think was 70 percent-plus—of all scientific research is under the auspices of some company or other; of some sort of funding somewhere that is likely to, or potentially can, influence the results of the findings.

Steve: Yes, I'd argue it's actually more than that, because where it's not directly funded by a company, it's probably funded by an educational institution that's funded by a company, and so it's twice removed.

Nyck: It certainly has an agenda, that's for sure. Jobs are on the line, funding is on the line, all these things. Not to say that some science is not good, of course, but there is this contention. We must actually have a good eye on this, as with everything else that we do on this planet now, that science cannot be taken as gospel anymore.

Steve: Absolutely, and let's just look briefly at climate science. There's some pretty wacky stuff continuing to go on here. You may remember us talking about the very severe winter that happened in the North American continent this season, just gone. The polar vortex went on a big excursion down into North America, which it doesn't always do, and as a consequence, it was a much colder winter. There were very, very heavy snowfalls in lots of places and massive disruption to the agricultural industry there, so there were crop losses from the cold weather directly. There were crops that couldn't be planted at the normal time of planting because the ground was still frozen or it was flooded from the snow melt, and in some cases, no summer crops have been planted at all by a certain percentage of farmers in North America. From what I've been reading, it sounds like the corn crops have been possibly most heavily impacted there, and I imagine that will mean digging into the corn reserves to keep supplies up. It doesn't take too many severe winters like that for things to start to compound. I'm sure it's impacted food prices in the US this year, and I've read about food shortages in stores in the US where, for certain with particular foods, the shelves have been empty

for a while with notes saying, 'sorry, we don't have any supply of this at this particular time'. So you'd think that the last thing that scientists would be thinking about right now in the US would be trying to do wacky things to block out the sun, but lo and behold.

Nyck: Lo and behold, they're doing that. What once was a conspiracy theory is now the subject of congressional debate and peer-reviewed studies, and now a *Harvard* experiment regarding ... well, go on Steve.

Steve: It's essentially a geoengineering project, and for those of you who might not know what geoengineering means, it means meddling with the Earth's natural processes, in particular in relation to climate most recently.

Nyck: This is funded by Bill Gates.

Steve: Yes, in order to effect change, and of course, the whole chem trails thing sort of comes under that banner of geoengineering, and also is often stamped as a conspiracy theory, but this particular story is certainly not a conspiracy theory,

Nyck: They actually go to lengths to say that: 'we are not a satire site, we are not a conspiracy theorist site. The information you are about to read is factually accurate and 100% real, despite the ostensible sceptics who claim otherwise.' That is an interesting move, isn't it?

Steve: Yes. You're reading from the Zero Hedge website, is that right?

Nyck: Yes, I am.

Steve: I've gone actually to their source, which is www.nature.com, which is talking about how "Harvard scientists will inject particles of calcium carbonate into the atmosphere and study the effects on incoming sunlight" (<https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02331-y>). They're talking about doing this over the US continent and I'm sure there'd be a lot of farmers that wouldn't be real happy about that, given their experience in trying to plant crops this year. What they're attempting to do is to model the impact that a volcanic eruption has. If you don't know what that means, it means that when there's a volcanic eruption, lots of small particles get thrown up into the atmosphere and some of these, for example, sulphite particles, can persist in the atmosphere for up to three years and so they have a tremendously

large cooling effect. We also know there are plenty of good, solid scientific papers that are published out there now which relate the increasing incidence of volcanic activity with Solar Minimum, which we're moving into right at this moment, and if you've been watching the news about volcanic eruptions around the world over the last couple of months, you'll see that they are increasing at the moment. There've been a couple of big eruptions which have put a lot of particles into the upper atmosphere and that will very likely—will certainly—have some sort of cooling effect on the planet.

So what an interesting time to be talking about doing this. *Harvard* are actually not starting the project just yet, but they have put together an advisory board and this advisory panel they're calling it is to examine the potential ethical, environmental and geopolitical impacts of this geoengineering project.

Nyck: And, of course, many environmental groups in particular are uncomfortable with this idea and consider it a dangerous distraction from addressing the only permanent solution to climate change in their opinion, and that's reducing greenhouse gas emissions. But as we like to try and articulate—and we certainly don't know what's going on ourselves—we like to articulate a broader view, that this is a much more complex system than we imagine; to just take that on board—that we are living in a very complex time and no matter how good our science might be, we are trying to estimate something inside a complex system and in a way, that may be impossible to actually predict.

Steve: That's very true. I think the proof is in the pudding, and when we have a climate model that actually works in terms of predicting what's going to happen within the next few years, then I think we'll be in a position to know what's wise and what's not in terms of these kinds of actions, but right now—and this is often forgotten in public debate—we do not have on the planet a climate model that works. All of the predictions that have been made over the last couple of decades, and particularly since the release of Al Gore's movie, have proven wrong, and some of them extremely wrong. The key issue there is that there are so many data inputs required, we don't have a computer that's capable of doing that at the moment. Only when we go towards, or actually have, quantum computers will we be in the realm of possibly being able to do that if we could track the data. But again, it's unlikely that we'll ever be able to track all of that data that we need to be input into a climate model that would make it accurate.

Nyck: Simply put, for me, clearly the global trend is that there is overall warming on the planet, but that's a linear understanding. That doesn't necessarily mean it's going to keep on going that way, in the way that we're predicting. We really need to take a much deeper look at the variables behind it and feed that in, as Steve's saying, when our technology is capable of actually analysing all the data. Then, maybe, we will have a good sense of what's going to happen here.

Steve: What we'd like to do now is play a very short clip from Al Gore's original *Inconvenient Truth* movie. At this point in the movie, Al is talking about a previous ice age, which was triggered by the melting of ice in North America, which dumped cold water into the ocean and actually impacted what they call the Atlantic Conveyor Current, which moves hot and cold water around the planet and actually has a massive impact on climate. At this point in the movie, Al has just explained how that actually triggered an ice age the last time that happened. I'll let him speak:

"At the end of the last ice age, as the last glacier was receding from North America, the ice melted and a giant pool of fresh water formed in North America. The Great Lakes are the remnants of that huge lake. An ice dam on the eastern border formed and one day it broke and all that fresh water came rushing out, ripping open the St. Lawrence there, and it diluted the salty, dense cold water, made it fresher and lighter, so it stopped sinking and that pump shut off. And the heat transfer stopped and Europe went back into an ice age for another 900 to 1,000 years; and the change from conditions like we have here today to an ice age took place in perhaps as little as 10 years time, so that's a sudden jump. Now, of course, that's not going to happen again because the glaciers of North America are not there. Is there any other big chunk of ice anywhere near there? Oh, yeah. We'll come back to that one" (Al Gore).

Steve: And you can't see the video that I'm watching here, but he was zooming in on Greenland and if you've been watching the news in the last few days, you might have seen that there's been record ice melt going on in Greenland much, much faster.

Nyck: 11 billion tonnes of water in one day amid historic heat, so, yes, it's hot, but the effect of that, as Steve and Al Gore pointed out back there, is, well, we don't know. It may well be something that we're not predicting; that we're not ready for.

Steve: This just points to the non-linear nature of climate, and so the idea of locking on to this concept of, 'okay, we're on a linear warming trend and it's going to go on for the next hundred years and then look what's going to happen' is just not scientific at all. It's just not scientific thinking, and it's particularly not scientific because it locks out having an open mind to other data that's coming in. There is Al Gore back in his original movie, talking about the non-linear nature of climate and how a sudden ice melt can trigger another descent back into an ice age, and it's absolutely critical at this time as confidence in science is decaying, that we sit up and take notice and don't get caught up in the popularist kind of movements and discussions that are going on, which are actually dumbing down the climate science. We really, really need to be paying attention to what's actually happening and be open to any possibility so that we can protect ourselves in the case of a sudden changes, as Al was talking about in the movie there.

Nyck: I have a couple of texts which are worth having a quick look at: "Hi, I think all men should read books by Jean Sasson", who I'm not familiar with, "and other books by women who have incredibly managed to escape ISIL and ISIS so then you see the meaning for women to be afraid, to be very afraid. Love your show", says one person. Yes, I'm sure there's a reason to be afraid there, I guess, but I think we're doing better than that. We'll come back to that in a second. Another one on a different topic: "When I think of the science of confidence, I always look at nature. Bumblebees with their large bodies have a physics-defying flight, yet the bumblebees don't know this and fly anyway. Nature doesn't let science get in the way of confidently going about their nature." Thanks to Julia for that one.

Steve: Very good. Indeed. And of course, in the comments that we made about the newspaper stories in Australia urging people to be afraid of al-Qaeda, we're not at all implying that al-Qaeda doesn't exist or they don't do terrible things and they haven't terrorised people. There's no doubt about that whatsoever, but if you study history, then you can clearly see that Western interference in the Middle East gave rise to extremist Islam. I think there's a pretty clear historical link there, which goes right back to the early influence of the British Intelligence service in the Middle East back during the time of the late stages of the Ottoman Empire, where they funded and supported extremist Wahhabism in order to try and destabilise the Ottoman Empire. Of course, that kind of interference has been ongoing and it's certainly been a contributing factor to the extremist behaviour of these organisations, and quite arguably, even the emergence of these extremist organisations.

Nyck: Absolutely, and as we said earlier, of course, Australia playing with America now, looking at sending more troops there to another mission in the Middle East, can only exacerbate this the situation, in my opinion.

Steve: It is, and of course, these things are so complex and I wish we had more time to talk about them, but the whole US-China thing that's going on at the moment is very much implicated in what's going on in the Middle East because of China's plans to rejuvenate the Silk Road trade route, which will actually end in Iran. China has been moving to establish greater influence in the Middle East and, of course, the US wants to counter that, but this is not something that's being reported by the mainstream media.

Nyck: We're nearly finished.

We want to draw attention to a film that we're helping to promote and bring here to the *Byron Theatre* on August the 18th—that's two weeks from yesterday. It is called *From Shock to Awe: A Journey of Hope and Transformation*. We talk here quite a lot about the new psychedelic revolution which is sweeping the planet—the research, the serious

work that has been done to use these kind of substances for much better health outcomes for people with, say, PTSD, with depression, with anxiety, and with end of life issues as well. This documentary tells the story of three soldiers in the US who I think had served in Iraq and Afghanistan, and had an incredible amount of success using psychedelic medicine under proper research auspices to heal their traumas. It's a really great film. We will be showing it at 2:30 pm on Sunday, the 18th of August—tickets are from the *Byron Theatre*—and there will also be a panel discussion afterwards which features Steve over here—Steve McDonald and Mitch Schultz, who'll be here next week, and I imagine will probably be on the show next week—one of our good friends arriving from Texas. He's the Transmedia Producer for the film, and also we have a female Naval veteran, so if this area interests you, please join us, get yourself a ticket and come down. It's going to be a fantastic afternoon there.

Steve: And it's a great movie.

Nyck: It's a great movie, indeed. I think that's about it.

Someone has just said: "Humans are not science. We are nature." Yeah, well, I like that.

Steve: Sounds natural to me. Yes, that's the end of our spiel on the confidence crisis. It's something that is going to peak a long way in the future, but it's coming and it's time to sit up and take notice and also take action.

Nyck: Take action.

Steve: To try and smooth our flow through this particular period, which is going to be somewhat chaotic.

Nyck: Absolutely, and an appropriate song now, because *From Little Things, Big Things Grow*. You can make changes by doing just the very small things daily.

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.