



18. Secrets and Success

Recorded on 1st April, 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: You are now tuned to *Future Sense* here with was myself, Nyck Jeanes, and Steve McDonald.

Steve: Here we are. As I was driving in this morning, I was really expecting to see some April Fools' joke played on our large new metal lighthouse structure, but unfortunately, no.

Nyck: There are green things growing on it. That's not a joke, that's a good thing.

Steve: Yes, I think it's a good idea, actually, but I read the council is trimming them back, too.

Nyck: Oh really? Don't want to suffocate the birds, so to speak.

Well, on today's show, what are we looking at? There are many things. As we've been talking about a little bit off-air, we are in the middle—and we will come back a little bit to this too—in the middle of, one could argue if you're into astrology, a big transit of Neptune and Mercury in Pisces. It's a bit of a diffuse, confusing time at the moment, and a period of some deception, you could argue.

Steve: Absolutely, and there's a big theme running through the paradigm shift with the collapse of our Modern Scientific-Industrial way of living and the drivers of that particular paradigm getting more and more desperate to hang onto control. It has a tendency to cast a false image and manipulate things to get what it wants and that very much fits with the theme of this day, in fact.

Nyck: Indeed, absolutely. Yes, the hoax. In fact, just as a bit of an aside, for those who don't know, the idea of April Fools' by the way, goes back quite a way. They're not really sure why, but I like this one from the *London Public Advertiser* on March the 13th, 1769—that's a long time ago, even for us: "The mistake of Noah", it says, "sending the dove out of the ark before the water had abated ...", hmmm, perhaps this is a bit of a metaphor, "... on the first day of April, and to perpetuate the memory of this deliverance, it was thought proper, whoever forgot so remarkable a circumstance, to punish them by sending them upon some sleeveless errand similar to that ineffectual message upon which the bird was sent by the patriarch", meaning basically that this is how April Fools' comes about (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/April_Fools%27_Day).

So in Ireland, for example, it's traditional to entrust the victim, the April fool, with an important letter to be given to a named person and that person would then ask the victim to take it to someone else and so on and so on. The letter, when finally opened, contained the words: "Send the fool further", so it's a bit like the political process itself—just pass the buck, just send it on to somebody else, and eventually it'll disappear; we won't have to worry about that particular problem on the planet or whatever it might be. Yes, it's pretty funny.

In Poland, just another one here, it's called the *prima aprilis*, of course, "first April", and I like this: "Serious activities are usually avoided if not banned and generally every word said on 1 April in Poland can be a lie or a joke", so we're in good company today with the politicians of our world.

Steve: We are indeed. It's almost like every day is April Fools' Day now, isn't it? You never know what to believe.

Nyck: It's hard to know what is a hoax and what is the truth, that's for sure; and to some degree, of course, we're all a little bit at each other with that, because it is frustrating—there is a lot of irritation, you could say, in how we are trying to live in life conditions which are arguably for most people, continually made more and more difficult in one way or the other.

Steve: Yes, we've got this interesting process going on where one paradigm is collapsing as the other one is rising, and of course, there's a time, which is pretty much

now, where neither of them is really competently in control and so we're navigating a no-man's-land. It's like we've entered the fog of change.

Nyck: The fog of change!

Steve: Fog of change, and how do we navigate in the fog? If you think about that, when you're driving or when you're walking through fog, really what you have to do is you have to contract your attention and take notice of what's going on close by, because you can't see.

Nyck: Yes, you can't use the high beam, really. You have to use the normal beam, and even then you have to focus, as you said, very much in front of the car, just a little way ahead. Good metaphor.

Steve: And that's the sort of thing that's happening all around the world because no-one really knows what's coming down the track. They see reliable things falling apart and the degradation of our political system, our economic system and many, many other systems, and so all of our anchor points are shifting, and at a deeper level; our values are changing. So those things that were once quite reliable, that 'if we stick to our values, then everything would be fine', the anchor points have come loose and we're drifting. What that leads to is this regressive search where we think back to a time when things were fine before we entered the fog and if we just keep doing what we used to do, then it'll work, but of course, in the changed life conditions, it doesn't work at all. But what it does do is that it accelerates the process of change.

Nyck: That's a hard thing to get a hold of folks, and here on this show we like to encourage you, I guess—my words here—to sit back and consider before assuming or making big decisions about anything, really. Have a good look at what really is true for you in this moment, in the miasm, if you will, in the flurry of media and noise that we are all subject to, to one degree or another. A lot of people like to avoid it, which is one strategy, but if you're a fairly intelligent person, you probably also like to be engaged and yet it's very easy to be confused and carried away with false flags, so to speak.

Steve: It is, and while we can't see forward, necessarily, into the fog to see what's coming or see what we need to do to prepare for the future, what we can do is look at some things that are knowable. Those include an understanding of the change process and understanding the cyclic nature and the fact that this contraction and regression is part of a spiralling cycle, and so it is heading somewhere, even though it feels like we are going backwards. In a sense, we actually are going backwards, but that regression

and the search and the consideration of 'what are our values? How to our values need to change?' is part of a trajectory—a roller-coaster trajectory that is taking us down through this chaotic time—and we will rise back out of that because that is the trajectory of change. We can know that. I think it's more important than ever to really understand this change trajectory and what we can expect to experience as we move along.

Nyck: Yes, I'm thinking that as you're driving through the fog, folks, one thing you can certainly do is tune into *BayFM* right now, right here. Oh, you are! Hello.

Nyck: You are tuned to *Future Sense* here. We've got a lot to talk about today and I guess that part of the problem is there is a lot of talk. For those of us who are engaged with world issues, local issues, national issues, issues both social, cultural, political, there is a lot of talk, there's a lot of noise and it's very difficult to determine what is actually real and where action actually gets done. So we're going to be looking at some of the things that we can do to navigate the confusing and certainly paradoxical state of the world at the moment and the changes that we are facing.

Steve: Indeed. The economic forecaster, Martin Armstrong, his computer algorithm has produced some interesting graphs about the collapse of confidence, in government in particular. He's got quite a complex programme running in his predictive computer and it maps a number of different cycles, and the cycles overlap so it's not just like a consistent, predictable curve that's changing, but it's the interaction of multiple cycles which are predicting unusual peaks and troughs and changes in the cyclic nature of things. One of the ways he's presenting that is in what he calls the *Economic Confidence Model* (<https://www.armstrongeconomics.com/models/>).

I've got a graph here in front of me which shows a plot from 1970 through to 2084 of this pattern that he's identified. As I always do, I take things like this and I look for other indicators from completely different—radically different—sources that support the patterns they show, and one of the things that Armstrong, himself, has found is that his *Economic Confidence Model* cycle coincides with solar cycles. He's written a bit about that and it does make sense because the climate has a big impact on human activity. If you look back in history, you can see that during warm periods, there were times when people prospered, they travelled and economies boomed, and then during cold weather, everybody goes indoors, locked down, there's much less activity and so the economic cycles to actually conform.

Nyck: Of course, if you live on the Equator and you always have, like in Jamaica or somewhere, you're not likely to go off and try and conquer the world anyway. The weather's too damn good.

Steve: That's right, yes.

Nyck: So you need a bit of chill to get motivated; to start thinking. I often think about that with regard to places like Melbourne. Melbourne is such a city of 'four seasons in one day' but that cold, that inward part of cities like Melbourne, and most European cities like that, really does create a ground for ideas to flourish.

Steve: It does. When I lived in Melbourne, I used to enjoy the winter time there because you'd get all these little nooks and crannies in the laneways in the city where they'd have open fires going and you'll find some really interesting little cosy spots to hunker down and have a good chat.

Back to Armstrong's *Economic Confidence Model*, it's showing that public confidence peaked in 1981, which was the end of a public period. What that means is that it was a period where community-oriented values sets were more dominating, and if you think back to that time, it was around the time when governments started to privatise public services and those sorts of things, or at least it gained a considerable amount of momentum. Through to 2032, we're now in a private sector-dominated period and this is most evident, I think, at the moment, when we look at the corporate capture of government and the way that private organisations have really grabbed hold of government and used money to control government processes and government motivations and those sorts of things. There was a peak within that period that is described—1981 to 2032. Of course, the progression through there is a series of peaks and troughs, just like any natural rhythm. It shows up on his graph as like a saw-tooth pattern, and there was a considerable downturn in public confidence towards the end of 2015. Historically, if we look at that time, it was around the time when in America, for example, there was a loss of confidence in government generally, which of course, led to the election of Trump as an outsider. People turned away from the traditional parties at that time.

Nyck: When you think of that time, before that last election saw Trump become president, it really was the beginning of the whole 'fake news' idea. I don't remember the term 'fake news' being used before that period. I may be slightly wrong, but it would seem that suddenly the oeuvre of bringing out hoax-like, false, deceptive, obfuscatory information from all directions has actually increased that private distrust—mistrust—in governments and regulatory bodies around the world, generally speaking.

Steve: Yes, I think that in terms of the old paradigm, the Modern Scientific-Industrial way has always had this public image thing happening. For a long, long time, corporations have had public image consultants and they have worked on their public image and their public image has been something that they projected the outside world while there is quite possibly something completely different going on inside the organisation. But the advent of social media, and the internet generally, has collapsed that image because people both inside and outside the organisation can communicate very easily. They can reach the world through social media and so it's very, very hard to keep secrets, and the control of information was a fundamental strategy for the operation of the old paradigm. The control of what information you held close and what information you released was really what empowered you, and having more information than the other guy, of course, gave you the competitive advantage. The central driver being success, that was of primary importance, and again, the social media thing--the capacity to communicate from anywhere to the whole world—has just collapsed that whole power base, and this is a big part of the reason why the old paradigm is crumbling now. Generally it has created much more complexity; there are a lot more considerations, a lot more perspectives on things, and it's much harder to treat the world as a poker game as has been the way of the old paradigm. When you can't hide your playing cards from everybody else, then it's very, very difficult to win a poker game. In fact, the game collapses and that's what's happening right now, hence the huge crackdown on whistleblowers and organisations like *WikiLeaks* and poor old Julian.

Nyck: Poor old Julian, and I should say as an aside that John Pilger, of course, will be here at the *Cavenbah Centre* for the *Ngara Institute* next week, April the 10th. Pilger, of course, is actually a close friend and certainly supporter of Julian Assange, and if you're going to that, I'm sure you'll be able to get the latest updated information on Assange's situation, which continues to be some kind of limbo—nobody really understands what's actually going on there. Perhaps Pilger will enlighten us a bit on that.

Steve: Yes, I think one of the most shocking things for me has just been the silence of the Australian government, and how they won't look at it and they're just pretending that it's not there.

Nyck: I mean, that's an interesting strategy, isn't it, for this layer of consciousness—Layer 5 that we call Orange—that silence is often the best approach. Rather than propaganda or distorting the truth or doublespeak, just don't talk about stuff and things just go away, they think.

Steve: We see that all the time from old-paradigm politicians, when they just don't answer the question. A journalist will say, 'oh, what about this?' and they'll say, 'our

policy is blah, blah, blah, blah, blah', which doesn't answer the question but they fill the space with words anyway.

Nyck: And it's amazing how much of that goes on now. Of course, those of us who are older and who have followed politics for a long time, like Steve and I, for example, and many of you out there, no doubt, just to listen now to the language of the politicians, and particularly, in my opinion, on the Right of politics, and notice this kind of obfuscation, this absolute inability to answer questions directly anymore, because the answers would be too damn uncomfortable, I guess, if they told the truth.

Steve: That's right. The truth is coming out and they don't want the truth to come out and it's breaking that barrier that they've always had around them—the public image barrier is busted and everything's coming out. So how do we navigate in such a confusing time?

Steve: I think one of the key things is to always remember that words are cheap at the moment, particularly as the old paradigm and people who are being driven by these old values are trying desperately to hang on to what they had. There's going to be this huge disparity between what's being said and what's actually being done, and so it's going to be much more revealing for people to look at their actions rather than listen to their words. In fact, we can anticipate that their words are probably going to be deceiving, so keep that in mind and look at what is actually being done.

Nyck: Especially as we come into an election this week. As you all know, tomorrow night is Budget night in Australia. Josh Frydenberg, our Treasurer, will hand down the Budget just pre to the election, so you can be sure that as much as the Coalition can, they'll throw all sorts of pork pies into the pot in order to get your vote online; and to be very suspicious about much of that, and not to be unequally suspicious of Labor and whatever their particular offerings are, because, of course, they're also vying for government. It's tricky to know what is the truth.

I like a piece that you wrote to me earlier today about these issues, to do with coping strategies. You were talking about the results, but also to be curious, because this is a big thing now. So many people, I think, have given over their curiosity and have just aligned themselves to a particular point of view that feels comfortable for them, and that is probably the place that they've always thought about something anyway—just to sit in that, because that's safer and more secure, supposedly—but it really is curiosity that opens up a different level of truth here.

Steve: It does. If you think of the metaphor of walking through the fog of change, being certain about what's ahead is dangerous, basically, and yet it's comforting for people to join in with their peer group in thinking that they know exactly what's coming down the track or exactly how things should be, because the simple matter is that we can't see into that fog of change, and that's just the way it is when we get into this sort of chaotic period.

I think there are lots of really good current affairs examples at the moment of how information is being twisted and fake news or false information—information wars—are being used to try and maintain this grasp on power that the old paradigm has had and is slipping away. A really obvious example from the news over the last week or so is the whole 'Trump was in cahoots with Russia, Mueller investigation thing', which has come out with a blank sheet, basically.

Nyck: Yes, I must admit, even though I was never particularly aligned to that situation one way or the other, I did think, in the sort of way that I suppose a Leftish progressive thinker might think, that of course there was interference and we're going to find out and then we can impeach Trump and so forth and so forth. I know a lot of people who have been very disappointed by that finding, but actually, in effect, it's not that surprising, is it?

Steve: It's not that surprising. I never put any faith in that particular story simply because of watching the current affairs around the time that Trump was elected and what happened next. Immediately the Opposition in the US set about trying to pull him down, obviously because they were disappointed they didn't win the election, and *WikiLeaks* was leaking the Democrat emails and the initial news or story that came out about that was that it was from an insider, from a whistleblower. There was an one email that came out through *WikiLeaks* from Podesta, who was calling for a harsh crackdown on whistleblowers, and not long after that, of course, the Democrat staffer, Seth Rich, was murdered. It seems quite possible that he somehow was involved in that whistleblowing process and that was retribution, but that's something that needs to come out. Whether it's true or false, we don't know at this stage but certainly it seems that the whole 'Trump's in bed with the Russians' thing is a hollow story that was constructed to try and buy time, and also pulling down public confidence in him, and yet it's shown up with a with a pretty much empty bucket.

Another thing in current affairs at the moment is that the US government just announced that the *Freedom of Information* legislation in the US won't apply to *Google's* work with drones.

Nyck: Yes, that's a strong story, isn't it? Today we're talking about secrets and success, as I think I said at the beginning, and the number of secrets that are kept in order to

create this sort of success. It's pretty obvious that we are able to see through this, a lot of us now, and yet there's a disjunct between them still perpetrating these sort of miasm distortions and secrets and so forth, and hiding things, and yet everybody seems to know that it's actually bullshit now.

Steve: It's getting more and more obvious, isn't it? And that's because as the complexity grows, what's happening is the values sets of the old paradigm are under pressure and so they're regressing. Everybody's regressing to a certain extent, and they're falling back into the old Authoritarian black-and-white kind of way of seeing things. In doing so, they're losing their sophisticated strategic approach; it is slipping out of their hands and they're going back into a more black-and-white thing, so rather than concocting some fancy false story to snow everybody, they're just saying, 'well, no, you can't look at that'.

Nyck: Redact, redact. I mean, what is *Google* doing with those drones? Obviously, it's military applications. What do we what do we know about that? Because for a lot of people this is very troubling—the whole drone movement and the rise of the drones, so to speak—and as most people know now, Obama actually sent those drones to kill all sorts of people, including a lot of what's called, as we know, 'collateral damage' that is killing innocent people in his tenure there. And, of course, Hillary Clinton, on the same side of politics, is known to have created more arms deals, particularly with Saudi Arabia which funds Qatar and other countries, than any other former Secretary of State in the history of America. So we're seeing, on the Democrat side, a warlike approach in the last tenure that they had there, and a sort of obfuscating of that somehow by placing the blame on Trump and Russia in some sense, or Trump and China.

Steve: Yes. Things like wars are always good to take people's minds off domestic politics. You know, it's like, 'well, there was a big explosion, let's look over there', and of course, the idea of being threatened by outsiders is one mechanism that's used to try and bring people together at a nation level. So it's no surprise that during that time when things were very, very obviously slipping away in terms of the control of the dominant paradigm, there was a big flareup of conflict and a big noise over there. 'All look over there, everybody.'

Nyck: Well, they're making a bit of a noise at the moment with Joe Biden, who is tagged to be, in a sense, the most substantial, respected potential Democratic candidate for President in 2020 next year, who has now been accused by a woman as having been touched and kissed on the head from behind. You've got to wonder about this story, and of course, if there was something untoward and not right about that particular action, if it did happen, okay, but basically, the woman who said that this happened is saying, 'well, he doesn't deserve to be President'. When I heard that on radio this

morning, I thought, 'well, god damn, Trump's the President and he's got away with hundreds of these situations.'

Steve: I know. In fact, there's a long history of presidents getting away with stuff like this I think, actually.

Nyck: Well, that's true.

Steve: So yes, it's a time where we need to dig deeper and if we think too hard about this surface level deception—the information war that's going on—then we just get lost in it, so, like walking through the fog, we need to look closer to home and really take notice of what's happening rather than what's being said—these deceptive nets that are being cast.

Nyck: Yes. You've also mentioned in some of the texts that you sent me for today's show about coping strategies, the term 'avoiding viral fear'. This is a huge thing, isn't it? I mean, this is what's going on now and to one degree or other, I think we're all subject to that virus that fear has created in us in various ways. It's pretty obvious but the most negative side of this, of course, is that people actually take action that can be dangerous—deadly, in fact—to avoid this kind of fear in their own lives. We see examples of that in some of the horrific things like Auckland, for example. Obviously this particular person had some sort of intense opinion—attitude about life—that created this psychopathic moment where he took all these lives. But it's a symptom as much as anything else.

Steve: Absolutely. When we're not lost in our fear, fear can be a great indicator, so when we're subject to these stories that are being put out there, a good question we can also ask ourselves is, 'where is this coming from? Is this coming from a place of fear? Is trying to instil fear?' and if that's the case, then it's an indicator of an old values set and also an indicator of an attempt to manipulate us somehow. So I think it's a good thing just to keep that in mind and look for evidence of people who aren't acting from fear but are actually speaking and acting in alignment. A lack of alignment between actions and words is another great indicator of something not being quite right.

Nyck: And we should all be to feel this now. I mean, as you're speaking there, I'm thinking that the place that we as humans are evolving towards—and this is a big generalisation because we're not in the same place, all of us, of course—but there is this capacity, I think, emerging for us to really read this well; to actually feel this intuitively, to know when the words that are spoken are not being followed by actions.

We can see the actions not happening, but in the moment of the speaking by the powers that be—by the politicians standing up in front of the press—you can feel the lack of integrity there.

Steve: You can, and this is one of the reasons why the new paradigm is rising up, is that in this evolutionary step forward from the Modern-Scientific-Industrial-oriented human to the Network-centric, more values aware, humanistic approach of the new paradigm, we are gaining an expanded sensory perception. Part of that, exactly as you just said, is this capacity to read other people, and particularly their emotions, more accurately than we could before. So for someone whose life conditions have supported their expansion into this new way being human, it does give them an advantage over the old paradigm. Our Prime Minister, Scott Morrison, is a classic example of this. He's rolling out all of these really transparent, shoddy attempts to manipulate and he doesn't realise they're so obvious because he's still of this old mind which isn't aware of this extra capacity. He's thinking it's going to work and it's laughable, it's hilarious.

Nyck: Which is very perfect for April the first, for April Fools' Day, because it is actually the Fool, and the Fool doesn't actually know he's the Fool on one hand. On the other hand, of course, the Fool on the tarot card, for example—the jester—is often the most enlightened person in the deck and the one who whispers in the ear of the King, but I don't think we're talking about ScoMo right here.

Steve: No, I don't think so.

Nyck: God bless him.

Steve: Although there is some parallel to Trump here in that Trump has also got that naive kind of Fool character about him, and at this time, the natural evolutionary flow is for the old paradigm to be collapsing, and so through acting as the fool, they are actually playing a constructive role in moving the old paradigm out of the way; in helping it's collapse.

Nyck: Indeed. Oh dear, oh dear, the things we do, the things we do.

You might remember this, folks. Have a listen to this:

"Ladies and gentlemen, the director of the Mercury Theatre and star of these broadcasts, Orson Welles:

"We know now that in the early years of the 20th century this world was being watched closely by intelligences greater than man yet as mortal as his own. We know now that as human beings busies themselves about their various concerns they were scrutinised and studied, perhaps almost as narrowly as a man with a microscope might scrutinise the transient creatures that swarm and multiply in a drop of water. With infinite complacence, people went to and fro over the earth about their little affairs ..."

Nyck: As most of you would know, that is the original broadcast of the *War of the Worlds*, broadcast on October the 30th—Halloween, not April Fools—in 1938 over the *Columbia Broadcasting System Radio Network*. It was from an episode called *Orson Welles*, speaking there from the H.G. Wells novel *The War of the Worlds* from 1898, and the episode became famous for causing panic amongst its listening audience, though the scale of that panic is disputed as the programme had relatively few listeners. Nevertheless, back then, I love this because the thing about April Fools' and thinking about the hoaxes that have been perpetrated upon people—because on April Fools' Day, a lot of newspapers around the world, radio stations and the like, do create sometimes quite elaborate hoaxes for April 1st—but even though this was not an April 1st hoax (and it wasn't really a hoax), it was amazing how people back then and in the early days of radio even, a certain number of people believed that Mars was actually invading Earth, and it was pretty easy to convince people of that, it would seem.

Steve: Interesting. That must have been a real key turning point in understanding the power of the media, I think, to manipulate public behaviour.

Nyck: I think so, yes. It's often cited as an example of just that, so, yes, I think that's right.

Steve: Yes, and right prior to World War II, of course, where propaganda became a huge thing.

Nyck: We are talking about change, as usual here today.

Steve: Under the influence of this murky astrological ...

Nyck: The murky Mercury, Neptune, Piscean transit that's going on. For some of you, of course, you don't have anything to do with astrology—that's quite respected—but we do. We like deeper astrology. It's kind of important.

Thanks for your calls. A couple of calls came in, one pointing to the fact that we sort of claimed that Trump was exonerated by the Robert Mueller investigation.

Steve: Aha, but we didn't. We simply said he didn't produce any evidence.

Nyck: That's right, the absence of evidence.

Steve: Yes, and it's interesting that with the regression of values that's going on at the moment, the tendency for many people is to slip back into these absolutistic values—the Agricultural-era things from the Middle Ages and the time when society was in rigid classes and everything was black-and-white. You had a set of rules to follow, which were God's rules or some higher authority's rules, and you didn't have to worry about figuring out the rules because you just looked at the list of rules and you followed them and it was all quite simple. It was either yes or no, right or wrong, and at the moment, even though people are regressing back to those values to try and cope with the increasing complexity right now, because the Modern Scientific values are falling apart, it's a time where we actually need to take more notice of the details and we need to discern all of the different shades and colours between black and white and try and resist this temptation just to classify everything as right or wrong because it's not going to serve us in the longer-term. The long-term outlook—and first and foremost, let me say that we don't really know what future brings ...

Nyck: We don't know and we certainly have no claim whatsoever to know anything more than you do, folks. That's why we're privileged in a way to be able to talk to you like this, and hopefully it's useful, but it's really you're your own individual and sovereign approach to these things which is really important here.

Steve: That's right, so don't believe a thing we say. But what we do is we look at various sources and we look for small signs that are all pointing in a similar direction as some guidance to what might be happening, and our best guess, looking at all the small signs that we can see at the moment, is that around 2032 is going to be a time of very significant change. It's a co-incidence of economic cycles, a shift between private dominance of the economic world and back to public dominance again; it's a turning point for the solar cycle—it may be a very significant time for the impact of climate change, most likely—and many, many things are going to be shifting around then, including human consciousness itself. So, if that's true, if we're right in saying all these

signs are pointing to that as being a very significant turning point, what that means is that between now and then, we can expect a number of more minor shifts, because with these things it's not a black-and-white process. There are always multiple small changes that add up to bringing some big change, which becomes very, very obvious, and sometimes the smaller ones aren't even all that obvious.

Steve: In terms of this process of trying to look for the small signs, this seems to be where science is heading at the moment. In our last show, we spoke about the recent *Cannabis Symposium* here and the science around cannabis that was being presented, and this idea of what they call the 'entourage effect'—which is a finding around the science of cannabis in particular, but this seems to be a general theme throughout the whole paradigm shift that's underway at the moment—is that looking at any one single thing doesn't necessarily bring you the answers that you need, and the action of one single cannabinoid molecule within the entourage of hundreds of different molecules which are in the cannabis plant, if you take one of those out, it's not going to do what the whole collective will do altogether. This idea of fragmentation—but also the recognition of the connection between the fragments and the collective actions happening in ways which are quite different to what we've been used to in the Modern Scientific era, where leadership has been clear, somebody sets the strategy, everybody else follows—now we're moving to a much more collective way of doing things, which is collapsing hierarchies.

Nyck: A level playing field where people will actually sit in a circle or sit in conference and seek consensus—as hard as that is to get—in order to make decisions, but in looser way.

Steve: A much looser way, without a clear hierarchy. It's very much a level playing field situation that's emerging with the new paradigm.

Nyck: It's very paradoxical, just that, isn't it? I think I said to you earlier, in this region here where there is such a strong movement towards that Green layer, Layer 6 as we call it in Graves's work here, many, many organisations and the community on a ground-level basis—to do with solar energy, localisation of food, activism against Adani and climate change, many other different elements of what people perceive to be a progressive way forward—there are so many groups everywhere, and in some ways the tendency is to want to co-ordinate them all and bring them all together under something, but that's kind of an old frame, isn't it? You're really talking about a different way of seeing that playing field of different actors.

Steve: Yes, it is an older frame, and what we're looking at here is the emergence of a collective intelligence that is not the intelligence of one or the other, but the collective intelligence of the connected whole. Often that can seem really vague and amorphous, but when it gets in sync—when the timing is right—it can be far more effective than the old paradigm and we're seeing that emerging now.

What's happening here in this local area is a microcosm of the macrocosm. The way that evolution unfolds is you get these small pockets of change where things are coming together in more complex ways and finding better ways of coping with life conditions. They'll start as small bubbles and then over time the bubbles will grow, and at a certain period, halfway through the change, it will look like these bubbles are all isolated, little things doing their business differently, which is what you just described, and then they'll reach a tipping point where suddenly things shift and everything comes together and you get a collective network effect, or the entourage effect as they're calling it in the cannabis science, which I think is a really lovely term. It's something that we can apply to a whole bunch of different aspects.

Nyck: And to me, the entourage effect also goes against, for example—one simple example—the trend in the previous dying stage of our evolution, the dying status quo of reductionism, of taking everything part, for example, in agriculture, of 'let's design and target specific genes for genetic modification here, let's just take a part of the plant out here and we'll just use that plant; we'll let go and forget about these other constituents here', and none of that really is going to work anymore, is it? It's actually a new way of thinking of science.

You also brought up the word 'consilience'. This has to do with this a little bit, doesn't it?

Steve: Yes, so there's a book on my bookshelf (that I haven't read) by a guy called Edward O. Wilson, called *Consilience*.

Nyck: That's the new way. You have a book on the bookshelf but you don't have to read it. You just kind of suck it up; take it in.

Steve: I've scanned it and I looked at some of the key concepts, just flicking through the book, and it's really talking about this entourage effect. He's talking about the way that a whole bunch of small indicators can come together to deliver a fairly certain picture, and yet if you take each one of the indicators, it on its own does not actually deliver hard evidence about what's going on. But collectively in this entourage effect, then you can actually get a clear indication by looking at the broad picture in the collection of all the little signposts.

Nyck: And this is true, even in science. One would think that science is specific—you make a hypothesis, a theory, you do some experimentation, you come up with an idea—but actually this idea of consilience applies to science, in that most established scientific knowledge is supported by the convergence, as you're saying, of evidence. If not, the evidence is comparatively weak and there will not likely be a strong scientific consensus. I found that really interesting.

Steve: Yes, and in the scheme of the growing complexity over time, the Modern Scientific-Industrial way was more effective—it allowed us to cope better with complexity than the previous paradigm, which was the Authoritarian paradigm from the Agricultural era, and the same thing is happening again. We've reached the limit of the Modern Scientific-Industrial method where we isolate things and we look at things in a specialist sense and we go very deep to understand the separate parts, but there reaches a point where that delving into the detail of the separate parts loses the bigger picture. That's when the tide turns and the shift begins toward a more sophisticated, more complex level of consciousness that can take a broader perspective. That's what's going on at the moment, and this is cyclic. There will come a time when, through the new paradigm that's emerging now, the focus on the collective will start to degrade our capacity to know the individual aspects and we'll shift back again, through this huge leap in consciousness into the Second Tier, which will take us into an integrated perspective where we're starting to bring those two separate polls together in a very sophisticated way.

I think one of the little tricks that we can put in our bag of tricks at the moment is just this capacity to step back and look at multiple indicators rather than latching onto one single idea and thinking that we know for certain what's ahead through the fog, when in fact we can't know for certain right at this time.

Nyck: Yes. You are tuned to *Future Sense* here with Steve McDonald and Nyck Jeanes. Before we take a break, a couple other things.

You were talking about the endocannabinoid system in terms of the entourage effect, which we talked about a lot in the last couple of weeks, having been at the fabulous *Medicinal Cannabis Symposium*, both of us. There was just a little bit on *Yahoo!News* the other day, saying that coffee actually "affects the same system in the brain as cannabis" (<https://nz.news.yahoo.com/coffee-affects-system-brain-cannabis-113115160.html>). "On the face of it, coffee doesn't have too much in common with cannabis", according to this. "One jolts you awake, the other is known as 'dope' for a reason. But the two substances actually affect the same neurotransmitters, according to a new study from Northwestern Medicine. The neurotransmitters related to the endocannabinoid system (the same ones that are affected by smoking cannabis) decreased after drinking four to eight cups of coffee in a day." That's quite a bit of coffee. "That's the opposite of what

happens when people use cannabis", but fascinating that it's actually the same system that plugs in in both cases. That's a bit of new information.

Steve: Yes, and what's interesting about that is that if you think back to the old rat race, corporate world where everything was about pushing things harder and working harder and staying awake to do more work for a longer period of time to be successful, then coffee was a key substance then—a stimulant. Now we're learning about how it acts in the cannabinoid system, and the endocannabinoids are actually doing the opposite thing. It's like 'chill out, slow down', and we see the emergence, socially, of things like the *Slow Food Movement* and *Slow Medicine*—cannabis is being called 'slow medicine'.

Nyck: What you're saying reminds me of the book from years ago, which I can't remember the title of, by our friend Scott Taylor, about dolphins and the like (*Souls in the Sea*: https://www.goodreads.com/en/book/show/1310810.Souls_in_the_Sea). One of his theories—well, it's not just his—was about the Enlightenment and the arrival in Europe of coffee, of chocolate, of tobacco, of sugar, and a few other things, I think; and also—that was the point—of whale oil to light the candles. So suddenly in the Enlightenment period, in the coffeehouses of England and Europe, people would stay up all night drinking coffee and chocolate, smoke the cigarettes and talk and think and have ideas, and so the stimulation occurred in that era. His argument was that it brought about the Enlightenment, and now in a way, as you're saying, we're looking at a whole different set of substances, or whatever you want to call them, that actually enable a different kind of aspect of human consciousness to emerge. It reflects that at least.

Steve: And what always fascinates me is that if you take a holographic effect and you look at these little insights into the science of systems in the body, and we look at the larger social patterns and how things are changing, you can see similarities—there's a really constant theme there—which is about collectivity, it's about understanding the action of the entourage, the collective effect, network effects; and it's about slowing down and stepping back from this mad rat race and bailing out, reconnecting with the earth and grounding. That's a really strong general thing.

Nyck: Very good.

Nyck: Here on *BayFM*, you are tuned to *Future Sense* with Nyck Jeanes and Steve McDonald. We mentioned the group *Yaima*, who are coming to Australia. They are actually doing an event here on 12th, 13th and 14th of April. It's called *To Celebrate Life*.

It looks like a whole programme of everything, just about, including workshops on syntropic farming, which I've just had a good look at recently. Very interesting movement, that.

Steve: What is that?

Nyck: There's a guy in Brazil, whose name eludes me right now, who's created a methodology of farming which is similar to permaculture.

Steve: Ah, this is the forest-based thing? Okay, I didn't know it by that name but I've heard about that.

Nyck: It's fantastic. Absolutely amazing. You can watch a little 16-minute video, which you can get on permaculturenews.org.

Steve: So there's another great example of the entourage effect—instead of monocropping, planting a great diversity of plants in a forest environment and they all thrive.

Nyck: This video is called *Life in Syntropy* (<https://www.permaculturenews.org/2015/12/08/life-in-syntropy/>) and it is about this particular methodology, as Steve was just saying, this is syntropic methodology of using everything that's there and essentially, basically, they just prune. Whether you growing vegetables, whether you're growing forest timbers, you prune excessively and just let everything drop to the ground and eventually this creates its own organismic worm-filled, bio-rich biome in the soil, which basically creates amazing results. Takes, of course, a few years to do that but once that happens, everything just burgeons. It is a very stimulating little documentary and part of the future, clearly, of more localised, more natural, organic and total holistic farming practices.

Steve: Very interesting. That's some good news, and I think we will turn to good news now, but before we do, I just want to summarise what we've been talking about so far.

The strategy of the old paradigm, in trying to hang onto power, is taking its efforts to the limit in terms of trying to spin the news, flood us with false information, distract us from what's really going on, maintain this barrier between what they're up to and what we can see, but just in the natural order of things, it's collapsing anyway because of the increasing visibility, the changing values of people inside some of these old paradigm organisations who are blowing the whistle and that sort of stuff. We are in for much more of this and I am predicting there's going to be some huge revelations in the next

decade or so leading up to what could be a very significant tipping point across to the dominance of a new paradigm around 2032. Between now and then, there's going to be more collapse and we're going to discover hidden agendas that we just haven't been able to see yet. There are many, many that we could talk about off the cuff, like the pharmaceutical industry, for example. There's a consistent theme which is driven by the values of the old paradigm, which is about personal success. It's about people wanting to succeed and usually that involves amassing a large amount of money through business ventures, and centralised business ventures at that, and so already we're seeing the truth coming out around, for example, *Purdue Pharma* which is in the news at the moment.

Nyck: Yes, that's right. They just reached a \$270 million settlement over the opioid crises. We weren't going to talk about opioids today but we'll just mention it briefly because it is a big story. This was in the *ABC News* a couple of days ago (<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-03-27/oxycotin-purdue-pharma-settlement-opioid-crisis-us/10943424>).

Steve: It is. It's a good example of a hidden agenda being uncovered, where they've figured out, 'OK, we've got this pain killing medication and it's actually addictive, and if we sell it, then people are going to keep buying it', which is the key strategy in the pharmaceutical industry—you don't want to cure people because if you cure them, you'll lose a customer, right? And that cuts your income, so if you can just keep everybody on your pills and have to keep taking your pills, then that's the best way to reach ultimate success. That's a classic example of an old paradigm, hidden strategy—a hidden agenda which really isn't serving the greater good—and there's going to be more of that, where will we'll see, probably across all industries, revelations like that coming out throughout the next decade or so. Some of it, I think, is going to be shocking to the general public and it's going to send shockwaves around the world and 'oh, my God, look what's been happening, we didn't know about that.'

Nyck: Of course, with those kind of examples of the pharmaceutical industry, which is pretty obvious—and we like to have a go at them here for some good reasons, because there are a lot of revelations coming out here—but on the other hand, you're going to continually have these reactions to this from these companies.

You might have seen in the *ABC News* in the last couple of days, we've got *Yoga, Naturopathy and Pilates are Going to be Hit as Natural Remedy Rebates Disappear* (<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-03-30/yoga-pilates-naturopathy-hit-with-private-health-rebate-ban/10920770>), so "if you are amongst the 80 percent of Australians using natural medicines and treatments such as naturopathy, yoga and Pilates to improve your health, prepare for a shock. From today, 16 natural therapies will no longer receive private health rebates, and the move is supposedly designed to push

down private health premiums." Yeah, yeah, sure, but "experts admit it will have a minimal effect." So this is interesting. We're going to get this too, aren't we? We're going to get the revelations from the powers that be, from the big companies—the pharmaceuticals, all those 'bad boys and girls' that we like to name in terms of bad practice and so forth—but you're going to get the reaction from the regulatory bodies from government that are actually going against the trend. The trend is towards natural therapies, and that's part of the movement, isn't it?

Steve: It is. As they get more desperate, though, their values are actually regressing back to Absolutistic values, and so their capacity to craft a very effective cover story for their hidden agenda is degrading into this black-and-white, simple 'well, this is what we're going to do', and in doing so, it just becomes more and more obvious. This is the natural flow of evolution. I mean, it's very tempting to take sides and say, 'good boys/bad boys' from 'new paradigm/old paradigm', but in fact, it's just a natural evolutionary process, and we've all been there.

Most of us who are old enough have lived through the old paradigm. We've had old paradigm values previously in life, and now we're shifting and changing, and so is the dominant global paradigm, and it's the natural order of things. None of these paradigms are, in essence, good or bad—that's simply a perspective that is taken by somebody according to where they're sitting: this is where the old paradigm sits. At the time that they emerged, every paradigm throughout history has been the perfect solution to our old problems, and every paradigm has solved the old problems but then progressed to create new problems that can only be solved in turn by the next paradigm, and that is the natural order of things. In a way, it's more supportive of the emerging paradigm to sort of sit back and not be too judgemental about it and accept that 'OK, this is just the way things are, things are changing, it's a time to be coming together to work together in community, rebuild community' and those sorts of things. Of course, that's going to help us cope better with life and changing life conditions.

Nyck: Very good.

Nyck: Here's a joke—you've probably already seen this: How many Brexiteers does it take to change a light bulb? One to promise a brighter future and the rest to screw it up.

Let's take a look at a couple of these big issues at the moment. *Brexit*. I mean, it's chaos there. One of the things that really struck me over the weekend that I came across, and probably many of you did, *ABC News* reported that *Brexit* negotiations have led some senior Conservative MPs (particularly one) to suggest a unity government with the Labour Party in order to solve and to approach the whole *Brexit* issue from both sides of politics. I thought that was extraordinary.

Steve: It is an extraordinary claim, yes. I'd like to see that happen.

Nyck: Well, neither May nor Jeremy Corbyn are in particularly good favour over there in England. My girlfriend is an English woman and she takes a great deal of time to look at the situation over there and has sort of throw up her hands. She says that some of her political British friends—people who are engaged politically over there—are actually talking about the overthrow of parliament. We were sort of having a bit of a laugh over the weekend—laugh, if you will—about Guy Fawkes and the great film *V for Vendetta*, which you are probably familiar with, which is based on the whole Guy Fawkes thing. But what's going on with *Brexit*? Because, as I think you've said at some point Steve, the EU, the European Union, was an early attempt to move from the Orange Layer—Layer 5, as we call it—to Green Layer 6, and to some degree, it's had some success, but clearly it hasn't really worked in full.

Steve: Yes, an early attempt at collective government across nation states. I think it started with all the best intentions, but because it was an early experiment, it was still very much subject to the influence of the old paradigm. The nature of the old paradigm, in its drive for success, is to exploit whatever it can, and in various ways, interested parties have exploited the collective of the EU and wanted to make money out of it; it's all become very complex and there hasn't been sufficient scaffolding in the EU structure to hold it up and it seems to be in the process of gradual collapse right now.

In general, if we look at the emerging paradigm and this idea of the entourage effect and network effects and those sorts of things, it's not really suited to rigid structures. It operates much better with freedom and without hierarchy, and, of course, within the EU, there was a hierarchy and hierarchical structures and some rigidity in terms of rules set and those sorts of things, whereas the emerging paradigm works much more effectively if it's got freedom of action, it doesn't feel like there's anybody particularly in charge, and groups can naturally come together that agree with each other about certain things and take collective action.

We're seeing the emergence of this kind of thing in the cryptocurrency world where no-one's really in charge of cryptocurrency; there's no hierarchy as such. It's just a whole bunch of people who are coming together where their interests connect and working together to produce these quite sophisticated blockchain-based systems, which are solving many of the problems of the old paradigm. One, particularly, is the issue of trust, so they're being constructed in such a way that they automatically work in a reliable way, and they, at this stage anyway, don't seem to be corruptible.

Nyck: This is a very uncomfortable position, though, for most people, isn't it? This notion of no leadership in a sense, of no hierarchy, of not being told or led. I'm thinking

about the mistrust in things like cryptocurrency by the bulk of the world's population still, even though it's slowly moving into a maturity of some sort, for sure.

Steve: Yes, and I think this is such a complex situation that we're talking about here—global change and the dynamics at play—and something that's often lost in the conversation is the fact that humanity is still spread almost right across the spectrum of values sets, and so we've still got many, many people in the world operating from older values sets—their circumstances arise from the complexity of their life conditions. So whatever their life conditions demand in terms of the complexity of their perspective on life and their way of operating, that is what gives rise to the dominant worldview in each particular area around the world. I often compare it to a conga line, and while there are people up the front of the conga line who are pushing into new paradigms, even beyond the global emerging paradigm, there are a whole bunch of people in the middle there who are still living life in relatively less complex sets of life conditions and so they're still coping OK with some of the values sets that emerged much earlier in human history. Of course, each values set has its own particular perspective on what's happening right now, and as you just said, a lot of people will look at these new emergent systems and say, 'whoa, I don't know about that, it's not the way we used to do things around here', and so while folks whose life conditions have brought them into this new paradigm early, ahead of the main body of humanity, might be quite comfortable with these new complex systems that are much vaguer than clear-cut hierarchies where we know who's in charge and we just wait to get the order from them and we do, and all that kind of stuff.

It's very, very hard, and this growing complexity and the fact that we're seeing the emergence of one extra and completely different way of being human, that's being added to all the previous ways of being human, which are mostly still around—except arguably for the Hunter-Gatherer lifestyle, everything else is still there. There are still a lot of people living in Traditional-Tribal ways in various places around the world; still a lot of people living in countries where 'power is king', basically the world is basically a jungle, and you've got to fight to survive; still a lot of people living in Authoritarian regimes.

Nyck: Religiously-dominated regimes.

Steve: Absolutely, and many, many people are living in the Modern Scientific-Industrial paradigm. All of it is shifting—the conga line is progressing—so there are lots and lots of paradigm shifts going on at the same time, and part of the reason why I don't talk about this too much on this show is it's too damn confusing.

Nyck: But it's self-empowering, really. As you're speaking, I'm thinking that the opportunity here is for self-empowerment. The opportunity is for an individual to go, 'how do I make sense of it for me in this? How do I sit in this complexity?'

Steve: Exactly.

Nyck: And how do I allow myself to be open to a different way to approach what is actually happening in the world; what's happening to me; what is in my reality?; and whether or not one thinks that certain powers outside have that much power over you—because that's what they claim—or whether you can actually go, 'well, there's power there and I don't trust that power and I have a certain feeling and understanding in myself. I'm investigating, I'm curious about my life, I'm curious about what's going on in my reality. How do I make sense of all of this? How do I find a pathway that works for me that it's actually true for me?'

Steve: Yes, exactly, and from a Second Tier perspective, there are fractal aspects of all of this change. So if we talk about the whole world as being this collective conga line, within each one of us as individuals, we have different aspects of our personality which sit in different values sets. We most often notice this when we change our life conditions. If we work in a corporate office, for example, we might go to work, it's very corporate and there's a hierarchy and there are different ways of doing things. Then you go home to a different set of life conditions and you ought not operate the same way. For most people, it's a natural adjustment that they make and they don't even notice that they're adjusting their value sets and their motivations and behaviours.

Nyck: That's a really important point, isn't it?

Steve: Within each one of us, we have this collection, and as we know, the values sets are nested inside each other, so as we grow through and grow into more complex values, we still have all those other sets inside us and we shift and change in day-to-day life as our life conditions demand. In a way, each one of us is a microcosm of the entire world and each one of us is also going through this values shift internally, and many of us in the midst of the external change are also struggling with our own internal change and coming to grips with different aspects of ourselves that might be conflicting.

Nyck: And of course, as we look out to the politics of the world, it's very confusing. We're seeing people in other places who are in different places within themselves. I'm thinking now of China—the paradox of China exists for sure. Let's take an example. We sell a huge amount of coal to China, coal is being burned in China a lot, for example,

and it would seem to be very important to our economy, so we are told, that we sell coal to China—not just coal, but that's one of the things. Some of us demonise China at times for how dirty it is—and certainly a city like Beijing is one of the most polluted cities in the world. At the same time, on the other hand, China is making some pretty strident steps into a greener future. An interesting piece in *The Guardian* just a couple of days ago says that in the city of Shenzhen, for example, "all 16,000 buses in this fast growing Chinese mega city called Shenzhen are now electric, and soon all 22,000 taxis in the same city will be electric" (<https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/dec/12/silence-shenzhen-world-first-electric-bus-fleet>), so I wonder about the change there, because clearly they're coming from an authoritarian regime; they still are Authoritarian. They're moving into Layer 5, Orange, into a sort of socialist capitalism, if you will, or whatever you want to call it, and at the same time, they are in some ways ahead of the game in terms of the Green Layer 6 emerging economy—the emerging Layer.

Steve: Yes, there's a lot of complexity to unpack there. China has been through a Republican phase, which is a Scientific-Industrial kind of a situation, in the early 1900s.

Nyck: Until the revolution.

Steve: Up until the Communist Revolution, which helped them back into the Authoritarian kind of a set up, so right there, you've got early waves of change which have been repressed by, or suppressed by, the emergence of older values again. As a very, very rough generalisation, it seems that the Eastern world, Eastern countries, have a tendency to hang on to communal values more than individual values, and the opposite is true for the West, it seems. Certainly in recent history, that's been the case. What we're seeing now, it appears, is that the West, and particularly the USA, has been globally dominant with individually-oriented values from the Scientific-Industrial paradigm, and now that's collapsing and we're seeing China rise up, but there is a lot of complexity in which values are driving what they're actually doing, and there are questions to be asked around, 'Okay, we see them increasing the use of electric buses but is that because it's coming from a new paradigm values set, or is it simply because it's coming from an efficiency, success-based Layer 5 values set, which sees this as the most efficient way of dealing with the pollution problem?' That sort of points out the precarious nature of trying to put human values onto material things, because you actually can't do that—although people do it all the time. People say, 'this is bad, that's bad, drugs are bad', but in fact, these things have no moral aspect to them whatsoever. The morality arises from the human employment of them as tools, or for whatever reason, but we do this all the time. It's part of human nature and obviously, it's also tied to certain values sets—this wanting to put our own moral values onto material things and say, 'this is good, that's bad.' So in unpacking the situation in China, which is quite

complex, just because we're seeing the emergence of electric vehicles doesn't necessarily indicate the rise of dominance of a new paradigm.

If we look at China, it's still very much controlled by an authoritarian regime which is linked to the Layer 4 Agricultural-era values, and we see from their history that they moved beyond that early in the 1900s, but then they fell back into it again with the Communist Revolution, and so with change being what it is and knowing the trajectories of change, we can say that, 'Okay, well, the next evolutionary step for them would be for the communist government to give way to a republican-style rule, which is going to free up the free enterprise nature that we see growing in China', and many of the predictions are saying that China's going to rise up and it's going to be the next global power.

Nyck: I think Martin Armstrong predicts that by 2030, 2032, doesn't he?

Steve: Yes, that's right. Again, this figure of 2032 is emerging is a significant time for change, but within that, even though we can look at these large-scale patterns and we can put labels on them, it's not true to say, for example, that America is all Modern Scientific-Industrial in its values. It's not. These values sets are always layered and so there's a very huge part of America which still sticks to the absolutistic religious-style values and the previous values sets also. So while it's essential to simplify things to explore these ideas of human values sets and how they impact our behaviour and how they dominate what's going on, in the simplification, we have to always remember that it is a simplification. If we want to dig down deep, the actual real circumstances are much more complex and they're nested layers upon layers upon layers of different values which are all interacting to provide an entourage effect. Starting to understand that entourage effect and how all these different things work together to produce a certain outcome is part of our movement into this new emerging paradigm of having a more complex understanding which is going to help us cope better with life.

Nyck: You also feel, though, that China is going to be under a lot of ecological pressure because of how it's built itself and just the movement of the world, let alone whatever is going to happen with the climate. Just the very fact of this sort of development through Layer 5, the Orange layer, is going to see Green [Layer 6] emerge quicker, because they can't afford, really, to have the huge amount of ecological pressures that the West, in building our societies, has used up—the resources and the like.

Steve: I think that's quite possible. If this seeming tendency of the East to favour communal systems and the West to favour individual systems is accurate, then what it can mean is that the Eastern countries might move more quickly through the individually-oriented value sets or paradigms, whereas the opposite applies in the West.

The West would most likely tend to hang onto the individually-oriented paradigms longer and then move through the communal ones more quickly. So what may happen with China—and this is just pure speculation—is that China may move quite quickly through an enterprising Republican phase and into a communal Layer 6 network-centric, humanistic paradigm more quickly than we expect.

Nyck: You are tuned to *Future Sense* here on *BayFM 999*. Thanks for your texts. I'll just mention a couple of them. Someone said, in regards to the electric buses in China: "Wouldn't it be coal-fired stations that would produce electricity to charge the buses in China?" Probably true, but at least they're not emitting further crap out of their exhaust pipes.

Steve: I did see a photograph recently of a very large solar farm in China which had been constructed in the shape of the panda bear. It's true.

Nyck: I believe you.

Another text, from Peter Morgan: "Fractally speaking, there will be much collapse at the local level. Greed, selfishness, individualism in the Byron Shire is also necessarily unsustainable. Thanks, guys. All the best." Yes, well nothing is going to escape the changes that need to happen, that's for sure, and we're certainly seeing a bit of a retreat into individual opinions and positions in this shire as well—politically and other things—and that's naturally part of the trend, isn't it?

Steve: Part of the regression, and considering this area, like a number of areas around the world, has been an early adopter of the new paradigm values, during the pressure of change, we always see a regression into individualistic thinking, yes.

Nyck: Let's look at some of the positive approaches.

Steve: Yes, so getting back to this analogy of being in a fog of change, it's really directing us to look closer to ourselves. This is a very strong theme of the emerging paradigm, is thinking closer to home and acting closer to home, and bearing in mind that these little pockets of change crop up as individual bubbles around the whole world, and they grow and grow and they grow to the point where the bubbles start to form together and you get the entourage effect, by working close to home and working on progressive change close to home, we're contributing to that global growth of the bubbles and the eventual emergence of the network effect and that coherence that will come from that which will

eventually tip the scales globally, and we'll see this communal way of being human—the new communal way of being human—as the new global paradigm eventually. But we've got some ways to go yet. If the signposts that we've been talking about this morning are correct, then it could be 2032 before we see a really significant global shift or a coherence of these emerging groups.

Nyck: A lot of breakdown to occur first.

Steve: Yes.

Nyck: I'm thinking, as you mentioned the entourage effect, we really want to emphasise this. It's such a beautiful concept and it's very obvious to most of us and yet it does speak a lot about how we are moving in the future. I'm thinking that even things like the local farmers markets are a sort of entourage effect in themselves—the way that people tend to grow local food and come together in markets, the whole system of the farmers markets is an entourage effect in and of itself.

Steve: Yes. So I guess the good news is that as the old paradigm is collapsing and we're seeing all of our social institutions fall apart, at the same time, the new paradigm is rising. It's always important for people to be operating in all domains in terms of trying to bring change, and I wouldn't discourage people from trying to tweak the old paradigm systems that we have and make them more user-friendly and more communally-oriented. There's nothing wrong with that at all, but the opportunity also exists now for us to think locally and to focus on building new paradigm systems in our local towns, rebuilding the village. I think that's a very, very strong concept at the moment—occupying the local villages and improving local resourcing. We will see, and there is already a strong emerging theme of relocalisation of everything according to the new paradigm, that people want that. People want to know that their food was grown under the right circumstances and it's not contaminated with pesticides and those sorts of things, and one of the best ways to know that is to know the local people who grow your food locally and to get your organic food locally and those sorts of things. So I'd encourage people not to get distracted by the wider chaos which is being portrayed—sometimes accurately, sometimes quite inaccurately—in the media, and think closer to home and start building this new world in your local area. If everybody does that—and everybody will be naturally drawn to do it eventually anyway as they change personally—then it's going to add to this collective effect globally and we're going to see big turning points where things really shift in significant ways.

Nyck: Thanks for your input here. A couple of little things coming out. I heard this on the news this morning, too, in terms of some of the changes that are necessary. We're

not talking specifically about climate change today, but I think it's interesting that "Labor is going to ban the use of Kyoto credits to meet Australia's Paris climate commitments in a key decision that opens up a gulf between Scott Morrison and the opposition leader, Bill Shorten, on the environment just weeks out from the federal election" (<https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/fake-action-labor-will-not-use-kyoto-credits-in-major-new-emissions-package-20190331-p519cy.html>). That's a rather interesting one, that one. It is a kind of reconfiguration—a bit more honesty in that particular equation, whether or not we agree with the direction it's going in—but I can feel a sort of a tendency, I think, in the Labor Left in this country, and generally speaking in the Left, to start becoming a little bit more honest and a little bit more authentic and have a bit more integrity within their own structure themselves, whether or not their policies are right—that's another question. But to actually say, 'well no, we're not going to do this, that's an easy way out. Let's take the slightly harder route', I think that's a key moment going on right now.

Steve: It is, and as I've been saying, we ought to expect the uncovering of further hidden agendas in all aspects of life and all our social systems, and the whole climate discussion, I think, is simply another example of that. I think there are going to be revelations in years to come which will reveal that what we're being fed about climate change and those sorts of things, and the science around them, is not exactly as it seems and there are hidden agendas at work there also.

Nyck: Yes, indeed. Another piece has just come in. Thanks to our good friend and compatriot on the team, Professor Ross Hill down there in Melbourne, because he's also sent us a piece. It has nothing to do with what we're talking about—or has it? A Russian Tu-154M-ON (that's the NATO reporting name) reconnaissance plane has conducted a surveillance flight over US military facilities located on the west coast of the country and actually has flown over the famous Area 51 (<https://www.ruaviation.com/news/2019/3/30/13251/?h>). What are they looking for there? Are we going to see revelations regarding this?

Let's go out on a limb just for the last couple of minutes. Are we going to see revelations about UFOs? How do you feel about that? What do you reckon? Because it's an area where so many people are attached to, or hoping that we're going to be saved from, and so on and so on. Are we ready for them anyway? I don't think we're ready for them.

Steve: I don't think you want to know what we're really thinking—I'm not sure we're ready for that—but yes, I would say certainly, yes. In my travels as a futurist around the world, I've met people that I know and trust who have inside perspectives on the US government programmes that aren't public knowledge, and I think there's a lot to come out around that. I'm a true believer in the existence of life beyond planet Earth, and I think their presence is closer than many people suspect. I do also think that generally

planet Earth is a very early stage civilisation in comparison to what else is out there in the big universal multiple universes.

Nyck: Hard not to have a large degree of hubris if we simply don't know of the existence of other species out there: 'If we're the only thing here, we're pretty damn good, aren't we? Look at us.'

Steve: If you see some of the images that are coming in from *Hubble* and other sophisticated cameras that we have pointing to the sky at the moment, the sheer number of galaxies and the number of planets that must be in those galaxies mean that mathematically—if you want to be just like a strict, materialist reductionist here and talk about mathematics—the mathematical probability of there NOT being life out there is astronomical, pardon the pun. It's just simply statistically unbelievable that we're the only life forms here. Human nature is such that we will project our own nature onto what we think is out there. This is why we read so much about scary ETs and this and that and the other, but if you actually look at the descriptions, what they're really describing is human nature, not other nature.

Nyck: I want to point out, on that subject about what is outside of our own solar system and beyond, there is a lovely *Netflix* programme you might have come across—I mentioned it to you, Steve—called *One Strange Rock*, which means the Earth.

Steve: Yes, I just watched the first episode of that recently.

Nyck: It's pretty interesting, isn't it? There's some good stuff in it. Will Smith is the host in it, but it features 8 astronauts who spent over 1,000 days in total between them out in space, on space stations or in rockets, looking at, well, the whole history of the planet—geologically, socially, everything really—and its place in the solar system; in its place in the cosmos. So it has a nice sort of philosophical/slightly spiritual aspect to it, but it's very scientific as well, and it really is looking at the big perspectives, the big cycles, and I think it is really important that we start to look at those bigger perspectives now as much as we can.

Steve: Absolutely. I've got a keen interest in the moviemaking industry, largely because of my good friendship with our Texan Elf, Mitch Schultz.

Nyck: The Texan Elf. He'll be here soon.

Steve: He will be, he's coming to visit. I think they've done some wonderful production work in that series, switching from the macro to the micro—the big off-planet pictures of the Earth and then they'll switch to some tiny plant busting out of the soil. It's very, very good, very mind-expanding.

Nyck: Any last words? We've got to finish up now. Time is up.

Steve: Take care, folks.

Nyck: Take care. Beautiful. Will be back next week. And don't forget, you can check out the podcast of this show on your favourite platform, particularly on *iTunes*. You can check us out on *Twitter* @futuresenseshow, and we will let you know there when the podcast is available—usually 2 or 3 days after the show when it is edited up. We do take out the music and the announcements and so forth, so you get the raw conversations.

Steve: That's right, and before you tune in again, check out the entourage effect. Take that for test drive and see what you think.

Nyck: Good idea. Thanks, Steve. Next week.

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.