



## 20. Collapse of Confidence in Government

Recorded on 15<sup>th</sup> 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](http://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 on *BayFM* 999 with myself, Nyck Jeanes, and my co-host, Steve McGon... McDonald. Good morning, Steve.

**Steve:** It's me, it's me. Good morning, Nyck.

**Nyck:** I couldn't get your name out there, McDonald.

**Steve:** That's ok. I'll let you off.

**Nyck:** Classic Scottish name. Do you relate to your Scottish heritage?

**Steve:** I certainly do. Yes, for sure. It's not all that far back, really, that my great grandfather on Dad's side came out from Edinburgh, so it's a fairly recent link there.

**Nyck:** My middle name is Scott, as you know. I too have a Scottish grandfather.

**Steve:** Yeah, right.

**Nyck:** Apparently. Beam me up. And that's what we're going to do today, folks. We are going to beam you up here on *Future Sense* into well, among other things, we are going to take a bit of a look at the future; beam you up into a prospective future—just a bit of a take.

**Steve:** Absolutely, yes. Over the last week, I've been refreshing a list of predictions that I've been compiling for a while now from various sources—completely disconnected sources is what I like to find that actually concur—where there's a similarity of predictions coming from a completely different angle. I look for those overlaps and so I put together a list of interesting predictions of key events. We will probably look roughly about 15 years ahead during the show—and I'm not saying that these predictions are going to come true or that they're going to be accurate. Most likely they're not accurate, but what it does layout is a change trajectory, and it gives us some clues as to how the world is going to be changing over the next 15 years or so, and the kind of trajectory that we're going to go on, so that's useful.

**Nyck:** Fantastic, and of course, as always, folks, you can communicate with us via the text line, which comes up on the screen right in front of us here: 0437 341119. If you haven't already, you should put it into your phone—the text number for all shows here on *BayFM*. You can communicate with us regarding stuff that we're talking about or anything you'd like to bring to our attention.

**Steve:** And of course, there's a few interesting things in current affairs right now, aren't there?

**Nyck:** And we will be referring to those things when we look at the future this morning. Of course, the big story, I guess, in the last week, besides the federal election coming up, is the change in status, so to speak, of Julian Assange over there in the UK. We will take a bit of a look at some of the angles and some of the forces at play there which go to—well, one could say, the Deep State if there is such a thing. John Pilger, who was in town last week speaking—you saw him speak, Steve, at the Cavanbah Centre last week—we might talk a bit about him where that's important, because he's also, of course, a friend of Assange's and has some points of view there. But I also note that he is really pushing the barrow now in terms of what we're really doing to ourselves in terms of our journalism and our blindness. I'm seeking this word in front of me here, this phrase that I think he used is "the submissive void". I listened to the recording of Pilger's talk the other night and he talked, in the introduction, about meeting Leni Riefenstahl, who is Adolf Hitler's great propagandist.

**Steve:** Filmmaker.

**Nyck:** Filmmaker in the 1970s, and she told him that the message in her films, the propaganda—and these days propaganda, you could say, is 'fake news'—was dependent not on orders from above, like she wasn't told to produce these things in that way, but on what she called "the submissive void" of the public, and I thought that was a very interesting phrase.

**Steve:** Yes, I think the point that Pilger was making in relation to his conversation with her was that she didn't have the impression that they were forcing this information down the necks of people, but that there was a void there which was ready to receive whatever was put out through the propaganda films, and it was easily digested by the general public, I think is what she was saying.

**Nyck:** And I guess why I'm bringing that up is, are we now in another period of being somewhat, as a populace, in a submissive void? And if so, why? One of the phrases we're going to be using this morning a bit is the notion of the 'collapse in confidence' in the powers that be—in the systems, the governance and rulers and the structures of society.

**Steve:** I think if we look back to that time during the Second World War, it's certainly an example of a regression of general values from the Modern Scientific-Industrial back to Authoritarian absolutistic kind of thinking, so there are some similarities there, certainly, with the current times.

**Nyck:** Yes, indeed. Already someone has texted in—thanks for that: "There was an ad on Israeli TV just before the elections with a sexy girl spraying perfume on her hair from a bottle labelled 'fascist' and I thought, there's this writer SBS Spanish news ..." I don't know what that refers to, "... but also, of course, we've had in this last week the return of Benjamin Netanyahu for the 5th term as Israeli Prime Minister." That's also significant.

**Steve:** It is significant and that's an interesting ad for the hair product. I guess it holds your hair EXACTLY where it needs to be and it cannot move—a very sort of rigid fixing.

**Nyck:** Although I guess you could also say that the boundaries of that sort of hair are kind of absolute, but I'm not sure if that's really the case—whether the boundaries are that strict over there, anywhere in the Middle East.

**Steve:** Well, I imagine that your hair wouldn't be really soft to the touch. It would be rather sort of scratchy and a bit irritating.

**Nyck:** Oh, God.

---

**Nyck:** We are talking today about, in one sense, the collapse in confidence in our systems. We have seen the arrest of Julian Assange after seven years of hiding in the Ecuadorian embassy in London; the *WikiLeaks* founder and leader is now arrested and in an English prison. What will be his fate? For many of us, I think that does display a collapse in confidence in the system as a whole. This man is an Australian citizen; arguably, he is a journalist who simply exposed some of the machinations behind the scenes of those in power—of the Deep State, perhaps, if you will—whatever he did there. Is he a journalist? Does he deserve protection? Should he be charged and the like? It's a very complex equation there, so we're going to take a little bit of look at the situation with Julian Assange first of all.

**Steve:** We are. Maybe just to step back for a moment and put it in a larger context, one of the central themes of this show that we discuss is the significant paradigm shifts that are underway on the planet—and I say 'shifts', plural, because there's more than just one. We're talking about, at a deep level, a deep analysis of how human consciousness is shifting and how that is changing human values and the actual change trajectory, and the dynamics that take place, which involve what I call a 'slingshot effect'. So we're looking at a move, ultimately, beyond the Modern Scientific-Industrial paradigm and the mindset associated with that, which is an individually-oriented mindset that is very driven by individual success. As the change unfolds—and this is the case with every paradigm shift in relation to human consciousness—as we shift from one to the next, the change trajectory actually takes us initially backwards to the previous values system, or sometimes even further than the previous one to older value systems, which has the effect of building evolutionary tension, and that's like pulling back the elastic band on a slingshot. When you are going to shoot something from a slingshot, you want it to go forwards, of course, but you've got to pull the elastic band backwards to create the tension required to give it the momentum that you need to make the change, and that's exactly what is happening right at the moment—we're sliding backwards, there's a regressive search that is happening through older values sets to try and find a way of coping with the increasing complexity in our life conditions. That search is triggered by the fact that we realise at some point that our values—in other words, I'm talking now about the Modern Scientific-Industrial values that we've been living by for the last few hundred years—are no longer cutting it. We're not solving the problems that are arising because the problems are too complex and so we've got to find a new set of values. We can't see forward at this point so we look backward to say, 'OK, maybe we need to go

back to the way we used to be', and that is taking us, in this case particularly, back to the previous values set, which comes from the Authoritarian-Agricultural era of human existence where thinking was very linear, very rigid, there was one right way to do things and that right way was passed down from a higher authority. That higher authority could be a number of different things. In many cases, it's a religious authority that gives you a list of rules to live by and you've got to abide by that list very strictly, but also it can be authorities like governments, the law, the military, and those sorts of things.

So we are seeing this unfold at the moment—this slip back into authoritarian behaviour—and we'll talk a little bit more about that later on in the show, I think, in relation to the neo-liberal article that you raised, Nyck. We'll come back to that, but immediately, let's just look at how this is playing out in relation to current affairs and Julian Assange.

One thing that's popped up on our radar is an article from earlier this year. It was published on March 6th, 2019, on *Mint Press News*, which is an independent news agency based in the US I think, talking about negotiations between the *International Monetary Fund* and Ecuador (<https://www.mintpressnews.com/ecuadors-cooperation-bought-imf-loans-washington-waxes-optimistic-assange-extradition/255942/>). If you haven't been following politics in Ecuador, when Assange was granted asylum in the embassy in London, the president of Ecuador was a guy by the name of Correa, and since then he has been deposed by a new president, Moreno.

**Nyck:** Yes, Lenin Marino—an interesting name, Lenin.

**Steve:** Absolutely, and certainly there seems to be evidence of this slingshot effect where Ecuador and the government there slipped backwards into a more absolutist, authoritarian kind of an attitude. He's been in negotiations with the *International Monetary Fund* for a loan of \$10 billion and Correa, the deposed, now out-of-government president, has been tweeting about these negotiations. He said that there are a number of issues that are coming up in the negotiation process between Ecuador and the IMF. Now, the interesting thing here—an interesting link back to Assange—is that *WikiLeaks* had also been leaking information about these negotiations and they released something that said that there were certain conditions put on the IMF loan, and they were specifically—and I'm quoting from this article—the US government demands of "handing over Assange and dropping environmental claims against Chevron", which is a big oil company ...

**Nyck:** Yes, polluting the rainforest in Ecuador for quite a long time.

**Steve:** Yes, and poisoning many of its indigenous inhabitants, according to this article. There are claims here that the only way that Ecuador was going to get this money was to fall in line with US demands of handing over Assange, and here we are. This was in early March and here we are just over a month later and it's actually happened, and of course, Ecuador has secured the IMF loan.

Also, as we mentioned earlier, we have had John Pilger here in town and he pulled quite a large audience in the local sports centre. He was generally talking about current affairs—this global values shift that's happening—and the fact that fake news is rife. He made links back to the time around the Second World War, where 'propaganda' was the name for fake news back then, but he was just saying, 'look, it's basically the same thing in that there are people with agendas and this is what they're doing, manipulating public information.'

**Nyck:** And most people probably know, just as a quick aside, of the story of Edward Bernays, Sigmund Freud's nephew, who essentially basically seeded and began and started the notion of marketing and the notion of propaganda in America in the 20s, 30s and 40s when the whole structure of marketing, and thus propaganda, took on this modern expression that we now have—the very sophisticated expression that we've had in this last period of time, in the era of global mass media. It actually came from the psychology, the knowledge of the psychological process of Edward Bernays, who is Freud's nephew, so that's pretty interesting.

**Steve:** It is interesting and it's very much a product of the Modern Scientific-Industrial era if you look at the marketing industry in general. As I often say, you can liken the values set of the Scientific-Industrial mind or worldview to that of a poker player. The restriction of information—in other words, not showing your cards—is key to your power and the chances of your success. As soon as you show your cards, then basically the game's over, so in the Modern Scientific-Industrial era, there has been a lot of energy put into presenting a public image—it's a huge thing in the corporate world—and there are professionals who do nothing but craft public images for organisations. The implication here is, of course, that the public image is not exactly the same as what's actually going on inside the organisation, which would be revealing your poker cards and you don't want to do that because you lose your advantage.

**Nyck:** Now, you can digitally alter your playing cards and show them anyway. 'This is my hand, look? Oh, no, it's not my hand. Ooh!'

**Steve:** That's right. In fact I mean, there's this very interesting point behind what you said there, and that is that you can look like you put your cards on the table when you're actually not doing that, right?—as a deception, of course—but the issue here is

that when you take that public image idea to an extreme, when it becomes extreme then it becomes the same, basically, as the kind of propaganda that we saw during the war.

**Nyck:** Also, just quickly, as another little aside too, Moreno, who is the President of Ecuador as Steve's been explaining there, is also in a bit of strife himself. Again, it's a bit of a double-blind, a bit of a sort of backwards tribute, because he's actually been implicated in a major corruption scandal himself, just two days before the IMF agreement was signed, so clearly there's a very personal thing there, even for the President of Ecuador, that he probably sees it as a bit of a way out of his own puddle of muck that he may be involved in.

**Steve:** Yes, so here we've got some alignment between information that was released by *WikiLeaks* and also statements directly made by the former President, Correa, about the negotiations in relation to this IMF loan, and the fact that the IMF loan has been publicly confirmed just shows that the negotiations went forward. If what President Correa is saying about these US demands are correct, then the release of Assange was a condition of the approval of that loan. Something else that John Pilger mentioned during his talk was the fact that *WikiLeaks* released, some time ago, the *US Army Manual on Unconventional Warfare* in 2008.

**Nyck:** Oh, yes, this is a fascinating document.

**Steve:** It says quite specifically, and I checked this just to make sure that the information was right—and in fact it's in paragraph 2-44 and onwards (<https://fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm3-05-130.pdf>). The section is headed *Financial Instrument of US National Power and Unconventional Warfare*, and it goes on to say that the financial policy and co-operation or participation in international financial organisations is a key part of obtaining international influence. It actually lists in the manual here, the *World Bank*, the *International Monetary Fund*, the *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development* and the *Bank for International Settlements* as US diplomatic-financial venues to accomplish various agendas.

**Nyck:** It's pretty straightforward and I think most of our listeners would subscribe to, be aware of, or certainly have suspicions, that the very substantial amount of money that is lodged in bodies like the *World Bank*, the *IMF* and similar, are used—can be used, will be used, have been used, and increasingly and boldly—right in the face of all of this, being used to manipulate world affairs in these kind of ways. I think most of us know that and yet there's a sort of disempowerment there because we simply aren't playing in the same ballpark as the people with billions of dollars to throw around.

**Steve:** Yes, I'd just like to make the point that on this show, we don't seek to make any particular political agenda our central purpose. We don't have a political agenda, we're simply attempting to make sense of the present and the emerging future by looking at what's going on, basically, and just putting pieces of the puzzle together and making a deep analysis of the key players, and so this is what we're seeing. This is what has happened: Assange's asylum status has been revoked by Ecuador, he has been ejected from the embassy in the UK; interestingly, he didn't walk out of his own volition, he was carried out by UK police who were apparently invited into the embassy to do that.

**Nyck:** Which is also a dubious international law fact itself, isn't it, I think, allowing police into an embassy?

**Steve:** I haven't verified this myself, but I understand that once you grant asylum to somebody, you can't withdraw it. I understand it's part of international law, but we live in a time when the rule of law ain't what it used to be and our very own government here in Australia is guilty of all sorts of breaches of international law because it suits them.

This comes back to the worldview and the values set of the Scientific-Industrial era, which is different from the previous values set from the Authoritarian-Agricultural era, which was very strict and was handed down from on high, so there was no negotiation of that list of things. I mean, if you take, from a Christian point of view, the Ten Commandments, you don't negotiate those things—they are what they are and you either abide by them or you don't—but in the transition to the Scientific-Industrial era, we discovered that we don't need to follow the higher authorities' rules.

Knowledge back in those days all came from a higher authority. If you wanted to know something, then you would petition to the higher authority for an answer, but through the Scientific Revolution and the European Enlightenment and things like that, humanity came to a different worldview, which was that we could actually go and investigate using the scientific method and find the facts out for ourselves, and in that same process, we could then craft our own rules for living by. When the key driver is success, then it becomes a slippery slope because you say, 'well, if I'm going to be successful, then I can't actually follow that rule, I just need to tweak it a little bit', and so throughout the hundreds of years of this particular era, we've seen the slow degradation of rules and standards and the rule of law.

**Nyck:** Morals, values and ethics were put aside or manipulated or adjusted to suit.

**Steve:** Yes, they became a moveable feast. Anybody who has anything to do with the Western legal industry or establishment these days will know that the law is very, very,



very much a moveable feast and if you've got a good barrister, then there ain't much that you can't get around.

**Nyck:** Of course, with all of these things it's not straightforward—it's not black-and-white—and there are many people who consider that Julian Assange, for example, is not a journalist. A piece by Peter Greste in the *Sydney Morning Herald*—Peter Greste was the journalist who was jailed in Egypt recently; obviously, a pretty dynamic and forthright journalist in his own right—but he says in a piece just a couple of days ago that essentially Assange is not, strictly speaking, a journalist; that in the leaking of all the documents via *WikiLeaks* and dumping them onto his website, he exposed the names of Afghans, for example, who had been giving information on the Taliban to US forces. He goes on to say, "journalism demands more than simply acquiring confidential information and releasing it unfiltered onto the Internet for punters to sort through. It comes with responsibility" (<https://www.smh.com.au/national/assange-is-no-journalist-don-t-confuse-his-arrest-with-press-freedom-20190412-p51di1.html>). What do you think about that? I mean, it's hard to know exactly what the truth is, of course, about how this all came about and what actually happened and where it came from, but given that, is he a journalist, does he deserve to be protected under the freedom of the press in our societies?

**Steve:** From my point of view, I'd probably say he's more a publisher than a journalist, but I'm not sure that it changes the argument, really.

**Nyck:** Well no, because it puts *The Guardian*, *The New York Times*, *The Sydney Morning Herald* and a number of other publishers who published some *WikiLeaks* documents at risk as well.

**Steve:** They're in the same boat, exactly. There are a lot of big issues which are challenged by this occurrence. Another one, of course, is the whole idea of diplomatic immunity and of an embassy being your own state within another country, right?

**Nyck:** I always found that curious, myself.

**Steve:** It's curious, but it's absolutely primary to the way that we conduct ourselves on the planet at the moment. If you take away that immunity, that safety of having your own ground within someone else's country and knowing that it's safe and it's not going to be imposed upon—and I guess we can't actually say that the UK imposed on the diplomatic immunity in this case because the story is that Ecuador has invited them in, but even so, the fact that the asylum pledge was broken ...

**Nyck:** Yes and I think that's really key in general in our societies now, that it's very hard for anything to be absolutely safe and secure. So, again, it's another piece of information that we receive and go like, 'oh, even if I'm supposedly protected under these kind of laws, I'm not actually protected', and that has references to people's individual lives in small ways, perhaps, I think.

**Steve:** That's right and one of the outcomes is that we're seeing a gradual but severe degradation of confidence in government; the rule of law is not what it used to be. There are so many occurrences over the last decade or two where international law has been breached knowingly and with disregard for the consequences by national governments. There's a long list of them, including our own here in Australia, and if you can't trust the rule of law and you can't trust your government to follow the rule of law, then who do you trust? This is actually the early stage of a gathering snowball of the lack of confidence that we'll talk about a little bit more shortly when we start to look at the predictions for the next 15 years and how this is going to play out.

Nyck and I also looked this morning at an article by Rudy Giuliani (<https://www.mintpressnews.com/rudy-giuliani-julian-assange-not-prosecuted/253420/>).

**Nyck:** Yes, I've got that up in front of me, too. We're on the same page as usual. It is from January 2nd, 2019 so it comes a couple of months before the change in status of Assange, namely his arrest in the UK, but Giuliani—as Donald Trump, the President of the United States' lawyer still—he said about Assange that he should not be prosecuted.

**Steve:** Yes, he said that: "Julian Assange has not done 'anything wrong' and should not go to jail for disseminating stolen information, just as major media does." He gave some examples: the *Pentagon Papers* were stolen property and that was in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, and nobody went to jail at the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*; he said there were other revelations, for example during the Bush administration, such as the *Abu Ghraib* issue, which was the jail where there were all sorts of human rights abuses going on in the Middle East. In relation to the leak there, he says: "all of that is stolen property taken from the government, it's against the law. But once it gets to a media publication, they can publish it for the purpose of informing people." Giuliani actually says, and I quote: "You can't put Assange in a different position. He was a guy who communicated."

**Nyck:** In this article, Giuliani does say that it's not right to hack, and I guess that might be where they seek to get Assange if they do get him back to the United States and charge him with something.

**Steve:** Yes, it remains to be seen if there's actually any credible evidence around that. I mean, I know there have been claims.

**Nyck:** He has a history.

**Steve:** He does, this is true, he does certainly have a history, that's for sure. He's perhaps best known for hacking *NASA* in his early days.

**Nyck:** Yes, amazing. You are tuned to *Future Sense* here with Steve McDonald and Nyck Jeanes.

---

**Nyck:** Here on *BayFM*, you are tuned to *Future Sense*. Thanks for your texts—some challenging ones; we will come back to those a little bit later on—and thank you for everything that you communicate on the text line. We're very happy to receive anything that you want to say, as long as it's fair and, you know, kind enough. The text line is 0437 341119.

We're going to come to a bit of a timeline—a projected possible timeline going into the future—but we're talking at the moment about some of the major issues running here in the world currently. We've been talking about Julian Assange in particular, and Rudy Giuliani, the lawyer of Donald Trump, who came out a couple of months ago, before the arrest of Assange, before the change in status, and said that he should not be prosecuted. The question is: what's going on inside the Administration? Because, of course, Trump, back during the election in 2016, actually said how he loved *WikiLeaks*. So it's a mixed bag, a confusing situation.

**Steve:** Yes, somebody sent me a tweet by Trump, which was a response to Assange's arrest, and it really gave me the impression that he was washing his hands of it; like he really was standing back and saying, 'oh, well', which is interesting. It poses the question: what's going on inside the US Administration in terms of who's driving the bus? Who's been influencing things like the negotiations for the IMF loan with Ecuador? And is Trump fully aware or is he consenting to what's going on? Is he driving it? We don't really know.

I had a phone call over the weekend from a good friend of mine and founder of the *Arlington Institute*, which is a futurist think-tank based in West Virginia in the USA (<https://arlingtoninstitute.org>). John's a wonderful friend of mine; he is a former US Navy jet pilot, actually. When he retired, he decided that he was going to become a futurist—and g'day John if you're listening. He actually went on a tour of the world—I

think this was back in about 1989—with the intention of speaking to as many professional futurists as he could. He said, around that time if I remember correctly, there was something like about 200 people in the world who were calling themselves futurists, and so he did that and got a really good feel for what was going on in the space. Ever since then, he's done a lot of very interesting work through the *Arlington Institute*.

He said to me that it's just so hard to know what's going on and he's finding this time extremely confusing because there is so much fake news out there. It's very, very hard to verify information and very, very hard to know exactly what's going on and who's driving the bus. I think for me, it just reinforced the importance of the kind of deep analysis that we're attempting to do here, which is looking beyond the surface-level facts and opinions and looking at the deep human values that are actually driving behaviours. While we also can't be exactly sure what's going on, what we can do is we can identify certain themes and trajectories for the change process that's underway.

**Nyck:** Yes, so we're going to launch into some of this timeline.

**Steve:** We will, yes. I was just going to make the point that one of the problems that we're facing at the moment, politically, is that there are a whole bunch of converging influences which are making it more and more difficult for people to maintain their confidence in government. Those influences include things like the corporate capture of governments.

As the Scientific-Industrial corporate-military era is coming to a close, it's a little bit like a combustion engine that's almost at the end of its life, and as the parts get older and they wear down, the engine actually runs faster and produces more power for a brief period of time just before it blows up. That's because the metal parts, as they wear down, are actually reducing the friction that normally keeps the compression seal and those sorts of things on the pistons, and just before they lose compression and blow, the engine is actually running faster than ever. We're seeing this Scientific-Industrial paradigm racing in an attempt to try and maintain control in the face of increasing complexity. It's trying harder and harder, and to a certain extent it's actually more successful than it's ever been in terms of control, but the indications are that it's about to blow, perhaps within the next 15 years. So there are things like corporate capture, the narrowing of political choices, so when we look at the options we've got when we go to vote, the spectrum is pretty narrow and certainly we're seeing here in Australia—there ain't much difference between what used to be called the Left and the Right of politics.

**Nyck:** Yes, it seems like the Centre is a place that nobody wants to be anyway. The excessive polarisation continues unabated in various ways, no matter what the claims

are, but it seems like the Centre, the place of perhaps—perhaps—some rationality at times regarding some issues, is kind of void at the moment and people are tending to align to the extremes as, again, a place of safety and security.

**Steve:** Certainly the extremes are pulling in that direction for sure, but consider that, for example, we're about to go to the polls here in Australia at a federal election, and recently the economic policies were in the media, comparing the two major parties—the Labor Party and the Liberal Party—and there wasn't much difference, really, apart from some really minor tax issues.

**Nyck:** I should bring to the fore just in regards to this—because it does go to what we're talking about with regards to the economic power that is employed by governments around the world now to manipulate, particularly by the US in the way that we're talking about them being the instruments of the *IMF* and the *World Bank* and the like—or are they? Just mentioning the *Adani* situation, I was with a good member of the local Greens yesterday, briefly, and he was telling me that one of the issues that the Greens have been told about by the Labor Party is ... because the question is: why has Labor been very slow to come up against *Adani*, just to draw a line in the sand somewhere? They haven't really done that, but it's claimed that this is because Australia is a signatory to the TPP, the *Trans-Pacific Partnership* that we all know about which Trump pulled America out of a couple of years ago; that we are signatories to the TPP and this means that if *Adani* does not go ahead, the potential for *Adani* to sue Australia for the loss of income through the TPP to the tune of something like \$200 billion means that Labor is very reticent to go up against *Adani* and that proposed development. Now, I don't know if this is the absolute truth, but it does factor into this manipulation of affairs via economics, as we've seen before. So keep an eye on that. If you're not familiar with that already, do some research about it. I haven't had time to have a good look at that but apparently this is the truth from inside the Greens here in Australia and what they've learnt from the Labor Party.

**Steve:** Certainly there's a general theme there of what I call corporate capture of government in various ways, and with the narrowing of political choices, the absence of opportunities for the general public to significantly influence political policy during a government's term—we only really have a chance to have significant influence at election time and even then, the choices that we're given are essentially narrow, bad choices. With the degradation of our political system—and really it's disempowerment and it's manipulation by money, essentially—what that means is that we're not attracting the best people into politics. So many people that I come across are shaking their head and say, 'look, there's no-one here that I really want to vote for, no-one has any impressive track record or they don't present themselves as being solid leaders, so what do you do?'

Again, this ongoing theme of the reduction of confidence in government, and we will get to that timeline shortly and look at a few potential future milestones around that, what it is doing though—the absence or the lack of confidence; the failing confidence in government—is giving power to, momentum to, grassroots organisations which are looking for ways to change the system in the absence of established and accepted and refined ways of changing the system. Extremist thinking is growing, and one of those organisations that's popped up recently is something called *Extinction Rebellion*.

**Nyck:** *Extinction Rebellion*. Strong terminology.

**Steve:** It is strong terminology. I guess one of the key drivers is climate change and the risk that they see in failing to address our adaptation to climate change; or attempted control in the absence of attempted control over the climate. There was an article in *The Guardian* recently about some activism that has been taken place in the UK where there have been some public protests trying to bring attention to their organisation to garner support, I guess—widespread support—and I've seen a few people in my sort of sphere of influence who've cropped up posting links to this organisation.

**Nyck:** There has been quite a big meeting in Hyde Park in London with the *Extinction Rebellion* movement. What is it actually saying, for those who don't know what it actually is, because it's still hard to pin down precisely? Clearly, the notion that there is a sixth extinction upon the planet has recently hit the press quite a lot; the idea that we are in the middle of a vast level of change on that level, on the physical level, mostly driven in this view by climate change of one sort or the other. But the notion of rebelling against that extinction, what does that look like? How do you do that exactly? What do we do? What's the impulse there?

**Steve:** Certainly people are quoting Gandhi and what happened in India as an example, and again, this aligns with this backsliding—this regressive search back to older values. We look back to that colonial time where that absolute authoritarian kind of control system was still in place in government—in the British Empire in this case. Gandhi led a massive non-violent protest movement there, which was ultimately successful, of course, and so people are looking to that kind of thing as an example. The question is whether in this day and age, with all the fake news and the anger that's growing around hidden agendas which are being revealed and those sorts of things, is whether we have a leader who will step up like Gandhi, who has the capacity to temper those angry responses and those sorts of things, and avoid clashes which could quite ultimately turn into violence and civil war. The *Yellow Vest* movement in France is an example of how things can overheat and there's certainly been a lot of violent riots and those sorts of things happening there.

**Nyck:** We will take a break again in a second, but I guess it's a good place to launch into the predictions regarding all these things, because I do know that certainly, in your little summary that we're going to be speaking to here, in this year that we're currently in there is civil unrest predicted in various countries, and we are seeing that. People are frustrated, people don't know, and about the only place they can go to now, I think, is into the streets and do what they can to make a noise. The question is: is that the most effective way of change at the moment?

**Steve:** Yes, we'll just speak to a couple of things that crop up at the moment. As I said previously, I'm not saying that this is going to be accurate. It most likely won't be accurate in terms of the exact timings, but what it can do is it can give us a general feel for the trajectory of change and whether we are descending into a time of chaos before we emerge out the other side into a new, more complex and more capable order—and that's certainly my reading. What I do is I look for sources that are completely independent of each other, that are coming from very, very different analytical processes, but that converge and suggest that the same kind of themes are likely.

One of those sources is Martin Armstrong from *Armstrong Economics* (<https://armstrongeconomics.com/world-news/sovereign-debt-crisis/global-recession-hard-landing/...>). I would like to make the point that it's not his personal opinion; he has a computer algorithm which he has put together over a long period of time and he, himself, is regularly saying in his blog post that this is not his personal opinion, it's simply what the computer algorithm is spitting out. His algorithm has been put together using a series of cycles that Martin has plotted out over the years, and very, very interestingly, he has found that once he put all of this in and the computer has been spinning things out, some of his cycles coincide with natural cycles, for example, the solar cycles, and when you think about it, it makes sense. He's coming from an economic angle, of course, but it makes sense that human behaviour changes when the weather changes. Obviously, when the weather is hot, people feel a particular way, and when the weather gets cold, societies slow down and have to hunker down for the winter and those sorts of things, so it does make sense that that correlation would be there.

His computer is saying that this year, in 2019, we are going to witness a cycle which is a repeat of the cycle that showed up during the 1960s when we had the time of revolution and social protest with the risk of civil unrest. He mentions France—and certainly we've seen that—and he also mentions the USA. We haven't really seen anything too significant this year in the USA that I can remember in the way of civil unrest, but it's early days.

**Nyck:** I think what we're seeing in the US, from this distance anyway, is a lot of small interactions, both in the public sphere and in the town square, where difference is

aggravated, exacerbated, played on and violently expressed at times, and so there appears to be a general feeling in the US, I think, of unrest in people themselves about what's going on.

**Steve:** Yes, without a doubt.

**Nyck:** So I think we're certainly seeing that. We haven't seen major events in the US at this time, as we've seen in a few other countries, including, of course, the Christchurch shooting recently, which is another symptom of our times, no doubt.

**Steve:** Of course, and those sorts of things are, very unfortunately, a regular occurrence in the US now.

Something else that's on the radar for next month, May, is a global liquidity crisis. This has shown up in Martin Armstrong's computer algorithm and I've also been talking to another futurist friend of mine, Benjamin Butler, who runs the *Emerging Futures Institute* based out of South Korea. Benjamin also has an economic background and he said that yes, certainly all the signs are there for a liquidity crisis to unfold in May. There could be all sorts of global ramifications for that, and it's a global crisis, not necessarily local to any particular country.

So I think we've got a few things on the radar this year that haven't shown up yet, which are yet to come. Martin Armstrong has this thing called the *Economic Confidence Model*. It is a cycle which he publishes on a graph—and we will tweet a link to that particular graph later after the show (<https://www.armstrongeconomics.com/models/7219-2/>)—and it's bottoming out. The *Economic Confidence Model* shows a couple of different things, and this algorithm is the product of overlapping cycles which Martin has observed through his many, many years of study—the study of economic history—so you get a graph that has, not regular peaks and troughs but periodic changes, particularly in an economic sense; and booms and crashes. The *Economic Model* is showing that 2020, and particularly the computer has said January 18th, 2020, is going to be a hard economic landing where the *Economic Confidence Model* bottoms out—and he's talking very specifically about public confidence in the economy and, by association, public confidence in government there.

**Nyck:** Mostly outside of the USA, he predicts.

**Steve:** The economic impact he's predicting is going to be mostly outside the USA, and that is a product of the fact that with all the various economic changes going on in the world at the moment, there's been a lot of money flocking back to investments in the



US, which is going to provide some level of protection to the US economy, he said. So 2020 is an interesting time.

There are a few other things that coincide there from other sources. One of them is that it's the beginning of the period of Grand Solar Minimum, so that prediction is in line with solar cycles.

**Nyck:** Yes, and the Grand Solar Minimum lasts until 2055, doesn't it? This is a really crucial period. If we can align to this, if this is a true model and there is a clear connection to—a correlation if not a causation between the Grand Solar Minimum period, which we are about to enter, and these forces that we're talking about—if this is the case then this is a really key thing to think about. For many people, of course, this is a way out of the purview, because it's not politics, it's not direct, it's not climate change, it's the Sun out there, and yet, does the Sun actually have this powerful influence through its cycles?

**Steve:** We've spoken on the show before about the work of Professor Valentina Zharkova, who's a mathematician and astrophysicist who is based in the UK at the moment, and she has done some amazing leading-edge analysis of the dynamics of the Sun. In particular, she has identified four different circulation patterns on the Sun, two of which are on the surface of the Sun and the other two are subsurface, so there are two sets of two which are in what you would call the northern and southern hemisphere of the Sun. Those different cycles can come in and out of phase so they can all be in sync, or a number of them can be out of sync, and what she has noticed is that if we look back to the period of what was called the Maunder Minimum, where the Earth essentially went through a mini ice age—a cold period—at that time, two of these cycles were out of sync. Heading into this new Grand Solar Minimum—from 2020 to 2055 is the time frame in her analysis—she is saying that all four of these cycles are going to be out of phase. I guess what that means is more complexity, more disruption in the solar influence on the Earth and the Earth's climate, and from her point of view, what it means is that we are on a trajectory of global cooling and not global warming, so that's her particular perspective on that.

---

**Nyck:** You are tuned to *Future Sense*, and I should also mention that all of our shows are edited and podcast within a couple of days after going to air here on *BayFM*. You can check those out at [www.future sense.it](http://www.future sense.it), and that website will give you access to all of those podcasts. Please have a look, there's lots of very vital information there.

Thanks for your texts. A couple of things I'll just mention. There are some texts a little off-topic so I won't go to them. We do appreciate you mentioning that *BayFM* online was a little bit 'something', and we seem to have fixed that now so it's good to have that feedback immediately from the listeners. I put our General Manager and our team onto it straight away and I think we've solved that.

I will actually mention this other text from someone who has said this about us, or about you, Steve; maybe it's about both of us. It says: "Smug, tall poppy stomping from your safe media bunker." That's us, apparently. I don't know how safe our media bunker actually is, for a start. I mean, we've already been attacked and accused of various things that we haven't mentioned here on air, and all sorts of other stuff, so I'm not sure how safe it actually is.

**Steve:** I know, but this is a well-known dynamic. I mean, as soon as you stand up and say something in public, you're subject to everybody's different opinions and we welcome that. The worst situation you can be in is everybody agreeing with you because it usually means you've got a blind spot somewhere.

**Nyck:** Exactly, and you know, the truth is—and we say quite often—we certainly do not know with absolute certainty, anything that we're saying. We are presenting information—our *Future Sense*, our sense of the future—gathered from, gathered from, and consolidated into a number of different ways of viewing the future, but particularly founded in the work of Clare W. Graves, which you mentioned quite often, and the model of human development of societal and ultimately global development and evolution that we see world affairs through. It's just a frame; it's just a model, but it seems to be very, very effective at giving quite a profound and almost an apolitical perspective, which I think is really valuable in this time. It's very easy to be Left or Right. Perhaps taking a Centre place and having a look at what's actually happening with a sort of wise eye is useful, but we're not claiming we know anything more than you do out there. Please do your own research, always.

**Steve:** On that note, I just want to quickly talk about complex adaptive systems change. Clare Graves's work is essentially a complex adaptive systems analysis of human nature, and attempting to explain human behaviour and dynamics around that. Of course, there's a vast body of knowledge around complex adaptive systems and how they behave and how they change at the moment, and I definitely attempt to draw on that as much as I can.

A complex adaptive system is essentially an intelligent system, so the 'adaptive' word in the middle of 'complex systems' implies that the system has the intelligence to sense its own environment and adapt its own dynamics and make intelligent responses to the changes in the environment. What happens when a complex adaptive system

encounters environmental change is that, first and foremost, the system takes notice, so there's a register within the system that changes occurred. The system takes notice, it becomes aware of the change, and then typically it will adapt its own behaviour. What initially happens, usually, is that it expands its normal envelope of behaviour.

Some of you might know that I have a background in aviation, and I remember being trained many, many years ago in the military system, in aerodynamics, and we got taught about the behavioural envelope, or the performance envelope of an aircraft—an aircraft's performance limits in terms of how high it could fly, what kind of speed it could fly to in terms of the slowest and the fastest speed—and the structural integrity of the aircraft was plotted by test pilots. They would draw up this envelope, which was basically like a graph. It would have an envelope-shaped box and so if you fly within this envelope, then everything's going to be cool, but if you go outside the envelope—like if you fly too fast or too high or too slow or something like that—then we can't guarantee the behaviour of the aircraft; it might fall out of the sky or it might fall apart.

We can think of a complex adaptive system as having the same kind of performance envelope. That envelope is very much dependent on the environment that it's operating within, so when the environment changes, it also ultimately shifts the shape and size of the performance envelope. The complex adaptive system, when it senses this change, starts to change its behaviour and typically it will search for the new limits of that normal behavioural envelope within which it can survive and thrive. From the outside, it can look like chaos because there will be spikes in performance at all extremes of the complex adaptive systems behaviour. With the climate, for example, when the climate, as a complex adaptive system—and just a subtle note there that I'm assuming that there is intelligence sitting behind the climate and that it has its own capacity to adapt and respond—when it senses change, then the first thing it's likely to do, according to this recipe, is it's going to start spiking its performance in all directions. So we'll get more extreme heat, more extreme cold.

**Nyck:** It's like having a fever, isn't it, in a way?

**Steve:** I guess that's one way to look at it. It steps outside of its normal performance or behaviour range, and essentially searches for the new limits: What are the new limits of what I can survive in and thrive in given these new environmental conditions? That's a known characteristic of a complex adaptive system and something that we can count on and look for when we're trying to analyse what's going on in the world. The system is searching for new limits; it's trying to find its optimum operating parameters given the new conditions.

For somebody who doesn't understand the characteristics and the dynamics of a complex adaptive system, this can look like chaos; it can look like hell—something's gone wrong here, the system's out of control, look at it, it's all over the place. It's all over the place for a very intelligent purpose, and that is to find what the new limits of this

envelope are. Eventually, once it's gone through that—taking notice and expanding its performance parameters, defining the new limits—it will find its new sweet spot; it will find the edges of this envelope within which it can survive and thrive and then there will be a gradual return to stability within this new operating envelope. Depending on what kind of system you're talking about, the change in limits can show up as all sorts of different things. In the case of climate, there can literally be new climate characteristics on various parts of the planet.

This little recipe for complex adaptive systems change can be applied to any complex adaptive system, so we can look at any system that has human design or human involvement, basically—human psychology and psychiatry. You can also think about, and I have thought about, mental health in this way as well. So when the environmental conditions change and particularly if they change radically for a person, then the person's own complex adaptive system needs to go through that same process—go to some extremes of behaviour in order to find how to cope given the new environmental conditions—and often that kind of thing is diagnosed as mental illness.

**Nyck:** And of course, I have said on this show I think, that the biggest problem in one sense on the planet at the moment is indeed mental health, because we are actually in such an insecure, unsafe, unstable unknown, and within that collapse in confidence—we've mentioned the era of human endeavour—it's very difficult to actually be certain about anything. Clearly that will tend to bring up your childhood issues, for example, your childhood psychology, other elements of your psychology through your life. Your particular narrative, your story, of course, is individual, as is mine; you don't know how that's going to interface with this complex adaptive system as it's moving faster and faster every day, and as we're finding, it is more and more difficult to be certain about anything, really.

**Steve:** If we relate that back to current affairs now, we can see that environmental conditions are changing radically for us across many different disciplines and areas of life, and apart from the fact that in the background the planet is changing, the climate is changing; we've got all sorts of changes to our normal operating systems, our social systems. With discoveries like 'ok, well maybe we can't rely on the rule of law so much anymore and maybe we can't rely on governments to abide by the rule of law', what that means is that you've got to expect this same change dynamic to play out in societies as complex adaptive systems. People will start looking outside and stepping outside the normal boundaries of behaviour and trying to find where the new limits are here: What is my operating envelope that I need to remain within in order to thrive and survive under these new conditions?

Sometimes those new limits of the envelope will be outside the old limits, and so that's going to look like radical extreme behaviour. This is why we're seeing elements in society now saying, 'OK, we need to actually step outside the box. We've been operating

within this box, it doesn't seem to be working so much anymore, so let's just figure out what the new box looks like', and a normal process for a complex adaptive system is to go beyond the old boundaries to find what works under the new conditions.

**Nyck:** I guess that partly explains, perhaps—or does it?—the rise in extremism on both ends of the polarity.

**Steve:** It does exactly explain it. That's the same dynamic—it's the same dynamic that you would find in any complex adaptive system. It doesn't only explain it, but allows us to predict it, right?

**Nyck:** Yes, and also gives us, perhaps, a little bit more ease in responding to it, and allowing us to realise these moments of extremism, wherever they're coming from—whether it's from the Right or the Left or from wherever; sometimes deadly and horrible and tragic for sure, and they shouldn't be happening but they are happening. But as seen as an expression of pushing the boundaries, pushing the limits, trying to find, as you're saying, this new definition of the self within society ...

**Steve:** Yes, what's the new normal? What is the new box that we're operating from?

**Nyck:** It excuses nothing, of course, but it does help to perhaps see it in from a bigger perspective.

**Steve:** Yes, and if we can understand human nature from this same perspective, then it can help us to manage change and it can help us to predict the kind of problems that we're going to encounter as we go through known change.

Back to the timeline, what this timeline is suggesting is that we are sliding into a period of this kind of chaotic, extreme behaviour within our social systems. 2020 seems to be a significant tipping point for change and Armstrong and his computer algorithm are suggesting a big financial hiccup of some sort in January, and there are some other indicators also pointing to that same period.

**Nyck:** We also look often on this show—and you may completely disagree, I know some of you do—we do look at a deeper astrology too, these astrological cycles. We did talk about the Grand Solar Minimum. This is not an astrological cycle, but astrology also factors in here and it's certainly very interesting to investigate the movement, particularly of the outer planets in our solar system and how they relate to what's going on here on Earth. It would seem that in in January 2020—January 12th, in fact—Saturn

conjuncts Pluto exactly for the first time exactly since 9/11, since September 9th, 2001. There may be explosive change to structures and institutions indicated again at this time. Many of you will disagree with this but if you have a look back through history, there are fascinating correlations between some of the movements and the conjunctions and the aspects between the outer planets in our solar system, and it is our solar system; we do live within this frame, this geometry, this vibrational frame—very powerful, a solar system travelling through space—the planets align at certain times and they seem to correlate with events and trends and movements on the Earth.

**Steve:** One of the interesting things that came out of the recent work of Professor Valentina Zharkova as she was studying the Sun is that as the planets orbit around the Sun, at various times there are more planets on one side than the other side, and the mutual gravitational influence actually creates an eccentricity in the Sun's motion through the galaxy. So as the Sun is no doubt spiralling through the galaxy, it's not on an exact steady course. It's actually being pulled slightly off course, very slightly, by the planets as they move around. That, of course, in turn, influences the climate on the planets because it changes their angle and the proximity of the planet to the Sun. Very, very interesting stuff.

And of course 9/11 is something very close to your heart, Nyck, because you were in New York.

**Nyck:** I was there, yes. And just on that, as we mentioned briefly off-air this morning, there was something in me that didn't trust the official version straight away. Living in New York, being in New York at the time, and having the 19 terrorists' faces thrown up on the screen the very next day, and the passport that happened to have been found at the foot of the collapsed trade towers and all those sort of factors ...

**Steve:** In pretty good condition, I understand.

**Nyck:** In very good condition—well, they could identify the guy. I mean, straightaway I had big question marks in my intellect and in my heart—just in my knowing—that there was something not right about the situation. But of course, that's happened and the results of 9/11 are seen right throughout world politics and we are suffering from and under the effect of those results, still in this in this time, of course.

**Steve:** And so the same way that that particular event demonstrated explosive change to structures and institutions, we have a similar energy indicator for January 2020, which coincides with Martin Armstrong's computer saying that a huge economic disruption, which could start late December 2019 or January 2020 and continue, he is

saying, through to 2021 and beyond. He has particularly flagged January 18th as the bottoming out or, in his words, "a hard economic landing" is indicated from this *Economic Confidence Model* of his, and this is just six days after that astrological influence. It's very interesting to find correlations between astrological alignments and other predictions which are from, I guess, more mainstream or what mainstream people would regard as more concrete and reliable sources. But the timing always seems to be a difficult one, doesn't it? Sometimes, when I've tried to make these correlations, I see, 'okay, there was an alignment there which suggests something', but then nothing really showed up in current affairs until maybe some time after that.

**Nyck:** It's a complexity, isn't it? We wouldn't say—I certainly wouldn't say—that two planets in a certain configuration in the sky out there in our solar system are causing something here. That is not the case; I don't subscribe to that myself. What I see in astrology is a sort of transgenerational science. There is a reflection in astrology which is readable that can direct us to interpret events on the planet and to be aware of trends and hotspots that may or may not appear in our physical reality as some sort of event or other.

**Steve:** Yes. As I said at the start, we're not suggesting that these are going to be fully accurate predictions—they may not even come true—but what we are getting by looking at multiple sources is the suggestion of a particular theme for changes that may occur around this time. January 2020 is looking like it's going to be significant, and then later in the year, of course, we have the US elections in November, 2020.

**Nyck:** November 3rd. Yes, that's a big one, isn't it? And Armstrong has predicted, there's likely to be a reaction to, response to, and possibly even a surge in violence around those US elections. You can imagine why that could happen, of course, with Trump probably wanting to be re-elected and whoever else is up against that. In this climate that we have on the planet now of instability and a collapse in confidence, you can imagine that the next US elections may be something that we've never seen before. We probably thought that last time in 2016.

**Steve:** Think back to all of the stuff that was going on in the media around the time of the previous election—the scandal that came out about the *Cambridge Analytica* influence of social media in terms of shifting voters one way or the other—and ask yourself, how is the general public in the USA going to trust the election result in November 2020? It's a big, big question and something that we need to watch very closely.

Gosh, time is flying today, isn't it? Let me just quickly skip ahead now and talk about a couple of other significant milestones. Martin Armstrong's computer is suggesting that this economic disruption is just part of an overall decline, accompanied of course by a decline in confidence towards government generally, and in the big scheme of things, this fits very much with our analysis of this paradigm shift and it gives us some idea of the timing of the decline of the dominant Scientific-Industrial paradigm and emergence of this next Relativistic humanistic and network-centric way of being human which brings a different quality of being human with it. Of course, we've got to include the slingshot effect in the middle where we're not just going straight from the one paradigm to the Postmodern or Relativistic, we're actually sliding backwards to the old systems where we get this slingshot effect happening and the tension building. There will be an emergence of chaos and then a breaking point where things tip over, and then a gradual movement of stability of some sort into this new paradigm.

Other things that are showing up on the radar here on the timeline are forecast increasing food prices due to crop losses starting about 2022. That's from Armstrong's computer and it also coincides with a prediction by Professor Valentina Zharkova, who said that between 2028 and 2032 particularly, we can expect major food shortages. In a talk that she gave late last year in London, she said that these shortages are going to be so bad that they demand some kind of preparation and anticipation by governments. That in itself is a very interesting comment, and when we relate it back to this collapsing confidence in government and the obvious collapse in the performance in the capacity of governments to manage certain issues, then it starts to paint a troubling picture for humanity globally, that we are moving into a period where all of the things that we have always thought were our anchors, those things that we can rely on—the institutions and the rule of law, all those sorts of things—all of a sudden they seem to be cutting loose and we're kind of left floating in uncertainty with the potential for serious social issues to arise as we move forward through the 2020s.

**Nyck:** Yes. Take a breath, folks, take a breath.

**Steve:** Exactly.

**Nyck:** Again, I just reiterate, as I feel to do so today, that whatever feels right to you, whatever is resonating with you, go with that. Go and do your own research. If you come to the conclusion that 'that doesn't ring for me', fine. That's absolutely true because we don't claim to know anything here. We're just offering a perspective, a certain way of looking at things.



**Nyck:** You are here on *Future Sense* with Steve McDonald and myself, Nyck Jeanes. Thanks for all your texts this morning. We can't get to all of them, quite a few have come in today. Thanks to you, Elaine—you don't have to put your name on it, by the way, folks—you don't have to do that but it's nice if you do. It says: "You guys are so onto what really matters—the real and the deep. I find your conversations each week very nourishing and sustaining. Thank you so much. Love yous heaps." That's very beautiful. Thank you.

Another one from someone else—a completely different topic. We were talking about the Earth and the Moon and the Sun before—the solar system: "The Earth supposedly spins at 1,000 miles an hour," I'm not sure, I think it's faster than that, but whatever it is: "the Moon also spins yet we only ever see one side of the Moon. Miraculous synchronicity?" It is curious, isn't it? The structure of the Earth, Moon and Sun in the solar system.

**Steve:** There are many mysteries.

**Nyck:** It's almost as if it was by design.

**Steve:** Almost, actually.

**Nyck:** But we're not going to go there today because we don't really know.

**Steve:** We've got other things to talk about. Let's get back to this timeline. We got to talking about some of the disruptions to food supply and crazy weather that is showing up in different predictions from different sources. By 2024, again Martin Armstrong's computer is suggesting strange weather events—and this is, I guess, not unexpected given what's going on for us right now. The repeating cycle of revolution, similar to the one that we had in the 1960s and which is also showing up this year, is going to repeat again in 2024. Armstrong's computer is actually suggesting that it could be an extreme example there and he's even flagged the possibility of an American civil war breaking out sometime between 2024 and 2026. I guess that's not hard to imagine given the disruptions that we've seen there.

**Nyck:** It's a big one, isn't it? I looked at that and I thought, is that really a possibility? But if you really tease apart some of the forces at play in that country, it's not unreasonable to suspect that something may occur.

**Steve:** No, all the ingredients are there. If it was a cake and you were going to bake it, what would you need? A whole bunch of guns, a whole bunch of differing opinions and differences in prosperity between different states and those sorts of things. The ingredients are there, and interestingly, if we look back to the previous paradigm shifts—so when the world was going through the last phase of the transition out of the Agricultural era and into the Modern Scientific—there was a civil war in the US and it was actually between those two worldviews. In the South, you had the Agricultural mindset in which people believed in slavery; in the North, you had the more Modern Scientific-Industrial perspective, and they went to war.

**Nyck:** Even though the North were quite happy to still use slaves in certain ways themselves, and other things like that, because it was economically viable and beneficial to them.

**Steve:** Of course. There is the argument that the slavery didn't go away, they just started paying slaves.

**Nyck:** Pretty much.

**Steve:** Here we are again in another paradigm shift where worldviews are changing, human values are changing, and so it's not beyond the possibility that the same kind of thing could happen. I think I mentioned last week that this shift that we're going through right now ought to be one of the last significant shifts that is punctuated by violence and warfare.

**Nyck:** Let's hope so. God bless.

**Steve:** The indications are that we're moving into a more peaceful way of being human in the future.

In that same year, 2024, we've got peak drought being forecast by Armstrong's computer also, and the end of GDP growth globally. A key aspect of the Scientific-Industrial era has been this idea that everything has got to grow all the time and it looks like 2024 is going to actually be a significant change to that when world growth ends.

**Nyck:** It's very true that we are now seeing a revolution similar to the 1960s—I'm just flipping back to that for a minute—with the civil unrest that was accompanied by that at the time.

**Steve:** The Psychedelic Revolution.

**Nyck:** Also in 1968 in France, and the Democratic convention in '68 also, in Chicago I think it was, but great disruptions there. All sorts of factors seem to be repeating again at this time.

**Steve:** Yes, music festival culture, getting beaten down by the dominant paradigm.

**Nyck:** Oh, yeah, okay. Don't you just love it? Don't you just love being beaten by the dominant paradigm?

**Steve:** Lots of similarities.

**Nyck:** Yes, and these reflections of course are not circular. It's important to remember that. We're not just returning to the same thing, we're coming back to a resonance on a spirallic higher level, so to speak—another level of expression of that same dynamic.

**Steve:** It's a spiral, exactly. Also around 2024, and there's some argument as to the exact date of this, but we've got, from an astrological point of view, USA's Pluto return. Do you want to speak very briefly to that?

**Nyck:** The Pluto return. One aspect of astrology is that you can determine, as per someone's birth date and birth time, the birth chart of a nation when a country was established. There is that moment where Pluto comes back to the same place that it was when you were born, or in the case of the United States, when the United States was born, which is about 268 years ago—I think that's the cycle of Pluto. Whatever it is, the long cycle of Pluto comes back to the same place that it was at when the USA was established. This, in astrology, indicates quite a revolution; a revelation too—a revolution and revelation of change and the bringing to the surface of things that are hidden in order for transformation to occur and for a new beginning to occur; for a new birth to occur, in fact. You could stretch it that far—a new birth.

**Steve:** Interesting. Moving forward then, it seems like 2028 is going to be another pivotal year, with Armstrong's computer predicting significant climate events—a turning point in terms of climate change; as I mentioned before, the beginning of major

widespread food shortages according to Professor Valentina Zharkova who has been looking at the influence of the Sun on the Earth's climate and how that might influence agriculture.

**Nyck:** It's interesting that it is pretty much 100 years after the Great Depression. We're talking about this era—the late 2020s into 2030s.

**Steve:** That is interesting. The other thing that we need to factor in here through these periods of solar minimum—and we are going through this thing called Grand Solar Minimum, which they are saying will last from 2020 to 2055—but within that, you've got a number of solar cycles. One of the Minimums is this year and then we will be moving into another one in roughly about 11 or so years later, after now. During those periods, the Earth's protection against cosmic radiation is greatly reduced because the solar wind which normally blows over the planet, is greatly reduced due to low sunspot activity on the Sun, and so we get exposed to a higher incidence of cosmic ray impact. There are some scientific studies already saying that this has health impacts for humans.

Because we're in solar minimum now, there's been a bit of research going on with high flying aircraft and I've seen videos of researchers taking little test tubes of water on high level flights and you can actually see bubble trails in the test tube where a cosmic radiation particles comes through the water and actually leaves a trail of bubbles. You've got to wonder what's happening inside our bodies? Because we're also subject to that kind of radiation.

**Nyck:** And it's really important, folks. Do you agree with this? I mean, just expanding our consciousness and awareness just for a moment if you haven't thought about that—about the influence of cosmic radiation—we are one planet in one solar system on the outskirts of an apparently fairly minor galaxy, the Milky Way, and we're travelling through space at a huge rate with all those planets revolving around the Sun. Off we go. We are continually moving through fields of cosmic radiation in the cosmos, most of which we don't really understand. Some of it we do, but we don't really know what the influence is. To not factor that into having an influence on the planet would seem to be, well, naive, actually, and I think we're moving into an era where these factors—these multifaceted, complex factors that have influence on our being—are being discovered, explored and hopefully a bit more understood as we go forward. But to take that into consideration—that everything that is happening on this planet may also be influenced by cosmic radiation coming into the planet.

**Steve:** I've been doing a bit of background study of my own, particularly looking at NASA's *Interstellar Boundary Explorer Mission* involving the *Voyager I* and *II* craft, which

are at the moment out around the boundary of our solar system's bubble. As we're sort of bursting through the galaxy, we take with us our own weather which is localised due to the Sun's activity and the Sun's solar wind.

**Nyck:** "You always take the weather with you", as the song goes.

**Steve:** Exactly. What's happening though, is we're transiting out of what's been called the Local Cloud, which is a particular sort of cloud within our galaxy that we've been flying through as a solar system. We're moving across it or through the boundary of that cloud and into the boundary of another cloud, which is called G-cloud, and with that, these *Voyager* craft are already picking up changes in what's called the "interstellar wind or weather"—the natural movement of charged particles and those sorts of things through the interstellar space. With our solar system being exposed to essentially different weather, we can expect that to have a trickle-down effect to what's happening here on the planet. I'll continue to do some study and talk about that in future programmes.

We're running a little short of time here so I might just quickly forge through here to now 2032.

We were talking about 2028. The next big blip on the radar here is in 2032, where there are a lot of predictions which are coming together. These predictions are making me think that 2032 will be a pivotal year in terms of this global paradigm shift, and it may well be the major tipping point where the current dominant paradigm of this Scientific-Industrial worldview falls from grace and we see the emergence of a dominant Relativistic worldview at a planetary level. In other words, most of the influential organisations and people on the planet will be thinking a different way—in a more humanistic way, a more network-centric way—and generally a much more communal and collaborative theme will emerge.

**Nyck:** And also more connected to nature in all its manifestations, too—that reconnection with the Earth and the notion of guardianship rather than what we've been doing for so many years of abusing, using and misusing the resources of this beautiful planet.

**Steve:** Yes, and one of the things that is making me think that way is that this *Economic Confidence Model* that is part of Martin Armstrong's computer algorithm is saying that we're coming to the end of private sector dominance in 2032. So if you think about that and you think about the rise of corporates, and you think about corporate capture of our government institutions and the general massive, widespread control that corporations have at the moment, the end of this period of private sector dominance is coming to a close in 2032 and there will be the beginning of a new wave which will be

public sector dominance, and the public sector dominance will be different than the previous public sector dominance.

**Nyck:** Yes, it's important to note we're not going back to anything here. We are going forward to something completely different—a different structure of systems; a network which is leading into a further expression.

**Steve:** This alternating pattern that's showing up in his *Economic Confidence Model* equates to the pattern that I found in Clare Graves's work where each paradigm or layer or stage of human development is characterised as either individually-oriented or communally-oriented. We can say that the private sector dominance equates to individual themes as found in Clare Graves's work, and the public sector dominance equates to the communal themes as found in Clare Graves's work, so there is a strong correlation there which is making me reasonably confident to say that this looks like it could be THE major tipping point in terms of global paradigm shift.

Other things that are showing up in his computer predictions are "a general fragmentation of Western society, including the USA which may split into four regions." So there is a possibility raised there of the breakup of the USA—perhaps not the same, but maybe we can compare it in some way to the breakup of the USSR last century. He's also flagged the possible breakup of the United Kingdom around that time, and also, interestingly, Australia.

**Nyck:** Western Australia becoming independent.

**Steve:** Yes.

**Nyck:** That's not an unlikely scenario. It's been flagged for quite a long time.

**Steve:** Yes. Also around that time, it's predicted that the global economic powerbase will shift from the US to China, and there are clear indications that that is a shift that's underway at the moment already.

Again, another key year for changes in our climate and also a potential disruption to the Earth's magnetic field, and all of those things fit with what we know about the climate cycles—about this period of Grand Solar Minimum. Around that time we'll be going through another solar minimum, which will be in the middle of the Grand Solar Minimum period. In case you missed a mention on one of our previous episodes or shows, the Grand Solar Minimum period is 400-and-thirty-something years, so we have these 11-year solar cycles and then there are the larger cycles on top of that.

**Nyck:** Maybe in the last two minutes you can just speak to this briefly: I found it really interesting to consider the impact of Second Tier higher consciousness in your timeline here—and we're talking here about Clare W. Graves again and his model. Past the First Tier, which is up to Layer 6 that we've been talking about today [Relativistic, humanistic], we're moving into the more egalitarian, communal-by-nature way of being, but beyond that, the Second Tier is something else. You're suggesting here that consciousness may reach a tipping point by necessity due to social systems collapse by 2032 which will accelerate, and out of need—out of necessity—the emergence of Second Tier consciousness on the planet. What does that mean? I know I'm putting you on the spot for two minutes here, but ...

**Steve:** That's alright. The first thing I'll say is it's very complex because we've got multiple paradigm shifts underway and we generally dumb it down, so to speak, when we're talking on this show, to the shift beyond the Modern Scientific era and into the Relativistic communal-themed era, and that's in terms of the dominant global paradigm. In other words, if you stood back and looked at the Earth, that would be the first thing that became apparent in terms of the worldview that shapes global activity. But within that, you've got layers and layers and layers and layers and so there are all of the less complex layers of consciousness, such as the Agricultural layer and the War-like layer and the Tribal layer—they all still exist on the planet. In different places where the life conditions are less complex, people are living in different ways, and where the life conditions are more complex, they're living in different ways, and this is all a function of the adaptation of human consciousness to fit with the background complexity of the life conditions. So we also have a certain number of people who are ahead of the mainstream here who have been exposed to very, very complex life conditions and their consciousness has adapted into what Clare Graves called Second Tier consciousness, which equates essentially to a quantum leap—a massive leap in capacity.

We know that Graves picked up some of these people in his research back in the 1950s—a very, very small percentage but there were some around, and that percentage is slowly growing over time—so by the time we get to 2032, there's going to be more people on the planet who are operating from that place. They, by definition, will have a much deeper and greater understanding of complex systems and a greater capacity to work with and influence complex systems and we should see, in response to what looks like a massive hiccup and milestone in our chaotic change process around that time, a stronger response and a stronger presence from that level of consciousness.

**Nyck:** Beautiful. And thanks for the last couple of texts. One person has just written: "2032 may be the shift from competition to co-operation." Well, I guess that's one way of putting it, for sure. Thanks for that.

Also thanks to our associate, professor Ross Hill, often a guest on the show when he's in town, who wrote that the correct answer to my question about Second Tier was: "Go and listen to the Second Tier episode of the podcast." That's a good suggestion so go and do that (<https://www.futuresense.it/12-second-tier-consciousness/>). You can do that at our website [www.futuresense.it](http://www.futuresense.it). It's very straightforward; you can go straight to the podcast series.

We've got to say goodbye. Thanks, Steve.

**Steve:** Thanks Nyck.

**Nyck:** See you in the future. Bye-bye.

*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](http://www.bayfm.org). Future Sense is available on iTunes and SoundCloud.*

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