



141. Desperate Measures

With Steve McDonald

Recorded on 17th December, 2021 in Byron Bay, Australia.

You're listening to the Future Sense podcast. You can find us online at www.futuresense.it

Hi and welcome to Episode 141 of *Future Sense*. I am your host, Steve McDonald.

As 2021 draws to a close, I feel it is a good time to look back and reflect on the precursors to the global pandemic which shaped our experience over the last two years. If you are not familiar with the Clare Graves model and terminology that I use, you can find a brief guide on the resources page of our *Future Sense* website, which is <https://www.futuresense.it>.

Before I dive in, I will just set the large-scale context for any new listeners. We are living through the collapse of the Scientific-Industrial era at the moment, and the parallel rise of what is next, which is a humanistic, network-centric, community focused way of being human—Layer 6 in Clare Graves's model. We saw a wave of this Layer 6 rise up back in the 1960s, and it was suppressed at the time by the old paradigm, Layer 5. This time around, though, it is here to stay and it is already starting to dominate some of our social systems. We are currently in a regressive phase of this shift between Layer 5 and Layer 6, and during the regressive phase of any such change, we go backwards to previous value systems to try them out. That is because we can't see into the future and know what the new value system is going to be, we sense that the old value system is no longer working very well, and so we think about a time when it was good and we tend to go back and try out some even older value systems and behaviours to see if they are going to solve our problems.

So, globally, we are seeing a resurgence of Layer 4 values—Authoritarian thinking. Layer 4 was dominant during the Agricultural era. It tends to be a very rigid mindset

that latches onto one right way of doing things and doesn't want to vary from that, and even a regression to, or a resurgence of, Layer 3 values as well, which is about the expression of raw power and can give rise to violence and tyranny. This regression phase acts like a slingshot to the overall shift, and so by going backwards we are creating tension on the rubber band of that slingshot. When the tension is sufficient, we will get a movement in the opposite direction and it is that tension that actually powers the shift to the more complex value system—in this case, Layer 6 and beyond.

The good news about all of this is that we are moving towards a tipping point, which seems to be predicted around 2032, that is going to tip us into Second Tier consciousness. That was a term that Graves used to represent a radical shift and a massive increase in the complexity and coping capacity of human consciousness which is really good news, but right now, we are seeing a lot of desperate measures being employed by the old paradigm, Layer 5, which is causing it to regress back to Layers 4 and 3 to try and get what it wants while it is still mostly dominant, and it is very, very desperate to hold onto its wealth and power at any cost.

In this episode, I am going to talk about: the development of global networks that sit above our formal government structures; the history of pandemic planning and simulations in the West up until the pandemic broke out; the continuing collapse of our economic system, which has been a long-term trajectory; the evolution of warfare and how warfare is changing. I am going to say a little bit about the climate movement; a little bit about the actual COVID 19 pandemic, but not too much because there is a lot of information out there on alternative media sources at the moment about the detail of that; and then I will finish by looking at what might be coming in the near future.

If you were listening to *Future Sense* back in early 2020, you might recall me saying that it seemed to me like a planned operation when the pandemic broke out rather than a natural event. I was drawing on my military experience there. I spent 15 years as a professional army officer in the Australian Army and did a hell of a lot of pre-planned exercises where I was out in the field doing something at the behest of people sitting at a desk with a list of events that they would go through and announce through radio channels and we had to respond. Those sorts of things have quite an unnatural rhythm to them. As one thing leads to another thing, it has been

conceptualised by somebody and put on paper, but when it actually plays out in the field, it rarely feels like it is a natural occurrence and I could see, as the pandemic was rolling out and the media releases were coming and the incidents were being reported, it had that very unnatural rhythm to it. Also, there were lots of things that didn't make sense, and again, I know from my past experience that when things don't seem to make sense, that usually points to some sort of hidden agenda at play. We saw this with the War on Terror, which essentially was an excuse for an endless war waged to achieve a whole range of different objectives—and not necessarily the stated military ones at times—and so I have learnt over the years to look for a different motive than the one being presented when things simply don't make sense. When you do actually find what the real motive is—the hidden motive—suddenly everything falls into place and it seems to make sense.

So if the pandemic was deliberately initiated, what was the reason? Who was behind it? To unpick this puzzle, I am going to start with the rise of transnational networks of global influence over the past 50 or so years. We have seen a bunch of international organisations created since the mid-1800s, particularly as the result of international conflict, including the *International Committee of the Red Cross*, which was created in 1863, and of course, the *United Nations* in 1945. Both of these were created as formal institutions. In more recent times, we have seen the development of loosely structured transnational networks—networking being, of course, an aspect of Layer 6. Some of these networks have held concerns about the collapse of civilisation on a global scale due to unlimited growth, destruction of the biosphere, and the exhaustion of essential resources.

The population growth enabled by the Scientific-Industrial era began causing global sustainability concerns quite early—at least as far back as 1798, when Thomas Malthus, a British cleric, published a book called *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. His wasn't the first book on population, but it fuelled debate at the time about the size of the population of Britain, and it contributed to the passing of the *British Census Act* of 1800. Other notable publications have included *The Road to Survival* by William Vogt in 1948, *The Challenge of Man's Future* by Harrison Brown in 1956, *Mirage of Health* by Rene Dubos in 1959, *The Population Bomb* by Paul R. Ehrlich in 1968, and in 1972, a report was published called *The Limits to Growth* (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Limits_to_Growth). It looked at the world's exponential economic and population growth with a finite supply of resources. It was

based on a computer simulation study done at *MIT*, and it forecasts the collapse of the global system by the mid-21st century. It was published in 30 languages, and it sold over 30 million copies, thereby raising awareness globally that with continuing growth, the world would eventually run out of resources.

These concerns were fuelled by the social, intellectual and economic turmoil of the late 1960s, which prompted a rethink of the economic growth paradigm, and of course, in the late 1960s, we were seeing an early wave of Layer 6 consciousness rise up—basically a preview of the next global paradigm—and again, this is the same value system that is rising up globally now.

The Limits to Growth report was commissioned by an organisation called the *Club of Rome*, of which David Rockefeller from the wealthy Rockefeller family was a founding member, and that was in 1968 that the club was founded. This was possibly the first transnational network that came together to discuss corrective action in the face of the sustainability issue at a global scale. The club was born out of the *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development*—the *OECD*, which is still going today—an intergovernmental organisation with 38 member countries back then, founded in 1961 to stimulate economic progress and world trade. It is interesting to note that the sustainability movement was seeded by an economically-focused organisation.

I am drawing now from an article from 2017 written by Matthias Schmelzer that was published in the *Journal of Global History* (https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Matthias-Schmelzer/publication/313483535_%27Born_in_the_corridors_of_the_OECD%27_The_forgotten_origins_of_the_Club_of_Rome_transnational_networks_and_the_1970s_in_global_history/links/5b758048a6fdcc87df810ea1/Born-in-the-corridors-of-the-OECD-The-forgotten-origins-of-the-Club-of-Rome-transnational-networks-and-the-1970s-in-global-history.pdf), and I am quoting:

The OECD has been described as a pillar of the post-WWII economic order, whereas the Club of Rome represented an intellectual insurgency against that order. The club's emergence was a key event in terms of the role of private non-state actors in international politics and their influence on both nation states and international organisations.

Here we can find, of course, the seeds of the current globalist movement. “Commenting on the social upheaval of 1968”, and he is talking here about Layer 6 values again, Matthias writes:

All around the world, policymakers were deeply worried by this truly transnational phenomena that criticized not only war, racism and conservative values, but also the injustices and the exclusions produced by capitalist growth and its materialism. Yet other developments were also contributing to these shifts. Rapidly emerging, powerful ecological movements spread the image of a vulnerable planet threatened by seemingly uncontrollable technological and economic developments.

Within the *OECD*, one of the most powerful senior officials at that time, head of the *Scientific Affairs Directorate and Science Committee*, Scotsman Alexander King, became increasingly concerned about the increasing environmental deterioration of the landscape: technology out of control, the nuclear threat, the student revolts, the hippies, and a situation in which the majority were enjoying the affluence that technology was delivering, and they craved more—much more. His concerns were shared by the *OECD* secretary general, Thorkil Kristensen.

Here is what King said at the time, and this is very significant in terms of understanding our present situation:

Kristensen and I felt that governments, although willing to debate these things, were not capable of acting quickly enough or responsibly enough to these changes. The bureaucracies of governments, even more than the ministers, are post-facto mechanisms. They only react after events and do not foresee them. They are not prepared for them...The Club of Rome was actually born inside the *OECD* around such concerns.

Schmelzer goes on to say the club was often dubbed the "Club of the Rich", and it was made up mainly of white professionals from the northern hemisphere.

In sharp contrast to environmental movements at that time, the group addressed the elites, encouraging them to manage the planet differently and provided top-down and techno-fix solutions. It became highly influential in launching a global debate, initially by informally talking to government officials, businessmen and ministers, and then much more successfully by publishing

Limits to growth, the computer-assisted analysis produced at MIT, and also by launching a major public relations campaign.

You might be thinking that this is sounding a little bit familiar—computer-assisted models, public relations campaigns and those sorts of things—it certainly is.

Back then, the macro-economists in the *OECD* criticised the *Limits to Growth* report, and eventually in 1975, they launched something called the *Interfutures Project*, which produced another report in 1979, which basically rejected the findings of the *Limits to Growth* report (<https://www.oecd.org/futures/35393713.pdf>).

The *Club of Rome* still exists, along with many other transnational networks that have developed since, many with overlapping members and interests.

The Scientific-Industrial mindset—that is, Layer 5 in Graves's model—is driven by personal success, so it is inevitable that people with wealth and influence will seek to preserve their own success, while also recognising that the world needs to change in order to do that.

Back in 2009, *The Good Club*, a select group of wealthy elites, met in New York in response to the *2008 Global Financial Crisis*, and there were also health and environmental concerns at the time as well. The meeting was called by Bill Gates, Warren Buffett and David Rockefeller, and attendees included billionaire Ted Turner, the founder of *CNN*, George Soros, founder of the *Open Society Foundations*, Oprah Winfrey, and a number of other wealthy business leaders. They discussed education, emergency relief, government reform, the economic crisis, overpopulation, and global health issues.

Something that had changed since the 1970s was the use of philanthropy to create social change, as well as government lobbying to bring about policy change within governments. An article about this *Good Club* meeting that was published in *The Guardian* on the 31st of May, 2009

(<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/may/31/new-york-billionaire-philanthropists>), said:

That the group should have met at all is indicative of the radical ways in which philanthropy has changed over the past two decades. The main force behind

that change is Gates and his decision to donate almost all his fortune to bettering the world. Unlike the great philanthropists of former ages, Gates is young enough and active enough to take a full hands-on role in his philanthropy and to craft it after his own ideas. That example has been followed by others, most notably Soros, Turner and Buffett. Indeed, this new form of philanthropy, where retired elite businessmen try to change the world, has even been dubbed 'Billanthropy' after Gates. Another description is 'philanthro-capitalism'

...

They have assets that rival the social spending budgets of many countries. Yet the implications of the development of philanthro-capitalism are profound. It was fitting that the Good Club was meeting near the United Nations. The club members' extreme wealth makes it as powerful as some of the nations with seats inside that august chamber.

What is key here is that philanthro-capitalism is essentially the old paradigm, Layer 5 thinking, dressed up to appeal to new paradigm, Layer 6 values, and this, in the current day, is sometimes called 'greenwashing'.

Here is another example of how a transnational network came out of the 1970s. Back in 1971, the *European Management Forum* was created as a not-for-profit foundation by a fellow called Klaus Schwab, and it was renamed in 1987 as the *World Economic Forum*, sometimes simply called *Davos* after the name of the town where the group meets each year. Schwab has authored several books on global reform, including the *Fourth Industrial Revolution* (2016), *Shaping the Fourth Industrial Revolution* (2018) and most recently, *COVID 19: The Great Reset* (2020), which you've most likely heard of. The *World Economic Forum* website says: "The forum engages the foremost political, business and cultural and other leaders of society to shape global, regional and industry agendas" (<https://www.weforum.org/about/world-economic-forum>).

In his book, *The Great Reset*, Schwab writes of: "a better world: more inclusive, more equitable and more respectful of Mother Nature" (<http://reparti.free.fr/schwab2020.pdf>), which actually sounds quite good. He outlines a proposed social contract that includes "universal social assistance," in other words, universal basic income, "social insurance, health care and basic quality services",

primarily aimed, it seems, at avoiding some kind of a dystopian future. He calls for "radical solutions that differ from our present trajectory". However, Schwab has raised eyebrows with his recent description of a future world where: "You will own nothing and you will be happy", which some have described as feudalism 2.0. Feudalism, of course, was a Layer 4 Authoritarian social system that existed in the Agricultural era, and as we know right now, a good percentage of the world has actually regressed to Layer 4 values.

The *World Economic Forum* website lists partner organisations, including the *Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*, articles by the *Rockefeller Foundation*, and a large number of member organisations described as mid-sized global enterprises across a wide range of industries. It seems to have considerable reach and influence.

There are more examples of these transnational networks, but I am going to stop there. What is important to note is that we have seen a flare up of global sustainability concerns since the late 1960s' wave of Layer 6 values, which has scared the hell out of a bunch of rich and influential people. Some, like Bill Gates, have completely reorganised their activities to appear socially-minded in order to change the world to suit themselves. This changing the world to suit your personal needs is a characteristic of old paradigm Layer 5 behaviour and it is working in opposition to current evolutionary momentum, so therefore it will not succeed over the long term. It is very capable of causing considerable disruption to global society in the short term, though, and that is important.

I am going to talk now about the history of pandemic simulations in Western society, because one of the big questions that I had back in early 2020 was 'how did the whole planet fall into lockstep so quickly?' So many countries reacted so quickly and in the same way. I came across a *YouTube* video of a presentation by German author and freelance journalist Paul Schreyer called *Pandemic Simulation Games-- Preparation For a New Era?* (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d3WUv5SV5Hg>).^{*} Schreyer's presentation started out referencing Eisenhower's warning at the end of World War II when he became president of the US, about the power of the military-industrial complex and particularly the danger of war profiteering driving strategy, and of course, we've seen that actually play out—his warnings were not heeded.

Come the end of the Cold War in 1990, the military-industrial complex kind of lost its main reason for being, and so there was a need to justify future funding. By 1994, there was a lot of public pressure on the US defence budget, and the budget was actually decreased. That was soon after the first terror attack on the World Trade Centre, the bombing that caused 700 casualties; Clinton was in power at the time. Then in 1995, Joe Biden introduced a new law giving more power to the president to fight terrorism and there was a lot of pushback towards that new law. Then, in the same year, there was another terror attack in Oklahoma City, the largest yet—175 dead, 1000 injured—and that became a turning point for public opinion in the US and an acknowledgement that 'terror' is the new threat that justifies defence spending.

In 1997, the CIA Director and the US Assistant Secretary of Defence warned that biological and chemical terrorism was the most likely threat to the homeland, and that was part of a media campaign to justify more spending, and consequently an extra billion dollars was added to the defence budget. That same year, the threat of Saddam Hussein using chemical weapons was raised. There were also some secret projects underway in the US at that time, developing bacteria bomblets and developing a genetically modified variant of anthrax, and these were done without any parliamentary control.

In 1998, things start to get interesting. Colonel Robert Kadlec, who was later a bioweapons inspector in Iraq, wrote, in an internal Pentagon strategy paper, that:

Using bioweapons under cover of an endemic or natural disease occurrence provides an attacker the potential for plausible denial. Biological warfare's potential to create significant economic loss and subsequent political instability, coupled with plausible deniability, exceeds the possibility of any other known weapon.

That same year, 1998, the *Johns Hopkins Center for Civilian Biodefense Strategies* was founded, and that centre was later rebranded as the *Center for Health Security*.

Of course, during the pandemic, you probably will have heard of *Johns Hopkins* because they were running the dashboard of pandemic statistics through their *Center for Health Security*. In 1999, they organised their first simulation exercise, which was at a bioterrorism symposium at Arlington, Virginia, and it was focused around a smallpox attack which developed into an epidemic. It was a full-blown

simulation exercise with people role playing the response to that. The post-exercise report included questions such as: "How far can police go to detain quarantined patients?" It noted that "consensus must be reached on how to proceed with vaccinations." It asks: "Should martial law be implemented?", "How do we control public messaging?", and for the first time, the US public health system was seen to be a key player in a military response.

Again, that same year, US bioweapon research focused on ad hoc anthrax production by terrorists, and training activities included actually setting up a lab and producing anthrax using publicly available materials, and that was done in Nevada. The first coronavirus manipulation took place that same year by Ralph Baric, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology at the *University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*. Then the next year, the second bioterror symposium occurred. This time it was a simulation of the plague, and in that post-exercise report, it noted: "Armed US military presence in US cities had provoked protests about civil liberties. How do we enforce it and to what degree? How much force do we use to keep people in their homes?"

2001, George Bush Jr. was elected as president, and the third bioterror simulation occurred—it was an exercise called *Dark Winter*. Smallpox was the subject, and this time, for the first time, the simulation was run on a US military base. It was attended by an ex-CIA director who acted as the CIA director in the role play for the simulation, as well as some senior administration officials. Top level people, including Robert Kadlec, were there as well. There was a strong focus on public information and media use, and the post-exercise report said: "Forcible constraints on citizens may be likely when vaccine stocks are depleted. Americans can no longer take basic civil liberties, such as freedom of assembly or travel, for granted." It is interesting to note that this Robert Kadlec, who keeps popping up at these activities, was Health and Human Services Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response under the Trump administration in 2020, and then when Biden got into power in November 2020, he warned of a 'dark winter ahead', and of course, *Dark Winter* was the name of this bioterror simulation exercise back in 2001.

Back to the timeline. In 2001, of course, 9/11 happened, and there were also some anthrax attacks in the USA, including against the offices of two politicians who were critical of proposed legal changes after the 9/11 attack via the Patriot Act. They

stopped opposing the Patriot Act after they were attacked or threatened with anthrax, and, of course, the act was passed. That same year, the US created the *Global Health Security Initiative* based on the perceived bioterror risk with the *World Health Organisation* as a technical adviser, and countries from the *G8* were members of that initiative, as well as Mexico.

The next year, 2002, the *Global Health Security Initiative* declared that preparation for bioterror was quite similar to an influenza pandemic, so from then on, the simulation exercises addressed both scenarios.

The simulation was expanded to be global in scope, not just the USA, and in 2003, the first global-level simulation occurred, and it was called *Global Mercury*. That same year, there was a SARS outbreak in Asia, and the US *CDC* filed a patent application on coronavirus transmitted to humans and associated testing technology.

These simulations were coming thick and fast. The next one was in 2005 and was called *Atlantic Storm*. In the post-exercise report, it said:

How should national leaders determine measures such as border closure and quarantine? How long would movement restrictions have to be maintained? How would they be coordinated internationally? and How would the decision be made to lift them?

All of these simulations have involved the declaration of a state of emergency, authoritarian control, bypassing parliament, and augmenting the power of selected officials, while suspending basic human rights and plans to vaccinate the population. Sounds familiar.

In 2007, the *CDC* asked the US patent office not to publish their coronavirus-related application, but to keep it confidential for some reason. Then, of course, in 2008, we had the *Global Financial Crisis*. A year later, a Frenchman with strong *G8* connections, French government experience, and a lot of political influence, by the name of Jacques Attali, wrote in his book, when talking about the swine flu pandemic:

History tells us that humanity advances in great strides when it is frightened. The pandemic now setting in might trigger one of these fears that cause structural changes. Then we will be able to lay the foundation for a world

government, something to accomplish much faster than it would have been possible by economic reasons alone.

In 2010, a document was published called *Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development*, and this document was financed by the *Rockefeller Foundation*. Four global scenarios were outlined as being plausible, and one of them was called *Lock Step*, and this was the scenario:

A deadly flu pandemic spreads globally and leads to panic. China is seen as the paragon of effective crisis management and is widely emulated. Mask wearing is mandatory everywhere. Authoritarian control is implemented and remains in place even after the pandemic. Citizens willingly give up their sovereignty and liberties. It is only around 10 years later, after years of top-down rule that people start rebelling.

How interesting.

In 2012-13, the US *NIH* became concerned about US-based government funded gain-of-function research, partially due to some reported lab accidents that had occurred, and eventually President Obama announced a halt to gain-of-function research funding in 2014. However, the research was not actually stopped. It was offshored to the Wuhan lab in China, and it continued to be funded by the US government through the cover of a series of organisations, including the non-profit *EcoHealth Alliance*, which at one point is on record as applying for funding from *DARPA*, which is the *Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency*. It was very clear that they did not want this funding to be obvious, due to the way it was channelled.

Wuhan has Chinese military officers on their advisory boards, suggesting the possibility of covert collaboration between the US and the Chinese Communist Party with a bioweapons focus, of course. This collaboration provided some level of deniability, though, when COVID-19 broke out, because the Chinese were blaming the US and the US were blaming the Chinese.

After a break of many years of simulations, from 2017, emergency response planning and pandemic simulation exercises gained fresh momentum after President Trump was elected. Bear in mind that the Pentagon had been researching how to deal with civil unrest since at least the 1990s, and in anticipation of another wave of

1960s-style Layer 6 values flaring up, once again bringing anti-war and anti-government sentiment. This was seen as very clear threat to national security and the status quo, and with Trump coming into power, who was not a career politician and who openly promised to bring radical change to the establishment, this was a major concern to what is known as the *Deep State*.

In 2017, at the *World Economic Forum* and the *Munich Security Conference*, the topic of Trump's impact was central. What did it mean for the financial system and world diplomacy? You might recall that Trump was threatening at the time to collapse the US alliance with *NATO*.

At the *Munich Security Conference* that year, Bill Gates said: "It is only a question of time that a dangerous pathogen will spread, be it by a quirk of nature or at the hand of a terrorist. We need to be prepared with a new arsenal of weapons. The world needs to prepare for epidemics the way the military prepares for war", and right afterwards, the pandemic simulations started again.

In May 2017, the health ministers from the *G20* nations, plus China, India and Brazil, met for the first time in Berlin, and they gathered to discuss the threat of a future pandemic. They watched a simulation of a pandemic, and it seems that this event in particular contributed to the world's uniform response to Covid-19. At that gathering, Germany was asked to develop a global health policy, and they formed an advisory group which included representatives from the *Wellcome Trust* and the *Gates Foundation*.

Next year, 2018, there was another major pandemic simulation. It was called *Clade X*. The plot was that a fictional elitist cult had let loose a virus and created a global pandemic. This cult's aim was to reduce the global population. Once again, the exercise was organised by the *Johns Hopkins Centre for Health Security*.

In January 2019—we are getting close to the pandemic now—Bill Gates declared vaccines "the best investment I have ever made", referring to his financial returns of 20:1 on his \$10 billion investment. That year, the *World Health Organisation's Global Preparedness Monitoring Board*, which includes Dr. Fauci and also the Director of the Chinese CDC, and Dr. Elias from the *Gates Foundation*, published a document

called *The World at Risk*. This included seven urgent actions to prepare the world for health emergencies, including:

Countries, donors and multilateral institutions must be prepared for the worst. A rapidly spreading pandemic due to a lethal respiratory pathogen (whether naturally emergent or accidentally or deliberately released) poses additional preparedness requirements.

In October of 2019, we had *Event 501*, another simulation exercise, this one held in New York City. The script was written a year prior and the scenario was a coronavirus pandemic. Hosted by *Johns Hopkins* again, a representative from the *Gates Foundation* was seated in a privileged position next to the host. The directors of both the US and Chinese *CDCs* were there, along with the former Deputy Director of the *CIA* and executives from Big Pharma and the media. This message was given to the attendees:

Governments will need to partner with traditional and social media companies to research and develop nimble approaches to countering misinformation. This will require developing the ability to flood media with fast, accurate and consistent information. For their part, media companies should commit to ensuring that authoritative messages are prioritised and that false messages are suppressed, including through the use of technology.

Isn't that interesting? Lots of very, very interesting information there in that pandemic simulation timeline. It does answer the question as to why so many countries fell in line so quickly and we are all on the same page in terms of their pandemic response. That really goes back to that *G20* meeting in 2017, where they were clearly indoctrinated and passed all of the planning information that they needed in order to fall into lockstep. It is also very interesting that there was a break of many years in these pandemic planning exercises and then interest was suddenly revitalised after President Trump was elected.

Next, I want to talk about the economic situation. We know that the nature of the old paradigm is to push things to their limits, and this has led to an economic system that continually goes through boom-and-bust cycles, and these boom-and-bust cycles are, I guess, getting more critical as time goes on. Martin Armstrong, the financial forecaster, had predicted years in advance, thanks to his amazing computer algorithm, an economic hard landing, very specifically around the 18th, or actually on

the 18th of January, 2020 (see <https://www.armstrongeconomics.com>). We have mentioned this many times on the *Future Sense* show in the couple of years preceding the pandemic, and of course, when the date came around, the mainstream media blamed all of the economic issues that arose there on the pandemic itself, which was quite incorrect.

I am grateful for the work of Professor Fabio Vighi. Fabio is Professor of Critical Theory and also Italian at *Cardiff University* in the UK, and his recent published works include *Critical Theory and the Crisis of Contemporary Capitalism*, published through *Bloomsbury* in 2015, together with Heiko Feldner, co-writer (https://books.google.com.au/books?hl=en&lr=&id=EmEBCAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&ots=0_wx1slgnX&sig=KP2uoumgC0qxAOAoFTj0kznKJtU#v=onepage&q&f=false). I came across an article online by Fabio called *A Self-fulfilling Prophecy: Systemic Collapse and Pandemic Simulation* published on the *Philosophical Salon* (https://thephilosophicalsalon.com/a-self-fulfilling-prophecy-systemic-collapse-and-pandemic-simulation/?fbclid=IwAR2i9mA1b-WKQe9u3TqohNFicQm1Ktbntn238HTicJd_TIGuYdeGQYVxqHY&utm_source=pocket_mylist).

So let me draw some of the information about the economic timeline out of Fabio's article. This paragraph starts with the heading *Follow the Money*:

In pre-Covid times, the world economy was on the verge of another colossal meltdown. Here is a brief chronicle of how the pressure was building up.

June 2019: In its Annual Economic Report, the Swiss-based Bank of International Settlements (BIS), the 'Central Bank of all central banks', sets the international alarm bells ringing. The document highlights "overheating [...] in the leveraged loan market", where "credit standards have been deteriorating" and "collateralized loan obligations (CLOs) have surged – reminiscent of the steep rise in collateralized debt obligations [CDOs] that amplified the subprime crisis [in 2008]." Simply stated, the belly of the financial industry is once again full of junk.

Same old, same old, in fact, and you will probably recall back in 2008, lots of commentary saying that the problem that caused that crisis back then really wasn't solved, it just kind of had a band-aid put over it.

9 August 2019: The BIS issues a working paper calling for “unconventional monetary policy measures” to “insulate the real economy from further deterioration in financial conditions”. The paper indicates that, by offering “direct credit to the economy” during a crisis, central bank lending “can replace commercial banks in providing loans to firms.

15 August 2019: Blackrock Inc., the world’s most powerful investment fund (managing around \$7 trillion in stock and bond funds), issues a white paper titled Dealing with the next downturn. Essentially, the paper instructs the US Federal Reserve to inject liquidity directly into the financial system to prevent “a dramatic downturn.” Again, the message is unequivocal: “An unprecedented response is needed when monetary policy is exhausted and fiscal policy alone is not enough. That response will likely involve ‘going direct’”: “finding ways to get central bank money directly in the hands of public and private sector spenders” while avoiding “hyperinflation.”

22-24 August 2019: G7 central bankers meet in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, to discuss BlackRock’s paper along with urgent measures to prevent the looming meltdown. In the prescient words of James Bullard, President of the St Louis Federal Reserve: “We just have to stop thinking that next year things are going to be normal.”

15-16 September 2019: The downturn is officially inaugurated by a sudden spike in the repo rates (from 2% to 10.5%). ‘Repo’ is shorthand for ‘repurchase agreement’, a contract where investment funds lend money against collateral assets (normally Treasury securities). At the time of the exchange, financial operators (banks) undertake to buy back the assets at a higher price, typically overnight. In brief, repos are short-term collateralized loans. They are the main source of funding for traders in most markets, especially the derivatives galaxy. A lack of liquidity in the repo market can have a devastating domino effect on all major financial sectors.

17 September 2019: The Fed begins the emergency monetary programme, pumping hundreds of billions of dollars per week into Wall Street, effectively executing BlackRock’s “going direct” plan. (Unsurprisingly, in March 2020 the Fed will hire BlackRock to manage the bailout package in response to the ‘COVID-19 crisis’).

19 September 2019: Donald Trump signs Executive Order 13887, establishing a National Influenza Vaccine Task Force whose aim is to develop a “5-year national plan (Plan) to promote the use of more agile and scalable vaccine

manufacturing technologies and to accelerate development of vaccines that protect against many or all influenza viruses.” This is to counteract “an influenza pandemic”, which, “unlike seasonal influenza [...] has the potential to spread rapidly around the globe, infect higher numbers of people, and cause high rates of illness and death in populations that lack prior immunity”.

It is interesting to reflect on what Trump knew at that time and whether he was simply being instructed and doing what he was told or whether he had any insights into what was coming. I suspect the former.

Almost a month later:

18 October 2019: In New York, a global zoonotic pandemic is simulated during Event 201, a strategic exercise coordinated by the Johns Hopkins Biosecurity Center and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

which we mentioned just previously.

21-24 January 2020: The World Economic Forum’s annual meeting takes place in Davos, Switzerland, where both the economy and vaccinations are discussed.

23 January 2020: China puts Wuhan and other cities of the Hubei province in lockdown.

11 March 2020: The WHO’s director general calls Covid-19 a pandemic. The rest is history.

Joining the dots is a simple enough exercise. If we do so, we might see a well-defined narrative outline emerge, whose succinct summary reads as follows: lockdowns and the global suspension of economic transactions were intended to 1) Allow the Fed to flood the ailing financial markets with freshly printed money while deferring hyperinflation; and 2) Introduce mass vaccination programmes and health passports as pillars of a neo-feudal regime of capitalist accumulation.

I am going to skip ahead now in his article and continue here:

The mainstream narrative should therefore be reversed: the stock market did not collapse (in March 2020) because lockdowns had to be imposed; rather, lockdowns had to be imposed because financial markets were collapsing. With

lockdowns came the suspension of business transactions, which drained the demand for credit and stopped the contagion, [financial contagion, that is]. In other words, restructuring the financial architecture through extraordinary monetary policy was contingent on the economy's engine being turned off. Had the enormous mass of liquidity pumped into the financial sector reached transactions on the ground, a monetary tsunami with catastrophic consequences would have been unleashed.

The hard landing that Martin Armstrong's algorithm had predicted well in advance.

As claimed by economist Ellen Brown, it was "another bailout", but this time "under cover of a virus." Similarly, John Titus and Catherine Austin Fitts noted that the Covid-19 "magic wand" allowed the Fed to execute BlackRock's "going direct" plan, literally: it carried out an unprecedented purchase of government bonds, while, on an infinitesimally smaller scale, also issuing government backed 'COVID loans' to businesses. In brief, only an induced economic coma would provide the Fed with the room to defuse the time-bomb ticking away in the financial sector. Screened by mass-hysteria, the US central bank plugged the holes in the interbank lending market, dodging hyperinflation as well as the 'Financial Stability Oversight Council' (the federal agency for monitoring financial risk created after the 2008 collapse) ... However, the "going direct" blueprint should also be framed as a *desperate* measure, for it can only prolong the agony of a global economy increasingly hostage to money printing and the artificial inflation of financial assets.

At the heart of our predicament lies an insurmountable structural impasse. Debt-leveraged financialization is contemporary capitalism's only line of flight, the inevitable forward-escape route for a reproductive model that has reached its historical limit. Capitals head for financial markets because the labour-based economy is increasingly unprofitable. How did we get to this?

"The answer can be summarised as follows", Professor Fabio says:

1. The economy's mission to generate surplus-value is both the drive to exploit the workforce and to expel it from production. This is what Marx called capitalism's "moving contradiction".[1] While it constitutes the essence of our mode of production, this contradiction today backfires, turning political economy into a mode of permanent devastation.
2. The reason for this change of fortune is the objective failure of the labour-capital dialectic: the unprecedented acceleration in technological automation since the 1980s causes more labour-power to be ejected from production than (re)absorbed.

The contraction of the volume of wages means that the purchasing power of a growing part of the world population is falling, with debt and immiseration as inevitable consequences. 3. As less surplus-value is produced, capital seeks immediate returns in the debt-leveraged financial sector rather than in the real economy or by investing in socially constructive sectors like education, research, and public services.

The bottom line is that the paradigm shift underway is the necessary condition for the (dystopian) survival of capitalism, which is no longer able to reproduce itself through mass wage-labour and the attendant consumerist utopia. The pandemic agenda was dictated, ultimately, by systemic implosion: the profitability downturn of a mode of production which rampant automation is making obsolete. For this immanent reason, capitalism is increasingly dependent on public debt, low wages, centralisation of wealth and power, a permanent state of emergency, and financial acrobatics.

If we 'follow the money', we will see that the economic blockade deviously attributed to Virus has achieved far from negligible results, not only in terms of social engineering, but also of financial predation. I will quickly highlight four of them.

1) As anticipated, it has allowed the Fed to reorganise the financial sector by printing a continuous stream of billions of dollars out of thin air; 2) It has accelerated the extinction of small and medium-sized companies, allowing major groups to monopolise trade flows; 3) It has further depressed labour wages and facilitated significant capital savings through 'smart working' (which is particularly smart for those who implement it); 4) It has enabled the growth of e-commerce, the explosion of Big Tech, and the proliferation of the pharma-dollar – which also includes the much disparaged plastic industry, now producing millions of new facemasks and gloves every week, many of which end up in the oceans (to the delight of the 'green new dealers'). In 2020 alone, the wealth of the planet's 2,200 or so billionaires grew by \$1.9 trillion, an increase without historical precedent.

Professor Fabio adds:

All this thanks to a pathogen so lethal that, according to official data, only 99.8% of the infected survive ... most of them without experiencing any symptoms.

So that's a wonderful summary—I thank you for your work, Professor Fabio—which has really captured the sense of urgency and the actual trigger that has brought us to where we are right now.

It is one thing to plan a global operation like this and to prepare by running simulations for 20 years, yet it is quite a leap to actually implement it. That requires military-level operational expertise and management, together with widespread psychological manipulation to ensure compliance, so I am going to turn now to another piece of the puzzle, and that is the changing nature of warfare.

Since the late 1960s, again, it has been shifting away from large-scale combat with kinetic weapons to precision strikes—for example, using drones—and various kinds of unconventional warfare, and we are all familiar with terms like 'trade war', 'cyber war', etc. In the martial arts, the highest expression of combat is to achieve your aim without fighting at all. To take that even further, if you are the aggressor, then ideally your opponent won't even realise there is a war going on.

I recently came across a report issued by NATO titled *Cognitive Warfare*, and it was published mid-2020 (https://www.innovationhub-act.org/sites/default/files/2021-01/20210122_CW%20Final.pdf). This was news to me; I hadn't heard the term used before. I have a copy in front of me and I would like to briefly share NATO's description of this type of warfare so you can understand what it is.

The title of this is *The Advent of Cognitive Warfare*:

Information warfare (IW) is the most related, and, thus, the most easily conflated, type of warfare with regards to cognitive warfare. However, there are key distinctions that make cognitive warfare unique enough to be addressed under its own jurisdiction. As a concept, IW was first coined and developed under US Military doctrine, and has subsequently been adopted in different forms by several nations.

As former US Navy Commander Stuart Green described it as, “Information operations, the closest existing American doctrinal concept for cognitive warfare, consists of five ‘core capabilities’, or elements. These include electronic warfare, computer network operations, PsyOps, military deception, and operational security.”

Succinctly, Information Warfare aims at controlling the flow of information.

Information warfare has been designed primarily to support objectives defined by the traditional mission of military organisations - namely, to produce lethal kinetic effects on the battlefield. It was not designed to achieve lasting political successes.

As defined by Clint Watts, cognitive Warfare opposes the capacities to know and to produce, it actively thwarts knowledge. Cognitive sciences cover all the sciences that concern knowledge and its processes (psychology, linguistics, neurobiology, logic and more).

Cognitive Warfare degrades the capacity to know, produce or thwart knowledge. Cognitive sciences cover all the sciences that concern knowledge and its processes (psychology, linguistics, neurobiology, logic and more).

Cognitive Warfare is therefore the way of using knowledge for a conflicting purpose. In its broadest sense, cognitive warfare is not limited to the military or institutional world. Since the early 1990s, this capability has tended to be applied to the political, economic, cultural and societal fields."

Interesting to note from the early 1990s there.

Any user of modern information technologies is a potential target. It targets the whole of a nation's human capital.

The most striking shift of this practice from the military, to the civilian, world is the pervasiveness of CW activities across everyday life that sit outside the normal peace-crisis-conflict construct (with harmful effects). Even if a cognitive war could be conducted to complement to a military conflict, it can also be conducted alone, without any link to an engagement of the armed forces. Moreover, cognitive warfare is potentially endless since there can be no peace treaty or surrender for this type of conflict.

Evidence now exists that shows new CW tools & techniques target military personnel directly, not only with classical information weapons but also with a constantly growing and rapidly evolving arsenal of neuro-weapons, targeting the brain. It is important to recognise various nations' dedicated endeavours to develop non-kinetic operations, that target the Human with effects at every level - from the individual level, up to the socio-political level.

...

In many ways, cognitive warfare can be compared to propaganda, which can be defined as “a set of methods employed by an organised group that wants to bring about the active or passive participation in its actions of a mass of individuals, psychologically unified through psychological manipulations and incorporated in an organisation.”

So there we have the expertise and the technology required to create the kind of mass compliance that we have seen over the last two years. The big question, which I don't have an answer to, is: Who knows the truth and who is simply being manipulated to comply? Key figures who you might call the front men, such as Dr. Fauci and Bill Gates, are fairly obvious and tied in with the transnational networks as we saw before. Where the knowledge stops and where the manipulation and compliance begins is very hard to determine, and that is by design.

We've looked at the influence of the late 1960s now and the development of transnational networks that sit above our visible government structures, the bioweapon development process and 20 years of rehearsals through simulations, the economic drivers that determine the timing, and the military mindset and capabilities that shaped the execution. I hope you can see the pieces of this puzzle coming together.

Next, I want to say a bit about climate, and what started as the 'global warming' movement and has since been rebranded as the 'climate change' movement. There are some similarities to current events in the history of this movement, and I would like to touch on just a few of those.

Before I do, I have spoken previously on *Future Sense* about advanced climate science and the picture it paints of an impending mini ice age associated with the grand solar minimum and also with the trajectory of our solar system. This ought to become very obvious to the general public within the next five years, I believe. If you would like to know more about that, you can look back through the past episodes of *Future Sense* and you will find some of them which focus on climate (<https://www.futuresense.it/episodes/>).

As you may have noticed, the pandemic response achieved many of the climate movement's goals, and some of those climate goals, which have been in existence for decades of course, are also very effective actions for applying an economic emergency brake. For our biosphere, there is no doubt that this was a good thing during the pandemic—I am not disputing that at all—and I know this is a very sensitive topic. Personally, I would love humanity to clean up our act and to regenerate a healthier biosphere. There are countless good-hearted people who are lobbying and supporting this cause, and this is not a criticism of their work in any way—it is simply an exploration of the diversity of human values.

One of my concerns is that if we are being urged to prepare for global warming, when in fact we are actually going to experience extreme cooling, then that will be disastrous for many people, so we really need to know what is going on here and dig down into the motivations behind it.

I noticed that the climate movement went quiet as soon as the pandemic broke out, almost like someone just flicked a switch and turned it off, and that reminded me of the 2020 pop-up demonstrations in the USA, such as the *Black Lives Matter* demonstrations, which were there one minute and then the next minute they were gone, and sometimes for many months without any natural continuity, which is a sign of possible deception in practice.

The original global warming narrative predicted a global climate crisis, which should have arrived well before now, and that narrative just hasn't aged well at all. A few weeks ago, as I speak, there are 20 ships stuck in a North Sea ice pack, which is its thickest for quite some years, and yet, according to the original climate narrative, it should have been gone for good by now, so that raises many questions about the original motivations of the movement—and again, who knew what and who may have been perhaps manipulated into supporting the warming narrative?

I honestly don't know if the movement was started as a genuine cause with pure intent, or whether it was created as a front to achieve a hidden political agenda. I do see some things, though, that suggest it might have been a bit of both.

Some commonalities between the pandemic operation and the climate movement include: a reliance on computer-based modelling over observational data; the

manipulation of data—and you might remember the *Climategate* scandal, the email scandal of many years ago about data manipulation; shifting goals and metrics—when one goal isn't met, when the deadline arrives, then attention is redirected to another goal rather than explaining why that one wasn't met; the use of fear as a tool is another very common aspect; and obviously there are overlapping goals, including the climate push to shut down industries, air travel, and to transform the global economy to avoid an impending disaster.

If we look back at the original Executive Director of the *United Nations Environment Program*, which owns the *IPCC* that we hear about a lot, his name was Maurice Strong and he was a Canadian oil and mineral tycoon. Prior to his *United Nations Environment Program* appointment, he had been secretary general of the *United Nations Conference on the Human Environment*, and after serving in the *UNEP* position, he then returned in 1976 to Canada to become CEO of *Petro Canada*, a state-owned oil and gas enterprise. Such diverse values and interests indicate that he wasn't solely motivated by environmental concerns, which confirms what I previously mentioned in this episode: that the motivations for global change are quite diverse and not as clear-cut as they are sometimes presented.

When it comes to Layer 5 values—that is the old Scientific-Industrial paradigm—the motto is 'whatever it takes to in order to achieve your concept of personal success'. Notably, Maurice Strong did some wonderful work, including commissioning various reports and holding conferences—the first of their kind—on the state of the planet and sustainable living. He was co-chair with Mikhail Gorbachev, of the *Earth Summit*, which gave rise to the *Earth Charter* document, which you might have heard of, and one of the investigations he commissioned on sustainability gave rise to what we now call the *UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Notably, only one of the goals from the original investigations report was omitted when they drew up the public SDGs, and that one was population control. I assume it was buried due to the moral challenges it raised for some people.

Strong, himself, is on record—and you will still find this video on *YouTube*—saying that he supported the idea of a licence to breed as a means of controlling the world's population, and during this current time of values regression, it is no surprise that we hear people like Bill Gates speaking openly of active population control measures and regarding them as essential to securing his preferred future.

Such is human nature and the impact of the value systems we grow through and how they shape our thinking and behaviour. Judging someone as right or wrong, moral or immoral, is ultimately a reflection of which value system we are coming from and how we view the other value systems. The best we can do is to actively develop ourselves to live from the most capable and comprehensive worldview and values that are available to us at this time.

It is interesting to note that Maurice Strong had a long term allegiance to the Chinese Communist Party, and after being exposed receiving a \$1 million cheque made out to him personally in 2005 while he was working for the *UN's Oil for Food* programme in the Middle East. He resigned from his position with the *UN* and moved to live in Beijing, where he passed away in 2015 at the age of 86. His story is an interesting example of how issues that are often presented to us through the media as simple binary choices—you are either for or against something—are in fact part of a complex web crafted by nature, us being an intricate part of nature.

Before I wrap up this episode, I want to talk a little bit about the future and also about how the pandemic has accelerated the global change process. There is a lot that I could have said about the pandemic, but I have chosen not to dwell on all of the things that don't make sense or the very long list of poorly hidden conflicts of interest that exist amongst those who are having a major influence on our pandemic response. Suffice to say that it all reflects the impact of this large-scale values regression that, from an evolutionary perspective, exists to accelerate the collapse of the old paradigm and the old values, and the emergence of new, more capable and comprehensive values, human behaviours and social systems. Like pulling back on the elastic band of a slingshot, it is creating stored energy that we have the opportunity to use now to power a major leap forward in human consciousness. I hope this episode has helped you to make sense of how we got to this point.

Looking ahead, we have a major turning point in 2032 that is being forecast by a variety of different sources and many that I trust, so we are looking at another 10-plus years of rapid change and disruption between now and then, and we really need to get wise to the tactics being employed by the old paradigm to try and slow the process down and hang on to their global domination. We can expect fear, we will continue to be used as a social control mechanism, and interestingly, one of the most significant issues in the transition between First Tier consciousness and

Second Tier consciousness, which occurs between Layers 6 and 7, is we move beyond fear as a driver of behaviour, so there is a huge opportunity in in this bombardment of fear that we are receiving.

How long will the Covid-19 narrative keep working? That is a really good question. The ultimate intention seems to be to create another *Great Depression*, to bankrupt governments and then to rescue the world with a centralised authority and a centralised digital currency at global level. The economic emergency hasn't gone away, so we have to ask, what is the next economic emergency brake going to be?

We have already seen an attempted pivot in the media to link climate to health, so there is a possibility of climate lockdowns at some point. Bill Gates, who often seems to be the early warning guy who comes out publicly and talks about something just before it happens, has recently warned of smallpox terror attacks and told us that we have to be prepared to deal with the germs. This week, the *IMF* and representatives from 10 countries met in Europe to run a simulated cyberattack on the global financial system, so is that simulation, again, leading to an attempt at shutting down our global financial system electronically?

[\(https://www.reuters.com/markets/europe/exclusive-imf-10-countries-simulate-cyber-attack-global-financial-system-2021-12-09/\)](https://www.reuters.com/markets/europe/exclusive-imf-10-countries-simulate-cyber-attack-global-financial-system-2021-12-09/)

And looking further into the future, one of the more extreme possibilities, which I do believe is a very real possibility, is a false flag extraterrestrial invasion using advanced technologies which are not visible to the public at the moment, and that, I think, would have enormous shock value and is probably being kept up the sleeve as an Ace by the old paradigm at the moment, and I am sure there are other things too that we haven't even thought about at this point.

It is important to understand the technique that is being used—what you would call, I guess, part of this cognitive warfare—a psychological technique to keep people off balance. The idea is to push people into fear because when we are in fear, we go into freeze-fight-or-flight and our rational mind actually shuts down. When the rational mind is not operating properly, we are not thinking clearly and we are not necessarily going to see and understand what is being done to us—we are just going to be reacting.

We are going to see, and we have seen, successive waves of fear-inducing events, and particularly media reports, and we should expect more of the same and understand how that process works so that we can actually deal with our fears, step out of fear and start to think clearly about what is going on and what our options are.

There are indications that have come to me of a total economic collapse within the next two-and-a-half years, talking about the old system, and a global shift to some kind of digital currency. I guess the options there could be decentralised digital currency, as the old paradigm is hoping to introduce, or it could be the decentralised cryptocurrency that already exists and is growing strongly ... and it could be both. It could be that we move to a digital currency that is centralised initially, because we can't stop that from happening, and then that collapses and we go to a decentralised option, which is inevitable at some time in the future.

Martin Armstrong's computer algorithm has an *Economic Confidence Model* turning point on the 14th March next year [2022], which he is calling "a market correction", and it is quite likely that we are going to have a very bumpy ride economically for the next couple of years, so, yeah, buckle up for next year.

The unknown long-term effects of widespread vaccination are quite concerning, and so is the widespread insistence that everybody must get vaccinated. We know it is actually not about Covid-19, so whatever hidden agenda there is there, whether it is simply profit-making for Big Pharma or something more sinister, I guess we will find out. Potentially there is a real global health crisis looming. Looking at the short-term indications of being vaccinated, that could well collapse our mainstream medical system, so as I always say, we need to focus on building resilient local communities and on building alternative systems, including alternative medical systems that we can rely on when these centralised systems collapse.

If you haven't come across some of the treatments for spike protein toxicity, get on the net and have a look. There is plenty out there and whether it is from actually being vaccinated or from vaccinated people shedding spike proteins, dandelion leaf tea is one of the ones that has been standing out to me as a wonderful way of treating the tendency of the spike proteins to get inside the cell nucleus and interfere with DNA repair, which you really don't want happening.

In wrapping up now, it is obvious—and this is a paradox, of course—that the pandemic has massively accelerated the change process. It has been both a pain, a disruption, and incredibly beneficial in terms of the shifting human consciousness. At this point in history, anything the old paradigm does is going to have the effect of accelerating the change process so it doesn't matter what they pull out. Whatever it does, we have got this huge momentum of nature itself moving us through the evolutionary process, and everything is going to add to that momentum.

Some beneficial outcomes that we have seen already in terms of this change have been:

- it has increased our desire for community and it has energised the process of community building
- it is further reducing our confidence in centralised government and centralised systems because naturally we need to head in the opposite direction to decentralisation
- it is exposing the weaknesses of our social systems, particularly in this case, our health systems
- it is highlighting the obscene profiteering of large industries such as Big Pharma
- it is exposing the capture of the mainstream media and widespread censorship that is going on
- people are increasingly moving away from cities to the country, and again, this is part of the natural decentralisation theme of the emerging paradigm
- it is accelerating the uptake of alternative communications platforms and media outlets
- it is highlighting human suffering, which is calling us to develop our compassion further
- it is creating the necessary tension, as I have said before, and part of that tension is to activate our own deep healing processes, both at a personal level and at a societal level
- it is overwhelming our rational minds with confusing and contradictory narratives, which is calling us to operate from a higher frequency using our deep intuition, which we are moving to as we go into this transition into Second Tier consciousness

And these things are just off the top of my head, so I am sure there are many more good things that are coming from all of this.

Some advice before I wind up now: it is a really excellent time to conquer your fears. We have been constantly pressured to be afraid, which puts the challenge front and centre where we can see it and address it. Understand that everything that is happening is actually supporting and accelerating our evolutionary shift, and even what seems bad is actually creating tension, the tension we need to bring positive change. Peacefully choosing the evolutionary change path and demonstrating our choice to others is a wonderful way to support this shift that is underway. Understand that Mother Nature is actually driving the bus, and working in harmony with natural change is key to surviving and thriving. Be wary of false narratives, trust and develop your intuition, and remember that compassion is a key indicator of evolved thinking and behaviour.

Wishing you all the best for the holiday season and the new year, which promises to be a very interesting one. Stay safe and trust in the process. Have no fear and spread the love.

Thanks for listening.

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

* Note: please refer to the Paul Schreyer video for references for the information that follows in this section.