



26. Australian Election Results

Recorded on 20th May, 2019, in Byron Bay Australia.

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

This is Future Sense.

Nyck: Thanks for joining us here on *Future Sense* in this post-election moment, and good morning to my co-host, Steve McDonald.

Steve: Good morning, Nyck.

Nyck: Lovely to see you here. How did you survive the election weekend?

Steve: Pretty well, actually. I didn't take an awful lot of notice, but it was very interesting to see the result as we know it so far; there is still a bit of counting going on, isn't there?

Nyck: Still a bit of counting going and we do not know if the Morrison government will have an actual majority or will have to operate as a minority government with the help of some of the crossbench. That would be interesting because they also have to pick a speaker from their elected representatives, or convince one of the Independents to sit in the Speaker's chair, in which case they lose a primary vote there. So they need 77, I think, out of the 152, to govern with a clear majority and a Speaker.

Steve: That makes sense. Yes, interesting.

Nyck: We'll be talking a bit more about some of this later on, not so much about the raw data that we know about who's won and all that, but perhaps a little bit of what's going on behind the scenes. We're going to look at that from particular areas, from a particular focus and perspective.

Steve: Yes, certainly the most obvious observation is that the election result reflects the continuing regressive values search to try and find a way of making sense of what's going on in the world, so there's been a retro trend there. Also, on a wider level, we're asked the question: 'Did humans break the planet?' and just unpack the psychology of this particular perspective that seems to be growing at the moment, that we've done something terribly, terribly wrong and only we can fix that too, which is interesting.

Nyck: And I guess all of the guilt and shame and despair that is associated with that. We've certainly seen a lot of it, for example, with many of the younger people during the period of the Greta Thunberg phenomenon, which is still going on, and the school strike and the like, and that urgency that a lot of young people feel in regards to issues like climate instability.

Steve: Yes. This is all part of the natural evolutionary dynamic so there's nothing wrong about it, but it's interesting just to look at the dynamic itself and see how it's working. Part of our discussion today will be looking at the problems that are arising and the problems that are actually very real and present at the moment. They are in one category but there's another category of problems which are anticipated or imagined problems which actually haven't manifested yet. We'll look at those two categories and just do a bit of analysis around that.

Nyck: As those in the New Age would remember, the word 'fear' is often represented as False Evidence Appearing Real, which is a bit to do with that—a sort of projection into the future of what's going to happen.

Steve: That's right. I think we can update that and make it Fake Evidence ...

Nyck: Fake Evidence? Right, good point. There is a difference between fake and false—false-true, fake-real—that's the difference. Interesting.

We will talk about these things from all sorts of angles.

You are here on *BayFM* 99.9, and it is Monday, the 20th of May, as you well know. We have overcome the federal election, but not the results of it; and also not the implications. I guess also going back to what has actually happened here in Australia at this time in our history is really important.

Thanks for your texts. As I've said many times, of course, you can text in on 0437 341119. Someone has already texted in and said: "So, the slingshot rubber band just got pulled further and tighter as a result of the election outcome? Chaos ensues. Interested to hear your thoughts", and that's exactly what we'll be talking about.

Steve: Yes, very true. It certainly did get pulled tighter. It was difficult to predict, perhaps impossible to predict, whether that was going to be the case or whether there was enough momentum, enough energy in that elastic band to propel us forward a bit, but obviously not. We needed to pull it backwards some more.

Nyck: Hmm. Before we go on, I thought I'd throw this in too—we've recently been looking at a guy called Bobby Klein, and Bobby Klein throws the *I Ching* from America, so to speak, for each week, and for today May 20th, 2019, he's written that the *I Ching* revealed: "It is time to be outrageous. With passion and inner fire, open the mouth of truth. The truth that says you suspected all along that you might encounter obstacles. These inconvenient obstructions can only be overcome by confronting your own inner deception and demanding that the truth from within yourself be revealed" (<https://www.bobbyklein.com/i-ching>). I find that to be a very salient at this point.

Steve: That's right. The actual character from the teaching that he's pulled for this week is representing obstruction and difficulties, and the wisdom, according to his interpretation, is described in this short poem that he wrote: "Abundance in view, Just out of reach, Identify the obstruction, Embrace the teaching."

Nyck: Very good. I just want to say for myself, too, that this show is designed, I guess, to look at these intuitive, creative, less , ah, what would you say? Less ordinary aspects of our beingness. Are we fixed in our box of rationality or are we actually starting to break free? That's a question I put to you today, folks out there.

Steve: It's all about really making sense of the bigger picture; making sense of the currents which are pulling us one way or the other, and are we flowing with them or struggling against them?

But the bookmakers were wrong this time around. I mean, usually the bookies are pretty on the money in terms of who's going to win and where they're going to make their money, but they've got it wrong this time.

Nyck: Yes, they got it wrong, greatly because the biggest two party preferred vote for the Coalition in any poll at any point was 49% and they've ended up with basically 52. That's a big margin of error there.

Steve: Very interesting, and if we look at the places where the vote did swing and where the win—the extra seats—actually came from, they're very much in line with the idea of the regressive search.

For those of you who might not know what we're talking about here, when we go through a major change, a transformational change in terms of our values—and this also reflects on the large-scale paradigm shift; some of the more recent paradigm shifts in history have been a shift from the Agricultural era to the Scientific-Industrial era, and now we're smack bang in the middle of another transition, which is taking us beyond the Scientific-Industrial to a new paradigm, which we don't really have a good label for just yet, but some people have called it Postmodern because it comes after the Modern era. It's humanistic by nature, it's very much centred around human values and the human emotional experience. It's network-centric and it's very reliant on our network technology that we have. We're in the middle of that transition right now, and when life conditions become a little bit too hard to cope with towards the end of a paradigm, what happens is there's this dissonance that arises between our capacity to solve our problems and the actual complexity of the problems themselves. What that plays out as is the fact that we feel like we can't quite cope with what's going on, and this creates a dissonance inside us, like a disconnect.

The first thing that we do, our first human instinct, is to make a regressive search. We look backwards, down our timeline, and we look for a period in our past when everything was good and we were coping. Typically that's not in the paradigm that's just ending, but it's in the previous one. In this case, this regressive search is taking us back to Agricultural-era values—they are very linear, very black-and-white. There was a time where the authority that we looked to for guidance on how to live our lives was mostly a God of some sort—mostly our religious aspect of life—and in the major religions, of course, there's a list of how to live your life according to God's values, God's directions, God's rules.

We're seeing this regressive search, this flashback right now, to this kind of linear, fairly religious, fairly rigid, clear-cut, very black-and-white thinking. From an evolutionary perspective, the reason that this happens is it's actually a way of speeding up change, because if we go back to a simpler problem-solving strategies, it actually takes us away from being able to cope. What we need in order to cope is to have more complex problem-solving strategies, more capable ones, and so by looking back to simplicity, we create this evolutionary tension, which is like pulling a rubber band back on a slingshot. You've got to pull the rubber band backwards in order to get the sufficient tension that's required to shoot the projectile forwards, and so, in a values sense, we are pulling ourselves backwards to older, simpler values and that is making it clearer to everybody that this isn't going to work, so it's building this energy for change.

Nyck: Yes, and take a moment to reflect on that, folks. It's obvious in one sense, but it's quite a hard thing to actually get a hold of. As you're speaking about simplification, I'm looking at an article from *The Conversation* from yesterday (<https://theconversation.com/morrison-has-led-the-coalition-to-a-miracle-win-but-how-do-they-govern-from-here-117184>) which talks about the simplification that Morrison obviously has a gift for. It says that "Morrison has a gift for easy simplification" and that he did so with things like the franking credits issue—the policy platform of the Labor Party, which he turned into "the retirement tax" as a scare campaign, and so on and so on. The simplistic, the matey, blokey, down at the barbecue with a baseball cap on, that actually resonates in the way that you're talking about with 'let's keep it simple; we just want to keep it simple, we don't want to break the barriers here or disturb the applecart too much; even though my life may not be perfect, I don't want to upset things here.'

Steve: Exactly, and making it into a binary choice, a simple black-and-white—it's either 'this' or 'that', you can make your choice. If you look at the electorates—the seats that have swung—they are generally very much connected to Agricultural towns ...

Nyck: Or the coal industry.

Steve: ... or to primary industries. It's in those places where life is relatively simple compared to life in the city, that people cope quite well with a simpler set of values—life is simpler in a country, that's just the way it is.

So the whole profile of what's happened here fits very, very well with this idea of the regressive search, looking back to older and simpler values, and that's been attractive for a lot of people here. If you look at the complexity of politics these days, it's really outgrown the capacity of our political system design. The system is clearly not working because we're not getting the kind of people that we want on our ballot papers. I remember reading one suggestion online before the election that you should just cross out all the options on the ballot paper and write on the bottom: "no suitable candidates."

Nyck: Yes, I've heard that, too, that's right. I think some people actually do that, but it is interesting because, of course, Labor, in this election, arguably set forth quite a strong progressive set of policy platforms—unusually so. Usually, negative campaigning against the sitting government works best in order to unseat the government—that's the conventional wisdom. Labor came out against that and actually had some policies; whether you agree with them or not, it doesn't matter, they actually had a raft of policies. If you look at the Liberal policies, there actually aren't any, other the big tax breaks they'll force through pretty well in next couple of weeks or so, likely. So you've got a complexity which people are avoiding. They don't want complexity.

Another interesting factor which we talked about off-air today is that apparently Australia is still the richest, or perhaps nearly the richest, per capita country in the world. That's an interesting statistic, which is qualified by the fact that we are also the most in debt in the world. The fear—the hip pocket fear—of losing what we do have is probably more expressive, more intense than we imagine.

Steve: Yes, and it's quite normal during times of significant change for fear to rise up to the surface.

Another issue that's had an impact, I'm sure, is the general fragmentation that's going on during this paradigm shift. We're moving from a centralised way of living to a decentralised way of living, which by definition means splitting things up and spreading them out, and that has happened with the vote. In times gone by, there was there was a reasonably clear division between the two sectors that would vote for the two prominent parties, but now what we've got is a lot of smaller independent parties cropping up, which are grabbing bits and pieces of the major parties' votes, and in this case, I think that worked against the Labor Party here in Australia. They lost some votes to some of these smaller parties through that fragmentation process.

Nyck: Yes, and of course, there's the element of religion. We talked about the moving back to Layer 4, which is that Agricultural but didactic, 'this is the way it is, these are the rules you follow.' We've no doubt seen in this election. With a Pentecostal prime minister and quite a few other fairly strongly religiously-oriented Coalition members, particularly, I would suggest that there's also been a strong Christian vote for the Coalition, which may not have existed before, and unusually so—different churches, different collectives, different communities, actually shifting their allegiance in some way or other, I think, in this election.

Steve: Yes, and that's indicated by some of the seats that did swing, particularly in Queensland, which tends to be our Bible belt here.

Nyck: The deep north. God bless you all up there if you're listening. I like Queensland, but certainly the Queenslanders turned a certain way. And same thing with age pensioners. Queensland is arguably, probably, the biggest retiree-settled state in Australia, and the policies of the Labor Party—and I mentioned before the retirement taxes—Morrison called the removal of franking credits, which was basically a gift, really, in a sense ... maybe gift is the wrong word, but certainly an offering, just like someone gets a Centrelink payment of some sort—it's not that far different from that, really, taking that away is called a tax. And again, I think a lot of older people became very fearful that they really were going to lose some of their retirement. Of course, some people were, and one of the arguments against Labor was that because they actually

articulated their policies for the first time, in Opposition leading up to an election, it could be really easily seen where those policies were going to have a negative effect on some people, and that was expanded by the Coalition: 'All retirees somehow are going to suffer', which, of course, was actually not true. So, a lot of misinformation here.

Someone has just said here: "Maybe the election results are fake news."

Steve: Yes. The other interesting thing is to think of the electoral process as a complex system and just remind ourselves of the fact that with complex systems, often some very small changes can bring some very large results. Of course, this was famously described as 'the butterfly effect' in Lorenz's work around *Chaos Theory* and climate systems (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Butterfly_effect).

There were some interesting small perturbations of the system that happened just prior to the election, and one of those was the anti-Adani convoy which went up into the primary industry heartland in Queensland, which is where a lot of the swing happened here. Obviously the people up there who work in the mines or they work on the land, don't want their life disrupted, and they probably saw their anti-Adani convoy potentially as a threat to their livelihood; a threat to their jobs. Even though there are many, many environmental arguments against the Adani coal mine, perhaps they see that as a way of obtaining more income as more business comes into the place where they live, and I'm sure—well, I'm not sure, but I expect—that there was some fear created amongst the local residents up there by that convoy going up there and claiming that it was all going to stop and it wasn't going to happen and those sorts of things.

Nyck: I think that what you're saying is really important, because I think a lot of Australians, particularly perhaps people in Queensland, don't like to be told how to live—full stop. You go into a country town, you go into a more conservative place in Australia, and people will not like to be told how it's supposed to be. It's a sort of virtue signalling.

Steve: It's an archetypal thing, isn't it? 'Don't come in to our town telling us how to do things.'

Nyck: Precisely, so there's that element, and then the second one is, again, that the Morrison management pretty well single-handedly managed to demonise that whole process of going against the average battler bloke working his job and his ordinary country town and so forth.

The thing that occurs to me about that particular issue—because there have been people who've said that the Adani convoy actually was counterproductive, as you're

suggesting. I shouldn't say who and I won't, but a certain Greens councillor from this area said to me yesterday in reference to the election, that it was a mistake that the Greens took the Adani convoy up there at this time. I don't know if that's correct or not, if that's actually how other people feel, but it's worth actually discussing that, because what I think is missing when we talk about the economics of coal, for example, in those country towns, there are economics, yes, there are some jobs when you open up anything, of course. But the idea that a renewable energy, new business model/structure in these kind of country areas in north Queensland, for example, could actually provide more jobs and how that actually would happen, that's never been really articulated well enough, I think, and that's the missing point. You need to try and educate people. Many people won't listen because they're where they are, but I think there's a big mistake there, generally speaking, not actually been able to articulate and quantify how many jobs, how much economic growth there may well be in sustainable and renewable energy, for example.

Steve: Yes, and don't get us wrong, we're not in favour of the Adani development by any means—it's a potential environmental disaster—but what we're looking at here is the dynamics—the dynamics of human values, of decision making processes. What's played out there is, if what we're talking about here is true to some extent, that the convoy going up there did push some people to vote differently, then it's a fairly classic dynamic associated with the emerging paradigm, which tends to get caught up in communication processes and in joining together with other people to agree on and unfold ideas. But in the process, through focusing on the communication and the interaction between the homogenous group, often it misses the deeper cause-and-effect dynamics, and so inevitably, there are these unexpected consequences of what happens.

We can look back to the 1960s, for example, and some of the unexpected consequences that emerged out of the flower power revolution, the Summer of Love, and all those sorts of things—things like the banning of psychoactive drugs, etc, etc. It's a known dynamic. It can almost be predicted when we see this group action going on.

I would expect the same kind of dynamic applies to what's happening with the *Extinction Rebellion* movement. While it's playing out in a very admirable way, I think, particularly in London where the big protests were—and it was done so peacefully and from a loving intent, with great heartfelt care for the planet and for everybody—but we need to be aware of this tendency to miss some of the cause-and-effect potentials around those kinds of actions and just watch out for those.

Nyck: Yes, and lastly, I think what you're exactly articulating is that it means that too often, those of us who are progressive politically, tend to talk in an echo chamber; we tend to create a bubble and are very satisfied within that bubble. We have that support, as you're saying, that community feeling, that activist feeling. We talk, we share with

each other, and yet perhaps there's something missing here. But it's not missing, because it's a transition, as we're saying—we're on the way to changing these ways of being.

Steve: Yes, these are normal dynamics for this particular set of life conditions and this playing out of the dynamics of human values. Sometime in the future when we step into Second Tier values sets, then the picture becomes quite different because we start to be able to sense and see all of the different values sets at play and see how they interact. That's something that's missing from the current picture—looking at things like the anti-Adani convoy, and in these bubbles that you're talking about, Nyck, there tends to be a general assumption that the whole world is like us and the whole world is going to love this or hate this, just like we do. Usually that's not the case.

Nyck: You are here on *BayFM* with myself, Nyck Jeanes and Steve McDonald on the other side of the space control panel, here in our spaceship. We're leaving town—we're going to New Zealand. I did mention it, but we didn't get to hear it, a great track called *Tangaroa*, which I think is the 'Gods of the Sea', from New Zealand—a Maori song from Tiki Taane—and I thought, well, there's probably a lot of people wanting to take a boat across the waters now and go and live in New Zealand.

Steve: It's interesting for us here in Australia to look across at New Zealand. New Zealand have elected a female prime minister who seems to be more open-hearted and understanding and caring, certainly than our leaders here in Australia, and most leaders in the world probably. You've got to ask yourself, why was that transition so smooth in New Zealand? How did they manage to just move through that without having to bump into all the problems that we're bumping into?

Nyck: What do you think?

Steve: Well, it's all by degree. The change process can be smooth if you're more aware of what's going on. So if you actually understand the change dynamics—if your perception is sharper and you can sense what's needed—then you can actively make changes in the direction of the change, and when that happens, you don't need the slingshot effect so much, right? The only reason you need a slingshot effect is because no-one's got any idea which way we're supposed to turn or how we're supposed to act and so they have to just be subject to the natural flow of the river.

It's kind of like jumping into a river or crossing a river as part of the change process. If you know the currents, then it makes it much easier because you know where not to

jump in the water. You know the right place to get in the water and just ride the current, swim with the current, and get to the other side. But if you don't know how that river flows, then you take a chance and you just jump in wherever and you end up in a whirlpool or you end up wherever you might end up. So the knowledge of those flow dynamics is really what gives you an advantage, and if you know the currents and you jump in in the right place, then you can make the transition much more smoothly without all the problems that come from getting caught in whirlpools and eddies where the same things repeat over and over again and the same people get elected.

Nyck: It's great, it's an endless metaphor. Love it.

Just quickly, a couple of texts here. This is a very practical question about voting itself; it's relevant: "Do you think that on a practical level, some people still don't understand how to vote using the preference system? Should voting be compulsory, especially if there's no suitable candidates for you that are on the ballot paper?" Certainly when you went in on Saturday, all of you or most of you who hadn't pre-pollled, that white sheet for the Senate was pretty daunting for those who didn't really know what they were doing, I imagine. I looked around and I thought, there's a lot of people right here right now in the Ocean Shores School there where I was, a lot of people in this room, I'm assuming—I'm making an assumption, yes—but probably don't really know what to do with this piece of paper.

Steve: No, I agree. I think it is too complex and most people wouldn't understand it. I think there would be a very, very high percentage of the population who don't really understand how to work that system properly. The system itself is archaic. It's way, way out of date and it really makes no sense, even when you take a Modern-Scientific approach to problem-solving. If you want to solve a problem—and running the country can be seen as a problem-solving process—then the first thing you might think about is, OK, who's qualified to do that? And yet our political system does not abide by a person's qualifications—no-one has to pre-qualify to become the prime minister. It's kind of like if you were running a workshop that fixed car engines and you had a problem that you couldn't solve, and so you just decided to pull in 100 people randomly off the street and get everybody's opinion as to which nut that you should tighten on the engine, and then you just take the 'okay, well, 53% of people said this nut so let's tighten that one and see what happens.'

Nyck: Might be right, might be wrong.

Steve: Basically, that's how we're running the country. It just doesn't make any sense at all.

Nyck: That notion in the future that to solve a given problem on a national, or for that matter on a global level, to sit down with those experts from various sides of the political spectrum—from science, from economics, from spirituality even, from various disciplines that feed into the nature of being human on this planet—and to come to some sort of solution of the problem via all those experts, seems to be, clearly, an obvious thing to do, and I guess they try and do that in some corporations that might be functional out there. But on a political level, it seems such a long way away for us to ever reach that point where we actually find the people who are truly qualified on a particular issue, no matter what side of the ideological spectrum they come from.

Steve: Yes. We will get there eventually; we might take a while.

Another issue with the system is that basically it's a system that was designed before the internet, and life has become so much more complex thanks to the internet that systems that were designed before it existed just don't work very well. It's as simple as that. Also, you've got to look at the values set that designed our current election system. It really is designed to appeal to people who want to pursue their personal path of success, and so we're attracting into parliament—and this is a generalisation, of course—a lot of people who are just interested in their own personal success. They want to be powerful, I guess they want to be seen, have a public image as a successful person, and they use our political system as an avenue to achieve that. That, of course, is a very individualistic path and it means that they're not focused on the communal aspects of the role of a leader. And again, that's a great vast generalisation. There are many exceptions, of course.

Nyck: There's also, of course, those who probably enter politics for that reason and/or a combination of the need to push some sort of ideological barrow.

Steve: Absolutely.

Nyck: Which I guess comes from an earlier values system.

Steve: From the earlier Agricultural era.

Nyck: So pushing through. You could say someone like Tony Abbott, perhaps, was it was an expression of that in parliament.

Steve: Yes, I think Tony Abbott was very much about the expression of his raw power too.

Nyck: Even earlier [Layer 3].

Steve: Even in his personal life, he's got a great interest in boxing and those sorts of things, and just being a winner, and I think he saw it as an avenue to express that.

Nyck: A pugilist. Yeah, true.

Steve: So it is very interesting, and the system is broken, there's no doubt about that. It needs to be changed and we need to pull that elastic band back a little bit further.

Nyck: One of the things (but we'll take a break and we'll come back to this) is the notion of values and morality as expressed in these layers and how that fits in—how we emerge out of one values system and how that happens and where those values systems are lodged in each of the evolutionary layers that we pass through as human beings.

Steve: Yes. We can look at the values systems and we can postulate what changes could be made to an electoral system to bring it up-to-date. Really, our current electoral system has hardly made it into the Scientific-Industrial paradigm, to be honest with you. If you take an example from the Modern paradigm, just say that you wanted to recruit a CEO for a corporation, and think about the process that you would go through to do that. To select somebody to lead a corporation, as you see the corporation as a kind of community, then you would have a clear job description; you would have a clear understanding of what skills and experience are required to fulfil the job effectively, you would go through a fairly intricate process of selection, and appoint somebody on merit. That's not what we do with our political leaders.

Nyck: Absolutely.

Another text just came in: "Thanks for that. Great programme, guys. Sadness about the vote result now becomes the question of how can I, as an individual, support the process of change?" Yeah, well, that's a good question.

Steve: Yes, and I think the answer here, in terms of working with this evolutionary tension, is really to join together with people who share your values and look for peaceful ways of communicating your voice; making your voice heard as a group, bearing in mind that this paradigm shift is taking us from an individual way of being human to a communal way of being human. So it's all about community, it's all about

building community, and it's all about communities, in this case, expressing their wants, desires, needs in a peaceful way.

Nyck: Many people listening to that would say, well, that's what we just did with the Adani convoy, with the *Extinction Rebellion*. That's come about with *Occupy* a few years ago and various other movements. *GetUp!* is the biggest example in Australia, you could argue, even though it's an online community, that is creating that sort of community for change, but it's clearly not worked this time.

Steve: No, it hasn't and we can look at the reasons it hasn't worked. It has worked in some places—the *Extinction Rebellion* thing that happened in London recently was successful in getting a decision out of the government; it actually had a positive, successful impact there, which is wonderful, and they did it without really creating too many problems and without any violence, as far as I know, which is amazing. So I think that's a good example to look to.

The things that will trip up this process are blindness to the cause-and-effect links, and also the assumption that everybody is going to agree with you. You've got to take note of who your audience is—who you're speaking to and what their values are and how their values might be different than yours—and that's a very difficult thing for this emerging paradigm to do generally, because it tends to create bubbles, as we said earlier. That's really the trick here, and to take a systemic view, like a system-of-systems view of whatever it is you're trying to change, and look for what Buckminster Fuller called the "trim tabs" in the system.

Taking the example of an aeroplane, a very large aeroplane, its stability and its position in the air can be adjusted with the movement of very, very tiny trim tabs. They're not the ailerons on the wings, but tiny little tabs that sit on the ailerons. The ailerons on an aircraft wing are the things that make the aircraft turn left and right—you tilt the wheel left and the aileron flicks up on one wing and down on the other wing and the thing turns—and each aileron has a tiny, tiny tab on it, which is called a trim tab. There's a wheel in the cockpit that you can adjust those trim tabs with, and just by making the tiniest of adjustments, you can make the entire machine move very, very subtly and slightly. In a way, that's what inadvertently happened with this Adani convoy. Rather than the butterfly effect, it was a flutter-by effect. They fluttered by the area and made a bit of a noise and it just tweaked opinion enough to make people go, 'oh, actually, that could be a problem'. From a constructive, positive point of view, what we need to look for now is, okay, where are those trim tabs in terms of tweaking things so they move in the direction we want them to move in? How can we, with absolute minimum effort, just perturb the system enough so that it makes a change and something shifts?

Nyck: That's interesting. There's a lot of interesting stuff in there. First of all, Steve knows what he's talking about because he is a pilot, one; and secondly, the notion of tiny adjustments that make the big changes if they're correct—at the right time, at the right moment, the right place. Is that sort of anathema in some sense to the rising Green layer that feels needs, because of the desperation, the grief, the pain, the guilt and shame that we haven't got round to yet—we will today talk about that—and pushed too hard to make those changes? They push too hard and thus get these sort of flutter-by effects that you're talking about.

Steve: If you want to take an isolated view of the emerging paradigm and its values and its general *modus operandi*, yes, it is anathema to some extent, but society is not just one value system—society is a mixture of value systems—and at this time in history, we do have Second Tier thinking out there. We have people who have very sophisticated understandings of how complex systems can change and how to impact them.

One example of—I wouldn't call it a Second Tier dynamic, but it was of quite an advanced emerging paradigm, Layer 6 dynamic—was this *Cambridge Analytica* tweaking of the social media system in the US for the election that brought Trump to power. They've done an extensive study of how all the dynamics work within social media and they understand how to make just the smallest changes to target the right people so that there's enough change.

Nyck: I never thought of it as small changes. I thought they were quite large changes, but I see what you're saying. All you need to do is to have enough data sets, enough data points, to actually just tweak a little place and a whole bunch of stuff can change down the line.

Steve: That's right, and that's the beauty of digital systems. You can set up a system so you just have to press one button and a whole bunch of things change. Of course, we know that the Australian Liberal Party met with the CEO of *Cambridge Analytica* not long after the US election and so there's an open question out there: Was that kind of strategy used in the current election? Were people in these seats that have swung targeted through social media or the media in general in certain ways, just to make small sufficient changes to get the swing? And how would we know that if it did happen? That's the question.

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

You've been listening to Future Sense, a podcast edited from the radio show of the same name broadcast on BayFM in Byron Bay, Australia, at www.bayfm.org. Future Sense is available on iTunes and SoundCloud. The future is here now, it's just not evenly distributed.