



## 74. Present and Future Leadership, Part 1

Recorded on 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2019, in Byron Bay, Australia.

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

*This is Future Sense.*

**Nyck:** You are tuned to *Future Sense* here on BayFM on this November the 11th on Remembrance Day, and remembering today how we deal with the many issues that we have. Here, we're faced with these fires at the moment; we're faced also with the questions of leadership with regard to issues such as these kind of peak events, so to speak, on the planet that we're suffering from now.

We only have to look around, I guess, from our arguably more progressive place—Green, Layer 6 in Clare W. Graves's configuration—of what is actually effective leadership now, because clearly much of our leadership, up to this point and still, has been sadly lacking—or has it? We'll get comment, of course, from Steve about these things, but you just have to look around the world now at some of the leaders we have—Mr. Trump, clearly, on one hand; we've got the Chinese leadership in regards to Hong Kong; we've got the Russian leadership; we've got Boris Johnson in the UK and the whole Brexit debacle; we've got people like Bolsonaro in Brazil destroying half of the Brazilian rainforests; and we have our own Scott Morrison and his government here, the Coalition government, all of which, to my thinking, are lacking seriously in forward thinking and progressive leadership—but perhaps not. Are they serving a purpose? And are they clearly expressing different layers or stages of evolution and the perspective which informs leadership on those different layers and levels? What is happening with that? How do we move forward to a more comprehensive forward thinking, longer-term leadership on this planet?

**Steve:** Goodness me, what a lot of questions.

**Nyck:** I know too many questions, but, you know, you can cope. Look at you. You've just come back from up north; you've been with your mob. You've got answers in the Dreamtime or beyond.

**Steve:** I have. I've had a very busy weekend, so I may be a little slow to respond to questions this morning. I spent 10 hours on the road yesterday getting back home.

**Nyck:** We should mention a bit about that. It's also about leadership in a different way, too.

**Steve:** Very much so. It was a very moving and important weekend for me. On my dad's side of the family, through his mother, we've long suspected an indigenous link, and it kind of was more-or-less obvious in the appearance of some of the family members, but we had no information about where the link was and who we were related to and those sorts of things. It was only really in 2017 when my cousin, Melissa, who did a lot of work researching family history, turned up a photograph of my great great grandmother, and she was very, very clearly an Australian Aboriginal lady. Only really within the last month or two, we've actually found a family member in Gladstone in Queensland, which is round about eight or nine hours' drive from where we are now, and I had the opportunity to go up there with my cousin, Melissa, and both of us were meeting Aunty Jackie, our newly found family member, for the first time. She turned out to be the matriarch of the Goreng Goreng mob up there, which was amazing, and it was unexpectedly important for them to discover us because we were really representing one third of their family

**Nyck:** Which had been sort of disappeared.

**Steve:** Which had disappeared. My great grandmother had kind of dropped off the radar and then they'd lost track of the family from there on and we'd been kind of unknown, I guess. I was trying to figure out for how long—probably about for the last maybe 60 or 70 years—there was no knowledge of my line of the family, and so it was quite important for them to discover us; just as important as it was for us to discover them, and so we had a wonderful gathering up there on Saturday afternoon and met a whole bunch of relatives that I never knew I had.

**Nyck:** You've actually got possibly thousands of cousins.

**Steve:** Without a doubt. What's interesting is all the places that I've lived through during my adult life, in Queensland in particular—Townsville Mackay, I actually lived in Gladstone for a year—I've got lots of relatives in all those places and didn't know about it. So, yeah, very, very interesting, and just to have some concrete knowledge around that indigenous link, it's just a huge learning curve, as you can imagine, for me, learning about that part of my origins in the culture and meeting all these people.

**Nyck:** Some of whom are also from the Pacific, because Jackie, as I noted when you sent a photo through, looks quite South Pacific and in fact, there is some heritage in Vanuatu, so you've got that other connection, too. I know that's obviously not your branch of the family, but nevertheless.

**Steve:** Yes, I think that's through her mother.

**Nyck:** So, extraordinary, and I guess that's very common in North Queensland, that long-term interaction with the South Sea Islanders.

**Steve:** Yes, a lot of them were brought in for working on the cane farms and those sorts of things. Some illegally and by force, actually.

**Nyck:** And of course also I should mention, and it's interesting to comment too, because you said to me this morning that many of them are quite Christian; they're Jesus-loving people. That's not a criticism, it's just kind of how it worked for many indigenous communities—the proselytisation of the Christian missionaries did work because it offered something to some of these people and still.

**Steve:** Not only that, but of course, I think for many of them it was it was forced upon them. As the country was colonised, they were taken off their land and put into the care of churches in religious missions. Of course, our mutual friend, Wayne ...

**Nyck:** Wayne Armytage, God bless him, yes.

**Steve:** ... who passed away recently, was telling us stories about his indigenous family and particularly connections up in Far North Queensland, where one of the people who became his tribal father and took him through the Law up there, was, I think, one of very few that managed not to get taken into the mission and remained living in the wild, as you said.

**Nyck:** Peter Costello. A different Peter Costello, folks, to the other one—the politician.

**Steve:** Yes, a very interesting part of their history. I was sitting talking with Jackie yesterday morning about the fact that it's quite likely that many, many Australians probably have Aboriginal blood in their line and don't know about it, because reading about the history of early settlement and mostly men going out pioneering farms and those sorts of things and interacting with the local Aboriginal communities, I think there's probably a lot of Aboriginal heritage in Australia that hasn't been recognised, acknowledged, or just isn't known about.

**Nyck:** Absolutely.

You can text in, of course, on our text line for anything regarding today's show—anything you'd like to bring attention to. We always enjoy your texts.

**Steve:** Yes, and for those who might be listening to the podcast later, we're in the middle of a bit of a fire emergency in this area at the moment. The state where we live in New South Wales, here in Australia, had, I think, 150-odd houses destroyed in the last day or two in wildfires, and right here, I've got a fire at the moment about 5 kilometres away from my house.

**Nyck:** Yes, it's about 10 kilometres away from mine.

**Steve:** There are people in our local area here who are evacuating, and, of course, lots of amazing, heroic volunteer firefighters out there doing their job. Our thanks goes out to them, so listeners this morning who are listening live might also like to text in any current news about fires that they have.

**Nyck:** Absolutely, and as I've already said, there is the community meeting this morning regarding the bushfires in the Mullum Memorial Hall at 11:00 o'clock, which is, of course, that moment of remembrance for Armistice Day.

We, of course, base a lot of what we talk about here on Clare W. Graves's work, and we're going to look a little bit at these styles of leadership. To start with, I thought it was very interesting, because one of Graves's key areas of research was to ask people in his longitudinal study of 1,065 people, what they thought was the mature adult personality in operation. It seems to me that if you're going to have leadership, you're going to have to have a mature adult, however you configure that.

**Steve:** Well, you'd like to have one but we don't always end up with that.

**Nyck:** No, I wasn't saying that we actually have one, but you would think that would be the choice, and as is beginning to be configured by many people in the world, I think, and particularly in our democratic societies, why aren't there parameters for standing for office? You can't just be anybody, and just like the, well, the obvious examples of the Pauline Hansons of the world, for example, in my opinion, standing because they want to. But we actually need people who have skills in the necessary direction to lead and to fashion strategic forward thinking far enough ahead to really deal with the issues that we have.

**Steve:** I passed a big billboard on the way back from Gladstone with Pauline Hanson's face on it, a big smiling face, and the words written on it were: "I've got the guts to say what you're thinking."

**Nyck:** Which, of course, is actually true. I mean, that's true, she does do exactly that. The problem is, I guess that what many people are thinking perhaps needs to open up into a broader perspective somehow. We can't tell you what to think.

**Steve:** Got the guts, but perhaps not the intelligence to understand the implications of what she says.

**Nyck:** Exactly.

So going back in history, because clearly on exactly what you just said, there are a lot of our leadership styles currently in this country, and many of our Western countries, that seem to have regressed from perhaps a slightly more enlightened leadership. Let's take a look at this country.

One would argue that back in the 70s, for example—and even the 80s with the Hawke and Keating, but I'd like to go back to Malcolm Fraser and Gough Whitlam—a couple of very fine men who actually had statesmanship; who cared, it would seem. For example, Malcolm Fraser famously opened up to Vietnamese migration to this country after the Vietnam War. That was very successful overall. We had a much more conciliatory and co-operative style of leadership in this country, and I think that's probably true for most countries in the democratic world. That seems to have shifted or regressed somewhat backwards, hasn't it?

**Steve:** Yes, for sure. And Whitlam, of course, famously pioneered indigenous land rights recognition here in Australia.

**Nyck:** Precisely, yes.

**Steve:** I just wanted to make a quick comment on that mature adult question of Graves's. I just wanted to point out how far ahead of his time he was in terms of his research from a scientific point of view, because most scientists come up with a hypothesis—in other words, a statement explaining how they think the facts are—and then they seek out to prove the hypothesis. Graves didn't do that. He started with an open question: "What is the nature of a psychologically mature adult?" And I think that's a sign of quite advanced thinking, that he just admitted straight up front that, 'I don't know, but I'm going to gather some data and see what the data says.'

**Nyck:** I think it's incredible. When I first came across Graves's work through you a couple of years ago, those kind of overarching positions of enquiry—what is the mature adult?—it

immediately just stunned me that that question is not asked. Really, it made complete sense to me, and I'm sure to many people, but it's just not how we have configured things; how we've thought up to now.

**Steve:** And the really interesting thing is that when he gathered his data and analysed it together with a team of peers who worked on it as well, he came to the conclusion that there really isn't such a thing as a mature adult; that it's a never ending quest, in his own words, and we're always growing, always expanding in response to the complexity of our life conditions, so very, very interesting.

**Nyck:** And of course, he was a contemporary of Abraham Maslow, who produced the very famous *Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs*, and Graves's model basically inverted Maslow's pyramid, because Maslow actually believed that there was an end point.

**Steve:** A pinnacle, that's right.

**Nyck:** And that we reach that pinnacle. But inverting that, Graves said, no, it's actually an open-ended quest and it makes it kind of exciting. Again, when I first started to get into this work, that was a great relief that we weren't trying to get somewhere in particular.

**Steve:** Exactly. And of course, if there was a pinnacle, what happens when you get there?

**Nyck:** That's right.

**Steve:** There would be nothing left to do.

**Nyck:** I'm on the top of the mountain now. I've just got to come down again or I have to learn to fly, perhaps, but yeah, tricky stuff.

**Steve:** Back to your question about contemporary leadership and politics. It seems that our political systems at the moment are really lagging behind in development. If we look at other parts of life—such as business, for example—that display relatively leading-edge values and approaches, our political systems, at least right at this moment, are very much lagging. Of course, we're in this in-between space, transitioning from the fifth layer in Graves's model, which is the Modern Scientific-Industrial way of being human, to what's next, and we're kind of we're moving towards the middle of that transition process. So the old stuff doesn't seem to work anymore, and that's what's pushing us along, but the new stuff isn't quite clear yet for many, many people, so it is an interesting time. Typically, at this stage of the change

process, people look backwards on a regressive value search, trying to find some values from the past that will fit better than the way that we've been doing things, because by definition, we can't see into the future.

**Nyck:** And they do that because things are too uncertain, too difficult, too unpredictable.

**Steve:** Yes, things aren't working so well, so we're reaching back into our old toolbox to see which one of these things is going to fix the problems. Consequently, we're ending up with leaders who are displaying regressive values as a result, and particularly the first step backwards from Scientific-Industrial to Agricultural Authoritarian, where you get the very, very clear distinction between Left and Right and only one of those is correct. It leads to a kind of extremist outlook on things where everything's dumbed down to black-and-white and we lose all those shades of grey that we normally have in a rich world. Then, even further back, we see some countries going further back to the third layer, which is the Egocentric layer—very uncaring because it doesn't have the capacity to actually understand the impact of its behaviours on others. It's not uncaring because it chooses to be uncaring; it's uncaring because the capacity just isn't there.

**Nyck:** And that's such an important point with Graves's work—to look at the capacity and to resist the temptation to easily judge another, but to rather see that this is the capacity that they have at this layer and to ask: 'How can we manage that? How can we find the right expression of that that fits into the whole expression?'

**Steve:** Yes. At that third layer, we get politicians who are really just looking after themselves and they're just in it for the personal benefit and really don't care what the consequences are of their actions.

**Nyck:** On a country level, I guess you could argue that China is very much in that part, at least somewhat, with regards to its repression of Hong Kong—or its attempted oppression.

**Steve:** No, look, I disagree, because if China was operating from that third layer, we would see violence from the Chinese government forces and we haven't seeing that. Their restraint has been quite extraordinary, actually, and that is, at the very least, fourth Layer Authoritarianism where they're thinking about the cause-and-effect. They're thinking about, 'OK, if we come down hard, then it's going to make things worse and that's not good for anybody', so there's definitely an altruistic flavour to the Chinese response there, I'm seeing. It's not a blatant Egocentric kind of response.

**Nyck:** Well, let's hope it doesn't devolve even further, into that.

**Steve:** Let's hope not, but again, it's a complex situation. Like I've said on the show before, if third parties aren't involved in the goings on in Hong Kong trying to stir up trouble for China, then I would eat my hat.

**Nyck:** True. I'm also thinking about someone like Bolsonaro in Brazil, obviously modelled on the Trumpean sort of manner of governance and electability—the whole fake news thing—and his absolute disregard, for example, for the natural environment, particularly with regards to the Amazon. To me, this is a kind of violence. It's not just Layer 4, it is a sort of violence upon the landscape; upon the other creatures and beings on the planet.

**Steve:** It is, yes. I haven't had time to look at him in any detail or to analyse his language, so I really can't make an assessment of him, but just looking at the consequences which have been reported in the news, there's an absence of cause-and-effect thinking there—just blatantly doing things because they're providing extremely short-term profits and not thinking about, 'OK, ten years down the track, how is the country going to be?' That cause-and-effect thinking really emerges at the fourth layer—the Authoritarian-Agricultural—where you have to think about the future. It's the consequence of the rational mind kicking in—the frontal lobes fully developing—and our capacity to be able to moderate those urges which come from our pre-rational self, which lead to us doing impulsive things and not thinking about the future.

**Nyck:** Yes.

We'll take a break here on *Future Sense*. You are tuned with Steve McDonald and myself, Nyck Jeanes. Thanks for joining us wherever you are in the world. As you know, you can tune in to BayFM any time, and we have an edited version of each week's broadcast a couple of days after, in two parts usually, and you can get to that via [www.future sense.it](http://www.future sense.it) or through your podcast platform. You can also listen to the full show again with the music and everything else in it on the BayFM website, [www.BayFM.org](http://www.BayFM.org) a couple of hours after broadcast.

---

**Steve:** We were just talking about politicians and our political systems, and how we select our leaders in society. It's true to say that our political systems are really lagging behind in many countries at the moment; and because we are going through this transition from the Scientific-Industrial era to what's next, there's a regressive search going on. So we're tending to be attracted to older value sets being displayed by potential leaders, which are leading to quite rigid leadership styles from the old Authoritarian fourth layer in Graves's model, where everything is black-and-white—it literally dumbs down the decision-making process when you only have two choices—and that really is a characteristic of our political system in most



Western countries at the moment. You only have two choices, right? It's this one or that one, and often they're two bad choices and you have to choose between which one of the bad choices you want to vote for.

**Nyck:** And there's this whole notion in the fourth layer, of course, of future reward—that's very obvious when it comes to religion—but you can feel that, and as you're speaking, you can hear that in the dialogue, in the discourse of many of the politicians: 'we're doing these uncomfortable things now, we're not doing too much because there's actually nothing to worry about here, because it's all going to be OK, it's all okay, just going forward, there's nothing to really worry about.' There's no real strategy going forward.

**Steve:** That's right. Things will be great again.

**Nyck:** Things will be great again, yes. Or, in the case of some people saying, 'things will be Greta again.'

**Steve:** Yes.

If you think about how we select our leaders just in the corporate world—which is still very much old paradigm, but it's actually somewhat ahead of our political systems—if you apply to be the leader of a corporation, you go through quite a selection process and you've got to provide a résumé with a history of successfully solving problems within that setting, and you've got to have references and those sorts of things. We just don't require these qualifications of our politicians. Our political system isn't set up that way; our voting system isn't set up that way. Many people, I'm sure, turn up to vote—I mean, here in Australia, we have compulsory voting, so everybody has to turn up and vote otherwise they get fined—and I'm sure many of those people probably spend little or no time sitting pondering who they should vote for. We get a lot of media coverage of the national leaders of the political parties, so people would be familiar with them, but in terms of our local representatives, many people, I'm sure, turn up to the polling booth and they don't even know who the local representative is of their particular party. They get a pamphlet at the front gate and look at the face and say, 'well, that person looks OK, so I'll fall in the party line and vote for them', and so it's a very unsophisticated process of selecting leaders. Of course, there's quite a discussion to be had about what works better—a compulsory voting system or a voluntary voting system. Of course, in America they have a voluntary voting system where you don't have to vote, and with the dissatisfaction around Trump, of course, everybody's been urging those people who haven't been voting to actually start voting.

**Nyck:** This morning, I was listening a little bit to the CEO of Qantas, who is the highest paid CEO in Australia with a AU\$24 million a year pay packet. So on one hand, chosen one way, on the other hand, the perks and rewards for winners is very much a Layer 5—an Orange layer, isn't it? So politicians may not be particularly competent in the way that we would like

them to be, so to speak, but if they are successful in whatever terminology that might be (does it just mean stockholder success; stock success?) they are awarded way out of the stratospheric amounts that those sort of CEOs are given.

**Steve:** They are. It's a good comparison, though, because I'm not sure what our current Prime Minister's salary here is in Australia, but I think it's in the order of hundreds of thousands ...

**Nyck:** Yes, it's somewhere around AU\$5-600,000.

**Steve:** ... and so you compare that reward with being the CEO of Qantas, it's just, you know, off the scale, isn't it, the commercial version of that? So you then have the answer to the question, 'why aren't our best leaders getting attracted to politics?' If their values are modern, Scientific-Industrial values, Layer 5, and they want to be successful in financial terms, then they're not going to go into politics. We therefore are attracting people with different value set into politics, and right at the moment, they are older, less complex value sets that really come from the Agricultural era or even prior to that, and at the end of the day, our political leaders need to—or we would hope that they were able to—solve our most challenging problems. If we want our leaders to be solving our most challenging problems, then we need leaders that can think in the most complex ways that are available, and consequently, it's no surprise that they are not solving our problems. In fact, they are at times creating more problems.

**Nyck:** Exacerbating them.

On this topic, futurist, Alvin Toffler, who of course is very famous from back then, defined the new illiterate person for the 21st century as: "The illiterate of the 21st century will not be those who cannot read and write, but those who cannot learn, unlearn and relearn."

**Steve:** Yes, that's a good statement—absolutely—and certainly at this time, speed of learning, speed of adaptation, is critical. That is a skill that we should be looking for in our leaders.

**Nyck:** Similarly, from something I found from Dr Caleb Rosado, who runs *Rosado Consulting for Change in Human Systems*—which is somewhat based on Graves's work, as I understand—writes on the challenge of change: "In order to address the future, people must be open to change. Yet, here lies the biggest hurdle to moving into the future proactively—a reactive mindset. Far too often, leaders are engaged in 'problem-solving' instead of 'change-anticipating.' These are two different approaches to thinking about the future. The first, by its very nature, emanates from a perspective oriented toward the past, toward a 'we have always done it this way' mindset. The latter that is proactive and is oriented towards the

future, towards 'how can we do things differently.'"

([http://www.edchange.org/multicultural/papers/rosado\\_leadership.pdf](http://www.edchange.org/multicultural/papers/rosado_leadership.pdf))

**Steve:** That's a fair consideration, and of course I guess many of our politicians are in it for the personal rewards and personal success, although obviously if they were capable and they wanted financial success, they wouldn't be in politics, most likely.

**Nyck:** Well, of course, many of them do go into politics for a raise in salary, perhaps, but then end up as advisors, as lobbyists, and end up with a much bigger pay packet somewhere along the line, or end up in one of the companies that probably they've got close to in their portfolio during their time in government.

**Steve:** Yes, and a lot of it, too, I think, is the attraction of long-term rewards, because if you're in politics for so many years, then you end up with quite a healthy pension for the rest of your life and all sorts of perks, like free travel and those sorts of things.

**Nyck:** Someone has written in and said: "Smart business people are not stupid enough to get into politics."

**Steve:** That's, ah, yeah.

**Nyck:** Someone else has written in, too: "Surely to arrive at the pinnacle is a position of wakefulness. A still delight, acknowledgement and gratitude for the extraordinary miracle of this vast event we call life." Well, that's a big picture.

**Steve:** If indeed there was a pinnacle.

So we're faced at the moment with a task ahead of us just to bring our political systems up-to-date with the paradigm that's dying.

**Nyck:** Oh, that's a good statement. Say that again.

**Steve:** That the task we're faced with is bringing our political systems up-to-date with the paradigm that's dying, yeah? You can see the nonsense in that statement and that task, and so what this is pointing towards is a complete system reset. This no doubt will be the case in some countries because different countries have different life conditions and are operating from different value sets at the moment, so some countries are moving into a Layer 5 Scientific-Industrial value set and will be seeking leaders that fit that value set, but what

we're going to see on a wider scale is essentially a decline in the importance of the Nation State because the Nation State is something that arose with the Scientific-Industrial era. Prior to that, it didn't exist; prior to that, we were in the Agricultural-Authoritarian era where we had kings and queens and kingdoms and those sorts of things and very, very different systems. And so we ought to anticipate now a decline in the importance of the Nation State. It most likely won't disappear—because these older value sets don't disappear, they just slide from dominance—and the emergence of a new way of organising ourselves.

All the indicators are that we are coming to the end of an era around about the early 2030s, where we'll see a shift from private sector dominance, which we're in at the moment—and this is from the computer analysis of Martin Armstrong. In this era that we've been in of private sector dominance, what we've seen is the private sector gain dominance over our government. This is what we refer to as *corporate capture*, where even though these are supposedly public systems which are managing our societies and leading us, in actual fact they're really controlled by the private sector because the private sector funds them, and if they don't do what their funders want, then we see the consequences. We've seen that with things like our Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, here in Australia where the mining industry turned on him and that was his downfall because his policies weren't what they wanted. It's such a weird thing because it's so obviously and clearly the case that our politicians are under the thumb of their corporate sponsors and yet we deny it, we pretend it's not happening, and it's one of those taboo things that no-one will talk about. The politicians won't talk about it, that's for sure.

**Nyck:** No, but it is being revealed, and while it's true what you're saying, I think more and more people, and more and more levels or layers of society and all across the board, are seeing through and are seeing the emperor has no clothes more and more. We're yet to do much about it at the ballot box—because there is this regressive search and people will tend to, in the end, put their vote back in that place where they think this old stability is—but I think there's certainly an awakening. More and more people are seeing through the game to some degree, because the desperation on the side of those who have power is so overtly, brazenly mad at times now that it's a bit hard, I would suggest, for even the most asleep and stupid person—sorry, folks out there, whoever you regard those asleep and stupid people to be—even some of those people, I think are beginning to go like, 'you know, it doesn't feel right. I can't pay my rent; the price of strawberries is through the roof this week', or whatever. Simple life conditions are impacting on people in a way that makes them, I think, begin to question.

I'm Being optimistic here. Hopefully that change is moving forward quicker than we ... well, as quick as it needs to be.

**Steve:** I saw an interesting paper published just recently, an academic paper talking about the political moral sidestep phenomena. It was particularly in relation to the opioid crisis in the UK, but this is very applicable to what's happening here in Australia, too, and also very applicable to the situation with our drug laws and prohibition and pill testing and those sorts of things, where politicians are being presented with scientific evidence which is clear, and

yet they are choosing not to follow the scientific evidence, but doing what the paper called a "moral sidestep" and basically making decisions on their moral value set and causing harm in the process (see:

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0306460318307925>). I mean, the scientific evidence is, 'this is what we need in order to reduce harm in society', and yet the politicians saying, 'no, no, this is the way it's going to be' and deferring to their own moral value set. I often wonder, and it's hard to know sometimes, whether those politicians ... and Gladys Berejiklian, our Premier here in the state of New South Wales is a great example, with her decisions around the drug laws and pill testing. We're getting very, very clear scientific recommendations from coroners, reports from special commissions of enquiry—which she set up herself—that are making recommendations, and then she's saying, 'no, we're not we're not going to do what they're recommending.' So either one of two things is happening. Either the politician really is coming from a Layer 4 or less complex value set where their values are so rigid that they just cannot change and won't change—won't even consider the change regardless of what evidence is presented to them—or they're being pressured through corporate capture, where the corporate sponsors that sit beside them and ensure that they stay in power are saying to them, 'you cannot make that decision because it will impact our profits'. So they have to say no to the public and they have to look dumb in order to serve their corporate masters.

Which of those is in play? It's hard to say, but it's one or the other most likely.

**Nyck:** Yes. I think I want to mention just now, talking about the drug situation and the use of both legal pharmaceuticals and the rest, we've talked a little bit here on this programme—well, quite a lot—about the new psychedelic revolution, for example, and the opioid crisis in America and also in this country here. Of course, Tasmania is one of the biggest poppy-growing regions for opium/opioids in the world—I think the second biggest in the world. Anecdotally, I've been told by a good friend who was with some people in Launceston the other day who are on opiates for pain relief, but very aware of the dangers of that and looking into medicinal cannabis. But they live in Launceston and they are familiar with and they actually know some of the poppy growers down in Tasmania—and this is cutting-edge news, if it's true; anecdotal, so who knows?—but they are saying that the poppy growers in Tasmania are being told by the State Government not to plant more poppies and, for example, to start considering replacing poppy fields with other crops. So clearly, somebody knows that a change is in the wind regarding that particular issue. So that's rather good news, it would seem.

**Steve:** It is good news, but it's not rocket science because there are massive, massive court cases playing out in the USA against these pharmaceutical companies, which are really responsible for quite consciously creating the opioid demand and the opioid crisis.

**Nyck:** Indeed.

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