MapCamp 2021 - Fireside Chat

Okay, we better give it a few seconds for everybody to join. Uh, I also got to remember to stop bouncing around. I keep on apparently jumping up and down. Like I've been so excited today. Uh, it's been such great fun and everything else. I am like the kid in the candy shop. Like I keep on banging the table as well, which makes noise.

So I I've got to try and keep still be much more sensible, which has gotta to be almost impossible because I'm here obviously with you, David. Uh, I mean, um, it's a, it's such an honor, such a delight. Uh, I've been looking forward to this all day long. How have you enjoyed math camp? You enjoyed it so far. I actually got a chance to go to some sessions this year, which was good.

So last year I just did this one blind. Yeah. But yeah, and I've just been in a session with JB and others. So that was interesting in three or four of them. I know you've been, um, cause we were just talking beforehand, also walking, uh, and $400 Steve miles you'll know, not separate. All right. So I've got two challenges at the moment.

One is Southwest coastal path, right? So I've got to get past Exeter before the end of October, because then the ferries stop. So I can complete it in winter. And I was meant to do 10 days in lake district because I'm trying to do all 214 Wainwrights in less than 40 days. So I booked 10 days to finish it.

Four days of rain. One day I had a great day and then fell and my knee went so I've had to come home. That's the frustration, but I'll be back on the coastal path Friday and Saturday. Bye-bye some point we'll have to persuade you to come and walk past, uh, before my particular area is underwater as a result of global warming.

Anyway, so. One of the themes that I hit in the hole. I didn't, it wasn't very well hidden, uh, was, was this theme about this sort of, um, uh, uh, climate change in the climate crisis, uh, coming towards us. And I've got a couple of comments I want to start with on that. But before I do that, I've got a little bit of a confession to make, and that starts with, um, sharing a slide.

So, uh, this particular slide. Uh, many, many years ago, I developed a, a weak signal for a particular pattern known as peace war on wonder, peaceful and wonder very, very simply, uh, our systems or our, uh, companies developing sort of a state of peaceful, but fierce competition. And they built up a nurture the change.

Then we get this point of war where we get the industrialization of technology, um, uh, very rapidly, a punctuated equilibrium. We call it an explosion of higher order systems, a new age of wonder, and they say this, I wrote about 12, 12 years ago. Something like that. It's based upon CS Hollings, adaptive renewal cycle.

It overlaps with the work of columns and progress it's, uh, uh, which I'm so delighted. Come off that speaker map. Um, but I use these weak signals to identify, uh, whether these points of industrialization of war coming towards us. And then I did various populations studies. Um, so intelligent agents starting to industrialize, um, 20, 25, 20 30.

This was done in 2014 now, but it's not the original. The original is this truly ghastly, but it should, um, uh, or it's horrifying to look at. Um, but there's something I missed off of the one I later used, and that is at the very bottom social change because, uh, the weeks that knows that I did all pointed to this point of massive disruption, uh, social change, uh, 20, 25, 20 30.

And of course people would came and asked me, what do you mean by that? I mean, this is what was 2014. Uh, what do you mean by that? W w what do you mean war social change and, you know, it's, um, uh, well, I, I, I decided the simple answer was to remove it from the table, um, because the questions were too uncomfortable, but yes, um, I'm expecting some conflict unless we stop heading up.

So I want to talk about that and the environmental issue, because, you know, I started off by highlighting. Um, one of the themes hidden, hidden in that camp, um, was this environmental crisis and that's the obvious bit, and this is unavoidable unless, you know, do something to mitigate against it. Um, but the, um, the less obvious is the mitigation.

And so I looking into the subject can kept on coming back to the sort of four basic things. Uh, first of all, we needed to understand our supply. Um, now my environmental background, I used to work in environmental field 30 years ago and I gave up for various reasons, but I'm always kept tabs. Um, but we need to understand that supply chains.

I mean, it's though it's laborious but necessary and we've seen COVID and Brexit and the impact of us not understanding our supply chains. We've also seen the fabulous work of the S FSA. I mean, I'm just great stuff. And also, Rachel Murphy's talk as well, but more than just supply chains, we also need to alter values and the balance of William B.

I mean, we're all elements of we and elements of me, but it's the balance of that and society that seems to matter. And unfortunately, our market system is both on trade, which is built on property, which is built on ex. So that exclusion gives rise to accumulation of power. We tend to be centralized around individuals, whether that's by luck or the pieces work, or whether, you know, you've heard about zip networks with a Conway today.

Um, and we can't exclude people from the environment, despite our market system being based on exclusion. You can't say, oh, stop living in the environment now, which is why we can't effectively value it. So the market itself, as it stands and the environment literally don't fit. So one way is called, you know, caring capitalism, golden age.

I hope so. It's a lot better than the social war thing that I've got in the back of my mind. Uh, the other ways may be Elysium originally down in space, all the rest of us. Well, now we're excluded. Now they can value it. The worse it gets on earth, the more valuable living up in spaces. So the values we've got that supply chains, then we've got a third thing, which is.

We need to move away from stores and the politics of storytelling. I mean, I love Gretta's blah, blah, blah. Um, the issue is not just, we have an entire industry running around telling people that great leadership is associated with good storytelling. Um, it's the power dynamics that come with it and the filtering and manipulation, all of this sort of stuff, the lack of transparency.

Um, and we also need to be careful, um, because it's easy to point to crisis failures within things. Uh, but you know, that's the Frankfurt school critical theory. You point to the crisis weaknesses, you create a new law. You say I've got the new ideology, give all the power to be, uh, so we, we get rid of one load of jokers and we end up with Dominic Cummings at his mates.

Not exactly filling me with hope either. And so that then brings me to the fourth point, which was. We need to find mechanisms of communication learning, uh, even when there is conflict exists between drinks. I mean, I did this with mapping and Brexit is, and remain, has gotten to talk to each other or getting out of the stories.

Um, but there's another slight problem is we also need to realize that competition has many forms. Conflict is one cooperation, collaboration, cooperation of others, and we can and do use multiple forms in competition. Uh, now there's a whole reasons of self-interest the certain groups who want to sort of associate competition with conflict.

I see, you know, back to the Frankfurt school again, it's because then now the holders of the new truth, new ideology given. So we about, um, I think we should try and avoid that again. So, you know, I've got these four factors, supply chains, values, power, and communication. Um, and for me, this is all at the heart of our chance to mitigate the.

Uh, crisis, which we cannot avoid if we do nothing. And I live on Cape coast and I don't particularly like the idea of just living on a pirate ship, I'll do it. Um, and being underwater. So, um, I suppose I asked you to chat because, um, if anybody can help point away through all of this, uh, it has to be used.

So is there a way out of this mess? Because if we do well, you know, where this all ends up, but it's that sort of conflict, which none of us want to see. I think there's a direction of travel. I don't think anybody says they got the solution is right, right. But there's a direction of travel. And I think this is one of the key complexity stories, which is, we need to understand where we are and we need to start journeys with the sense of direction, but we've got to stop goal-based because.

And a lot of the climate change problems are because we're trying to create goals and that ain't gonna work. You know, it w it's it's ontologically fought right. In terms of the way we work. I'll come back to that in a minute. So I think this, um, I mean, this is what I've been talking about lately is the frozen two strategy.

All right. Um, if you haven't watched frozen two, yet you need to go and watch it. It's the best complexity movie, every produced. All right. And the real heroin and frozen two is not the one with all the magic. It's the one without the magic. And there's this lovely song that she sings at one point in a point of despair.

It's, by the way, it's a profoundly ecological movie, um, frozen too as well. There's a point where she thinks do the next right thing. All I can do is do the next right thing. And at. Yeah, and I think that's a key complexity message. And I'll come back to develop that in a minute. Right. I think the other thing is we've got to be realistic about the different alternatives, right?

Um, so I mean, I I've been involved in a whole series of war games over the last six months. All right. I tend to get red team blue team, right? I'm quite good. At red team. I've currently conquered Taiwan twice by sacrificing three, three Chinese carriers for every American carrier. I took out on the basis.

I couldn't care less. How many of my people I kill provide that achieved my objectives and the American system Detlef because the global warming one is depressing because the most realistic scenario is we ended up with about 10% of the population on 15% of the planet. And the issue is what comes out.

Yeah. Okay. Can we create something out of that now? I think that's unduly depressive and I think there's things we can do about it, but we've got to make it a micro problem, not a macro problem. So I just did a big webcast with Tyson. If you know, Tyson, he wrote some talk. Yeah. And we're creating this really interesting series of webcasts where the Welsh meet indigenous populations around the world.

Because if you don't know, the English did to the Welsh a hundred years ago, what they then went to do to the rest of the world thereafter. All right. Tried to destroy our culture, tried to destroy our language. So we're all swapping stories and we're having a great time it's called yarning. Right. But there are a couple of big things we've come up.

This, the brilliant thing that Tyson did in some talk is to look at global warming from an indigenous perspective. Right. So he looked at a Western problem in the sense from a completely different perspective. And I think this comes back to the essence of two or three things I want to mention here, and I'll come onto a wider issue.

One is the minute you pose a problems me against way, you've made a socially optimistic assumption. The reality is nobody from a communitarian culture, which includes indigenous Africa. Racia. Actually the Kelsey fringe identity is actually clan and families bugger all to do with me. Yeah, the identity is actually radically different.

Yeah. And one of the things which the next big session on Dan with Tyson, we're going to start looking at new economic forms. So I would prefer my cello over Kate any days because Kate is with donor is conforming to the needs of, you know, near liberal capitalism. She's making something look acceptable to them with the way it works.

All right. I think Carla is actually closer to the future because she's trying to make great companies and from where it is to something which is more sustainable by creating the value stream. So I think there's valuable stuff there. Um, but then I get really depressed by all these people playing with blockchain and block blockchain variance.

And I'm now going back to my Catholic marks is past right. Is, you know, the whole point is the, the exchange mechanism. If you control the means of exchange, you have. So moving from money into a distributed blockchain, effectively managed by people, misogynists males in their forties. You take care and run seriously.

All right. After puberty, which is a very dangerous sign is deeply problematic. This is libertarian error at the heart of blockchain, which is probably one of the big things that I was going to say. You mean changing one form of exclusion for another form of

artifacts. And I really am popular at the moment with a whole bunch of people, because we were both attacking the whole concept of block chains and we're attacking the concept of stage based models of development and no peaks back. I mean, they're kind of like the bet me to do it, but not doing it as well makes it doubly worse.

All right. But I think one of the key anthropological concepts, and we're starting to see this emerge at the moment is the concept of again, Now the point about a gift, and it's why I've always objected to the term social capital. I argued this with Larry proofs for years. All right. There is no such thing as social capital because you don't do something for somebody on the expectation of an equal and opposite payback.

If you want to see that satirize look at big bang theory and Sheldon's problem with gifts, all right, his gifts have to be reciprocated in exact financial form, right? That's not how it gifts work. A gift is a membership fee. And once you pay the fee, you're part of a community which is responsible for you.

So one of the things we're working on with deacon university and Tyson at the moment is try and get some grant based money to look at gifting methods, to handle local communities. And that's trying to, and what we're trying to do there is to get rid of the idea of a means of. So I think that was one set of initiatives.

I think the other thing is, um, you are, you have always been a child of the enlightenment Simon, who you can trace your ancestry back to Descartes coming back to where M J was coming earlier. Right. So there's this fundamental myth. Yeah. Which basically says, um, kind of like, we just give everybody the right information and they have the right education.

They'll make the right decisions. Yeah. And you can see that in the way people are trying to counter trolls on the internet, the way they're trying to get people involved in global warming. And the fact is that is it's ontologically flawed in terms of philosophy and it's biologically fault because that's not the way human beings make decisions.

So there are two big things we're working on at the moment. These are my pet projects. So I'm going to talk about them. All right. So one is looking at, um, agency assemblage and afforded. So rather than talk about me or we, you look at what has agency in the system, what are the affordances provided by the system and what are the assemblage structures, which prevent people, seeing things which could actually change the way they work.

Yeah. So that's taken a different mode of analysis. The other thing, and I'll stop after this two openings up, which is the thing, which is really exciting at the moment. I've been playing around with constructor theory and physics. Now for about 10 years, since I first read it from the work that Dr and others did, um, and dietary isn't being well-served by the Italian PhD students, who's trying to commoditize it at the moment, but if you go back to Dodger's work, right.

And th what constructor theory says, it's the first attempt in physics to look at a system, not in atomistic terms. So instead of trying to find the fault smallest particle and my general view on that is quarks are good enough. Or I like quirks. They come in threes if they feel like to me. Um, instead of trying to do that, what we actually want to do is to, um, first of all, look at the system as a whole, by defining the counterfactual space.

So in physics, that means the law of gravity isn't going to change. So anything which breaks the law of gravity is not. Um, but you started off by not looking at what you want to be the case. You look at what can't be the case. And then within that you create constructors and constructors produce replicable outcomes.

So the simplest example, for example, is a machine and human beings of ritual actually also produces rapid outcomes. Yeah. And this, by the way, the reason physics loves this is it solves the problem with quantum uncertainty because constructors get rid of that. It's a much older concept anyway. Yeah. And it's nothing to do with constructional law, by the way, which I think is a waste of time.

But quantum mechanics over thermodynamics any day. Right. So. Let's come on and ask, could you give us an example? Uh, artificial one, um, construct a theory applied to the

and actually I'm teaching it all day. Monday. We finally got physical masterclass together in writing. I'm really looking forward to this last time I ran one in red and I didn't know, a 70% compression on the left hemisphere. I brain. So I couldn't even write on the board, but I got through it. Right. So this time will be better.

Right? So the way, so if you think about it, what we're doing now, I say that the work we did on constraint mapping and scaffolding, which over the last three years has been really critical is that if we map the constraints in terms of scaffolding, we can identify what isn't possible. We add the temporal aspect.

So we can say this is impossible, but we could potentially change it. But now it's. Yeah. And then this is a safe to fail concept of power, safe to fail. We start to create multiple constructors and we see what works and doesn't work. Yeah. And the things which work more engine and things, which don't work at less energy.

So what we start to do is manage the dispositional state to the system to see what can happen. And this is the point I've made several times. We need to look at energy gradients. If the energy grade into virtue is too high. And then what is, is it ain't gonna happen? So we need to change the energy gradients.

So the energy grades into virtual is more than. So if I go back to sorry, if I focused on the environment or the shoe and that, that single issue, that the market fundamentally trade and properties based upon exclusion. And of course we can't exclude people from the environment. So you've got natural conflict between the market and the environment.

And th th there's no way you can truly resolve this. And I, we can't just turn around and say, sorry, can't use the market anymore because that'd be just too much reaction. So what you're saying is you need to have that as a direction, but it's almost like crossing the river by feeding the states. Uh, we, you, we need to know which steps we can actually take to move us in that direction.

Is that what your. Yeah, it is actually one thing I did in the south. The last section I did on Southwest coastal path, I had to cross, uh, cross, uh, a major estery, like there's half an hour gap, either side of low tide where you can do it. And the other wall is up to the middle of your thighs. And I'm feeling my way with my feet.

Right. And one of the things I've been arguing a lot lately is we need to stop talking about maps in terms of top of logical maps. And we need to think about Max's charts because charts have a high level of uncertainty in them. So I'm really working on that, but you also get to make it a local problem until people feel the pain of global warming as a local level.

And this is linked to keep there's three key books by Terry Eagleton, which everybody should read. Right? So one is hope without. And that picks up on Moulton's theology of hope, which was really important, deliberate theology, but has context outside of religion. The other one is why Marx was right. Um, sorry, Terry and I were both Catholic Marxists and I did slant journal and I've got one up over him because I was summoned to the Vatican for heresy.

He never made that status. Right. Um, but the other really interesting one is radical sacrifice. All right. Now the issue is until people make sacrifices as the local level, politicians will never have the dispositional state to make sacrifices at a national and international level. So you've got to make global warm in a highly localized issue, very fast in order to change the dispositional state.

And that's where we're doing things like, for example, you know, children ethnography. Yeah. And in terms of the way systems work, but, you know, getting funded for that is really difficult because it's, it's indirect, not direct government wants a big, big funding for big projects, which promise one does in five years' time, but don't require them to change in the present and the whole of the system that is entirely dependent on that.

Of course they don't want to change. There's all the inertia and everything else based upon exclusion, you get accumulation of capital, whether it's zip floors or kind of shift. All right. If you look mean systems thinking came in in the eighties and nineties, um, the great tragedy, it was popularized by hammer and chamfering Peterson.

That was the problem, right. And everything. So they got this dichotomy between rigid process and what I call fo Buddhism, which has gone on into the presence movements and everything else. I mean, phobias and folk Buddhism is a real problem for American academics. Um, but it went from academic idea to dominant metaphor in three years flat.

And this is what I talk about on fractures curves. And that's where we, we then came in maps. We're seeing this sort of same sort of thing on complexity and elsewhere at the moment. It's one of these COVID is triggered, is the unsustainability of old models of working. Now, the issue is when you go into that period, what comes out the other side?

Because what comes out the other side will be the new apex predator. Now what comes out the other side could be Savage individualism. So it's, I mean, it's the point I made to you before we came on, there's a bunch of very rich Americans building caves in Hobbiton so that they will survive at the end of the.

All right. Or going to space where they should really read, um, my friend, Neil Stephenson's book the Seveneves, if you haven't read that, go and read it. If you want one of the best epileptic models of all time, that's it. So all of those sorts of things, I think the problem, right? So the issue is over the next five to six years, and that's actually a critical period, and this is me doing my forecasting.

We've got to find new trajectories. Yeah. And that's going to be done on a distributed basis. And that, that is the only hope to be honest. And going back to your point, it doesn't have to be a big change. I mean, it's like a, it can't be a big change. It's gotta be lots and lots of small changes apply. So it shifts over time, the entire system in a particular direction.

And so what it does is it changes? No, no, sorry. I'm, I'm being finicky now. This is my background in philosophy and theoretical physics. All right. We get a very pedantic, right. Um, you're changing the dispositional state so that better things are more likely to happen. Right. It doesn't mean there aren't going to happen because you're going to have to push.

Hmm. Hmm. Okay. So do we have an idea of what those things are that we need to do? Uh, are you, are you, we're doing some things. All right. So we've now done this in Sweden, in Wales, in Colombia, in Egypt, in Pakistan. And this is linked in with, I mean, one of the great Welsh initiatives of recent years is the future generation.

Um, for people who don't know that we passed legislation in Wales, I mean, Paris is doing its best to make us part of the kingdom of England and Wales at the moment, and making us fly the bloody butchers apron above the, the red dragon on building. Sorry, I was brought up to court at the bushes. They promote the union Jack and I still think that was the Muslim appropriate praise.

Right. But one of the things we did is we passed legislation. It says no laws can be passed, which don't take into account the needs of the next generation. And we created a commission. So we created an overall governing constraint about law, and I've actually stopped the extension of the unfold that was killed by the future generations.

Right now, I'd say Westminster's trying to destroy that at the moment, but that's a really interesting concept. So what we've been building is I'll tell you a story about this, about David health and in a minute. So our concept for some years, and we've been working on it is if you allow children in schools and sports clubs and church groups to become ethnographers to their community, this is the way you break Ashby's law because now, you know, who's generated the data.

So instead of trying to fix problems by trying to define what's the right data, you focus instead on who creates. Yeah. And that gives you a solid base. Right. But it also means, and that's where we're also working with things like transgenerational parents. So putting young people with people in their grandparents' generation, in trios with people from government who can make their ideas happen.

So you've got inspirational youth, pragmatic, old government, and, you know, w we built a bike park for God's sake in the valleys, which broke the drug dealers and the Welsh government. Didn't like it because it wasn't a big, massive project, but it made a huge difference and it cost nothing. Yeah. So that concept of, of wholescale citizen engagement is key.

The other thing which we've just completed is a wonderful project for the year, as you know, or I, I really liked the European union. I think it's the future of society, but we have had disagreements on that. Um, I mean with the field guide actually has been really good for complexity because it's endorsed complexity, but the other big project we've been doing, um, called pontic Pontier, uh, this is Welsh for bridge.

If you don't know. Well, she has well she's whales with the Romano cows. So there are Latin roots and Celtic roots tomorrow's language. So Pontier means bridge. So what we've been doing is building virtual walls in which people tell stories, and then artists can reinterpret those stories with pictures or sculptures or film, and then people see the re-interpretation.

They encounter those reinterpretation and they see how other people have seen how they see the same data. Now that's called a micro nudge policy. So what we're trying to do is to get people to encounter differences at the micro level where they can handle it. And we're about to launch that. And I think that the big thing on this is.

And I mentioned this in an email to you. We need to switch from talking in order to do, to doing in order to allow conversations because the Northern European north American tradition is everything can be solved by us, all getting together in the workshop and a bunch of white liberals try and get MIT, run a workshop with, you know, pretty pictures, which talk about transformation.

And I mean, that's where we gone. Right. And that's never gonna work. Right.

Well, it's never actually produced a difference, but, um, I'll put, I'll put a link in here. All right. Um, I mean, we've had, uh, there was a big difference in Northern Ireland. All right. Um, um, so I'm when I was involved in peace and reconciliation, those nine in the seventies. Right. And I still remember getting picked up in the falls road by an, our UC land Rover and us, which are my legs that won't broken first.

And then they heard my accent and realized I was a mainland Catholic. No, Irish CA so I wasn't a filthy take. So they threw me out the land Rover. I mean, if the Provo commander had come up from that night, they probably joined. Right. But we had two, one was Corey Mila. And the link I'm giving you is a wonderful satire of course, Jameela by dairy girls, which is a brilliant, brilliant comedy.

And th that the clip is where the Catholic girls are brought into a peace and reconciliation process with the Protestant boys. And it's terribly funny, right? And everybody agreed at the end of the work props, they will behave differently, but within weeks they were throwing petrol bombs. Again, we took asymmetric groups of Catholics and Protestants and dumped them into Latin America for six.

And we didn't talk about the troubles now, that's also what we're doing on random blue in the states at the moment is you create a context in which people discover there's something common, and then they have a conversation about it. Now, the work we're trying to do with Tyson is how do we get a situation where people have a different conversation with the planet so they can see things differently and that's gotta be the level.

So just the answer. I mean, I was saying we've tried this for 30 years in terms of getting these sort of big groups usually led by consultants, big consultancy firms, and it has worked. But what you're talking about is a small groups, much more localized, um, much more discussion discussion between the group about action that can be taken at a very local level and small steps.

Christoph has made the point in the comments here, right? What we're looking to do is to create things which can be picked up and replicated as a local level, very fast, rather than things which require national initiatives or require a big consultancy feeds. You're going to be, you're going to be hate more heated by the big consultancy firms then I'm trying to be, I mean, it's interesting, right?

Some of them are realizing, I mean, this is what I mean. I remember speaking with Ipsos more at one point with the CEO, or I won't give the full context now because I think I'm still bound by confidentiality agreement. But one of the things he said is the market research industry is facing a Kodak. Now, I mean, this links in with what both of us worked on is Kodak.

Wouldn't give up on film because they were making too much money out of it. So they got wiped out by digital. So at least two of the big consultancies, because I'm talking to them at the moment, you realized that the utilization model isn't sustainable and it's going to get broken. All right. And when it breaks, who see, who comes out and the other side, it won't be a big sex unless they change.

But I'm really into fall on hopes. It's been my life for it. I always liked the concept of a fall on hoping. Anyway, it comes from the proteomic warfare. So I tried to make IBM a services company. I've tried three times with pharmaceutical and companies to make them service companies. One of these days I'm going to succeed.

All right. It's a C, but it is a false hope. Okay. Now actually, Sarah's come up with a really good concept that I made an argument with ed Miliband in the days when I was in the labor party, before I resigned, I resigned from the labor party twice once with telling me Blair. And once we put Corbyn right on, on similar grounds that both of them were extremists and we could do without them.

Right. I've resigned twice. Now once with a Tony Blair St there, but I also resigned under, under Salma. So how, okay. So either way. All right. So, um, but they come back. One of the proposals I made, um, and this was for labor party election. I said we should reintroduce national service because it would completely throw the conservators.

They wouldn't know what happened. If the labor party talked about national service, it could be military or it can be social. And if you do national service, we pay your university fees and we give you a. And if you don't do it, you pay for that yourself at full economic rates. And I said, there are three functions on this one is it will give people the platter education because they will get the right experience.

Secondly, it breaks racism because if you spend two years of your life overseas, you can't see the world the same way anymore. Okay. And sorry, I said it has that function. And B it means that the people who are prepared to contribute to society, society pays for their education, which by the way, it's how Singapore manages its elite system.

And say, Paul is about the only socialist state I know in the world at the moment. Well, I, I, I don't have an issue with the idea of national service. Um, I was actually, um, at 67 or it, by the way. All right. Very easy at 67 to agree that things are good for your, oh, I didn't have a ASU when I, uh, I was younger as well.

Um, I've just noticed, you mentioned Sarah. We've got Sarah. Uh, in the Sarah is wanting to come on station, come on Sarah. Because, well, we shouldn't pressurize people. I mean, the, we always bring somebody on the stage. We have Sarah, let's see if Sarah is willing to, I mean, just to come to some Sampson on the chat line as well, which is important.

I mean, one of the big things we're talking about in the, you feel going is building informal networks. Now, if you look at Singapore, the informal networks are based on national service. So they're meritocratic in the UK. The informal networks are going to eat and are Harrow and then join in with scientists at Cambridge.

So they're perverse. So you know, this issue about building things across silos is key. Carry on like that cat will invite you back on as well. Ideally in costume. Well, I think we have the mother. Sarah has joined us. Hello, Sarah. Hi. Can you hear me? Okay.

Oh, thank you. I'm glad you did. It was, uh, it was a real challenge to do it in a more generic sense. See, it's far easier to do it when you're in a business where their own sort of business model and, and challenges. But yeah. Thank you. Um, and I'm loving this conversation. Um,

you've been passed at the Friday meetings, so you got no excuse to not have to contribute. I know I was sort of watching, watching the chat going round and going today. Maybe, maybe I hadn't realized how privileged I was to get to spend time just shooting the breeze with you too. Um, but there's, uh, you know, I've, I've learned an awful lot.

Um, I mean the national service thing, actually, my dad did national service. He, he, he was in one of those last generations. He was born in 37 and one of his parts was national service, um, was in suicide. It did completely change his worldview. Um, as well as having tales of, um, skiing diamond, no, in filling up his very wide bell, so high, he thought he was going to get phrased and extremities.

But, um, uh, I, I really do think, and I've talked, I've talked about this idea of, um, uh, financing kids to live different places for a while. Cause I, I mean, I took myself off on a, on a shoestring to live in France for a couple of years and it wasn't the typical sort of great, great picking into railing. I went and lived somebody somewhere for a couple of years often, not having anywhere to stay until I don't enough money to pay for rent and had to live in a well, I had sort of, kind of had to camp on the streets a bit until I got myself together.

But, um, yeah, it would be interesting to see how that changed perspectives if you could track the effects of it. I, I, I think one of the things we show with me on that is. When I left university, or I ended up on the world council of churches program to combat racism, the student wing. And I started remember working on Aboriginal land rights and Darwin and a mind security dog just walked out and shot one of the Aboriginal activists dead in front of me.

It sounded like 25. Right. And we went to the police and they said, tell me an APOE. And when we complained, we got sent out to the territory. When we told the story in Geneva, we were ignored because Australia was on the right side of the gains Africa. So there was genocide going on the Australia. Whereas South Africa was a tribal conflict.

I say that story because it profoundly influenced everything I did thereafter. But if people need those experiences, when they young enough to realize what they mean, yes, I love this idea of solving. Uh, more local efforts involving people, not big programs, um, but also combine it somehow with an aspect.

Unfortunately, we talk about natural service that started getting into, uh, uh, you know, it's an umbrella, shall we say for lots of small efforts? I think the giving a direction, you know, uh, I saw JD veteran to war on climate change. Uh, you know, what a wonderful idea to sort of have a national service. Um, but yes, um, we'd have to involve, sorry, just to sort of something else in one of the key things I wrote, when are the you feel God is decision making it a crisis about increasing all.

Yeah. So all you can do in a crisis is, is do things to make the options open. So what your cinder did in New Zealand was to lock down the country illegally, but it kept her options open downstream. Now, if you look at global warming, having a long chat with a former chief scientist of hay festival a couple of years ago, and the science of how to rephrase the polls is worked out.

It's now an engineering problem. If you can rephrase the polls, then we got another 10 or 15 years to solve some problems. And nobody's looking at short term short term things to create options. They're all looking at trying to solve the big problem, which means that we'll never get. Um, so we went in the small things at the local level and when not doing the option based approaches, which the scientists actually partly understand.

And the more you use doom and disaster, the more people turn off. I mean, the job, I mean, I was found with three really intelligent people that one of the big consultancy firms, I almost gave their name away. And we've been talking about this for about five or six years. And one of them said it's, and she's a very intelligent woman.

I've almost decided not to watch the news on global warming, just make hay while the sun shines because it's too depressing. Right. And I think the problem is where we're disabling engagement at the moment, because we're not making the problem pragmatic enough that people think they can do something.

And the scare tactics we'll never know. But, but also Dave, I mean, I've been brought up on a steady diet of, um, stop thinking king of the reasons why not stop being a naysayer, which is, which is completely at odds at your construction theory approach of understanding your constraints and working with them, which would be, be seen as bringing, bringing negativity to the room.

It's completely nonsense. All ideas are equally good. I mean, there's this, I call it luck to see. All right. And, and, and that's actually, if you want to look where Peter Sangin auto Sharma garage, they're the modern equivalent of love to seaters. And everybody comes together in the workshop and they eat the plant to the facilitation and they all agree how things should be different and nobody changes.

Right? So we, we. Th this sort of divorcing from change, which is a real problem. Yeah. So the sort of pragmatic element to doing something local quickly is just been lost. And I mean, that's the thing we've been talking about. Governments can make happen. Yeah. Because if you can create local initiatives, it costs you less money.

All right. It's a significantly less money if you get lots of local initiatives. So my bike park example cost the world's government. Absolutely zero. Yeah, because it used the existing resources, but we didn't have a governance structure by which a thousand such initiatives. I mean, I'm definitely going back to my days in the sixties and seventies now, now by which a thousand local initiatives could bloom.

Yeah. And then you, then as you get critical mass, you get emitted to behavior. This is complexity. So you need to get lots of local things which start to cluster, then people copy it. Then that changed the dispositional space. So no big bang approaches, lots of local approaches, lots of very small ones, uh, some sort of national service umbrella groups that bring everybody you've got a wide range of ages.

It can't just be, uh, put the problems on the youth. It's gotta be

the issue is now I know there are initiatives going on, but they're not connected. One of the things we want to do with the children's project is to create peer to peer. Okay. So if every community has to send children gathering stories about what's working and that's university available, then you've got peer to peer flow of ideas and you get imitation frustrating.

So I'm not saying there are no initiatives going on at the moment, but they're not connected and they're isolated and they will not survive. So I, I had, uh, um, when I did some stuff with, uh, uh, product government looking into, uh, prisons, uh, we had a particular, uh, prison, which had an education program, which massively reduced re-offending rates.

And so you think, oh gosh, we should do this at every prison. Except for the fact they had none of the KPIs, none of the KPIs or anything that had anything to do with re-offending and no incentive to share this stuff. That's interesting. All right, because I'm doing some work at the moment with Murray and New Zealand and the Maori justice system is quite interesting.

Because it's clan based, not individual based. So if you offend and your client is prepared to accept you back and you go through a ritual of acceptance of, of authority to come, will not punish you. For example, the drug dealer. Now I spent a lot of time in one or two in the department of justice explaining this was valid, but because they were taking it, every individual should be called perspective.

It's unfair because some individuals get accepted by that card. And some don't now in any Klan types society, it's just inconceivable. You should make everything equal for all individuals, because then nothing will change because individuals are defined by their interactions. So I think one of things I'm really interested in, I mean, it's one of the projects I'm trying to get funded in the states at the moment is to bring that Maori concept of, of extended family based RIAs simulation into the narco problem.

All right. And that's not making it. I think people, right. It's not just to be a, it shouldn't be a war on drugs. We've got to make, make the drug, the drug process much more, a community responsibility and community obligation not to take well in the increasingly inaccurate fireside chat between two people.

Cause I keep on inviting other people to JD is it's great to have you here. How, how, how you, uh, what are you thinking in terms of this conversation? Is there something here?

Immunity, Jenny you're muted. You're on mute. Not anymore. Are you with us? She's not muted, but we can't hear her. Jenny. I have that earlier and I have to actually reboot. If you coming in through the website, Oh, um, is there any options that we have as, you know, um, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, stop, email timing.

So throw it out to the group and invite to by email zoom direct. If he, if he can handle it, right? Oh yes. Hang on a second. Oh, did I? I had it been annoyed. He said, Jenny, are you with us? No. Can you hear us though? Can you hear me now? Oh, hello. Okay. Sorry about that. So I keep hearing this and I keep thinking about in this conversation, is, are we asking ourselves, what is the cost of delaying like as a society?

What's the cost of delayed, like. Big action. We're talking about a lot, a little people doing a lot of things here and there. And that's what we've seen so far. And, you know, while maybe there'll be a critical mass, but we're not maybe elected leaders that focus on us. We're not having them actually say we're going to do something.

The talk, everybody keeps talking, talk is cheap. My kids are going to be growing up in a world. That's a lot more chaotic and they're terrified. Honestly, they're terrified we actually need to make change. And those are the thoughts that I have around this. But sorry, this is fine. I'm trying to make, I completely agree with that, but governments will not make the big decisions on short election cycles until overall attitudes change.

So whether it's right or wrong, that's reality until you change the dispositional state, bigger change is not possible.

So you've got to find ways to trigger that mechanism. And so, you know, if any government is elected on a four year cycle, it doesn't matter what the hell is going on. Unless the overall attitude to people is different. And by the way, I'd argue one person, one vote is not sustainable in the face of ecological crisis.

Yeah. So, you know, I, I think it's, it's a problem. All right. And what I'm trying to argue for is we need to understand the science of how systems change. And we need to work within that. Not how we would like it to be system's changed. The biggest way you can change the system is by changing what, what values are changing, what, what you're reaching for changing the direction or the area, or you're striving toward and by limiting your work in progress.

Right? So if the government said, and if we all got together and said, we're going to focus on this as a problem, instead of focusing on something that's lower priority, And then they wouldn't get elected. You get Trump reacted in that selection. I mean, my point is not, I disagree with you, but it's not going to happen.

And that's part of, one of my points about if I get, yeah, this is a low to seating product is easy to agree what should happen and what other people should do. But until you create a general human beings are not very good at this. I mean, this is why I recommended Terry's book on radical sacrifice, but not very good at sacrifice in the present for the future.

And we will not do it in sufficient volumes for politicians to respond accordingly. So we have to find ways to change it. So it's impossible for the people not to do something. All you have to wait till the catastrophic failures build up to the point, whether I intend the alternative and the danger, there is the only model we've got in the history of humankind for resource starvation is patriarchal feudalism.

So that's the default option is patriarchal. And you could see already starting to happen with some of the big, you know, that's big tycoons. It's actually worse. We're not, uh, uh, not only not good at sacrificing the present for the future. We constantly borrow from the future and spend it today. That's, that's one of our fundamental problems is that, uh, it's not, uh, you know, when we think about sustainability on the planet and the pollution, everything else we, we caused and the pursuit of, I don't know, holidays or whatever else it is we've been pursuing.

Um, that's our future generation stuff that we've borrowed said thank you. And spent. And, um, it's interesting. Find the Malcolm's man. I mean, I've argued for the past five years is the only state, which is likely to really do something about climate change is probably trying to yeah. Uh, great points that way.

If you didn't read it about a future dominated by Chinese David, Wingrove it. Right. So it's almost like you're not the sort of Neo liberal concept of democracy is based on individual self-interest. And as long as people are focused on individual self-interest, you ain't going to get society level changes.

And China is most of the world's natural resources now because they'd be more focused on acquiring resources than the American focus on acquiring an etiology. So I'd like to pose a question. What, what's the difference between now and say 1939 as far as existential crises? Um, I think, I think that the difference is all right.

Actually, if we don't get this right, it's over in 1939, we could recover. But climate change is that serious. Um, I mean, you, you could actually, I mean the sort of 10% or 10% of the planet of population on 50% of the resources could be held to be optimistic. I mean, if you look at some governments, for example, so Singapore are assuming that they will have to have the whole of their population in air conditioning for two or three hours a day during summer, otherwise they die, right?

So the immigration problem, which is going to, and that's going to be in my lifetime.

So you can get mass migration from Indonesia, from the middle east, anywhere, which doesn't happen. And that's Merkle actually started to think about it. It's usually impressed with the way Merkel tried to find a way to absorb a smaller amount of refugees, and then she's going to face in the future. But then she had.

So I think I was asking that with a certain frame of mind around like, what's the difference in the behavior of our leaders that led us up to directing so much energy and resources to solving a problem. If you look at some COVID all right, it's the imminence of the threat. So human beings are really good at imminent threats and very bad at future threats.

So if, if, if you don't do something different, the gym is going to invade and it's all over, you can get focused. Right. So with COVID we got focused. So people did lock down, they did all sorts of things. They would never have conceived it and they stopped fighting. Yeah. Um, but the problem with climate change is it's too far away from people's proximate vision.

Yeah. So I mean the intellectuals, which we all are. All right. We can see it. We can understand. But we're not communicating that. And there's no way to communicate that until people feel it personally, because it's a future problem. And again, this is, this is one-on-one, you know, cognitive unit of science is people focus on people do not see threat beyond a certain time horizon, not on a sustainable basis.

So I can say I've personally felt effects from it this summer, the indigenous communities have been feeling the effects of it from me for years because of their bundling, like hunting populations and, and changing, uh, climates around that. How, how do ha maybe are there ways. Surface that better children project.

So we're basically saying if people, if people see the world through the eyes of the younger people, that's important. Yeah. Um, and it's local initiatives. So for example, there's a guy in a garage up the road from the village where I live in LA in Lockridge, who's now created one of the best bakeries I've ever been to in my life.

And I've been all around the world. Right. Including, you know, I can. All right. Um, so the sort of localized food production went up during COVID. Now, if you look at the supply chain problems, going back to where Simon started on this, the supply chain problems, labor problems, if you will, cost is localization of food is starting to become something.

People are talking about almost a critical mass level. Yeah. And we need to build that. I mean, one of my arguments with some of the, I mean, we, we we've been working with extinction rebellion. And I think they're making the classic mistake of the left. Is they going too far, too fast? So they're pushing people in the other direction and we have the same back in the seventies.

Right? So, you know, w when, when they were, when they were inconvenienced in capitalists, it works well. When they inconvenienced people trying to take their mother to hospital on the end 25, it puts them put some movement back a long way. So w we need to think about these sorts of things in a much more strategic way than we are at the moment.

And Simon and I have argued democracy many times, so we can always come back to that. So just seeing one of the comments and Chris. Um, I didn't see that, uh, that comment, uh, uh, uh, you know, my particular viewpoint on democracy is I'm all in favor of it. As long as we get rid of elections and replace it with random selection and sortation, cause it's the only way we're going to create a representative example.

There's no chance of that happening because of pre-existing power structure. So this is the back. You might get delegates to vote, to vote for people at a local level. And those people end up the next level. That's actually how the American constitution was built. That's actually an achievable chain. Okay.

So on the up side, things like Brexit and COVID have actually exposed problems in our supply chain. So on the ups. People are starting to explore those issues. And to that spent good thing because there isn't, we, haven't got a hope of managing the, this, this, this change. This price is heading towards us.

If we don't understand the basics about supply chain, which I know some people say that we, we are good in certain parts of government, but it's been quite clear. Um, but other areas, this is not opportunity. I look at it to improve in this. Um, the second issue is that issue of, um, It is that issue of power?

Um, so, well, we've got a change in the global system is that technological and economic power is shifting, uh, from the west to the east. And China is heavily focused on things like sustainability. And there's also now coming out with common infrastructure and, and talking about that the whole whole need for a, um, a greater, uh, quality, um, because it realizes that that's an essential part of economic crates as well.

So we've got a shift in power that's going on. We might not like it on in the west. We might have somewhat different values. Well, that's the third point is the values. Uh, and this is where we've got, we still haven't had that societal discussion on the balance of the whole, me and the we and where it is, where it isn't, we're at equal we'll make sacrifices within.

Yeah, I think that the focus and it's interesting, somebody just referenced the yes. Prime minister, um, episode, which I often quote, right? So basically hacker is opposed to a labor local authority in London. Now, if you remember the one and this professor comes up with this idea by which everybody elects everybody else, and there's this famous scene.

I quite like this because it's a math Welsh professors. So I feel good about, because I'm saying the same sort of thing. And then they all come up with the lines, right. Um, because they can't control it. But the concept of voting for people, you know, was always a critical aspect of democracy and society is now so big that you don't vote for people, you know, and that's what we got to change because then it, then it becomes, and if you look at British democracy up until the 1940s, the political parties rearrange themselves every 20 or 30.

And since the forties, they haven't done that. Nobody crosses the floor. It's exceptional. So you get, I mean, this is apex. Apprenticey what you get is a marginalization of political views around the center. And once you do that, the energy cost of extremism embarrasses, an example of that goes down. Yeah.

That was the same with Trump because you've got a marginalization of Democrats and Republicans. So most people couldn't see a difference then extremism can come through. Right. And again, that's because you've got this ideological battle rather than the battle around people. I know. And people I trust.

Yeah. So in our favor Brexit, COVID making us wear supply chains in our favor, the shift of power from west to east China, taking that out. That's inability if you fuel, which will, I mean, there is a amount of starting to believe in Gaia theory and I'm trying to work out whether she's benign or malicious at the moment, I can't make up my mind.

Right. But, um, yeah. And I think you are seeing that. All right. So travel patterns have changed, right. Um, but we're still not making those changes. So when in Wales we wanted to invest hugely in public transport. Westminster's. Um, because of the road lobby. So I think this is why you can see applied Camry sticker on the wall behind me.

I don't think countries like Britain and France and Germany are sustainable because they're too big. It was interesting. I was chatting with Robin Dunbar about this the other day, and I said, I've, I've long thought 5 million is the maximum as society can reach before it becomes culturally going cohesive.

And he's actually, it was quite easy. He sent me the paper on it, the evidence that backs that up. So if you look at it, most of Europe, the cultural units are still units of medieval. Well, we're hoping not to, you know, uh, well, um, we're hoping to somehow, uh, keep some semblance of, uh, existing society that may not be possible.

I agree completely. Jed's point about the speed of action. Um, cause you know, the issues here, communication speed of where acting and we are doing a lot of talking, uh, and I think Gretta is absolutely. Perfect with the whole blah, blah, blah. Because I worked in the environmental field 30 years ago. We knew these problems.

Um, we did a lot of talking and we trying to do things. Uh, we hit brick wall after brick wall. Um, Sarah, you, you hit brick wall after brick wall with whole whole loads of things in security, AI, any, any final words of wisdom, hope for the future, any, um, uh, throughout all on your shoulders,

the most effective tactic I've ever used with most of the people who were most resistant to change is I'm planting seeds nefariously until they start thinking about something. And at the very point at which you start to feel any resistance or pushback say, well, I'm, I'm probably mistaken and absent yourself from the room to let it sink in and come back when it's their idea.

Um, Uh, maybe that's just, uh, uh, maybe female centric, survival tactic. Um, but I'm not recommending that to anyone else. Yeah, I think that's fantastic idea. And I think it's also for people to join you again in the future. I think there's elements of what Dave is doing, and I noticed we've run over time as always, um, and find words, uh, has gotta be, um, J D um, any final words, comments, pearls of wisdom, or should we just, do we just need to move faster?

We need to actually act. Focus. I think action with focus in a general direction is an important thing. Well, of course, I'm going to argue, we should use a map at least that way we know where we're going, but that's another story I'm going to say. I have loved Matt camp. I've been to some fantastic talks.

It's been brilliant to talk to all of you. I know we have our sort of regular calls anyway, which we, we catch up on, but, uh, uh, this has been, I hope you've enjoyed it. I think, um, Jane and Steve has done an amazing job putting this conference arm. I've got to say Jen, uh, CA Dave in have. Excellent. It's the chairs.

There's a whole bunch of background work as well. And we've also, uh, we've had, uh, Ben Ben's also been on the committee and he's been helping out. And, uh, uh, he's also been doing lots of introduction, uh, stuff as well today, just absolutely. And, and, uh, several other people. It's just, it's just, just fantastic.

Um, so, and of course, then we had a lot of speakers who were mothers. Oh. And, and, uh, Alexandra Burke as well. Uh, well that was a bit of a shock, but, um, uh, I, I'm just going to say I've left today. Oh, I know. I know. I know. I know. I I'm. I'm just going to say lastly, and certainly not least that is, uh, uh, the audience as well.

Everybody coming along support in that camp, helping grow the mapping community. Um, I'm sort of hopeful that out of some of the discussions, some ideas, some seeds or flourish, and maybe we'll find a way forward, uh, because, um, you know, we need to change and preferably, so, and on that note, uh, um, try to cheer it out, but, uh, there are failed miserably.

I'm just gonna say it has been wonderful. Um, thank you so much. And thank you for joining us on the spice Sanchez.