

---

# Gracalism

---

a revolution in  
economic thinking

---

Martin Goodyer

---

## Gracalism

A new word for a new world - a revolution in economic thinking

Our economic system is wrong for this brave new world of high-technology and artificial intelligence. Sooner than might be imagined, menial and monotonous jobs will be gone. People will no longer be required to carry out repetitive and unthinking work because AI and robotics are now cutting into tradition systems like a hot knife through butter. Managers and supervisors will no longer be required as there will be no people to organise.

Here's an example of a recent BBC report about the application of AI, in this case when applied to business travel;

*'...it could be artificial intelligence (AI) that has the biggest impact. Felicia Schneiderhan's New York-based company 30SecondsToFly developed "Claire": an artificially intelligent (AI) travel assistant designed to take the stress out of booking your next trip, which launches later this year.*

*"Claire allows companies to automate travel management in a cost-effective*

*manner, even if their annual travel budget is on the lower end," she says.*

*The travel bot uses companies' travel policies and employees' travel preferences to create "smart itineraries".*

*Employees can talk to it via Slack, Facebook, SMS and Skype.*

*"Say the user messages Claire saying 'NY to SF, next Friday, to land before 7pm'," Ms Schneiderhan says.*

*"Claire asks 'Do you want a return flight?' then provides a set of two to three options that the traveller can book instantly, as Claire has their personal*

*information and payment details saved."*

*Two kinds of AI are required for Claire to do this: natural language processing to converse with the traveller as another human being would, and a trip selection algorithm that personalises the booking experience within the employer's policy constraints.*

*"Users will be able to book and access basic travel analytics free of charge," Ms Schneiderhan adds.*

*"The cost of advanced features, such as software integrations, will depend on the*

*volume of bookings made."*

*Paul Erickson, senior analyst at IHS Markit, believes virtual assistants will soon play a significant role in business travel reservations.*

*"Virtual assistants can save end users one or many steps in lots of everyday tasks, including booking business travel," he says.'*

Travel is just one aspect of business and life that's already being impacted by AI. The change isn't 'coming', it's already here.

Once it is recognised that the generation of profit and the system of capitalism is no longer appropriate, there will be massive upheaval; Leaders of businesses whose sole preoccupation was the generation of capital will no longer be needed or desired. The whole of the financial 'industry' will be a thing of the past, a footnote in the annals of history. The change that is coming isn't a new wave, it is a tsunami that's going to wipe out the 'way of the world' as we've known it. This is coming whether we like it or not. There is no choice about it, because it has already begun. Therefore, we had better get our

collective heads around a viable alternative before chaos ensues.

Make no mistake, this is a revolution and like every revolution in the past there will be people violently against it. In this case those against will almost certainly be the wealthiest capitalists, and those who consider they have the most to lose.

However painful it might be to accept, the reality is that they have lost it already. There is no way to turn back the clock. As I shall point out, there are ways that it can be delayed, but those

are so selfish and immoral that all people of integrity must stand together against them. The best way to transition is to identify the path of least pain and then commit to take it. The worst that can happen is for us to allow those fearing loss to vent their frustration on the world. The ultimate outcome has already been decided by the actions of our immediate history; like a ribbon of dominoes stacked in a row, we have already knocked over those that stood at the beginning of the line and one by one they are coming crashing down. The momentum already established cannot be undone, instead we must face

its consequences and start deciding how to deal with them.

Ask yourself what the inevitable consequences of this are for our existing way of life, and there are a couple of things that become abundantly clear. Firstly, the economic system designed to create more and more 'capital' by making profits will become defunct. What is the use of capital if it comes only into the hands of people who already have more of it than they could ever use in their lifetime? What benefit is there in reducing labour costs and increasing the profitability of products by

using AI and robotics if there are then not enough people with the capital themselves to buy them?

The thinking that helped humanity build a society from nothing is different from that which is required to take us to a new level of development. In the past it was difficult to harness resources and people were still in relatively short supply. On one hand today's world is turned on its head; resources (particularly 'free' energy that allows for cultivation of parts of the planet previously out of reach) are now more easily accessible. The primary reason

that these possibilities are not enthusiastically tackled right now is because our capitalist system does not support doing things that don't make money. Population on the other hand is rising at unprecedented rates and therefore if we don't find ways to make better use of this world than the spaces we have will continue to be squeezed. Relatively soon we must make habitable parts of the world that were difficult to colonise. Contrary to tabloid scare stories, the planet is by no means heading for overpopulation. However, those small centres of commercial and social activity in which people have

congregated are full to overflowing. Therefore, it gives the impression that there is a problem with space, when actually the problem is with the economic system that keeps people tied to such small spaces. Look at the world on 'Google Earth' and pan around all those uninhabited spaces; compare the empty space with the highly condensed urbanised places, and instead of assuming the world outside your window is all there is, imagine what it would be like if more choice was available because the whole world was available to us. It is undeniable that we live on a planet that offers more potential than we

are accessing and that only our self limiting beliefs about the way human beings must live, (our economic system), are holding us back.

### Example:

In 2014 I happened upon a Scottish based firm of scientists that had developed a oven material capable of turning sunlight into power, and their experiments in English growing centres had produced promising results.

Being partly based in the Canary Islands where vast swathes of land are covered by woven material to protect tomatoes

and bananas growing beneath, it struck me that the community over there could benefit from the Scottish innovation.

However, there was no appetite for its application. Not because it would not generate free energy in abundance, but because it could not make a profit. It was also muted that the existing power companies would not take kindly to losing such large portions of their business across the islands.

This example of the capitalist system acting to prevent the betterment of communities, and society as a whole, is

not new. Nicola Tesla is thought to have had his work trashed and his life cut short because he advocated a means of sharing electricity freely and without the need for copper wires. His approach would have meant the death of the profitable electric companies and the loss of an immense amount of profit. The principle that capital is the goal did not benefit society, it only make already wealthy people wealthier. It has never been proven that he was the victim of capitalist greed, but the evidence certainly points to it. What might the world of today looked like if there were no 'utility' industries but that the power to

generate new products and new businesses had been made available over the past century? Obviously, no one knows because it never happened. All we can say with certainty is that it would have been different, and also say with a fair degree of confidence that it would have been 'better'.

The capitalist 'myth' that the continuous and unrelenting search for more and greater profits provides a stable job based economy that is better than any alternative has been perpetuated because capitalists have been able to point to jobs and say, 'look at this,

without our capital you would have no work and therefore no security'. This argument has kept people locked into the fear of being without a job ever since it was first uttered. However, as those jobs now disappear the lie, (because it surely is an untruth that this way was the only way) no longer holds water. Having a job that makes money for someone else is not the only way for a society to organise itself to provide resources and a rich cultural diversity. The '*labour theory value*' (the means by which a person's work might be measured) is wrong as a concept, and capitalism will implode if a large portion

of the population are out of a job and can't afford to feed the capitalist machine. The banking system, already in a precarious position will fail completely once it becomes clear to everyone that it is a 'make believe' system of valuations and assets on which supposedly 'real' money is loaned to ordinary people to allow them to live. The concept of loaning cash and credit cards can't work if there's no prospect of the loans being paid back. Let us be clear, this is not painting a negative picture for the sake of propaganda, but is merely a reflection that is by its nature already dark, very dark indeed.

We either attempt the futility of trying to stop progress in its tracks and somehow crash our economic gearbox into reverse - and starting a war has been the natural choice to do that in the past, or we do something new.

If we don't then there's a very real risk that those with the deepest pockets push us all back a few decades by forcing the world into another massive conflict: War feeds capitalism by accessing people and resources that pay the war-mongers while causing the majority to lose what they have and

have to rebuild again. It is immoral and it is distasteful, but what else might those faced with giving up a superior way of life do to protect themselves?

Please don't pretend that this is a conspiracy theory, because it's actually just a history lesson. It has happened many times before so there's no reason to suggest it can't happen again. Hopefully, most of us want to avoid this. Even those who feel richer than they actually are; they may own their home, have a share portfolio, and a chunky pension pot but compared to the capitalist power brokers they might as

well be dirt-farmers, barely surviving. Therefore, we all better start getting real.

People won't lose their 'wealth' by embracing something new, but will in fact be protecting the relatively cushy lifestyle most of us already have if we are smart about stepping into something new.

There can be little doubt that once a wave of change is established, and fear is replaced by a new certainty, that the home and lifestyle a 'middle ranking' capitalist has achieved will be

maintained and bettered. By that I mean the ordinary home owner with a pension, their own car and maybe a few shares or some savings. I also have no doubt that those with less will relish the chance of having access to more. That's a good thing. The 'protestant work ethic' that forces people to believe that unless they've worked their fingers to the bone they don't deserve anything simply is not helpful when building a society based on sharing and abundance. Of course, a society needs rules, it would be foolish to suggest otherwise, but those rules must be about working together so that we fulfil both our individual needs and

the needs of society, and not one or the other. Therefore, if it benefits us all to have a better life as a base-line starting point then that is the way it must be. However, don't imagine for a second that this concept will be easy to swallow. Our current system has steeped people in the belief that they need to be 'superior' to someone else in order to feel good, that only the 'deserving' should have a life they can enjoy, and that it is perfectly reasonable to walk past a person in need or in pain because that's 'their business and not yours'.

Therefore, I can't imagine any scenario where the most powerful voluntarily give up the economic system on which they rely. Unfortunately, this transition is almost inevitably going to be difficult. It does not need to be painful, and yet I fear it will become so, because I anticipate an irrational refusal of those concerned to accept the inevitable. These two 'inevitable' consequences; the necessity of stripping away the veneer of superiority from the 1% of the world's population who control the majority of the world's capital, and the refusal by them, (and those who imagine themselves superior by dint of

the number n their bank balance or the number of toys they own) to give up that status will come together like an enormous crash of symbolic cymbals. When 'it' happens there won't be a person on the planet that doesn't hear it.

If they threaten the rest of us we must protect ourselves. If that threat can't be dealt with after a move is made, then we must pre-empt it. Forgive me, but if that sounds like old fashioned revolutionary rhetoric then be that as it may; think of it this way, if you could go back in time and say, let Archduke Ferdinand know he needed to duck so that the First

World War might be avoided, or tell Prime Minister Attlee that the piece of paper in his hand was no guarantee of peace so that maybe Hitler could have been stopped earlier rather than later, would you? This situation we find ourselves in doesn't require time travel, merely that we recognise what's about to happen and stop it.

**This is the first time in our history that we are technologically ready to do something new.**

We can develop a new model that reflects what we want from the world. A

bee system will have to be introduced because the old one is broken. Our choice is simple; we either wait and allow the old to create havoc, death, and destruction just like has always happened in the past, or we don't wait, and instead take action to sweep away the old and usher in something better without anywhere near the amount of chaos that will otherwise ensue. It is a binary situation and can only end in one way or the other.

At the moment there is time to act, but time waits for no one or no situation. Soon, perhaps sooner than any of us

had imagined, time will run out. If that happens then there will be nothing to do but allow the pain to play out. It might take generations and it will cost everyone something dear, but by that time we will have wasted what opportunity we had to choose a better way.

This better way isn't just another failed concept like Marxist socialism or communism. They too have had their day. Their antagonism toward capitalism reflected the idea that the only way to be for a thing was to be against something else. Hence they pushed against the

generation of capital and profit by claiming that profit was 'theft'. Profit isn't theft, it's just an outdated concept that will very soon no longer work as a system.

This revolution is not about getting angry with one system in favour of its opposite, but one that simply reflects the reality of a new situation. It's not about making capitalism wrong or bad, but merely stating the obvious and the truth, that it is no longer relevant or appropriate. The only traditional revolutionary aspect is the acceptance that some people will behave irrationally

and aggressively, probably putting their own needs above all else. For all our sakes (including the misguided who believe that fighting against the tide is a good idea) cannot, and must not be allowed.

**What then is an alternative, and what is Gracalism?**

*Three goals instead of one.*

Think of it this way:

*In the future a manned mission to an uninhabited planet much like our Earth arrives and sets up a*

*camp. The mission is equipped with advanced robotics that can go out and harness the renewable resources of the new planet and turn them into unlimited food and drink. Even relaxation beverages and non-work related activities are catered for as their robotic tools provide all that is required. They construct places to live that comfortably meet their needs and have no limit to whatever they desire or need, as they play their part in the maintenance of their little society. Some people have engineering and technical roles to*

*look after and develop more technology, others are educators or scientists, or planetary explorers or provide a service for their fellow non-earth dwellers that can't be matched by a machine. It'd be hard to believe they live in perfect harmony, after all they are human, so some will have the job of upholding order. Their society will reflect ours but with one major difference, - capitalism will have been replaced with a new system. A system that has no place for money or hoarding of anything. A system that has **three goals***

*replacing the one; it must deliver a quality of life that feeds and provides for the material needs of the people, it must support the betterment of society through the development of education, positive relationships, self reliance and personal responsibility, and it must give every citizen time to balance their contribution to society with their opportunity to make the most of their time alive.*

On a new planet with a fresh start it's not hard to see how that system will work. It deals with the harsh reality of

human behaviour while also meeting the needs of those other aspects of being a human common to us all. By designing a system with the end-goals in mind, and starting with a metaphorical blank sheet of paper a new approach to managing a society that desires to live in harmony, make the best use of whatever is available, and live a life of purpose and fulfilment emerges. In the example above, the system emerges out of necessity; try imagining the introduction of a capitalist system in that environment instead, and think about the reaction those pioneers might have to being artificially allocated into societal

strands based only on the amount of cash they might have brought with them, or they find a way of taking from someone else. When considered like this, the way in which we live now makes no sense. It doesn't serve any of us, even those who imagine themselves superior. They don't know what else they might of benefited from if everyone had been free to make the best of themselves and the resources around us, and they have no concept of what life could have been like without the stress that comes with having more than everyone else, because there is always a lingering fear of what might happen if

one day it was taken away. Well, perhaps that day is coming.

Therefore, it is not a question of 'if' this system will work, but rather 'how' the replacement of capitalism is replaced by it in the here and now. We must answer the question, 'if not this, then what?' before dismissing 'Gracalism' as fanciful or unrealistic. I'm guessing that you may find that any initial gut-reaction against such a radical proposal starts to fade as facts rather than fantasy are laid bare. At least, I hope that is the case, because it's a fact that the economic world order is irreversibly changing, but

a fantasy that we can hold onto what we know and persevere without incurring any consequence.

**Any new system like that of the imagined 'interplanetary colonists' must start from the premise that a person can only eat so much, drink so much or sleep so much.**

All people need a purpose in life and all people respond positively to a mix of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

When we start with the belief that there is enough to go around rather than scarcity then anything is possible.

All people know that the most valuable commodities we have are time, love, and health. These are the 3 things we must hold as most important above all.

Social cultures need rules to which all citizens comply; rules that are established for the benefit of all and that work at both a personal and cultural level will be successful. Therefore, it is possible for a society to agree that all people are required to contribute to the benefit of everyone. If this contribution is based on what the person is most enthusiastic and skilled at producing

then it works as an aligned outcome.

Remember, capitalists want to make more capital because that's the name of the game. It was the way to 'win' for most people. Of course, it isn't a perfect system which is why the rich get richer and the poor get poorer but at the same time the majority in the middle did better; living standards got better, people got more 'stuff', and most had a better quality of life.

We don't need to generate more capital any more in order to benefit the majority. Now, capitalism will make the majority

poorer and poorer with just a very few ultra rich. This is just as bad for them as it is for everyone else because having too much without having 'deserved' it causes people to behave irrationally. Add irrational behaviour to a desire to garner power and it's a recipe for despotic disaster.

**Let me stress that this is not a new version of communism, because communism does not work.**

Marx had the right idea in that our goals can be common, but the idea that people's output can be equalised was

flawed, the idea that people could be motivated by a common goal flew in the face of psychology, and the delusional utopia he envisioned just wasn't consistent with the technology of the time. There were simply too many jobs that needed doing that people didn't want to do. The warlike hierarchical organisational systems of the day didn't take account of the corrupting influence of power. If being in charge provided the opportunity to improve one's own lot in life it was a given that some would abuse their position. Communism stood no chance of working because science told us it was doomed to crash and

burn.

There is an opportunity to think differently because things are now different. People are still pretty much the same, but we face a new world whether we like it or not.

Famously, a senior IBM executive couldn't see beyond his immediate reality and because his world was firmly grounded in the 'big computer' industry he denied that home computing would ever be competition. In a few short years there was a desktop in most homes, not long after that people were

carrying their laptop computers with them, then came tablets, and now the phone on which I'm writing this has more computing power than one of his 'big' office computer systems. The world changed so quickly it was like an avalanche. A new avalanche is already making its way down the mountain. Only this time it's not computers that will change, it's jobs and the relevance of our economic system.

Today we need to make more time for the majority, create a more meaningful life for the majority, and keep the majority as healthy as is humanly

possible. Those must be the outcomes of our new economic system. These are our new three graces that will give beauty to the world.

*A change of goal*

*Capitalism = One goal: drive up capital*

*Gracalism = Three Goals: drive up time, meaning, and health*

Gracalism is the engagement of people and technology to generate health (food, drinks, and healthcare provision), a meaningful existence (work that meets

the aligned goal of personal satisfaction and societal need, opportunities to develop fulfilling relationships, and an education that is for life), and the time to enjoy every aspect of life available to us. If each factor is matched and mapped with the others the system can operate in balance.

Old ideas of risk and reward are made redundant. All opportunity can be made available to everyone because the notion that everyone will want it all at once is spurious. If there does happen to be more demand for, say a theme park, then Gracalism responds by

creating more theme parks run by machines to do the menial, highly skilled roles to fulfil the needs of those who want them, and if people are eating hot dogs then they're not eating something else - and everyone always needs to be fed. The creation of a society that accepts the premise that abundance comes from sharing and not owning is a fundamental shift in thinking.

At first glance this may appear simply too idealistic, but on closer inspection it becomes clear that such views are the result of our immersion in a system that values the polar opposite; a selfish

system that accepts the right of one person to figuratively own another and one that supports one person turning their back on another, for no other reason than one has capital and the other does not.

### **Can we feed the world?**

The answer has been 'yes' for a long time, but 'no' using our current economic system.

### **Can we support every person having whatever they want?**

The answer again is 'yes' if what they want is rationalised on the basis of

sharing, but 'no' if greed and hoarding are still considered acceptable.

**Can the Earth support us all living a life of fulfilment?**

The answer is absolutely 'yes' once we remove the self-imposed shackles of economic servitude, but 'no' if everything we want to try is limited by its capacity for profit.

**Can we live without conflict?**

That's trickier because the abuser is 'yes' we can minimise it by ensuring that no one person or group of people have ultimate power over another, but 'no' if

we continue to accept as a society that mob-rule democracy driven by who spends most in the media is the way we govern.

## **How then do we govern in a Gracalist system?**

One of the best ways to manage going forward is to reflect on what got in the way in the past. History tells us that collaboration is better than binary confrontation, and that policing must be in service of society and not the other way around. Therefore, a new system of democracy based on influence and the

appointment of expertise in multiple layers of overlapping collaboration, with a team of elected facilitators is probably a different and improved approach. It certainly is not beyond the wit and wisdom of the best humanity has to offer to combine a revolutionary system of organisation with another of government. Democracy must be at the heart of whatever we do, but the continued warped version of democracy we suffer today must be consigned to the same trash-can of history in which we tossed capitalism. Democracy should not be a capital supported media-driven popularity contest in which

the winner may then disregard whatever they said to win the contest and use power for their own benefit. That's not how the founding fathers of democracy intended it to be, however, it is how some of their well-known objectors imagined it might end up; Socrates believed that a democratic system based on winning an argument did not serve 'justice' but would more likely result in corruption. Sadly, his predictions and fears have been realised. The democracy we experience today is neither just nor in the service of the majority, - even the majority who voted for whomsoever they elect.

**What about people who want to just take what they desire and abuse other people?**

Gracalism is an economic system, not a system of government. Of course the world needs policing, and of course some localised societies will make their laws as they see fit. Capitalism didn't cause gun crime, drug abuse, and other crimes and nor will Gracalism prevent them. However, a realistic approach that utilises the vast amount learned from psychology will be better than the current system that lives on in practical

ignorance. Our new world is one where technology sits at the heart of all we do, and technology is a far more effective means of identifying and isolating unruly or irrational people behaviour.

There's no doubt that a system providing unlimited food and drink to everyone has to be protected from abuse. Quite how that happens is going to be interesting. Better minds than mind will no doubt have the wherewithal to figure this out, even so there are some things I can guess at with respect to people behaving themselves and not over-indulging:

It's probably a given that mandatory drug and alcohol screening at places of work is applied simply to safeguard everyone. That at least will act as a means of self-control for most people. Health screening and dietary support along with immediate counselling and coaching will help reduce issues of obesity. I imagine food outlets will be quality controlled through feedback and ratings, and as profit is a thing of the past their goals will be to reach maximum efficiency. Growing choice will be the way of the future as opposed to self-imposed austerity.

Of course people will still desire 'things' and as such some reasonable approach to ownership must be established per person, thereby allowing people to exchange and barter one good for another. It is relatively easy to deal with issues like collecting by grouping people together with similar interests to share and exchange their specialism's. A system of abundance supports the notion that all is owned by none but available to everyone. Again, not a new idea but something that ancient peoples like the aboriginals of Australia have always applied to land. The concept of

land ownership comes from capitalism. However, there is no need to own anything as long as you are left alone to live with what you need.

**What about the movement of people, surely this has to be funded - like selling one house to buy another?**

This isn't so in a world where if necessary, machines can dismantle and rebuild a house to any specification wherever you need to live. Giving up one space to occupy another only becomes a problem if the space is limited, but as the only reason our global

space limits us now is because we squeeze billions of people into economic centres, that imperative disappears.

**Will people cheat and try to have more than the next person?**

Probably, but the goal of Gracalism is to provide so much abundance that such motivations become moot. Once a new system has had generations of acceptance it will be as if the old way never happened. Like the 'dark ages' in history most of us (except perhaps those abused by fanatics) find it hard to imagine a society that put their fellow

citizens on a rack or hung them by their thumbs simply for saying something that contradicted a religious doctrine. In time, people will find it just as challenging to understand how the human race limited itself through the unquestioned goal of profit at all costs.

### **How might it be achieved?**

Honestly, I'm not sure. I fear it won't be achieved without aggression but live in hope that wiser people than me find a way to transition the world from a nose dive into horror and instead create a better future for us all. That being said, it

could go something like this:

## **Stage one**

Use the worlds capital - yes, take it from the electronic vaults wherever it now resides. It hasn't been real for a long time now, there's no Gringot's style (Harry Potter bankers) cellar full of gold beneath our banks, it's just numbers held on computers. Therefore, while the existing system is deconstructed we just spend the numbers on paying companies to manufacture more and more AI robotic systems wherever they are needed; farmers need machines to feed their animals, drive their tractors to

till the land , plant the crops, look after them, and then process them once they're grown. Manufacturers need machines to replace all their workers not just a few, and retailers to stock their shelves, deliver their goods, and replenish their warehouses. Trucks need removing from the roads and perhaps AI drones may be programmed to fly above them in convoy, and so and so forth. Our initial goal must be to rapidly replace everything except the fulfilling roles people aspire to.

### **Stage two**

Firstly, provide an education for all that

seeks to maximise the potential of every person. That's a far cry from today. We still have a class system, - not upper and lower class but classes of about 30 led by a teacher, that was originally designed to fill factories with ready-made workers. As the world will keep turning thanks to AI and robotics, there's no reason why education shouldn't play a part through life for everyone.

Secondly, support all changes by propping up the old money based system for as long as necessary until goods and services can be provided freely without its need.

### **Stage three**

Match roles to enthusiasm and expertise; there will still be growth and progression but not extrinsically rewarded, as intrinsic rewards will be enough as long as no additional risk is linked to progression. As education is lifelong, all job roles need not be for whole days or full weeks. Time needs to be shared between service (work), growth (education), and balance (leisure).

### **From the outset - the 'musts'**

These things must happen (possibly not quite as I'm suggesting but however they come about, come about they must). There are things that must continually happen throughout the process of change:

People must be convinced. Power is accessed by spreading messages, spending capital on spreading those messages, and convincing people that the message being spread is one worth listening to. Beliefs change because people choose to change them, not because they are told to.

Power must shift. For change to begin there will have to have been an overturning of power using the existing system. Hopefully, that can be achieved peacefully by engaging people in this discussion. One thing is for sure, the more we talk the more chance we have of a peaceful transition. The more the idea is spread and analysed, torn apart and put back together again the more likely it will be accepted as a reality and not some crackpot idea to be ignored.

Change from capitalism to Gracalism must happen with the support of the

popular vote for it to be legitimate. The existing warped approach democracy must be used as the means to transition to another reality.

Existing capital must be utilised. Once those leading the 'revolution' are in place they may go about the dismantling of capitalism by sequestering 'capital' as required. As it will all disappear at some point the arguments against this will be emotional rather than rational. However, it is likely there will be resistance that must be quelled.

Simultaneously the leadership of the

change must engage widely to construct a democratic system that supports access and influence to decision making and leadership, appoints only the best and most qualified to positions requiring those skills, and appoints a changing group of administrative facilitators seconded to positions of responsibility on behalf of the electorate.

Government must return to being of the people and for the people. It must become a trusted set of institutions that are open and free from 'politics'.

Discussion and debate about decisions at every level must be open, justified,

and supported. Without the need for personal gain, with reduced possibility of using position to influence, and a culture that is based on abundance than scarcity it is significantly less likely that the problems of the past will travel with us into the future.

We should prepare and plan and protect ourselves from what is already begun to happen. Just look around you and then decide; do we put our heads in the sand or step up to the challenge?

These matters are real, the impact of them are real, and the reality that some

change must happen is real. The question; 'if not Gracalism, then what?' is a better question than why this, why now, or why should we listen to 'this bloke'!

This intention of this paper is to stimulate debate. If it causes you to think, to talk, and to consider the reality of the world changes we are all engaged with, then it has achieved its purpose.

Martin Goodyer, March 2017

## Who is Martin Goodyer

*Martin Goodyer is a psychologist and business / executive coach with an extensive track record of coaching built on the solid foundations of a 17 year business career, qualifications in business management and as a psychologist, and 20 years as a full time coach and coach educator. He is an author on books on coaching, business productivity, and popular psychology, and a teacher of coaching philosophy: Accredited at the highest level and close to completing a coaching research PhD. He is a world class coach with an exemplary track record.*