



***AUSTRALASIAN STUDY OF
PARLIAMENT GROUP
(Queensland Chapter)***

THE QUEENSLAND 2024 ELECTION UNPACKED

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, 11 March 2025

Brisbane

TUESDAY, 11 MARCH 2025

Dr CRAWFORD: Good evening, everybody. I would like to welcome you to this event on the 2024 Queensland state election, which is jointly hosted by the Australasian Study of Parliament Group Queensland, the TJ Ryan Foundation, the Australian Institute for Progress and the Queensland Former Parliamentary Members' Association. Thank you to everybody who has braved the weather to come tonight. We are very pleased to welcome you, given that we had to reschedule. Thank you for coming.

My name is Mary Crawford. I am the executive director of the TJ Ryan Foundation. I am also on the committee for ASPG so I have on a few hats here tonight. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners and custodians of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to elders past and present.

Tonight's panel is very interesting and exciting. We have Dr Frank Mols, who is a senior lecturer from the School of Political Science and International Studies, University of Queensland; Graham Young, Executive Director of the Australian Institute for Progress; the Hon. John Mickel, who is a former Labor MP and a former Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and who is now an adjunct professor at QUT; and Sarah Elks, who is a senior reporter at the *Australian*.

After the panel discussion we also have a very special event. Each year the ASPG has an essay competition. Our prize winner for last year is Connor Harvey and we want to acknowledge him and his work. He wrote a wonderful essay on the 1974 election. I do not know whether there is anything people have learned.

There are a couple of housekeeping matters. Firstly, the panel discussion will be recorded by Hansard and a transcript will be available on the ASPG page. I would now like to welcome ASPG-Q's patron, the current Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Hon. Pat Weir, to come and say a few words.

Mr WEIR: Thank you very much for inviting me along here today. It has been an interesting few days. We had to move this event by one day. We actually moved parliament by one day. The road is open today and everything has worked out really well. Occasionally you get a decision right!

I would like to acknowledge our special guests: Graham Young, John Mickel, Sarah and Frank. It is an interesting subject. I am one of the beneficiaries of the 2024 election. As at 31 January I have been a member of parliament for 10 years, and this is the first time that I have had a chance to sit on the government benches. I am very pleased with the result of the 2024 election. All elections are different. Every one of them has a unique character. It will be interesting to hear the conversations here tonight.

I would like to acknowledge all of the former members who are here. Every elected member knows that he will be at some stage, whether it is of his own choice or the choice made for him, a former member. I look forward to working with the Queensland branch over the coming time. Glen Elmes has been at me for quite some time. We have a meeting coming up this week with Glen. To the former members I may not have met—some of you I have met—welcome along here today. I look forward to the evening. Thank you very much.

Dr CRAWFORD: I would now like to introduce the moderator for this evening, Dr Kit Kowol, who, as well as working at parliament, is a political historian. I am sure we are in his very fit hands, to introduce the panel.

Dr KOWOL: Thank you so much for coming and especially for braving the wind and rain and the multiple changes of venue. We were going to be up on the roof of parliament. I am glad that last night I made the call to change that. The format for the event today is that each participant is going to speak for five minutes and then we will have questions from the floor. I have warned the panellists that I was an academic in the past and therefore I have a history of running over my allotted time and I will not be standing for it. I also will not be standing for questions being shouted out until we have got to the question and answer section.

Without further ado, I will introduce our speakers. We will start off with Dr Frank Mols, who is a senior lecturer at UQ and a renowned political scientist. Frank has worked on stuff to do with the intersection of political science and political psychology—how leaders are understood in our current era. When it comes to Australian politics, Frank has worked on everything from the impact of bushfires to the decline of Pauline Hanson's One Nation. Frank will tell us a little bit about where we are and how we got here.

Dr MOLS: Thank you very much, Kit. My task is actually really easy: I am going to tell you what you already know. I was asked to give you a bit of a review of what happened in the election of 2024, and I suspect that what I am going to tell you is something you know already, but to refresh our memories I will go through the basics. I think it is worthwhile reflecting on the backdrop of the election. It was, of course, a time at which Labor had been in government for a long, long time, with three Palaszczuk governments and Steven Miles had taken over. There was probably a degree of ALP fatigue in the state.

The other thing I think worth recalling is the COVID crisis that is just behind us and which may have had interesting effects as well. I think there was some legacy and we can talk, maybe in the discussion, about to what extent that may have been an influence. I think also the growing influence of culture wars has been simmering and is probably more prominent now than it was at the time, but I think that, too, is probably a background condition that we may want to revisit.

In terms of nuts and bolts, as you probably all know, the LNP won 52 seats. Previously the ALP had 52 seats so it was the opposite outcome. The ALP ended up with 36 seats, the Katter party won three seats, there was one Independent—Sandy, who is here; hip hip hooray—and, of course, a Greens candidate was renewed, Michael Berkman. What can we say about the parties individually? Obviously, the ALP suffered a loss of 16 seats. That was seen as quite a landslide against them. The swing towards the LNP was seven per cent statewide, first party preferred, which was anticipated. No-one really thought that was much of a surprise. Seventeen seats were won from the ALP and one from the Katter party. That is the big picture with the ALP and LNP. The Katter party stayed stable with three seats, the Greens went back from two to one. That is, of course, a story that is worth revisiting.

There are some interesting seats that we could look at if we had more time. Ipswich West was an interesting one. It was lost by the ALP and then in a by-election won by the LNP and then went back to the ALP. Mirani is always an interesting seat to watch, with Stephen Andrew being elected for One Nation, becoming an Independent, turning to the Katter party and subsequently losing to the LNP. That is, in a nutshell, what happened there. South Brisbane is also very interesting, not least because of the outcome. Amy MacMahon wins most votes and has the highest percentage but, because of LNP preferences to Labor, Labor gets in and hence we have Barbara O'Shea holding that seat now. These are probably the micro stories that are worth talking about.

There are four main trends that we can reflect on. Once again it was an election of two tales, rural and South-East Queensland being two different entities that warrant their own analysis. Let's not forget that the LNP gains were primarily made in rural cities rather than in the south-east corner. The second one is the 'Greensland' move in 2020. There was hope that suddenly the Greens had broken through—it was now from one to two. Rather than going from two to three or four, it went back to one. That was probably not anticipated. I saw media commentators—Paul Williams, for example—who wrote that in all likelihood we were going to see more Greens seats, and that did not materialise. But Paul Williams was right in saying that the LNP was going to have a solid win here.

The third one bucks the trend. If you look at the 2024 outcome, the LNP and Labor together got two more seats. That actually bucks the trend more widely of the minor parties being said to be on the increase—that people are getting rusted off, that there is less and less appetite for the major parties. At least the 2024 election was an outlier. I am not suggesting that that is a pattern long-term, but it is worth reflecting on as well.

The fourth one, which I referred to earlier, is the influence of culture wars: effective polarisation. I think that is something we can revisit in the discussion. My sense is that it becomes more and more the backdrop to anything that happens now, even moving forward into the new elections. We see that Queensland politics is increasingly, by the voters—particularly what we call the unsophisticated voters, voters who are not all that informed—read through the lens of US politics. I have stood on the hustings with an Independent candidate and observed them handing out how-to-vote cards. They would regularly get the question: 'Where do you stand on Trump?' as a proxy for 'Am I for or against you?' Just by asking you where you stand on Trump I know enough. I think US politics is increasingly shaping what we feel and what we see. I will leave it at that. Thank you very much.

Dr KOWOL: Thanks so much, Frank. Next up we have Graham Young. Graham is the Executive Director of the Australian Institute for Progress. He is also a pollster, a political analyst and a political consultant. He was a former state campaign chairman for the Liberal Party. He is going to tell you how they did it.

Mr YOUNG: I should make it clear that I am not speaking for the Liberal Party. They say I am the official black sheep of the party, having been expelled just before they merged with the LNP. I have not been a member of a political party since, but I do have friendly relations with them. In the last election the Australian Institute for Progress was a registered third party, so we actually ran a campaign. It was anti Labor. It was not pro Liberal. I bring some of that perspective to it.

As part of the polling work that I do, I do qualitative polling. I have a panel of people—some of them have been with me for 24 years, since 2001, when Mike Kaiser and I kicked it off. They tell me why they are doing things. I can go and read Sarah and find out what Newspoll says about what is going to happen. It is not important when you are running an election campaign. You want to win, so you want to understand why people are thinking the way they are and how you might change their votes. What I am going to tell you is partly based on that.

There is a truism in politics that governments lose; oppositions do not win. I think this election bore that truism out. It is not something which is always true, but in this case it was. It was a 'time for a change' election. When I do my polling, the word 'change' is usually twinned with 'climate'. It wasn't this time when I asked people how they were going to exercise their first preference vote. They had essentially made up their mind that they were going to change the government. David Crisafulli's job was to make sure they did not change their mind. Hence, you saw that really small target strategy. Steven Miles's job was to try to disrupt things and get them to have second thoughts. At the end of the day, they did not have second thoughts.

The Liberal Party had an historic task, really. It was much harder for them to win a majority than I think for any other government, at least in the modern era, in Queensland because they had to climb over four KAPs who had seats which they would normally expect to hold; Sandy Bolton, who, again, holds a seat which she took from Glen Elmes, who is an apology this evening, which was a safe Liberal seat; and the Greens in Maiwar, which normally you would have expected to be a Liberal seat. They had a lot of Independents who, if they wanted to get a majority, they had to jump over the top of. There was also what I call a financial gerrymander. A spending cap on elections plus the ability for people to be third parties, as we were, meant that the unions had a huge amount of leverage. Part of the reason we were in there was to try to redress that leverage.

A seven per cent swing is a large swing. You cannot take away from the feeling you get when you are in the trenches knowing that you have to do something which no-one since Rob Borbidge had done from your side of government at a state level. The expectations were against the LNP in the sense that everyone wants to be the underdog but everyone expected them to win, and that is a problem because for people in Australia our favourite horse race is a handicap and our only professional foot race is a handicap. We will go for the horse that we think is trying hard, not necessarily the horse everyone is backing to win.

When it came to deserving—and this is out of our polling—voters did not think either side deserved to win but they gave the LNP higher marks, not because they wanted them to win necessarily but because after nine years it was time for someone else to have a go. In terms of the leaders, David Crisafulli was rated more highly than Steven Miles. But people did not hate Steven Miles; they just thought that he did not really know what he was doing. He came to the game pretty late. Again, it was probably time to give someone else a go. During the course of the campaign, Crisafulli's approval rating, on my research, came down. I put that down to the abortion issue—not abortion per se but the way he answered the question. People thought it was a bit shifty, including his own supporters.

Cost of living was the biggest issue. The LNP for some reason were running on crime. I think that was because it echoed up in North Queensland and in the regions and that helped to get them the votes there, but it meant they were probably not doing as well in South-East Queensland. I do not know whether the abortion issue changed that many votes. On my polling it did not. It tended to reinforce what people thought, because there were right-to-life people who reacted one way and there were pro-choice people who reacted the other. I only found a few people, as in one or two, out of my group who said that they would actually change their mind on the issue.

Crime by the end was a proxy for cost of living. If people said 'crime', you would find they would mention the cost-of-living things—which were housing, electricity, petrol and groceries—at the same time. Because the LNP was running on it, because they were going to change the government, it ended up, I think, being the major issue. The result was what Frank said, but there were larger swings in the regions where crime was an issue and smaller swings in Brisbane where maybe abortion was the issue. However, I had a look at the referendum results and they mapped pretty well to what happened in Brisbane. You look at Chatsworth. He got a good result there, but then you look at his vote in the referendum and it was a big 'no' vote. If you look at Mansfield, where we got what looked like a poor result, the referendum result was much closer. It might not have been abortion at all.

We now have a government that is beholden to regional Queensland. If you look at the seats they need to lose to lose government, they are not in Brisbane. Maybe you won't get a new stadium for the Olympics because people in the regions won't like it.

The last thing I would like to say is that it possibly puts a question mark over whether the LNP has actually been an organisational success. You can see at the federal level, where they are separate parties, the Liberal Party seem to do much better in Brisbane than they do at a state level, and at a city council level, where essentially nothing has changed, they do better than at a state level.

Dr KOWOL: Thanks so much for that. That was great. Next up we have John Mickel. John, if you don't know—I imagine no-one here falls into that bucket—is, of course, a former member for Logan, a former Speaker and also quite a frequent commentator during the election, writing for a number of newspapers. You could not find an ABC News story about the election that did not have a quote from the Hon. John Mickel. He is going to give us his insights about the Labor campaign.

Mr MICKEL: Like Graham, I am not speaking for the Labor Party; I am speaking about the Labor Party. Frank is right: it is simply a mirror image of what occurred in 2020; they just flipped sides. The swing, as Graham said, was high. If you watched it on election night, it looked like it was close. That was simply because nobody much voted on the day. You were flat out finding anybody to vote. Even there the swing against Labor was five per cent.

What happened is this—and I think arising out of this election the Electoral Commission has to change this. I cannot see why the early votes cannot be counted during the day with the scrutineers in there and those votes admitted soon after six o'clock. What happened is Miles made that ridiculous speech when, if he had waited two minutes when the early votes came in, the swing was quite decisive on those early votes. As a result, the election was not close at all.

The dynamic change for Labor in this election, unlike every other defeat Labor has had, was the inability to secure a majority of the regions. If you go back to the decisive defeats of 1974, Labor won the majority of those 11 in regional Queensland. In the great result that Anna Bligh bequeathed to the Labor Party of seven seats, just under half of those were from regional Queensland. This election broke the trend where Labor was smashed in the regions—not just smashed in the regions but smashed in seats that it had held in one instance since 1915.

Labor has a problem. It had a problem after 1957 in rural and country Queensland, where it used to hold the majority of those seats. The seats that it lost then it never won again. If Labor is not careful, it will consign itself to opposition. You might say that is a dramatic call. Labor has not won a majority of federal seats in Queensland since 2007. In all the big occasions that it had—like last time—it did not move. In fact, it went backwards. It has not won a regional seat for quite some time at the federal level.

Graham mentioned the council. At the end of this term it will be 24 years since Labor has won the mayoralty in Brisbane. My point in saying that is: even in its worst years of 1974, Labor was securing a majority in the Brisbane City Council. Either there is an existential problem for Labor, but the notion that it will be like 2015—I disagree with Graham slightly there. I think coming from seven to 44 was bigger than coming from 36 to whatever the hell they got—52.

Mr Young interjected.

Mr MICKEL: Don't 'but' me, Graham. It was seven to 44. I didn't even pick that one.

Mr YOUNG: I did. I've got the betting ticket that shows it.

Mr MICKEL: He always tells me this stuff after the bets are in. He has never forgiven me for cleaning up the pot. When did you invite me to that thing? In 2019. I think, Don, you had nicked off before you had to put in the 20 bucks, but I won 144 bucks from the Liberals. I thought that was pretty good. They have always said the Liberals were a miserly lot. I thought they were pretty good, so I will always go to lunch with Graham.

The point is this: Labor, in doing well in South-East Queensland, bucked this trend. Before the election I think the genuine fear was that on 28 per cent of the vote—which the polls were showing they were—it would get a 2012-ish sort of vote, but Labor managed to retain the traditional change-of-government seats in the south-east—Pine Rivers, Aspley, Mansfield, Mount Ommaney, Gaven and Springwood—and also, against all odds, retained the marginal seat of Bundaberg, which it had held by nine votes. I had said to Tom Smith, ‘Look, mate, if you work really, really hard with nine votes, you might double your majority.’ But he has done a lot better than that. For the life of me I cannot work out why Labor has not taken him on a travelling show up through your electorate, Pat, because he has something that I think some of the others might look out for.

Why did Labor lose? If you go back prior to COVID, there was a point where Labor was behind. In other words, there was a mood on to dump them in 2020. What happened was: COVID came along and there was a fundamental difference. Labor won the seniors and the vacant seats who are made up of the elderly because the notion was ‘keeping the community safe’. By 2024 it was ‘keep me safe’ and Labor was negligent in arguing that case. In other words, from about 2022 onwards the LNP was in front of Labor and from mid-2023 Labor never was in the hunt no matter who the leader was, and the election result proved that.

Dr KOWOL: Thanks so much, John. Next up we have Sarah Elks. Sarah is senior reporter at the *Australian*. She is the winner of a number of journalism awards but is most famous here in parliament for being one of the authors of the must-read guide to Queensland political gossip *Feeding the Chooks*. Sarah will give us her perspective on the way in which the campaigns engaged with the media and how that played out throughout the campaign.

Ms ELKS: Thank you, Kit. Yes, I am a ‘chook’—very proud of it. If you haven’t read *Feeding the Chooks*, what have you been doing? Every Friday—except for last Friday, when we were going to get blown away by a cyclone—we have a column called *Feeding the Chooks*, which is all about what is really going on behind the scenes of Queensland parliament, and I believe you enjoy it until you are in it!

I cannot remember the number of campaigns I have done. The first one was in 2009, with Anna Bligh and Lawrence Springborg. Each campaign I have done since then has had one central theme as a journalist on the buses or the planes. That is, you have almost zero idea of what is going on from one day to the next. We call it the ‘magical mystery tour’. Often, regardless of which side of politics you were with, we would be told to meet before dawn—thank you very much, Mr Crisafulli’s insane body clock—at the bus just out here on Alice Street and then we would be whisked away to somewhere in the state for however many days. Sometimes you would be told to pack a suitcase for two days; sometimes you would be told, ‘You’ll be back sometime today,’ and we would have no idea where we were going. I am assured that there are very good reasons for that. It used to be because there was an assumption that the media would tip off protesters or other things. I have never encountered a journalist who has ever told a protester where we would be, but perhaps times have changed. That makes it difficult.

I suppose the key part of trying to cover a campaign and do it properly is to step outside the stage-managed picture opportunities and think for yourself about what you think are the questions of the day and what you might be able to ask that is not necessarily something that either leader is expecting. We have had it reflected already here today, and that question for the current Premier was the abortion issue. That was always going to be an issue during the campaign because the unions were preparing what could be accurately called a scare campaign about it. However, my colleague at the *Australian*, Lydia Lynch, asked some key people what they thought. She spoke to Jann Stuckey, a former MP for the LNP—I can see some eyes rolling in the middle rows; some of Jann’s former colleagues, whom I will not name—who said that she was not sure what would happen if there was a conscience vote, whether those abortion laws would be rolled back. Lydia then, very enterprisingly, spoke to Robbie Katter, a key crossbencher, who said, ‘Yes, of course we’re going to introduce a private member’s bill and allow members to have a conscience vote.’

David Crisafulli, despite his best laid plans to pretty much only talk about crime for the first two weeks, was completely derailed. I spoke to a senior LNP strategist today who said that if there was one miscalculation of the Crisafulli campaign it was that he did not shut that issue down soon enough. Despite repeated questions, he did not state what his personal position was on the issue of termination of pregnancy until the very last Media Club debate. In that situation he said he was actually pro choice, which is different to how he originally voted on the issue when the issue was before the parliament. He also sort of insisted all the way along that there would be no change to the law. Reporters—I count myself among them—were quite frustrated because he would not explain how he would manage to keep his various MPs, many of whom had voted in an anti-abortion way in the past, in line this time.

As we saw in one of the first weeks of parliament, he actually did something—the Leader of the House outside told me it was him who suspended standing orders to allow the Premier to move a motion without notice so that the termination-of-pregnancy legislation could not be changed within this term of parliament, giving effect to his election commitment. I cannot help but wonder whether, if he had explained earlier on in the campaign how he was going to ensure the laws would not change, he would not have been as swept away by that.

I do think that issue did play in the inner city and managed to hold off the Greens from Labor's fortress Brisbane. The other thing Labor strategists put that down to is—I don't know if many people in the room are on TikTok, but Steven Miles paid a lot of attention to TikTok and to social media. Labor strategists believe that had a huge impact in bringing people who were always left voters but maybe had strayed to the Greens in the past back into the Labor fold. They put holding onto seats like Aspley down to the TikTok effect and to the abortion effect. Please ask me questions when we get to them, because I have lots more to say. I am sure everyone does. I will pass my microphone back.

Dr KOWOL: Thanks, everyone. That is brilliant. I am already so much better informed about underlying trends as well as the minutiae of what was going on day to day. Now, usually I would woefully abuse my moderator's privilege and ask a load of questions but, given that we have so many people here they are actually spilling out of the room, I think that would be spectacularly rude. Our panellists have done such a good job of keeping to time that we have 40 or so minutes for questions and answers, so you can say all the things that you wish you had said!

Mr MICKEL: Are we getting paid by the minute or the word?

Dr KOWOL: You're not getting paid at all! I will ask my colleague Ella to pass around the microphone, so if you have a question could you put a hand up? I will ask you to say your name and what organisation you represent if you do represent one. Given there are so many people here, can I ask you to please restrain yourself to one question.

Mr TANTI: I thank everyone for their comments. My question is to Graham. Can you given the percentages on early voting and how important it now is?

Mr YOUNG: No, I cannot give the exact percentages, Frank.

Mr MICKEL: I can.

Mr YOUNG: My better informed friend here from the ALP, who keeps winning bets off me, apparently can. The final early voting total was 44 per cent, which is kind of following an American trend, too, to echo something Frank said earlier.

QUESTIONER: My name is Barclay. A lot of people talked about how this election was the first time in really any election that we have seen the Greens go backwards as opposed to continuing their growth in some of those inner-city electorates. How much of that can be put down to LNP preferences? I know that last time they did make a move to get rid of someone like Jackie Trad in the seat of South Brisbane, but this election they switched back to putting Labor above the Greens. Was it the collapse of the Greens or was it more just the LNP flicking the numbers around?

Ms ELKS: Thanks, Barclay. I actually spoke to strategists from the ALP and the LNP today about exactly that point and they both said it was the LNP preferencing decision that made the big difference. Someone in Labor I spoke to today said that they hope the LNP does that in the federal election as well because they are targeting Griffith, hoping to get Griffith back. Yes, that was the huge game changer. I think the other thing is that it is a confidence boost for Labor and the non-Greens parties because there has been a supposed 'truth' that once a Greens candidate gets in it is almost impossible to get them out. I think what happened in South Brisbane gives the non-Greens parties hope that it is possible to defeat a sitting Greens MP.

Mr YOUNG: For me, one of the mysteries of the last election was why the Liberal Party did not say, 'If you don't do that swap with us in Maiwar, we won't do it in South Brisbane.'

Mr MICKEL: The proposition is simply not correct. That is, in Maiwar the Greens went backwards by seven but in Greenslopes they went up by 2½. In McConnel, which is the old Brisbane Central seat, they went backwards by four and in Cooper they went backwards by four, but in Miller they went up by 1.7, in Ferny Grove 3.5, in Toohey 4.7, in Stafford 0.9, in Clayfield 0.3 and in Bulimba three. So it is simply not true that right across the board the Greens went backwards.

If you look at some of the booths—in Stretton, for example—the Greens won the booth. They did that not because they were Greens; they did that because the Muslims voted for the Greens in what was a Muslim booth at Kuraby. You see the same thing in the electorate of Woodridge. In central Woodridge, the Greens polled higher than the Liberals off that phenomenon. The further west you move in Woodridge, the less there is of that phenomena. What happened was the Greens went up in places where they were doing no good and went backwards in the inner west.

The other thing is: whilst it is fashionable to talk about Barbara O'Shea, who I think is an excellent candidate, it is true that she nearly lost because the Liberal Party did very well, the Greens went backwards by four but One Nation, in giving its preferences to the Libs, almost guaranteed that the Greens got re-elected. Imagine that: an extreme right-wing mob—I will not finish the sentence.

Mr BARTLETT: G'day, I am Andrew. I am not speaking for anybody, just myself. I will ask Graham to put on his pollster hat. There is a general narrative that, even though Labor lost fairly comprehensively, Steven Miles sort of saved the furniture, at least in the south-east, through some of the things he did, 50-cent fares being the obvious one. There is also the narrative that I think Sarah referred to that they were going to do worse but the abortion thing helped. Without you saying 'a bit of both', is it fair to say that he did sort of save the furniture to some extent, compared to if Annastacia Palaszczuk had stayed there?

Mr YOUNG: Former senator Andrew, isn't it? Bartlett? You have always been far too modest. Well, he was certainly trying to save the furniture. Whether it worked or not, I am not 100 per cent sure. It is difficult to know exactly where it all falls. Some of my respondents said, 'He's trying to buy our votes.' So they were cynical. Other people said, 'This is what a Labor government is about. It is about easing the cost of living.' I think one of the corollaries of that election campaign is that you are going to see Anthony Albanese run a similar one.

Mr STEVENS: Thanks, Kit. Ray Stevens, member for Mermaid Beach, where the swing was just under 10 per cent.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great candidate!

Mr STEVENS: Thank you very much. I paid him to say that! One of the reasons, besides myself, for that great swing was the crime issue in our areas on the Gold Coast. My question is to Adjunct Professor John Mickel. Does the fact that the left have the power in the Labor Party now, in terms of their policy and direction and the fact that they were basically ignoring the issue of youth crime and crime in general, mean that Labor suffered badly in the last election and will continue to do so?

Mr MICKEL: The historical fact is that when the AWU run the show we win. When the AWU are running the Labor Party, that is when you get the moderate people; that is when you always had regional voters and the Labor Party always held those regional seats. That is just a fact of life. I will leave you to draw conclusions as to what I might think of the left. I was having a look at your vote—10 per cent. I mean, this is an amazing vote. It reflects the power of the individual.

Mr STEVENS: Thank you.

Mr MICKEL: The swing on the Gold Coast was 7.5. But here is the rub for the LNP: if crime was an issue on the Gold Coast then, equally, it should have been an issue on the Sunshine Coast, where potentially it is older and more conservative, yet the swing on the Sunshine Coast was 3.7. In the south-east it was 5.9. In the rest of the state it was 9.3.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Maybe there are more drug kingpins in Ray's electorate than anyone else has.

Mr MICKEL: Some people might say that. I could not possibly say that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They would not go on the Sunshine Coast.

Mr WALKER: Ian Walker, former member for Mansfield. For Sarah: I was handing out on the day, and a couple of people came past me and said, 'I am voting for the bloke with the guns.' I had not been aware that firearm control was an issue in the election, but in fact this was Mr Miles flexing his muscles on TikTok. My question is: how much of the campaign do we not see, particularly people in this room, which is happening underground on very different issues than you are reporting on?

Ms ELKS: I think that is a great question. I have a stat here, although I am not sure it is really a stat in Graham's book. Apparently there was a moment on TikTok when the now opposition leader bench pressed 100kg, which is apparently an impressive thing to do. I am sure we could all do it if we tried; we just choose not to. He got one million views across all social media platforms. I would hazard a guess that not many of those people are Queensland voters; however, it does show how much emphasis the Labor campaign was putting on TikTok and was putting on social media. I spoke to Mr Miles's chief of staff during the campaign—we were in Bundaberg, I think—and after every press conference they would take him away and he would do something purely for TikTok. It was a way of speaking directly to the voters; you do not have to worry about the pesky media interfering with your message.

The other thing I thought was interesting was that Labor was paying influencers to put out Labor's message. That was something I had not seen before. It is something the LNP did not do. I expect the LNP to do it in the future; I have that on good authority. In fact, they might do it in the federal seats of Brisbane and Ryan, where they want to win the youth vote. Yes, there is a whole shadow campaign that old people like me do not know because I am not on TikTok and we find out two weeks later on Instagram, but there you go.

Mr YOUNG: Could I just say a couple of things about TikTok and the whole social media thing? I saw his guns and my attitude was that he is spending far too much time in the gym and not enough time working. You get a million people—you are right, Sarah: they did not come from Australia, so whether it actually moved any votes I do not know; it is very difficult to tell with that kind of stuff. However, one of the interesting developments is the long-form interview that has been happening in US politics. I would suggest you all go and have a look at YouTube and have a look at Donald Trump being interviewed by Joe Rogan. It is amazing. Rogan has greater weight there than proportionately Channel 9, Channel 10 or Channel 7 have here. I would suggest if you are in the politics business, do not go so much for this sort of stuff on TikTok, which is just making room for another influencer, a celebrity. As a politician, people want you to be instrumental. They want you to do something for them, and flexing your muscles is not one of those things. Go and have a look at what they have done in the US and what Trump did. I think that is probably much more effective:

Mr MICKEL: I want to add this. There is some evidence that, whether it was TikTok or whatever social media he was using—if you look at what has gone on in Europe in recent times and, I think, to some extent in the United States, it is the young people who feel that the system has not worked for them, who feel shut out. A whole lot of you are nodding, and I will have to nod, too, because I feel it every time my kids give me the lecture on how lucky my generation is—

Mr YOUNG: And they will never afford a home.

Mr MICKEL: And they will never afford a home.

Mr YOUNG: Unless you give them a deposit.

Mr MICKEL: Unless you give them a deposit; that is right, Graham. But here is my point: the young people around the world are switching to right-wing parties, but at the state election what seemed to happen is that Miles lifted in some seats—some of those inner-northern seats—at the expense of the Greens.

Mr CAMERON: Don Cameron, federal member from 1966 to 1990. A lot of you were not even born back then. If I can be forgiven for just making a comment, I really have believed since the election that the reason Labor did well in Brisbane was that abortion issue. Even on polling days, there were signs out by the unions warning people of that issue. I really believe—and I put this in writing to the Liberal Party earlier in the piece—that David Crisafulli—and he won—and since I have seen him on television often. I can understand he had a lot more going for him than people understood at the time. He has done well since then but not that well during the election, and it was the abortion issue where he kind of stuffed up. With the Liberal Party not doing well in Brisbane, that was understandable. What the Liberal Party has to be very careful about come the next election is winning seats in Brisbane. I have difficulty in thinking that all those

far northern seats will stay Liberal unless their sitting members are right off their backsides and going hard and making an impression. Sorry, mine was not a question. I agreed with the three people who nominated that issue because I really think it was the killer in metropolitan Brisbane.

Dr MOLS: I will give my two cents worth. I think it is a really interesting discussion, because I think this is the benefit of the fact of the wisdom of the crowd. If you ask an individual person to give an analysis of what happened in 2024, you will probably get a projection of what the person is very passionate about or what they believe was the cause, but I think by having a crowd this intelligent and this well informed we have all the theories on the table. What is interesting about it as well is that predicting election outcomes and retrospectively making sense of them are different things. I had to think about Phillip Tapp. Phillip Tapp, the famous political psychologist who once did research into how well pundits can predict elections, came to the conclusion that even the best informed people had no more chance than chance. You could flip a coin and most pundits would have a 50 per cent chance—just as much as throwing up a coin.

I think it is an interesting thing that we have to be probably mindful of. We come with theories and explanations that are kind of solid, or solid enough or good enough, but we do not know for sure. We are making assumptions; we are making a leap in that process. Of course, as social scientists, when we publish articles we need to have the evidence and we have to have significant facts for something before we believe and get published. For me, it is interesting that we indulge in these kinds of discussions about ‘this is what drove that’—not that I disagree with what I hear but, again, that is why the wisdom of the crowd idea is very interesting.

Also for me personally, it makes it interesting often to not be too much with my snout in the trough and trying to understand all the nitty-gritty but to have a healthy distance. With a healthy distance, you can often see things that others are glossing over. I, too, have had a few successes predicting things that no-one else predicted, and it was precisely because I had a healthy distance from it rather than having this intel.

I just wanted to rattle the cage a little bit by saying: let’s be cautious with what we are doing here. We are all having theories and explanations that probably are fairly sound, but there is always that leap of faith that we have somewhere in there.

Mr YOUNG: One of the reasons I do polling is for exactly that reason. One of the reasons I do not talk to politicians, like Sarah does, is that they are always trying to mess with your mind, and if you were trying to work out what an ant bed was doing you would not go and interview the individual ants. I agree entirely with what Frank is saying.

I also know that a lot of what we say after we have won an election or when we are going in is to justify our narrative. You cannot be sure. Even with all the research we do, there are so many things out there you cannot possibly know. However, what I figured on the abortion issue was that it showed the Liberal campaign to be a bit brittle because they were anticipating that question. There are some obvious responses to it. The last time anyone seriously tried to repeal laws or tried to stop abortion being freely available was, I think, 1983, and Bill Knox, who was the health minister who introduced the bill, swore he would never go near that issue again.

No-one was pro abortion, Sarah. People were anti late abortion. If you look at the debate, that is what they were voting on. David Crisafulli’s problem was, ‘I am going to win on crime. I do not want to talk about this, so how do I push it to one side?’ It was too heavy to push to one side. If you cannot push it to one side, there are a couple of techniques you can use. One is to really get stuck into Steven Miles for raising something as a diversion from the fact that he cannot do anything about cost of living and ‘how dare you try to scare young women into voting for you on a fallacy?’ The second thing is to say, ‘No-one is going back to the fifties—backyard abortions and people dying. No-one is talking about that. That is a complete misrepresentation.’ But David was not prepared to go into that and he paid a price for it. Again, you do not know. So, he has to weigh up, ‘If I go and talk about that, does the whole campaign get tied up in abortion? Do we get blown off what is going to get me in there?’ I would have done a different thing, but I would not criticise him for doing what he did do.

Mr MICKEL: The other point I would make that you are overlooking is that, for example in Mansfield, the candidate there for the LNP was a second-string candidate. The bloke who ran in Lytton got a huge result, yet he was the one beaten in the Mansfield preselection, so it was the party processes. I could elaborate a little further, but sometimes in these things when you look at individual results you also need to work out whether or not the candidate was putting in the huge effort. There is evidence of that, too, in Springwood, for example. It is a brittle seat in Logan City. I will give you a Labor example of where the

candidate was a huge issue: Capalaba. Why was the swing in Capalaba 10 per cent and yet in the neighbouring seat of Redlands it was 4½ ? Four and a half is enough to take out Redlands, but it was enough to well and truly take out the bloke in Capalaba. Do not overlook the candidates.

The other thing is that, unlike in 2012, Labor this time sandbagged a lot of those marginal seats and put a lot of money into those. In the past, though—I know in 2012—it was horrific in that they would not recognise the peril they were in and decided they would help every seat. You have to make a hard-nosed decision sometimes, and that research that Graham does helps you with that hard-nosed research.

Mr BISHOP: Anthony Bishop, former LNP candidate for Bulimba in Di Farmer's seat. The tagline for the election was 'Adult Crime, Adult Time'. Amongst the four of you, how much do you think that was connected to child safety, which is the underlying issue of youth crime? Did people get what the tagline was about?

Dr MOLLS: I suspect they did. The undertone of it was well received or understood by the electorate. That is my sense. I do not have the evidence for that.

Mr YOUNG: I did not think it was about child protection; I thought it was about punishing people for what they have done. There were a lot of things in the news about young people stealing cars, home break-ins et cetera and what looked like raps over the knuckles and being put out again. I think people got it. I think it also played into the narrative that Labor was not in control, which was kind of an underlying theme. It was not something that the Liberals exploited, but there was an underlying feeling from people that 'this has all got too much'.

Ms ELKS: I think your point, Anthony—and let me interpret it, but perhaps not—is that Adult Time, Adult Crime, punishing youth criminals by locking them up, does not necessarily recognise the root causes of youth crime. I think that is right. I think that is what a lot of the evidence says. I think that will be the struggle for the LNP government now: whether or not the harsh penalties will result in less youth crime. I think we can remember from that first televised debate on Channel 9 that Mr Crisafulli promised that if there were not fewer victims of crime by the end of his first term he would resign and then he later put a caveat on that—I cannot remember what the caveat was. I do not think we are seeing enough serious policy work in terms of the true systemic causes of youth crime. I also think the tricky thing for the LNP government now will be that every time there is a terribly awful crime committed by a young person the government is going to have to answer for that and why the law is not working. I imagine there are tricky times ahead.

Mr MICKEL: There is no doubt when you look at the results in regional Queensland, leaving aside Rockhampton and Mackay—and I will come to why, if you want. If you look at Maryborough, where there was an horrific incident where people were killed, or Townsville, where the issue was always on the go—I sense, Ray, a lot of it is on the Gold Coast too—and if you look at the results in Logan, you can look at cost of living as part of it, but the reason Labor had to always be on it—in my former electorate a lot of the criminals came from all the flashy suburbs and committed the crime in Logan. Nobody in Logan ever committed a crime. On the rare occasion that they did, they would have stolen from neighbours. It is a live issue in those areas and people expect you to do something about it. They do not give a stuff if the kid is 10; they have lost either their loved one or their possessions. They want a firm response. It is as simple as that.

Mr PATANE: Ross Patane, interested citizen. Just on the theme of crime, I was wondering if the panel had any views on the impact of the revelations around the CFMEU and the relationship with outlaw motorcycle gangs and how that fed into the incidence of crime. Did that play on the minds of the electorate at all?

Mr YOUNG: I did a little bit of research on unions. People are not anti union. The CFMEU did get their hackles up, but it did not come out in any of the qual that I did. The CFMEU was playing in there in sub-stories to do with cost of building. The promise to do away with the BPIC, Best Practice Industry Conditions, was part of that. It potentially played into a little bit of kind of grubbiness about the ALP campaign, but not really that strongly.

Something Sarah said reminded me of something in my polling that I thought I should mention. That is, the right-wing minor parties were not that enthusiastic about the LNP. My interpretation of that was that David Crisafulli is on P-plates and he needs to perform to those people's expectations to have a good chance of winning the next election. Despite the fact that the major parties kind of did okay—kind of: Labor

was well down on where it normally would be and I think the Libs were just over 40 per cent from memory, 41.3 or something like that—there is still a large block of minor parties out there. They are not rusted on. The LNP has to perform on those sorts of issues or it will not be up to David Crisafulli whether he resigns or not; he will get retired by the electorate.

QUESTIONER: Can I ask the panel about probably one of the most interesting seats in Queensland that has been referred to, the seat of Bundaberg. Both in the last election and in the election before, it is an outcome that probably was not predicted by too many people. It is interesting that in that particular seat Dying with Dignity Queensland have a very strong presence. Voluntary assisted dying is one of those sort of sleeper issues that I think probably had an impact certainly in the previous election and it has definitely, in my view, had an impact in Bundaberg. Tom Smith was opposed by David Batt and the LNP. The issue there was that, at a number of forums I attended, the LNP were not able to come up with support for voluntary assisted dying but Tom Smith did. It is interesting because that impacted also in Hervey Bay and Caloundra and various other electorates. VAD is one of those progressive sleeper issues. I would like to hear from the panel whether in some way that could explain the outcome in the seat of Bundaberg or not.

Mr MICKEL: The fact is that Tom Smith was a good local member against a very poor candidate. Why do I say that? Because she did not even win the preselection for the Hinkler seat. That was won by the previous member. If you are a red-hot candidate, there is no way on God's earth you could not have knocked back nine votes. You only had to win five of them. He got the biggest swing, at 1.5, for Labor. There were only two seats in the state that swung to Labor. That was one of them and the other one was Cooper. The time before, when David Batt was the candidate—I do not know David Batt at all—the Paradise Dam issue was alive and well there. My recollection, and it is hazy on this one, is that the LNP were compromised on what they were going to do about that dam. Lack of rectification could have meant flooding at quite a catastrophic level in Bundaberg and he was right on that issue—enough to get there by nine votes. If we speak about candidates, he was the best candidate for Labor in what had been a string of absolute duds, so maybe the string of absolute duds had suppressed the Labor vote too.

Ms ELKS: I think it would be really interesting to know what impact voluntary assisted dying had had across the state given it is such a contentious issue, like abortion. Just on the point of the local campaign, I know that there was consternation from within the LNP both ways. The local candidate was a woman called Bree Watson, the CEO of the local fruit and vegetable growers association, and she spoke a lot about the problems with Paradise Dam and the concerns if it did flood. There was a concern from the central HQ that she was not doing enough of the hard work on the ground. I think perhaps you become a little bit complacent when you think you have only a tiny little margin to overcome in order to win.

Mr MICKEL: But it would have been good.

Mr YOUNG: Can I just add one thing—not on Bundaberg, per se. Campaigns, I think, did make a difference. The weight of money that you can throw at a campaign makes a difference. I saw the sandbagging in places like Aspley and Mansfield, where you had unions out there. They did not have a Labor Party logo on them, but their material would have given you, if you were a casual observer, the idea that this was your Labor member reaching out to you. They were harvesting email addresses and so on. It was not just in terms of policy. There was a huge effort from the Labor side in terms of putting boots on the ground. They have the ability to fund that out of union fees. The way the electoral laws and the spending laws are cast in this state mean that they have a huge advantage in doing that. There is a sort of industrial/political complex there that the LNP does not have. For those of you who are LNP in the room, you need to sort it out and do something about it. It is not just fixing the laws; it is doing your own thing to make sure you have your own boots on the ground.

Ms ELKS: Perhaps this is the time for Graham to talk about being a third party, because you did run a campaign that was anti Labor. When I added the sums for the third-party campaigns—and this is purely third-party spending, so I acknowledge there are other things the unions do that do not get included. The anti-Labor third parties—your group for instance, Master Builders, Queensland Resources Council and Chris Wallin, who runs QCoal—actually outspent, in raw numbers, the union movement. I found that pretty striking, because I imagine this is the first campaign where that would have happened.

Dr KOWOL: We have time for a couple of questions. Perhaps we take them together and then the panel can respond to which ones they choose.

QUESTIONER: I wondered if the panel could talk—you touched on it briefly—about the Resources Council and their campaign against the Miles government's increase in mining royalties and whether the panel thinks that had an effect on the big swings in Gladstone and Mackay.

QUESTIONER: As part of the younger working generation, it is common that we really feel that the current system is not working for us—specifically the economy. On the one hand, the cost of living really puts pressure on us but probably not much on wealthier senior people. On the other hand is opportunity. Do you think both the ALP and the Liberal Party really have a workable strategy that is able to be implemented and can empower the younger generation so that we can still claim Australia as the lucky country, as you did in your generation?

QUESTIONER: My question is for John, mainly. How does Labor win back regional seats we just lost like Mackay, Rockhampton and Townsville but also win back regional seats that we once held—seats like Toowoomba North? Is it a social policy issue or an infrastructure issue?

Mr ANTHONY: I am Larry Anthony, a former federal politician from south of the border. We have been talking about an election five months ago. You are all experts in your field. There is another election coming in two months time—the big one. I would be really interested in your comments about what is going to happen in Queensland.

Dr MOLS: There are plenty of very specific questions that these people to my right are far more qualified to answer, so I am going to hand the microphone to them to answer those kinds of questions, but I would like to go back to what I said earlier.

This is a very interesting group. We are very weird. We are all very interested in politics and policy. That means that we have a very skewed view of the average voter. We overestimate the rationality of the average voter. Every analysis that you have offered me suggests that the voter out there is fairly rational and informed. In 1964 a book was published, the *American Voter* by Campbell and colleagues, that said—we are shocked because most people are rusted on Democrats or Republicans and they just turn up at the voting booth—that the percentage was about 10 per cent of voters who had a coherent understanding of where values could be placed on the left/right spectrum or on a conservative/progressive spectrum and who could identify the three branches of government. It was 10 per cent at the time.

Then there was a theory a decade later—the great leap forward—that 'that was the voter of the 1960s; we are far more informed now'. Guess what? All research done in that regard confirms the same thing. The percentages may be different in electorates and countries, but most voters have far less understanding of what we are talking about here. A lot of messaging and the campaign is not targeting rationalistic arguments about policy, crime or cost of living; it is just dog whistles. Let's be fair and square about that.

I teach my students—Simon is here, my tutor in my course, and he will testify to this—that if you are an analyst and you are immersed in the traditional ways of looking at politics and policy you have a hammer in your hand and everything starts looking like a nail. What is that hammer? It is the whole economic rational actor model. It is the idea that voters are rational, self-interested and susceptible to views around gains and losses. It is, of course, a very small sliver of the electorate that is the economic rational voter who gets the calculator out and compares manifestos and says, 'This party is doing a better job for me.'

I think it is really interesting. I want to turn a mirror on us and say that what we are doing here is very interesting. Again, there is the 'wisdom of the crowd' effect here—of seeing all these very interesting hypotheses that, I think, all make good sense—but we should never lose sight that the voter that you have in your mind may not be your average voter. Campaigners, both Liberal and Labor, know that full well. They know that the voter is not rational. If anything, they are tribal. Tribal sentiments get triggered by messages. It is the kind of thing we do not speak about because we are so used to seeing people on television getting the microphone.

I always do this thing at home whenever there is an analyst turning up on TV to talk about the upcoming election or afterwards. I count the number of seconds before I sense the whole economic analyst—it is the cost of living, people are doing it tough, they have had a windfall, maybe they are less fearful. To me, it is equally interesting to analyse the analyst and see what assumptions the analyst is making. To some extent, they make the right assumptions. Graham's research is, therefore, very important to have that kind of connection with real voters. I turn up at voting booths to get a sense of the average voter. That keeps me grounded. I am rambling now so I will hand over for the more specific answers to questions.

Mr YOUNG: Frank, next time I run a campaign, which may well be never, I will get you along to make that speech to the candidates, rather than me having to do it, and have you explain to them that you have to make an emotional connection with people and you have to look like you are trying hard.

I will take Owen's question. Housing is probably the most important thing for the younger generation. Having your own block of land that you can live on is the future for most people. If they cannot solve that problem then that is a problem for them. For my think tank—I cannot speak for the LNP—that is one of our key concerns.

I just wanted to address what Sarah said. I do not know where the Master Builders spent their money, because I did not see anything in the electorates that we were dealing with. I do not know that each of those organisations spent their money well. That is one issue. I do not know that they spent it on issues that changed people's minds. That is another issue. I am sure the unions were. The unions are very good at that.

The other thing is that, under the definition of 'electoral expenditure', salaries, office space and all that sort of thing are not counted. You are looking at a duck sailing along and you are not seeing what is happening under the water. I know that in the seats we targeted, and we had 12, there was a lot of Labor material going out—much more than we were capable of doing. They were producing it somehow. You will see the printing costs there, but you will not see the graphic designer who was on salary. Maybe they used their own people to deliver it rather than Australia Post, I do not know. It will be in the declarations so I will have a look.

They certainly have a really slick operation. I am not taking anything away from them. I am not saying it is wrong. You are in war, in a sense, in politics. I learned a lot from what Wayne Swan did in 1989, when I was a losing candidate, and we applied some of that in 1995 when I was one of the people running the winning side. It is not as simple as it might look from the declarations.

Mr MICKEL: I will answer Larry's question. Larry asked what is going to happen. The election will be coming up. It will be held on a Saturday and it is somewhere between now and the end of May—put your money on it!

We were also asked about Mackay and Gladstone. I will not talk about Gladstone, but I will talk about Mackay. There were two things that happened there. One was the retiring member. It was just like Labor did in 2020 and the member retired. Labor won the seat. There was a bit of that in Mackay in 2024.

There is also the issue that Labor conceptually has not got its head around. That is where the resources people ran the campaign against Labor in Mackay. I am not saying that that is a bad thing; they should have. Labor has not conceptually got its head around the difference between thermal coal and coal for making steel. I know I am biased on this because when I was energy minister we got the gas thing going—the thing that supplies New South Wales, where Barnaby Joyce was against gas, and Victoria, which never seems to make up its mind on the big gas reserves it has there. The fact is that, because Queensland had a policy on it and were never afraid to go out and argue it, it saved Queensland. It gave us an expert industry that is also supplying the domestic market. Labor needs to get its head around that.

Then there is the second bit of the Queensland economy, which is agriculture. They are the two drivers of the Queensland economy. In a place like Mackay, historically that is where the action is. Labor has to get its head around that.

The other seat that you missed out on, which is why I want to ignore Gladstone, is Rockhampton. Labor brought all that on itself in Rockhampton. Margaret Strelow was far and away the best candidate. She wanted to run for the Labor Party. She had been selected by the premier in 2017 and the Labor Party organisation stared down the premier of the day and put in that guy who got out in 2024. How smart was that? The candidate who would have made the difference was Margaret Strelow. It was self-inflicted. I know that Jackie Trad mentioned Robert Schwarten, but I could not possibly do that.

Ms ELKS: You say party organisation. I think there were a lot of big personalities in Rocky who made it very difficult for any Rockhampton candidate from the Labor Party to win. Seb, I think your point is a really good one, because I think there is a battle for the soul of the Labor Party. It is very difficult for the Labor Party to both communicate to people who you would think would be traditional Labor Party workers, the party of traditional Labor Party voters—tradies, miners and whoever else—up and down the coast in regional Queensland and then also appeal to the voters in the inner city you are trying to bring back from the Greens. That kind of existential battle for the Labor Party is one that they have not worked out how to deal with and is probably why Labor has only five federal seats out of the 30 in Queensland.

On Larry's question, I have no idea what is going to happen, but what I am going to be watching, in particular, is what is going to happen with those three lower house seats that the Greens won at the last election. I think that is going to be fascinating. Both major parties are absolutely desperate to win those back. Potentially, I think that is where the big movement is going to be in Queensland, whenever the election is.

Dr KOWOL: Thank you. That was wonderful. I hope people have come away massively informed. I call Mary to finish things up.

Dr CRAWFORD: Thank you very much to our panel and Kit. I would now like to invite up Connor Harvey and John Mickel, who is a member of the ASPG. Congratulations, Connor. It was a very fine piece of writing. I was one of the judges and I have to say it was very well done and well researched. You may have a future in politics or at least political studies. A big congratulations to Connor.

Thank you to everybody for coming. If you want to do any follow-up, the ASPG has a website, which is where the transcript will be. The TJ Ryan Foundation has a website which deals with public policy. You can also follow up on the Institute for Progress website. The former members of course know where to find everything.

Thank you very much for coming. I think it has been a very interesting evening. We will look forward to our next event very soon.