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*TRANSCRIPT:*

*0:00:00*

*Some irrelevant comments prior to the meeting.*

MS We’re just going to get Allan on the phone but maybe we should start.

MC Yep.

MS Hello everyone online, there’s been a changing of the guard, I’m going to chair them meeting today instead of Michael which gives him much more space to voice his opinions so watch out.

MC No, less space.

MS There might be a few more people coming in in person I think but let’s start with some introductions, those in the room maybe.

TB Tom Brewer.

EO Elspeth Opperman.

*Noise over the telephone/online.*

MC Helen are you there?

HV I’m here.

MC Matt are you there?

Matt I’m here

MC Jimare you there?

NT I’m here.

MC Okay, we have a new friend in our group by the name of Kami from Sri Lanka. Matt worked for a long time in Sri Lanka, he’s in Alice Springs.

KM Okay.

Matt Hi there.

MC And we’ve got Michaela, me, Michael, young Mike Harrison.

MS Okay so there’s lots of things on the agenda today. We’ve got the Northern Futures … paper that … circulated for us to talk about with some questions and Elspeth’s going to give us more introduction to that and then we’ll just open it up for discussions. Michael has sent around a conversation article that he has drafted that we can also look at, people might consider they want to add to or be an author on that. There’s a book proposal that went out quite a while ago we can revisit and see what the next steps on that are. And then the new website. Which we can I can introduce to people and talk about how we want to use it, want it to look like, what we would like to be up there. I’ll hand over to Elspeth to introduce it.

*Phone ringing & phone message.*

MS No luck from Allan okay.

EO He’s turned his phone off because he needs to be on Skype. I’ll start with some questions that Michael’s asked me to respond to about the paper as an object of governance in itself. So I’ll respond to Michael’s questions and then I’ll move over to the questions that we want you guys to help us with. So Michael’s first question was, how did we come to be writing this paper in the first place and who is it for. The initial answer to the question is we wrote it for us and the long answer is we had to write it for us because we were drawing such a huge broad range of disciplines that we actually had no idea who us was or how to work together or how to collectively address this question of learning futures, which is what we’ve been tasked with researching as a group. So as an object of governance as Michael puts it, the work of writing this paper was actually doing two things. First we were generating a narrative … ourselves and collectivity but in some sense, which was quite generative, but in other senses that was quite a collusive narrative, it was trying to find common ground, we were also pushing aside our differences as well. Then Michael asked how is it the same or different from the other papers that have been circulating in the group. And so obviously this whole group has been about exploring governance being discussed in various different ways and similarly to the objectives of the group, we are also problematizing governance in this paper but essentially, picking up on some of the discussions to date, we’ve used this sort of focodian governmentality critique of liberal governance and to some extent of neo-liberalism and we’ve explored the post-political as the sort of current depoliticisation, and often very violent … in other ways, of being our alternative ways of being. So there are some inherent issues about the way neo-liberalism claims to be consultative and consensus seeking and how in fact that disallows difference and that’s what we reflect on in the paper. So I think it’s a little bit ironic because in some senses we’ve gone through that same processes ourselves; in actually writing the paper we’ve sought consensus and we’ve disallowed difference so it’s quite an interesting position to be in that we’re quite conscious of which I think comes out a little bit as we pursue this issue in the group as well.

 So we haven’t really set out to change anyone’s understanding per se but we’ve explored, we hope that the paper contributes to everyone’s thinking a little bit. In providing a broad summary of governance in Northern Australia and some critique of that, so if I just summarise the paper, basically it identifies three themes which help create the national conversation about Northern Australia and governance in Northern Australia: big development, big conservation and Indigenous well-being. And big development documentation with second theme would be conservation and both of those are also in tension with Indigenous cultural or Indigenous well-being broadly … land and sea country. So with the agendas associated with each of these themes we contend push forward in isolation then the tensions between those three are likely to disrupt the social and natural systems in Northern Australia which reduce the health and well-being and economic vitality of the region, understood both in sociol and ecological terms. And we suggest that one way of addressing this is to take a more comprehensive and systematic approach to analysing governance in Northern Australia and the paper tries to present an overview of that governance landscape as a sort of first step to doing that, because that’s where those themes are negotiated and practised. And in doing so it seeks to highlight the complexity of governance in Northern Australia to ensure that those themes are dealt with cohesively but crucially we integrate with that attempt to look at themes cohesively a critique of neo-liberalism, and liberal governmentality which as I say, looking at those things cohesively is not the same as ensuring that they are consensus driven in that violent fashion. And so we’re establishing then a need to produce a kind of counter governance in Northern Australia which renders explicit those multiple agendas, world views and resulting tensions and which moves towards a positive engagement that seeks to be more genuinely open with genuine dialogue that’s inclusive of but also respectful towards the … values of what communities in Northern Australia … So there’s a couple of things going on here one of which is the systematic analysis that identifies the damage that can occur when you have these contrasting systems in place but not explicitly recognised but another thing that’s happening is also this wariness about this notion of how difference is done, and liberal governance’s tendency towards conciliation that actually … differences rather than … to … Having said that and identifying these tensions, basically the question becomes for us how do we recognise this irreducible difference without subsuming it … and the paper basically does a high level survey of northern governance to try and bring out the very materials to … is quite fundamental to this philosophical question. So we are now in a position where a group is starting to look forward to how do we actually resolve this, what kind of practices do we engage with that actually pull us out of this kind of paradox.

 And so that’s really why we came to these lunchtime groups and why we were so keen to be participating in it because we think that there’s a lot of resources of other people in the Northern Institute and more broadly who can help us with the theoretical and methodological resources for addressing this issue. We’ve mooted in the paper a couple of approaches, one as governance systems analysis as the recognition of the multiple systems and their foundation of beliefs that bring them together, but also that they can conflict with each other. The second is what is an approach to enable this openness to difference or engagement with irreconcilable or irreducible multiple ways of being and how do we engage with togetherness or negotiation of these differences without actually being violent or ordering or assimilatory in our practices as well. So that was where I brought in those two questions so basically it would be really nice to hear from the group how the paper resonates with you guys, whether you see some theoretical or methodological approaches that would actually help us to address this question of governance in Australia and alternative ways forward, and particularly if there are … for incommensurable ways of being, are there processes or ways of communicating or negotiating through these that don’t seek to order and assimilate and how might we go about enabling or exploring these as a group. Good to hear …

MS Thank you.

EO Did it make sense?

MS I think what you just said helped.

? …

MS In the sense that some of the more philosophical aspects don’t, … glossed over those a little bit more as I read.

EO Yeah we started from the practical and we’ve kind of been implying the philosophical question and I think that’s where we’re going to go in the next paper, or we’d like to explore … But there wasn’t really space to engage with it properly in that paper without establishing a foundation for why we would do that.

LR This is a really good framework for looking at the competing, three major competing interests, I guess. The next step is so, to start thinking through in a lot more detail, what you actually mean by governance. There’s listen to, I read it a couple of months ago, and another look at it this morning, but I guess somewhere there does need to be a sort of working definition from your ... in the paper about what you mean by governance because part of it’s about how do you reconcile competing interests in, and hear competing views, in the development of Northern Institute. Is that how you’d characterise it? And allow it to all coexist.

EO No. I think what we’re trying to get at is there’s a fundamental assumption in liberal governance in its discourse of itself and what it does, which thinks that coexistence is possible and thinks that coexistence is … there’s very different ways of being and life can all happen under a liberal umbrella. And what we’re saying is that’s just not true and that liberal governance, when it actually does what it does, has to dissolve or exclude or mutate other ways of life so that they comply with its particular ordering system. And so we make the distinction between governance and liberal governance and liberal governmentality is the critique of governance which looks at what governance actually does and looks at those ordering processes that governance actually does in order to fulfil the myth that it has got itself that it actually enables consensus. If that makes sense.

LR Yeah it does. I guess you had a critique. Did you have an operating definition of governance?

EO I don’t think we did.

TB It was less the … … from now… governance systems and now it’s just that ground work where the definition of governance as I understand it is very amorphous in itself. … …

EO Yeah because governance is amorphous, it isn’t one thing. It’s a … technologies that seek to manage life. And so I don’t think you can necessarily and that would be how governmentality would define governance.

LR Yes but I couldn’t find it in the paper. And I guess.

EO So we maybe …

LR Yes.

MC Or one possibility would be to as Tom said, make it clear that governance is a provision sort of empiric or multiple sort of thing and it’s an empirical question, what is it in particular contexts, what does it look like here, what does it look like there. The same, in terms of what Jim was saying about the little paper for the conversation and what Helen was saying about how neo-liberalism is a plural multiple thing, it’s not a monolithic thing, it’s lots of it, and as Jim was saying, to really do that properly we need to keep thinking about the local and the specific and the examples of how these different things are playing out in complex sorts of ways. Jim’s example of the North Queensland was very interesting and the example of here about the new supply chains and things for the ways in which, new ways are negotiated for the economies of North Queensland seem to be … sort of case study that brings out the complexities of what might governance be and what we can do about it. Does that make sense Jim?

JT I guess. You’re talking about my part of this paper or my comment … conversation?

MC I don’t know which parts of the paper were from you but I suspected it was the North Queensland bit.

JT Yes that’s right.

MC But I’m also talking about what you said about the comments … for the conversation about how we need to keep focusing on the local and the specific in order to be able to do our work properly.

JT That’s … This paper as Elspeth said in the beginning was really a chance for us to go beyond having conversations, to really try and work together to try and articulate some of the broader theory because you can get caught up with the … and think about how government or Aboriginal … in order with the theories are … around whether they’re neo-liberal or post-colonial, and what we tried to do in this paper, we really tried to get a shared understanding of some of the broader theoretical construct but then try and tie it into those three broad themes. Certainly my philosophical approach to this is unless you’re working tangibly with something on the ground everything is a bit esoteric and so that’s why I think and I agree with you we really need to contextualise and exercise the need for context, with so many policies and so many discussions become theoretical and then the reality is, whether you, depending on your knowledge, your skills, your background, your access to resources, in a governance sense, that really influences what you can do or … how it works on the ground. So it’s pretty important we’re grounded in what we’re doing.

EO In that case taking from everything that Linda and Michael and Jim have all said, we can put in there or enhance in there, I think …, this definition of governance as particular assemblages with different in different local places and grounded in different ways of particular relations that seek to manage and produce a particular form of life for society. And I think … That accounts for its multiplicity and its many manifestations but also that it is assemblage of governance, of technologies and management essentially.

KM From a different point of view, are we just talking on the surface of accepting another person’s culture and thoughts and lifestyles and just being accepting of that and living society; or are we going slightly deeper here of respecting each other’s world views. Isn’t it a little deeper than that? I’m coming from a really troubled society where I come from. Governance they never talked about it. Whereas understanding and respecting each other’s views, thoughts, lifestyles, culture etc., that’s a more amicable way I think because governance, government governance, that whole concept of what are we trying to be here. Are we trying to make everybody under one roof or is someone else trying to do that, is it a top down thing or, how does it work.

EO I think it’s a really nice question that responds to the point about the local and specific relations and I think that’s where … and Allan and I talked about it, where we think the next paper might go, into this what is that process of encounter. Because it’s not a top down thing like someone sets the rules and you all just adopt them. It’s like a, a day to day encounter where you have to make real decisions that are really genuinely de political about do I accept or not accept this. Do I change what I do or don’t change it. Or am I trying to force someone to be other than what they are. And yeah so that’s why we feel like that’s the critical space that we need to start engaging with and we don’t really have the tools to do it yet but yes, I think it’s a great question because. And it’s not necessarily un… either and it’s certainly not easy.

? It runs right out to the … UN. It’s quite a … agreement with … that you … the work we do where there is some agenda, … … engaged with that agenda, and so … and it will suit some extremely well and it will not suit others at all. So even within that diversity itself I have never been able to … that just because of a different … to us. For me also important as well as, Allan said it really well, it’s engagement with contact, it’s for me particularly and others might agree, but it’s translating and expressing that up through the chains of the … structures that … and to inform, because a lot of Michael’s work … talks about that disconnect, that loss of language. So the practical element of … here is helping with that translation. So you asked me one thing so …

? From a philosophical point of view and … can add to this, but if you look at the UN charter of Indigenous people’s rights, it talks about respect of traditional authority structures, it talks about a whole range of rights around development and how people can be involved etc. etc. and if you think about that charter that sits around development, conservation and Indigenous well-being so that’s another thing you could probably throw into the mix in terms of, well they’ve actually got this whole not just national but this whole range of international rights that are signed off on the charter, that actually talks about the way that this whole thing should operate from a rights based approach.

EO I find that a really interesting example because I think on the one hand, okay there’s a really useful resource for Indigenous people if they’re seeking some kind of established and legitimate in western governments’ narrative that they can draw on to do what they need to do or want to do. On the other hand the UN charter is a charter of Westphalia western governmental system that and I’ not being all kind of oh it’s just colonial here, I’m saying that it’s deeply embedded, in a particular imaginary world, that not only has these western values but also assumes that the nation state is a thing. And it’s like but we need to even, that the nation state like the Australian nation state should exist or, there’s legitimately and I don’t know. So for me, that’s actually an example of the way particular discourses can be used to undermine things like that because you could legitimately use that as an additional spokesperson to undermine those systems.

? That document and that whole process is developed, that document wasn’t done within a nation state, it was done by all Indigenous peoples right around the world.

EO Yeah. Under a UN system. So that’s a really interesting. That … makes it very interesting because it’s like a really interesting tangent.

? … talk about in governance and the UN at the end of the day how do we govern the world.

MC Or can this question, how do we do it from the bottom up.

EO Yes.

JT Just picking up on I think that you’re really getting up into the … PhD where she talks about the rights of Indigenous, the international … rights … the same … of … about whilst we’re informed by … and …, in the political sphere I hear people would pick up different parts of that … I think the reality is and I think what Michael’s saying and what others have said also is, … when we’re working with people on the ground and maybe … some of the issues and so they were actually. And also I think we’re going to be looking at that research and … working. Are we going to take responsibility for this issue that other people need to make or remake … explicit so you’ve got other issues that are going on in the world and some of the drivers that might be … in a language that people can understand and think about and then make decisions about how they might want to engage with liberal western governmentality or not engage with it from an Aboriginal point of view.

JT The quick comment I was going to make is if you look at it from a ground up perspective and what’s actually happened in a number of regions in the Northern Territory particularly around the topical issue of the NT land rights act and where that sat and the debate around what that means, at the end of the day the land rights act is one mechanism for Aboriginal people to make decisions about what does and doesn’t happen on their country. There’s obviously limitations, it’s a whitefella law at the end of the day. But there’s lots of variations in terms of what’s actually happening with what’s actually happening with that. So if you contrast what’s happening on the Tiwi Islands for example, and Michael has been doing some work around governance over there now, and you look at the range of structures that are in place, the way a small land council built on one language group and one land trust for region operates and the sorts of decisions that those leaders over there have been making for the last essentially 30 years, and where they’re up to now, that contrasts very differently from what might exist, for example, if you’re going with some of the regions in the central desert or some of the regions in Arnhem Land or other places where those whole confluence of potential structures to be able to influence what’s going on aren’t in place.

KM A question about I don’t say the white man’s law, I suppose that’s what it is, but in countries like ours, before the Roman Dutch law came to be imposed on us we had a value system, and I say a value system not the value of this and the value of that but it was referred to as the ten royal disciplines, of values that were honesty, sharing, these cardinal values that we as humankind feel as cherish or put on top of our heads. So that was replaced by this law system, thou shalt not take that seat when the Governor of the Australian province of whoever is here. So that’s another whole system of governance where the law dominates instead of this value of respecting one’s elder or what’s in the traditional system. So I’m not sure where all of this fits.

MS It might be interesting to start thinking about some of these mechanisms or mechanism based technologies and then within governance systems if you like and then what they’re doing so what the human rights act, or different acts, or particular contracts that have been formed, what that as a technology actually does within the performance of governance, so provide something tangible that people might then be able to make decisions around and want to be a part of and …

EO And then connecting that to what you both said. You’ve got these different technologies of governance which can be used differently as Mike was saying and what’s really interesting there is that moment when it gets used differently. So what is going on in that moment where people are to articulate that in a different way and reverse the technology or use the technology differently or. That’s where I kind of think that moment of encounter or change is so important. And I’m struggling to find a way of is there a method or an ethos or a modus of which we look at that … and come to that for active, even activate that, I don’t know.

TB? Ask the simple question, go and talk to, go to any Aboriginal community you want to and sit down with the group of elders and start at, how do you participate in making the decisions about what you want to do or don’t want to do in your country? We’re concerned, if you’ve got concerns about the future of your young people in terms of them being able, do you have concerns about the future of your young people in being able to participate in the whitefella economy? Yes we do. Okay well how do you as a group, how does your clan, how does your nation of clans, influence the sort of things that might or might not happen on your country.

EO? And maybe even breaking that down

TB? And how do also then protect what’s important for you in terms of your cultural heritage and the stuff that you’re not prepared to negotiate, how do you also, what mechanisms can you do to do that, how can you also make sure that you’re in a position to be able to protect your environment. Is there stuff that’s important to you in terms of your sacred sites and the country that sustains your culture. And how would you like to be able to go about actually balancing those things. So you could go for example and talk to the Bowen … mob at Maningrida who are really quite progressive in terms of their approach to their land and sea ranger programs, and that whole process of the development of that, they’ve been very good and very strong on that but on the economic development side, if you talk to the clan leaders they’re maybe not so strong. So you’re going to get these whole, based on the structures that these people, these artificial structures, as well as the traditional governance structures that people sit in, to the extent to which they’ve been impacted by white settlement you’re going to have these whole different permutations and combinations of what might occur and what might not occur. And it’s not going to be any one simple answer to that. Like what I’m proposing is those three or four key questions. And putting that at a local level and saying how what sorts of things could be done, and at the end of the day it’s about empowering people to understand both worlds, and how those both worlds relate, and how they can influence from the bottom up what the hell’s going to happen. Rather than being constantly impacted by them.

EO? And empowering them to understand … or maybe empowering us to understand.

? Oh, empowering everybody to understand both world views.

? I think it’s important, in keeping with … ideas and neo-liberal rationalities and eco-colonisation examples with the conservation, but it’s very much about the ideas not about the practicalities and how those technologies get laid out, on the surface, which is the kind of counter side to what you’re talking about, is, I’m totally with you, what people want and what they’re aspiring to and how to make that happen is crucial. But also relevant if you’re coming from this is your opening chapter is, how these ideas play out as violent barriers in their lives that have historically blocked those words and voices and ideas from being fully articulated.

TB? So to give you a really impractical example, the development … conference that I went to, there was representatives from Wadeye there, that have been on the … incorporation, long term middle aged strong leaders, they’ve now set up their, they’re now in the process of rejigging the Vic Daly Shire, and a couple of these guys came up to me and said we want to participate in this stuff, we want to actually be able to put our own views about what we want to do with our own country, not just at the community of Wadeye but the clans within the region. But Mike, we’ve got no bloody idea of how to go about doing that. And we don’t know what we don’t know and half the bureaucrats and most of the people that are dealing with the people in that region on a day to day basis whether it’s the local government level or Northern Territory government level or commonwealth government level, and I completely agree with a lot of the papers, the further the distance is the greater the lack of knowledge. So you’ve got one group of people who don’t know what they don’t know, working with another group of people who don’t know what they don’t know about … mains, and sure there are from the point of view of people who want to exploit Aboriginal people and exploit Aboriginal country there’s a whole range of other subsets of motives that are sitting in the background, but in the first instance we’ve got two groups of people who don’t know what they don’t know, trying to talk to each other and we don’t have a common language to do that.

EO? And that’s really the key and I think that’s where Allan’s getting at that fundamental thing of people who don’t know what the other, you don’t know the other, and governance systems analysis is how do we service all those characteristics of these differences to … so that we can make that explicit so we can have a genuine conversation about fundamental knowledges and values etc. but then also yeah, I think that’s what we’re getting at. What is this method of encounter, how do we engage with us not knowing of the other, is it just asking people questions, is there a method just sitting on the ground, I know ground … approach to …

*Phone/Skype lines went down, some comments about this. ‘Everybody’s gone.’*

? I think one issue is probably going to be sort of, a little bit of … where a whole lot of line men try to figure out what an elephant is and we’re all feeling around and we’ve all got a bit of it and the issue is, how do you go from talking to people on the ground as well as, … mining companies. I think you’ve got to potentially, the context of this is northern development. That’s actually what you’re talking about. That’s what you …

EO? Oh not this paper? Wild. …

? That’s actually what you’d say.

EO? Yes. Not engaging with that. What we’re talking about now, really … the paper but.

? But we’re sort of talking about how you move on from this and this is meant to be a framework for govern, or what ways to be looking at governance in northern development. That’s actually what the title suggests. So if we were to move on, it’s been suggested that we make it a bit more concrete in that we actually start to get some … out that you could research of, for example, Indigenous communities and do they sort of want this interface in development that might be happening in relationship to their land or their, them.

TB? But also just as strongly, what’s not negotiable. We’re not prepared to, we don’t want development, this white fella term development doesn’t apply to these bits. And the other important factor I think is that there will be aspects particularly of traditional authority structures which are secret and sacred and they’re never going to be divulged, they would be maintained and they would be hidden. And that point that came through really strongly with Michael, that document I gave you from the work that was done to establish the Tamara? Regional council after the community’s local government structure fell over, there’s a reoccurring theme. … meant to just trust the fact that we have these authority structures in place that are going to make these decisions. They are never going to know and understand the depth of these relationships and the depth of this stuff. Let us use our structures and our processes, we’ll do that, you need to respect the fact that it’s going to take us the time that we need to make these decisions. And sometimes we may not be able to make a decision, you might have to wear the fact that this is going to be pretty ambiguous for a period of time. So there’s a whole range of sort of subsets to this whole discussion where you can if you take the place based approach, where this is going to be quite different. And that’s the problem we’ve got with if you want to use the term, novel whitefella government structures, you put a group of people in a room and you’ve got a particular issue and there’s an expectation that there’ll be a rational discussion and there’ll be an outcome within a timeframe. Well that doesn’t always work in the bush and it’s not going to work in the bush because you’ve got this whole underlying traditional authority structure that doesn’t sit in that domain and won’t sit in that domain.

EO? And so there’s a principal of a more ethical mode that we’ve encountered there that is really challenging and confronting for liberal governance because you’re saying that to be ethical in our encounter with Indigenous or anyone else for that matter, we need to give people an opt out option where they can choose to not be part of this system and we need to trust them to do that and not intervene and interfere and we also need them to not make a decision which is another … versus not engaging. And as we accept that non engagement it’s a fundamental principal, or if you like a right, of people, then we’re not being ethical. And that’s exactly what liberalism doesn’t do. Liberalism is totally designed to co-opt and contain and absorb everything and so it’s a really.

? In a way you’re trying to keep open this tension between sort of local differences and … all the time which is also what you’re trying to do in the paper which is a really difficult thing to achieve when you’re offering a framework, so it’s a really interesting framework to offer which holds that tension.

? … immediate … …

? Yeah but you’re actually trying to not, and so yeah, presenting a framework that is a tension between local difference and … governance, if you like. I don’t know if they’d be my exact terms.

TB? Because you could use the same that same framework and then say okay, what does this look like on the Tiwi Islands, how does that compare with what’s going on in the somewhere topical, the West Daly region at this point in time where they’re going through a whole restructuring of local government in that region. And there’s a range of existing structures. They’ve gone through a process to determine what that looks like. As compared to other regions where there’s not much happening in space but where people want to do some stuff so Michael’s project is if you just look at the regions that are involved in that, there’s a pretty diverse the position that those people are in, Michael, it’s a fairly diverse situation really isn’t it when you think about it, in terms of where people might be … around their knowledge and understanding of this broader development agenda and their own structures and the negotiated structures they’ve got in place to be able to deal with and understand that, and negotiating them again.

MC So I think you’re asking the question about irreducible and incommensurable ways of being and doing. I think that’s the reason for why you’re starting to focus on the encounter, is because you’re starting to focus on how do you actually do the work of answering that question, and I think you’re answering that question, those things that look like they’re irreconcilable then are now different because things are changing, and the ways in which governments are doing their business is changing the ways in which universities have to do their business, it’s changing the way that Aboriginal people have to pay attention is changing and we need to look at those complexities in a really empirical way in order to tease out how those things are changing us, and the world, and how we respond to them. So the question about governance and the definition of governance as it seems to me, is that it’s multiple and it’s changing and it’s an effect of something, it’s not a cause of something, it’s an effect.

EO? Yeah. It’s a product of.

MC It’s a product, yeah. So I think that focus on the encounter is great. I think Paul Carter has just finished a book on the encounter.

? Has he? He should come and talk to us.

MC Yeah he should definitely. I was just talking to him, he bought that, that Aboriginal woman that I worked with, the Yolngu woman from Darwin and just ringing up this morning and saying we just need my gorung, her son in law who she’s not allowed to talk to, has just told a story about how balanda, whitefellas, need to understand how to encounter Yolngu, so there’s a lot of people talking about it and it’s a very interesting process. Because I think that those incommensurabilities are an effect of encounters rather than a cause of them. You’re saying it met under neo-liberalism there’s no room for difference or tension.

EO? There is but it abuses it. Abuses it to extend itself.

MC Okay, those are the difficult questions that we need to look at and we need to look at them in particular contexts where we’re telling stories about how have we experienced something in a very complex way. What I like about the paper is that now that I’m going on thinking about all the complexities of my life, there are things through there that I think yeah that’s exactly what Swinji Jo was talking about or whatever his name was. So the encounter thing’s the way forward.

TB? I think the other important thing is that this whole northern development thing is very much seen as a top down so it’s about the federal government, it’s about the Northern Territory government, we’re going to unlock all this country we’re going to develop all this stuff. But if you look at what’s been going on certainly in the Northern Territory in the last ten years there’s a whole range of things that have been happening with Aboriginal people setting up their own negotiation and their own rules about the new structures that they have developed themselves to try and negotiate this patch between the broader white economy and their own authority structures that have been going on for the last 10, 15 years in spite of what the government is doing. And will probably continue to occur in spite of what government does. So it’s probably not a bad idea if we started to look at what’s actually been happening in more recent times and probably some of the getting a handle on those, get a bit of an understanding of what’s already been occurring, more in spite of what government’s up to rather than because of what government is doing.

? And I think some of the questions might start answering themselves by unpackaging them, a bit, to the north and south, I think … I had a bit of difficulty with this kind of compartmentalising to the south or these ideas about neo-liberalism and … conservation.

EO? Yeah.

? Because as far as the encounters that these guys are talking about, they come from the birthday cake in town and they come from a very, very northern based centre of government and they get played out in shires and they get played out in the environment centre and all kinds of very morbid spaces. And then you’ve got people in that paper who are, as northern as depicted in this paper, as people see …, people … or Wadeye or something.

EO? You’re right. That’s something that we were kind of aware of. We just didn’t do a very good job of expressing it. It’s in that whole … those … … It’s not actually geographical split so much as it is economic split, it tends to focus on one area of neo-liberalism.

? But it comes across as if there’s Indigenous people in … and then there’s white … in … Canberra.

EO? Obviously they’re not the case.

? And sort of nobody in between.

? Just a little bit the global … concept. It’s where all the north is white and developed and all the south is Indigenous and non …

? exactly.

TB? Which we wrote into the paper because there are a lot of … similarities, … the quality … and so on. … … people who are … There are, it speaks to that. The idea that people …

? … value in using that model … whatever it is.

? We’re not as central as, we’re not … centralising staff but we’re … doing the north.

? Yeah and you’re writing … of all others just as if you’re , as neo-liberalism.

TB? But if you’re talking about the mechanism of that sort of approach so if you’ve got a neo-liberal approach to the world, and you’re sitting in a central government in Canberra, the way policies are developed, the way programs are designed and implemented is very much about that north south approach.

? If you’re … someone?

TB? Same.

*Inaudible.*

? When you’re talking about the community of the north, being a bit clear that it’s not just remote Indigenous communities, there’s the fly in fly outs, you know, the urban residents of Katherine, Alice Springs and Darwin, and the … is very white, and everyone in between, everyone is implicated in these power relationships that are being talked about and these …logical relationships that are being talked about.

? And I think also we immediately form to talking about Indigenous communities and predominantly land owning Indigenous communities and I guess there are presumably going to be other people who are affected. I think for example the farmers who are affected by fracking. And the … for mining development on their land. There is, in northern New South Wales for example, although you might say that it was all traditional Indigenous land, the point is that there are a lot of people who are affected by this push for economic development in whatever form that it takes, whether it’s mining or big agriculture or building big infrastructure through different environments. And I guess the extent to which you essentialise it into a north south, local north local south, sort of concept does lose an awful lot of, because you immediately go back to the point of view of how do Indigenous communities develop the system of interaction with government, which is what we keep talking about, we keep talking about government. That they have to have a system. I guess we need to think about are we going to focus, are you going to focus predominantly on northern development and Indigenous societies, and is that the best way to articulate this, and to talk to some Indigenous communities that are involved in trying to deal with it.

? I think it’s just one component of what the group …

? So then would you want to engage with some other groups and if you were going to go to other groups what kind of other groups would that be, that you might needing to work with.

? Well I don’t.

? Sorry are we talking about that … paper or.

? I’m talking about where you go from here in terms of if you like, rounding this on some experience that you can get some understandings that you can then take forward and build up.

TB? So you can talk more broadly about the political imbalance, so if you accept the fact that we’ve got this thing called a democracy and that all the votes basically belong to people who live in large metropolitan centres, and you look at the number of elected representatives that actually sit in northern Australia compared to the rest of Australia, the imbalance is there straight away.

? Yeah. I think this is, as a broad kind of this is what we want to explore, it’s going to play out in a lot of ways. … on board and it’s good, and Anne and Jim worked in Indigenous communities and the rest of us haven’t. so I think there is definitely an interest for us theoretically but also in terms of ground examples to explore that … also with the ground up or the administrative team, you know, the people. So that would definitely be a way forward for us. But there’s no reason why Indigenous communities would be the be all and end all of that encounter. It’s one of the places where we see it most. Because it’s almost alien to us. But I would say that I see it as much on a building site in the negotiation of economic values over the health and wellbeing of workers, where you know, that contestation and encounter between oh, … feel nauseous and got to have to get this step of work done on time, is happening as much there as it is in other places, it’s just not, we’re sort of bedded in that, we just don’t see it as readily as we do in Indigenous communities.

? So it might be … to actually pick up a couple of different examples, that you might actually …, okay we will explore this and we’d start with Indigenous communities. And I think … …

*Some inaudible comments.*

MC Jim’s example of the north, the Queensland farmers is a really good one too.

JT Yeah. I’m just wondering where we’re up to with this discussion about the paper because … I think that it’s been really useful and we dropped out on Skype for a little while but i think … governance. The reality is we’ve spent about six months sharing ideas, sharing this paper and a lot of the other things that I think people are particularly … and I agree with … but I’m not sure how you’d fit it into the 5000 words or the … this paper’s about as well. And in terms of what the paper was for it was about us sharing and starting to get a clear understanding about some of these theoretical constructs and how they may operate in the different domains and … working … in agriculture, development or whether it was in Darwin Harbour or … natural resource management or health or wherever you came from. So I think it’s been useful in achieving that and the other thing is, that the paper was actually targeted at policy …, and we were thinking about and Anne was … also … and I acknowledge the work that she’s put into this as well as Elspeth; is the idea was, to really start to have … a young middle aged policy person sitting in Canberra who was reading these sort of journals maybe get some understanding of the theoretical things that we’ve been thinking about, within the three thematic areas. Then that’s really where the paper’s up to and I was not wanting from a personal point of view to put a bit more effort into it, because I think a lot of the other things will be different papers and … The discussions that we’re having within this group is a new sharing, new information and ideas and will produce new products. That’s sort of where I’m up to personally with it anyway.

EO I totally agree with that Jim thank you very much.

? It’s been a great conversation, perhaps we should just now extend it by moving on to talk about the conversation piece which is quite related.

MC Unless there’s somebody that hasn’t had a chance to say something that would like to say something.

? *Inaudible.* (Can you hear me okay?)

? Not very well.

? Is that any better?

? A little bit.

? Okay. I’ll try to. *Inaudible.*

? Sorry what did he say?

? No additional comments.

*Laughing.*

MS? We also have a new person that’s just joined us in the room. It’s …?

TP That’s right.

MS So I just wanted to introduce her from social work.

TP Yeah, I mean that’s the discipline I’m sitting in but it’s … probably to scientist, moved to sociology, cultural studies, now you can make … or whatever you want, I’m in social work so it’s all confused.

MC And you are?

TP Tejaswini.

MC Welcome to our group.

TP Just wanted to comment on the paper and about the metaphor the north south. I actually like the north south metaphor because it appealed to me in the sense that this paper was more about the knowledge production process of how the north south, the metaphor itself, actually embeds this framework of … thinking. So for me that’s not a problem at all because actually even though, it’s kind of, even though we are talking about the north and … per se, it’s more about the knowledge production process, and how the practices of governmentality actually operate in the northern context. So it’s more the knowledge production rather than actually the geographic or place … So I actually think that it’s a good way of introducing and making relevance. That metaphor can be, it’s a bit provocative but I actually like it because it’s instructive of and knowledge production process. The only last point was about the encounter and Michael made some points about that. I guess, the difficulty is when you articulate something when you say you want a base, you are trying to have a framework which talks about encounters or alternative practices of… … a better way of government policies and procedures. which I think is … Anyway let’s not work with that word. But just as a working example. I was not … sure what at least some of the main conditions. Like the non negotiables, we articulate conditions of modalities which okay, this is the basis of that encounter, that other … space we are articulating. So maybe two or three papers if we could because I loved the historical discussion at the front if that could be condensed a bit, and if you could add a bit more on the encounter that could be something which.

*Others: inaudible.*

TP No just, I’m sorry, I’m not trying to be.

EO? You’re right and I deal a lot with words. We’d love to write a whole paper that basically takes this forward into that encounter stuff so I think we can definitely do that. But I don’t know …

TP Because when I read an extract I was excited to go to the encounter.

EO? I know.

TP The conditions of possibility. Or the modalities. And I did read the other chapter but sorry I didn’t read … but you know what I mean. It was exciting.

EO yeah. But we can maybe make that a big … that we think there’s an alternative approach to need it, we just don’t know what that approach is.

? There’s two sets of issues here. I think one is how you get the paper to where you can submit it, and tentatively get it accepted. The other is, where do you go from here in terms of thinking through the next steps, not the paper but we … start to try and get, so get … of governance and ways of working together, … tend to confuse the two. Jim’s saying, no more work on it …, you just want to get it off.

EO Very minimal. I think we’ll take it to Cat, what everyone’s said here today, I think there’s some minor tweaks to phrasing at the sentence level we can take some of those nuances … and … out to … and governance.

? *Inaudible*.

EO Yeah.

? But come back and ask …

EO We’d definitely really appreciate everyone’s feedback on that and there’s a really nice, although we’re constrained to making them tweaks here with they’re really important points and we’ll put those in, and then I think we’d love to hear more from everyone else about how to unpick this and … And so we’d really like to hear from the ground up … about ground up both ways approaches and we’d like to hear more about how you do that practice.

? *Inaudible*.

EO A substantive, of a substantive practices on … doing that. And I’d love to hear more from Beau about how …

? *Inaudible*.

EO So that’s my two cents’ worth on … than expected.

? For me that idea of … is other people’s … thing. It’s that human engagement and that is really where the penny drops I would say in much of this work. As a … … for governance, for … maybe developing an idea up, on the … started doing, he gave … interviews no reflection of … … given. … … So … … So I guess.

MS? Great so, sorry you were going to say?

JT? I was just going to say that the other important mix in this is about closenesses of encounter and methodologies for that that are important that recognise best ways to do that good rammed up practices if you like. But it’s also that process of facilitating and shifting power at the end of the day, so how you’d shift the, how you actually at the end of the day, give people the capacity to actually undertake those things that they decide that they want to do and give them the tools and the power and … to do that. So the process. And the process is an important part of that and one of the reasons why a lot of this two groups of people who don’t know what they don’t know, … bashing up their head. If you haven’t got the methodology right in the first place actually doing, work in the right way to respect that, you don’t actually have; the processes then, if you like, is diminished right from the start if it is all about actually a legitimate process of empowering people to undertake the things that they want to do. That might sound like a bit of a circular argument but that’s my experience. If you don’t approach it from a true process of engagement and facilitation and respect then you’re never going to get to the next stage because certainly in my experience, Indigenous people just shut up shop straight away. They’ll sit there and go through the motions and you haven’t even got to first base. Just another whitefella coming to sell yet another gammon process that they say well you’re not fair dinkum, why would we even bother. And they’ve had to do that for a long, long, long time because if they got involved in all these other gammon processes they’d.

? Be exhausted.

JT? Their own cultural identity and their own cultural integrity would be …

EO? Yeah I think that’s tons of and I know that there are tons of literatures that engage with that stuff out there, and points like that, I think you have this moment of encounter and then this you know. Constant coming in and out of it maybe or yeah. I don’t know.

? I guess biological … … evolution … the process… become interlocked till both parties change together … … Yeah.

? *Inaudible*.

? *…* shared, usually beneficial.

MS I sort of hesitate to move this along but… twenty minutes or so left so maybe we’ll move on to the conversation I’m informed that Michael will… Do you want to say a few words?

MC Yeah. The conversation thing which is a website thing were people have conversations. A thing on the ABC about the Aboriginal news on the ABC and they asked us, they said to Cathy, Cathy Boat, Cathy gave it to me and we wrote a little thing on what it means for the ABC to be deciding for the news to be put in Aboriginal languages, Warlpiri and Yolngu, and one of the things that I said in the paper was, with the ways in which governmentalities are changing, Aboriginal people are having to make more and more complex decisions on less and less information and the old people are again being brought into these local authorities and they often don’t have a lot of literacy so that it’s a really good way of helping people come on board with some of these changes that are happening. People came back to comment on the conversation … saying what do you mean about the devolvement of responsibilities by government and the outsourcing of service provision and things like that. So I got back to be, … Katrina who’s the arts editor for the conversation and said would you like a little thing on, Indigenous governance and she said yeah that would be great. So I made a little draft, sent it out and thank you to those people that have fed back. I’m already calling to, Allan and Matt and Anthea and Jim and Helen, I’ve already talked about Jim’s emphasis on context and place in terms of how do we understand what we’re doing and how do we tease out the differences. I’ve already mentioned Helen’s point about neo-liberalism as not being monolithic but of being many different things that keep hitting us from all different directions, and make us into different people as researchers and make the university into a different thing and make Aboriginal communities a different thing and make the encounter into a different thing and all that sort of stuff. Anthea’s point about who do we mean when we say ‘we’ in this thing and I think that’s partly to do with whether we should be emphasising that ground up side of it or whether we should be emphasising the more general theoretical side of it and or trying to balance those two things out. So I’ve talked to the lady Katrina, I said after this meeting if everybody was happy we would send it, and she said don’t try to get everybody to … and listen, put their things in, just say it’s from everybody, and then she said we could open this thing called Q&A which is something else which I don’t know but she will get back to us on that. So I will do another version of it. I’ll get … and Michaela to put it on the Wordpress site. And we’ll see what happens. But other people might be induced to respond to any of the comments. There was one thing that Helen said that I think was worth mentioning and I don’t know whether, I’ll try to say it as well as I can Helen and see whether you’re able to fit it in, and it’s, one of the things I said at the beginning was that we’ve got this whole area of good governance when we’re glued into a different thing, where different things seem to be required, and we’re surrounded by relentless monetisation of landscapes and knowledge and cultural practices. And Helen seemed to be saying, that in fact, as we’re working on good governance in these particular contexts it seems like we are the ones that are being told that we must produce the monetisations, not already out there but something which is an effect of the way in which governments are increasingly regulating economies’ economic activities, and the infrastructure of economisation, and that we are being put in a position to make decisions about what is good governance in the context of those visibilities only. Does that make sense? Is that the sort of point you were making Helen?

HV Yes. … This idea that the practices of governance by scales or by government offices if you like, are to do with economisation, they are to do with inventing markets or keeping markets free, and the markets that we’re involved in are the markets for services provision, and we’re very busily being services providers in picking up these opportunities offered by government, often under the governance practices of the state. So we’re seeing things coming down and coming up and this is why the focus on objects of governance is I think quite useful, because you can see it going both ways through these objects. …

? What’s the object in this case Helen?

HV Well, … I think objects are very, very precise and I’m working on heat stress for example.

Laughing.

HV And the way in which heat stress really isn’t … that allows governance practices of the state, particularly when they’re numbered, and it’s an object that is … about ground up versions of whether, what sort of labour practices are allowed and how do you run a football match and so on. ground up. So this is a specific turned into technologies, that mediate throws up and down.

? A quick point. I think just in terms of this whole issue of what government is up to in terms of service provision this has been a twenty year trend. Governments are progressively moving to a situation where they are devolved, they don’t deliver services directly any more, they’re moving to purchaser provider arrangements, there’s the over weighing there from a neo-liberalist’s point of view of looking at actual markets and quasi markets for the delivery of those services. So if you take a good example of that look what’s going on in the university sector. Look what’s occurred in the VET market, in the VET sector. When TAFE was first established in the 1970s it was all done by government funded TAFE providers who actually were genuinely arms of the state governments who actually delivered that stuff. Now there’s a whole quasi market out there. The same thing’s happening with education. We’re moving to independent public schools. you run through all the core deliver and services that are currently being delivered, at either federal or state government level and even at local government levels, governments are progressively moving to a situation where they need to establish entities that they can outsource functions to so that they can then purchase those, and then establish a market. That’s what’s been going on for 25, 30 years.

HV Yeah, it really started in the 1990s. Really got up and away, varyingly, in different sectors. I think Aboriginal settlements were are just the latest sector really. NRM was … 10 years before or five years before and so on. so it’s been rolling out and markets and now of course the Liberals and Labor differ in how they feel the role of government in managing markets, and in many places, in Germany for example, the major difference between … and …, which really dominates … the German states, and they regard markets as social entities that need to be managed actively and they set themselves against neo-liberals, which say that markets should be left to organise themselves and … themselves, organise the collective life of a nation. So what used to be the … party of …, the Liberal party, is in those terms a neo-liberal party, that’s all we’ve got now, but what used to be the party of organised Labor is you could call … liberal, and they were the ones that we had until fairly recently and they were busily inventing markets and regulating markets. And Tony Abbot, … had to have his say and ... up all the regulations, or naming the regulations, and regulations are about markers. They were burnt on that day. So.

? … philosophical comments … … ten minutes so I just wondered whether we needed to come back to the conversation because I think all that conversation is useful but I really think we probably need to focus on trying to slow that conversation … away.

MC Well what I’m going to do is go out of this meeting and do what I think is appropriate with all the comments that have been sent, then I’m going to send it to Katrina, and I’m going to give it to Michaela to put on the website. You have 24 hours to express your position or dissent. And then Katrina might say no we don’t want it. And in fact when I put the thing in to the original box and just sent it through the have you got a suggestion they came back and said no, no, no, we don’t want anything like that thank you very much. But Katrina’s the boss and she came back and said yeah, that will be great, just send it on. So it might not get there but I’ll do another draft, we can all have a look at it, but she wants it sooner rather than later.

? But hang on, is this to go into the conversation or is this for going up on our website in the first instance?

MC It’s going to go to the conversation.

? It’s going to go to the conversation, okay. … …

MS It’s not public yet so it will just be a place that you could access it.

MC … Yeah.

MS I can also email it to you.

? No it’s not a problem. What we’ve got here is the most recent edition?

MC Yes but it’s got all my scribbles over it now as to what’s going to happen to it next.

? And I guess it, we’ve been talking about grounding and sometimes, we’ve got a couple of grounded examples in here it might not be a bad idea to make sure that it’s got those, … you’re limited to this 600 words…

MC We’ve still got another 100 words and I’ve got four examples there but more feedback, if it comes within the next hour or so it will be fine. Is that all right Helen?

HV Sure.

MS In the last 10 minutes maybe we revisit the book. Yes? Has everyone had a chance to look at the proposal that?

? The one from 17th June?

MS I think so. It was quite a long time ago.

? … Outlining the book and.

MS So I guess the question is, if there’s any general comments … Also Michael and I have been thinking about.

*Inaudible.*

MS Michael and I have also been talking about how we might generate some content for it coming in out of these meetings so … worked that out. and I have been talking to power brokers and possibly a publisher. So if there’s any comments first of all to the proposal?

AD One minor comment. I like the idea and correct me if I’m wrong, whether it’s … … narrative … experience doing … governance. … totally … … … So that more relaxed informal … gets … expression. But yeah, if it’s like that it’s good.

MC I think it’s important also to remember that Bec saw the first person narrative not only as more informal and interesting but it’s actually does a lot of epistemological work, because it’s upsetting categories and pushing some things to the side and focusing on other things in very subtle ways that allows us to think quite differently about some of the received categories that we’re working work. And we need to somehow emphasise that. The bit that Michaela was saying before was what we were thinking of doing was going through the transcripts of our conversations and just getting a … Ken or something and saying this looks like a point that brought us together or moved us along a bit further, and this one does, and then everybody gets a chance to do that because they’re all on the website. And then start copying together something from that and saying this is where the one pagers might look like they could fit. If we could do something a bit more in that direction or can you do this or let’s do this or let’s talk to; the lady in Shanghai is quite keen to do something which is specifically to do with Northern Australia and specifically to do with the area of good governance, the emergence of governance discourse. So it’s going to be a long slow process but I think we can use the transcripts and just keep building those ideas.

AD *Inaudible.*

MS Sorry we can’t hear you.

MC Are you talking about the audience?

AD What I’m talking about actually …. *Inaudible.*

MS We can’t hear it.

AD *Inaudible.* So we are … to see that … I’m comfortable with the understanding … … away the CRN book, … over … people about … *Inaudible.* The only trouble Michael would be, I didn’t really know the word around good governance, I … government systems. … … system of government … in Australia. … government relates to government. … government systems … So the language of where governments … the state and the settings is about the … governments within the … governance, but with other people you’d have good corporate governance as well. If they were … So … good governance is about … … culture. … … achieve a … system of governance … ;… would allow a dialogue to … governance … traditional … *Inaudible.*

MC A couple of things on that Allan. One is, nobody is allowed to do any writing for this book until the writing for the CRN book is finished. The other is that the whole question about governance and good governance and what is it, is so much a part of our conversation that it’s going to be there in the book and we don’t need to make decisions, we don’t need to agree, we just need to make sure that all those positions are covered.

MS Great.

AD *Inaudible.*

MS He was listening intently.

*Some comments about the dog barking.*

MS Another thing really is the website which we don’t have time to discuss in great detail at the moment. It’s there. I don’t know if people have had a chance to look at it or a chance to try and work with it.

? …

MS Wordpress site. So everyone’s one pagers are up there so you should be able to log on and change that if you want and there’s also a little wiki at the side that has the skills register on it which you can contribute to. You just click the edit button, and you can contribute to that. There’s also a little tab for next meeting’s agenda so if you wanted to add anything or compose anything you could actually put it in yourself there. Probably at the next meeting we should have a longer discussion about what we want to be there before it goes properly public.

? So is it properly private now or?

MS Yeah. It’s on the CDU server under their centre’s tab so it seems to be, I can’t search it on Google, I can’t search it on CDU so I think it’s only if you do have the log in that you can get to it but if anyone has the log in they would be able to see it.

? So log in on the site.

MS The web address. Do you think we need more than that?

? I don’t know I just wanted to make sure everyone was comfortable with that… so it’s not totally private but it’s not really public either.

MC It’s got a password.

MS But not to view it. you can view it without the password.

MC Well nobody knows the address anyway, everyone’s too busy to be looking at it. The other thing is, I just think that we should. What Allan was just saying about different definitions of governance and governmentality and governments and things like that, every time if you have a point like that you should write a little thing about it and put it up there. In the same way I’ve got a note here that I’m going to, Tom or Elspeth said that they wanted to hear more about ground up and the encounter and the methods and the thinking behind it so I’m happy to do a one page on that. Just to keep the conversation. So just because you’ve got your one pager up there it doesn’t’ mean that your work is finished. You keep adding to it.

MS keep adding to the blog on the website. And if there’s technical troubles contact me and we’ll try to work it out.

JT? Just on that I think Helen’s conversation about … neo-liberalism and … would be useful to go into there. Certainly we all … markets. One of the issues I think is important is the idea of competition, because of markets, the actual market is what we call it but competition is what the issue is. I think … competition and how it works or how we do it …

MS Yes market is a bit of a black box for a lot of things.

MC Okay we’ll see if we can get Helen to write a paragraph about that.

HV Okay.

MS Any other final comments?

MC I’m working on my contribution to the skills register. I’ve got some notes so you can all afford to see those when you next look at the website.

JT? My comment on the skills register. Jim here. I think it’s a good idea. I wondered whether skills … sent us back an email, whether skills is the right language, we’re always talking about … and experience based things. With skill it’s a limited sort of word.

MS Excellent, put that up on the website. At the moment we’re just trying to work out how we’re going to think about it before we start pulling it in so that’s exactly the sort of conversation to put up there. Thanks Jim.

MC I’d like to thank Michaela for taking over the chairpersonship. We’re happy to have volunteers if other people would like to do it as well. See you in a month’s time, go back to the website and have a go at it, and make some notes for us.

? Before Allan goes can I just ask him something.

*Inaudible.*

? Allan.

*Beep beep.*

? He’s gone. Don’t worry. Okay I’ll ring him separately.

All Thank you.

*01:27:00*

*End of Recording at: 1:29:08.*