**Transcript, In Conversation with kylie valentine, ‘*Institutional Erotics of Social Policy and Welfare’.***

**Critical Conversations, Policy and Power, 13.07.22**

**Rachael Dobson**

Okay, shall we should we get get into it? So we've got until 11. So I think yeah, the idea is just to kind of have a bit of a chat really about some of the things that came up and, obviously, if anybody's got any questions, specifically, but as I said, the format tends to be that, you know, invited kylie to kind of provide some reflections and in the first instance, so maybe if we can go to you, kylie first and then just go from there. Does that sound okay?

**kylie valentine** 1:00:58

Sure. That sounds great. So thank you very much for inviting me. And it's, it's a real pleasure to meet you all. I mean, of Rachael before, but to be here, I'm in Sydney, I'm coming to this evening, my time, from the unceded Gadigal land in Sydney, the Gadigal people of the Yora nation. And I acknowledged that sovereignty was never ceded and pay respect to Aboriginal custodians and owners of the land, past and present. And I should say that I heard this paper tonight for the first time, just as you did. So if it seems that my remarks are very unprepared and kind of disorganised that's because, ah, but I will try to say a few things. And as I'm talking, try to turn those things into kind of questions for broader discussion. And, Rachael, I have confidence that you are, that you have an effective investment enough in this material that I won't actually need to ask you any questions, you will be able to talk anyway. But if it seems that that's not the case, I will certainly prompt you for more information, because I do know that you have a lot more. So it struck me as I was listening of a thing that I saw on Twitter just before I came on, which was from the BBC News. And it's one of those things that is a kind of delight to journalists. But it's also quite a fun thing to read. And I would, I would send a screencap in the chat, except it won't support it. So we'll just have to read it. So this sort of lead is giving teenagers mindfulness, mindfulness lessons at school to boost well being is largely a waste of time, a major UK study has found the technique which encourages people to meditate and live in the moment was no better than what schools were already doing for mental health goes on to say that most of the students in shocks revelation to anyone who's never met a teenager, found it boring and didn't want to do the homework at home. And the first paragraph ends by saying other interventions that might help like tackling deprivation and giving targeted mental health support should be explored. And this is recommended by the study. And it just struck me that this was a kind of beautiful kind of illustration of the deep seated mistrust that we have of things like emotions, effective investments, our well being to bring about real social change for both excellent and I think, less excellent reasons as well as the utility for both right and left or you know, however you want to sort of frame stances towards these things of a separation between structural and the ongoing utility of opposition's between structural and individual factors. So, I think that we all probably do it sometimes despite our best intentions. of saying things like individual interventions, things being things that are about the personal or about the non material are fine, but they're window dressing, what you really have to do is tackle the structural things like deprivation, poverty, inequality power. And although Rachael you cited well, Bion and Audre Lorde, and various other people, it did strike me that, that the kind of obvious person for me in this space is always the, you know, the Alpha and Omega is always Freud. And part of the discrediting of emotion and part of the distrust of emotion, I think, is still that kind of discrediting of psychoanalytic modes, behaviourism has got a lot to answer for in that discrediting as well as psychoanalytic’s sort of distinctly unscientific and modern scientific method. And yet, at the same time, as you pointed out, there is an enormous kind of growth in the idea that passion, emotion libidinal investment is absolutely vital. Because things that are boring, don't work, things that are boring things like activism, signing petitions, institutions, schools, and we need entrepreneurs, we need young people who bring their passion to it. And so I think that one of the one of the ways that this kind of dual process of both denying and mobilising institutional erotics is based on the one hand a kind of official discrediting of emotion, and the individual is doing anything, at the same time as a kind of recognition that the emotional and the personal. Absolutely. As you said, Rachael recognised, so it is absolutely recognised that policies peopled that people bring that without that, you know, that emotions and investments and relationships are what drive kind of policy processes. And yet a kind of deep suspicion of doing anything much with that except recognising it, or seeing it as a good thing, if it's an entrepreneur and a bad thing, if it's a single mother. So I think, Rachael, what you've done really nicely is, is to kind of bring to our attention some of the challenges of doing analytic work with that, as well as bringing the importance of it to a recognition that kind of moves. I'm thinking kind of, this is good, this is bad, or this matters, or this doesn't matter where this belongs to the structure or this belongs to the personal because that the kind of separations between the structural and the personal, are heuristic and useful in some contexts, but actually not real. There are, there is still I think, not a kind of robust or recognised means of working with that, or acknowledging that. And part of that is, as I've sort of already kind of said that emotions, passions, the personal are highly valued in some contexts and for some people, and highly discredited in others. So, already degraded groups are classed as highly emotional and they're kind of a affective and emotional way of being in the world is regarded as evidence of their you know, unruliness. Whereas if you're a young, kind of startup tech guy, then that whole same emotion is regarded as kind of passion and this has been subjected quite deservedly to a lot of criticism because of that kind of harnessing of it for things like that. You know, investing all of yourself and your work, which means, you know, you don't need breaks, those kind of horrible ads for startups saying, if you don't need lunch, if you, you know, if you think, you know, holidays are for old people, then you know, our company might be for you. So, I do think that the that the challenge, one of the challenges you've identified really nicely, Rachael is, is the challenge of working with emotions as operant in a range, like you've, you've highlighted a really broad range of kind of areas in which this works. And policy processes, I think, is one way of kind of covering a really huge area. But it otherwise it does, as you've sort of pointed out, need to get kind of more specific and more, more kind of local, I think. And it may be that some of the stuff, some of the theories that have been really discredited in kind of anti psychoanalytic, and then behaviours, and then anti behaviourist, and then anti psychologist more generally, they're kind of colonisation of the mind, by the sciences, the kind of Giddensification of thinking about understandings of human subjectivity. I think there's a whole lot of work to be done in sort of recuperating, what's interesting in all of those things, and there are some really nice kind of historical work being done on the kind of histories of how what have become really stale ideas kind of came about in the kind of richness of that, but I won't talk about that, I'll just kind of leave it there. And see, I'm really keen to see what other people thought of your talk and what other people thought of your ideas. And I have to say that, I will go back to that, to those videos for me to hear again, and again, because they are just the most giddying horrifying, beautiful examples of just awesome bullshit that that I've seen for a long time, you know, like anybody who thinks Americans are in this space really need to really need to see those, those videos. So yeah, so thank you very much. It was a really stimulating talk. It was incredibly persuasive. Really, I think stimulating and you covered a lot of terrain in a lot of depth. So thank you for that.

**Rachael Dobson**

So thanks, kylie. I will just come back on to you, and also that might prompt some more thoughts from my brilliant would be great to absolutely, I'd love to hear from everybody. And thank you, kylie, for those reflections. And in particular, yes. I feel like the work around it sort of slightly, these examples get collapsed together in ways that aren't really appropriate, because I think that there are many kind of, there are different layers to the role of the emotions in a kind of practice, context and practice. I just, I suppose, I mean, in any institutional space, where we see policy professionals or practitioners operating with a variety of different kinds of peoples and staff and so on, and I think there it needs pricing apart, I think quite considerably, because actually, there is quite a big difference between, you know, the way that a practitioner may kind of rationalise what, you know, what it is that they're doing in a given moment to you know, say the example of that kind of of group dynamic moments, you know, so that that is those examples of the kind of piling on, for example, and actually that came from I was having a chat with a social work colleague of mine He was talking about how he was in a scenario where somebody was about to be sectioned. And there was a sort of sense of just a huge amount of people going in, and it felt so inappropriate. And he's, he kind of hung back. And that's sort of where that thought came from. But that is actually also a very different kind of, you know, and I've referenced example of my neighbour where there was this really kind of grotesque, what felt like a particularly disproportionate reaction in terms of the way of interacting with her and her children, and so on. So anyway. But that's also, you know, there are very different dynamics going on in any of these given moments. And whilst they may kind of all be in service of the same kind of things, which broadly, I guess I can talk about, you know, maybe in service of the constituting of the state in various ways, or local state space in various ways, the dynamics of the moment are quite, quite different. So I think that prising apart, and that working up very much needs to happen. And you mentioned Freud that, yes, Klein, I think is also, you know, another kind of set of scholarship that needs, you know, thorough engagement with, basically. So that, I think, is something that I look forward to doing. But the and then the other thing that some of your thoughts, they're provoked for me it yet. So this thing of the way that the emotions are front and centre and a lot of contemporary policy and practice work, in terms of how people understand, you know, what it is that they're doing, and it kind of highlights local sense. So my interviews with people last week, you know, there's really strong sense, you know, whether we call it like commitments, motivations, what is it that people think that they're doing, and why they're there, and so on. But also this stuff is like heavily front and centre in a, in quite a formalised way now, and that's what you know, if I think about that new markets of vulnerability stuff, the reason that that came about was that from like, I don't know, the mid 2010s, I was, you know, just looking around and kind of spotting stuff on Twitter, and it did to this. And obviously, there's this like, slight risk that all of your scholarship comes based on this particular kind of social platform, but yeah, this sense of people really earnestly utilising the language of the emotions and I say language of the emotions, because I suppose you know, there is also this thing of like, what is what is the depth of feeling or what is the feeling, if any kind of behind this, like, broadly, there is this sense of emotions, I suppose becoming, institutionalised in a particular kind of way. So the emotions sort of being front and centre. So you know, whether we're talking about organisations like the consultancy firms, or the training operations or so on, that talk very earnestly about, you know, the right people, the right passions, the right talent, the right attitudes, the right, yeah, so it becomes this kind of language of emotions, but actually that, I mean, really, bluntly, I suppose it's sort of this sense of, is this just the kind of new audit is this just the new kind of audit mechanism that we have the new kind of regulatory mechanisms that we have for assessing what constitutes the effective institution, organisation and practitioner? So there's, there's that and there's also a sense I suppose what I found interesting kylie, because you were talking about you know, when the emotions are allowable, when they're not the way that the emotions are. And maybe this is a reading and to what you're saying the way that the emotions because it also kind of be resisted in certain kinds of ways. Rather than kind of lived out and I was thinking about how so there's this thing that when you know, particularly if we look at like year here, those fast track streams, there is this issue of like high dropout rate so the people kind of once they get into practice, actually, it's just you know, people kind of drop out and, and whilst that could just be, because it's just grinding realities, and it's not sexy, and it involves all of the kind of mundane but kind of vital work of a sustaining and supporting life and navigating systems and so on. I do want to kind of reflect on the idea of like, what is it that? What is it that grabs people? Or what is it that consultancy serves, you know, and it is the sense of basically kind of being on the outside, you know, all the time. So you kind of get to be in this role where you get to kind of drop him on a particular kind of institutional setting and moment, and you get to kind of unpick it in this sort of heavily processional way. And you get to kind of I remember, when I was doing some work with the local authority in southwest London, and one of these consultancies had been bought in and they had a huge room to themselves and you walked in, and they had process mapped the entire local, like department that they were attached to, which was like in this room next door, and they were in this room. And the whole thing was just A3 bits of paper, where they had charted, you know, what it is this organisation does. And I suppose there's the sense of, to put it bluntly, just like involvement, but not being in but you know, you get to just sort of withdraw, basically. And that's what I meant by the kind of fetishizing process idea that you get to kind of just do this prizing apart and unpicking and you get to kind of think about the system and how it could be improved for people. And that could lead to you know, all sorts of fairly instrumental effective things for sure, in certain situations. But actually, you don't have to engage particularly in the everyday dramas of the space, you sort of don't have to have this kind of felt experience, potentially. And maybe it's so you get to kind of stay on the outside. And yeah, I think I also found it really fascinating. One of the clips about the professionals, there was the guy who was working for a mental health charity, and you know, so it's not all, it's not all, you know, middle class professionals that went into banking, and now want to find some purpose, right, you get these people who kind of have attempted to do it. But I can't remember what phrase he uses, but it's this sense of like, I just, I wasn't working with people. And it's a sense of like, I couldn't touch it. Like I couldn't, I mean, this is my reading of it, I couldn't touch the people, I couldn't touch the problem, I couldn't feel the life, right, that was sort of how I sensed it. But also, it's like, you don't get to do that anyway, like, necessarily, I mean, you might do if you're doing kind of this long term, deep kind of relationship based kind of working with somebody over an extended period of time. And even within even within say, I don't know, social work roles, or housing support roles, or any of those roles that we typically associated with kind of extended relationship based work, you don't really, you don't have access to somebody's inner world you don't get to see or live with their life, you know. So I think it's interesting, that kind of push and pull is basically maybe what I'm trying to get at this idea of imagine imagining that you can touch the thing or the thing that you find fascinating or interesting that you want to sort out, but equally the way that these kinds of entities as they are kind of growing and expanding, both in terms of like role purpose but also their practice also means that you kind of get to just not feel an awful lot in certain ways. You don't have to feel the the political kind of problem or rage or you don't or or whatever it all reparative whatever you're not in a felt sense of anything. You don't have to kind of feel the every day drama of institutional life. You know, I'm on a research fellowship at the minute you know, without without a doubt the thing that has kind of melted away is that kind of heavy, heavy kind of drama of, of yeah of institutional life. I'm, that's my, my, you know, that's the kind of thing that I'm not experiencing at the minute. So I kind of find that kind of push and pull in that relationship to emotions. And that's I suppose, clearly, for me your reflections of kind of really, surface that are ambivalent relationship to The emotions and and yeah, okay, so that's my initial reflections. But thank you very much that was really, really helpful, but I'd love to hear it. Yeah. And I'd love to hear from anybody else if anybody else has got any thoughts generally on maybe any of the things I was saying on kylie's thoughts on my thoughts there. Any any reflections? Hey, John.

1:25:27 John

I'm okay to speak. Thank you. Yeah, thank you so much for a really, really interesting presentation. And also kylie as well, thank you for your discussions on it and your extra thoughts. I agree with what kylie said, I think what you're touching on is so broad. And that's really interesting, there's so much there. to kind of get out of this. For me. I'm very early on in kind of my research career and my policy career. So it's been a very reflective experience for me, because there's a lot of things that you're talking about that I'm starting to think about in terms of like my own relationship with the work that I'm trying to do. I have a bunch of notes, but I think the thing that really stood out for me was the thing that I kind of read from, from what you were what you were saying was this idea of like the motivations of, of us as practitioners as researchers or as policy practitioners. In terms of why we're doing the work that we do, is it because we're really trying to, like help other people? Or is it because it's sexy, and it's cool, and we like doing it as well. And I think there's definitely an issue of trying to find a kind of balance there. Because ideally, we should all be doing work, which is, is actually being genuinely impactful in terms of changing systems to improve other people's lives. But it's not sustainable. If you're, you know, burning yourself out, there's very emotionally draining work, and you don't find it interesting, either. So there's that I think there's an inherent tension there. And it's not about saying it's one or the other, it's about finding the right kind of balance. So I wanted to ask, do you think that maybe bringing in an idea of care, into work around research and work around policy could be a way to kind of recenter the focus on kind of the things? Well, I was gonna say, the problems that we're trying to solve, again, that's coming from that very kind of like, realist perspective, which I'm still, you know, trying to work out. But yeah, do you think an idea of care is perhaps one way that we can, as practitioners, we can start to like reorient the way that we see things?

**Rachael Dobson** 1:27:44

I'm just I'm just thinking, I suppose it I'm just keen to ask you. Just unpick that a bit more. So for you, when you're thinking about care. Do you mean that in relation to maybe the first point that you raise, which was around terrifying a motivation for sort of what is it that any of us think that we're doing in a sense that, you know, and, and how, and what does that idea of motivation for action? Like, what is it actually rooted in, I suppose, is it rooted in a kind of meaningful, genuine sense of care? In a kind of, I'm sure, there's all sorts of words that we might use to kind of explain what a good a good form of care or what we might understand as a good form of care big, I suppose I'm interested, do you mean? Is it that idea of care that you're thinking about? Or is it care is and in relation to how like how we care for ourselves how we care for others?

1:28:53 John

I think it's, I think it's a bit of both, I guess, I'm seeing it from the perspective of saying like, you're, you're a consultant, you're coming into a thing. You're trying to understand the system, because you want to improve the outcomes for people going through that system. You're doing the system maps and stuff. Ultimately, you're getting as you go through your processes and your work. You're moving between these different kinds of spaces within yourself of like, I'm doing this to solve a problem. I'm doing this to improve someone's quality of life. I'm doing this because this is interesting. I'm doing this because I like drawing diagrams and stuff. And it's about, I guess, by trying to focus on the idea of I want to change the system, not because I like tinkering with systems, not I want to change the system because I'm trying to fix a problem which is inherent in the system or a problem which is external to my involvement in the system, but I'm trying to, I'm trying to work with the people who are embedded within the system just as the way I am as a form of caring for them. Like building systems of care, moving systems towards like, because I think that you come across a lot in the system's thinking literature as well as this idea of what is the purpose of a system? Not necessarily kind of like, what are the different components of the system? And what are the measures that we use when we evaluate the quality of the system, but the idea of the system is having some kind of like, underlying, embedded, possibly hidden purpose that influences its structure and influences on feedback loops, so, maybe reorienting but purpose, again, around the notion of care.

**Rachael Dobson** 1:30:47

yeah, I mean, you know, certainly there's, whenever, you know, whenever any, there's so I'm just trying to think of what order to go at this. And so I'll start starting with the last bit there. I mean, there's, whenever anybody says care, well, you know, the immediate thing is to think about care ethics. And there was a really kind of fantastic body of literature around care ethics. Thinking about people like Joan Tronto, and colleagues, and, you know, I can think of my colleague, Lizzie Ward, she's written recently on care ethics. And so there's a really important body of work that thinks about care within policy systems, just in terms of that, if that's useful for yourself in terms of thinking about care, but there's a lot of really interesting things that your reflections there really provoked for me, and I suppose one of the things is, it's just, uh, you know, the bit where you're talking about sort of what our purpose might be, I mean, I actually kind of feel like, if somebody just wants to tinker with a system, because they'd love a system, then that's, that's kind of, bluntly, like, cool. Like, I don't necessarily feel like people need to have a particular motivation to help the vulnerable other as it were, not least because I think sometimes those motivations reproduce interesting kind of binaries, as if we are, you know, as if I mean, just because you're in a position of institutional domination doesn't mean that you won't have shared orientations with the people that you're trying to facilitate or support or help. And that's quite an interesting thing, I think, to keep hold of, but in and of itself, like, I don't feel that there is anything especially problematic about somebody just coming to the work, because they just want to kind of play within the systems that they have. And by play, I mean, just to exist, just be somebody that like, goes to work. And like that guy, Simon, the housing director, he just has a great time unpicking decisions, because for him, what he's loving in that moment, is challenging the status quo, or maybe something, you know, there'll be local dynamics going on there, where he's had relationships, maybe with the people whose decisions, he's challenging or whatever, like, I think that those local dynamics in and of themselves, or those kind of personal dynamics in and of themselves, or those personal needs, or motivations don't necessarily trouble me. I think, though, where it becomes thorny, is. And I suppose this is where we start to kind of bring questions of power and power dynamics in is in the effects, I guess, that this stuff can have. And also, the ways that these systems become oriented and conceived of that's where it kind of becomes trickier. And yes, of course, you know, that's where like questions of care and responsibility become really important. I'm going think about that a bit more. I'm going to, if that's okay, because I feel like I'd quite like to kind of stick with that because there's some really important things there. And I can see that Emma and kylie, kind of, you put your hand up and I wonder if it's in response to that, too. So Emma, come to you first.

1:34:47 Emma Wincup

Yeah, I think there's connections across I mean, what I was I'm just like, John, I've been trying to think about how what you said and what you said I need still need to process it. Yeah. Is is about how it kind of connects to work that I've done. I'm in the past as an academic, and I'm doing now in a kind of more policy role, but not in someone who kind of develops policy, but was part of a charity that then is making policy recommendations and campaigning for change. And some of that is in a very traditional sense, you know, sort of, I don't do this, but the organisation does it, I'm feeding the evidence through I guess, it is as a researcher, but it's sometimes it's about kind of us developing kind of policy solutions and and putting it forward as it's kind of more co designed stuff. So, but it made me think really about kind of how sometimes we do leverage emotions in the policy process, and particularly through engaging with people with direct experience. Because most policy documents that you read are really, really quite unemotional. There's the odd exception. And occasionally, you'll get you'll get a highly emotive policy that had been developed, but mostly the, the kind of the emotions kind of been out. And the kind of more individual bits have been raised around that image, obviously, still gets up about individual blame. But with the you see, not just in the kind of policy sector, but in other sectors, people kind of coming in, and their role is to identify, they speak in ways which inevitably, are emotional, and they're trying to connect with kind of practitioners and policymakers, and influencers on kind of an emotional level. But what you then get is a sort of translation of that sometimes is like, well, people speak in a very kind of emotional, emotional way. That's how they connect with people. And we try to translate it into kind of the usual ways of pulling of policy. So we take then take it into, we don't talk about the things that kind of cross cutting, like kind of stigma, for example, or discrimination or well being, we turn it into things that are about kind of, in the way we work around kind of housing or digital exclusion. And maybe you need to do that. I mean, those are the kind of concrete things but it's almost by take it taking into the kind of very practical stuff, we kind of move away from the things that are much kind of harder and more challenging to kind of turn into sort of policy solutions. So that's kind of that's what I've been sort of thinking through it, and the care, but I think it's really important for that, because then you're putting people it's when you're kind of involving people in that process, I think there is a real kind of responsibility then because when people are kind of sharing stories and exposing themselves upon of what are the expectations that they might have, and if it's just kind of just squeezing people into a system that works in particular ways. And that's how we that's how we do policy to not always pretty effectively, then I think that's kind of problematic if anything that relates back to think to the kind of power if you're wanting to engage with a wider audience and kind of in different ways, then it kind of shifts the kind of power dynamics.

**Rachael Dobson** 1:37:42

No, that's really, really helpful. And you prompted some more thoughts in relation to that for me, so thanks for that. And maybe come back to that. And kylie, what are you thinking?

**kylie valentine** 1:37:56

Um, yes. So thanks, John, I found that really helpful too. And just to say what I think is really obvious to all of us, but maybe hasn't been said yet, specifically, which is that this is a really gendered kind of field, obviously. And one of the things that I find really great in some ways, but really maddening in other ways, is the way that the phrase feminist ethics of care gets thrown around, because it does kind of read gender care as a female thing. And it does, I think, bring emotion squarely into a feminised space. And sometimes that is not necessarily because it's women. But it is, I think, what is often failed to recognise is that those boys who were tinkering with systems for the love of tinkering with systems have as much libidinal investment in what they're doing, as the social worker who attest to the passion that she feels, or to the young drug user who talks about trauma and vulnerability, maybe in that vocabulary, maybe not. So I think that part of the work to be done is to Yes, bring care into the frame, but also to make it really clear that a feminist analysis does not mean this applies to women, or this applies to the kind of feminist bits but that feminists analytics apply to everybody here. And part of the gendering of it is part of the kind of analytic reach of it right. And I'll just say by way of personal anecdote that the British Social Policy Conference is quite different from the Australian Social Policy Conference. And if you haven't been to the Australian politics, social policy conference, we think that it's going to change but we hope that you make it in whatever manifestation. It happens because it's really good and it's really generally nice and warm, but not too hot. So come to Sydney and we'd love to see you all in person. Rachael can talk about the Sydney climate. But the Australian social policy conferences and much more kind of policy practice research makes them the than the English one or the British one, which is very research focused. And it was only when I went to my first British one that it became really clear to me what should have been obvious, which is that social policy research is really split along gendered lines, in a kind of academic sense, particularly in the UK, in that the bright young boys are doing quant and data and graphs. And a lot of entities are really feminised space still, and a lot of women are doing not data and not quants, not graphs they're doing the actual impact of policies, the actual implementation of policies, the effects of them. And there's a kind of sense in which what the boys are doing is not emotional, because it's subjective. And what the girls are doing is, you know, necessarily emotional because it has to be because look at those, you know, like, mess up emotional clients were dealing with. But I introduced myself or reintroduce myself to a very eminent, social policy scholar from the UK, who had been our plenary one year, and said, you might not remember me, but I'm from the Social Policy Research Centre, blah, blah, blah. And he said, he, you know, made it really clear that he didn't remember me at all. And when he asked me about my work, and what I was doing it at my centre, he then interrupted me by saying, oh, social care. And it was a first time I'd heard it used in that context. But it became kind of clear to me, and it's been a useful thing ever since to kind of say, well, you know, the way that people often conceptualise social policy research is social care. And then the social security is really, you know, I mean, if you're an economist, you think that that's the bit that matters, right? And if you are an old school, kind of social work, person of a particular bent, you think no, no, the emotion is what really kind of matters. It's, it's the people, it's not the numbers, it's the people. And I think Rachael, what your work is doing and John and Emma, what you're kind of gesturing towards is the kind of necessity to move beyond that, right? Like, you know, that it's not that that the quantity is objective, and that everything else is not, and it's not that the emotions are appropriate in some settings, but not in others. Or that emotions have presence in some spots, but not in others, but they are absolutely there for everyone in every circumstance. And we've got better at recognising that as a kind of thing that needs to be tended to for some people. And kind of positive force for some people. But part of the real work of it, I think, is to look at it as as, as you've said, Rachael, the kind of productive generative thing that also produces relatively stable institutional, objective, big picture empirically accurate things, you know, so. So that kind of it's not that everything is emotion. So you know, nothing matters, nothing counts and nothing sticks. It's just that emotion kind of constitutes those things that are more structural and institutional, as well as those things that are more relational and personal.

**Rachael Dobson** 1:44:12

I mean, one of the things that I was thanks for that kylie. That's really, really helpful. I hope it's okay, if I just sort of intervene with some thoughts. I'm mindful of of time as well. So we're coming up to 11 if people need to go at 11 obviously just welcome to disappear, so maybe focus on doing some wrapping up then. I mean, I think one of the things and to coin your phrase there kylie as well, you know, to state the obvious, but I think to state the obvious in relation to some of the things that are being talked about here and John, I wanted to kind of link back to your question about care, because it's really, really thought provoking actually. And in, you know, interviewing policy professionals now. And it is really, really hard to get to what people feel, I think. And by that, what I mean is that my experience of interviewing people, particularly in the kind of leadership and strategic roles, is there is incredible, like earnest quality to it, which I think you also see in some of those consultancy kind of straplines. And in those clips as this incredible, like, you know, we're here, we know why we're here. And we're motivated to do this. And it really reminds me because I'm a new parent, it really reminds me of the kind of the excesses of what it is to be around some, you know, mothering spaces, or parenting spaces. It's this incredible kind of earnest quality to aspects of it, where you just want to like, prick it with a, you know, as if it's a balloon, and just be like, where's the? Like? Why? Why aren't people being bitchy and laughing? I mean, I'm, I'm being like, kind of a bit useless in terms of my articulation, because I'm a bit tired, but like, do you know what I mean? So why, sorry, going back, so that question of like, what does it mean to care in those spaces? Ostensibly, people will talk to you endlessly about what it means to care, like, those organisations will, you know, speaking to the three people I've had done interviews with, will write. And it's actually, I think, really quite difficult to get into the weeds of like, what, what the heck, people like think that they're doing, generally. And then to really get into the weeds of people's investments around that, because those investments will be multiple, and be so very many things at the same time. And that that's normal and functional, I think, but, but I think that is a real challenge. And that's a challenge that I think, you know, coming to this empirical work. Now, I'm saying, you know, when you've got two hours of an interview, but very kind of few, you know, you're looking out for the glimmers of where somebody just kind of steps away from those very kind of earnest monologues about what it is that you know, people think they're doing, and that doesn't apply just to policy professionals. I think that is it kind of applies to all of us, in many ways. Anyway. So those are my reflections to that. So thank you for your thoughts. It's really helped me kind of reflect on that a bit. Yeah, any other kind of final reflections or thoughts from people that they'd like to share before we wrap up? We’re good. Okay. Well, just thank you very much for coming really, sincerely, thank you very much for coming, a small group, but it's been very, very provocative and generative for me, as I'm working up some of these ideas. So I really appreciate you listening to me and really appreciate the questions and reflections. I've got a good page of notes here. And you know, I'm going look forward to kind of diving back into them. Please keep an eye out and love to see you again, at future events. And yeah, in the meantime, thank you very much. Have a great day. Bye.