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I think that today is maybe a chance to make explicit some of the ideas that really important to me through the concept through this concept or this developing concept of institutional erotics. And as I think will become clearer, maybe this concept is a way of perhaps bringing some different strands together that I've been thinking about for quite some time now. And we channelling them in some ways. And I think in the channelling, I'm trying to kind of work out what what I want to do with it. So I'm going to start by providing some context about me and my work. And then go into this concept of institutional erotics and use this to circle back I think, to some of the ideas that I talked about at the outset. So today's event is supported through activities funded through my current Leverhulme research project. research fellowships are a fun project, where is the power of policy ontologies in Theory and Practice, and in that I think about the application of ontological orientations for social policy and welfare, and social policy and welfare. When I'm talking about that I'm talking about both kind of empirical sites, I guess, the various kinds of institutions, entities, things that constitute, you know, the stuff that we're interested in as social policy and welfare scholars, but also, I guess, I'm also talking about kind of Anglo Global North kind of focused field of study. And I'll maybe chat about that as we go through. So when I'm talking about this term policy ontologies I'm referencing critical and cultural approaches to policy that draw variably on critical feminist critical race, post colonial Science and Technology Studies, socio legal, anthropological and Psychosocial Studies, to theorise state relationality, spatialities, temporalities and materialities. And this involves thinking about what constitutes the range of policy phenomena, that within the context of social policy and welfare debates are generally conceived as settled stabled and certain certainly in the mainstream of popular political and academic debates. So when I'm talking about policy phenomena, I'm talking about the range of objects and subjects like States policy, legislation, institutions, problems that require interventions and policy actors themselves. And so, this kind of idea of policy ontologies is, I would say, a commitment it's a commitment to exploring processes and practices of becoming and formation. So that idea of constitution at the level of agency identity and experience understanding that policy phenomena do not exist as things in and of themselves, but rather they exist as the effects of social relations, social cultural material, affective, symbolic, discursive, you know, the list kind of goes on relations. The starting point for this work for me, okay is practice actions and interventions by practitioners and professionals in positions of institutional domination, and the variety of investments that impel, sustain and disrupt these, these actions and interventions. And I think of these people, including myself, all of us, you could say, in psychosocial terms as complex human actors, non unitary, conscious, unconscious, reflexive and reflexive, rational, irrational, praying to or with capacities for constructive and destructive actions with inner and outer world and who are driven by ambivalent, past present future aspects, experiences orientations across their social worlds. And in the context of the present discussion practices matter, I think for two reasons and you know, just generally kind of reflect on what is the utility of ontological approaches for social policy and welfare. And I think that one of the things that I always find quite a quite helpful, I mean, maybe just in terms of teaching, let alone research is this kind of constant duality that presents itself so what I mean by that is that you know, when we're talking about practices, there is this instrumental thing, the empirical, the empirical matter of social policy, welfare policies, interventions, actions, interactions, the stuff that you see right, or experience or do yourself as a policy or practice policy, professional practitioner. But second, because practices in a kind of ontological social practices sense actively constituting institutional space, through processes of construction negotiation, that are material symbolic social cultural emotionally and physically felt. And it's these inner and inter subjective dynamics of an organisation, the local and group dynamics, which I want to get on to talking about today a bit, that are the realities of policy work that I think and I know others think you and others like highly thing deserve attention, as opposed to in I'm referencing Wilfred Bion, a psychoanalytic scholar Wilfred Bion, was the stated primary task of what it is that people are said to be doing or should be doing. So you know, so to develop good policy to achieve positive outcomes to recognise and respond well to complex needs, for example, that stuff may be considered the kind of primary task stuff. And it's important to, you know, explore those sorts of things, but it's these kind of inner worlds, these intersubjective worlds. And I'm loath to say, hidden worlds, because actually, they're not, they're not hidden. Particularly, they're just not easily surfaced. And they're not always seen, you know, so perhaps that's kind of one of the things that, you know, is it is at stake here. And holding these two points in frame, this idea of duality of practice kind of doing and meaning different things that I guess, as a researcher, so the instrumental kind of realist, and the productive kind of constitutive is a tension that I'm working through in the working up, I think of this concept of institutional erotics and policy ontologies. More broadly, I just want to talk about that a bit more. But before getting into the kind of weeds of some examples of institutional erotics, and I just want to clarify this idea of reactive versus productive because I think it's quite important methodologically and theoretically, but also practically, so. So ontological orientations, as I'm thinking about them, are part of a kind of productive mode of analysis. And in many ways, and this is circling back to maybe some of the references I made to social policy and welfare as a field of study, they are a kind of acting back to the normative arguments and reactive modes of analysis that dominate in the mainstream of policy analysis. So reactive modes, as I understand them, are a kind of centralising and realist orientation, that underpinned by binary constructions that come from an understanding that the state and associated governing techniques, policies, institutions exist this things in and of themselves, in that policy issues tend to be understood as occurring in worlds outside. And therefore if if things occurring worlds outside, then the powers to generate change are consistently over there. And it's that kind of over there-ness and elsewhere-ness that I'm particularly interested in. And this is most obviously emergent in what critical anthropologist Tess Lea describes us, the perpetual, anxious and desirous popular and state exclamation, what is to be done, right. And Lea regards that statement as emblematic as the magic of intervention where in subjects except the ruse that they're not pre framing the world around them, but simply reacting to a world whose problems are spontaneously present. So that idea of like, of surprise, I mean, obviously, that can be read cynically, as in, you know, particularly people in positions of institutional domination and strategic and leadership positions, with politicians, MPs, directors of x, y, and z that kept that kind of sense of elsewhere. And surprise can be read cynically, of course. But I would suggest that it's potentially more complicated than that. And at some point, it would be good to talk about the empirical research I'm doing. And that's, that's what I'm doing at the minute speaking to policy professionals in positions of leadership and seniority anyway. So by way of contrast, productive modes, understand policy and related phenomena such as the state and related institutional practice and policy problems themselves as, and I'm referencing Stuart Hall's work here, constitutive in that policy phenomena like social problems, issues and events and the state its policies legislation, institutions, actors are relational multiple spatial temporal in infinite and dynamic movement, and therefore, incomplete profoundly unstable, profoundly uncertain. So following this policy phenomena exist as the effects of temporary albeit enduring power inflected social relations enacted through a flat ontology constituted by and through infinite past, present future human and non human matter and social practices. So, taken together productive modes of analysis, cross policy and related institutional practice as part of the material social and affective interdependencies and networks that produce crisis for individuals, groups as well as more broadly at the level of state and nation. So, as I've noted, reactive modes dominate the mainstream of policy analysis. And this describes works that establish what policy is or what policy does in social, cultural, political and economic terms. And it encompasses not just realist approaches, like evidence based evaluation and policy critiques and the kind of normative Anglo tradition, but also contributions from expressly critical debates, which in different ways think about policy and power in constructivist dynamic and processional terms. Such critical accounts due in various ways acknowledged policy is complex social and shifting. Because of course, we know that there is no such thing as a top down unitary state. We know that linear power flows are antithetical to both the instrumental technical networked realities of contemporary governance structures as well as conceptions of governing practices that regard power is dispersed and subject looks like it's kind of like we all know that now. As it were, you know, policy is understood to evolve as it cascades through diffuse central and local governance structures legislative and judicial machinations influential coalition's networks and stakeholders and it's recognised as emerging out of historic contemporaneous socio cultural, political context and relations. It's regarded as peopled an intersubjective achievement subject to human interpretation and meaning making across central and local state settings and human actors. But at the same time, I would, I would suggest that reactive constructions are really, really stubborn, both in the writing and the kind of hearing of policy, events and matter. Policy phenomena and powers that are associated with this stuff are implicitly and explicitly constructed as a kind of disembodied set of drivers and containers for governing practices and subjects that make things move and happen, right, you know, that question of what makes policy move and in that, and this is again, a kind of Tess Lea’s terminology, phenomena like the state policy and socio political forces become kind of animised, constructed as an abstracted day that assumes monolithic form in positional power, and such construction of sustained singular coherence scalar and detached articulations of governing intervention systems and actors with spatial temporal and material endpoints. And through this, the everyday people in cultured and agentic, making all phenomena like the states and related rationalities, and institutional practices become hidden and concealed and kind of unmoored from their multiple acts of becoming, and these fixing moves engender certainties, and I'm going to come back to that idea of sureties as I get into some of the empirical stuff. These fixing moves engender sureties about what policy phenomena are so what the problem is that requires intervention, for example, and what what power is, as in where it comes from who and what holds it. So powers to both oppress and resist policy at the state tend to be linked to physical sites and peoples in positions of institutional domination or subordination located at the top, the local middle or the grassroots bottom. And these certainties, I think, tend to intensify in times of urgency and crisis, when questions of harm to vulnerable individuals and social groups are at stake. And I think this is just to kind of pause for a second Yeah, I think this is the kind of enduring challenge particularly for social policy, and anybody interested in social policy and welfare? Because although we can say that we're in the, you know, in the present moment, there are this kind of like, endless, endless, endless kind of cascade of crises, seemingly, the subject field has always, to some extent rested on crisis it rested on the crisis of deathly harms of vulnerable lives, of lives at stake, and the certainties, certainties unnecessary. You know, there is a necessity to certainty so I'm not being dismissive of certainties, I guess is what I'm saying. But I am curious about what those certainties do and what they serve, and what they kind of conceal, potentially. And much more prosaically, actually such certainties and not just theoretically problematic. They are also at odds, I think with my own and others and by others, I'm thinking about colleagues that have tended to participate in these events like Shona Hunter, Tess Lea, John Clark, Hanna Hilbrandt, and Anne Marie Fortier. And, of course, Kylie, that uncertainties are not just theoretically problematic. They are at odds with my own and others sense of, of complexity ambivalence, alienation and dislocation when encountering state and policy worlds. So in other words, my commitment isn't just to somehow establish the legitimacy of an abstracted set of theories by proving some kind of practical utility, although, actually, I think there is a bit of that. But rather, it's to demonstrate how ontological commitments to social worlds as unstable, uncertain and incoherent align very much I think, with the everyday realities of state and policy, worlds experience, lived and felt. And that is what I mean, I'm sort of thinking how did today come about how it came about, on a kind of basic level was Kylie did her presentation, and it just prompted so much thinking for me, and this is, I think one of the things that just came through so strongly in Kylie's presentation, on, you know, complex needs and kind of systems as felt, and I'll circle back again. And to that end, I've just started empirical research with policy professionals, where I speak to people working in senior leadership and strategic positions across different briefs. And in that I'm interested to understand people's sense of place and power. And it comes out of sense that even or perhaps more, so as professionals achieve senior leadership and strategic positions, there is a sense that power to generate change to influence to impact is, is consistently elsewhere and over there. Right. And one of the things that the institutional erotics concept helps me to think about is unpicking the relationship of categorization to experience by exploring policy professionals relationship to the variety of objects, their everyday lived, and felt experiences of the matter, and the kind of thickness of policy phenomena. So that idea of the relationship of categorization to categorization of you know, a variety of policy objects to actually how, you know, what is the experience of those things, but also, what's the experience generally, is I think something I'm really curious about. So I wanted to just provide that context. Because it provides a kind of framework, I guess, for where I'm coming from. But also I'll come back to kind of why that context is significant, I think for me to really kind of go through right, so I'm just going to get into now this idea of institutional erotics or what I think that might be right. So when I think about institutional erotics, it starts with something about pleasures, desires, and excitements and it relates to sensation, including the libidinal, I'm referencing there Tess's talk at the March policy ontologies event. That actually wasn't in her talk. It came up in the discussion where test started to talk about the role of the libidinal in policy worlds. So we're talking here about intensity of feeling and deep satisfaction and it is worth saying that none of this is especially so if we think about erotics, if you know, the most important scholar and person the idea of erotics that it provides for me anyway and I'm sure others is Audre Lorde, black feminist scholar, Critical Race scholar, and activist Audre Lorde, who talked about the power of the erotics, but that was in erotics in a liberatory sense, you know, there's nothing particularly liberatory or non liberatory about the erotics that I'm talking about here, but I did just sort of think worth mentioning that. So accounts of policy professionals’ institutionalisation have I think long demonstrated the role of the emotions and feeling deep feeling for what it means to become a policy actor in an everyday practised and constructed sense. So for example, you know, if I reference, one of the people who you know, is consistently present, you know, particularly in my teaching, Michael Lipsky is, you know, becoming what it meant to become a street level bureaucrat is for him a survivalist. And a coping strategy, you know, workers are ground down, they become gatekeepers, and engage in practices of resistance, stereotyping, subversion because of what they must endure. And so this is the, you know, I'm not suggesting that Lipsky kind of understood his work in an affective term or structures of feeling or whatever. But certainly, the emotions are just so kind of prevalent to me whenever I kind of read and reread his work. Elsewhere, there is the argument that people are drawn to positions of institutional domination and the most violent expressions of state power, such as armed forces, policing authorities, and immigration officials and border staff, because of divine desires to inflict harm and cruelty. And this plays out conversely, in motivations for action through love for subordinated us others. And there's a link here to faith based contexts and action on the basis of kinship and family. And I was reminded of this, when I was listening to the radio at the start of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, where a woman based in England explained that she was bypassing usual donation options by large scale charities and organising donations and drop offs direct to Ukraine, because ‘I just had to get involved, I just couldn't just sit here’ right. So that kind of idea of kind of love for the subordinated vulnerable other is also kind of mired in feeling. So the emotions and strength of feeling are central elements to questions of power agency in action, as it relates to what it means to be and behave as an institutional actor. The notion of institutional erotic speaks perhaps to a stronger sense of interpersonal and group dynamics, however, and there is a performative element to this, I think, here about a former neighbour who left her three children at home, police were called the house was broken into the children removed, and in that situation, two huge police rounds and a police car arrive. And this lone woman is arrested and handcuffed in the streets. And I also think about my experiences of accompanying a rough sleeper account one night, and the way that multiple people would surround a lone person sleeping rough. And so what I'm getting at here is this idea of a kind of performative agency, I guess, or a kind of group dynamic, where we see this kind of disproportionate response, or this kind of idea of piling in, in a certain kind of way, which seems to be at the service of many things other than the person whose lives are at stake, I guess. So to reference black feminist psychoanalytic scholar Suriyah Nayak. These are scenes from the drama of everyday practices and Nayak finishes that sentence ‘of imperialism under the lens of the activism of black feminist theory’, and that's something I want to revisit in a bit. So these recollections speak to intensification of response in action in high stakes scenarios, the negligent mother the danger to children the threat to life. The everyday dramas of institutional life are also captured in the sense of pleasurable thrills, so Tess Lea in Bleeding Hearts and Bureaucrats speaks of ‘the bush life he had the urban life, I've tried to have the buzz of putting on prim court shoes to literally step into bureaucracy’. In my interview, last week, Simon, a housing director of one of the largest metropolitan authorities in England, he recounted a formative experience in a review team, which he credits for his now strategic leadership position. In terms of that kind of, well, he described it as a road to Damascus experience, where he kind of had this huge kind of period of learning and personal development. And in this role, he had reviewed decisions around entitlement to housing resources by local authority assessors. So in other words, he was part of a team that was reviewing complaints, essentially, that could potentially overturn decisions made by frontline officers. And he said in this interview, ‘*we loved it, we buzzed off it, and that sounds very geeky, but you know, we loved looking at a particular decision that had been made. Going back to the policy going back to the procedures going back to the quarterly guidance and whatever and unpicking it and trying to work out what the answer was, but on a much more interesting deep level’*, right. So I suppose just broadly, you just for me anyway, you just get this sense of, I suppose not just kind of intensity of feeling. And you know, he's talking about really loving and buzzing off something. But also just this, this sense of and we went back to it in the interview later on, and I asked him to describe it further, but just a sense of a kind of closed room, almost like a police procedural that you might see on the TV. And it's just group of people just picking away at something and just really getting into it. And I'm sort of thinking about what that means at the minute. And I want to link these comments from Simon, I think to another aspect of institutional erotics reflecting on fetishization of process in contemporary policymaking. And this draws on my previous work on the markets of vulnerability, as well as to kylie's talk at the March policy ontologies event ‘Against complexity notes on the policy ontologies of vulnerable clients’. So this, I'm just going to reference that presentation if that's okay, kylie, because it was really, really important for some of my thinking, as I think you'll see in terms of some of the examples I want to get on to next. So within the talk kylie, you're talking about conceptions of the complex client's needs, pathways systems and failures, referencing both clients and practitioners experiences of statutory systems and policy. And bringing up an example of an organization's process map currently challenged the notion of systems as amaze demonstrating that this is completely at odds with the more existential, disorienting, punitive and grinding realities of how these are, these systems are experiences. And I remembered, you know, within the presentation, just looking at this process map. And just this huge sense of an attempt to establish and impose order really, you know, the sense that somebody's in some kind of position of institutional domination or a group of people are, are trying to make sense of, you know, what's going on really, where, and by whom, but also the evidence of kind of pleasures here, you know, the shapes, the crafting the commitment to the thing, the colours, the fonts, the labelling, and sort of thinking what, you know, the, they've always loved, these kinds of things have names, you know, so this is the butterfly model, you know, I think about this model of support called the outcome star, you know, I'm just curious about what this stuff is in the service of really. So I'm just going to change slide again. So I think kylie’s analysis prompted me to kind of go back really to some of my work on new markets of vulnerability in English Housing and Homeless sectors. And I kind of explain this a bit more, but I suppose I'm really trying to kind of think about how this applies to some of the empirical work that I'm doing at the minute but also how it's going to start to seep back and hook into some of the more theoretical work that I've talked about already. Anyway. So when I was talking about new markets of vulnerability in this particular paper, the 2019 paper that I wrote, I thought about the rise of complex needs talk, conceiving of it as a travelling concept hooking into and resting in models of intervention and thought leadership. So complex needs talk regards people their problems and needs as messy multi layered and hard to define, but also notable, transformable potentially or actually, by the right type of intervention, institutional culture and orientation and practical actions. And I thought that this intractability versus surety dynamic was especially interesting in the context of increasingly dislocating and fragmented institutional realities, courtesy of for example, austerity, and subsequent competition for resources within a historically under resourced and highly disparate sector comprising major organisational players operating at a national level, alongside local and community based offers. But beyond those discursive and material realities. The new markets of vulnerability concept was also concerned with capturing a sense of new sets of norms, rules, practices, and organisational forms, specifically an enterprising drive and surety around developing and delivering interventions that the state can't do. Emotions are central to these dynamics insofar as such interventions are cast in positive, enthusiastic, excited, desirous, hopeful terms. They are in Janet Newman's argument ‘affective repertoires’ regarding an evolved sense of what it means to be a practitioner. Go and work in contemporary institutional settings. And this concept is reflected in the rise and articulations of new models of support such as psychologically informed environments, and related frameworks, like trauma informed care. And I touched briefly in the paper on consultancy, training and thought leadership and public service reform. But I want to spend a bit more time on this today because it relates to the substantive utility of process and this idea of fetishizing process for what it is that I'm thinking about today. So by consultancy, training, and thought leadership, and referencing here non statutory actors and entities primarily associated with contemporary policymaking that demonstrate commitments to public sector reform via a focus on digital and design systems and processes. These entities are based in the UK right, these examples that I'm bringing up here, but they have significant links to other locations in the global western North, particularly North America and Australia and not just in terms of allied organizations but also financial backing. So we've got here some examples. Policy Lab came about in the early 2010s. And as a government department linked to the rise in social investment businesses, Nesta TPX impact and snuck on nonprofit entities that evolved out of a similar era. And their strap lines I think just contain really striking similarities create change by effective systems design, adopt a human centred orientation generally meaning putting users and people with experiences of systems front and centre when crafting improvements, harness approaches that cultivate and capitalise on behaviour change and that perhaps links to the you know, the concept neuroliberalism, which has been extended by various people, including the person I tend to think of is Jessica Pykett and colleagues. And through these approaches, effective solutions are found to intractable social and institutional problems. So, what we see is that in a move away from kind of the modernised institution via audit methods, so the kind of traditional target approach, I suppose the goal here within these organisations seems to be something about culture change via softer methods, put the right people in the right places with the right attitudes, as expressed through here collaborates systems activist and year his social entrepreneur. So Collaborate, States Of Change and Year Here are all organisations that are involved in different ways in consultancy, but more significantly around training and training policy professionals, as they actually are all training would be policy professionals. And I think that this you know, particularly if I look at the Collaborate’s director, whose name I can't quite remember at the minute, writes this article on the seven shifts of the systems activist. So the move away from organisations to outcomes management to mobilization, me to we, expert to explorer, delivery to cocreation, expectations to agency, head to heart, you know, I suppose that just kind of hooking back into the institutional erotics idea, there's just this kind of sense of feeling or emotions or intensity of feeling of being at the heart of this. And then we get to a Year Here. Year Here just for context, is a year long programme, which is based around social entrepreneurship. It is kind of modelled or branded, I guess, as a kind of postgraduate qualification, but it doesn't have any accreditation and it is free. Okay, so people have to support themselves through the programme and they need to be London based, but they don't pay to join the programme. It is there is a competitive application process to do that, however. This is the kind of key straplines ‘We recruit people who are driven to tackle society's toughest problems. They learn from people hit hard by inequality in care homes, hostels in new services across London, and with this hindsight in support of our faculty, they build solutions that are creative and robust’. So how the programme works is that people who sign up to be a part of the programme undergo various forms of kind of training with people who are involved in social entrepreneurships. But a primary aspect of the year, the Year Here is that people will be placed right they will have a placement in In places as diverse as say, a GP surgery or a hostel, or a youth service or a care home for example, and the idea is that as people exist within those placements, they will identify problems that require solutions and come up with potential kind of models or social entrepreneur ventures that may be useful for tackling those now I want to kind of get into your hear a little bit more because I find it both kind of fascinating and a little bit disturbing as well. And I'm going to take the time to play two clips if that's okay so these last about kind of 10 minutes each if there's any issues with sound quality let me know but I'll start here. [PLAYS CLIP] So that was just a bit of an intro, which I think kind of highlights some kind of interesting dynamics, but I'm going say they get more intense now. So this is where we get into what are called the Fellow stories. So are they this isn't a university there's a lot of kind of university language this is a faculty there are fellows right. So let's hear from them. [PLAYS CLIP] Okay, so I think that, you know, there's a lot that can, there's a lot that can be said to think about these clips. There's a lot in there. But just really broadly, you know, there is this sense that this is business, but it's not business, right. It's about addressing things that matter getting involved being hands on problem solving, it resonates I think, with other practice based programmes as rising numbers of Fast Track programmes in England for social workers, police officers and teachers, I've got them here Teach First Police Now Frontline where there is a strong appeal to do something rather than not doing something and the idea that stasis and failure is really linked to traditional to use the words in the clip forms of politics, but also activism, right? So is the idea that even like activism, protests, it's, again, in quotation marks, traditional forms, that is somehow old, like old news, or it doesn't do something. And in that sense, traditional responses, as they're framed here is seen as failing, the state can't do it. universities don't cut it. traditional forms of protest, don't cut it. So yeah, here in particular, prides itself on explicitly rejecting opportunities for its courses to achieve a quantitative status asking, you know, why pay for this stuff, you don't need to pay for it, you can just get out there and do it. I mean, it's sort of like, as I was listening to it, it really reminded me of the kind of, you know, the kind of Chicago school thing, you know, the kind of early 19th century just get out there, you know, what are we all doing in the classroom. So, one way of looking at these developments is to regard them as social work scholar Joe Hanley has as the latest iteration of governance networks, constellations of actors and entities that generate concentrations of power and influence through their relationship to the state. So I don't know if anybody's seen Joe Hanley and colleagues, Hanley is based at Brunel University, and he's a social work scholar. And he and his colleagues have done this incredible mapping exercise. It's a visual exercise, and maybe I'll bring it up if we get into it in the talk, where they've mapped these different kind of networks of power, naming individuals and entities and their linkages to each other to assess, you know, how this kind of how you have these constellations of power and influence that start to affect governance processes and have quite a high impact on policymaking processes. And to that end, Hanley and his colleagues, excellent work has mapped these networks and associated capital. map these networks and associated capital flows to US corporations and the Big Five consultancy groups. And using this to think about into the institutional erotics concept. The emphasis on processes is for me really interesting in terms of visuals, the amount of post-it shots, it just ubiquitous, there's just endless amounts of colourful post-its that these people are working with. And I think of course, you know, it may be easy to say because the material makes it easy to say but you know, there is a sense of an apolitical and superficial quality to the whole thing, operating as it does at the level of epistemic. Resolve a policy problem as it is presented with an apparent absence of the political and while there are bold claims to what innovation and business but not business can achieve the effects oddly piecemeal and fragmented focusing on particular interventions in specific locales here and there. So if I kind of go back here, like it's optimising boilers using AI for social impact free school meals, demand for heat pumps, building payments. I mean, there's, it's not that none of this like, doesn't matter. But the idea that, you know, this is really doing something in this kind of really grand impactful way just feels really at odds when you start to look at the actual projects that that people are doing, which are also in train already, like so either. For example, the rise of the digital, for example, has been part of National Health Policy for a good decade now. But it's the idea of newness, I think that you get from these kinds of interventions. Yeah, so there's that idea of, of just, it just feeling really oddly piecemeal and fragmented when you start to look at it anyway. But of course, none of this is apolitical, you know. And there are elements I think of the treatment industrial complex in play, where in global national and private corporate interests and associated capital flows, again, referencing Joe Hanley and colleagues work on networks in mesh with the vicarious indulgence of racialized, gendered and class professionals. And, you know, interestingly, when you start to look at the empirical work around, for example, those these kind of placement based Fast Track streams, they've demonstrated that dropout rates from practice based policing, teaching and social work fast track streams are really high once people get into the workforce and everyday practice, while noting that this in itself is often not actually considered necessarily problematic by the architects of such programmes, if the goal is just to develop a cadre of leaders with the right performance capacities and orientations. But there is a sense, I guess, of new frontiers in the contemporary metropole. And of course, this is nothing new, really, the historic relationship between social policy and welfare empire and racism is well documented, most significantly in social policy in welfare debates by Fiona Williams's seminal critical social policy, the birth of the welfare state or other its blueprints are mired and imperialism and industrial revolution in meshing conceptions of human condition and productivity, birth of new professions and knowledge claims, things that feel pretty present actually, within these clips. So what I think I'm going to do is I feel like I've talked for really a long time now. But I, so I'm just kind of kind of rounding up because I could talk for much longer, but I won't. And I'll just round up by talking about what it is that I'm why I go back to sort of talking about the structure of the talk really, why I started with this kind of theoretical grounding, and then moved into kind of describing some dynamics that I think I'm I feel like I see. I think one of the things that I'm thinking about is the way that once we tend to get into discussions of the empirical and in particularly once we start to get into discussions about things that are particularly intense in terms of the feelings that they demonstrate, but also the feelings that they provoke, you know, it took me a good week of looking at those clips to calm down, because I found them so provocative, in terms of what they were saying and doing, you know, you it becomes quite tricky, I think, to hold in frame, this idea of some of the ideas I was talking about at the outset. So in a sense, my question is, you know, how do we you how do we harness or how do we look at these dynamics, usefully? Right. And by usefully, I mean, in a way that enables us to understand the bigger kind of, bigger things that are going on. And by bigger things, I suppose what I mean, for me is the way that emotions are constitutive of state structures, institutional space, and how the emotions and how the emotions as I understand them, through this kind of institutional erotics idea can be used to think about those ideas of enactment and state enactment and the enactment of policy phenomenon more generally. And I have done that in some of my previous work a bit. And that's what I'm looking to extend now. So perhaps, as we get into maybe some of the chat that will come through but I think it might be good to stop now rather than really going into the weeds of that because otherwise I will just keep talking for another half an hour!