

Indigenous Settler Relations Collaboration critical public conversation series No. 2

SANA: Hello, and thanks for joining us today in what is the second of the Indigenous Settler Relations Collaboration critical public conversation series for Semester 2, 2020. I'm Sana Nakata and before I introduce today's guest, I'd like to invite Uncle Dave Wandin to open for us.

[Welcome from Uncle Dave]

SANA: Thank you. It is my great pleasure today to introduce our guest. Someone who is before and above other things my dad. Professor Martin Nakata, for whom there are too many accolades to mention. Including that he was the first Torres Strait Islander to receive a PhD. But I think that the greater accomplishment is in the fact that he made sure that he would not be the last and that many more have and will continue to follow in those footsteps. He has over 100 journal articles and book chapters and a number of books. Today, I'm using one of them as a jumping off point.

Savaging the Disciplines was written at our dining room table. It is for me not just a text, but a memory. Contained within it is both an accounting of a past about how Torres Strait Islanders were known by those who came to study us. But also, a set of claims that reach out towards futures that have always been and always will be of our own making. Dad, one of the significant contributions



of this book was focussed on revealing how Islanders came to be known by a range of disciplining practices at the heart of the western academy. Your book attends to linguistics, psychological, physiological and anthropological inscriptions in turn. I want to focus on how you've responded to it in your work, not just the book, but your broader career. I want us to unpack the savaging in the savaging of disciplines you have sought to achieve. My first question is: When you wrote this book, what aspirations did you hold for how it might impact and shape the western disciplines?

MARTIN: It was a very tedious bit of work that happened over quite a long period of time. I'd gone through a journey of trying to understand how western teaching practices worked. I quickly moved on to trying to understand what western philosophy and western theories were about that were being recruited to the conversations that we're having about Indigenous people. Particularly Indigenous people in education, for me. I got tangled up in other kinds of narratives about who we are. That was confusing, how we can actually discuss both practice in the classroom towards the theorisation of who we are as Colonial subjects. We have to first understand how we've become preoccupied into a conversation and a narrative of sorts that really wasn't about us. The other part of that was, how does this work in the western knowledge production process? How do we rescue people from their own context and transcribe that? In that process, I learnt about how the different disciplines worked to assign a very different status in history for us. How that happens in psychology, how that happens in linguistics, how that happens in anthropology. How that happens in archaeological analyses and so on. I wanted to transcribe that into a form that the academics who reside in western



disciplines, to provide them a view to how their own practices, their own systems of thought prescribe the engagements about everything Indigenous.

And in compiling the book, I was trying to show evidence about how that actually works in various disciplines. So, they can see there's a constant way of actually doing the inscription of people of difference into whatever the discipline was. In building a body of knowledge about Indigenous Australians, but how that goes on not to serve our interest. By showing how the makings of Indigenous people as subject and object of western disciplines, they may then begin to understand that they have very much a role in sustaining an infrastructure that continues to subjugate the knowledges of Indigenous people.

My hope really for this book was for people to have early conversations, the first conversations and reflecting about how do we do this? How have we done this? Can we look to history to learn more about how we've done this? We end up with positionalities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in the country at the moment. We have ludicrous things like we have to go and fight for our native title in a western court. Why? Shouldn't be the white people be in the Indigenous court justifying the pillage of our land here? There's a lot of stuff that confuses the everyday conversation and the article this week about the medical profession and the medical research world only having a body of knowledge on the ailments of skin diseases of white people's skin. It's such a new thing now and a revelation to us to see a book about black skin that might inform how to treat black people. Why is it that in the 21st century we're here being surprised by this? This was hopefully to show some of the natures that



western academics and western scholarship has actually forsaken a lot of other conversations that are quite important to the ways we might discuss the contemporary experiences of Indigenous people. That was my hope for the book. I'm hoping it has started some of those early conversations.

SANA: Thanks so much for talking through that. I think where it leads today is, we have started having those conversations. There is, for my generation, more awareness, a greater understanding of the ways in which western knowledge systems have produced these entrenched binaries and dichotomous characterisations of the Indigenous and non-Indigenous. I think part of what we grapple with today is the tensions that come from having to live in those entanglements, and the choices that we're presented with in whether it's possible to disentangle ourselves entirely and walk away to a life uncomplicated by western knowledge about us. Or, the extent to which we stay in those entanglements to really tease out their power and produce something new from it.

So, there's a question in that, but what I'm going to do is show you a photograph. Perhaps you haven't seen it for a little while, and while and put some of your words back to you so we can unpack the complexity of these entanglements more. This is what happens when we share screens, I lose track of things. Sorry. I want to read a quote here before I throw this up.

You wrote in 1993 when I was a child that, "To pursue mainstream education at a level that is enjoyed by other countries is always posited as at the expense of our culture and to pursue our culture is at the expense of making sense of a



mainstream education." I think that expresses the kind of entanglement and that kind of bind that we're still grappling with today. And you write that yes, perhaps as parents we are neglecting the cultural education of our girls. You were writing about Lucy and I and you wrote that they will:

"Always without question be perceived as girls of colour and to contend with this I feel as my father and grandfather and great grandfather what they need most is an understanding of the political nature of their position and that requires a language and the knowledge of how positioning is effected in the mainstream world."

I want to use it as a way to have a conversation with you about what entanglements have been produced about the lives of Islanders as real material things, and the binds that Islanders are constantly called to speak back against in the academy.

MARTIN: It's a very difficult situation and it's just not for all Islanders. It's for all Indigenous people in the world really and for colleagues here in Australia, it's quite a dilemma for us to be a partner in contemporary society where a whole body of knowledge has been created about us and those conversations that come to us set us up for these simple juxtapositions between culture or not culture, education, not education. Us/them, Colonial and colonised and so on. These have filtered through to even our own conversations amongst Indigenous colleagues about what to do. Not all of us have investigated where those conversations come from. That provides a dilemma, because we can't progress our own conversations without getting caught up in lesser narratives



that provide us the opportunities. The subject and object of their broader narratives to be always considerate of each other as “others”. But we’re not “others” in our narrative. We’re at the centre of our universe and it’s those conversations that we all aspire to having again so that we can make meaning in our own context, and not having to be surrendering all of what we know for thousands of years to be only conversing about ourselves as the “other” of the Colonial centre.

Some of these conversations have been not helpful in the way that we can untangle ourselves, because one of the lures of the western conversation in the “us” and “them” narrative is that if you break away from that narrative then you essentially become a traitor to that narrative. For those who want to go the structuralist dimension of a nation-state theory that positions the white Colonialists against the Indigenous people, see us in a narrative that’s constantly about overthrowing the nation-states. So that we can have a place that is ours, and that is a very simple proposition that doesn’t really provide us real options. The expectations in those propositions is for us to actually overthrow the states for the whitefellas to get in their dinghies and row back to England. As much as we’d like that, that’s highly unlikely that would happen. I could not sit around waiting for them to row back to their country. I had to work out a way to try and untangle ourselves from those narratives.

That journey to exploring other ways of thinking about our predicament was a removal from the “us” and “them” narrative. You get that position of; you’re moving off and not really doing the Indigenous resistance position here. That’s a bit sad, because we’ve used that Indigenous resistance position for such a



long time now and we still get no movement in the improvement of our opportunities, our education and health and so on. For me, in the early days as a PhD student I had the luxury to go and explore other things and other ways of configuring understandings of the Colonial predicament and to be questioning everything as I go into that. In that process learnt there are other ways to actually engage in the predicament that is much more about a future that we can actually change. Not some promise about rowing back to England, but some change that we can affect in the contemporary world, in the everyday world, in the world of tomorrow.

Those kinds of opportunities to move beyond has been difficult. It's been seen as moving away from the mainstream Indigenous scholarship. But there beyond that, was a real opportunity for understanding how our predicament forms in the contemporary world so that we can then address it in a much more immediate fashion. And therefore, get some resolve for our people today. Not people a few generations in the future. To some, it's been called as an abandonment of the Indigenous agenda. But I'm hoping that there's an understanding that this has been a journey to find other ways. Rethinking and not buying into western narratives about Colonial predicaments and to be asking ourselves how to make space, so that we can talk about our predicament in the ways that doesn't have this obscure loyalty to western tradition. That's been this obscure loyalty to western tradition.

We've developed a theory round this. We've taken the theory. We practiced it in different research projects to deal with studies of anger and men in prison. We've done that with the way that we've rethought how to teach Indigenous



studies and how to redesign curriculum that works on our narratives. So, we've been practicing that for the last 15 years to try and see what we can manifest. In ways to start the journey to disentangle ourselves first from this apparatus. But then, how do we then start to dismantle and start to savage that apparatus? We're on a journey of sorts. We've got a case studies to show that there are benefits in moving away from the typical us – them narrative and to mount things on Indigenous standpoints. Those standpoints are more akin to the way we're positioned in this predicament. That has led to us trying to explore other ways of rethinking the contemporary world. Hopefully there are a few more studies using this position that builds a body of knowledge and we have a reference point for the next generations to view and advance the kind of conversations we need to have. So that it emanates a situation of sort, where we can get the more direct benefits from engagement, rather than the promise of a distant future where all the whitefellas are in the dinghy rowing back to England.

SANA: Thanks for that. This is how I've come to appreciate your work and your description I guess of the cultural interface as a whole. And this idea that western and Indigenous knowledge and lives are brought into this interface and that knowledge is produced in that space rather than produced in these "us" and "them" dichotomies. That is not to say that there aren't different kinds that can sit apart. But the Colonial predicament as you've articulated it in your work and what I hear in how you've posed that to us today, is that the Colonial predicament is one that sees these knowledge systems coming into relation with one another in really complex, unequal ways that carry harms and risks. But that also, there is agency and Indigenous standpoints in that space from



which we can pivot in different directions to redirect or redefine the kinds of priorities and intellectual interests and political agendas for ourselves. I would push a little bit on that and ask, are there examples that you'd like to talk about, about where that's been done in particular projects? What kind of effects on how we understand western knowledge itself?

MARTIN: A few examples come to mind. The study we did with Indigenous men about anger. We worked with men in prisons and men who have left prisons. My colleagues who were in clinical psych and forensic psych. Essentially our research team was at an Indigenous standpoint and psych coming together. In the meeting place of the two disciplines, we kind of realised that some limitations in psychology. Psychology propositions, anger is a manifestation in *here* [points to head]. Whereas with the cultural interface theories, I propose that it needed to include something beyond the individual, as well. Something that incorporates the individual in a particular environment and that anger is a manifestation of you in a particular environment rather than it sits here [points to head]. The psych guys were very keen to understand, because with this proposition of this anger in your head, it goes on then to inform rehabilitation programs. These rehabilitation programs are essentially about fixing the head. They know from many, many years or decades of applying anger management programs, the men told us in the study it just makes them more angry. Because it's confusing, how are they going to fix *this* [points to head]? They've been asked to fix it, but how do you fix it? Anger as a manifestation of you in a social environment brings a whole lot of dimensions and conversations about how that happens. What are your thoughts about that? How do you respond to that? How have you responded to that? In the nubs of the understandings of



anger, men have a lot of strategies. Those strategies weren't informing the rehabilitation program. Fundamentally, the psych guys wrote an article subsequent to that to say how pathetic this makes psychology look.

I mentioned earlier about the new book in the medical studies for black skin. We've only just realised that study of skin is only white skin? That's ludicrous. Same as a study on Indigenous academic persistence. It was always about, let's make the curriculum more relevant to these kids. Let's make the teaching more relevant to the kids. In trying to get congruous between the home and the school we've been preoccupied with a lot of measures about how to fix things. But not much of that research actually positions that Indigenous people are also learners and they need learning capacities built. So, we actually then went to study how does learning and how learners develop. We studied and learnt a whole lot of stuff about how Indigenous people do learn and how they actually build their capacities. That now informs the kind of services that we have in our universities today. I've run two case studies at a G8 university and now in a regional university. By focusing on them as learners not as culturally different, we've now assembled all this work to be able to say, how do we support and develop them as learners?

Here at James Cook University we've more than doubled the numbers of graduates that JCU has in one year. We've gone from a very small number now to quite a huge number. Last December, we graduated 142 Indigenous students. That's remarkable in such a short period. If you can take a theory and work it away from the simple black-white or us and them, and look at the complexity of the people's experience learning, you find all these strategies of



how Indigenous people are, they have agency. They are having engagements that are productive. There are lessons for us to learn about, and how do we build that into a learning support agenda that helps and scaffolds underneath them so they develop capacities necessary to function in courses? When you do it, you get results. It's not magic. It's actually just shifting the weight and surrendering loyalties to a western black-white narrative to look at everyday complexities of the cultural interfaces. Then, open up the parameters wide enough to understand all the experiences. Not a universal experience of black-white. But in that set of the experience there's agencies, there's hope, there's aspiration, there's strategy, there's resistance. There's everything you need and if you learn more about that and build more content around that, then you have a lot more to talk about in terms of how you might improve the process. These examples of how you take the cultural theory beyond the loyalties we have to structural theories and they're the kinds of things that you can get passage with that go on to then benefit our own communities. For me, the lessons over the years is the clarity that brought. We are not here for anything else, but to help benefits for our community and making a difference in someone's life.

SANA: That's great. One of the things that always strikes me – and I was thinking about as you were speaking of those examples, both in psychology and education – is that in a lot of ways Colonial power didn't just bring about a dichotomy between the Indigenous and the non-Indigenous. It brought about – European modernity brought across dichotomy across all facets. Dichotomies between the mind and the body, between the land and the human. In a lot of ways I've come to understand the field of Indigenous studies I guess less as a



disciplinary practice in itself and as more a space where Indigenous scholars have been able to produce these kinds of more complex spaces and interfaces through which – speak back into the disciplines to reveal some of shortcomings and risks of a western knowledge system that we presume to be neutral and somehow universalising. Whereas, that’s not the case in a whole range of different dimensions of human life. Is that how you see it? Is my read to the broader academy a useful one?

MARTIN: We’ve worked very hard in the Indigenous studies to bring new scholarship to the area. It largely has been a manifestation of the same conversations. We’re totally preoccupied with critiques of the western disciplines and the western researchers and so much western content has been delivered. That’s great and it serves a particular purpose and that’s fantastic. But we’re always looking backwards. We’re always looking to what’s been created in the past. What we’ve chosen to do in our Indigenous studies program is to take that knowledge and then to say, what do we do with it now? How do we teach the workings of those studies of Indigenous people in the past? How do we use the knowledge of how this one works to ascribe into the positions I’ve made to you? Not necessarily react to the concept narrative, but what is it in the knowledge production process that allows us to create something that’s alien and then for the broader community accept that that’s who we are? Those workings of knowledge is an area that is well written by western scholars that looks at not just the knowledge production process, but the systems of thinking that have been inherited in the way it manifests its knowledge. The philosophies that come with that, that informs truths and so on. There are mythologies as well that also play a role in how we create



knowledge about each other. There's a whole apparatus in there that sits behind silently this ongoing production of engagement, that sits in the space. That continually feeds this kind of scholarship that we've got now, which is just speaking back to the past. Whereas what we've done is we've taken that apparatus to say, you're the thing that we need to study. Because that is the thing that sits behind all of our conversation today and narrows down the kind of conversations and innovations that we could have that would benefit Indigenous people.

Our Indigenous studies program here at James Cook is to really try to give an education to our new graduates that highlights this whole process. In history, and how it then comes to inform practice, and how now what we can do with it. So, the last capstone if you like subject that we have is teaching kids how to navigate the boundaries. Normally in Indigenous studies programs, you don't necessarily have that kind of orientation to a particular subject that you could teach in your course. It's always a kind of pitch battle against the nation-state. We put so much energy into that space and to a state that will hardly reform to benefit us. But now we can create scholars who are coming out who understands what the State sits upon and this apparatus of knowledge can be dismantled and it can be repositioned. We can be repositioned in that, but we have to have the encourage to be able to go off and explore that. What we're trying to do with our Indigenous studies program is to skill up a tsunami of scholars who can come back and engage in that process so we can create new bodies of knowledge, and new points of reference for projecting out different agendas.



SANA: I think it's one of the things I'm most alive to at the moment is the increase in interest often from a good place to include and ensure that Indigenous peoples and perspectives are being represented across a range of curricula and disciplines. But it feels like there's a big risk in stepping into those movements without a more critical position from which to ask, why do the disciplines, and why is that work around curriculum development sought now? And, what are the risks of not doing it well, in terms of reinscribing these dichotomies and power relations for another generation? That leads me to our last question. We began with your sort of aspirations around what you intended with writing that book. I was going to end by asking when you're going to retire, which is a joke and me being typically facetious, but also a question of saying how much of those aspirations do you feel have been realised? What do you think is going to be left for the generations that follow you to still do?

MARTIN: I most certainly will retire, because I want to be a grandfather full-time, but I do hope for your generation and the other generations to be doing the kind of work that we've started so we can create this other corpus that provides the subsequent generations other reference points to start to project out very different agendas on behalf of Indigenous people. We can't continually reference the body of knowledge that we're critiquing. By staying and continuing with the tradition of us and them, that is the risk of staying there. The risk is that we won't really have to make the systematic changes we need in Indigenous communities. Because we've done that, we know what it delivers and the risk is really there. The risk is there, because you're not moving off to other ways of thinking about things. I know the younger



generation people are much more smarter than I am. To be able to be dexterous to shunt between these kinds of emerging bodies of knowledge and the existing corpus. They could probably do a lot better job in straddling that position, and talking into and talking about the kinds of awareness about what is going on in the everyday. That awareness is an important step in the journey to consolidate a very different scholarship down the track. But we're still in the baby steps. What I've done over the past years, it's really the emerging kind of steps. We've got to be patient to not just take the journey, but to project out a kind of positive thesis that eventually will shift the fundamentals between the positionality in the narrative of "us" and "them". "Them" is always on top. "Us" is here. That position is really the one that's not explored. The "us" and "them", we've battled that out to death and we don't win. Once we've changed the position, then we will begin to see the different narratives emerging based on a different kind of reference point. At that point we'll start to manifest the kind of agendas that would be more satisfying to Indigenous Australians. At the moment we're running on that narrative and that's not going to serve anybody's purpose other than the colonial settlers.

SANA: I think it allows us to think really urgently about what the task of savaging the disciplines are and what work needs to sit behind that. I feel a lot of responsibility to carry this critical work forward in a way that also begins, also allows non-Indigenous academics to see the ways in which they are implicated in this field of relations in this interface of knowledge production. Whether they choose to engage explicitly with Indigenous peoples or not. Because even in choosing or deciding that Indigenous peoples and issues are not part of the landscape of their disciplinary knowledge, they are sustaining



these categorisations put in place in the 19th century. There's so much that we have to continue to work towards. I'm also mindful – I have lots of other questions, we didn't get through everything we said we were going to – but I am mindful of time. I'll just ask anyone who's watching today who has questions, or would like particular threads extended upon a little bit, please feel welcome to drop them in the Q&A. I will navigate them as I can. I will also, while people are thinking about that, reflect a little bit about the kinds of tensions that even that produces. The tensions about how to make non-Indigenous academics more aware of how their practices themselves are implicated in and have been embedded in these historical relations of knowledge about Indigenous peoples. And of wanting to create this as a landscape in which all academics in university have a responsibility to attend to. With the kind of anxiety that it can be done badly. I wonder if you have any thoughts on how you've navigated that in your career.

MARTIN: There's always a bit of anxiety when you start to come across a situation where you have to question your discipline, your practice, your knowledge. Indigenous people have had to do that, so it shouldn't be too hard for our western colleagues. The important thing is to try and facilitate the conversations like we're having now, so that it is open for western colleagues to come in and participate in the ways that we want. The important thing to understand is what we've learnt about this body of knowledge that marginalise us so badly, it's going to take a lot of people and a lot of work to untangle ourselves from this. That will have to be from us as Indigenous scholars in the region. But it will also take our non-Indigenous colleagues working from the inside out. That's really important. That's not to go out and bag western



science per se, because you will lose your way. You will lose the agenda of what we're really trying to pursue. What we're trying to do is to develop understandings of how it works. How it's worked from the inside and how we see it working from the outside. Together, if we're able to overcome our discomfort, we might be able to manifest the kind of energy levels and the focus so that we can actually get on top of this. Because we have to share the binary relations between the pair in shifting towards ones that are more centred on Indigenous people. And as the first people of this country and we've already begun that journey. Now we have to do that, the way that the practice will shift is to challenge the apparatus that sits behind. That apparatus is the one that you and I are loyal to. We have to raise the problematic in that and we have to teach our students the everyday world is problematic, because it is informed by the very kinds of things that we are dear to and have an obscure loyalty to. Yet, it manifests the disposition to have the argument about who can and who can't. That should give us more reason to work together to try to dismantle ourselves from an apparatus that is present constantly in our lives and our logic and our reason. That serves us, particularly those Indigenous people, no benefit. We're tired of being patronised in our country. We're tired of being classed as welfare dependent. No Indigenous person want to be dependent, least of all on whitefellas. We're proud people and we want to have the dignity and the stature of an individual that everybody else enjoys. There's no fun in being a marginalised group of people in Australia. We don't wish that on anybody. So how about we roll up our sleeves, we take some risks and we get in there and see if we can work this out. Standing off is not going to help anybody.



SANA: That's great. I've got lots of questions coming through now and to all of our audience members, thank you. I will not have a chance to get to put them all. I've got time for a couple and I think one of them is for me. One question I'd ask dad is, what has been the response – you've worked in a number of different academic institutions – what's the institutional response been to undertaking this kind of work?

MARTIN: Very slow. That's why we can't wait for the universities to do this. Us as individual scholars have to step up and take the risk and be different in our scholarship. There's a lot of opportunities for new scholarship. We should be excited about going into this challenge, not go in there with fear. We should be really excited we can emerge other ways of thinking about anger. Other ways of thinking about education. Other ways of thinking about people's rights to their land on this continent. There's a whole lot of richness here that we've yet to explore. I guess the simple message is we've been so loyal to 200 years of history being written about us. Now is the time to actually be part of an agenda to rewrite a different body of knowledge that positions us very differently in the conversation.

SANA: I'm also being asked from some of our audience members about how I've navigated this as someone who has come through and studied western political theory and how that shapes my engagement with Indigenous knowledges in the academy. Before I answer that question myself, what do you think of it, dad?

MARTIN: Say that again.



SANA: What do you think of me as your daughter majoring in political science and studying western political thought?

MARTIN: More than pleased. Because as true to my positive thesis, we have to learn about how we're positioned in the world. I'm really grateful you took that opportunity to understand the political systems that continually position us in the everyday. Very proud of you in finding ways to maintain yourself in that process. As the quote that you put up, I wrote that when you were 10 years old. That is the project. We need ourselves and our children to understand how we are positioned in the world so that we can better defend ourselves against it. So, by you going into doing an arts-law degree with a major in American history, I was more than proud of your boldness to get outside of Australian history and understanding of the system. That has served you well in terms of how you now come back into the space so that you're better armed with more knowledge about how the institutions that sit behind and what their role is in all of this. I'm so pleased that you're teaching this to new undergraduate students and the research students, because you probably are aware that the journey has already started for you as it did for me. I'm hoping that it will start with others. That we start going out and engaging with this stuff. Not to just tear it down, but actually study its workings so we can better position a generation of people defending themselves and maintaining themselves in spite of it.

SANA: Yes. I think that's how I have tried to navigate it. There are some people listening who are confused about the American history major, but for those who don't know, my major was in American studies and it happened to



constitute a politics major which is what I ended up furthering my studies on. But I think that's right. My interest in western political thought has always been driven and motivated by the experience of being an Islander, living on the mainland. Not being an Islander living up in the Torres Straits where you grew up. But being an Islander who had to navigate other people's country who had to live on other people's land that had been stolen in a very present and ongoing day-to-day, where I'm encountering the colonial system and racism on a day-to-day basis. An experience that both took me away from those kinds of more traditional Indigenous knowledge practices and forms, but not one that ever made me less of an Islander. Just one that made me an Islander who had a different experience and a different environment around me that I had to navigate. For myself, the study of politics has been a really interesting discipline that attends to power as its central preoccupation. Being an Islander studying within that discipline lends itself to very different kinds of analysis than other non-Indigenous peoples might be inclined to provide.

MARTIN: I'm very, very proud of you, but I'm also very proud of the generations coming through now. They are much more astute than we ever were. They are much smarter than we ever were. I have a lot of hope going into the future with the young ones coming through. We've just opened up the gate and we've just started to fracture the discourses, so we can have a bit of space to have these conversations. I want to thank you and your colleagues at the University of Melbourne for inviting me here today. It's a conversation I'm hoping that we'll have lots more of.



SANA: Thank you so much. To everyone whose questions we didn't get to, we will take those questions offline and where possible, dad and I will take a little bit of time to see if we can offer a written response or record some short responses. Please don't think you've been ignored. We are fresh out of time. It is 1pm. Thank you very much Professor for your time. Have a good afternoon everyone. Thank you.