

## Negotiating Space in Culture and Technology. Interview with Ruth Catlow and Marc Garrett

<http://creatingcommons.zhdk.ch/negotiating-space-in-culture-and-technology/>

- RC: 00:42 Furtherfield is an artists led organization, community platform, that asks critical questions about art and technology and addresses today's important questions through exhibitions, labs and debates across many platforms and spaces.
- MG: 01:03 There's a few reasons why we started. One of them was that we felt at the time as artists that the narrative of art culture was being stolen by kinds of groups like Saatchi and Saatchi, where a bit like a kind of premier league, a new premier league was being created of artists being kind of cherry picked to represent a kind of market pulled economy, which really wasn't about the art culture or the ideas. It was very much about producing individualist artists that reflected kind of corporate identity and that kind of isolated lots of different artists at that time. Especially artists that are dealing with, say, poll tax, issues on poll tax, the time that needed artists to reflect that in their culture and also come from kind of punk culture as well. So before then, you know, pop and post punk culture where you create your own pirate radio station, your own television station, your own kind of art context on your own terms, where it does, where it's kind of not, where you're not being given the canon, so to speak, of what art should be, where you create the canon in a much more grass-root level.
- 02:35 **"the role of technology"** (subtitle)
- RC: 02:40 So, then in 96, we started to build our first webpages, like taught ourselves how to do it at Backspace.
- MG: 02:51 At that time we had our Furtherfield community website, it was actually based on the backspace server itself. And then we shared the server with, that was run by Ivan Pope, with irrational.org and in a sense that we're all negotiating place through technology as well as place within kind of culture. So, and that was what was quite interesting, you know, cause then you had, in a way, backspace was a very influential kind of

community, kind of lab that we all went to and shared ideas together. Then Furtherfield was kind of deciding to not copy it, but kind of create its own example of that as well, because it felt such a very promising kind of idea.

- RC: 03:52 So, but kind of really starting to understand the possibilities for a platform that connected people across distance and difference, and that anyone could publish to, and to start to work with artists, techies and activists around the world to kind of create spaces that created our own context. And that allowed us to kind of build our own social relations, and to start to explore that both as an artistic medium but also as a medium for kind of review and critique, in a network of peers. The quality of technology that was most important was the fact that it allowed us to improvise different kinds of gathering spaces. And I think that's remained a really important.
- MG: 04:42 Yeah, and the key is platforms.
- RC: 04:44 Yes.
- MG: 04:45 Infrastructures and networks.
- RC: 04:47 Yeah. So kind of infrastructures for resistance and you know, taking a kind of critical look at how you can work with these things to kind of, yeah, to change the things that get seen, the things that get talked about and the way they get talked about. So let's be specific, really we talk about the web. I think it's, it was kind of about the impact of the web, for me it was the kind of big thing that just changed my idea of what art was and could be. And it's never really returned, you know, it changed it permanently, with this idea that you could create work that would, could be seen by, simultaneously by people in a lot of places and you didn't know where they were or who they were, that it could be seen all at the same time. So you could do real time things or you could do things asynchronously. So it changes your relationship with time and your relationship with the audience. The fact that it's a feedback loop, so that we're, it makes us much more aware of ourselves. We see ourselves connected and we see that we are shaping the world together. This was the imaginary, and I think that this was, it really gripped a lot of people and gave people a lot of hope that this new global digital system would allow us to take more sense of collective ownership, of the way we might shape the world together. It didn't really turn out that way, but that was kind of part of the original imaginary I think.

- 06:14        **"furtherfield"** (subtitle)
- MG:    06:19        So if we imagine an assemblage of things. So you've got computers, you've got buildings, you've got people, you've got food, you've got other things that may create a kind of usable ecology. And in a sense, so we've got two spaces in the park, in Finsbury Park, and wherever [incomprehensible] use it every day. So we've got a gallery and we have a commons, Furtherfield commons space. And also we've got platforms on the internet that we use. So we've got communities online, but also we're connected with a physical community. And that's a very unusual dynamic for, say, for art culture. Cause it's usually everyone evolves around a gallery and there's pictures on the website that relate to that gallery. And it's all very static. And Furtherfield is an ever changing kinds of process of different people that come along and change the shape of Furtherfield as it goes along. So you can have permacultural classes, you can have settings doing the
- RC:    07:41        live coding salon
- MG:    07:42        yeah, and so, and we've also got refugees that we work with, that be hiding in the park, which we're not gonna mention their names. And then we've got homeless people that we've worked with as well. So in a sense, what happens is that the people that we come across kind of make an imprint of what we, what we become, but then that changes as it goes along. And technology is always in the mix, whether it's in an exhibition or whether it's in workshops or whether it's in publications. And it's always up there at a high percentage, but the ambition, the ambitions around the technology, that very kinds of very directly reformed, uh, formed by body politics, but also by the community or collaborators at very different levels, often engagements. So, it's quite a complex set of different activities, and ideas, and engagements, and desires, and needs.
- RC:    08:50        I think it's worth saying a little bit about the specifics. So, Finsbury Park is in north London, there is a 180 different languages spoken by the people who use the park, the park is used by an average of 55,000 people a week. People use it as a, their commute, for leisure, the summer it's just packed full of people. And it's important for us that we're in a park, it's one of the few remaining public spaces. So, and somehow the relationship with the idea of a public space is very important to us. So, often what we're doing is bringing exhibitions about the kind of making, kind of very abstract ideas about how technology changes the way we relate to each other. But making these abstractions very feelable and recognizable to people who're there for all different reasons, so a lot of

the people who come to our gallery, people who are just there to have a day out in the park or having a picnic. So they come in a state of openness and we engage them on whatever level they want to engage. And this is really important to us.

09:57      **"furtherfield gallery"** (subtitle)

RC:      10:03      So the first show that we opened in the park five years ago – I'll tell you the first and the most recent – so, the first one we opened was called "Being Social". So this was specifically looking at how digital technology was changing the way we related to each other. And one of the works in there was a work by an artist called Liz Sterry. Liz Sterry had followed a young Canadian woman online for three months, did nothing illegal. And as a result of following her, she was able to build a replica of her bedroom in the gallery. And she posted, so she built the replica and then she built a wall of images and information about where she moved, where she was hanging out, who her friends were. So it was a kind of forensic analysis of just how, especially young people, were living their lives online without realizing that they were actually inviting people they didn't know to come and look through their bedroom windows at them. And this was really interesting for us because we'd see families come into the gallery and everyone at first thinks, Oh God, not that. You know, after Tracy Emin's bed, they just think, Oh, another artist is making another bed, way, how is this interesting? And then they go and look at the wall and they see the photographs and they understand that the bedroom is actually a replica. And then you can see the hairs go up on the back of the neck of parents as they understand that the behavior changes of the young teenage children. So it starts a conversation about kind of what the, both of the ethics were of the artists, people worried about, they were uncomfortable about what the artist had done. But also just about what new behaviors were being kind of promoted. That's then, and most recently we've just hosted an exhibition called "Are We All Addicts Now?" and it was about built-in addictions to our interfaces. So it was about how, I mean, Facebook has armies of psychologists to understand how to build interfaces, that people will be, that are sticky and that keep people coming back. And it was really looking at the techniques and impacts of addiction, in an exhibition that was really a kind of delicious experience. So you'd go in there and it was very alluring itself. So it's kind of, yeah, making these things that are hidden and generally not talked about so much available to whoever comes through the door.

- MG: 12:28 So there's another example, which is, when we had an exhibition about drones and, which is quite popular and we did workshops with Dave Young who was doing research around, uh, which is very much a permacultural system thinking, and finding out where all the actual bits of drones came from originally around the world. And a lot of that, to make up a whole drone, you don't make it all in one country. You hire bits from different parts of the world to make up this bit, this military object.
- RC: 13:03 To negotiate international law, basically.
- MG: 13:05 To go around, renegotiate, break the law, in fact. And because a lot of the components were illegal to make because some of them are classed as military weapons in their own rights, objects, and some of them aren't. And so to get that kind of context across to everyday people that came in. So they signed up, and they would know just its galleries or that, and they just loved it. They were so, they were all remapping where all the bits came from. What does that mean? And all these different people from different cultures, discussing that some of them got relatives, you know, kinds of currently being chased by drones themselves, you know, discussing this and that kind of inclusive learning experience, where they're learning with us about the context of drone culture from a military perspective was a very interesting experience. I mean, in fact, most of the projects we do have that kind of relatory experience, about and with the people that we work with.
- 14:24 **"projects at furtherfield's commons"** (subtitle)
- RC: 14:29 So we're hosting an artist duo who have been called "They Are Here". They have been in residence with us now for two years and we're planning to extend the residency for at least another couple of years. And they've been working with a group called "Migrants Organize" and bringing in people who are refugees and migrants to come and develop a project called "Seeds From Elsewhere". So they're growing seeds from the countries that they've come from to understand what will flourish in our soil with what kind of attention. And this provides a context for people to come and be together in a way that is informal, and without the kind of ordinary kind of too much focus on the things that are making life really very difficult for a lot of those people. And at the same time, after a year of being in residency, the artists had worked with them to put together a show called "Please Identify Yourself", which was looking at some of the kind of pinch points and difficulties of the migrants experience in, specifically in London, and the technologies of

surveillance and monitoring and bureaucratization of that experience, and how oppressive and kind of, yeah, just to, and it really conveyed a sense of what that experience was like, back to users of the park.

MG: 15:57 One example is we have permacultural classes there at the moment and they're paid for, people paying for permaculture classes, they're very popular. So that brings in a kind of small income, but also new audiences to Furtherfield and to some of the ideas that we're exploring.

RC: 16:13 And then we have workshops for young people to come and do, learn how to do things, take things apart, work out how it would be they could be put back together in a way that makes more sense for them and their families or their friends.

MG: 16:28 Fossbox

RC: 16:30 Fossbox, yeah. We've done feminist cyber security. Really just like full range.

MG: 16:39 There's a whole culture that, just, we just hand over the keys and they, and some of them find an income to go back into Furtherfield as a kinds of form

RC: 16:52 to make some contribution, yeah

MG: 16:53 and some don't [laughs].

RC: 16:53 Yeah.

MG: 16:55 But in a way that we don't mind that because our job is to kind of allow a diverse kinds of society to form out of what we're all up to. And it kind of, you know, it's not about closing doors, it's about opening them, and that's what we try to do, what's physically possible, as much as possible, that doesn't kill us.

17:23 **"the furtherfield commoners"** (subtitle)

MG: 17:23 Well, I suppose we're the key ones, the two people that are kind of still here and still kind of mad enough to carry the project on.

RC: 17:35 So Mark and I are both directors. Mark, we both do curatorial stuff together. We do the kind of development of the organizational vision together. And Mark is a editorial, that does the editorial commissioning.

I tend to be the person more on the ground at the moment in the park. We have a staff team, kind of operational. Everyone really feeds into the vision of the project. So staff team does, we have a freelance, I'm doing this, that kind of de-circle of influence and action. We have a range of freelancers, and then people who participate, or volunteer, or engage, or partners who come and bring things in, they're artists, they're technologists. All together though, the staff team I think is currently, if you put all the full and part time people together, the core staff team is about 3.4 people and then a series of freelancers who, some of whom we've worked with regularly for 15 years, and then a whole range of new people who are coming and then going on to do other stuff.

- MG: 18:56 The community in respect of decisions being made, the decisions aren't made in isolation. So it's very much like a lot of the people, say on the NetBehavior list, which is a discussion platform, and a lot of people, a lot of them shown, have actually shown with Furtherfield through the years and had engagement in the ideas that we've produced through those years as well. So if anything, they feel that they don't agree with, they're very quick to tell us and if they do agree with as well. And, and some of it involves in direct collaboration, some of it's kind of network collaboration, and sometimes funding collaboration as well. So, and sometimes the ideas come from them, then we kind of try to put it to make it work and work with them to make it work. So there's lots of different ways
- RC: 19:54 yeah, I mean the vision of further field really comes from, like 85% is coming from all these other people, so it's really close negotiated.
- MG: 20:03 they're our research, we learned from them, they educate us and then we're doing projects around them
- RC: 20:07 and sometimes we initiate things and sometimes we participate in things that other people initiate as well.
- MG: 20:14 Also on the ground.
- RC: 20:15 Yeah. We do also have an advisory board, which I think is really important to mention. So we have an advisory board at the moment I think there's about eight of them, and they're from quite different areas and they remind us to look after the organization, mostly I think is their role, and that we need to look after ourselves. Over the next five years we are developing a project called platforming the park and it's really taking the public space of the park and its natural resources and environments,

the social environment, the idea of public space and doing this kind of layering and involving the users of the park in helping us to shape what an artistic program would look like across the physical and digital layers. So it's, we're always kind of looking about how to make the curation and vision more porous so that people can be involved in different ways. This felt still like, it's what we've always been interested in and it still feels like a really important thing to be doing.

21:16 **"influential ideas"** (subtitle)

MG: 21:22 And I'll also want to talk, slightly going back about ideas. So, 'cause I feel it goes back to, some of the ideas around curatorial processes and where the vision comes from. And so for instance, the vision around is kinds of post-situationism and kind of a decentralization of control around knowledge and our culture and yeah, Haraway has very strong influence, and other writers like Judith Butler and, but, not true in a trendy way. This has been stuff going back years ago, you know, and that it's been incorporated as part of our practice, but, and also other writers like Gregory Sholette, Lucy Lippard and people that have really kind of lived out their practice where they can, where they've shared knowledge to us, where we can actually use what they've learned, and what they've experienced in their real practice that we can actually use ourselves. And situated knowledge is one of those. So, so situation, it's quite situationist, and where you kind of like choose your battles to advance your kind of context and conditions, and yes, but we've affiliations, it's about making collaborators and connections with people that share similar values and where you can advance with them in a context of where you're oppressed, which is the patriarchal world that we all live in. And in a way that's where Haraway is coming from. And that was, so, you don't have to necessarily topple your father to get home in the world, or the symbolic of the father. You can actually survive in a system that's against you by making affiliations which you can progress, and in the end you actually might win because of that.

RC: 23:38 Also with the situated knowledge thing, I think it's important, it's basically respecting the knowledge that comes from experience of different situations and have different life experiences, and acknowledging that an awful lot of what gets passed down in the canon of knowledge comes from actually quite a thin layer of experience, which is one of privilege. So I think it's about understanding that there are many different knowledges and acknowledging the value and contribution of those.



24:11           **"funding"** (subtitle)

RC:     24:11           When we first started we were self-funded, we were a group of people who were coming together and we, it was like the stone soup model. So everyone brings a little bit and together you make something, together that you all want to participate in and have parts of. We received our first, we've received early for the Vista Studio project that Mark talked about earlier, we received some lottery funding, we received a commission, an early commission by the BBC to do an early online interactive project called Skin Strip, which I'm not going to describe now. And then in 2005 we received core funding from the Arts Council, so we became what was called a regularly funded organization, which paid for core infrastructure like server, and at that time, so server, a contribution to rent, and maybe the equivalent of the wages of some people for a couple of days a week, which really allowed us to continue. I'm not sure quite how we would have continued doing what we were doing.

MG:     25:24           We still had other jobs as well.

RC:     25:25           Oh yes, so we've had like, that, there've been other jobs

MG:     25:31           plenty of other jobs [both laughing].

RC:     25:31           And then, around that time we opened the gallery in a warehouse space and started to put on shows, and, so all the time we've been doing these things on a real kind of patchwork model of funding. A couple of years ago we realized that this wasn't really sustainable. That combined with like really intense austerity, living in London, which has become really expensive and a very hard place for people to live. Also for students, it's a really hard place, so we kind of like, we noticed that the emerging artists, it was harder and harder for us to work with them because we really needed to be able to give them more resources in order for them to be able to afford to work with us, unless we only wanted to work with people who came from backgrounds where they didn't need paying. So that's really problematic. And so we've kind of done a re-check and now what we're doing is consciously looking to kind of spread our resource space and we're really looking to grow, as well to build our capacity. And we're now drawing down money through partnership and commissions from both arts but also other public funding. So working with different local authorities. We have some EU funding at the moment in a partnership called State Machines, which is looking at kind of transnationality and borderlessness as a result of digital culture. So we have public funding through arts and kind of some social related funding.

Then academic research partnership is becoming a really big part of what we want to do because it allows us to do deep thinking about things and then to enable artists to kind of draw on that learning and to actually have quite a bit to widen the impact for the academics as well. So it brings their work to a much wider audience and allows some kind of to and from on that. And then finally, we're really exploring other areas of both private, less corporate funding. We keep looking at it and then it doesn't, it's not really a good match for us. But more recently we've done a lot of research and have attracted and worked with really diverse people, looking at the possibilities for new kinds of sustainable models, working with blockchain and new ways of working with data.

RC: 28:12 It's a little bit about changing your models of mind. So whereas before we were, we would, we were thinking as little about money as we could in order to do the work that we thought was interesting and important. And really since we started working with blockchain technologies in this program that we launched in 2015 called "Art Data Money", we've been thinking about working more critically with money and thinking about money as a medium and money as an artistic medium. And then the world starts to kind of change shape a bit, and it allows us to work differently with different partners. So watch this space, we'll see what it turns into over the next couple of years.

RC: 28:48 The technical requirements are, we must apply, previously it was once every three years. This last round that we got through was for four years funding. We must write a business plan. We must say how we satisfy the Arts Councils goals, which are around artistic excellence, creative diversity, so there's a strong focus on diversity. Audience development and education is a optional one that we usually opt out even though we do it. These're all, I mean I think we've just had, I don't know what this means, but we've had a general, just kind of the things that are really important to us are also important to the Arts Council. And then we don't have too much constraint on what we do, we do what we like. The thing that's been very difficult for us is the level of reporting and kind of monitoring that we are required to do, which has been until this, now they've just changed the rules, but until now we've had the same requirements as the London Southbank Centre, which has a team of 50 staff or the Royal Opera House, in terms of the requirement for us to report.

MG: 30:02 So we have to fill in the same amount, yeah, 'cause they've got a whole team.

RC: 30:07 It's really horrible. So all I can say is it's lucky I'm not that conscientious, so we just do it well enough [laughing].

30:15 **"commons as a working concept"** (subtitle)

RC: 30:23 So I think that the term commons has become really valuable to us as a way to express our affiliation and partnership with certain groups, especially the Peer To Peer Foundation. The commons has the kind of formal structure, the commons is kind of threefold. So if you are commoning, it's because you have a community, you are creating or using resources and you are, though these two things are brought together in a governance process so that you have a kind of active approach to how you make decisions about maintaining, stewarding, and organizing and managing that resource. So it's helpful to us to think about both the kind of physical spaces, the knowledge commons, the cultural commons that are produced by the people that we work with in a network, it helps us to remember to involve the producers of those commons in decisions about what happens to those things, whether it's the archive of writing and artworks that we have on our server or whether it's about the physical space.

RC: 31:41 And, I think going forward, especially thinking about especially in what's the most out of the conversations about blockchain, the idea of the commons is becoming more important in relation to things like data and big data. So we have data, public data, so open data that could be used and accessed by anyone. We have private data, which is the data which is currently being harvested by Facebook, Google, et cetera, the big five. And then the idea of the commons becomes really useful when we think about the data that we produce amongst the network of peers. And then thinking about how we want to manage that because we know that future, the predictions for where technology's going, whether it's through AI or automation, that the handling of data is going to be core to that and therefore, knowing who owns the controls, what happens to that data is going to be really important. So this kind of middle ground between private and public suddenly becomes a really useful and interesting way to think about it.

MG: 32:51 Yeah. So, and the other kinds of aspects of commons is in the UK commons has that kind of historical political context. And so say around, well go long before Oliver Cromwell, but around [inaudible] in 60s, 50s, about 1649 actually, you had groups like the new Levellers and with kind of Gerard Winstanley, who was one of the kind of early commoners to reclaim land for the diggers, and where land that was stolen from people,

and enclosures were kinds of imposed on farmers and other kinds of people that own land, that suddenly didn't, wasn't there as out of kind of – one day it was, the next day it wasn't. And just because someone who they didn't know decided to become King or ruling at that time, or gentry doing deals with whoever was ruling at the time, decided that they can just take that land off people that were doing something quite useful with it at the time. And so in a way, from that period of time, you had the commons around then. So there's a very strong historical link around people, we claiming what was commons, whether that was land and now technology and data and rights, human rights as well. And so, and also indigenous rights, and say there's all these commons that need to be reassessed and considered, not just in the UK, it looks like everywhere now. So in a sense that's the other aspect of what's so interest about re-evaluating what commons means now. And that's kind of the perspective that we're kind of coming from as well.

RC: 34:53 Kind of underneath neo-liberalism. We just see, we see the privatization of everything, you know, and with social media we're starting to see the privatization of our consciousness or our social relations because the data, that is built from the way we interact with each other is then owned by somebody else. And it, the commons is a active resistance to, he kind of resists this kind of encroachment of privatization into our consciousness, into, you know, into every aspect of subjectivity.

MG: 35:25 So redefine, redefine in what commons means. Now I think is a really important kinds of action and a set of agencies. And it needs to bring other people in, like, you know, kind of refugees, and because under the gaze of neoliberalism, everyone is now, that everyone's going to become indigenous under that overarching power system that is looking down on us. And so sooner or later we will be

RC: 36:01 experiencing the closures all over again.

MG: 36:04 Yes. So, and so that's why the commons are so important. As far as we're concerned now. I suppose, to break it down a little bit and say with workshops, it's a good example, we can suggest some of them, but, there's small groups that are kinds of having kinds of, which they're not working with big data, but they're actually working in being off grid in relation to having their data kinds of scraped and resold to multinationals and governments, et cetera. And there's whole new movements that are trying that, and out of that's become a new kind of common, a new form of commons regarding that specific kinds of design not to be on grid anymore. And there's so groups that are kind of

creating their own kind of mesh networks and ad hoc networks that are kind of creating their own internet, that they don't want their data to be, they want to own their own data. And, and that's creating a commons in that respect.

RC: 37:17 Yeah. So you have the idea of kind of local small scale mesh network, data, that kind of data commons. But on the other hand, you also have, like there's a new company in the UK called Citizen Me, which is kind of doing the opposite and really looking at blockchains as a protocol for managing and organizing this, where people are able to make informed decisions about how their data is used and by whom. So, they can decide whether they want to share their social media data for use by the NHS in the research into mental health, for instance. So there's this idea that you can actually start to have a much more nuanced idea of what the value of your data is and who it is that you want to share that value with. So that's then a commons because your saying that, yes, I'm happy for this data to be used in this way. You're negotiating in what the value is and how it should be managed, but you're not just saying, look, here it is user however you want. So it's kind of, it's engaging people in a kind of negotiated organization of that data rather than, I mean, there was recently some outrage, I can't remember the details of it, but with the NHS worked in partnership with Google and just handed over huge buckets of people's medical data to Google so that they could then scrape it and do whatever to produce some kind of value that they could then sell back to the NHS, know to how. But it's this kind of like, what are they doing with that data? Do we trust them not to be doing things that it was never intended for? So it's a kind of, yeah, it's a resistance to that.

RC: 39:16 I think one of the big kind of tragedies of a free and open source software is, the fact that free also means costless, as well as emancipatory, has just allowed a whole load of people, it has allowed this kind of slippage that we imagine that Facebook, Google, they're free, then somehow there's, there's this liberatory sense about it without understanding what we are losing potentially or what we're giving away or what we're letting ourselves in for. Who knows what AI is going to be able to do with the massive data that we've just happily shared in the future. What kind of process, processing is going to happen to that. So, yeah, I think that the question around what is free is really problematic and I mean it's better known now that if something's free then you are the product, that you are the product. I think people understand that better now, but it's still not on mass.

- RC: 40:28 What the commons context does is that it allows us to constantly readdress what the question, what the value of art is, and to constantly keep thinking about what the value is, what kind of resource it is to both individuals and society. And that's it, that in itself is, so not just to accept that we need to think only of artist's market value or educational. The other thing that I think it does is that arts are able to, they kind of, we use our elbows to push back at norms, the kind of normative processes. So this is really important in commoning spaces because often commons can end up being really, really a lot about utility. And I think it's about pushing a different kinds of experience and affect and the most that humans can be in terms of feeling and meaning making and relations and really pushing this back into the space that we then share and renegotiate with each other, so that we don't end up with this endlessly kind of narrowing sense of how we negotiate what a good life is together, but we keep it as broad as possible.
- MG: 41:45 So these interventions into data, or interest in, not very specifically kinds of give obvious answers, what the commons may be, but in a way, what they do is open up something, they unlock something.
- RC: 42:01 They do. They do like, it's possible for people to conceive of what the problems are. And that's really, that's probably what the role is that the arts has in the commons in our particular field.
- MG: 42:12 But it must be, it must be assessed in terms of kinds of a larger group of people, to be able to make something out of it themselves. And that is where, say the future of say, a tactical medium I'd say, it will be because if you're just always creating disruptions, then it's always temporary and you can't build on those disruptions. And I think that our job is to kind of create a commonality or a set of new ideas where there's much more sustainable around these kinds of disruptions that tactical media has been doing for a while now, obviously. But where you can actually build something out of that, that's more sustainable, a culture that's our own groove, which we are doing right now, but we want other people to do it in their own ways as well.