

The Box of Vegies: Method and Metaphysics in Yolŋu Research

1 Introduction

The failure of government initiatives in Aboriginal communities, and the invasiveness of much research practice are often attributed by Aboriginal people to a failure of outsiders to sit down, spend time, listen and work things out together. This failure is often the fault of pushy public servants and ill-mannered researchers, but I want to argue that the call for respectful engagement is also a call for a quite different method and metaphysics of research.

In telling the story of a small government consultancy on a remote community in Northern Australia, I want to make my argument by reference to the work of feminist philosopher Kathryn Pyne Addelson. In looking at what Yolŋu (northeast Arnhem land Aboriginal) researchers and community members said and did when dealing with a proposal for a community garden, I reflect upon how research may be differently understood, and what this means for the academic researcher.

Kathryn Pyne Addelson was an anarcho-syndicalist in the women's movement in the U.S. the 1960s and 70s, and reflected on her activist experiences in her later work as a feminist moral philosopher. She was particularly interested in developing a collectivist moral theory as an alternative to that of the individualism at work in most moral philosophy. I see her theory as valuable in helping untangle some ethical and methodological issues in Indigenous research because her work in the pragmatist and non-foundational philosophical traditions seems to resonate strongly with my experience of Yolŋu knowledge work.

2 The Box of Vegies

At Charles Darwin University our research group works through a longstanding collaboration between Yolŋu and Balanda (white Australian) linguists, educators, and philosophers stretching back to the 1970s. We call this group the Yolŋu

Aboriginal Consultancy Initiative¹. We are often approached to undertake research and consultancy work which involves transdisciplinary methods, and opens questions about Indigenous research. A few years ago, our research group was asked by the The Crops Forestry and Horticulture Division (CFH) of the Northern Territory Department of Regional Development, Primary Industry, Fisheries and Resources to seek 'feedback, input and comment' on the feasibility of a proposal by an international group called Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) to be tried at Galiwin'ku, a Yolŋu island township. Through the 'Box of Vegies' program, it was proposed by CSA that a Balanda gardener would establish a community garden, Yolŋu householders would pay \$30 per week, and each week a box of fresh fruit and vegetables would be delivered to their homes. John Greateorex, the coordinator of Yolŋu Studies at the University, a group of local Yolŋu consultants and I agreed to develop and implement a community consultation plan, and to help draw up and present a report from the research.

Through discussion with people we had worked with over many years, a group of six Yolŋu consultants was brought together, all respected community members. There are many clan groups represented by the 2200 people at Galiwin'ku, and complex patterns of connectedness among people, places and ancestral history. We chose people to help who could cover the whole community, each one working within a particular extended group to whom they were connected, and who trusted them. After preparing a poster for discussion (Fig 1) and after considerable planning by phone, John Greateorex, who had been a resident at Galiwin'ku for many years flew to Galiwin'ku one afternoon to help them set up.

The Yolŋu consultants met together with John at the Galiwin'ku Yalu-Marŋgithinyaraw Yolŋu Research Centre, and made final arrangements - who would be best to talk to whom, and where. The final arrangements could not be made until the last minute, because circumstances change quickly, and we need always to agree upon the best deployment, moment by moment. Everyone agreed that it was crucial first to talk to Timothy (Demala) Buthiman who has

¹ See www.cdu.edu.au/yaci. The group includes bilingual, bicultural Yolŋu consultants, as well as John Greateorex, the coordinator of Yolŋu Studies at Charles Darwin University, and Helen Verran, a philosopher from the University of Melbourne, who introduced me to the work of Kathryn Pyne Addelson.

had a banana garden down near the sewerage ponds for many years and was recognized by everyone as the expert Yolŋu gardener. When they met first with Buthiman, he told them to 'think about the land first'. Each piece of land belongs to particular people, managed by particular other people, and everyone has one kind of relation or another to every named place. When we listen to a new idea, Buthiman said, we need to begin with the connections we already have.

Kathy, an elder from a related clan agreed: new plans which come without connections are 'like cyclones which come blowing through consuming energies and plans'. She told a story of the old days when we used to have harvest festival every year, people bringing their clan based produce – shellfish and fish for example as well as the produce of the mission garden - to the church to celebrate. Buthiman contrasted that with the story of how the old mission garden had eventually been taken over by the community council, and the Yolŋu felt 'run over', and drifted away. That had happened to the fishing industry as well. Working with the right people and starting with the land said Buthiman, 'made people feel strong and valued'.

Feeling strong and valued themselves after talking with Buthiman, the consultants went out for their community visits over the following couple of days. Each discussion was held at a key clan authority's house, outside under a tree, with the senior people on the ground, and other people of all ages sitting or standing slightly further away listening, concurring, or making comments when they had something to say. The meetings were held in the various Yolŋu languages of those involved. Sticking to your own language is a sign you are taking your ancestral responsibilities seriously and can speak on behalf of land. The conversations went everywhere. People most often started addressing the garden through talking about their own poor and expensive diets. Most mentioned the staple *gatuwatu* which is a simple paste made from flour and warm water. They talked about the rhythms of food in the community: fried potato chips and takeaway fried chickens and Coca-cola when there is money, and damper, black tea, tinned beef and weetbix when there is none. They talked about the community store and what they buy and how expensive it is 'especially since the intervention' – what with the price of rent and power cards there's very

little left for food out of our \$400. They talked about how they cook – most houses have a stove and a pot. One had an electric frying pan, and others still used an outside fire.

They talked about little gardens that people try to set up around their houses and about kids stealing fruit. They spoke about the various different homeland centres they were connected to, and the food they are sent from homelands – ‘geese, fish, shellfish, crayfish, turtle and turtle eggs and mangrove worms’. Grandparents talked about teaching kids to eat bush tucker, about their understanding of how healthy it is, and about bad kids who don’t like bush food. Parents talked about children demanding lollies, ice cups (‘They like the colours’), chewing gum and mangoes.

Before any mention of how the proposed community garden could come to life, the Yolŋu began work on agreeing to the conditions of concern in which the garden may emerge: poor quality and expensive food, healthy connections to each other, to ancestral lands, disaffected children and workers, and community and mission history, including the ongoing productive (and largely unrecognized) garden already at work under Buthiman’s authority and labour.

It took each group a while to get down to addressing what the CFH had thought the discussions would be about – technical decisions about what, where, and how, and general agreement for families to pay the \$30 each week. They listened to the lists of possible vegetables provided by CFH and laughed at the idea of eating greens – which they refer to as ‘mulmu’ - grass. All agreed it would be good to have another community garden like the garden in the mission days, like Buthiman’s garden, but if government is wanting to come in and get things started, it must be properly negotiated and build on what we already have. Frequent reference was made to other similar initiatives like the Red Cross project and the Marthakal Galawarra gardens, introduced by well meaning outsiders, but which had failed because they have not been negotiated properly. No one was surprised that they didn’t work, nor that they generally made Yolŋu cross with each other and Balanda call them lazy.

Wherever the garden is placed, people made clear, the land belongs to someone and the way that people relate to the vegetables would be understood in terms of their kinship links to that land and its owners. The old 'mission farm' site is not land to which Buthimanj has a custodial connection so he could not farm there. Not only does Buthimanj need to be properly related to the land, but people need to be involved through their kin links to the land and to Buthimanj. Other people kept suggesting different agencies within the 'community' (school, women's centre, clinic etc) which need to be brought into the action to build the community together.

How did people feel about paying \$30 per week? Fine. How about a Balanda farmer? A Balanda farmer would be okay, a Fijian Methodist like the gardeners of the mission days would be better. There were seven different family meetings, in seven different places. All the consultants worked with John to prepare some written comments and together we developed a formal report for Crops, Forestry and Horticulture. The thrust of the report was that everyone was happy with the idea if the garden could grow, so to speak, from Buthimanj's established initiatives, and all the various families could be involved through their ancestral connections to Buthimanj and his land. While the plan was quite straightforward in the Yolŋu imagination, it must have daunted the CFH because each step would require further negotiation. There was not going to be a formal plan on paper, with pre-agreed costing and firm timelines or if there were, it could change at any moment.

We heard nothing back from government after they received the report, the garden never happened, and Galiwin'ku residents continue to pay exorbitant amounts for poor quality food. Everyone thought it was a great idea, so what went wrong?

3 Methodology and Metaphysics

When the Yolŋu consultants divided up the work among themselves and went off to do their research with particular identified groups within the community, it seemed like a good way to get a reliable coverage of community opinion. It was also the 'proper way' to do things – right people talking to the right people in the

right place at the right time in the right order. But on reflection, it was more than just good responsible coverage. It was coverage of a particular sort. It was, first of all a rejection of the common figure in academic research – whom Addelson refers to as the *judging observer*. Yolŋu can not, will not involve themselves as judging observers. The judging observer, as

‘detached knower ... is separate from time, place, social position, body and intimate relations. Judging observers require a certain kind of world, a world of objective independent facts principles and laws. It is a world in which prediction and retrodiction are supposed to work ... that requires a particular understanding of time, nature, and human action and moral development’ (Addelson, 1994, p. xi).

By taking themselves off to the various extended family groups in which they themselves had some authority to speak and responsibility to listen, they positioned themselves as what could be called *generative participants* as opposed to *judging observers*. *Generative participants* are actors (not observers) in the everyday collective action of life on a community - meeting, eating, agreeing, caring for children and old people, working the land, making their collective lives together – and here in their research work, they were doing no different. They engaged their Yolŋu kin *as Yolŋu* and *as kin* in everyday life. (They also had an extra authority – as paid university researchers, and we will go on to discuss that. But for now, the point is that by working with their own family structures they refused first of all, to position themselves as judging observers.)

The consultancy proposal also bore within it an assumption about the Yolŋu of Galiwin’ku. The CFH could see a problem of the shortage of healthy and reasonably priced fruit and vegetables on the remote Aboriginal community, and CSA could see in the community garden a possible solution. But herein lies our second problem: the proposed method of working towards the solution implied that the 2200 people at Galiwin’ku be taken in key respects as ontologically equal: all community members, all consumers, all therefore somehow significantly the same when it comes to community consultations and decision making. In Addelson’s terms, this is an assumption of *epistemic equality* – the

idea that anyone can potentially know anything, and everyone knows in the same way. Treating the Yolŋu townspeople as all somehow the same enables the government (and the CSA) to understand the problem of a community garden as essentially a technical one (how many people interested to pay how much money for how big a box of vegies from a garden situated where?).

The Yolŋu consultants of course made no such assumptions. By rejecting first of all the role of judging observer, and working with the community members as kin, they also rejected the assumption that everyone does or can know the same things in the same way. Everyone is related to Buthimanj and to his land, but in many different ways. Any garden which works is going to have to take account of this network of accountabilities to people, places and stories. Not only because people know differently, but also because acknowledging and embracing these difference, in Buthimanj's terms, 'makes people feel strong and valued'. The garden has a role to play in making strong the whole ongoing network of Yolŋu people-places.

By moving into the appropriate spaces to talk to their own people in the free-ranging but always refocusing ways (resisting being judging observers), and by acknowledging that there is more than just food at stake and many very different stakeholders (resisting epistemic equality), the Yolŋu consultants made the technical problem of the garden public. *Public problems*, as defined by Addelson are social problems which emerge (or in our case are inserted) in areas of public action (1990, p. 1). The Yolŋu all deliberately turned the proposed garden into what Addelson (or before her Dewey 1927), would call a Public Problem, conscious that this was the only way that a garden could be (re)created as a collective responsibility. The consultants' research method allows for the whole gamut of concerns to be addressed, to allow a workable solution to come to life. Each telling the story of their own lives, their food sources, their diets, their connections to land and people, and 'mission' history, senior (and then less senior) Yolŋu recast the garden in terms of collective action and responsibility. They allowed the garden *to emerge in collective action*, wresting it away from the utilitarianism of the CSA, and at the same time ensuring that as employees of the university, they were not taking it upon themselves to speak on behalf of any

Yolŋu. As generative participants, they were able to take the government and CSA proposals seriously and respectfully, while continuing with the ongoing work of building community life carefully together.

This work was moral work. The move that the Yolŋu researchers made here could be seen as embedding the technical problem of the proposed garden in the wider question of going on together, or in Addelson's terms the fundamental philosophical question of '*How Should we Live?*' (1994, p.1). By making the problem public, the Yolŋu consultants and the people they talked to turned the garden from a technical problem into a *collective moral problem* rejecting the myth of epistemic equality and embracing the difficult, complex and authoritative work of listening to everyone differently. As *generative participants*, they refused to think of themselves in government terms as all equally individual consumers of food (with associated notions of rights and accountabilities) and turned naturally to understanding themselves as networks of kin (with associated notions of care, concern and responsibilities) (Addelson 1991, 1994) working together on how to make community life (and the garden) respond to our need to go on together faithfully, remembering who and where we are. The failed gardens had been an unnegotiated purely instrumental effort arriving like another cyclone. This would be a *responsible* garden not unlike the old mission garden, because it would emerge out of responsible work.

In the terms of the French philosopher of technology Bruno Latour, the Yolŋu had drawn attention away from the technical '*matters of fact*' to wider '*matters of concern*', that is

'what happens to a matter of fact when you add to it its whole scenography, much like you would do by shifting your attention from the stage to the whole machinery of a theatre' [The matters of fact with which we have started, now] render a different sound, ... start to move in all directions, ... overflow their boundaries, ... include a complete set of new actors, (and) reveal the fragile envelopes in which they are housed' (Latour, 2008, p. 39).

In Addelson's terms, the contrast between the individualist *judging observer* and the *generative participant* in collective (research) action is not simply to do with *ways of knowing*, but also 'a difference in the ways that space, time, facts, reality and the knowers themselves are defined. Prediction of the simple scientific sort requires that reality be captured in certain measurable categories of space and time. Prediction requires that the future will be like the past and it also supposes that the past is like the present' (1994, p. 138). A judging observer may plan or predict how a garden could be made (which is what the government was hoping for), but a generative participant believes that the future is always open, always waiting for concerned and responsible action (which is what the Yolŋu were insisting upon). Producing a responsible garden prohibits the acceptance of preemptive planning. While the government essentially wanted the Yolŋu to predict what a viable community garden would be like, the Yolŋu were concentrated upon how we could work towards a community garden together in good faith. This meant spilling open the 'measurable categories of time and space' and abandoning our hope for a concise set of instructions for government. I see this as the Yolŋu enacting a distinctive metaphysics of research, pointing to an often hidden divide between the epistemologies of academic and Aboriginal knowledge work.

This Yolŋu practice of constantly spilling open metaphysical questions which lie beneath or behind the *matters of fact* that (in Latour's terms) are 'indisputable, obstinate and simply there', challenge our understandings of history and the future – and of time itself. By opening to question the received categories and accepted laws (what Addelson in *Anarchy and Morality* (p.150) calls the 'archist' – dealing with rules and laws), Yolŋu took the work of redefining through here-and-now agreement the entities that made up their world. They (like Addelson's 'an-archists') take the whole human being - with connections, histories, commitments – as the basis for ethics (not the abstract equal unit of citizen or consumer). In Verran's terms (talking about negotiations of the ownership of Aboriginal land), the Yolŋu work entails mobilising 'a vast repertoire by which the world can be re-imagined, and being re-imagined be re-made' (Verran, 1998, p. 242)

As the Yolŋu told their stories, the past as the raw materials for understanding how we should go on together, was reinscribed. The mission gardens, the church, the harvest festivals, the failed community gardens, ancestral connections to land were all brought up and (re)told in a way that brought them into the present in a new way. It also brought the participants to life in a new way as we agreed upon who has the authority to decide and make decisions about what are the important issues to consider (ancestral connections to land, involvement of government departments, dealing with the Shire, growing up young people) and who can give the go-ahead to proceed at each step.

Doing it this way, the 'community', that mythical entity with which the CFH imagined we were consulting, had no real prior existence. The population of Galiwin'ku in all their connectedness (and the homelands and the children of the future) emerged as 'community' in a special way in the complex localised discussions about the garden. And received anthropological categories of clan group, owner, authority, connectedness etc – the stuff of academic research – also became reconstituted in new ways as the discussions progressed. 'Even when the same categories seem to be used, it is a creative collective act to enact them as the same' (Addelson, 1994, p.143).

There is an irony here, that Australian Aboriginal cultures are commonly seen to be conservative, and governments to be progressive, but the government plan assumed stable, given categories, and the Yolŋu method worked with a wide open future which needed to be decided using very fluid, changing, carefully negotiated categories, and depended upon abandoning the certainties and predictabilities of the techno-bureaucratic approach.

The Yolŋu consultants may have been engaged as professionals but they avoided providing what Addelson calls a '*professional account*' (1994, p. 153) which is based on an account of equal individuals in terms of preexisting categories. Abandoning the firmness and obvious meaningfulness of categories ('community', 'families', 'food', 'arable land') also entails mitigating government hopes for firm and workable plans and time lines.

In this Yolŋu metaphysics, the knowable world comes out of action, not the other way around. The *act* is primary, whether it be gardening, or talking about a garden. Both produce what Donna Haraway (2008) has called 'naturecultures' in good or bad ways: good when we work together respectfully and in good faith, bad when people come in with plans and try to implement them 'like a cyclone', without negotiation.

So in Addelson's terms (n.d.1) we are not working with either Darwin's time (in which we can know the past but not the future) or with Newton's time (where we can know the future but not the past), but with 'collective action [in which] time and the world are created' (1994, p. xi). The time of the judging observer is a 'timeless time' (ibid p.139) on which the categories of the future are described in the present in terms of the categories of the past. Ground Hog Day. The known world of government intransigence, academic weakness and Aboriginal marginalization endlessly repeating itself.

There is no difference between the correct ways to do negotiation, and the correct ways to do gardens. Both focus on the *action* as the primary unit of meaning. For both the Yolŋu and Addelson, people and societies have their existence and meaning, in the actions and experiences of making, meeting and managing situations. '*The unit of meaning is the collective act, which generates self and the social order*' (1994, p. xi). Acting respectfully and collaboratively to specify the conditions for the emergence of a responsible Yolŋu garden (commitment to places, kin, ancestral histories, everyday stories) is not different from the act of gardening producing Yolŋu with commitment to places, kin, history, totems and so on.

At the end of the process, the Yolŋu community members were relatively happy. They had been paid for their contributions to the consultancy, and had been given a chance to talk to the government on their own terms, in their own terms. Everything that the CSA proposed – the nonYolŋu gardener, the weekly contributions, the delivery of boxes of fruit and vegetables - was agreed to by Yolŋu as a good idea, and they made clear that there is a way of producing the garden which will guarantee its success. While it was never made clear to us, it

seems that the government decided that the complexities of implementation of a negotiated emergent Yolŋu garden were more than they could ask (or trust) the CSA to take on. It's much easier to pay a gardener to set up a garden than it is to work constantly with key representatives of seven major networks of clan groups and community organisations to negotiate, step by step, something which must be tailored to the emerging and changing collective life of the community while remaining faithful to ancestral principles of action and connection. Doing things the Yolŋu way, government could never predict how people would need to be involved, how long it would take, or how much it would cost. The recasting of the garden from a technical to a collective moral problem set it well beyond the (perceived) capacity of government and the CSA to deliver. The engagement and negotiation practices which to Yolŋu are so natural, so necessary, and not so difficult, are to the rational practices of government, uncontrollable, expensive, and not amenable to rigorous implementation.

4 Double participation

It is therefore rather easy of me to conclude that, as a judging observer myself, I could see a perfectly reasonable (and in fact the only possible decent and productive) way forward with the development of Buthimanŋ's garden which the government and the CSA were unable or unwilling to implement. In such an analysis, the Yolŋu and the government remain frustrated and unable to work productively together, the government is seen as inflexible and disengaged, the Yolŋu lazy and disengaged, while I as the academic researcher is seen as pondering armchair metaphysics and not getting on with the job of making a garden happen. As an academic researcher, I hide easily behind the role of the judging observer. Addelson herself struggles with the problem reconciling her position as a tenured academic philosopher within an oppressive system, with her activist anarcho-syndicalist sensibilities. In her analysis, solving this problem requires addressing seriously this *double participation* (Addelson, 1994, pp. 158-9). As researchers, we (John and the Yolŋu consultants and I) were taking part in the action in a way which was systematically different from the ways in which the other community members were engaged. While they were paid for their contributions to the discussion, families and elders were not responsible to the

university (for the '*professional account*') or the government (for useful workable solutions). We were. Double participation is unavoidable. The question is how to do it responsibly.

We were commissioned to undertake the consultancy because of our experience with such work. We agreed to do it because our intent was to some extent political. We wanted to show that a good garden could be produced if it were done in the Yolŋu way. As I have argued, the Yolŋu way seems on the surface to entail not a lot of different work from the Balanda way, but in fact there are quite radical methodological and metaphysical differences beneath the surface. In early 21st century Australia, are working in an intellectual climate in which academic anthropologists, linguists, sociologists (much less philosophers) are seldom called upon to advise governments, but in which governments often enlist consultancy services from research groups. This creates a space in which, first of all, the Yolŋu can teach and implement their philosophies and practices of knowledge and agreement making in the academy, and academics privileged to work with them, may work to change slowly the structures and practices of the university and of government, in the piecemeal tactics and carefully deployed theoretical work we are developing together. The weak link in the chain turned out to be my/our relationship with government. I assumed a causal trajectory from the call for the consultancy, to organizing the community meetings, to gathering the stories, to producing the report to the decision on the part of the CFH, to the development of the Yolŋu garden. It wasn't going to happen. In an important sense the government was never included as a participant in the collective action, a failure of my double participation. Using the framework of Participatory Action Research (see for example Fals-Borda & Rahman, 1991) (which it could be argued resists the notion of the judging observer, but struggles with epistemic equality) the consultancy-garden failed because particular government authorities were not included in the community of researchers.

In the timeless time of the judging observer, I assumed a utilitarian approach to producing the garden through an instrumental consultancy which would lead to government action. I failed in my responsibility to try to work with government

in the way that Yolḡu had been trying to work with me for many years. Thinking about the garden and Kathy Addelson's writing helps me to think differently and maybe get it more right next time.

I conclude with Addelson's reflection on her own garden:

"I could tell the story of making a garden in terms of the usual, human agency: the gardener makes a plan, decides on what she wants to plant, selects the seeds, tills the soil and adds compost or fertilizer, buys worms and lady bugs, sets a schedule for watering and weeding, and plucks the fruits for her table. In an ordinary sense she transforms a place and makes a place that was not there before--a garden. Her activity falls under a folk concept, with a telos. It is the story written in "how to" books on gardening, and it is the story a gardener might tell to her friends when she invites them over to admire her work. It has a simple and quite legitimate focus on the gardener's activity, on human use of land (in an ordinary sense) to provide for human comfort and survival. It suits the traditional account of intentional action that is central in Western ethics. I can also describe the garden as it emerges out of a broader collective action that creates the time and the place. The bacteria, soil organisms, seeds, plants, insects... , blights, rains, sunshine, the season and the gardener - all these participate in the collective action of making the garden as a place. The gardener does not create her garden as God created the Garden of Eden ... To succeed, the human gardener has to understand the broader collective action to some degree or other - why else would she prepare compost, fertilize, add worms and lady bugs, plant seeds, etc.? To see the gardener as the only important participant is suffer from a severe case of anthropocentrism. ... (I)t introduces an obstacle—the boundary between organism and environment (and) between ourselves and our places. If our places are created in collective activity, then relation to the land is not a relation between two objects, humans (or living things) and a place. There is only the activity. Activity that is located and particular...." (Addelson, n.d.2).

Acknowledgements:

The Yolŋu researchers Garngulkpuy, Maratja, Djirrimibilpilwuy, Gotha and Djekurr have been patiently working with us over many projects over many years. John Greateorex's long experience allowed the consultancy to happen according to local protocols, Trevor van Weeren prepared the poster (used here with permission), and Martin Young and Anthea Fawcett gave useful feedback on earlier drafts.

Addelson, K.P. (1976), 'Anarchy and Morality', reprinted in Addelson, K. P. (1991), *Impure thoughts : essays on philosophy, feminism, & ethics*. Philadelphia, Temple University Press. pp149-158

Addelson, K. P. (1990), 'Some Moral Issues in Public Problems of Reproduction.' *Social Problems* **37**(1): 1-17.

Addelson, K. P. (1991), *Impure thoughts : essays on philosophy, feminism, & ethics*. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.

Addelson, K. P. (1994), *Moral passages : toward a collectivist moral theory*. New York, Routledge.

Addelson, K.P. (n.d.1), 'Newton and Darwin' The Entangled Bank
<http://entangledb.com/pdf/netwon-darwin.pdf>

Addelson, K.P. (n.d.2), 'Meeting Rose.' The Entangled Bank
<http://entangledb.com/rose.html>

Dewey, J. (1927), *The Public and its Problems*, New York, Holt.

Fals-Borda, O. & Muhammad R. (1991), *Action and knowledge: breaking the monopoly with participatory action-research* Apex press.

Haraway, D. (2008), *When Species Meet*, University of Minnesota Press

Latour, B. (2008) *What is the style of matters of concern? Two lectures in empirical philosophy*. Department of Philosophy of the University of Amsterdam. Van Gorcum: Amsterdam.

Verran, H. (1998), Re-imagining land ownership in Australia, *Postcolonial Studies*, Vol 1, No. 2, pp237---254