

EPICENTRE TO AFTERMATH

'Fishbowl' discussion, end of Day One

Convened by Stefanie Lotter, transcribed by Amrita Gurung

Participants

JB Jeevan Baniya

FB Francesco Bogoni

CB Christiane Brosius

BC Ben Campbell

ND Nimesh Dhungana

AG Amrita Gurung

DH Daniel Haines

AH Andrew Haxby

MH Michael Hutt

JGK Janvi Gandhi Kanakia

ML Mark Liechty

AL Austin Lord

SL Stefanie Lotter

EM Eleonor Marcussen

SN Sabin Ninglekhu

KO Katie Oven

HR Hanna Ruszczyk

SS Sara Shneiderman

MS Michele Serafini

JW John Whelpton

SL: Katie asks: if we are now interested in earthquakes, where does the hazard come in?

KO: So, first thing, I was being deliberately provocative here..... Is there a role for understanding hazard, and where does it come into this? Into our research as social scientists, historians etc.

BC: I think you need to define what it is, for us who aren't using it on an everyday basis.

KO: So by 'hazard' I mean the physical process, an earthquake for example, future earthquake events or landslides, the actual physical process is what I mean by the hazard. So then hazard at the simplest level coming together with the vulnerability of the population generates... risk

BC: So your question is...?

SL: If we are not interested in earthquakes, or as academics we are not, where does the hazard come in?

EM: To me it sounds like if you are interested in risk perceptions or the constructions of risk, of course, then you do not have to study only the disaster, as such, you can also study how people create a larger universe and so forth.

KO: I work with physical scientists who are constantly reminded by social scientists to put the hazard in context, in the wider social context, so my question is asking social scientists about physical hazards and where that comes in, in the same way that physical scientists are trying to grapple with understanding the social context.

BC: By physical hazard, you don't simply mean the non-human? It could also mean a road system, the road structure is also a hazard.

KO: ...I am thinking about physical hazards and where does that come in... I guess it comes from working with physical scientists who are...perhaps criticized to some extent for not considering the social and political cultures. So I guess I'm just spinning it around to say: what about all of us then, as a group of social scientists? Are we engaging with hazard or not, and where does the hazard come into the conversations that we are having?

SN: Responding to you from this scene I have, of doing this research work with collaborators of Nepal for a brief amount of time, and coming from the physical sciences background. So it doesn't directly respond to your question about hazard, but the associated risks for vulnerabilities and affordability, and so on and so forth. Having collaborated with persons for the good amount of a month in different Newari settlements, how that enriched my own research, moving on, was, so you would ask a lot of questions about the structures and structural strengths and the foundations, going through the details of how many rebars and the depth of the foundation and what kind of cement and what kind of mortar, technicalities are involved. So what that allowed me to , moving on, was to kind of reframe those questions in a way that allowed me to obtain realistic responses about the cost of rebuilding structures in a way that is seismically more resistant. So that allowed me to make arguments about what happens when these big master plans containing so many building codes encounter people's life, how are they going to afford it, to secure more safe, seismically resistant houses? In some ways it responds to your question, but not directly.

SS: Maybe a way of reframing it more broadly is to think about the idea of materiality which I find really useful. I think right after the earthquake there was a strong critique of many anthropologists who have all kinds of ideas about cultural responses and so forth, but the question was – ‘yeah but what does that matter when you have no place to stay?’ And that really struck me and I took it very seriously to heart and it affects what I’m doing now. Just thinking about the material world as a crucial part of the social and political world and that goes more towards Ben’s definitions too, of thinking about infrastructures and houses and the built environment as well as the natural environment. I think a meeting point for natural sciences and social sciences can be around that idea of the material world, whether it’s in its hazardous form or otherwise.

KO: Yes, absolutely.

AL: I think it also gets the epistemic politics really directly. Katie brought it really wonderfully, the type of critical thinking that’s implied within critiques of resilience and the way that resilience sort of implies a particular sort of disturbance regime. But it also implies a certain type of epistemological orientation and how we define the disturbance regime, how we define hazards, is a relevant matter, whether it is an earthquake or another kind of event. I also think, which is particularly interesting to social science and critiques from the social science perspective, is that resilience thinking in adaptive management requires and already internalizes some of the critiques that we’re about to lob at them anyway. I mean the way in which you come, the way in which resilience thinking, governance based upon resilience liberal models, is constantly adapting in absorbing and swallowing critique, and I think that looking at those episodes of politics of how hazard is defined and how critiques of hazards are incorporated and redefined, is relevant.

SL: the next question, which is connected to initiating social change, comes from Mark (ML). He says: build back better discourses often include social engineering elements designed to challenge caste and gender inequalities, yet these efforts don’t have much impact. If anything, inequalities are reproduced, so the question is: are these social change initiatives legitimate? Are they realistic? Are they doomed to fail? Are there better ways to try and bring about change?

AL: I think it goes back to resilience, what kind of resilience and for whom are we trying to engineer, and how do decisions get made about house designs.

BC: And who has ownership of the discussion in terms of debate, who can identify with the language of resilience, who does it exclude from it? When you get inclusive resilience...

AL: or vernacular resilience...

SS: I think part of the issue is also around project design, that sort of approach to fixing inequality as is, that is a ‘one size fits all’ kind of concept, right? Because we all know it could be quite different from country to country, or even from valley to valley, in Nepal or any of the other contexts in which we work, so I feel like that’s part of the challenge. Without having the kind of longterm in-depth local knowledge, to design a programme that will not have those kinds of ramifications is challenging. I think it could be possible with the appropriate knowledge and the time and consultation taken.

BC: It's a fascinating thing to think of bringing all these different expertises and forms of knowledge into communication, and to see which ones are able to listen to each other and which ones don't. The idea of engineering generally is to reduce something to the simplest and the most elegant solution to a problem, and it's not to do what we are trying to do, which is to find the contextual nuance, many different layers surrounding it. It's of a completely different order but if we can get some, and I think it is occasionally possible to get dialogue, between these two sort of polar opposites, then that's going to be productive.

AH: One of the reasons these things often fail is this understanding of disaster as revelatory, suddenly we can see all these things and this inequality. After the earthquake there were all these think pieces about how now we can see inequality, we can see caste, we can see gender, and yes the earthquake hit in ways that kind of followed those lines, but there was no reason that you couldn't see all of that stuff already. Like it was always there and people have been dealing with it forever. So the idea that we are suddenly going to have, there is going to be this brilliant idea now because of the earthquake that's going to be different from what we had before, is based on a faulty premise of disaster as a revelation.

AL: I think there are interesting questions of what counts as data. As a revelatory and receptive moment, all of a sudden, I think Nimesh's paper did an excellent job of describing this [...]. And when I think about this, partly because I have a collaborator from information science, if there is a legacy in Nepal, like someone was asking me, is there a Nepal model? We were talking about a Gujarat model. Haiti is outside the frame here but there are blueprints that are coming from Haiti and other places as well. But, the Nepal model seems to have something to do with disaster informatics, it has something to do with the laboratory of disaster informatics and these new data practices and accountability reporting and live adaptive management of projects.

BC: It generated a kind of massive event, didn't it? I was at the American Association of Geographers. They were all there in the room. Using their TPS system and everything, it produced a huge virtual community, didn't it? Of people remotely figuring out exactly which bit of flooding would now be caused by that landslide in that...

AL: James Sharrock, who's not here today, he made this great point at the Baha conference about how you're right there at the Gorkha headquarters but you're looking at the disaster in an open source map, as opposed to walking the physical land.

SS: Except that he also made the point, in a 2016 presentation in Toronto, and this goes back to what Michele was saying earlier, that the Google Earth data was taken to supersede existing cadastral surveys, for instance. In many cases I am personally aware of, that was deeply problematic. So I think that you're right that it is about information just because of the temporal moment when the Nepal earthquake struck, in the way that all of these different communities of practitioners and scholars—and community members, right? People on the ground using Facebook and Twitter across Nepal and so forth were able to use these new media in different ways but that also has led to some really predictable oversights, that you rely upon what's seen as the new kind of data rather than the old and longstanding data.

SL: One more question in the direction of representation and social media. Austin asks: how do we tell stories about earthquakes in new ways in new media? How do we maintain the attention and interest of diverse audiences, new methods and methodological experimentations. So: from method to representation.

HR: What I found quite interesting when I visited Nepal five months after the earthquake was all of the street art. I found that really important, for me, to see what people were highlighting for themselves and that whole idea about the youth being mobilized. I even also saw one graffiti street art about urbanisation which I've used over and over again, but I thought that was really quite powerful, it was the self-produced ways of showcasing what is important to people in reconstruction.

AL: It's clearly what I had in my mind as a question, I will be talking about it tomorrow, the recent implications of Photo Kathmandu in the way in which exhibitions and different multimedia just create new publics for talking, or re-incorporate publics who are all very aware of disaster but how they're thinking about it again in a new way, in a way that an academic paper... you are not going to have a thousand Nepalis walking in and reading an academic paper....

MH: What I was thinking about when you were talking about the street art was the very large number of Youtube videos, which are musical. So an awful lot of Nepali artists, from rap to filmy songs to other kinds of things, filmed themselves and others singing songs about the earthquake with a number of different messages, which map on pretty much to the themes of the poetry I will be talking about tomorrow. Interestingly, the number of views is incredibly, there is a huge range, so the most views is over a million, one that is usually passed around expat community in Kathmandu has about 60,000. So there is quite an interesting range of different kinds of materials on Youtube.

SL: Katharina asks, if we continue with memorialization; in the aftermath of the earthquake who needs to lay claim upon places of memory? How are they shaped and by whom?

HR: Can I make a comment about the previous question? This book that we did at Durham was from different departments, but also more than half the authors are... From the statistics on the paid downloads of the book, the chapters that are downloaded the most are the chapters by Nepali scholars and not by foreigners. I think that's really a powerful message that people around the world are trying to get some Nepali expertise on Nepal.

ND: I think, on the point of social media, because I think that was also social media and data in the aftermath of Nepal's earthquake, which is not so much only about the use of those data for mapping and other exercises and for the delivery of aid, but I am looking at it as a point of activism in which how online and offline spaces were used in order to hold government and aid actors accountable. So that reminds of the work of Patrick Meier, *Digital Humanitarians*, that's a very interesting book. He doesn't really talk about the activism or advocacy that follows after the earthquake but I think that's an interesting idea that in terms of thinking about these technologies and new social media that are fruitfully used by the activists in the wake of disaster.

JGK: I just want to quickly move on to the next question on memorialization. I think especially in the case of Gujarat earthquake there was talk of making a museum in Bhuj about all the casualties and everything that was lost. I am not quite sure if it's been made but I think it's important, memorializing an event like that. Especially when heritage structures are lost, it is an important step also to rewriting the voices that created history. So, in the way that social inequalities that existed in terms of the voices that were heard of history can be actually reimagined.

CB: I think the question about memorializing and who defines the value, meaning of place: that's something that is certainly not new when the earthquake hits, especially in the context of Kathmandu. The art scene has started to get very interested in place making, practices and oral histories, in local memories and in heritage processes from below. But then there is this ongoing asymmetric relationship between the five star heritage of the UNESCO and the vernacular heritage and place making of other dimensions of the city, of the relationship to the rural, farming and the loss of farmland to urbanization and sprawling urbanism and that comes in quite centrally in the context of the earthquake again. And I think in that context what you just said seems very interesting, this need to archive, to bring together and share repositories of memory and of place seems to be an interesting way to locate different voices and perspectives of the role of heritage at loss but also in the new making.

JGK: Especially art and craft is so important in Kutch. For example, every community has different kind of stitches they use to do their handicraft work and a lot of these new companies, new businesses have started to recreate some of these art and crafts that were lost and actually bring back certain communities with certain kinds of embroideries to bring them to the forefront and actually recreate something new from what is already existing in the embroidery and the art and craft. That's actually interesting stuff that has come out, which may not be memorialization but it is an act of memory.

FB: Some of the particular questions of place making are connected with the big changes that arrived after the earthquake. For example, in the sense that they put in question what is the traditional local? So the reinvention of tradition in certain ways tries to replicate what was before and so place making also needs to be seen in relation to difference between what was before and after the earthquake.

CB: Francesco, can I ask you what you mean by this 'local traditional', I mean how do you define traditional in this context?

FB: I remain, I don't enter the issue, what people, locals, consider to be traditional in the sense that the redefining of traditional by locals is changing.

SL: We have spoken about locality and there are two questions that are quite clearly linked to this question. Locality can be community but can it also be actual locality? So, Eleanor (EM) asks: can we identify common tropes in South Asian earthquakes in arguing for relief, in describing or depicting victims, in constructing protector identities? and Mike (MH) asks: are there features of earthquakes and disaster aftermaths that are particular, peculiar to South Asia?

JGK: I think the colonial identities of a lot of countries in South Asia need to be talked about when we discuss what is particular about South Asian experiences of earthquakes. Somebody can take off from here. I mean there are so many complex networks that are in some ways related, embedded, in colonial histories have worked through the existing systems. It's important to look at recovery from that perspective.

DH: I see your point but I think it's also important to remember that Nepal wasn't formally colonized. The majority of earthquakes I work on took place in the colonial period in what was then India and now through Pakistan. And, the Nepal experience in 1934 seems to be quite distinct from the experience elsewhere. There's a lot that is common, at human level people were suffering in the same way and the Rana state did engage in relief policies and I'm sure John or Michael could talk much more about this so I'm not going to embarrass myself by trying to talk about in detail right now. But what I see in the more recent examples of contemporary earthquakes is that the international norms of disaster governance and disaster risk reductions and rescue responses and so on seem to have flattened out the differences between the different contexts. So, Pakistan, India and Nepal seem to be rather more similar now in the way they respond to earthquakes even than they were even 50 years ago and more so 100 years ago.

ML: I would just like to engage one of my pet peeves which is the claim that Nepal was never colonized.

DH: It was not *formally* colonized.

ML: Formally, right! The question becomes to what extent was it not colonized and to what extent did the Ranas colonize it. I think we have to be careful not to make a black and white distinction, there are many shades of grey in Nepal's relationships to colonial India and its own forms of governance that... it's become very important for Nepali nationalism to make this claim of never having been colonized but the question becomes in what *sense* was it never colonized. It's important to get beyond the binary and to think about the ways in which things actually played out, if and how they were different and how the relations of power were different between colonial India and what I think of as then a colonial Nepal.

DH: Yes, I certainly agree with that at the general level, although in the specific case of the 1934 earthquake, the government of India had elements of a bureaucracy that did not exist in the same way in Nepal. India was able to move resources from a very large geographical area, so, for example in Kangra, there were 20,000 people killed in the Kangra earthquake in 1905. And, the government of India sent people up from the plains within about a week to take over the government. I'm not saying that was a good response in a 'building back better' type sense. That was very different from Prime Minister Juddha taking weeks and weeks and weeks to get from the Tarai back up to the Valley.

ML: Right, although.... I don't want to go on for ever...I guess, and John Whelpton could speak to this in more detail... The very fact that Juddha resisted colonial Indian aid is a manifestation of the kind of quasi-colonial relationship that existed there and so I agree that the responses were different but they are responses that were deeply linked, not in somehow essentially different about Nepal.

JW: Turning a bit beyond Nepal and that the whole business of holding a binary opposition is valid, I think. I forget the guy's name, he worked on Greece a lot, yes, Michael Herzfeld, the idea of semi-colonialism, because as Mark (ML) explained, Nepal is very much within the British sphere of influence. The Ranas' strategy which is nowadays presented in nationalist Nepali historiography as a kind of treason by the Ranas but that strategy that you adjust to the dominant power next door would make sense for any regime. Still in Nepal, they make a contrast between Bhimsen Thapa, the great patriot, and Jang Bahadur, the great traitor, but Bhimsen was moving towards an accommodation with Britain. So you can't say that there is an enormous divide between India and Nepal quite as complete as the fact that Nepal wasn't a former colony would suggest. But there is perhaps one difference that is linguistically, if you like, Nepal, at least until the modern period and globalization, wasn't in a situation where English was a link within the elite. Whereas one of the major characteristics of the Indian nationalist movement is that to a large extent to it was a reaction against the common experience of being under domination by the colonial government. But at the same time, it was a response made possible by the fact of being socialized into this English-speaking elite. I forgot which book it was on BP Koirala, who was in India for some time. Anyway, he or someone else, a Nepali resident in India, was thinking of joining Gandhi on some demonstration and the mother said that was a great idea because Gandhi could help improve their English. There is this idea where you were in this situation where part of your identity as an Indian as against a regional identity was caught up with English education. And it was Nepali which was the link within Nepal, and of course then you can talk about internal colonialism in the same way.

ML Exactly. Nepali became a national language whereas it was the language of the dominant. So, it becomes very much the English of the Nepali nationalist project.

JW: Yes, absolutely.

SL: May I suggest that we stay with elites but move into contemporary liberalism? So John (JW) asks: are social scientists unfair to neoliberals? Eleonor (EM) asks: what is neoliberalism's role in producing south Asian disaster? Francesco (FB) asks: what is the role of conservative values and ideas and the production of innovation after earthquakes? And, my own one: if earthquakes are seen as catalysts for change, why do they often bring out most conservative ideas?

JW: I asked the question about being unfair to neoliberals. The reason is not that I am a neoliberal, but it's a bit like when I read CNN on Trump. I hate Trump, but every time I go on to the site nearly every story is angled against him. So, there is a sort of devil's advocate part of me, that says that just as it's nice to meet a left-wing merchant banker, I would like to meet an occasional right-wing neo-liberal social scientist because you get a feeling that you are in bubbles. Whatever debate's going on, we tend to socialize, we interact with people who see the world that we do, so even without actually sharing the ideology, I begin to get a bit uncomfortable if we are exposing ourselves all the time to an environment which has a sort of consensus view on this. So, does anyone know any sociologist and anthropologist in the UK who is a neoliberal?

ML: We all self-select into different camps and by definition, a neo-liberal social scientist would be an oxymoron. All I can say is that I think these earthquakes and other disasters become

opportunities at which forms of neoliberal governance can be strengthened, inserted into the populace, and I think much of what we have talked about today is an illustration of these phenomena where certain forms of governmentality, governance, inserting forms of, ways in which people can be governed, the state uses the disaster as a moment to pursue those projects in ways that would have been more difficult to pursue otherwise.

JW: Without confining it to any liberalist ideology, but any other ideology which had got a hold on significant section of the state machinery, and you have a chance to implement that.

ML: I think historically disasters have been moments at which the state can pursue whatever agenda it wants.

SL: Was that all on neo-liberalism? Unbelievable! OK, then let's move on to corruption and nepotism... Sara (SS) asks: 'Michele mentioned in his discussant comments that relief, reconstruction, donors and implementation agencies have been invested in equity in relief distribution rather than in differential aid based on need. This seems to me largely in an effort to avoid charges of corruption, nepotism, inappropriate responses to diverse forms of social capital, etc. How do we advocate the more individual differentiated approaches without invoking charges of corruption and nepotism?'

MS: In a completely unrelated field, I try to study the vernacular point of things beyond youth clubs and football in Lamjung. And I think, those processes were quite similar to other kinds of processes related to post-earthquake reconstruction which I happened to see in other districts. I think two things the analysis that Lucia Michelutti and a variety of other scholars have made for India in terms of vernacular politics could be a good point of entry. Because it means that, looking at corruption as one specific set of moral judgments towards certain kinds of behaviours which may not be advocated as corruption if you look at that from another perspective, in the sense that the work that Richard Burghart did on the polity in Nepal in the sense of these different scales of expectations that subjects have in relation to power. I think this could be quite useful here, in the sense that sometimes the expectation towards what to receive from a powerful person is actually more an expectation which, seen from a liberal perspective or at least a western system of judgment, could be taken as forms of corruption. But, seen from a more emic point of view, whatever that means, are just very practical approaches to how things go, and especially at times when a lot of money floats around.

ML: Earthquakes and other disasters rarely disrupt power structures and it is those in power that will be the channels through which intervention occurs, inevitably, and unless we come up with some way of bypassing that, which is unlikely, I'm not optimistic.

SS: I was asking that question because I agree with everything that Michele just said. Of course, we understand what looks like corruption may not be corruption but I personally experienced in many conversations now with various donors and aid workers, both Nepali and foreign, that whenever I say 'but it wasn't that way in this case with which I am familiar' or 'fake victims is not an appropriate term'— and that's the term that's being used very currently, that came up in a news piece just last week and is an operative term within the NRA in Nepal—it's very quickly cast as (and I think Nimesh has this term in one of his slides) 'inflated', as if those who have

actually been affected by the disaster are inappropriately manipulating the system rather than in fact they may need some kind of differential approach and that is tied very much into the discourse around accountability and corruption. So, in terms of answering the broader question the conference organizers asked about how we bring this sort of nuanced micro-level approach into policy conversations, this is for me one of the kind of flash points of how you address that issue. And I don't know what the answer is.

JW: The short answer is probably that if you are making any distinction whatsoever then it's always open to the accusation over the purity and impurity of your motives. We'll just have to live with that.

AG: In terms of corruption, I think from the data that we have from our study I found that political elites in local spaces tend to act as the mediator between the interventions and for their place. So we also found that it was not just the issues of corruption, but they were also trying to streamline NGOs and INGOs that would come and in their words that would hamper the legality in spite of the good intentions. We found that there were political parties, political elites, they were negotiating with the I/NGOs that if you have a certain amount of money then you are allowed to work in our place, otherwise you are not welcome to, because they were looking for sustainability and long-term projects as opposed to short-term that would do more harm to local people and local civil society. So I think that also needs to be taken into consideration.

MS: Also from the perspective from those who intervene, like, I can't remember someone wrote an article about the processes of reconstruction in Nepal and they found that the operational phase was just one tiny bit of the big charge before we map out all the processes of who needs to decide what. And then on the fields we get the volunteers from wherever they just arrived a couple of weeks ago that they sent to negotiate at the local level, which I think is terrible, in the sense that this is the most important part. Because, even from the intervention side, there should be some knowledge of how to enter these different perspectives on corruption and relationships which really could have to find a way out of certain things because, for instance, if you are just going out with a document written in English that is cutting the population in half. Giving privilege to those people who can understand English rather than the other way around, and probably in a broad situation these are people who are less in need of their help.

SL: As we draw to a close, we also speak about timeframes, so one question is how and when should we transition from post-earthquake recovery to wider issues of development, how do we re-absorb post-earthquake institutions into normal institutions? In a way, this asks: when does the discourse of aftermath end and how useful is it to compare earthquakes?

JW: That's a question that worried me a bit in my writing. I have spent my equivalent of fieldwork sitting in archives either in London or in Delhi and a certain amount in Kathmandu. There are other people who have been looking at the Nepali archives mostly, but when you are sitting there what you're doing is mostly like panning for gold and you just read through and virtually all the time there is nothing on earthquakes but you just go in the hope that you will get something. I was actually looking at files in both the British National Archives and the Indian ones, going right up into the late 40s and thinking exactly this: where is the cut-off point? The Nepalis, the emic

viewpoint I suppose, Bahadur, Juddha's favourite son, told the incoming British Minister (or ambassador, he would now be called) in 1938, that they had more or less finished the reconstruction, they had put up the public buildings and there you had, there was an equivalent of the NRA which Bahadur headed, and he said that we just turned that into an institution for pursuing economic development. So they kept the committee but just redefined what it was supposed to be doing. So, three years or five years or six years, it's like how long is a piece of string?

MH: When we were formulating our proposals for the project that is a part of this [conference], it was funded nearly a year after the actual earthquake happened so we began our work well into the late aftermath, if you like, and I think coming back to that question that was posed about causality really, but obviously in temporal terms, the further you get away from the date of a particular event the more tenuous the causal relationship is, and the more you might be overstressing things by claiming causality. So, in a Nepali context, I get an impression that, outside of the immediate sphere of the whole ongoing reconstruction process and debate, that the aftermath is over. I mean the development circles still talk about 'post-conflict' on a very regular basis and very rarely now do they mention 'post-earthquake' except if it's particularly related to reconstruction. But, I think people who live and work in Nepal can probably speak more clearly on whether I'm right about that.

JB: Should I jump in? I was just interested in the earlier discussions we had, I think we touched upon many of the issues, when we talk about accountability and corruption we tend not to talk about the role of institutions outside of Nepal. We should also talk about to what extent the development institutions are also responsible to facilitate these corrupt activities on the ground, when we talk about manifestations of corruptions, survivors and as somebody who has looked at this throughout the process, I would say that the way that some of these activities of the projects are funded by development organizations are also problematic, might also be problematic, that they can also reinforce these corrupt activities on the ground, be it in the relief phase as well as in the reconstruction phase also. And somebody who is based in Kathmandu and wants to do research in post-earthquake context, we are always hindered by the kind of structure that we have. If we want to critique the role of INGOs and development organizations we don't tend to get funding, right? My question here would be what kind of roles people like us are playing in terms of making our development organizations responsible, to also hold them accountable. Because as far as I can understand, that's the money of particular citizens of particular country as well. I think not much has been invested in this sector, so we should also be talking about it.

Stefanie: That was the last word. Thank you very much to everybody who stepped in. We will see each other again at the keynote.