No Peace without Security: Shoring the Gains of the #MeToo Movement
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Securing peace for women and the vulnerable is a long and ongoing war, with battles won and ground lost, in most countries and regions. This metaphor of war is not without its irony, of course, and forces the recognition of systemic patriarchy as the entrenched enemy of peace for women. Systemic patriarchy has been opposed with whatever tools could be brought to hand; the most recent of these has been social media and the power of individual stories. The #MeToo movement, as Tarana Burke points out, consists of the millions of individuals who have added their personal voices and stories of sexual harassment and abuse to the growing resistance against them. Yet, the focus is not any single person, but a collective experience of powerlessness against systemic injustice.

In our conversation, we focus on what feminist peace means collectively and for individuals by addressing the following questions: What is peace and what does it mean for women and the vulnerable? Is it the absence of assault or the ability to cope with it? What is security in a woman’s or vulnerable person’s life? Can we define peace in terms of physical security, and if so, what would this mean for the mapping of gender-based violence that takes place in ‘peacetime’ outside of ‘war zones’? In this context, what are the gains of the #MeToo movement since its launch in mid-2017? How can these be preserved, prevented from shrinking or disappearing, and strengthened? How do we see our work as academics as a kind of activism? Through these, and other, questions, we look forward to feminist disruptions, interventions, curiosity, understanding and empathy as a roadmap to feminist peace.
Hello, Cynthia and Irma, and welcome to this chapter of our ongoing conversation! I thought that in this discussion of feminist peace we might begin by thinking about how peace and security are usually interpreted in militaristic terms, and focused around the context of armed conflict. Could we chart out an additional area here, and maybe redefine the space of peace and security as being outside of war zones, but within the always conflict-ready zone of sexual harassment or sexual abuse, whether it be in homes or public spaces, offices, boardrooms and so on? It would also be very useful, I think, to contextualize it with regard to the #MeToo movement. Cynthia, I would like to start with you and ask how we would define peace and security. What is the connection between the two? Will we have peace if we have security?

You know, Giti, it is a wonderful moment for you and Irma and me to be having this conversation. It’s the 20th anniversary of the UN Security Council Resolution 1325, called Women, Peace and Security. In its 20th year, there is enormous frustration, rightly, and downright anger among scores of transnational feminists at the non-implementation of Resolution 1325, at the deliberate shrinkage of its terms, and at the ways that so many Member States and UN agencies have crafted to sidestep the commitments that were made. So it may seem to be a funny time for us to be trying to expand 1325 by redefining ‘security’. A lot of feminists are really pouring their energies and their lives into implementing even just the two original commitments of 1325. But I do think that genuine security in women’s lives does have to be reimagined as being even broader and deeper than we as feminists might have thought in 2000.

I am thinking, Cynthia, that we think of wartime and peacetime as two separate things, but the connecting link here is the always-present violence against women. It is a constant in our lives. When we step out of our houses, you have to make sure that you have certain things ready, like a pepper-spray, or even just your cell-phone, in case of danger; you have to check that it is an appropriate time of day, you have to know that where you are going is a safe space, that someone knows where you are, or that someone will be with you in case it is an ‘unsafe’ neighbourhood or time of day, and so on. We know this, whether you are in an urban or rural area, or wherever in the world you live; this is the fear of violence that always looms over
us. That violence is physical violence. We are not even talking about psychological or other kinds of violence; we are talking about physical assault. There is a very real connection between peacetime and wartime experiences for women, because we are always under a threat of violence. Would I be right in making that connection, Irma?

IE: This is a very good starting point: that this simple opposition between wartime and peacetime conditions is not helpful when discussing security for women; the constant threat of violence, which women experience, shows that it makes no sense to make such a distinction. Women’s testimonies of violence provide ample evidence that war and peace are entangled – that they collapse into each other – and that women feel the constant need to navigate and negotiate between the two.

CE: In fact, it was Liz Kelly who, I think, created the concept of a ‘continuum of violence [against women]’ and Cynthia Cockburn3 revealed how relations between conflict and conflict resolution suggest a continuum of violence when investigating what was actually happening to diverse women in the period after wars. Feminists are always challenging conventional timelines. A lot of non-feminists are most comfortable with little choppy timelines: there is a wartime and pre-wartime and post-wartime. Whereas feminists, because we are interested in women’s actual experiences, do not chop up time like that. In fact, some of the best researchers on women in wartime and women in armed conflict areas have advised that, if we want to fully explain what happens to women in wartime, we need to look at what women’s status in the law and women’s conditions economically and women’s understanding of themselves and other people’s understanding of them are before the war. Don’t start to take women’s lives seriously just when the first gun is fired. For instance, look at women’s relationship to land titles before the armed conflict; look at whether domestic violence was a violation of law before the guns were fired. Only by investigating women’s complicated lives prior to a war can we gain clues as to what is going to happen to women – and conditions of security and insecurity – during the war. In that sense, I think Irma’s warning to us is really so right-on. Of course, it is hard to be analytical without timeframes. Still, I think that feminists are constantly pushing open the historic envelopes. Rearranging timeframes has enabled us to make more reliable explanations.

GC: It really has, Cynthia. This distinction between feminist and non-feminist inquiry is so accurate. Irma, would you agree
that we, as gender scholars, can see war as a part of patriarchy and masculinity? That this is an ongoing thing as Cynthia reminds us, and saying that wartime is when violence happens for women is simply not true: the same patriarchal, toxic-militarized-masculine forces in their lives exist before and after the war, and in fact, plague men after the war as well as women? Do you think that Gender Studies has something to teach us about this easy division of things?

IE: In gender studies, the dangers of binarism have been highlighted. For feminists, it is unquestionable that war is part of the negative consequences of the patriarchal heterosexist binary. Patriarchy, which pervades society, is reproduced through silence. That is why we need gender studies to dissect and uncover patriarchy’s oppressive tactics. Gender analysis allows us to see all modes of violence as being interdependent – in war as well as in peace. For women and non-cis male identifying genders, peace from patriarchy is not an option in today’s society and culture, whether in war or in peacetime.

CE: ‘Peace from patriarchy’ – we can all dream!

IE: You are absolutely right, Cynthia. We can all dream and we should dream. It is the most urgent responsibility. Dismantling systemic violence and oppression starts with imagining something else and by experimenting with alternatives. This has been an important part of the feminist agenda. Subverting the discourse of patriarchy is to open it up to contradiction and to difference. This is exactly what dreams do; they accept incompatible or contradictory ideas and allow for a different kind of thinking – of the relationship between what is possible and what is not.

GC: In a sense, we are saying that war begins, or the roots of war begin, much earlier, at least as far as women are concerned. You also have this militarized masculinity which follows the men back home from war.

CE: Yes, one way perhaps to pose the feminist question might be: In any woman’s life, when does the last war actually end?

GC: Yes, exactly. I was thinking also about the ways in which the effect of war is seen in peacetime, or so-called peacetime – as Irma says, there is never ‘peace from the patriarchy’. The language, the jargon of war, is very much alive in the patriarchal, nationalist, and racial imaging that we see in the streets and we see it in different ways in different countries. The meaning and threat of war is constant, even in peacetime and the connections are the same; it is still a march of domination, it is still a show
of power, and as we can see, a show of patriarchal power is almost always connected with military strength.

I think we are agreed, then, that for our purposes we are reimagining the space of war and conflict as being well before and far after an actual conflict zone. What would ‘peace from the patriarchy’ mean for us? What does security mean? Do I feel secure if I am in a safe area or if I have a gun? What would security look like for women? Irma, I am going to ask you to go first, because you are born and raised in such a secure country. What would security look like? Can we imagine it?

IE: Iceland has never been a war-torn country, but the spectre of nuclear war was a constant threat for me growing up during the Cold War. Even if Iceland has no military, it is part of NATO, a military alliance, and has supported misguided interventions, such as the one in Libya. The absence of war at home does not ensure human security. One of the by-products of COVID-19, for example, has been an increase in domestic violence and violence against children.

To refer to what I said earlier on feminist and gender research, it has, in many ways, functioned as a shelter from where it has been possible to organize a counterattack – or in non-military terms – to strategize the impossible. The aim is to rethink concepts from the perspectives and experiences of women and those who are not secure in public and private spaces. I think that the #MeToo movement, which builds on a legacy of a hundred years of feminist activism, has offered an unprecedented example of what peace could look like for women and consequently the opportunity to rethink the meaning of security for women. #MeToo created a venue where a great number of women could step forward and tell their stories without feeling threatened or insecure; it opened up a kind of third space for suspending epidemic violence against women.

CE: Irma, one of the things I was so struck by in the coming of the #MeToo movement to Iceland in late 2017 was the decision by women to create closed Facebook spaces, open only to those women working in certain job categories. These women were creating Facebook pages that made them feel secure because they shared working conditions in common: women in the airlines had their space, women in the National Theatre had their space, women in universities and teaching generally had their spaces. The second decision I noticed Icelandic women making was they would not name the male harassers, the
perpetrators. I was struck that these Icelandic women who, as Giti says, live in a country that to the rest of us looks like such a secure space, still had to make a lot of strategic decisions among themselves to ensure that they would be secure when they had their #MeToo conversations.

IE: Exactly; the response to #MeToo in Iceland was, in part, generated through the creation of closed spaces where women belonging to distinct professional occupations could speak out, organize themselves and then publish their stories or issue declarations as collectives. These were among other groups such as women in politics, sports, engineering, law, the church and so on. Not naming the harasser was a calculated move; it helped bring attention to the social malignancy as such, the systemic nature of the problem – to exposing ingrained social and cultural injustices where violence against women is part of wider gender inequalities. It was not about assigning punishment. Without doubt, Iceland’s small population and strong family and community bonds influenced this position. But the political focus was, all the same, more on structural inequalities rather than on single persons or particular crimes. This was unlike the #MeToo movement in the United States.

CE: Which is much more radical. It is not just about the Harvey Weinsteins, it is not just about the Jeffrey Epsteins, the ‘monsters’. It is about how the airlines, universities, hospitals, the National Theatre, are organized. To challenge those patriarchal deep realities – and all the enablers who sustain those realities – will take a lot more action than simply putting a few perpetrators behind bars.

GC: It’s interesting that you should use that term, Cynthia. Karen Boyle\(^5\) has written about this creation of the ‘monster’ perpetrator, and how it allows us to see these men as exceptions rather than the rule, and their crimes as individual rather than systemic.

IE: The framing of sexual violence as a systemic problem reflects also, I think, a renewed understanding of justice as a \textit{continuum} – or in Clare McGlynn and Nicole Westmarland’s terms, justice as an evolving, lived experience where concerns such as voice, dignity, recognition, prevention and connectiveness prevail.\(^6\) For them, the sexual violence ‘justice gap’ remains because the justice interests of survivors have not been fully understood. This relates to what we discussed earlier in relation to security and women. We need to go beyond the binary understanding of justice, and of justice as a linear or one-directional process – of
getting justice or not – to grasp what justice can look like for women.

Touching on lived experience, I need to add to my recounting of #MeToo in Iceland that while it was definitely a platform for social change, it was, as in many other countries, criticized for a lack of inclusiveness. In a recent book on #MeToo, Carly Giseler has stressed that the movement should refocus its attention on intersectionality and marginalized communities. She is absolutely right; however, I would argue that, as the Icelandic case shows, it has also been one of a few sites committed to opening a protected social space for sharing experiences of marginalized groups to broader segments of society. In the first weeks and months, certain voices were not heard and various names were not seen in the collective statements signed by a large number of women. Women with insecure employment, women belonging to the LGBTQI+ community, women of foreign origin and women with disabilities felt as if their experience was absent from the debate; many did not experience belonging to groups established on the basis of occupations. For them, the complexity of their lived experiences – the singularity of their vulnerabilities – was not addressed in the mainstream groups. Migrant women, for example, eventually became part of the conversation as a separate group and then published anonymously their stories and testimonies about brutal discrimination, humiliation and abuse. They also issued a group statement calling on the government and local authorities to act. Yet, women with disabilities – despite having created their own discussion group – decided to remain silent, feeling that such an act was more powerful for them than to speak out publicly. They took the position of the ‘troublemaker’. As one of their spokeswomen, Freyja Haraldsdóttir put it, they killed the joy of feminists over #MeToo. In my view, it was a highly successful strategy since their voice was heard through their silence.

GC: I wanted to say, to wrap up this part of the discussion, that what Irma said about the #MeToo movement creating spaces of peace and security for women is really interesting because it makes us ask what exactly does security mean. At one level, there is the question of what a safe space is. In this context, we could define a safe space as one in which you will feel safe, your story and identity will not be betrayed by somebody else within that space – there is a loyalty, there is an implicit belief,
and you will be treated with compassion and kindness, you will not be questioned or victim-blamed and so on. This is what a safe space is. In a way, this is the security of anonymity, where your name is not your identity, and your community is one of experience rather than socio-cultural markers. In a very real way, you could say the creation of these spaces around the world is a trauma-informed response to extended PTSD resulting from sustained gender-based violence of various kinds. This underlying acknowledgement of trauma connects with the related question of why safe spaces give us peace; and I think it is because they provide psychological peace, to be able to speak your mind, to name the crime committed against you, to know that you are heard. Defining peace and security in this way allows us to understand why the #MeToo movement provided peace and security, in a way that laws and police perhaps can’t. Law is a patriarchal protection, which is run by men, mostly. A lot of the debates around #MeToo have been about how the law is either not enough, or not accessible equally, or does not respond in the ways that it needs to even when it is accessed by women to whom violence has been done.

The gains of the #MeToo movement

GC: I was wondering if we could go on from here and consider what are the gains of the #MeToo movement and how can we shore them up? I thought one good connecting point was this debate between forgiveness and what is called carceral feminism. Do we want perpetrators to go to jail? One of the things that the #MeToo movement has brought to the forefront is the work on restorative justice and rehabilitation, restoring people to a better self. I have views about forgiveness – I think it is to further burden women with the labour of having to forgive. It can be even more dangerous in the way it comes disguised as self-help. As we all know, women’s anger is the most frightening thing for the patriarchy, and possibly this is why we are asked to do away with that anger ‘for our own good’. Reflecting on carceral feminism: should we do away with incarceration, as Angela Davis argues? Would that be security? I want to lead us into that part of the #MeToo movement – what are the gains there? Cynthia, do you want to go first?

CE: Okay, here’s a confession. I was so happy to see Harvey Weinstein as a plaintiff in a criminal court. Seeing him
there brought positive joy. Nonetheless, I understand where, particularly in the United States, incarceration has run riot and where it is a racist tool of systematic oppression – limits must be created on jail as a solution. However, I would not do away with the ICC [International Criminal Court]. I would not do away with hard-working, fair-minded, anti-racist criminal prosecutors in our several countries. Nonetheless, just as with police and prison administrators, I would have all of us stay critically alert to the sexist, racist and authoritarian abuses and misuses of any criminal justice system. Anti-patriarchal security cannot be achieved by such abuses. Feminists don’t get enough sleep because we are always adding new understandings to what it is that undermines diverse women’s genuine security. Thus, it was only in 1979 that the legal term sexual harassment was created in the US. That is barely a generation ago. I don’t want to give it up as a concept that shines a new bright light on patriarchal abuse, mainly gender-based violence. Forgiveness has its place, but maybe not prematurely. As you say, Giti, it should not be a burden placed on women to be the forgivers. Somebody who has committed abuse needs to be held accountable, needs to show that he is willing to keep doing the work of shedding his objectification of women. Then, only then, women who have been abused by harassers will decide that it is time for forgiveness. As Irma said, anger has its place. Feminists are always accused of being angry. I actually think, though, that one of the things that really scares patriarchal people is that feminists are very funny. Feminist humour can be pretty terrifying to patriarchs.

IE: Humour and laughter have always been part of the practice of feminist resistance. Feminist humour breaks silence. It introduces a rupture; it exceeds authority and destabilizes hegemonic structures. #MeToo functioned in that way, even if it was about feelings of suffering and cruelty. It created a state of excess, abundance and overflow, which was very beneficial in the fight against patriarchy. Female grief and mourning, seen as an overflow of emotions, has actually represented a real threat to the state or city-state since Ancient Greece! This is also true for literature from the medieval period in Iceland where women’s emotional expressions, be it tears or laughter, manifest themselves as performative acts of a counter-discourse. I think that since we are discussing “safe spaces”, it is worth mentioning that literature is precisely such a site, a site also where things can take place that are the unthinkable in the oppressive structures
outside fiction – where new forms of being are experimented. Perhaps one can say that #MeToo staged its own trial, as is common in literature, over a system that has failed them. A forum was created where the victims could tell their own story, a right they had been denied in the houses of justice or the legal system – or through other judicial processes.

GC: This is such an important idea, Irma, which as literature people we almost take for granted. Speculative fiction, for instance, can be considered the most appropriate genre for feminist writing precisely because it allows this process of dreaming that you and Cynthia spoke of earlier, to create ruptures and new spaces in the more realist imaginaries of gender equities. In some ways, I think that when we say that the #MeToo movement has allowed women to tell their own stories, and when we acknowledge the power of the narrative, we are looking at this moment of rupture when women can finally speak in their own voices and appeal to the imaginative empathies of their audiences to understand and acknowledge their pain.

To return to my earlier question: how do we shore up the gains of the #MeToo movement? Because it feels like we have been fighting this forever. There is this forward momentum, there is an impetus behind movements that tends to lose steam at some point. As academics and activists, how can we make sure that this momentum is not lost?

IE: The impact has diffused far beyond the simple use of a hashtag. In countries like Iceland, where the impact was widespread, the conversations resonated through all layers of society. It sparked a surge in public awareness of the prevalence of sexual harassment and violence. I think that one of the most important gains is that #MeToo offered an unprecedented number of men with the opportunity of acknowledging systemic sexual violence and of starting a discussion on toxic masculinities. The pressure on governments, educational institutions and employers to take collective action against sexual harassment has never been greater. Yet, the movement’s call for accountability still needs to be translated into political practices grounded in structural changes.

CE: We shouldn’t imagine that anti-sexual harassment mobilizations only began when we first noticed them. Perhaps this is the point at which to raise a feminist warning flag. One of the dangers that I’ve noticed around both the #MeToo movement, as well as the ongoing efforts to enforce Resolution 1325’s commitments, is that we as feminists can
become satisfied with a new bureaucratic structure as a solution to patriarchy. Whether it is in our university, in our hospital, in our corporation or in our bank or in UN operations. The danger is that we slide into imagining that, now we have got a sexual harassment officer or gender focal point, now that we have cleaned up our reporting processes and set up training sessions – all of which takes effort to do, and was not easy to do – we’re done. As hard as these reforms have been to install, the danger is that they will be subverted when we take our eyes off them. Beneficiaries of patriarchy in diverse workplaces may resist our reforms, but once they are in place bureaucratically, they will craft ways to shrink and dilute their original intents.

GC: I was thinking that we are all academics, but we are also all activists in our own different ways: we just published this huge handbook where we tried our best to be as representative and as wide-ranging as possible and to be as accessible as possible, because a movement is fuelled by activists and anonymous people. After all, it isn’t leaders who make a revolution or who are the movement: it is the millions of women and non-binary gendered people whose voices made the movement. How can academics contribute to this? I think one of the ways is to be accessible to non-academic scholars, so you are crossing that sometimes-real, sometimes-imaginary line between the ‘ivory tower’ and the ‘streets’. Is that a valid mode of action to keeping this going?

CE: In your #MeToo global handbook, you made a political decision not just to feature the countries that have made the headlines, but to feature a whole range of countries in which the #MeToo movement has played out rather differently. That was a political choice on your part. A second political choice I noticed you both made was the accessible language you asked your contributors to adopt. People with a range of comforts or discomforts with English, which is already elite, still could make use of the chapters you solicited. Because what is the point of writing or editing such an ambitious book if most of the people who need the knowledge you’re providing cannot make use of it?

GC: Information is power and, if, as academics, we can collect that information and help communication or collaboration between communities and groups, then that is a contribution as well. There are so many people who might not know what is happening in which country and if we can make that connection available and help create conversations, then that
knowledge will produce more knowledge in turn. Ideally, this will fuel further action.

CE: One of the terrible stereotypes that has been floated is that the #MeToo movement is just about Hollywood, about the experiences of celebrities. Countering that cartoon version of the movement and its repercussions are two lessons that I have learned by paying attention to Bollywood and Hollywood, as well as television studios in Japan and Korea. One is that there are a lot of very hard-working anonymous workers in the entertainment business, most are not celebrities or even bit actors. Most people in the entertainment industries across the world are more akin to factory workers. The factory happens to be in television or a Hollywood studio, but it is a factory with all the inequalities and inequities, and sexist repressive systems of silencing and unaccountability that are too common in most factories. The second lesson I’ve learned is that, just because some people look like they are leading elite lives, doesn’t mean that they have been immune to physical, verbal and emotional abuse. When those seemingly privileged women found the courage to speak out, it did make other women think, well, that means any woman could be abused. That, in turn, sent ripple effects of awareness and speaking out in automobile factories, law firms, architectural firms, travel industries and political parties. When women in seemingly privileged positions described their abuse by male perpetrators in their own workplaces, that made so clear how patriarchy works: patriarchy encourages all sorts of men to imagine that all women are fodder.

GC: I think in India it also began with an actress and then you saw the cascade effect. The minute it came out in Bollywood, the art industry said when is our moment going to come? Then the music industry said when is our moment going to come? You could see this idea that if it can happen there, it can happen here; if they can talk about it, I can talk about it; so there is something very infectious about courage, just as there is with fear.

As a last point, let’s think about intersectional solidarities. We know that the #MeToo movement has not spread evenly through people of colour, people with disabilities, people from different classes or people of different genders and sexualities. But there are not-unlikely points of solidarity between quite disparate groups of people, and there are theoretical bondings, solidarities, being established. I am thinking also of how grassroots movements that preceded the #MeToo
movement joined hands with the #MeToo movement, or the other way around. I know there is some apprehension that the #MeToo movement might drown out grassroots movements and only time and sustained research will tell if that is happening, but the idea that we can join hands, that we can take what we need from each other and move forward, whether it is the #NiUnaMenos [Not One Less] in Argentina and the #MeToo movement, or the hashtags in Russia and the Ukraine and the #MeToo movement, which did not make much of an impact in those countries. This movement has managed, in some ways, to transcend language and class and nation, and it has ranged across academia and elite actresses and grassroots movements.

CE: This is an old cliché, but it is hard to do: think globally, act locally. The only way we can gain solidarity is to gain trust. We can gain trust only by listening, listening out of genuine curiosity. If you don’t know how sexual harassment works on a tea plantation, or you don’t know how sexual harassment operates inside a political party in Norway or Cambodia, you had better listen. If you listen and you learn, you become smarter, first of all, which is encouraging. More importantly, listening-based trust-building can become the glue of solidarity. Solidarity is never up there in abstractions; solidarity is down here in messy, complex, dynamic realities. Sustainable solidarity calls on all of us to stay curious – especially curious about things you did not know you had to be curious about. Thus, a corollary: stay ready to be surprised about things you have to be curious about, and ready to be aware of assumptions you hadn’t even realized were your assumptions! We are very lucky, all of us, to be living in an era where we can listen across spaces, time zones and even across languages. We can be local in our curiosity as a way to build and sustain a globalized movement.

IE: Yes, I think we are returning here to the vigilance of the dream. We need to stay alert and focused and open to what might come or happen. Cynthia, I like your way of prompting curiosity as sort of a hospitality to the unknown. This is what is needed – coupled with the urgency to act. #MeToo must be grounded in the ongoing history of women in revolt in both national and transnational contexts, as well as understood as part of a global uprising and recomposition of women’s struggles. Its unprecedented spatial reach goes hand in hand with the need in women’s movements and feminist scholarship to take a more radical stance: to incorporate intersectional
perspectives – post-colonial, anti-racist, queer and ecological – at the expense of narrow, market-oriented and culturalist visions of equality.

GC: Many years ago, when I was working on my doctoral thesis, I was trying to theorize the connection between the person to whom violence has been done and the experience of violence as something inarticulable. As Cathy Caruth reminds us, silence marks the site of trauma. Elaine Scarry tells us that pain is, in its very essence, inarticulable. In the face of so much violence, and the pain and trauma that it causes, how can we evolve a politics of listening? How do we access this event, and how do we produce it as knowledge? What are the skills that we need to have so that we can listen to this person who does not speak? It is an issue of special concern to me in almost all of the research I have done, and perhaps this is a connecting thread through many of the concerns we have thought through here – this idea of being a good listener. As Cynthia has argued, having a ‘feminist curiosity’. How you listen builds trust and trust begets solidarities. All of this reminds us, again, that war and conflict, peace and security, are ongoing processes at so many levels, and the ways in which we have to counter it are very basic and, in some sense, very human.

CE: And that means hard.
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