Culture and Boundaries: Antiquated, Useful, or Vital Concepts?

The paper reviews two main concepts of culture and boundary – the essentialist and the anti-essentialist one – to introduce the completed research carried out within an ongoing collaboration between Serbian and Slovenian ethnologists. The published studies are characterized by the fact that they have surpassed the old disciplinary paradigm of ethnically/nationally defined ethnologies rooted in the essentialist cultural concept. Rather than within the boundaries of what is supposed to be “ethnic” or “national” they situate the research in discrete social contexts. Collective and individual cultural affiliations are not a priori subordinated to the ethnic and national identities that were employed formerly to “measure” or interpret specific cultural profiles and identifications. Moreover, these are not always delineated by political or administrative borders, as well as not inevitably by ethnic and linguistic ones. Contextual and hybrid identifications are produced in ongoing flows of people, goods, experiences and ideas in individual, familial, generational, interest-related contexts and trajectories. As such they require non-essentialist conceptualisations of culture and boundaries that are grounded in everyday practices and reflected in theorizing about the everyday.

We need to understand culture as something which can neither be exchanged in the marketplace, nor reduced to its political face.

(Eriksen 2002a)

Cultures and boundaries

Since the first sources that constitute ethnological and anthropological views on human existence, culture (or, more precisely, cultures) and their boundaries have significantly defined the horizon of research discussions:

When anthropologists defined the subject as the study of other cultures, they necessarily (if...
unwittingly) placed ‘boundary’ at the very centre of their concerns. The relativism of anthropologist/anthropologised, us/them, self/other, clearly implies boundary. (Cohen 1994: 53)

Regardless of the theoretical and methodological orientations that, especially from the nineteenth century onwards, became more expounded in locally, linguistically, and politically differing Western world, by the second half of the twentieth century culture had already become an overly theorized concept—both in terms of its universal and relativistic meaning (culture vs. cultures, or in both its singular and plural sense).\(^1\) So far, culture had gained a high “explanatory importance” in the humanities and social sciences (Kuper 1999: ix–x).

Up to the 1960s the established ethnographic practice insisted on the collection and organization of culture’s descriptions in a comparatively productive style, whereby even the seemingly neutral descriptive models were normative since they defined what (a specific) culture was, and what was not. Such a reified concept of culture was taken for granted as a set of specific characteristics of human existence in discrete and cohesive social units. Universalist discourses on culture were interested in what unites people all over the world at all times or, in other words, in universal cultural features. Ethnographic diversity was translated into or made explicit with contingencies of history, geography, psychology, mentality, and even climate. Discourses on discrete cultures insisted precisely on these contingencies, seeking to find in them explanations for the incentives and drives of cultural differences.

In the first case, in a way the boundaries\(^2\) delimiting the (cultural) wholes are negligible, whereas in the second case they are constitutive: they define the areas and the extents of (historical, national, regional, …) cultures/cultural wholes, as well as their boundaries or edges that mark the differences between them:

The term boundary is often used to point toward something that is contained and characterized by homogeneity, coherence, clear-cut separation, or difference from that which is outside. Many authors claim that individuals and collectivities define themselves in terms of what they stand against, what they are not, or from what or whom they are different. In this way, borders become central to understanding concepts and practices such as identity, belonging, and culture. (Sajed 2005)

---

\(^1\) Already in 1952 Alfred L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn tried to analytically systemize a conceptual jungle of more than 160 different definitions. Their survey “made it abundantly clear that no consensus on the concept existed even within anthropology, but it also revealed that the multiple definitions were overlapping, differing in their ‘emphases’ … One might take these emphases as different aspects of a single concept, but their totality did not make for an elegant definition, and Kroeber and Kluckhon opted to talk about culture rather then define it” (Silverman 2002: xvi).

\(^2\) From the anthropological viewpoint, today the boundaries that are “essentially a matter of consciousness and of experience, rather than of fact and law” (Cohen 1994: 22) are at the forefront, without obscuring their political aspects that significantly frame specific lifestyles and cultural practices.
However, boundaries not only mark the differences that are supposed to be culturally relevant or constitutive (for example, ethnic origins, race, language, religion, survival strategies, social forms and practices, symbolic imagery, world views, and so on), but they “delineate that which is permissible from that which is forbidden, and that which is familiar from that which is different. In this respect, boundaries speak more vividly about the limits of the possible in our societies” (Sajed 2005), about (expressions of) cultural sensitivity, or, according to Herzfeld, society’s collective space filled with cultural intimacy, and according to Eriksen (2002a), those cultural aspects “that [are] not chosen.”

The issue of cultural diversity and partly also the discourses about the differences among people in general and various social groups have been woven into human history and the diverse contacts among people, and have also been abundantly documented. Focusing on the research agendas during the classic period of growth of both the anthropological disciplines and the European national ethnologies, it can be established that for a very long time they have been engaged in searching for and confirming specific cultural units, whereby motivated by various ideological and political interests. In such contexts, cultural specifics were *de facto* used and abused, including cultural relativism as a respectful attitude towards them. Within the European and especially the continental European ethnologies, they focused primarily on the character or identity of ethnic and/or national cultures, now and then also regional cultures, which were mainly represented by applying descriptive definitions of culture as sets of material, social and spiritual elements. Implicitly or explicitly, they concerned a specific concept of “cultural identity” that “refers to the representation of the person or group in terms of a reified and/or emblematized culture” (Cohen 1994: 22) that was coupled with the hypothesis about culture as a determinant of behavior, or culture as the means by which the supposedly discrete processes of social life, such as politics, economics, religion, kinship, were integrated in a manner which made them all logically consistent with each other. In this view, the individual became a mere replicate in miniature of the larger social and cultural entity. (Cohen 1994: 50)

The volume *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* edited by Fredrik Barth (1969) represents the milestone in the disciplinary reflection on the issue of cultural/ethnic identity and boundaries, including his famous introductory essay on ethnic boundaries defined by the social organization of cultural differences. Accordingly, boundaries are not fixed; they are unstable, contextually interpreted, and negotiable. Despite later well-argued criticism, Barth’s paper is deemed innovative from the

---

3 I. e. “the recognition of those aspects of a cultural identity that are considered a source of external embarrassment but that nevertheless provide insiders with their assurance of common sociality…” (Herzfeld 2005: 3). Furthermore, it is important that cultural intimacy has to do with aspects of the local, the national and inter- or transnational, and with the historization of cultural dynamics.

4 For example, ethnicity is not only a strategic tool, and ethnic identity is not only a tactic identity. However, Barth’s text brought important insight for a debate between primordialist,
perspective of studying ethnicity as strategically and contextually shaped. Ethnic studies became better informed by the cultural perspective. On the other side, a decade or two later, understanding ethnicity as a social process was an important element in the paradigm’s shift of European national ethnologies, large and small.

As in the case of culture itself, when dealing with boundaries we are often faced with essentialist and constructivist interpretations. Essentialist boundaries presume rigidness and often evoke a material, physical foundation while constructivist boundaries take into account individual and collective agency when studying the processual and contextual character of cultural belonging. Compared to the first, these boundaries are often abstract, invisible, flexible, negotiated, but always materialized in specific daily practices. In this regard, cultures and boundaries are a product of interactions, communication and symbolic language as well.

The physical and administrative boundaries of spatial units are also set up in order to delineate social groups. However, “[m]aking physical and socio-cultural separation congruent, … is based on illusions about homogeneity. Boundaries always enclose many contradictions, tensions, and paradoxes” (Sajed 2005), be on the national, regional, local, or some other level of abstraction. They cannot be perceived and recognized using essentialist tools. Besides, boundaries are not merely contrastive or merely a “claim to a particular culture” or, more precisely, “claims to and belonging to particular cultures”; they do not imply merely a “dissociation from others”. They can also be crossed, and serve as meeting points and areas of conjunctions and sharing.

Serbs and Slovenians

The analyses of these issues from the perspective of the latest studies of encounters between Slovenians and Serbs, and different migration flows between these two areas, are characterized by the fact that they have transcended the older disciplinary paradigm of ethnically/nationally delimited ethnologies. More than within the boundaries of what is ethnic or national, they situate the research in discrete social contexts and on identification levels that are not subordinated to ethnic and national ones to “measure” or interpret specific cultural physiognomies and identifications. Besides, it seems that these are not always marked by political or administrative boundaries, as well as not inevitably ethnic and linguistic ones. Ethnographic research does not involve explicitly “what Charles Tilly (1984) has called “big structures, large processes, [and] huge comparisons” (Brubaker 2004: 2) but tries to unveil what may be called ‘banal nationalism’ or ‘everyday ethnicity’:


5 I am referring to studies that researchers from Belgrade and Ljubljana performed as part of two bilateral research projects in 2006/2007 and 2008/2009; they were published in Traditiones 39(1), 2010 and in the volume Srbi v Sloveniji, Slovenci v Srbiji (Serbs in Slovenia, Slovenians in Serbia) (Slavec Gradišnik & Radojičić 2010).
Ethnicity is embodied and expressed not only in political projects and nationalist rhetoric but in everyday encounters, practical categories, commonsense knowledge, cultural idioms, cognitive schemas, interactional clues, discoursive frames, organizational routines, social networks, and institutional forms. (Brubaker 2004: 3)

Furthermore, it is imperative to acknowledge that “the assumptions, hopes, needs, longings and interests of ordinary people … [are] not necessarily national and and still less nationalist” (Hobsbawm 1990: 10).

The flows of people and goods from individual, family, generational, interest-related context, are often equally close to a local experience as the translocal, transnational, and global horizon. They create distinctive forms of identifications that may be appropriately denoted as hybrid, in the sense of being, for, e. g., locally, nationally, professionally, age, gender or otherwise specific.

As socio-cultural boundaries become less constrained by territorial political ones under globalization, the assertion of claims to personal autonomy takes on new political forms. For example, gays and lesbians become more conscious of themselves as a transnational community anchored in particular views of sexuality. These notions of self also come to be recognized in supranational charters of human rights. These changes create new opportunities for personal autonomy within given nation-state borders, while also changing the politics of such claims. (Sajed 2005)

Our studies disscussed diverse cultural forms and cultural contents: the folk, ethnic, and national (that is, Yugoslav, Serbian, and Slovenian) from a historical and contemporary perspective as shown, for example, in comparing previous research patterns in Serbian and Slovenian ethnology (Slavec Gradišnik 2010), findings concerning antagonism between collective or “civil” identities where the dividing line is simply the absence of the Other (Stevanović 2010), findings about the importance of settlement history in the case of Serbs in Bela krajina (White Carniola) (Ivanović-Barišić 2010) and the formation of communities that strive to self-affirmation and self-presentation (for example, in Serbian associations in Slovenia and Slovenian ones in Serbia; see Kropej 2010, Poljak Istenič 2010, Ravnik 2010a, Pavlović 2010), while keeping an open perspective on the fact that in a majority society the boundaries can and should be crossed. In the case of Slovenians in Serbia, this enabled the emigrant community to be acknowledged as a minority, thus obtaining a completely new legal status and identity consciousness. However, the fact of this recognition itself speaks in favor of the statement, that multiculturalism and equal civil rights for all the citizens are still not self-understood values in the multicultural setting of the former socialist Yugoslavia. Namely, it implies the “‘we and them’ way-of-thinking”, that, of course, has more to do with politics than culture.6

---

6 Cf. “Political responsibility weighs heavily on our shoulders these days; our academic or semi-academic statements about nations, ethnic groups or cultures may immediately be picked up, or assimilated more or less subconsciously, by ideologists and politicians wishing to build their
“minorities … [do] not need protection because they have the same rights as everyone else” (Bošković 2008).

From this point of view, the case of the Serbs who emigrated to Slovenia after 1991 proves to be interesting as well: the study exploring them focuses on individual identifications that place the identity boundaries at a local and regional (rather than an anticipated national) level, and discusses the phenomenon of ethnic mimicry:

An interesting feature of this migration type is an attempt of the newcomers to determine their own identity according to the respective city, town, or a country but not the state of origin. The emphasis of the local or regional identity in this case is initiated by a need for ethnic mimicry. Accordingly, this … [study] attempts to show and explain possible reasons and strategies of this hidden ethnic identity of the second wave of immigrants, all through analysis of symbols/markers used in a construction of an ethnic identity. (Dorđević Crnobrnja 2010: 83)

In a similar way, national identifications were pushed completely into the background during the Second World War in the case of Slovenian internees in Serbia. In 1942, refugee families from Primorska in Prekmurje (near the then Yugoslav/now Slovenian-Hungarian border) were moved by the Hungarian authorities to Sárvár Labor Camp in Hungary and later evacuated by the Ortodox Church of Novi Sad. Farming families from Bačka in Vojvodina took many of their children in foster care. After they had been returned to their original families, they maintained and cared for mutual ties of friendship, affection and gratitude. Individual trajectories are carefully documented with data provided by settlers who had returned to Prekmurje after the war, on literature, and particulary on eyewitness accounts (Ravnik 2010b).

The boundaries perceived by those removed from the residency register in Slovenia (the “erased”, among them Serbs, as well) are also ultimately individual

reputation on national chauvinism, ethnic antagonism, enemy images. The liberal academic establishment thus wags a warning finger at those who dare to talk of culture as the cause of conflicts, shaking their heads sadly over those lost souls who have not yet heeded the words of Saint Barth and Saint Gellner, who do not realise that culture is chimerical and fleeting, and that reified culture is a dangerous tool in the hands of non-specialists. It is, as Kurkiala points out, not only intellectually correct, but also politically correct to reject all forms of essentialism.” (Eriksen 2002)

Still, minority societies are important: they represent ethnic institutions as the most “evolved” form of ethnic associations that are “generally of great importance to emigrants. By socializing, communicating, and receiving education in Slovenian and through cultural and artistic creativity, Slovenians in Serbia are maintaining contact with the Slovenian language and culture, thus strengthening their affiliation with their ancestral land. Through societies, their descendants are also finding it easier to familiarize themselves with the Slovenian language and culture, which is slowing down the assimilation of future generations of Slovenian immigrants.” (Poljak Istenič 2010: 215)
Practically overnight they became a marginal group that, among other things, also delineated boundaries within the Slovenian political and civil groups, as well as among the general public. These were studied through the researcher’s direct active participation. The case is different with individual trajectories from the past for which only hisotrical sources are available to researchers: in the case of Davorin Jenko (Prelić 2010), a man with two homelands, he can only be placed between two cultures and identities by reconstructing diverse historical and contemporary discourses, both in Serbia and Slovenia. In this specific example, the boundaries are largely influenced by a time dimension with important methodological and epistemological implications.

How tradition and culture – conveyed especially through migrations during the 20th century – simultaneously preserve and obscure the boundaries through daily cultural practices is illustratively shown in a preliminary study of Serbian cuisine in Slovenia. Dragana Radojičić (2010) followed “the process of acceptance and adoption of new dietary habits among Slovenians ... The changes in the Slovenian diet appear to be the result of immigration, first brought by Serbian military personnel.” It is interesting that Serbian dairy product (Serbian fresh cheese and kajmak) "were sold at Slovenian markets by producers from Serbian villages until the 1990s, and today these products are made and sold by Slovenians themselves … This supports the claim that the ‘language’ of food is always authentic, testifying to the deep and intense connection of gastronomy with cultural heritage and development as well as identity changes” (Radojičić 2010: 122).

Much more dynamic cultural flows may be observed when consuming popular music is in question. Two interpretations of global entertainment industry flows in the case of neo-folk music in Slovenia and Serbia (Đorđević 2010, Radović 2010) show how contemporary media are important in the reception of the so called neofolk music in Slovenia. However, “neofolk is not the marker of any particular ethnic ascription because it is simultaneously consumed by people of different ethnic affiliations, but it retains some capacity for internal differentiation along social, age, or class lines within this group” (Radović 2010: 135). It seems that these cultural variations do not follow the same lines as ethnic variations do. The second study of this phenomenon “places special emphasis on … neofolk music as a typical product of ‘southern culture.’” From a slightly different point of view the author “establishes a link between this pop culture segment and ethnic and social (self-)identification of its consumers, considering neofolk music as a distinctive

---

8 After not applying for citizenship within six months of Slovenia’s independence, the residents of non-Slovenian nationality were erased from the Slovenian civil registry. They lost their legal resident status and became stateless illegal residents.


10 I.e., neofolk and turbofolk music originating from other former Yugoslav countries, hybridized with two local genres – Slovenian turbofolk or turbopolka and Slovenian pop-folk.
marker in creating hierarchizing discourse based on the majority population (Slovenians) vs. ‘Southerners’”, and observes “an almost complete absence of a political aspect related to the regime of Slobodan Milošević” (Đorđević 2010: 152). It seems that this (a)political aspect explains the popularity of the genre and a positive reception among Slovenian young generation. Furthermore, it is “a result of the specific cultural position [of Slovenia]: it is sufficiently far from the Bakan to be afraid of it, but close enough to be able to enjoy it” (Đorđević 2010: 153).

Conclusion

When we speak of cultures and their boundaries, we are dealing with the never-ending process of identification or, in other words, the recurring creation and re-creation of identities and multilayered expressions of belonging. Identity, very generally speaking, is a complex process of self-signification or self-perception, and not always also a conscious self-reflexive process. If it is an expression of the ways “in which a person is, or wishes to be known by certain others,” it is then possible to speak of identity only at the level of exchange between individuals, their significant others and referential groups, or communities. And of course: the identity of an individual is not singular, it is multidimensional, hybrid, and heteroglossic for on a daily basis individuals find themselves in different social positions: their roles define the rules of behavior, map out the borders/limits with socially and culturally coded roles. Individuals continually stop at, respect and transgress boundaries, engage with them, or adapt to them with the aid of negotiable rules. In the case of individual (and collective) experience, his/her trajectory does not unfold as a simple and linear process: there are often parallel, overlapping, conflicting, competing and sometimes temporary strategies arranged in terms of current relevance and past experiences. These “require a reformulation of self which is more fundamental than admission to items of lore, or being loaded with new rights and obligations … Having crossed a boundary, we have to think ourselves into our transformed identity which is far more subtle, far more individualised than its prediction on statuses” (Cohen 1994: 55). Anthony P. Cohen has to a great extent pointed out the implications of this: “If we recognise boundaries as matters of consciousness rather than of institutional dictation, we see them as much more amorphous, much more ambiguous than we otherwise have done” (Cohen 1994: 56).

Another very important identity layer is shaped by those cultural aspects “that [are] not chosen”, as Eriksen put it:

---

11 We have not specifically discussed the »boundary« concept that actually significantly affects different generations of emigrants/immigrants, that in the last hundred years were citizens of respectively two different (Austro-Hungarian Empire and autonomous Serbian state up to 1918, Republic of Slovenia and Republic of Serbia after 1991) and two common states (The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes/Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the Socialist federate republic of Yugoslavia, 1945–1991).
it makes sense to distinguish between those aspects of culture which are self-consciously worn as identity labels – the tulips of the Netherlands, the tribal dances of Kenya, the steelbands of Trinidad – and those aspects which are quietly reproduced without forming part of self-identity. By singlemindedly focusing on the loud and conspicuous expressions of culture in interethnic contexts, researchers have not only been able to conclude that ‘culture’ largely exists as a political tool, but by implication, the implicit and incorporated taken-for-granted aspects of culture become neglected. (Eriksen 2002a)

Furthermore, it is important to work on a looser, more flexible and more strategic use of the concept of culture, “as that which aggregates people and processes, rather than integrates them. It is an important distinction for it implies difference rather than similarity among people. Thus, to talk about ‘a culture’, is not to postulate a large number of people, all of whom are merely clones of each other and of some organising principle” (Cohen 1994: 50).

It is possible to conclude that the culture concept is “helpful” in terms of “standards” that everybody adopts for his/her daily operations and activities. And especially from a daily and practice perspective, including aspects of longue durée,12 “human cultures are neither necessarily coherent nor always homogeneous. More often than we usually care to think, our everyday lives are crisscrossed by border zones, pockets and eruptions of all kinds” (Rosaldo 1989: 207).

When trying to answer to the question posed in the title, one cannot ignore the well-known considerations about culture: according to Raymond Williams (1983: 87), culture is the most complicated idea in the humanities and the social studies; according to James Clifford (1988: 10) it is a “deeply compromised idea, . . . but one we cannot yet do without,” and according to Adam Kuper (1999: x) it is such a hyper-referential concept that it is best left alone. A decade ago Sydel Silverman questioned why anthropologists were beset by “culture worry”:

One answer lies perhaps in the fact that culture condenses a number of tenets held by anthropologists, much as did several ‘emphases’ that Kroeber and Kluckhohn pointed to: the distinction between genetic and social inheritance, the connection among different domains of life, the patterning of cultural content . . ., the historicity of such patterns, and their potential adaptedness to specific conditions . . . anthropologists agree on what the concept summarizes much more than they do on the term itself. (Silverman 2002: xvii)

12 “It is certainly illuminating to study how history is being used; but it is also a great intellectual challenge, which may shed important light on the present, to investigate the effects of history that is not being used for a particular legitimating purpose. What is called for, in other words, is a reorientation back to the study of implicit, non-reflexive, doxic foundations for thought and action; historical depth and cultural sensitivity, that which is beyond strategy and self-consciousness.” (Eriksen 2002)
Thus, culture might be taken as an obsolete, but still useful and vital concept—depending on how we think about it (e.g., as an ideational or inclusive concept, focused in the mind or in the daily behavior of people) and how we research it: “Anthropologists should react against fraudulent attempts to delineate ‘authentic cultures’ … At the same time, we should point out that cultures do exist and not just persons exerting choice” (Eriksen 2002a). And:

“We may choose not to speak of … features of social reality and everyday life in terms of ‘culture’, but they are neither more nor less invented, or real, than anything else. People do not choose their kin, they cannot choose to do away with their childhood and everything they learnt at a tender age. These are aspects of identity which are not chosen, which are incorporated and implicit. Of course, we relate to them as reflexive agents, but we do so within limitations that are not chosen. Such limitations form the objective foundations of identification, on top of which situational selection and relational identities can be played out.” (Eriksen 2002a)

The interpretatively most fruitful first research step continues to be the empirically realistic one: to grasp the insider interpretations (or follow the classic Lévi-Strauss slogan claiming that “every culture has its theorists”) and distinguishing between actions, norms and representations (Holy and Stuchlik 1983).

The ethic-emic distinction has been reflected further in debates about essentialist vs. constructivist concepts of culture. The essentialist concept – its main characteristics being: 1. a culture is a bounded system which is separate and distinguishable from others; 2. a culture is “homogeneous”; 3. a culture is shared by members of the society – informs also the essentialist cultural border rhetoric. This rhetoric seems to lose its power, if the focus switches from a society (or group) to individuals. Shifting the research focus from societal culture to individual culture may acknowledge the cultural differences as an embracing factor rather than as a schismatic one: “Cultural boundaries within individuals become blurred as components from diverse cultures become incorporated into their individual cultural identity, instead of remaining separate from each other” (Chang 1999).13

The discussion of cultural boundaries may not be separated from a culture concept and the existence of cultural difference:

Modernity is associated with fragmentation, individuation, *Gesellschaft* and fast-moving changes. If modernity is everywhere, it thus seems, then there can be no hope for cultural communities based on a sense of sharing and continuity. Yet ‘we have never been modern’. There is by now massive evidence to the effect that in spite of the ubiquity of modernity, systematic cultural differences continue to exist. Collective identities based on assumptions of cultural similarity also exist. Moreover, there is a complicated relationship between the two: sometimes there is a convincing

---

13 Exemplified by some cases of our research: see esp. Djordjević Crnobnja 2010, Prelić 2010, Sabo 2010.
fit between culture and group für sich, but sometimes groups are neatly bounded while the cultures they profess to represent are not. (Eriksen 2002a)

Cultural boundaries that find expression both in the strategic use of cultural markers or symbols and in “that which is not chosen” may be seen as an useless concept as long as they reflect those scholarly conceptualizations of culture that narrow down or fix the research horizon into imaginary cultural and societal wholes. However, their value lies in the fact that they enable us to investigate a field where cultural differences and shared aspects of culture meet in anti-essentialist terms, and where researchers acknowledge peoples’ attitude to the “other” and “different” seriously. 14

To avoid ethnographic picturesqueness or postmodern bricolages of ethnographic cases, everyday or vernacular theorizing should be connected with reflexive theorizing about the everyday (Briggs 2008: 91) and culture 15 within a more democratic model of knowledge production and with a sensible reading of culture’s political implications:

After more than a decade of varying applications of culture concepts — from the questionable (Samuel Huntington) to the horrible (Bosnia) — we cannot relinquish it, but we must be careful in distinguishing between cultural differences and the political exploitation of assumed cultural differences (Eriksen 2002a).
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