

Podcast Series 3 - Reimagining politics through human rights

Episode 7 - Reimagining actors: politics as participation

Gauri van Gulik

Hi, this is To The Righthouse, a new podcast series by the Global Campus of Human Rights. From scepticism to hope, from utopia to empathy, we discuss human rights, riding waves, but also signalling where the light is. This podcast was recorded in Venice, Italy, on the island of Lido at the Global Campus headquarters.

George Ulrich (GU): Hello, I'm George Ulrich, host of this episode in our series on 'Reimagining politics through human rights'. Our focus today will be on actors and on politics as participation. Active citizen participation in politics and meaningful representation and political leadership are key elements in reimagining politics. It all starts with dedicated people with a desire and conviction to join forces, strategize, and collectively affect change. One such person is Gauri van Gulik, our guest in this episode. Gauri is co-founder and chair of Multitudes Foundation, which was created to support political change makers, building more inclusive, humane, human rights focused and hopeful politics in Europe. With over 20 years of human rights experience, she led Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch across women's rights, refugees and politics in Europe. Gauri is also alumna of the European Master's Degree in Human Rights and Democratisation, which is organised by the Global Campus. She graduated from our programme in 2006. Gauri, you started your career in human rights with political institutions such as the European Parliament. How did this experience help you shape your mindset around a more inclusive, fair and human rights centred politics?

Gauri van Gulik (GvG): Thank you, and it's so nice to be here. Thanks for having me. Yes, I think interestingly, working as, first as an intern, in the European Parliament, it's a big institution in Brussels, seeing this sort of broad diversity of members of the European Parliament, and many, many, many people that work around them, it definitely gives you a sense of the sort of the dynamics of politics. And I worked at the Civil Liberties Committee. So it gave me a good good view of what is possible in politics, how it works. Also, some of the downsides... [inaudible] but it definitely gave me a flavour of how important the political side is to anything that we want to do in activism as well.

(GU): And are there experiences in your subsequent career that you would like to single out, specifically related to political mobilisation, political participation?

(GvG): I mean, I worked as, for example, as a Global Women's Rights Advocate at Human Rights Watch. And so the whole purpose of my role was to connect sort of the findings of the research and the work we've done in many countries around the world, and politics to convince politicians that certain policies needed to be adopted, changes had to be made. So I've always been active in sort of translating what we found, which was often very, very difficult, entrenched, horrible human rights violations, and finding ways to really get that moving, so to really find solutions together with policymakers and politicians. And you learn very early on and especially as I started also working on migration, for example, at Amnesty International in Europe, that you see this very, very deep disconnect between, on the one hand, the sort of activism space where we're trying to expose violations and horrible things that are happening. And on the other hand, the sort of

reality of politics, of needing to make policies work, on getting them voted on, on making things work. And bridging those two has really always been my passion, figuring out what the best way is to actually achieve the human rights we care about so much, right? It's not enough to be morally superior about them. We have to achieve them. We have to work hard to actually make them happen and you just need politics for that, you just do.

(GU): Very interesting, how you have worked both with a powerful, influential institution like the European Union, and then going to civil society organisations campaigning for change, like Human Rights Watch and Amnesty, and then the whole question of bridging those two worlds, what can you say more about that? And do you feel there is an underlying common agenda? Or is it really two separate spheres without much intersection and connection?

(GvG): It's a great question. Because I actually have come now after this sort of full circle of experience to the point where I really want to work on both. And I think there's, there's great work in both these spaces. I think very often, when we are, for example, working at nonprofit organisations, we tend to see politics as the bad evil world. These are the baddies, the people who are doing bad things. It's just not as simple as that. You have incredible people who go into important positions of power and who do really good work. So it is possible. But what I'm finding more and more as I dive into this space, also now with Multitudes Foundation, where we're supporting these amazing people all across Europe who are trying to change what politics is like, make it better, make it more inclusive, it's possible, I'm very hopeful. It's very nice to see that all across the region, you have people who are trying to go beyond just talking about issues, and are really trying to change things. And so I'm thinking of, especially for example, in the field of migration, you have incredible activism, and you have fantastic people who are trying to convince and work with politics and also get elected as local leaders, for example, really trying to change things, step by step from also within that system. The bigger problem, though, that I think we have, is that we have to shift what politics is like altogether, like we have to change our democratic systems to make them more inclusive, to make them more interesting, more vibrant, safer, and a lot more diverse, of course. So right now, it's not, it's just not fit for purpose. And that really needs to change. And it needs more attention from human rights actors as well.

(GU): Very interesting, thanks. I hear you anticipating my two next questions all in one go. And I'll now try to pick them apart a little bit. And the first one would focus on the actors, as we anticipated in the introduction as well. So how do you understand what is a political change maker? And why are innovators so important, and what characterises them?

(GvG): I would say it's basically anybody who wants to change in politics what a certain issue is worked on, right? So for example, people who are working on women's rights, right now there's a fantastic campaign going on Europe-wide to make sure that women actually have a right to abortion all across the region. Okay, that's a great example where political change makers would be the people who are doing political organising to make that happen, right. So they go beyond, I would say, protest, which is crucial, right? They go further, they work to actually practically make these changes happen within politics. So they use, you know, these huge surveys, to actually get people mobilised all across the region, they use local activism to get local councils on board, they use European level activism and advocacy to get members of the European Parliament on board. And they try to change what politics looks like generally. So we also support people who are fighting to have certain groups have access to power, right? Who gets the whole power in our region? I mean, often it's people from the same kind of schools, same kind of backgrounds, same kind of skin colour, same kind of level of income. And people are trying to change that too. So you have fantastic

people and organisations trying to get more people with a migration background into positions of power. So it's just to give you a sense, it is all across the spectrum from political organising, all the way to actually working with politicians to make politics better, to make politics healthier and safer and more inclusive. And so all of that together makes for this large group of actors who are trying to change.

(GU): So what I hear you saying, is that a big part - and this points to the second question I was going to ask you, which is about political space and configuring the political space - and so one of the core functions of change makers, in fact, is to redefine the political agenda and to configure the political space in such a way that it becomes more enabling, more inclusive, maybe? Is that...and if I hear you correctly, you're saying that's actually something that happens simultaneously from below and from above. And in a certain sense that does have to do with the bridging between different typologies of institutions. Does that make sense?

(GvG): Yeah, I think that's right. I always say, I know, it sounds a bit like a cliché, but it's really true that democracy is a verb, right? To be part of a society that functions, that is respecting the human rights of all in a society, that is dynamic, inclusive, appealing to people as a political system, right? A place where people actually want to engage, where people can stand up for their needs and their rights... that requires work. It just requires a lot of work. It requires work from everyone involved. So we see a lot of people who care deeply about certain issues, right? So it's not true that people don't care about politics, it's true that they care about certain issues. So climate change is an obvious example, right? There's amazing activism happening around that. And we need to see that translated into better politics. So it's the people who are doing that bridging, who are trying to build constituencies in politics, who are trying to change who has access to power, who are trying to shift how lists are put together, for example, so that we're seeing different types of people and with more interesting and different backgrounds getting elected. That work is the labour of healthy democracies that can respect human rights. And so those are the people that need more support. They need to have, frankly, more funding as part of why Multitudes Foundation exists. But they also need the kind of support and respect from their communities, from people in human rights spaces, in nonprofit organisations who can work together with politicians to actually make change happen. And this is often where things go wrong, we separate the two too much, but actually, all of it is part of a healthy, well functioning, rights-respecting society.

(GU): So if one takes a longer look at history, you could say that traditionally marginalised groups, whether it's women, whether it's working class people, whether it's, I mean...you could say also immigrants to society, through different epochs have over time, taken a lead, in fact, in configuring the political space, and the political space has very much been determined by agendas defined from marginalised people, disadvantaged people in a variety of different ways. What are some of the contemporary, let's say, focus points and new sort of areas of intervention?

(GvG): That's a great question. Well, I think one clear area is climate change, and the sense of how deeply climate change is connected to other injustices; how deeply it's connected to... How climate change impacts groups in the world differs, not everyone is impacted in the same way. And not everyone is impacted in terms of...we see that there's a lot of talk, for example, about future generations might be impacted. Of course, there are huge communities already suffering deeply from climate change. And so this intersection between climate change and racism, other injustices is a very sharp, important, interesting area, I think of work. There's also just, on top of the issue I already mentioned, which is migration, which is always the sharpest end here in Europe, I mean, migration is - and probably will remain to be - a very, very

important driver of a policy crisis in Europe. So it's actually not a migration crisis, because it isn't a crisis at the level where Europe cannot handle this. It is a policy crisis. It's a crisis of politics, a crisis of empathetic politics.

(GU): And who defines the agenda? Because if I were to be just, blunt and honest, my feeling is it's not the migration...it's not the migrants who are defining the agenda and even not necessarily second and third generation immigrants to Northern European, Western European countries who are in many ways well integrated and taking a lead in many aspects of society, I feel they have not yet successfully sort of shaped the political agenda to the degree that other groups have done in earlier decades.

(GvG): I think that's probably right. It's actually the perfect example for... what we've been talking about earlier, which is, there hasn't been enough access to power for these groups, right? There's still a massive problem when it comes to who owns that conversation. So there's just not enough people with migration background, especially of this generation, or refugee status, who are able to actually participate in a meaningful way in politics right now. Now, that doesn't mean that necessarily that is the solution to all migration problems or issues around that. But it is an absolute necessity, of course, because you do need those direct voices in positions of power, they are such an important part of our society that should have a proportionate seat at the table. What I'm also seeing a lot is that we don't actually take democracy as such, as an issue to fight for. It feels a little bit abstract sometimes. People don't really love the concept of the institutions. They're a little bit bored with this notion of democracy. And what we're seeing now is that we're losing democratic institutions, values in several countries in Europe. And this is slipping away quite quickly, as sort of more far right and fascistic parties actually get into power. So democracy in and of itself, is becoming a target. And so we have to work on this. And the only way that at least I know how to do it - is read from all angles. So making sure it is more inclusive, making sure it changes and modernises, making sure there's actual innovation in policy, making sure it's safe to go into politics and making sure that people are actually well trained, and able to be the leaders they can be. And until we see that, I just don't know how we can achieve the issues that we need to achieve.

(GU): If we think about threats to the integrity of democracy, which I hear you putting on the table, and I think it's very relevant and important, I think this has a lot to do also with some form of rising inequality in society...

(GvG): Of course.

(GU): ... the way in which fairly large segments of our populations are feeling to some degree, overlooked, disadvantaged, marginalised, not recognised. And, frankly, the political right, so non-human rights friendly agendas, in many ways have been better able to embrace and speak to these constituencies than have the more centrist or political left parts of the spectrum. How do you see this? And how do you see reacting in this space?

(GvG): I think you're right. And I think what we're seeing is that there is an underdeveloped field of political organising on the centre, centre left. So we're, for example, in the United States, there's many issues, there are many, many very, very big problems. But one field that is very well developed is progressive organising, is the very grassroots work of door to door organising, working with people, talking to people, figuring out together, how to organise on certain issues, throwing the link between the fact that you can't afford a house and politics. That work, the political organising work is completely underfunded,

undersupported in Europe, because we don't like to mix politics and money, for good reasons, right. But this is a huge problem. So what we're seeing in Germany, for example, the rise of the AfD, so far right party, partly when there's floods, for example, the AfD are the ones who do organising or supporting each other who are supporting the people there who are helping out visibly. We don't have as developed a space here in Europe, on the other end of the spectrum, and that's what Multitudes is there also to try and change. We have to build that culture of constant - not just during elections - but constant political organising work to make sure that people are invested and know that there are alternatives, that it's possible that there are different ways of doing politics and that's just not yet happening to the degree we need to see it.

(GU): So, the element of community engagement in the old fashioned sense, actually... and how you're doing this in Multitudes, your organisation, what specifically are you doing?

(GvG): Well, we're just the backbone of support, right? So we just have people's backs and we're trying to support it - (those) who are doing this work. So, we're funding organisations like in France, there's a fantastic group called [Démocratiser la politique](#), who work with people from especially lower socio economic backgrounds, to actually get them engaged in politics, they try to change this idea that ...tell everyone: 'if you can vote, you can run for office', to help people get active - that sort of amazing work in neighbourhoods, especially, that are quite poor in France. So it's that type of work, we're doing. We work in Germany with an amazing group called [Brand New Bundestag](#), who is trying to get different kinds of people elected into Bundestag, just because they have more interesting and diverse backgrounds that can really offer something different in politics. We support individuals who have good ideas all over Europe, just with a grant and support and guidance on how they can build a new organisation doing this kind of work. And so it's a very rich and diverse landscape, but what we're offering is just sort of the...we want to have their backs, basically, and support this new field as it's growing.

(GU): Interesting, I'd like to turn to some of - I think it is again implicit in what you've been saying - so turn to some of the challenges that are sort of at the heart of these kinds of efforts. And I would single out a few of them. One would be a challenge of, let's call it, apathy, the idea or lack of sense of agency, the idea that, that structures are so powerful and so entrenched that you simply can't change them, whether it's corporate governance, corporate privileges, whether it's consumption patterns that lead to climate change, and all of this, that we simply we can't do anything fundamentally about it. So why bother? You recognise that as a problem?

(GvG): Yes, no, absolutely. And I think that partly, and this is hard to say, because it is self critical, partly us - think - human rights organisations - are to blame for that. In the sense that if you only point out what is not working, the response in people's brain is simply to shut down. So there might be shock, there might be awareness. But it doesn't lead necessarily to action. When you actually turn that around and start to talk about it, start to show the things that are changing, that have changed - I mean, if you think about - I used to work on abortion - well, before it was, you know, sort of a hot topic, in a sense - and we thought it was absolutely impossible to change it. And yet look at Ireland, right? Absolutely possible to change it. If you have the right set of people involved. If you have the right combination of activism, political mobilisation, organising work, it's absolutely possible to make changes happen. But we tend to not publicise that, we tend to not talk about that. And so we need to get much better as a field, and also in these democracy organisations that I now work with, to demonstrate that it's possible, to look and show that there have been so many examples where this work has had an impact. And we might feel that it's particularly grim now. And it does feel very difficult, right now, it feels hard in the world, generally, right? With this existential crisis

going on, with these massive changes that we're seeing, of course, terrific conflicts in the world. And a lot of things have shifted for the better. And so, as we work on changing our systems, we have to demonstrate what is possible, how you can get there, and a sense of optimism, that it's actually a beautiful thing to change the world, right? It's actually possible and it's actually a beautiful thing to do. The process in and of itself, is beautiful, is beautiful work, right? It doesn't all have to be torturous and painful. It can actually be wonderful.

(GU): So you want some form of complementarity between mobilising actions through outrage or indignation and sense of wanting to take action against wrongdoing on the one side and some form of hope-based human rights campaigning on the other side, where you really focus on how change is possible step by step or even in a bigger sense, and maybe also some stories about how you can align different agendas like we were saying a grassroots political agenda with high level European Union political agendas, or community-based action and maybe certain forms of corporate social responsibility or something along this line?

(GvG): Sure, absolutely.

(GU): We need space for that.

(GvG): No, I do. And I think you're right about needing that mix and again, I see this very self critical, I used to be on CNN and BBC everyday talking about the refugee crisis, and emphasising these things, I still feel those things as deeply. And I've also learned that it doesn't tend to lead to very effective changing of minds, and mobilisation of people. So it's not enough to raise awareness, you need to know what to do with that. Right? Like, once you have the awareness what happens? So we...my partner, work on this. So I'm very deep in this work, he founded [Hope-based Communications](#). But I think it's very important because I'm seeing this in our work every day, right? It's possible to make change happen. And what choice do we have? I mean, we don't live in a world right now, where everyone has the same access to their rights. Okay, so we need to change that, right? I'm ready to work with anyone who wants to change that, right? I'm ready to work with businesses who want to change that, I'm ready to work with politicians who want to change that, I think we all need to work on this together, it's the only way and I think the only way we can really make progress together is to have that sense of our shared vision, of this light at the end of the tunnel, and then practical steps to work towards it. And again, the only way it can happen, I think.

(GU): As a sort of a side on this particular question, are you following the whole effort to increasingly hold non state actors in particular corporate enterprises accountable? The new European Union, Corporate Sustainability, Due Diligence Directives? And do you attach hope to those developments?

(GvG): You know, I think it's, look, I think it's important work, generally, accountability work, I believe in that generally, I think it's important to say: 'look, in a world where companies have almost as much power as governments, there should be a same level of accountability.' But I have to say that I don't know if that is what's going to lead to systemic change in the end. Again, it's a little bit heartbreaking to say this, because these are the systems I've always worked on and built and supported. But I just don't know if it's enough to punish. Right? You have to also figure out ways to work with these entities somehow, so you need both.

(GU): And the requirement to undertake human rights due diligence is that not an entry point for some form of collaborative effort?

(GvG): Maybe. I like at least a coming together of these worlds in some form. So there is the need now to have people who have some human rights expertise in these companies who can maybe draw in some of that work. All of that is positive, I don't want to say that this is in any way negative, it's a really important step, I think. We just have to be even more ambitious, we have to go for something even better, which is, I don't want companies to not just be... not violate human rights, right? I want them to proactively support democracies, I want them to proactively contribute to a more positive world. And I know I sound crazily naive, right? Because, of course, I mean, the system we live in now that feels so out of touch. And, I really think it's the only way we're going to get any progress in the end.

(GU): Going back to the question of politics and configuring the political space in a way that's inclusive and enables change, and conveys changemakers, and so on - I mean to be realistic, one of the key features of the political space in our time is polarisation, we're seeing increasingly polarised communities, and we're... who aren't hearing, aren't listening, aren't hearing each other, and where whatever one side says seems to just confirm the oppositional stance on the other side, and vice versa, you know. Both sides tend to make appeals to human rights, although you also have a kind of blanket dismissal of human rights as something that's relevant, politically charged, whatever, politically correct. How do you see that?

(GvG): It's such an important issue just on a human level as well, this inability to speak to each other and listen to each other. I think sometimes it's almost more about these human qualities that we've sort of lost, the ability to do that. What I find difficult is that while polarisation is a big issue, sometimes it's used as an excuse to not reform and change - what our centrist parties look like and how they work. Now, what I mean by that is, it's not the only problem in politics - polarisation - the other problem in politics, and one of many, but one other problem is that for far too long, the centrist parties have essentially imitated the far right to try and defeat the far right. Now, what that has done is it's normalised very anti democratic and anti human rights agendas, including on migration, but many other issues into our systems. So it's normalised that and so when you have seen that, and this is a nonpartisan statement, right? This isn't actually about one side being better than the other. It's about a political shift that's happened in many of our democracies, where, for the longest time, this notion existed, that if you just adopt a couple of the policies of the far right, we won't have success of the far right. It's absolutely failed. This has failed everywhere. Right? It's failed in Sweden, it's failed in Italy. It's failed in the Netherlands, my own country, where we now have a far right leader trying to form a government. And so it's time to rethink that. What is the vision of human rights-respecting parties? What is the political vision that we want to sell, that we want to bring forward - whichever party you are - that's quite a broad spectrum? What is it that we want to achieve in the world? Can we achieve that without copying the parties we are scared of? Can we have a positive vision moving forward? So for that, you need diverse people involved in politics, you need dynamic solutions, innovation in how things are done. You need a political system that's close to its citizens, that's connected to people on the ground from all spectrums. And that needs to work now, of activism, of organising, of political parties and of the political system as a whole. So again, it goes far beyond polarisation. I think it's really important to see a much more ambitious and forward looking agenda in politics.

(GU): I hear you're saying that this is sort of back to one of our initial questions about how change makers are also defining the political agenda. And you're giving the example of the migration politics and how the right has successfully, in many ways, defined the agenda across a broad political spectrum and how central central left parties have simply accommodated - in a defensive way - certain agendas that were defined by the right. You could maybe say the reverse with regard to climate change, that some fairly strong climate

change campaigns and voices have, in fact, managed to define an agenda that's been embraced across the political spectrum. Would you agree with that?

(GVG): It's such an interesting one, climate change, right? Because it's almost like we're buying into this idea that it's politicised, but of course, climate change is sort of a scientific fact. It's just something that's happening in the world. What's politicised is, is our role, how we can or can't change things and how much we want to invest in that. But it's always... I find it fascinating that somehow climate change work has become associated with the left, which in a way is fascinating, right? Because it is, of course, just sort of the scientific reality that we live in. But I do think, I think you're right in the sense that, although there has been some backlash against - and there still is - backlash, against, I would say the more progressive activism, for fast moving and effective climate change work, it is true that you rarely see a complete denial of the existence of it. So at least that's been improving somewhat. But I guess I'm challenging your notion that the left... or that sort of climate change actors have significantly influenced the whole spectrum? Because I'm not sure that is where we have seen the most change? I'm not sure it depends...

(GU): It probably depends a lot on which particular political context you're focused on.

(GVG): Yes, of course, that's right.

(GU): I'm not sure, by the way, that this discussion we're having right now fully exhaust the question of polarisation of the political space?

(GVG): No, that's right.

(GU): The other thing that I have a feeling, it's something... there's something deeper going on, which has to do with simply inhabiting a space where you don't, as a point of departure, respect the possibility of an alternative point of view, this is the kind of thing, which defines a constructive political space that there is also scope for legitimate disagreement and this kind of thing, and we're seeing somehow less of that, the opponent gets vilified as almost point of departure. But that's something which I think we should be very aware of. And I think we should be aware, very aware of that, also, on the political left...

(GVG): Absolutely.

(GU):... and certainly, from the point of view of the human rights agenda, we simply need to frame that as our starting point and inclusive agenda that also allows for legitimate disagreement on a broad range of issues within bounds.

(GVG): Exactly. Well, that's the key piece, the within bounds piece, right. So, so it's quite a tricky, this gets you into very difficult conversations, I have to say, I agree, I see this too, and has to do also with all the things that I've worked on, such as social media, and just sort of the impact of the bubbles we live in and the lack of exposure to do other views and just other opinions about things. But the pieces that are difficult are questions around basic fundamental human rights of certain groups, right? Those things shouldn't be up for debate, right? There are certain things that aren't up for debates. And defining that, of course, is very difficult, right? Who decides that? Who decides what those things are? I like to see human rights as a good framework for that, basic, fundamental human rights. But if you really look at that...

(GU): ...how they were intended, in many ways by the frame, yes. Right. So quasi constitutional principles that frame the space for political action rather than themselves are subject to political disagreement. Right. But then that's a question of interpreting...

(GvG): Yes, interpreting. And also, because if you really look at that, right, I mean, just you know, as a human rights scholar, I guess, it's a very...that's a progressive agenda. Right? It's quite... it's broad, it's very broad. It includes many elements around economic rights, a lot of discrimination angles, right now, that in most countries, would be seen as a progressive agenda. So where do we draw the line? What are the issues that are not up for debate?

(GU): ... Back to your own early experience in the European Parliament, I mean, the European Parliament for a very long time was - and to some degree still is - defined by a common commitment to core values, and they include values of human rights, democracy, non discrimination, rule of law, and so on, and I do feel that has been one of the strengths of the European Union in general and the European Parliament in particular that there has been a relatively broad consensus on this, but I think it's also coming apart a bit.

(GvG): It's about to change. Yeah, I think that's... look, the EU is its member state. As we see these political shift happening around Europe, we're going to see that shift happening in European elections now. So I do think that is about to change. It's not quite as firm, I think, as we hope it is.

(GU): So that remains to be seen, but...

(GvG): Fingers crossed.

(GU): Stay tuned. We're coming towards the end of our discussion, I could easily continue. It's very interesting, and I feel increasingly so as we go forward. I would like to just end with one question in particular and invite you to just reflect on the, in particular, the issue of inclusion of youth. I mean, if you're focused on inclusiveness and inclusive politics, how do you bring on board young people and the next generations and even maybe pre voting age, so the whole issue of voices of children and youth and what do you do?

(GvG): Well, I think that there's a lot to learn from how young people - and depends on your definition - but you know, young people generally - are right now organising around issues. I mean, it's actually amazing to see some of the work that's happening. That is not... it doesn't feel the same, maybe, as what, we've seen so far, it doesn't follow the exact same rules or doesn't really take the shape of really big organisations or political party, but it's organising nonetheless. And so I think bringing younger people into spaces of power is really important. That means allowing for a connection between issues that people care about, that young people are engaged in already, are leading on actually in many, many spaces. And connecting that with local politics, with party politics, with how people are active around elections, even lowering the voting age is something that's come up, which is a super interesting idea. And just getting people to a place where they understand that if you care about an issue, there are places you can go. There are pieces of impact you can have if you work together, if you join community spaces, if you work in parties, if you work on what parties look like, if you work on the political spectrum, all of that stuff, and there's a lot more, I think it's about showing that it's possible to make a change.

(GU): That's maybe a good place to conclude, 'possible to make a change'. This was the message we wanted to communicate.

(GvG): Exactly.

(GU): So I really thank you Gauri for being with us and showing us at least small paths and ways forward and to share your insights and reflections on genuinely important and genuinely complicated questions. And also, thanks a lot for joining us. We really wish you success in your continued work.

(GvG): Thank you. Thanks so much for having me. It was a pleasure.

