# 9. To Whom Do You ‘Beautifully’ Belong? The Slums’ Response (If Indeed They Were Allowed the Tongues): Or, The Rite of Passage to the Right to the City: But, Where is the self of the Slums?

I begin with a poetic evocation,

‘*Their relationship consisted*

*in discussing if it existed’*

*Jamesian*; Thom Gunn.[[1]](#footnote-1)

After almost two-decade of slumming, so to say, it is in these two brief lines that I am finally able to locate (and articulate) the relationship between the city and the slums. The core of this cathartic relationship is not defined by the existence of the slums or the manner in which the slums come into existence, but is in fact determined by negotiating the modalities of dealing (or in fact not dealing ) with the *existing* of the slums in the city. Central to these discussions - one-sided, and deliberated by the hegemonic voices with both control over the means/modes of production and determined intent of maintaining control over the expropriation of resources - is the strategic, systemic and structural denial of the sense of self to the slums. This denial of self to the slums manifests in varied ways in the everyday negotiations to the imaginative accommodation of these spaces in the future of the city. The denial of the self of the slums is not always predicated on intent of design or deliberation but informed - overtly, insidiously or subtly - by the processes of estrangement, alienation, dehumanisation and depersonalisation central to the capitalist machinery and reducing the labour as its living appendage.

In this essay, I draw attention to the manner in which dehumanization of the slums (and its residents), with particular insistence on denial of its emotionality, is and will remain a crucial impediment to the actualisation of the call of the ‘Right to the City’ until significant discursive shifts are compelled. I will also highlight the manner in which the ‘anxiety of proximity[[2]](#footnote-2)’ with the slums in the everyday interactions, in urban planning processes but also in academic and activist undertakings, however well-intentioned, further lends to reducing and relegating the slums to an ‘infantile, perennially peripheral and an abnormality’ reckoning. Lastly, towards the mandate of actualising the ‘right to the city’, as Lefebvre envisaged in the manner of an ongoing, urgent utopian project whilst not succumbing to the tendencies of ‘unimaginative realism’, the essay insists the need of the hour is to discursively shift from the ‘moral, humanitarian, communitarian, paternalistic’ evocations whilst engaging with the concerns of the slums to collective, ethical responsiveness and democratic participation in the urban futures by both sounding and responding to the clarion call for a revolution which shifts its focus to, as Lefebvre emphasises, ‘defined either in terms of the political change at the level of the state or else in terms of the collective or state ownership of the means of production’. He further insists, that ‘such limited definitions of revolution will no longer suffice. The transformation of society presupposes a collective ownership and management of space founded on the permanent participation of the “interested parties”’ with their multiple, varied and even contradictory interests. This revolutionary project, Lefebvre continues, ‘whether utopian or realistic, must, if it is to avoid hopeless banality, make the reappropriation of the body, in association with the reappropriation of space, into a non-negotiable part of its agenda’.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Lefebrve’s call for the ‘right to the city’ is a theoretical, philosophical and political project toward an ongoing, dialogic negotiation which involves inhabitants engaging each other in meaningful interactions, interactions through which they overcome their separation, come to learn about each other, and deliberate together about the meaning and future of the city. These encounters make apparent to each inhabitant their existence in and dependence on a web of social connections. They come into consciousness of themselves as inhabitants, as embedded in a web of social connections, as dependent on and stewards of ‘the urban’. As they become conscious in this way, they recognize the need to struggle against the industrial capitalist city and for the urban. They come to see participation not as speaking at a public hearing or serving on a citizens’ panel, but as the living struggle for a city that is controlled by its inhabitants.

In responding to the discussions about the right to the cities, the symptomatology that presents itself are two-folds: why does the ‘right to the city’ still remain an un-actualized project, particularly within the Lefebrevian intent and as David Harvey articulates towards ‘the greater democratic control over the production and use of surplus’?[[4]](#footnote-4) And, why do the existence of the slums deliberate the discussions (or, the lack thereof or when in fact undertaken in skewed and stunted) and sustained anxiety? The prognosis of this diagnostic examination is that the denial of the ‘self’ of the slums is a conditioned impediment which perpetually defers the moment and momentum to accrue the critical threshold essential to actualise the first and overcome the second symptomplogy.

I begin with a personal admission of my initial encounter with the slums. Even though now I claim and demand intimacy, embedded relationships and investments in and with the slums, the first couple of years were nothing less than fraught with anxiety. I was adequately acquainted (and sincerely) believed in the ‘right’ left politics of the rights of the marginalised, the politics and violence of displacement and disenfranchisement, but left to my own devices of having to spend hours into days in the lanes of the slums, I found myself ill-equipped to deal and negotiate with the emotions the intensity of the slums materiality, pervasive everydayness of the denial of internalised – which the residents encountered merely on account of being slum-dwellers. But my anxiety was far more insidious (in response to my own limited experiential encounters with the slums but also responding to the popular/mainstream reckoning of the slums). In short, at times I was scared, at other times, violently angered by gendered, communal, caste practices within the slums, and at still other times found myself deeply drawn to a few and took a strong dislike to others.

In the essay, *In Search of the Slums Never-Lost*, I discuss these encounters at length. However, here, I want to insist on the *knot in the stomach* that I perpetually felt during my early days of forays into the slums. This sense particularly heightened to intensifying crescendo - which often left me debilitated, emotionally, politically and intellectually - when I started pursuing research towards my doctoral research. I no longer had the convenience of a project’s mandate to hide behind (which initially brought me into the slums); I had chosen to be here. I had written an impassioned proposal, ‘re-drawing the lines’ about the engaging, exploring and eventually ‘revealing’ the selves of the slums which not only most did not want to acknowledge, let alone encounter. Among my middle-class cohorts and friends, I chided them, I accused them of classist positionalities, I was quick to make a judgement: ‘what the fuck do you know, I, only I, know the reality, I have ventured into the lanes, I have broken bread with “them”, they are my friends’, and so on and so forth. For performative purposes, such anguished cries from a bleeding heart often got me the attention I was precisely evoking it to achieve attention, a shoulder to cry on, and sometimes, a long embrace into a dark night.

But, when the mornings beckoned and I had to set out to the slums, the *knot in the stomach* gripped the being of me. I felt hollow and hypocritical, the embraces and attention from the nights pungent. I theoretically knew enough about working the hyphen to speak of the knotty entanglements and messiness poetically and politically. However in the ‘now and present’ of conducting research, I found myself in such knotty entanglements that the ‘selves of the other’ presented themselves more as hauntings from far-distant shores.

I begin with an intensely personalised account my own encounter with the slums to insist that (and particularly to the group of aspiring academics, activists, or fundamentally as the collective custodians of urban futures) that however well-intentioned, politically sound, theoretically rigorous one’s position is, the ‘encounter’ with the other – here, the slums – irrespective of its essentiality (either traumatic or otherwise tantalising) demands reflexivity. Because ‘as such, the encounter constitutes the link between stability and change, determinacy and contingency, theory and practice. It is therefore one of the key elements to unlock a new materialist understanding of political transformation. The encounter is also the connecting thread between politics and aesthetics’.[[5]](#footnote-5) But there are more fundamental implications lending and leading to the ‘denial of the self of the slums’. Masking one’s own anxiety – as a researcher, activist, and an academic - particularly when it is from the vantage point of privilege at the intersectionality of class, caste, gendered, and communal affiliations only goes as far as to suffices as not dealing with the *knot in the stomach.* But these anxieties nevertheless find their ways of accommodation in academic texts, policy documents, activists interventions, and thus the insidious task of obliterating the self of the slums is set in motion. If the other does not have the agency to evoke a response, stir an emotion, does the other even has capacity to emote? And if the other in fact cannot emote, how can the other be trusted or even recognised to have the ability to make decisions, determinations unto themselves?

I sought out guidance from the non-state actors both working with the slums of Govindpuri and those involved in broader concerns of the ‘rights of the slums’. I took recourse to academic texts to if not find a ‘guide’ - *a kunji -* to this slumming, but at least a hint of the similar anxiety experienced and articulated by other researchers and academics. I was left wanting from both of these engaged groups in the concerns of the ‘slums’.

The overarching tendency of the non-state actors and activists was [and continues] to situate the slums as a draining resources of the state: ‘demented; lazy; and prone to avarice and indulgences of the morally compromised sorts’. The more well-intentioned of the sorts, among this group, treated the same constituent group in a highly, paternalistic, patronising manner: ‘but, they don’t know really know what they want, they have all the wrong priorities’. And, ‘of course, you cannot discuss politics with them, particularly when you find their views problematic, do not ‘antagonize them; they don’t know better’, was the advice given to me by a very senior slum activist in the city, when I was in the midst of pursuing my research on political formations within the slums of Govindpuri and which finds it way in the essay, *The Subaltern as a Political Voyeur.*

Of course, I recognise and do stand for the rights of the slums, but do they have to live so close to us. I am a single woman, I bought this flat for the peace, solitude it offers and now this filth, I feel scared […] I have never walked the arterial road connecting her apartment block through the two camps of the slums to the main road, and thank god for the aircon in the car, I have never rolled down the windows, that way I can not only avoid the noise but also the smells.

Thus reckoned a self-proclaimed left-leaning political scientist living in the apartment block across the road from Navjeevan Camp about her neighbours in Govindpuri. During my doctoral research, in response to my question about why the residents of the slums where in fact allowed in the intimate, domestic spaces of the middle-class households in the capacity of drivers, house-help, nannies and such, the usual refrain was, ‘our houses are civilized […] left to their own whims, it then they get the crazies; it is actually not their fault, it is where they live’.

In the academic texts, I felt even more fraught, I could not relate to the ‘researcher’ venturing about the slums in these accounts. The lanes, conversations and the experiences of the slums for the researchers in these texts were bereft of the ‘anxiety’ I found myself engulfed in. Here, the position of the ethnographer is eulogized vesting in her unlimited and unrestricted access to venture into a ‘site’ with the ‘subjects’ more than eager to reveal their histories, experiences, and lives. And the fact of the matter is that, and recounting from my own personal encounters in the slums of Govindpuri, but also in other marginalized spaces, yes, indeed, as a middle-class, educated person embodying structural privileges, I (and most other researchers) have unlimited, or at least unquestioned, access into these spaces*.* But this admission is very rarely made. And even rarer is the acknowledgement that if the positions and spaces of research and researched were reversed, would the middle-class researcher in fact allow herself to be researched; and particularly if the interlocutor came from the margins?

The answers to this question are difficult to find, not because the answer is easy, but because the gated community of academic scholarship on slums has collectively agreed on never allowing these questions to be raised.

These reckoning of the slums – and their representations – at the most fundamental level set the tonality, and thus the practices, of the ‘denial of the self of the slums’. Here, even whilst high-pitched calls for the voice and agency of the slum-dwellers is made for, the manner in which they are ‘represented’ the slums come across in monochromatic, passive and ‘not fully evolved’ entities in the Marxian sense. Thus, if both the ‘needs and there fulfilment’ of the ‘other’ in fact can only be identified and met with by their benefactors’, can the ‘other’ than be reckoned to have any capacity of ‘self-determination’? The flattening of the anxiety of the researcher’s - their *knot in the stomach* never really acknowledged - thus also lends to the *knotty entanglements* on the field and the multiplicity of the selves of the other being flattened out.

The otherwise ‘harmless’ practices which are commonplace (and deeply embedded in class, caste, gendered, and communal prejudices) in middle-class households, are enacted in different and varying manners across activists and academic engagements with the slums. The most commonplace of these are: more often than not *not* acknowledging the residents by their names; very rarely deconstructing, or at least discussing, the mandate and agenda of the project at hand in its entirety (to make explicit the web of connections, etc.); to discuss the arguments drawn from these engagements, to attempt to ‘deconstruct the space of theory and politics’ for the otherwise celebrated residents of the slums as collaborators. The framing to ‘mobilise, engage and involve’ the residents, more often than not, is in the vein of ‘we are conducting this research/campaign for you? We will fight for your rights’. And almost always, the researcher never returns to the ‘site’ to discuss how far he travelled with the ‘insights’ and the tales he wove, the argument he made and the publications accreditations he got.

In my doctoral research, I conducted an ethnography of everyday interactions within the slums of Govindpuri and with their middle-class neighbours through the politics of sound. The research highlighted the nuanced practices and processes of ‘othering’ the residents of the slums enacted both within the slums (across class, caste, gendered and communal vectors) but also that the middle-classes are reckoned as ‘immoral, corrupt and repugnant’ as the latter views them. Over the years, I have closely followed the lives of sex-workers, domestic-workers (both, men and women in different capacities) and manual labourers, among others.

Of course the residents of the slums – in different capacities of the permissible encounters – with their *others* are well aware of the *othering* they are subjected to and it is recognised as stripping them of their selfhood, requiring them of performances of passivity, invisibility, unbecoming and unlistening. The residents of the slums are very well aware of the ‘benefits’ that can be accrued from their encounters with non-state actors - activists, researchers, and academics, and thus the residents are also well-versed in ‘performing poverty, helplessness, and speaking of oneself only in vocabularies of lackings’. These performativities of dehumanising themselves in repressed and perverted ways extends in not only in their interactions with the state agencies and in accessing infrastructural and fundamental services – banks, hospitals and schools.

The residents have their own strategies to deal with this ‘othering’ - there is Baby who had worked in a Tamil-Brahmin household for past twenty years and who on the first ‘encounter’ with Baby assumed of her Hindu, widowed status for the lack of adornments maintained thus with them not revealing her identity as a Muslim woman, well aware that she would be asked to quit. Babita, the sex worker, who to maintain associations with a regular client who pays for her rent, sometimes afford her children’s fees and other necessities to ‘bathe with filtered water’ - using the expensive water filter which he installed – so as to maintain his ‘purity’. She chides behind his back, that not only does she not use the filtered water for herself but also not whilst preparing a bath for him as well, and thus adulterates him. The men who work as drivers for middle-class ‘*madams and their daughters’* share very intimate space and are privy to their intimate ongoings and discussions admit to performing ‘unlistening’, find it particularly amusing that these women assume they don’t understand English, and in doing so discuss the details of their ‘ongoings’ in salacious manner. In particular when it is regarding the young women from nearby apartment blocks, it often leads to the said young women being targeted in rather unbecoming ways, but also leads to these men exercising far more control over their women so that they do not start emulating those way. The women in the slums find it particularly difficult to find redressal for domestic, sexual and other kinds of abuse, or assert their claims or articulate their emotions. Until 2012, when the Indian state ruled attempt to suicide not a criminal offence, it was not an uncommon ‘threat (and at times put in effect) of 376[[6]](#footnote-6)’. However, since it has been ruled that ‘attempt to suicide’ is decriminalised but not abetment to suicide, the practice of , ‘drinking just enough phenyl, calling in 100 number [the national helpline number to call the police authorities] and negotiating whilst or before the cops are summoned for testimony with those harassing’ has become a popular manner in which the women seek redressal. The sex-workers in Govindpuri, who during India Against Corruption, 2011, and following Demonization, 2018, had to extend their ‘services’ not only to the local police personnel threatening them with consequences but also to local shopkeepers for their daily upkeep, and used to effectively to maintain their work, ensure their children’s education and maintain the household upkeep.

Whilst it is seductive to reckon these acts as performance of the assertion of the self of the slums, these assertions accrue any currency of recognition when performed across two registers – either by being violent or by implicating themselves – however imaginary – in the acts of violence. The ruthlessness of the violence inflicted is often masked within the rhetoric of benevolence; in that they are in fact being extended 'legitimate' claims to history, memory and culture. The lack of acknowledgement to their 'emotionality' is yet another strategy (though seemingly insidious and instinctive) to perpetuate their violence. For: if the residents of the slums were indeed identified as 'emotionally' capable they would have to be acknowledged to have capabilities of 'individual' expression, which would then extend to acknowledging their 'collective' identities as well. However this denial of emotionality does not imply that their 'performance' or 'expression of self' in the public, or for that matter in their private spaces, is not unacknowledged. In fact the performance is constantly scrutinized; however it is not engaged within the framework of expression of 'self' but as a gross deviance from the 'modern, disciplined and self-governed' in their infantile, delinquent manner demanding disciplining.

The self of the other is only permitted as much space as the capitalist modes of productions can accommodate, and that is the fundamental impediment in the actualisation of the ‘right to the city’ as envisaged by Lefebvre at the centre of which is an inhabitant who has a solid, undeniable core which then facilitates ‘encounters’ of democratic, dialogic, participatory negotiations. To state the obvious, it is not an easy task, intellectually, culturally, theoretically, socially, to engage in a discussion about ‘slums or their right to the city’ because most of these calls are made within the very system – the capitalist modes of production and negotiations which produce them in the first instance as Engels pointed in 1872 and which remains still relevant.

This was particularly revealed when during the course of my doctoral research, my intent and presence was particularly found disconcerting when I was categorical about the fact that I was not interested in knowing about their poverty levels but just about themselves; and in all truthfulness, it was in these encounters and hanging about that *listening as a methodological framework* had its genesis. Whilst pursuing the DFID research to examine ‘The Role of ICTs in Poverty Alleviation’, armed with an questionnaire, I would venture into the *jhuggis,* with entitlement and no regard for the personal, political, poetic, privacy positions of the residents to fill out details of their financial profiles - how much you earn, where do you spend, how much, why, why not - to essentially determine whether they in fact qualifiedas poor enough or not. The poverty- as imagined to be experienced within the mandate of the project - had to be validated by the poor*,* and as always in review discussions later there were doubts raised about the *authenticity* of their claims, what were they under-reporting, how to really ‘expose’ them.

Needless to say when I was allowed an opportunity to pursue my own research intent in the *jhuggis,* even though the questions evaded me, I was determined in the resolve of not discussing *poverty* with the poor. The poverty, the deprivations, the limited infrastructural availabilities were not a *secret* that had to be unravelled. It was obscenely obvious, and from my political, intellectual position, it was a bloody insult to the intelligence of the residents to ask them to spell it out.

Instead I decided to just *listen* into the manner in which the given conditions and manifestations of deprivations lend and lead to the experiences within the broader political, emotional, social, aspirational cosmos which the residents could claim, denied to and subverted. In and through these acts of everyday practice, I wanted (and still continue) to insist on that the diverse experiences of *poverty* - social, financial, political, emotional - impact on the capacity to claim and enact citizenship as a rightful, legislative, constitutional right.

The material form in these inquisitions was never-absented, its roofs, corners, crevices (or lack of thereof) became one of the ways in which everyday was experienced living in conditions that mark the infrastructural, emotional, political and social landscape in and within the lanes of the *jhuggis* in Govindpuri in my works. However, I reflect now, there was a matter of deliberation and intent - though not conscious and well articulated - to not insist on the anatomy of the material form, per se, as its presence was one of the most obvious and bearing manifestations of the *poverty* that specific discourses and practices insisted on.

Perhaps it was the keenness to *listen* that also confounded me regarding the participation and claims of the residents of the slums in the city that was dramatically transforming towards the Commonwealth Games, 2010, whilst I was pursuing my doctoral research. The academic texts and activist discourse were singularly intent on highlighting the manner in which the transformations were unleashing new politics of middle-class aesthetics in the city, and in which the slums and its residents had no place. In retrospect I acknowledge my naivete to reckon these accounts with absolute veracity of absolute truth. And thus I approached the residents of the Govindpuri slums with precise critique and assumed collective indignant response to the devastating fate our city was being held hostage to. I was *silenced* and *sidelined* on several occasions, more than a few residents took immense pride and delight in how their city would become one of the world-class ones, that there will be roads and infrastructure, and new airports and other similar facilities to showcase to the world. One of the camps of the Govindupuri slums, Navjeevan camp, has a very robust market catering to the construction industry, mostly the scaffolding that is essential in these enterprises. Commonwealth Games provided them the boost as never before, both the retailer and the workforce from the slums were not only proud but announced themselves as significant ‘contributors’ to the changes the city was witnessing. I am yet to come across any such assertive expressions of claiming participation in the transformation of the city from the residents of the slums in the texts, which in fact rely on ethnographic accounts to make statements about the manner in which the very slum-dwellers appear as passive agents.

There are tactics of complicity, duplicity and possibilities of ‘inter-liveability’ on which these relationships are precariously and delicately balanced. Here, the conceptual framing of ‘people as infrastructure’ by AbdouMaliq Simone while discussing the inner city of Johannesburg in the context of racial tensions in a volatile, transforming city holds particular relevance. In this formulation,

Ways of doing and representing things become increasingly ‘conversant’ with one another. They participate in a diversifying series of reciprocal exchanges, so that positions and identities are not fixed or even, at most times, determinable. These ‘urbanized’ relations reflect neither the dominance of a narrative or linguistic structure nor a chaotic, primordial mix.[[7]](#footnote-7)

In mapping the diverse, overlapping and intersecting networks, modalities and landscapes of living precariously, there is an urgent need to engage, expose and arrive at the ‘traumatic core’ of the tensions underlying it. This is not merely an ambitious, well-intentioned, romantic agenda. In my reckoning, only the task of revealing these densities, connections and intersections of living with conditions of precariousness will highlight the real, banal of the ‘other’ which is systematically absented and invisibilized by the state and other hegemonic narratives. The absence of such engagement often leads to these communities being caught in another kind of totalizing Borgesian–Kafkaesque narrative without any scope of liberation. The image of the ‘other’ as precarious can only be disrupted by demolishing the myths and representations of the distancing and othering it is predicated on. The demystification of the ‘other’, by highlighting the structural, systemic and material conditions which produce the conditions for this othering in the first place, then announces itself as the political project which researchers across disciplines ought to align themselves to.

Slums are representative spaces of what the city ‘ought not to’. However, an equally persistent, subtle threat is of the city turning into a colossal slum, given the rate of development, population increase, and lack of infrastructural facilities. In that sense, slums stand out as a demonic, prophetic instance of ‘*what could be*’ but ‘*ought not to be*’.

A paternalistic disciplining agenda is inherent to these narratives which is symptomatic of the broader anxiety of the dominant structures and narratives to allow for emotionality, and thus an identification of a well-defined and claimed sense of ‘self’ to the marginalized spaces and communities. Slums are heterotopic spaces in the city. They are both dreaded and desired. The former for its 'potential' to disrupt the fundamental core of social-moral values owing to the imaginations it evokes on account of its density, dirt, and digressions – social, cultural and moral. And it is within this dreaded potentiality for digressions lies its perverse desire.

However this desire rarely translates into a direct engagement with the space, but manifests itself in the hyperbolic interest in situating the position of the slums in the 'present' of the city. Slums are strategically denied a 'self' as it allows them to accommodate the anxiety about their 'otherness' across political, intellectual, social, cultural and, indeed, emotional manifestations. In its most fundamental aspect it completely disenfranchises slums of any 'identity' and thus its assertion. It systematically limits their 'right to the city'. This fundamental disenfranchisement further extends into denying the slums and its residents the possibility to imagine an (or any) other. The denial of the 'self' of the slums in discursive spaces, middle-class imagination and mainstream representation is then logically extended to unacknowledging any 'emotional' capacity or its performance, emotionality. This double denial, first of the 'self' of the slums and then the possibility of othering by the other translates not only in immediate disenfranchisement, but also significantly allows for the displacement of the marginalized both in the historical and futuristic imagination of the urban. The peculiarity of the suspended displacement in the imagination of the state is not incidental, but strategic. It owing to this suspension that the demolition, displacement or the violence inflicted on the slums finds justification as it is understood that they neither have any historicity nor any future claims to the memory and culture of the space they inhabit. That until ‘re-settled’ by the state, they exist in a void.

The right to the city for those on the margins ought to manifest in their capacities to reject the city without the fear, threat and/or violence of being expunged. For this relationship between the hegemonic forces and the marginalised to be premised on a non-negotiable pact of neither imposing or nor insisting on displacement. To reckon of this relationship as a love affair wherein the lover and the loved with, without, besides and in spite of any disruptions have and do accommodate the other. Accommodation has to be the critical factor here, to be able to throw a sulk, hide in a corner, turn your head away but not throw the tantrum of expunging the lover (or loved). In this analogy at varying times, the loved one is representative of the hegemonic forces, and whilst the lover retains the power to alleviate the status of the former, its position is still shrouded in precarity. For the marginalised to walk recklessly the streets with the swagger in the hips of the confidence that none can halt us.

And thus, if indeed the self of the slums were recognised, and if in the hegemonic forces in the manner of an entitled lord in *The High Bid*, the play from which the title of this talks draws from, inquires of a valet he fancies, ‘to whom do you “beautifully” belong?’[[8]](#footnote-8) And thus divesting the valet in the play and the slums in the city of any sense of ‘self’ and only acknowledging them as propertied entities to be exchange hands, one imagines slums respond resoundingly:

Do I contradict myself?  
Very well then I contradict myself;  
(I am large, I contain multitudes.)[[9]](#footnote-9)
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