

EPISODE 22

SUGAR & SEX

Hi there. Welcome to the end of the world. My name is Michael Folz. And this is Episode lucky number 22 of my podcast Dial It Back Or Die. Now two episodes ago I went over some of the positive aspects of the 17th Century, such as Rene Descartes, Rationalism, and the Scientific Revolution. Last episode I went over some of the not so positive aspects of the 17th Century, such as the fearful atheism of Thomas Hobbes, and the beginning of existentialist philosophy with John Locke. And at the end of that episode I admitted that maybe it wasn't just philosophers here and there who were responsible for the creation of what I call the modern outlook. And that there were various sociological and economic forces at work that were just as important, if not even more so.

So today we're going to look at some of those influences. And we're going to start off with sugar.

Now all primates have sweet teeth. Which makes perfect sense, since they started out as lemurs and monkeys roaming through trees and eating fruit. And even though humans transitioned to the ground and ended up eating mostly meat and grains and vegetables, the urge for sweetness never went away. Outside of fruit, however, for hundreds of thousands of years just about all that was available to satisfy that urge was honey.

About 8,000 years ago, though, natives in New Guinea started cultivating a member of the grass family which we now call sugar cane. They chewed upon its tough stalk in order to release its juice, and this tasted so good that the crop migrated to Southeast Asia and to India. By the 4th Century AD someone in India had figured out how to mash up the stalks and refine the resulting syrup into granular sugar. A terrific new product destined for world commerce was born.

By the 9th Century the Arabs had brought sugar cultivation to the Mideast. By the 12th Century Crusaders were coming home with tales of this wondrous 'tonic'. Two centuries later, though, in Europe granulated sugar was still as expensive per ounce as nutmeg, cloves, and other exotic eastern spices.

This started to change when Sicily and Southern Spain were taken back from the Arabs and sugar started to be grown there. Then in the 15th Century, what with the colonization of Madeira and the Azores and the Canaries out in the Atlantic, people figured out that a warm, balmy climate was by far the best environment in which to grow the crop.

When Columbus happened upon the West Indies, the Spanish at first were eager colonizers. But mostly they were interested in amassing huge amounts of gold and silver. And having the natives do all of the hard work involved in finding and mining it. But the natives kept dying, both because of imported disease and from having been overworked. For instance, it is estimated that in 1492 there were between 200,000 and 300,000 Indians on the island of Hispaniola. By 1514 there were 14,000. By 1548 there were maybe 500.

Meanwhile incredible amounts of gold and silver had indeed been found in Mexico and Peru. And there were more than enough natives in those places to enslave and exploit. So all of the Spanish moved over to the mainland.

Which meant that by 1600 all of the Caribbean islands were pretty much deserted.

But the British and French, who had been left out of the picture when the Pope had divided the New World between Portugal and Spain in 1494, now saw their chance. Barbados, the southeasternmost of the islands, was the first British colony, and initially poor white people from Ireland and England were transported there to try farming tobacco and the like. But the tobacco ended up smelling terrible, and none of the other crops were successful. Far worse, though, was the fact that the Caribbean was a pestilential hellhole. For each and every person who moved there, there was about a 50% chance that yellow fever or malaria or any number of other diseases would kill them within a year. Unsurprisingly, even among the dirt poor in Ireland, there were few new settlers once word of that got around.

Meanwhile, back around 1500 the Portuguese had discovered that nice flat, tropical Northeastern Brazil was perfect for sugar production. Trouble was that this particular crop required a lot of labor. A tremendous amount. Indeed the planting of sugar, its harvesting, and the mill work required to squash all those stalks—all of this in the hot tropical sun to boot—was so incredibly backbreaking that no free person would ever want to do it anyway. Fortunately for Portugal, however, it had also pioneered the trade routes to Africa, and in the process had started a flourishing slave business. So that by 1600 thousands upon thousands of black slaves were being transported to the giant sugar plantations of Brazil.

Around 1640, however, the Portuguese made the mistake of kicking out all of the Dutch traders. Some of these people then migrated up to Barbados, where they started to preach the gospel of sugar. The effects of the agricultural shift that soon happened were astonishing. In 1645 there were about 30,000 white people and about 5,000 black slaves in Barbados. In only a few years that ratio would be reversed. And by the late 18th Century there would be up to twenty slaves for every white person. Landholdings went from farms of a few acres each to giant plantations of hundreds of acres. And all of the milling equipment required for sugar production required in turn a tremendous amount of capital. And in fact the huge growth in the milling and refining of sugar was actually the world's first real large scale industrialization. And the huge returns on the capital invested made all the whole business incredibly profitable.

Barbados quickly became a sugar monoculture. And this model quickly spread to the rest of the Caribbean, with Spain holding on to Cuba and Puerto Rico, and with France and Britain dividing up most of the rest. This meant that much more of the product was imported into Europe, and sugar soon transformed itself from being a luxury into becoming a commodity. For instance, in 1700 the average Englishman ate 4 pounds of sugar a year; by 1770 that average (for a larger population) was up to 18 pounds. And this was just for one of the countries of Europe.

Which meant that even more sugar had to be grown.

And that also meant more slaves. Many, many more slaves. Because black people perished just as easily from yellow fever as did whites. Plus you had the problem that a large percentage of them would die on the passage from Africa to the Americas. And then there was the fact that so many of them were literally worked to death. So that you had to buy at least two slaves for every one who survived. And more often than not (and certainly from the slave's point of view) those who did survive were the unlucky ones. As a small example, a common legal penalty for having escaped for more than a month was the amputation of a leg.

(By the way, if you're feeling guilty about American slavery, you can take some small comfort in the fact that, of the estimated 7-12 million slaves which were transported from Africa, about half went to Brazil, about half to the Caribbean, and only 250,000 to the United States. What's more, if you were unfortunate enough to have fallen into slavery, you were luckiest by far if you ended up in North America. By 1850 those 250,000 had multiplied to almost 4 million. Whereas in the Caribbean, even with all the families and births, in 1850 there were still fewer than 3 million blacks alive.)

And the slave trade itself was also incredibly profitable, with the trader would making huge

margins on the guns and iron that he would offer in trade to the African slave merchants, and then even more on the sugar that he would take back to Europe on his triangular journey. In short, slavery became a critical component of the European economy.

How important had sugar become? Even in 1697 tiny Barbados was more valuable to Britain than New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas combined. In 1763, at the end of the Seven Years War, Britain had captured from France both the giant realm of Canada and the tiny sugar island of Guadeloupe. Given the choice of getting back one or the other, France chose Guadeloupe, and they were convinced that they had put one over on the British. The British, in turn, felt snookered.

Because, of course, everyone had to have their sugar.

After all, it was delicious.

And, given all the money and profits which were involved, it's probably not that surprising that notions of morality, Christian and otherwise, would change. The Apostle Paul had told slaves to meekly accept their station in life. But Roman ideas on slavery were much more humane than what was to develop in the sugar trade, and anyway Paul was expecting the imminent return of Jesus, so that in his mind your position on this Earth at that moment didn't really matter. He certainly never said that Christians should *own* slaves. Even in more secular law the only legal justification for slavery had been as an outcome of war. And the Church had fully recognized that slaves were persons with souls, fully fledged men who just had fewer rights than others. Thus in Catholic countries codes were drawn up which said that owners couldn't mistreat their slaves, that slaves were free to marry whom they chose, that they could own private possessions, etc.

Not that those codes were honored all that much once the sugar monster had been created.

But what's most perverse in all this is that these were the times in Protestant countries when the rights of man, the rights of the individual, of autonomy, of 'freedom', were coming more and more to the fore. So that now in Holland, in England, and later in America, the backwards logic developed that, since slaves did not have rights or freedom, they were therefore *by definition* less than human. That they were just animals. Perhaps smarter than orangutans. But probably by not all that much. And therefore slave owners were doing them a big favor by clothing and feeding them, not to mention saving them from the heathen life of Africa.

Meanwhile incredible fortunes were being made off of sugar, and plantation owners built huge estates, ate off of fine china, and were the envy of high society. In the social order of the 18th Century, money dervied from sugar produced by far the most awe and social status. Plantation owners had a

cachet about them which was a strange mix of how the present day regards wealthy owners of wineries, but with a touch of the drug lord thrown in.

Not that the plantation owners had to actually deal firsthand with the slaves, since they themselves lived in England or France. And had overseers in the Caribbean who handled all the brutality. Although it's also true that they and the lords and ladies who they socialized with did have to sleep at night.

So that one doesn't have to stretch too far to argue that they and their friends would be open to a philosophical system which said that morality wasn't absolute. Which said that there wasn't a personal God who was going to judge you. Which said that there shouldn't be a Church looking over your shoulder and calling you to confession. Which said that you needn't worry how you treated your workers so long as you made a decent return on capital.

You see, we generally associate these changes in attitude, especially the commodification of people, with the Industrial Revolution. But although the steam engine, etc., were invented in the 18th Century, Britain didn't really become a nation of endless mills and factories until the 1830s. In the 18th Century the country was still primarily agricultural. And the early industrialists, such as the pottery innovator Josiah Wedgwood, or the Darby family and their iron works, were Quakers and the like. In other words, overwhelmingly Dissenters. Nonconformists. So that because of their religious beliefs they weren't legally allowed in high society. Because of their religious beliefs they in fact didn't want anything to do with high society. Because of their religious beliefs they spent their time doing something useful. And because of their religious beliefs they were actually extremely concerned about the welfare of their workers. And they weren't about to compromise their morals or principles just in order to make some money.

(They were also, by the way, great patrons of science. Not to mention the original abolitionists.)

So forget the Industrial Revolution narrative. And consider this: Because of sugar, in 1770 there was far more capital (*ie* money) invested in the ownership of human beings than there was in all of the factories and foundries in all of Europe.

So if you are looking for something to blame here for the rise of capitalism and capitalistic 'values' you won't be that far wrong to put your finger on that addictive white powder which preceded the cocaine business by two hundred years or so.

Now, of course, I'm not implying in any way that King Sugar was the only cause of the modern

mindset. That would be taking it too far. But the story is a great illustration as to what was really going on back then. Because until sugar came along slavery had indeed existed throughout history in most societies. But although it was by no means a pleasant state of affairs to find yourself in, you were at least (usually) treated as a person. You probably had a personal relationship with your owner. What's more, racism as currently understood didn't really exist. The vast majority of slaves in fact were white.

It was sugar which turned slavery into an industrial process. Where huge numbers of faceless hordes were ground into nothingness so that proper Europeans could have jam on their toast. To deny the importance of the sugar industry to the 18th Century economy is just to deny reality.

And the lure of sugar might in a nutshell give you a reasonable clue as to why age old ideas of philosophy and morality might have been changing back then.

Now as I keep pointing out, our common historical narrative has it that the Renaissance and Reformation opened our minds, our consciences, and our imaginations. And that as a result we all got healthier, wealthier, and wiser. And what I have been trying to show all along is that none of that is true.

For instance, I have pointed out that it was the dumb bad luck of the start of the Little Ice Age which was the main death knell for the civilization of the High Middle Ages. And Nature's random interference has in fact been critical throughout history. For instance, the Anasazi culture of the American Southwest, the people who built all those giant cliff dwellings, died out because of drought in the 14th Century. The Mayans also collapsed because of prolonged drought. It was a massive outbreak of bubonic plague which kept Justinian from recreating and re-energizing the Roman Empire.

Personal fortune and misfortune has also played a major, maybe predominant, part. It was by flukes of marriage and personality that France became a large, centralized state so early on. It could have just as easily turned out that Germany became centralized while France remained a collection of squabbling little kingdoms. There have been so many instances of good, kind, intelligent heirs to the thrones suddenly dying and being replaced by their evil, idiot brothers. There have been so many great leaders and generals killed right before they were going to win some great battle.

Max Weber notwithstanding, belief in the doctrines of the Catholic Church did not keep people from being sober and industrious before 1500. And the greater European prosperity in 1600 had little to do with the Reformation, and much, much more to do with the giant piles of gold and silver that

Catholic Spain had luckily found (and extracted with the help of those enslaved Indians) in the New World. Which in turn had resulted from the even luckier voyage of the geographically challenged Columbus. The rise of England around the year 1600 had to do with its fortuitous defeat of the Spanish Armada, and had nothing to do with its adoption of Protestantism. Which anyway was solely a result of the fact that Henry VIII's mistress Anne Boleyn demanded that he marry her. And the scientists and tinkerers of the 17th and 18th Centuries who set the stage for the Industrial Revolution represented the full spectrum of religious beliefs. Or lack thereof.

But what about all the other people who lived in this era, the ones who were not scientists or theologians or intellectuals? From farmers and craftsmen to lords and ladies, were their moral compasses getting stronger? Were their intellects improving?

This episode's short discussion of slavery and last episode's journey through the stock market were meant to show how it was suspect morality which was behind many of the new economic forces. Which then caused even more suspect morality. Now I would like to make some observations about the state of the collective intellect as the 18th Century was gathering steam.

First, as an exercise, try and name a major English poet between Alexander Pope in the early 1700s (and he was primarily a satirist) and the emergence of the first Romantics, Coleridge and Wordsworth, in 1798. You might come up with William Blake. But he doesn't really count, since he was a so-called 'primitive' living outside of polite society. And anyway he was mostly unknown until long after his death.

Compare that with Dunne, Dryden, and Milton in the 17th Century. Plus any number of great poets from the 19th.

Now look at painters. Gainsborough was good, but nobody compares him to the Italian and Dutch masters from the 15th to 17th Centuries. David was famous in France around the time of the Revolution, but you've probably never heard of him. And he and his ilk pale in comparison to the flowering of French art in the 19th Century.

What about music? There were no significant composers in France or England during the 18th Century. From Bach and Handel and Mozart to Vivaldi and Cellini, all the great ones were from Germany or Italy, far from the Enlightenment.

And literature? After Jonathan Swift (another satirist) around 1720, where was his equal? Let alone anyone remotely equivalent to Chaucer or Shakespeare? It is true that this era is associated with the rise of the novel, and that at its best the novel, through showing the complex personality and

behaviors of a believable individual, can cast a light on our human condition. But that mostly came along much later. The significant novels of the 18th Century, such as 'Moll Flanders' and 'Tom Jones', relied mostly on sexual titillation. And for every 'Moll Flanders' there were hundreds of horribly childish pulp novels churned out about cliched romance, the trials of the wealthy, and Gothic horror. We may laugh at how preachers of the time railed against the sinfulness of reading novels. But if you regard immersion in triviality as at the least a huge waste of precious time, then maybe they actually had at least a half of a point.

Finally, we can look at the subjective opinions of contemporary observers. You may be of the impression that every age has thought that those before it were inevitably smarter and better. And to a certain extent this is true. But you'll remember that, from Erasmus through Galileo, Descartes, and Newton, the view among the learned had pretty consistently been that the present was better than the past, and that the future would be better still. By the 1740s, though, one runs across any number of commentators who were throwing their hands up in despair over how dumbed down everything was getting.

And a lot of the cause of this can be explained by the rise of the middle class.

There had already been wealthy merchants. Also highly skilled craftsmen, doctors, and lawyers. But economic historians generally peg the early 1700s as the time when enough shopkeepers, stockbrokers and the like had been added to the mix to create a separate class between that of the nobility and that of the worker bees. For the first time 'consumer goods', in other words items which were not absolutely necessary for life, and not all that worthy artistically either, were being produced and purchased.

There was now a leisure class.

And what higher cultural and intellectual pursuits were these new bourgeoisie into? Without just now going into why this should be the case, let's just note that throughout history whenever the political franchise or the intended audience has been expanded the results have not been reassuring. When all American men got the vote in 1828, the frontier yahoo Andrew Jackson was elected. When woman's suffrage was enacted in 1920, the incredibly good looking Warren G. Harding, who also happened to be the most incompetent president in history, won. The world's first large scale popular entertainments were minstrel shows in black face. When commercial radio became viable, its inventors gushed that now the masses could hear Shakespeare and concert orchestras. Instead in the Twenties people voted with their ears for the precursors to country music. Television started with Playhouse 90;

by 1963 the Number One show was 'Beverly Hillbillies'.

But back to the early 18th Century. And perhaps the best way to illustrate the tastes and inclinations of this new bourgeoisie is to take a quick excursion to the city of Bath, about a hundred miles west of London.

It was an appropriate name, because since Roman times people had been drawn to the hot springs which existed there. In 1700, though, it was still a small town. But then in 1709 the first Assembly Hall, where people could assemble, dance, play card games, and have tea and socialize, had been built adjoining the baths. And by mid-century massive residential Georgian buildings had been erected. There were now many more halls and diversions. And a (and this was a newly coined term) Master of Ceremonies, who looked everyone up and down and assigned the proper people to their proper places, ruled the social roost.

Now endless and pointless frivolity had been the main preoccupation of the wealthy from the time of the Medicis to that of Louis XIV's court in the 17th Century. Now, however, even lowly traders could get into the act. So long as they could dress the part. The first resort since the time of Pompeii had been born. And soon many other resorts sprang up, both in England and on the continent.

So this is what the bourgeoisie was doing. But what about the upper middle classes and the aristocracy? You know, the people who would end up supporting the philosophes and the Jeremy Benthams. How were they reacting to this newfound wealth of leisure time?

Well, many of them were also going to the same resorts, all the while sniffing at how disgusting it was that commoners, *tradesmen* even, were being allowed in. But for some of them darker pleasures beckoned.

For instance, the Earl of Sandwich was one of the most prominent men in mid-century England. Among his many posts, he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was also a patron of the explorer James Cook, and Hawaii was for over a century called the Sandwich Islands as a result. Hobnobbing with royalty, he was a glittering personage indeed.

He was also a Satan worshiper.

Okay, no one truly knows what actually went on in the Hellfire Club, of which he was one of the most prominent members. Perhaps the black masses which were held there were just good clean fun. But there is no doubt that club meetings included prostitutes, full blown pornography, drunkenness, and various other forms of debauchery. Indeed the legend is that in order to save time for his indulgence in the black arts he would eat by slapping a piece of meat between two pieces of bread,

thus inventing his eponymous meal.

(Which raises the interesting theological question: Is it moral for a sincere Christian to eat a sandwich?)

Anyway, not that I am suggesting that the majority of Englishmen had suddenly become minions of the devil. The 18th Century was also the time of John Wesley and the great Methodist revival. Proper, conservative deacons and bishops still made up the bulk of the Anglican Church. There were any number of sincere and successful voluntary organizations formed for the aid of the poor and the fallen. Likewise in France a silent majority stayed true to tradition and the Church.

But these people weren't the fashionable elite. As I've already mentioned, members of Dissenting churches, who usually were the most devoted Christians, weren't even legally permitted to be part of the fashionable elite. On the other hand, however, the Earl of Sandwich—and many of his Hellfire Club friends—were some of the highest ranking members of society. And what each one of them did probably had far more importance in the direction which society went than did the deeds of a hundred good Methodists.

But perhaps the best way to illustrate just exactly where the world of the mid 18th Century was heading would be to talk about sex.

And you are forgiven if you believe that people throughout history and across cultures have always wanted to have promiscuous sex. And that the only times that they haven't done so has been when Puritan repression and Victorian sensibilities have taken hold. After all, this is what the culture which surrounds you has tried to teach you.

(And in that regard you might be interested to know that the Nazis taught that the only reason people were squeamish about brutality was because of those same 'Victorian sensibilities'.)

But—as we shall see in the Science section—there is every biological reason to believe that humans evolved to be monogamous, and there is every anthropological reason to believe that all successful societies evolved to make sure that people stayed that way.

For instance, consider this: Recent advances in DNA sleuthing have made it possible to track down aristocratic births from around 1500 on, and to figure out how many were the result of a wife cheating on her husband. It was less than 2%. Considering that we usually assume that the rich and famous flout morality more than normal folk do, and considering that there was no effective birth control back then, this is pretty dramatic evidence. At least for the faithfulness of wives.

It's not that sexual jealousy, cheating, and the rest hasn't been going on forever. But anecdotal stories do not prove that it was widespread. Nor that it was normal or was considered to be such. After all, the reason there were all those stories of depraved emperors and bacchanalia is precisely because such behavior was considered to be so far outside the norm.

As a comparison: Our present day movies and TV are all too often hyper-violent fantasies. So that, assuming that people still exist in a few hundred years, they would be forgiven for thinking that our everyday life was just as hyper-violent. Although, of course, it isn't. At least not yet.

Or how about this: Even in our modern hyper-sexualized era the widely respected 1994 University of Chicago study of sexual behavior found out that fully 28% of adults in the present day basically never even have sex.

Anyway, here is what the situation really was like in Pre-Reformation Europe. As is also true of Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism, Christianity had always seen sex as a lower urge, something which ideally should just be indulged in for procreation. But, except for fanatics like Pope Gregory VII, in general the Catholic Church understood that it was governing the whole mass of imperfect humanity, not just a few hyper-disciplined devotees. Therefore, in practice, just as in the modern era parish halls would sponsor bingo games so that people wouldn't be tempted into much worse forms of gambling, so, too, the Church back then would often look the other way when men went to prostitutes or when young people fooled around.

As I've already mentioned, though, to Protestants like Luther and Calvin this moral laxity by Rome was outrageous. And in their ideal world sexual conduct would be much more rigorously enforced. In fact, the penalty for adultery after the Reformation soon became death.

And for the first century or so of the Reformation, old fashioned family values did hold sway. Records indicate that in 1650 the rate of illegitimate births in England was less than 1%.

But with the English Restoration of the monarchy in 1660 all of this started to fall apart. Rakes and libertines came to the fore. The public started to become fascinated with the doings of the mistresses of kings and noblemen. The writings of Samuel Pepys, by far the most important diarist of that time, show a mind totally obsessed with sex. And various 'free-thinkers' were coming out with elaborate rationalizations for why casual sex was natural and good and noble. Why, it was even what God wished for mankind. And 'Christian' morality? That was nothing but a means for power hungry priests and ministers to control the rest of us.

By 1700 the first recorded stirrings of a gay subculture were happening in London and

Amsterdam, now the co-capitals of finance and capitalism. As structures started falling apart in the heterosexual world it was being taken more and more for granted that man's sexual lust was insatiable, and that women would inevitably end up fallen and ruined as a result. In reaction all sorts of well meaning efforts were put forward to improve manners and behavior. But by the middle of the 18th century almost all the best selling novels were about those rakes and libertines. People couldn't get enough of printed pictures of courtesans and prostitutes.

So the 18th Century was when the real sexual revolution happened. Much as it may be hard to believe, the fact is that before that it never even occurred to the vast majority of people to have sex outside of the holy bonds of matrimony. But during the time leading up to and including the Enlightenment, sex became an obsession.

An important caveat, though, was that this revolution of complete sexual liberty was only for upper class men. Proper upper class women wouldn't even think of partaking. And those few women who did, along with the courtesans and prostitutes, were on the one hand weirdly glorified and on the other treated as objects of disgust.

Nor were the middle and lower classes invited to participate. After all, it was widely assumed that society would totally fall apart if they did. Although, of course, this collapse of old fashioned morality couldn't help but percolate down to the masses. By the year 1800 the rate of illegitimate births had increased to 25%.

But let's stay with the upper classes. Because, as we shall shortly see, it was in the world of upper class men and their patronage that the Enlightenment took place and took root. And it is true that Hobbes, Locke, David Hume, Adam Smith, and Jeremy Bentham themselves all led chaste lives. In fact—just to remind you once again—none of them actually ever had *any* intercourse, social, sexual, or otherwise, with any real women. And although their ideas might have been wrong, they were sincerely held ideas that were not just lame rationalizations for immoral behavior.

But just as the sugar plantation owners would naturally gravitate towards theories which promoted moral relativity and the supreme right of the individual to make money, so, too, would these new mistress keepers and the like be attracted to 'hedonistic principles' which declared that all pleasures were by definition good.

And lest I haven't sufficiently made my point about the level of degeneration reached by 1765, consider this description of a 'club' started around 1740 which spread to many cities around Britain and even into Europe. Called the Beggar's Benison, its members were a cross-section of respectable

society. Meetings would consist of reading pornography, talking about sex, and paying young women to strip in front of them. They would then compare penises. And although no one took minutes of the get togethers, objects that still remain include 'phallic wine glasses, a specially embellished Bible, and a round pewter platter with various obscene decorations, upon which members collectively ejaculated.'

So you have Slavery. Mindless get-rich-quick Greed. Kitschy consumer goods and the intellectually trivial. Sexual practices which would have made most Romans blanch. Not exactly what Martin Luther and the other Protestants had in mind when they made their case for independence from the Church. Looking back, maybe a world where indulgences were sold and where simple people prayed to a statue of the Virgin Mary wasn't the worst one possible.

Anyway, that's it for today. And now we've arrived at the threshold of that wonderful Age of Enlightenment. Which means that next time it will be time to wade right into it.

But that is for next time. For this time, once again, I thank you so much for so far having listened.