

## What are we worth? Artists and the Economic Crisis

October 2011

The New Economy of Art series is a collaboration between Artquest, the Contemporary Art Society and DACS which focuses on economic developments and opportunities in the cultural sector that impact on artists.

The first debate in the New Economy of Art series, *What are we worth?* looked at how artists can create income in support of their practice in a period of dramatic economic, social and technological change.

Through open discussion John Kieffer, Zineb Sedira and Bob and Roberta Smith considered how artists can harness their cultural assets and intellectual property – both tangible and intangible – to support their practice financially.

What follows is an edited transcript of that discussion

### Keynote by John Kieffer (JK)

---

I am not going to talk about Greek debt but I am going to delve a little bit into the current crisis we're in at the moment. I think what we're seeing right now is probably a major periodic crisis in capitalism. Generally global economic crises are always very good news for the very rich, very bad news for the poor.

I want to talk a little bit about the context for artists here as well. The good news is that in terms of public funding, there's more money for the arts in the UK than there ever has been before and arguably more money than twenty years ago. We're used to, I think, talking about how we don't spend enough money on the arts in the UK but in fact we're actually spending a hell of a lot of money on the arts. So, however bad it gets and however much that is reduced, it's probably going to be reduced from a much higher level than we might have been at twenty years ago.

I remember once cornering a Secretary of State for Culture and actually asking her about cutting the Arts and she admitted to me that "we don't spend that much money on the Arts and they're not that important. So at the end of the day, sometimes we leave them alone when we probably should cut them."

I'm going to talk mainly about England, I'm afraid, so apologies to anybody who is from Scotland or Northern Ireland or Wales. I think one of the possible concerns is even though there will be money undoubtedly still flowing through the Arts Council at some rate or other, there's a slightly wondering tendency that possibly some of that money might start to be routed through major organisations and I think this could be problematic. At the moment some of the funding which is maybe going direct to the Arts Council may well be spent through NPOs (National Portfolio Organisations). So, that's a concern because then issues of taste or priorities of different organisations start to kick in and you get, not as level a playing field as maybe you had before.

Trusts and Foundations have become major players in terms of arts funding over the last twenty years and to their credit, quite a lot of them do have schemes that benefit artists. They do tend to hunt in packs a little bit, so there's not an enormous amount of diversity between what the different Trusts spend their money on.

Something that we don't often talk about in the Arts is what's happening with social mobility on a wider level. I think we're beginning to see some signs that social mobility within our world is actually on the decrease. There's a great little example where the pop music charts were analysed and they found out that in October 2010, 60% of the acts in the charts came from public schools whereas in October 1990, only 1% of people in the charts came from public schools. I do quite a lot of work with the BBC and although it's

completely anecdotal, the BBC seems to be getting much posher somehow or other again. It feels almost like going back twenty or thirty years.

Although that's something we can't do much about as individuals, I think we need to be aware of this because in some other countries, to some extent in the States, there's beginning to be a bit of a debate about who the people are who work in the Arts. I think we need to be self-critical but we also need to be aware of the fact that we are primarily a fairly posh profession.

A lot of artists work across both public and commercial sectors and I'm sure I don't need to tell anybody who's working in the commercial sector that if you try to get any credit, you can't. Equally if you try to get investment, it's very difficult, and I think the creative sector is traditionally seen as the Cinderella sector in terms of the economy – very high risk for investors. But that's not true. There is a very interesting Demos publication called *Risky Business*. It actually shows that the creative sector is no more risky than the more general economy. So, it's certainly worth having a look at it and next time you go into a room with a bank manager or investor, use it against them.

The commercial art market usually booms in a recession and certainly looks like it probably will again this time and in fact there's a school of thought which sees record-setting auction prices as being a leading indicator of wider economic collapse. There's a very funny article on a website called *The Atlantic* which has tracked Sotheby's auction prices against the performance of the economy and it goes completely in the opposite direction. So, I think if auction prices carry on going up, we're all in trouble.

Obviously there are plenty of artists and art collectors in The Sunday Times Rich List but we know this is not the reality for most artists.

Lastly in terms of context, it's probably worth having a quick look at the education sector. We know that many artists earn all or most of their living by teaching or by accessing research funds from the *Arts and Humanities Research Council*. *Creative Partnerships* which the Arts Council set up initially with the Education Department, has gone and I'd be very surprised if Arts and Humanities Research funding holds up in the coming period.

So, right through the system from Post-Graduate to Arts and Humanities, they're all becoming systematically marginalised and this is going to cause some real issues, I think, for artists who supplement their income through teaching or sessional work.

In a sense artists need to be engaged with the debates about education as well and be seen to be engaged with those debates because they are fundamental both to survival of the short term but really fundamental to our whole world thriving.

So, that's all the bad news. Let's look at some possible strategies. One of the things that I felt for a long time about the visual arts in particular is that most artists who operate are below the VAT registration threshold, so in terms of economic planning and policy, nobody knows you're there. So in a sense people do not understand what the sector is made up of, who works in it, how much they spend and how much they earn.

*MyCake* is an interesting accounting package for artists. It provides a really easy to use accounting package that artists can use to do their books and it also starts benchmarking data. So the more people who sign up for it, the more it starts to pull out a really good picture of what people at that lower level of income, are doing. There is a lot of planning for SME's (Small and Medium Sized Enterprises), but not really a lot of understanding about what individuals sole traders and artists do.

I think there is a need for that kind of initiative which starts to actually say, "OK, we're not just struggling artists we've got a business actually, we're doing stuff and we need to make some noise about that."

If you've got the stomach for it, go along to your local Chamber of Commerce with a friend or with some other artists and stake your claim saying we're in this borough or in this region and we're working, we are businesses as well and we want our interests and our needs represented. It's a very alien kind of territory for a lot of people but it's something that in some parts of the country has actually come up with interesting results.

Of course what works for 'Artist A' will not work for 'Maker B' - it's difficult to make generalisations. It depends in the media people work in, it depends on what kind of person you are and it depends on the resources you have available.

Traditionally we think about assets as being artworks. An asset is everything about you and the people who like what you do as well. It's extending that notion of what constitutes an individual artist as much as possible.

It's like looking towards making a hinterland around your work and what that does is it gives people more opportunity to connect with you. People can obviously find your work on a database or a website but just sometimes, just telling some of that back story yourself can give people other ways of connecting.

Fellow speakers here are great examples of that in terms of their online presence. For example Bob's great letter to Michael Gove – even if I didn't like his work, I'd love him just for the letter – luckily I do like his work as well.

There's some great examples in music– there's an artist actually who appeared in the Cut & Splice festival at the ICA at the beginning of November called Jennifer Walsh. She in a sense has created a whole kind of story around what she does. She's actually not only created a persona for herself, she's created an entirely fake art collective of which she's the only member and she has about seven personas in it, all of whom are appearing at the ICA at different times.

There's an American composer called John Zorn who I'm interested in, I like his music but I'm also interested in what he's got to say about Jewish culture and what he says about making music for particular kinds of communities. So it gives me more than just one way of connecting with his work and I think that's something which is not as familiar in a sense.

Increasingly I think this is not about marketing, it's about place in the world and it's about trying to connect with people emotionally and intellectually as well as connecting with them as people who are interested in art. How does this help you make a living? It gives more people opportunities to come across your work, more opportunities to like what you're doing and more opportunities to get interested in you as well.

In a recent DACS debate called *Artists' Futures* – Paul Bennun from Something Else talked about the world remaining pretty much the same for commercially successful artists. The gallery system really is an industrial model; it's like something out of the seventeenth century, never mind the twenty-first century, but being very different for everybody else. Right now, there's obviously a lot of attention towards selling work online and it would be interesting to know what people's experience here has been of that as well. My impression is that it works for some people but it doesn't work for others. Possibly over a longer period of time it could become very significant but it's not clear at the moment whether this is going to be a major part of our world.

None of the platforms seem to quite work for me at the moment; they seem to fall somewhere between quasi shopping and not a very good way of looking at art.

There are also some new forms of philanthropy. We all know about 'the single philanthropist' but there are beginning to be some initiatives which are looking towards things like crowd funding, which are ways for groups of people to get behind a particular project or artist and support them. There's a relatively new site called *WeDidThis* - and there have been some really quite successful fundraising strategies on there.

A young artist who wanted to set up an exhibition in Istanbul and also document that exhibition, raised all the money she required by just putting details of her project online. But, another artist who seemed to have on paper what looked like a very similar project didn't manage to raise anything at all. So I think again it's going to be a bit like the online environment, it'll work for some people, but it won't work for others.

I'm going to use a couple of examples from the music world that I'm working on at the moment which I think could have some resonance for the visual arts, to illustrate the next point. Firstly I work with an experimental record label and they've been going for quite a long time. They had a meeting last week and we were just looking at what's happening in terms of their sales and what is really interesting is that they had never particularly pursued licensing opportunities for their sound. It is mostly sound, not music and all of a sudden in a very short period of time, just by one or two opportunities, the licensing has increased rapidly and things have been used in games as atmospheres in TV programmes, theatre and dance productions.

What is interesting about this is that they haven't really pursued it but it's beginning to become a very significant part of their income. It's not impossible to imagine that this could overtake physical sales over a period of time.

Just related to this, a young former colleague of mine is about to start a freelance life connecting up his extensive knowledge of music with funding opportunities, and finding opportunities for licensing and placement in visual and other sound media. He's been doing his homework; he's been talking to a lot of people working in this area. They're saying in a sense it is one thing to have a database or to have a library of images or sounds but somebody needs to be out there finding opportunities because most of the licensing opportunities come out of conversations that are had. Somebody needs to be in a room talking to an art director or a production company.

It seems to me that it's not about trying to invent a new profession in a recession but it seems to me that this is a role that people could usefully play. It might be curators; it might be artists but people who have got a lot of information, a lot of passion for particular areas of the visual arts, trying to get themselves in front of people who are licensing material.

My feeling is this is part of the future – I'm sure there are people who have had material licensed, but it's about being proactive and trying to get into those conversations that are had in rooms, it's not just about what happens online.

It's also about trust as well. The artist needs to trust whoever's out there doing that for them but in a sense the person who is doing the licensing also needs the trust that the person having the conversation with them is going to come up with the right kind of solution for whatever they're doing in their game or their TV series.. Also, the person who's out there needs to understand, if you like, what the values of that artist are, where they will go and where they won't go in terms of what kind of relationships they had.

Again, a lot of what I've been saying is about connectedness really. There have been some interesting initiatives recently, with artists making very strong connections outside of the world of the arts. Stuart Semple's curated exhibition at the *Old Vic* with *Mind* is a good example of that – in a sense it was partly a fundraising show for Mind but it also was a show about mental health issues. Even though in a sense that was a single exhibition, it opened up possibilities probably to a whole load of mental health professionals who may not normally go into a gallery space. I wouldn't be at all surprised if one or two of them went away and started thinking about either commissioning work for a mental health setting or actually working with an artist in a different kind of way.

So, the marketplace, the way it is, somebody may hit lucky and their work is spotted by a dealer, gallery or art institution, and if you do there's a reasonably well-trodden career path ahead of you if that happens, but that's not going to happen to everybody as we well know. So, things are going to be difficult but it's very important to use resources out there. One of the other things I'm quite aware of is that we've got a lot of information out there. Artquest's website is actually packed with stuff, I spent an hour on it last week actually, same with DACS, same with the Contemporary Art Society. But there needs to be a real incentive to get hold of that information in a way which is meaningful to people.

It's also strength in numbers, I think, we've seen plenty of times where there have been art movements which have brought together artists who have different practices and different approaches but actually make some common cause. I think we are probably in that kind of time again where actually working with other people, finding new ways, if you like, of pulling together not just for campaigning, but actually new ways and new models for working.

Elsewhere, outside of the arts, there are people doing all kinds of things in terms of new models of social enterprise, bundling together risky and less risky projects into packages and trying to get people to either fund them or invest in them. I think this notion of actually everybody having to make their own pitch, if you like, is one that can be cut through by actually working together and presenting a portfolio of projects to a funder which includes things which are safe bets and things that aren't.

If there aren't any models out there which already exist, make one up. I'm working at the moment with a project in Northern Ireland which is supposedly doing two different things: one's an ideas sharing website working with young parents, – it's got a very low subscription level, and the other one is about music which

gives advice to individual musicians and small music organisations. In a weird kind of way they're beginning to blur, actually, and the musicians who are parents are finding they've got quite a lot of interesting things to say to each other.

I haven't used the words social networking very much and I'm increasingly aware that as useful as all these platforms can be, they can also be a bit elusory as well. I think the danger is that sometimes some of the social platforms can give an impression of connectedness which actually isn't really there.

Also I think there's a need to be a time of crisis, a real need to re-evaluate and if you like co-mentor each other, be critical, actually not just in a sense worry by yourself, worry with others. You can probably bring something to bear on somebody else's practice how they run their business. Support is one thing but it is also about being critical.

Of course, everyone's going to drop everything if they get a call from Jay Jopling or a teaching tenure post in a university, but that's not going to happen to everybody so I think it's probably important to actually get some kind of solidarity and work together.

### **Response to Keynote from Zineb Sedira (ZS)**

---

I want to talk about my experience really and I've never been an artist who sold a lot purely because I do a lot of video work and we know this doesn't sell especially when you do a multi-screen installation. So, I don't really sell to private collectors, but a bit to institutions. I'm told I'm an institutionalised artist, rather than a private collector artist. Therefore it means that I do sell every now and then but probably not as much as others.

The other thing is I don't teach, I've been lucky up until now not to do any teaching but that doesn't mean that I've got a lot of money. I don't want to teach, that's just the way it is. So, if I had to seek another job, I would try to find something else other than teaching, just because I don't believe I'll be a good teacher, it's as simple as that.

But, I've been lucky over the last few years. I've been commissioned for some quite important pieces of work. Experience and maturity has taught me to request an artist's fee. Sometimes you are not really offered this as an artist, you need to ask them or build it into the commission budget.

So, that's my way of making money. I also try to save money too. For example, I don't have a studio like many artists - I do have a small room in my flat where I work from and, as a video artist, perhaps I don't need a studio space in the same way that other artists do.

I do a lot of work in the Middle East and I'm lucky there but I don't know how long it's going to last. If I do get a commission it usually it comes with fairly good money.

I also do a lot of artist talks which is something I really enjoy and I do them in the UK and abroad.

So I don't make a huge amount of money but recently I have begun thinking about the future. What if my work stops selling, what if I can't get commissions? Could I go into teaching or would I have to actually drop out altogether. I also have a family so it's always on my mind - how do you raise money and look after your children.

## Response to Keynote from Bob and Roberta Smith (BS)

---

I think I'm going to respond by having a list of reasons to be pessimistic and reasons to be cheerful much in the same way that John Kieffer outlined in his keynote address. I do think that there are a couple of things that we need to really understand about the present government: one is there has been a fundamental shift away from the post-war idea of emancipating 'the people' via the Arts Council by bringing them theatre and art. All the things we enjoyed in this period have ended and we have to oppose it.

So that is a kind of pessimistic tone on which to start but it does need opposing. *The Browne Review* into higher education with its £9,000 fee will mean that people like me, maybe yourself, will not go to university. The effect of it is really damaging, it means that all of the art schools in London are coagulating so they that can become a big institution that attract overseas students – who will be the only people able to go to these art schools in three years time.

The effect of that change is reflected in primary and secondary education where Michael Gove with his English Baccalaureate, is proposing to remove Art from the National Curriculum. That has already meant the closure of Roehampton's PGC course so there won't be any qualified art teachers, there will just be teaching assistants. That has impact on generations of people. I've never made a lot of money from teaching, I've never made a lot of money from selling art and I've never made much money from doing public art projects but those three things together have meant that I've been able to continue being an artist.

All that is under threat and the broadest scheme of things means that we have to think about whose culture is it? We are all cultural beings, everything is made, everything is designed, and everything is thought about by human beings. Conversation is really important and everybody needs to be involved in it. I know that lots of my friends say "Oh, it's great to have a job at DACS or Artquest", but that means that they won't be an artist, they'll be organising the lives of some other artists. So, that means who will then be the artists of the future and of course we know that culture is something that we all share, but if we're not careful, culture shifts away from us and it becomes something that we visit rather than we participate in and make.

So, we have to think very fundamentally and politically, and what we have to do is say we want the things that we want. We want to participate within culture in our many and various ways. This doesn't mean we all want to show at Frieze Art Fair or something, but it does mean that we all want to participate in this world and celebrate each other's creativity.

The man in the government who is organising this fantastic review is Darren Henley, the Chief Executive of Classic FM which is barely a music station – it plays a short snippet of something that you've heard a million times before, followed by a series of adverts. That will be the model for education.

I actually enjoy the Frieze Art Fair but I've never had a legitimate ticket for it and I don't want to see the NHS or our universities or schools constructed on that model.

Also, the government says to us that philanthropy is a good thing and of course philanthropy is a good thing but the problem is that it transfers power away from public institutions and distorts their mission and it persuades them to behave like private institutions. So, it's all a bit grim really but there are some reasons to be cheerful and one reason to be cheerful is all the people protesting at St Paul's. Last week I was in New York and saw the Wall Street protests. They have a whole heap of performance art and creative food going on there. At St Paul's, it's an incredibly creative environment and one of the things that will happen – and it won't be my generation but the next generation of artists who will be inspired by this wave of incredibly peaceful and creative protest. We haven't had a decent counter-culture in this country since rave and it is quite exciting because it does look like there is a genuine upsurge of manifestations. I'm wondering what the stimulants of the new counter-culture will be.

So, I think there are some things to think actually it is an incredibly exciting time but it's also a very fundamentally depressing time and we need to realise that, become creative and oppose all these things.

I have one last point which highlights the complete stupidity of the government. Apple has more money sloshing around than the US Government at the moment. Why is that? It's because Jonathan Ive went to St Martin's Art School and studied Art and Industrial Design. He was patronised when he came up with a design for some taps in Hull by somebody with a kind of crazy red nose and that person could well be

Michael Gove, and so he left and worked for Apple. I've constructed this world that Apple live in and that has come out of British education, it's come out of that emancipator post-war period. The brand of Britain is cultural, it's visual, it's musical and even on the government's own terms, and they're doing something which is utterly stupid.

### **Panel discussion, led by Chair, Gilane Tawadros (GT)**

---

**GT:** John, you talked about this question of visibility and how that's so important and, in a way, perhaps one of the things that is wrong with the post-war consensus is that we haven't been visible or talked enough about opportunities and openings, that have been seeded by educational opportunities, by support for artists, by the public sector and so on.

**JK:** I think it probably started to happen before the recession actually. There seemed to be a closing down going on, not just individual arts but across the board. I worked for a while for Sound & Music, and we used to play a game of guessing what was going to be in a festival and getting about 90% of it right. I think there has been a certain amount of homogeneity creeping in. Probably it is about institutions actually being quite well-funded and sure of themselves and therefore quite sure of their kind of taste. I think the danger is that this will accelerate as there is less money around and increasingly the opportunities are closing down.

This will probably get me booed off actually but I think there's been a bit of a 'me-thing' going along with the visual arts as well and that hasn't helped in a sense. It's been "Look at me and aren't I great?" I think there have not been a lot of people, if you like, consciously kind of bringing other people into the mix.

Somebody running the biggest live entertainment organisation in the world said the trouble with the Arts is that they don't give anything back, and I thought this is a really odd comment coming from somebody in the commercial sector. He backed it up fairly vigorously saying it's all about getting more money for your organisation or yourself.

**GT:** You all talked about the opportunities created through connections. The fact that institutions are becoming less homogenous and certain things are closing down, I wonder if this doesn't create opportunities for new kinds of networks and connections. If those institutions are showing the same thing over and over again, and people are looking for something else, could this create an opportunity as a counter-culture and offer another opportunity for different voices to be articulated

**BS:** I was in New York over the summer making this show and one of the things that's very exciting about America which a lot of people on the left don't really understand, is that after 9/11 they elected Barack Obama and on the left everybody's very upset with him because the expectations were so crazily high. But one of the things that that government has managed to do and which our government hasn't done is that it hasn't run the American economy based on the idea that we're going to butcher everything and have deficit reduction as the only measure of success within the economy.

What we have in our country is a very depressing government, it offers no hope. Michelle Obama has written this fantastic book, about the importance of creativity in the economy and as creative people we need to say to the government that actually you need to offer people hope and actually art and culture and creativity does that as much as it creates. It is helpful to the economy, it offers people a way forward and I know for years I worked as a removal man and the only thing that actually kept me going was the idea that I was somehow participating in this world of art somehow, although I wasn't really but I thought I was.

Art provides a strand and it provides ladders and social mobility. it's very important to provide ladders for kids to think "Oh, I can participate in this world of ideas" and I think perhaps the idea of the protestors is saying: "Well, actually, I want to participate in grown-up culture but the only way I can do it is to sit outside St Paul's because you're not interested in me."

So, I think it's a very double-edged thing, it's very nuanced but I do think it won't be my generation who sort out the problems of the world, you know, in terms of the economy, it will be the generation below mine and below that who will do that. So I think there is incredible hope in that kind of creativity but it's a bit painful, it's really painful.

GT: John also talked about this notion of collective, and Zineb you mentioned artists' fees, something which at DACS we hear stories about, how artists find it increasingly difficult to make demands for fees, worry that they won't get included or that if they're too vocal, somehow that will work against them. I think for the first time in a very long time, there are conversations going on between artists about artist unions. I wonder if you see any potential and collective action, direct action, by artists as being something which could potentially create both collective action and actual real benefits.

ZS: I always say the more we do all ask for fees, the more we're likely to get them, and after having done all the shows in different places, I can say that the UK is very stingy with artists' fees. You always have to demand them. In America, I've noticed often that you don't ask and they still give you, it's automatic. You're doing a show, even a group show, and you're given a contract with your fee. In England, no, you have to ask for it because they always hope you won't ask.

It even happens sometimes to me that I've ended up in group shows where some artists had fees and others didn't. I always say we must all ask for fees because after all it's our livelihood. I'm spending time preparing for my exhibition and I want to be paid.

GT: But you're making an argument for collective action because everyone's acting as individuals, negotiating their own deal. Surely if there was a consensus and a collective...

ZS: Obviously, yes, but it can't go on whereby they always hope that the artist will be silent. They're playing on the fact that yes, young artists are worried, they think if I ask for a fee I'm not going to be included in the show.

GT: I wonder if we could talk a bit about philanthropy because Bob, you mentioned it and John brought up some models of philanthropy which are not the ones of the private collector extending patronage – call that patronage rather than philanthropy – but actually of crowd funding. I wonder if, as is likely to happen, commissions are on the decrease and if you're not a not a private collector artist, whether you think there's any potential in the philanthropy, the mass philanthropy model if you like, has potential for artists.

BS: Yes, I'm a bit of an odd character in that I've only ever once applied for public money for a project. After hopping through endless bureaucracy, I did get this money and I was very grateful for it but I slightly felt a bit guilty and weird about it, so I've always tried to sell things in order to fund what I do really because I think that somehow I don't really want to be robbing the taxpayer more than I have to!

But, I do think there are interesting things about philanthropy which are really problematic for institutions. One is collectors. Museums that show collectors' collections instead of running their own programme – I think that's really distorting of what the public money for museums is for and that's an incredibly problematic area because of course we want to see art, and actually we do want to see private collectors' collections in the public realm. But, I don't think we ought to be paying for that to happen in quite the way that sometimes we are and I think they ought to be paying for it to make their work public.

It's also quite interesting with White Cube opening this new space in Bermondsey. I haven't visited it yet but apparently it's a huge, fantastic monolithic space, a wonderful space for showing art, and so lots of people at Tate are saying "My God, what does this mean for public institutions, if these private institutions can build buildings much bigger than Chisenhale Gallery or Gasworks or something – what does it mean if this institution constructs this thing?"

The audience for the big public institutions in this country is growing and it's huge and I can tell you that at White Cube, there will not be 4.5 million people traipsing through it. So actually it's about the public realm, and that's a very important thing for artists to realise. That their authority,

the authority of art exists through this conversation that we can all have, not the conversation that the elite can have – it's meaningless. The conversation that we can all have within the public realm is something to really celebrate and that's one of the things that we ought to fighting for.

GT: So that does mean there's no opportunity, and I come back to John about the idea of artists engaging in conversations with audiences directly? Are those things mutually exclusive? The idea of the conversation that happens via the public institution between an artist and your public, and the idea that John was putting forward about the possibility of engaging directly with your audiences unmediated using online and offline.

JK: I completely agree with Bob about the importance of public institutions and that kind of level of engagement. I should declare an interest – I am an adviser to the Tate on an occasional basis – but I think the direct thing is really important as well and in fact the two things can actually work together very effectively. Again, there are plenty of examples outside of the visual arts where that's happening, so I think it's both actually,

In a sense I don't think it's probably sensible for anybody to expect public institutions to have their conversation for them with the public, I mean, in a sense there needs to be direct routes in there as well.