Chapter 4

Personal values

Preamble

Chapter three suggested that the quality of one’s personal resourcefulness is expressed by personal skills, whose effectiveness is linked to developmental influences, and to the personal values held. It is interesting to note that, during the 1960’s and 70’s, the conventional wisdom required that helping professional practitioners should be ‘value free’. It was against that trend that Carkhuff (1977) declared that the values that drove his work were, Love to give reason for contribution, Truth to give substance to contribution, and Excellence to enhance contribution. This chapter looks at additional values, within the physical, emotional, intellectual, social and spiritual dimensions. Their full expression adds to personal fulfilment, and to the nature and quality of interaction with others. The discussion seeks to embrace the different meanings of the term ‘value’ so that the meaning and significance of each will not only have application to one’s person-hood, but will provide useful windows through which counsellors can see ways of assisting clients assess the ‘me’ in them (a function of the personalising skills covered in Chapter 13). An exercise to review one’s personal profile in these and related dimensions appears as Appendix II on page 413.

Values and human effectiveness

A broad sifting of the Macquarie Dictionary definitions of the word ‘value’ separates the ‘commercial’ sense of the word from the ‘non-commercial’. The commercial aspects that relate to ‘price’ and ‘trading merit’ are of little relevance to this discussion. However, a distillation of the non-commercial aspects gives a multifaceted view of ‘personal values’. The general view relates to things that are respected for their desirability, usefulness, excellence or importance. The ethical view relates to qualities that are desirable as a means, or as an end in itself. The mathematical view relates to the magnitude or measurement of a quality. The sociological view relates to ‘the things of social life’ that may elicit either positive or negative feelings, such as ‘freedom’ or ‘cruelty’. A range of values that fall within the ‘non-commercial’ aspects of the dictionary definition are listed within the physical, emotional, and intellectual dimensions in Table 5 on page 64, and within the spiritual, and social dimensions shown in Table 6, on page 80. Each value within these dimensions is briefly discussed below.
## DIMENSIONS of HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS of FUNCTIONING</th>
<th>PHYSICAL</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL</th>
<th>INTELLECTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Interpersonal relating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. VERY EFFECTIVE (actualising leader)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>stamina</td>
<td>mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EFFECTIVE (contributor)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>intensity</td>
<td>self-fulfilment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MINIMALLY EFFECTIVE (participant)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>adaptability</td>
<td>achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. INEFFECTIVE (observer)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>survival</td>
<td>incentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. VERY INEFFECTIVE (detractor)</td>
<td>– –</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td>avoidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dimensions in blank cells have been excluded from the sample.

Table 5. Summary of the different levels of effectiveness of the qualities, behaviours, outcomes or skills that are valued for their importance, utility or influence in contributing to human effectiveness within the physical, emotional and intellectual dimensions of human experience. The table is drawn from *Toward Actualizing Human potential* by Robert R. Carkhuff, Copyright © 1981, and *The Freedom Doctrine* by Robert R. Carkhuff & Bernard G. Berenson, Copyright © 2003. Used by permission of the publisher, HRD Press, Amherst, MA, 800-822-2801, [www.hrdpress.com](http://www.hrdpress.com).
The dimensions in Table 5 were developed by Carkhuff (1981, p. 98; 2000, p. 260) and Carkhuff and Berenson (2003, p. 86). The dimensions in Table 6, on page 80, were developed by Sanders and Kranz (1987). The values within these dimensions will be discussed, column by column, at five different levels of functionality.

The ‘levels of functioning’ columns (in both tables) contain two sets of five associated, but discrete, descriptors that embrace the ‘mathematical’ and ‘sociological’ aspects of values. The first set of five descriptors, from ‘very effective’ down to ‘very ineffective’, provides a qualitative measure of each value as its particular row intersects each column in the table. This (mathematical) measure denotes an impact from ‘plus plus’ through to ‘minus minus’. The second set of descriptors, from ‘actualising leader’ down to ‘detractor’ are terms that sociologists might use to classify groups of individuals. These (sociological) classes are likely to evoke positive feelings of admiration for contributors and actualisers, and negative judgments of observers and detractors. The descriptors link as follows.

**Level five** skills are *very effective*. This is where achievers excel. They push the boundaries of their learning towards the actualising of their potential. They get there primarily by having been contributive to others. Effective leaders function at this level.

**Level four** is characterised by *effective* functioning. Competency at this level is *contributive*. People at this level not only participate in life but they add to it, both for themselves and others.

**Level three** is the level of *minimal effectiveness*. At this level people are sufficiently competent to ‘get by’ reasonably well. They *participate* in activities but, on average, have virtually no impact on events—there is neither net contribution nor detraction.

**Level two** typifies *ineffective* living. People functioning at this level are more competent than those at level one, but they tend to *observe* life rather than participate in it. They either ‘sit on the fence’, or criticise what they have observed.

**Level one** behaviours are *very ineffective*. People functioning at this level are viewed negatively. They are seen as *detractors*. They sap others’ energy, and generally make things worse for themselves and others. They are frequently on the take.

The flow, from level 1 to 5, is the direction in which competencies develop, and that in which any remedial action needs to occur. When all columns have been discussed the profiles to each level will be considered, and some related implications highlighted. The cameos are not intended to be exhaustive explanations of the elements.

### Dimensions of effectiveness

#### The physical dimension

Whilst there are a number of elements within the physical dimension, fitness is seen as the critical factor because it is a general index of one’s wellbeing. This is good news for those of us who are glad that physical appearance is not the arbiter!

**Fitness**

Our level of fitness provides the energy for living. Fitness relates to the outcomes we achieve from our approach to overall health care. It is, perhaps, the area where we can
increase personal functioning most tangibly, but maintaining fitness also requires strong discipline when activities from other dimensions demand our attention. Lapses in fitness will deplete emotional and intellectual resources in the short term and, if not maintained, will significantly diminish long term effectiveness in other dimensions. Different levels of functioning are considered below.

**Level 1: Sickness**
The term sickness, in this context, relates to the state of being where one lacks sufficient energy to attend to ones own needs. There is dependency on others which, in functional terms, is a detraction—even though those attending the sick may do so both willingly and lovingly. The notion of detraction is more socially visible when people appear to be slothful rather than ill. People at this level are physically very ineffective.

**Level 2: Survival**
People functioning at level 2 tend to ‘kick-start’ the day with ‘coffee and a fag’ (or other non-nutritious ritual) and manage to limp lethargically through a day’s work with extended breaks. They make it back home after work, and might well watch ‘the telly’ until they shuffle off to bed! They are physically ineffective.

**Level 3: Adaptability**
At level 3, people have enough energy to work well during the day. They can deal with contingencies that may require increased effort whilst at work, but they are tired at the end of day. They choose not to get too involved in evening activities, but are likely to manage non-energetic outings or activities at weekends, or on rostered days off.

**Level 4: Intensity**
People functioning at level 4 are physically effective. They have energy to work well regardless of the nature of their job. They have energy reserves for ‘out of hours’ community involvement, recreation, and play. They are likely to have a systematic exercise program at home, the park, or the local gym. They are physically effective.

**Level 5: Stamina**
People at level 5 are very effective in terms of their energy. They can manage rigorous work with ease, and have rapid recovery rates after playing strenuous sport, and the like. They have energy for significant community involvement, recreation and play, with plenty in reserve. They are likely to adhere to strict exercise programs where they closely monitor their heart-rate, body fat percentages, and the like, to stay in peak condition for their age.

**The emotional dimension**

Two factors were identified by the foundational research in the emotional dimension. They relate to personal motivation, and the way that we relate to others. Other factors may yet emerge.

**Motivation**

*The chapter continues to describe levels of behaviour for each tabulated cell…*

*and other snippets follow…*
The social dimension

Of the host of social dimensions that exist, we see personal networks as the most universal, and as exerting the greatest influence on human effectiveness.

Networks

In looking at Table 6, on the page 80, we consider the ‘social’ dimension first, so that we can work from right to left towards ‘love’—the richest of all human values. Social networks are valued because they meet the deep human need to belong, to give and receive support, and to engage in a broad range of activities that are impossible alone. Our observation is that people interact with others in their network in ways that relate to their level of contribution and perceived status within the network.

Level 1: Exploit

People functioning at level 1 are seen as ‘exploiters’ in a social network. They are seen as ‘bludgers’ who not only use others in all kinds of ways, but who isolate themselves from all but the ‘saintly’ folk, and those who are paid to ‘rehabilitate’ them. Exploiters are likely to function at low levels across all dimensions, but many are likely to have a ‘cunning’ for survival. They may move from group to group, or choose isolation. They are not all ‘down-and-out’. There are wealthy exploiters whose networks hold together from utility—not from care for the persons, or pleasure in their company.

Level 2: Net take from shrinking network

People functioning at level 2 are harder to recognise than a ‘constant’ exploiter. In overall terms they ‘take’ from their network, but they may make periodic contributions to it. They tend to make promises that they do not keep, borrow tools, and forget to return them, and the like. They may just be very passive—without exploiting in any overt sense. They may just be ‘observers’ whose only detraction is to fail to interact. For such people, networks tends to shrink. Other network members choose to offer such people fewer and fewer invitations to functions, or fail to re-elect them onto social committees, and the like. After people have identified another as a ‘net taker’, they tend to excuse themselves from engaging in social initiatives taken by the net taker.

Level 3: Interact with static

Level 3 is a comfortable zone for many people. They like being with the same people, and they are liked by others for who they are. These people enjoy being with their families, workmates, and the people they drink with at the pub, play cards with at the club, or worship with in a stable church community. They contribute to the network, and are contributed to by the network, in about the same proportions. They get along, do not rock the boat, and are quite happy with the stability.

Level 4: Net give to expanding network

People at level 4 generally have a good supportive network, but they are also the kind of people that are ‘looked up to’ because of the overall contribution that they make. Others tend to come to such people when they need a bit of support—and they get it. These contributors may volunteer to undertake tasks that require a time or financial commitment. They tend to be good mixers, and good at ‘sorting things out’. They tend to be trusted, and are likely to be sought out for nomination to various committees. They go beyond the ‘call of duty’ at work, at home and in community, but still make time for their ‘base’ network. They are the kind of people that attract others, or welcome others into their expanding network.
## DIMENSIONS of HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS of FUNCTIONING</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>SPIRITUAL</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. VERY EFFECTIVE (actualising leader)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>storge/agape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EFFECTIVE (contributor)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>eros/storge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MINIMALLY EFFECTIVE (participant)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>pragma/eros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. INEFFECTIVE (observer)</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>ludus/pragma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. VERY INEFFECTIVE (detractor)</td>
<td>− −</td>
<td>mania/ludus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dimensions in blank cells have been excluded from the sample

Table 6. Summary of the different levels of effectiveness of the qualities, behaviours, outcomes or skills that are valued for their importance, utility or influence in contributing to human effectiveness within the spiritual and social dimensions.
**Level 5: Lead**

People who become network leaders are likely to have grown into level 5 through the cameo of level 4. Fellow committee members see their competence, and nominate them for Presidency. They emerge in community crises, and have the energy, perspective, personal qualities, and skills to address the issues, involve others appropriately, and maintain confidence. They are likely to be fast-tracked in their employment. They know when it is time to quit, and they are likely to have groomed a successor.

**The spiritual dimension**

When we drafted the elements of the spiritual dimension in 1985 (Sanders & Kranz 1987) we called it the metaphysical dimension. That seemed outlandish to some, but our histories, experience and observations persuaded us that ‘spirit’ was a substantive realm that influenced human effectiveness, so we decided to ‘add on’ the metaphysical dimension to Carkhuff’s ‘physical’, ‘emotional’ and ‘intellectual’ dimensions. We struggled to find a starting point. At that time we scanned the indexes of a number of psychological texts, but failed to find any reference relating to either ‘metaphysical’ or ‘spiritual’. We recalled the work of John Lee (1975) on ‘styles of loving’ which we intuitively ‘graded’ through five levels. The remaining factors seemed to identify themselves spontaneously as if by cosmognosis (‘knowing’ derived from the ‘cosmos’).

We were tentative in sharing our table at first. The ideas were not based on any research. It was well outside the boundary of the Public Service in which we worked. Nevertheless, we were very encouraged by the feedback that we got from others in terms of the relevance, helpfulness, and discernment of the table. We invited input to refine and shape the table, and watched the literature for new developments. We forged ahead regardless of the contemporary view that ‘there is still a total lack of consensus regarding the actuality of any parapsychological phenomenon’ (ed. Gregory 1987, p. 586). We leave readers to evaluate the relevance or applicability of Table 6 for themselves. We recognize that there may be a range of different cultural perspectives in some of the descriptors. Indeed, we acknowledge that there may be disagreement that our factors can be called ‘spiritual’. We continue to invite comments on the range of factors, and our treatment of them. The dimensions are listed in Table 6 on page 80.

**Ambit**

Ambit is the term we use to describe the personal boundaries that people hold. It reflects the ‘world view’ that typifies the extent and nature of individual perspective. The element is valued because it encourages expanded concern for, and inclusion of, others—and ultimately for the well being of the planet.

**Level 1: Self**

At level 1, the ambit does not extend beyond the person’s skin. It reflects the egocentricity that continues to ask: ‘What’s in it for me?’ It is totally unrelated to the philosophical perspective that argues that even the noblest philanthropist is ultimately selfish because of the absolute joy that such generosity brings to the giver.

The chapter continues to describe levels of behaviour for each tabulated cell…

and other snippets follow…
Love
The element of love considers the different degrees of affection that humans have for one another. We have taken the six ‘styles of loving’ described by Lee (1975). He wrote of their differences, and suggested that the satisfaction in loving is in finding a partner ‘who shares the same approach to loving, the same definition of love’ (Lee 1975 p. 21). We considered his styles and concluded that it was possible to table them into merging levels of effectiveness, at least to our satisfaction, in the following manner.

Level 1: Mania/Ludus
Manic love seems to be at the bottom of the pack at level 1. The Greeks called it ‘theia mania’, the madness from the gods. It is characterised by an insatiable desire for attention and affection from the lover. It provides grist for theatrical mills—‘furious jealousy, helpless obsession, and tragic endings’ (Lee 1975, p. 25). Despair prevails in the absence of the beloved. It is neurotic and unhealthy; a pathological kind of affection that throws a dramatic tantrum when things do not go right. It may, or may not, be a transient experience in adolescence. Lee points out that Mania can be reduced by resolving underlying self-esteem issues, and by diminishing the desperate need to be loved.

The Roman poet Ovid coined the term ‘amor ludens’—playful love. Such ludic love is a game, enjoyed as a pleasant pastime with limited involvement. Ludic lovers may have several partners on a string. They do not become dependent on any partner, nor allow intimate attachment to themselves. They want sex for fun—not emotional bonding. In fact, sexual gratification is only a minor part of the complex, tactical game. We figure that work-sponsored ‘happy hours’ are a kind of ludic gesture in those organisations that play the game of caring for staff, but actually depersonalise them into ‘units of production’.

Some manic lovers behave in ways that are similar to ludus. These manic, ludus lovers ‘alternate between a detached devil-may-care attitude towards a partner, and a worried, lovesick desire for more attention…They need, and resent, love; and they cannot control their emotions long enough to maintain a cool relationship’ (Lee 1974, p. 22). This loss of control may well contribute to the ‘honeymoon–beat up’ cycle in domestic violence.

Level 2: Ludus/Pragma
The next notch up, in level 2, is the style of loving known as pragma. Lee describes it, rather neatly as ‘love with a shopping list’ (Lee 1975, p. 27). Pragma is characterised by conditionality. Arranged marriages, in traditional societies have this flavour. Both sides know what they are getting. Computer matching services take this pragmatic view. Data from ‘his’ and ‘her’ list match—and ‘bingo’, the shopping is in the bag! Lee suggests that pragma has the manipulative aspect of ludus blended with the stability of ‘storge’ (yet to be discussed). This is discernible in pragmatic ‘affairs’ which are ‘managed’ so that neither individual domestic relationships, nor regular routines are disturbed.

Level 3: Pragma/Eros
Erotic love is the most familiar. Its typical symptom is a strong, immediate affinity with the appearance of the ‘beloved’. There is a ‘chemistry’ in the air. In the initial stages of a relationship, physical affinity is seen as far more important than personal and intellectual qualities. Erotic lovers have a strong desire to ‘know and be known’. They yearn to share themselves with each other. Through such sharing, the fascination with ‘beauty’ can
extend to psychological intimacy between lovers who, classically, ‘seek a deep, pervasive rapport with their partners and share development and control of the relationship’. Even so, Lee suggests that ‘pure’ eros relationships are vulnerable—as fiction attests—and that ‘the success of a few keeps the dream alive for many more’ (Lee 1975, p. 21).

**Level 4: Eros/Storge**

Storge seems the ideal ingredient to add to ‘pure’ eros to introduce some endurance to erotic lovers who are keen to override their vulnerability and stay together. Storge has been described by Proudhon (in Lee 1975, p. 23) as ‘love without fever, tumult or folly, a peaceful and enchanting affection’. Storgic love is ‘grown’ in loving families, and with lifelong friends. It is based on friendship and companionship. It seeks stability and richness. Pure storge is a bore to erotic lovers because it tends to avoid the conflicts that passion brings, and its ‘reasonableness’ and ‘predictability’ go beyond the ken of pure erotics.

**Level 5: Storge/Agape**

All the great religions share a concept of love that is a generous, unselfish, and compassionate giving of oneself—even anonymously. In our culture, this is called ‘agape’ simply because it was the word St. Paul used to tell his Greek readers in Corinth what he meant by love from the Christian perspective. Lee reports that he did not meet any saints in his study of 112 subjects, although he had a ‘few respondents who had had brief agapic episodes in relationships that were otherwise tinged with selfishness (Lee 1975, p. 27). It will be news to no-one that there is not a glut on this style of love. We listed it last, at level 5, because it seems axiomatic that actualising people will seek to express such love, both in their giving and receiving. We add ‘receiving’ because we have been saddened, on many occasions, to see some sparkle leave the bright eyes of children who have put their ‘all’ into making a gift—only to hear a well intended parent say: ‘That’s lovely dear, but wouldn’t it be better if you had…(done something differently)’. Such comments shift the receiving from unconditional agape to conditional pragma. Repetitions of this kind sows the seed that ‘love comes when you please others’. Such seeds grow pathological perfectionists.

**‘k’**

The column headed ‘k’ (in Table 6) is blank because there is nothing to write. Scientists use ‘k’ to signify the unknown. For example, in their initial research Truax and Carkhuff included ‘k’ to make clear that there will still be more to research (see page 18). As unknowns become tangible they are no longer in ‘k’—but ‘k’ persists, nested in the bosom of the Cosmos. There is always more. ‘k’ has been called the ‘constant k’ but it is now recognised that the only cosmological constant is ‘changeability’. Its boundless mystery may tantalise during quiet reflective moments.

What is k’s substance? What are its boundaries? What is its influence? If we assume some cosmological factor—say the rate of inevitable evolutionary development, whether linear, cyclical, helical or exponential, we are led into reflections of ‘beginnings’. For us, this triggers both the poetry and the science of Darryl Reanney (1994).

The start was the big bang—the paradoxical event where everything came from nothing, and before which there was no time! It was the birth of stardust—in which we grow more conscious that we, ourselves, are ‘star-stuff’—part of a boundless Cosmos ‘awakening in self-awareness, seeking to know what it was in order to understand what it is so that we can look forward to what may be’ (Reanney 1994, p. 20). According to
Reanney, all matter, having exploded into the space, carries a ‘memory’ which yearns to become one again—cosmological ‘reconciliation’. The yearning of the physical world is gravity. The animal kingdom is guided to find its place by instinct and cosmognosis. Humans discover it by choices. The ego, in choosing its own indulgences, maintains a boundary that militates against its host’s intrinsic yearning.

The actualising of any potential that does not diminish ego and ‘fuse’ with (or relate to) the collective knowing, is counter-productive to the ultimate cosmological reconciliation towards the paradoxical ‘everything’ that is ‘nothing’. There is wonderful freedom here—‘where nothing is present as form, everything is present as possibility. All order is the gift of chance. All song is the gift of silence’ (Reanney 1994, p. 26). Actualisers becomes nothing in the quest to become everything—relating, as one, with all phenomena.

Some observations and implications

The discussion from Table 5 flowed from a blend of Carkhuff’s work between 1981 and 2003. In 1981, he compared the broad profiles of two groups of people. The first group consisted of twenty people, whose productivity, contribution and relationship skills classified them as ‘actualisers’ of their potential. The productivity of the second group of eighty people was low, but they were selected to match the actualisers in terms of working environments, backgrounds, age and exposure. The researchers recognised that the numbers did not represent random sampling, but following selection, all were observed, inventoried and interviewed under circumstances of random sampling. The researchers aim was to account for the difference. Crudely put, they asked: ‘How come some people get to be productive and helpful and others do not, when they are so much alike in all other respects?’ The profiles, shown in Figure 10, were predictable in general terms because they were selected to be ‘actualisers’ and ‘non-actualisers’. The significance lies in the conclusion that the actualisers were learners who had ‘freed themselves from the conditioning schedule’ (Carkhuff 1981, p. 102).

**Figure 10. Comparing the average profiles of Actualisers and non-Actualisers. From Toward Actualising Human Potential, by Robert R. Carkhuff. Copyright © 1981. Used by permission of the publisher HRD Press, Amherst, MA, 800-822-2801, www.hrdpress.com.**
Simply put, when confronted with a given set of circumstances, actualisers explored all the factors involved; made sense of them; saw what would improve the situation; created a program to achieve what needed to happen; and did it. They learned new strategies. Given the same circumstances, non-actualisers tended to do what they have previously done in these circumstances. They replicated what they had been conditioned to do. The actualisers used the Interpersonal Skills listed in Table 5 on page 64 (shown as E² in Figure 10) in their interactions with others. The non-actualisers did not. The actualisers used these skills to develop programs for their personal fitness and in their work. The non-actualisers did not—apart from some who had a fitness program.

It follows that in actualising one’s own potential we seek to have abundant energy, and involve ourselves in areas that are fulfilling to ourselves and contributive to others. Above all, we hone, and apply, our interpersonal skills so that we can continue to learn, and pass on our learning to others when appropriate. We learn to process information to produce creative initiatives that will lead to human benefit—all backed by a loving spirit that pursues truth with passion, and seeks to reconcile factional interests that distort the harmony that all nature embraces.

We have not researched the profiles of people in the spiritual and social dimensions, but our observations have been that there are many people who score at high levels in the ‘love’, ‘truth’ and ‘cosmology’ dimensions, in particular, who literally ‘blossom’ in terms of impact, confidence, and ability to learn after achieving a degree of mastery through interpersonal skills training. We also observe that people with poor interpersonal skills are likely to behave between levels 2 and 3 in the social dimension.

It needs to be noted that developmental, or remedial, programs should move one level at a time. One level seems achievable and desirable. More than one seems unachievable and demotivating. Too frequently, parents, teachers, and other helpers tend to push growth beyond one step. They want ‘observers’ to be ‘contributors’ before they have learned to be ‘participants’. Such intensity is likely to fail, and create poor self images in the learners to the extent that they give up.

The last observation to be made is that whilst the elements discussed so far can be valued intellectually for the their utility for humans, they only really have value when they are expressed in the actions of people. Their acquisition and refinement, as skills or behaviours, is a lifetime activity. The challenge is to ‘die growing’.

The chapter is summarised and referenced
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