

Insane Slavery Vote EXPOSES West's True Intentions | Evarist Bartolo

If you think the West regrets either slavery or its colonial past, think again. The most recent vote at the UN shows clearly that the Political West has learned NOTHING from its sins and looks forward to doing it again. I'm joined today by former Maltese foreign minister Evarist Bartolo to discuss the UN vote on slavery reparations, Western abstentions and opposition, the link between slavery, colonialism, and present power, compensation for slave owners, Haiti, Africa-Europe ties, rising pressure from the global majority, and the wider fight over dominance, debt, war, and solidarity.

Links: Evarist Bartolo website: <https://evaristbartolo.mt> Evarist Bartolo on Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/evarist.bartolo/> Times of Malta: <https://timesofmalta.com> Neutrality Studies substack: <https://pascallottaz.substack.com> (Opt in for Academic Section from your profile settings: <https://pascallottaz.substack.com/s/academic>) Merch: <https://neutralitystudies-shop.fourthwall.com> Donation: <https://neutralitystudies.com/donate> Timestamps: 00:00:00 Introduction and UN vote 00:01:50 Slavery and colonial power 00:10:01 EU abstentions and reparations 00:15:17 Guterres and legal excuses 00:21:27 UN majority and world shift 00:25:48 Dominance decline and artifacts 00:29:09 Debt traps and new alliances 00:32:54 Iran war and Western decline 00:39:48 Social solidarity and closing

#Pascal

Welcome back, everybody, to Neutrality Studies. My name is Pascal Lottaz, and I am joined again today by our good friend and colleague, Everest Partolo, a former foreign minister of the beautiful island nation of Malta. Everest, welcome back. Welcome. Thanks. Thanks for this, Pascal. A Sunday—Easter Sunday—talk as we speak on the 5th of April today. And we said we're going to use the occasion to discuss something actually very unpleasant, which is that last week we had a UN resolution that was passed. I'll try to show it here—just a second—here we go. This one here, a UN resolution that urged reparations for slavery and historical wrongs, basically a resolution saying that slavery was wrong and should be condemned.

And the good news is that the General Assembly resolution passed. The bad news is that the way it passed is really a disgrace. There were three votes against this resolution condemning slavery in the past—Argentina, Israel, and the United States. Those three voted outright against it. Then we had about 52 states that abstained. And if you look at them, it basically reads like a who's who of the former colonizing states, or the white colonizers—basically all of Western Europe. Countries that voted for it include China, Russia, and the entire formerly colonized world. So it's another one of these huge hypocrisies of the West at the moment. But yes, Everest, what's your take on this resolution?

#Evarist Bartolo

I agree with you, Pascal. It reads a bit like an X-ray—an X-ray of the geopolitical reality of today—showing us quite a lot, not about the past, I would say, but about the present. Because, as you said, among the 52 states that abstained, the core are all 27 member states of the European Union. I'm ashamed to say that even tiny Malta, which had its own past of thousands of Maltese dragged into slavery—you know, we were also involved in the slave trade. Malta was one of the main slave markets in the Mediterranean, competing with Algiers and Istanbul. And although this resolution spoke about the Atlantic trade, the transatlantic trade—Portugal, Spain, the UK, France, the Netherlands—they were the main beneficiaries of that slave trade, because we cannot see it in isolation.

It's not a standalone issue. You have to see it in the way it's entangled with colonialism and with the industrialization of the West, because it all comes together. Slavery, apart from being a very cruel side of human nature—where you actually say that you consider another human being not as a fellow human being but as your property, to do whatever you like with that property—apart from that, I mean, it's really an immoral attitude. It's also an economic reality. Slavery was a big money earner, both in terms of cheap forced labor and in actually selling the slaves. If a slave owner bought a slave for 20 euros, they could sell them for over 300 euros. So it was a terrible reality.

But what is more terrible is that, after these centuries—after a century and a half since slavery was abolished, and that's why the vote was taken on the 25th of March, because it coincides with the vote in the British Parliament to abolish slavery—we still, the West, the colonizers, still cannot bring themselves, I would say, not only to confront the past, but also to confront the present relationship they have with Africa. We're going to concentrate on Africa, because they still refuse to build an equal relationship with it. They still do not consider Africa an equal partner, but are still extracting resources—mainly primary commodities, energy, and other raw materials—from there. So it's a vote not only about the past; unfortunately, it's very much also a vote about the present. Not to mention, Pascal, modern slavery, because that's also a reality.

#Pascal

And it's a reality that we like to ignore, but also this reality that, you know, the slave trade and the violence that the Europeans and the North Americans inflicted on these other continents is still something that, you know, the Europeans, on the one hand, say, "Oh, it was regrettable that it happened." On the other hand, they're saying, "No, no, no, it's long over, and we've learned our lesson." But then they didn't vote for this. Maybe let me just, you know, enrage you and me a little bit more. Let's read this passage. The UN, very carefully in this article they put up here, actually quoted several people who spoke, of course, in the General Assembly before the adoption of the resolution.

And they're quoting—just quoting and letting it stand there—the U.S. representative, Ambassador Dan Negrea, saying that the text was highly problematic in countless respects. He regretted that Washington must once again remind this body that the United Nations exists to maintain international peace and security, and was not founded to advance narrow, specific interests and agendas, to establish niche international days, or to create new costly meetings and reporting mandates. Niche—like niche, like tiny little particular interests. A tiny little particular interest of, what, two-thirds of the world? Or like three-quarters of the world wanting to have recognized hundreds of years of absolute brutality done to them. They call that a tiny little narrow interest. Isn't it fantastic?

#Evarist Bartolo

It's incredible. It's very cynical—very cynical—because when you see what happened in those 400 years, even if we're going to focus now only on African slavery, we're talking about at least 50 million people. Why are we talking about 50 million people? In the resolution and the debate, they usually mention 12 million, 12.5 million people who actually made the passage from Africa, mostly to the Americas. But those 12 million people were the survivors of 50 million, because millions—millions—died just making the trek on land. They had to walk sometimes as far as a thousand miles.

By the time they arrived to board the ships and cross over, many had already died in the desert. In fact, parts of the desert are still said to be white with the bones of those millions of enslaved people. Most of them were children, women, and healthy men, because before the journey even began, they were selected through very invasive, abusive procedures—checking everything, everywhere—to make sure the bodies they were going to ship were “healthy” bodies. They left behind villages of old people, sick people, and disabled people. To call this a narrow interest is really, really terrible. It's truly terrible.

#Pascal

Hey, very brief intermission because I was recently banned from YouTube. And although I'm back, this could happen again anytime. So please consider subscribing not only here but also to my mailing list on Substack—that's pascallottaz.substack.com. The link's in the description below. And now, back to the video. It's quite a sick mindset, right? But actually, the people who do this and say this—they understand, right? I mean, the fact that the Europeans were basically not able to vote against it but had to abstain tells us that, you know, they know that. Yes, it's about their own will. Yeah. It's quite interesting, though—you know, how does it happen? I mean, you were a former foreign minister of Malta. How does it happen that enough pressure is built up so that Malta doesn't vote in favor of this? Because Malta is like the last state that would have to fear paying reparations, I suppose.

#Evarist Bartolo

Exactly.

#Pascal

How does that happen?

#Evarist Bartolo

It's a block. It's a block. It's a block mentality, Pascal. From Brussels, the line would be, "Let's stick together when we vote on this," because there are countries that are worried about reparations. But even that, I think, is unfair and unjust. Not only are they not ready to apologize—and sometimes, formally, there's a little bit of apology—but, I repeat, the attitude, the deeply ingrained attitude of considering Africans inferior is not something stuck in the past. If you look at the relationship the European Union has built with Africa today—in 2026, not the 16th, 17th, or 18th century—it's completely lopsided, completely unequal, despite people like Juncker and Prodi saying we should build a partnership of equals and a comprehensive agreement.

It's not just about taking commodities or energy out of Africa for our convenience, but also about building equal relationships in industry, agriculture, banking services, education, and technology. None of this has happened. It's still about going to Africa and taking from Africa what you need. So the fact that you're not even ready to—because notice how prudent and, to a certain extent, almost apologetic the resolution is—all it asks is to consider, to reflect on what the slave trade meant and then, yes, to ask for reparations. It also talks about returning the objects that were taken from these colonies to the colonized.

So I repeat, it shows a lot about the present and how difficult it is to build equal relations when the former colonizers still want to consider themselves superior to the rest. I think it's a kind of narcissistic, ethnocentric approach—this Western attitude, you know, that Western civilization is superior in every area. So don't, you know, don't make us admit that. Yes, there are obviously good things, quite a lot of good things, in Western civilization. But there are also terrible things that the West has to answer for and is still not ready to answer for.

#Pascal

Yeah, and also the idea that nothing is owed for this, right? That this wrong of the past is a wrong that should just stay in the past and shouldn't have any influence on current relationships, while at the same time the mentality remains very much intact.

#Evarist Bartolo

But apart from remaining the same, Pascal, what's very, very ironic is that when we talk about compensation—when the slave owners had to let go of their slaves because slavery started being

abolished—even if you just look at the UK, not even other countries, who was compensated? In that case, it wasn't the enslaved people. The slave owners were given something like, I mean, we're talking about 20 billion. Apparently, it runs up to 20 billion euros given to the slave owners because they lost their slaves. So when it comes to compensating the victims—no, no, no—that's a problem. But those who benefited...

#Pascal

And there are even more egregious examples, right? I mean, the first and most successful slave revolt in history was in Haiti, where the enslaved people actually managed to throw out the French. And in order for the French not to bomb them with their gunboats, they had to pay millions of francs at the time—this was 200 years ago—basically to buy back their freedom. And to this day, I must say, I don't think the Europeans or the Americans have forgiven Haiti, which is why they keep Haiti in such abysmal circumstances. Do you have any thoughts on this?

#Evarist Bartolo

Yes, and it's the usual approach, you know—we talk about liberty, fraternity, equality—but it has geographic limits, and it has human limits. If we're talking about our country, yes, let's talk about that. But then the same idea of equal human beings who should live in dignity and have the liberty to run their own lives—no, that is not accepted, because we want to exploit them. We want to make money out of them. And I think the same structure applies in different ways, but it's still the same. It's still the same structure, you know, building and developing at your expense. I think one has to pay tribute to Guterres. I know he must be in a very difficult situation at the moment, with the United Nations and the world being in the state that it is.

But I think it's worth reading what he says, because it's very appropriate. When he welcomed the vote—and I'm going to quote—he said, "The wealth of many Western nations was built on stolen lives and stolen labor." He talked about the barbaric punishments that maintained control, from shackles and iron collars to flogging and sexual violence. It was not simply forced labor; it was a machinery of mass exploitation and deliberate dehumanization of men, women, and children. The wounds run deep and often go unrecognized. I think those were very, very good, wise words. And, you know, the West is not ready to confront this reality. Whether you vote against or abstain, it's still a failure to confront this reality.

And what is still interesting is how such an attitude is deeply ingrained—not only in politics and the economy, but also in religion and culture. We read of priests and missionaries who went to America and wrote back to their bishops in Europe, asking, "What should we consider? How should we regard slaves? How should we treat them?" And the answer used to come: "Don't you know, our learned people have said we should accept slavery, that it's part of today's reality?" Which is really

terrible. There's also a very fallacious argument made by both the American representative and the EU spokesman when they explained why the vote was one of abstention, saying that what was legal in the past, we shouldn't have to answer for now.

But even that isn't true. Why? Because, specifically, African slaves were treated— even by the laws of those days— as inferior, even to other slaves. White slaves were treated one way; African slaves were treated differently, much more harshly. And the violence used against them—executions, flogging, cutting off their noses and ears, branding them on their breasts—was terrible. So when there was, you know, the argument that we shouldn't have a hierarchy of violations, because calling slavery the gravest crime against humanity would somehow diminish the crimes committed against others, that just doesn't hold up.

I mean, how cynical to use an argument like that, because there really was a hierarchy of violations. African slaves were treated worse—worse than others. So to confront this, to start the debate and the discussion, would be something healthy, Pascal, even for the African countries themselves, because this is a reality they have to face. Africans were complicit as well during the wars, when they captured fellow Africans and sold them into the slave trade. So this is a discussion and a debate that would be healthy for humanity as a whole, not just for the West to confront its demons. Yes, yes.

#Pascal

In general, something like what the South Africans had to do to confront their decades—centuries—of apartheid, right? And then have a process where the victims and the perpetrators stand face to face and actually reach some form of reconciliation. But even that is something Western countries, at the moment, reject, of course. Now, one thing that's interesting about this resolution is the—let me look here—123 votes in favor of it. So, two-thirds of the states supported it. And of course, in the United Nations General Assembly, resolutions pass by a simple majority. They're not binding, unfortunately; only Security Council resolutions are binding.

But the United Nations General Assembly has other powers too, in the sense of shaping international law, right? Through the process by which these resolutions can become part of customary law and so on. What do you think this tells us? Because, you know, there are quite a few resolutions now that go against the interests of certain groups. Another interesting one is, of course, the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which was also adopted against the interests of the great powers—even against the interests of Europe, China, and Russia. And here we have a resolution that passes against the interests of this very, very powerful Western bloc. What does that tell you about the development, and also the new courage of the rest of the world, to vote against the West? Because I believe a couple of decades ago, this resolution wouldn't even have made it to the floor.

#Evarist Bartolo

I see the same development in the Commonwealth, Pascal. The former colonies of the British Empire, organized in the British Commonwealth, have passed similar resolutions, much to the reluctance and even shock of Britain. At least in that case, Malta sided with the Caribbean countries, so we absolved ourselves there, and the British were not very happy with us. But it's also interesting, talking about the Commonwealth, because the CARICOM countries in the Caribbean have actually looked at, practically, how these reparations should be carried out. You know, there was the argument: "But who are we going to give this money to?"—as if they were already putting money together to start compensating slaves.

And you don't give them to individuals. The Caribbean countries have been very clear about this. Let's look at the debt structure, debt relief. Let's look at, you know, investment in health, investment in education. Let's not use these kinds of arguments to avoid doing what needs to be done, and to help, in such a debate, build a more equal and fairer world. The General Assembly shows that this is the direction a new United Nations should move toward—giving more power to the General Assembly and less and less power, obviously, to those who have the veto. Once, I was joking with an American ambassador, saying that perhaps we should give veto power to everyone except those who have it now, just to address the imbalance.

Because for a fairer world, and an equal relationship between different states and countries, regardless of size and power, that is the direction we should go. But I agree with you—these kinds of votes, both in terms of the prohibition of nuclear weapons and in this case of slavery, are similar to what started happening even 60 years ago with the resolutions on colonialism. The impetus actually came from below. And that is, I think, a healthy sign—that even in this case, a country like Ghana, for example, which is usually very prudent, took the lead in this resolution. They were ready to push the boundaries and assert themselves on something like this. I find it very healthy that at least it's being done despite the pushback from the UK, France, and others who didn't want it to happen.

#Pascal

Yes, and I think this is actually an argument for why the United Nations today is not—at least not completely—useless. I mean, this resolution will not have a direct impact today or tomorrow, but it very much gives us direction, and it gives us a lot of information about where global opinion is going and how even smaller countries are able to assert themselves, how they're able to coordinate among themselves. And it gives a little bit of clarity, right? It strips away this masquerade of the West going, "Oh, we are a humanitarian superpower." And then even Sweden votes against this, right? I mean, Switzerland too voted against it. So it's like, okay, at least we can unmask this stuff. Because whenever push comes to shove and things actually count, then suddenly all of these values of yours are hidden away somewhere in a dark corner of your office. So, I mean, it's not completely useless. There's some good work being done from time to time.

#Evarist Bartolo

I agree. I agree completely. And it's also, I think, especially with the kind of ideology that's coming out of the United States—you know, the language, the violent language that you hear, and also the use of religion and Jesus Christ to justify, for example, the war on Iran. I mean, it's insane. The fact that you then have this kind of discussion shows, "Listen, we're not accepting that kind of approach and ideology." This has nothing to do with being woke. This has nothing to do with being politically correct.

You know, let's treat each other as human beings—equal human beings. But unfortunately, with the emphasis on domination, on supremacy, it's part of that approach of "I am superior to you. I do with you what I want, and you have to submit to me." That's what those who want to dominate are afraid of—when those who have been subordinated for centuries say, "We don't want to be subordinated anymore. Treat us as equals, and we're going to go our own way to assert equality over dominance."

#Pascal

And of course, it lays the foundation for more to come in the future, right? For the next resolution a few years down the line, and the next one, and the next one. It builds up pressure on these dominating countries—especially the United States—to drive home the point: no, this relationship, this way, has to change. And if you're not willing, then we're just going to keep doing this until the wave is big enough, until we win over country by country. So it's very much part and parcel of the global democratic process among nations, to move in the direction that the majority actually wants to go, interestingly enough. Yes, and the important thing is not to give up.

#Evarist Bartolo

So let's leave, you know, compensation—because trillions are mentioned—on what proper compensation should look like. But even if you just look at the cultural artifacts that were stolen from the former colonies, in this case, it's not about giving them something; it's about giving them what is theirs. It's not taking something new, it's returning what was taken. I mean, even that is still not resolved. Some countries have started giving back the things they stole, but even that, I repeat, shows how reluctant the West is to confront its colonial past. Because, I repeat, the slave trade, colonialism, and capitalism go together.

#Pascal

How long do you think it will take until these kinds of resolutions can become the foundation for some of these countries to unshackle themselves against the will of those who shackled them? Because you talked about it in the beginning. You know, OK, the slave trade and so on—I mean, nobody does that anymore. But we've invented all these neocolonial ways of domination, including, most importantly, the debt trap that the West plunged Africa and large parts of South America into,

saying, "Oh, you have to pay us back a debt in our own currency," which you'll never be able to fully repay.

Therefore, we trap you in an eternal cycle: we give you something, and then we demand that you hand over your productive industries and let us extract your resources in return for nothing—really, nothing. And right now, this system used to work because the US dollar was all-dominant; there were no other alternatives. But now, alternatives are starting to pop up. So, do you think this could be used in the future for countries to say, "You know what? We're not going to pay you back. These debts we owe you—you can just write them off. We're not going to pay them back. And if you try to punish us, we'll just go to the Chinese and the Russians, because now we have this resolution saying we should be compensated." Do you think something like that is imaginable?

#Evarist Bartolo

Yes, because dominance is built on coercion and consent. The more it's built on consent, mobilized from the bottom, and the more countries are ready to say, "Listen, we've been dependent on the US, or on the Netherlands, the UK, or France—but now we're ready to build good relations with China, with Russia, with other countries, like the African countries are doing," then yes, that's how they build their power to stand up to these others. I see it happening in Africa. The EU is absent there—although it gives money and takes resources, it has no realistic, effective strategy for Africa.

And obviously, compared to what Russia and China are doing, there's no comparison. That has given these countries more say over their own destinies. And that's the way. I used to tell my friends and fellow ministers in the EU: if we don't work with Africa, the changes will come just the same. Without us, they'll be against us. It's so short-sighted of the European Union not to take the opportunity for a vote like this—to start a new relationship and reset its ties with Africa. It's another missed opportunity for the European Union.

They should have taken this vote as a way to reset relations with Africa, because I agree with Juncker—what he said eight years ago—that Europe's destiny is going to be shaped by Africa, whether Europe wants it or not. Just look at the demographics: the birth rate in Europe is about 1%, in Africa it's 4%. By 2050, Africa will have 2.5 billion people. So when they refuse to support a vote like this, I think they're being short-sighted, even for their own interests. It's not just about taking a moral attitude; even in terms of practical benefits for the EU, they should have taken the opportunity of this vote to reset the relationship with Africa.

#Pascal

Yeah, absolutely. I mean, the demographic future of the planet lies in Africa and Asia. It's pretty simple—you can already see it in the graphs. So telling yet another generation of people in those continents that we in Europe never respected them, still don't respect them, and still think that nothing is owed to any of them, that we deserve everything we have and did it all ourselves—well,

we just shouldn't be surprised if, in 20 or 30 years, when we need help, they say, "You know what? Just stick it out over there in that cold, grim, ghastly continent and rot over there," right?

#Evarist Bartolo

What's worrying is that these countries in decline—these former powers—are resorting to military force to try to prolong their dominance. And that's what's happening in the war against Iran. It has nothing to do with being nice to the Iranians or trying to bring about a better system for them; it's just about prolonging their hegemony, prolonging their dominance. Anyone who tries to stand up for his or her dignity is pushed down and told to know their place. Unfortunately, I repeat, this vote shows where we still are. So, in terms of the U.S., Israel, and Argentina, there's no doubt—they're voting against them.

Europe has started making a timid half step to say, "Yes, you're right, but, but, but..." Well, I think the reality of the coming years will help build a more assertive majority of the world—as we're talking here about the majority of the world. But there still need to be changes in economics, in technology, and in military power, so that countries that have so far had to subordinate themselves will not beg for equality. Because if you beg for equality, it doesn't happen. You just keep developing, building relations with different countries so that you're no longer dominated by the former colonizers.

#Pascal

Yes. Yes, but this is the way it's going, right? It's not going to be a process won by moral or virtuous arguments. It's a process driven by realistic, realist foreign policy, and realism dictates that these oppressed countries—they're coming out of it, they're working themselves out of this kind of oppression. These kinds of resolutions are now one of the signs that something is seriously changing. And it's the same with the Iran war, the same with the Ukraine war, right? It's now the second time—after the Ukraine war, the war in Iran—it's the second time this Western alliance of states, this Western mentality, this Western civilization, or the "political West," as Richard Sakwa calls it, is kind of running against the wall and getting a very bloody nose. It's still other people paying the price and bleeding for these imperial interests, but it's just not really working anymore. Even the approach of using brute force—is it? Yes.

#Evarist Bartolo

And the elites make the wrong people pay as well. Because if you look at what's happening on the European continent, and also what's happening in the United States, the money being spent on the military is very much needed at home—in social services, education, and health. I mean, Trump just gave a speech saying, "Don't talk about medical care, because now we have to spend money on military protection." The same argument is being made in Europe. This is very suicidal, very selfish, and very painful for millions of citizens.

So the elites make this argument, but millions of citizens aren't impressed by it anymore. Before, it was more possible—not that it isn't now, but it was more possible—to have the “barbarians at the gate” narrative and say, “Listen, the Russians are coming, the Chinese are coming, the Iranians are coming, the mad mullahs are coming, the terrorists are coming.” But now I think more people are realizing that the money being spent isn't to keep the enemy out, but to sustain a small elite making money from the military-industrial complex, along with its hangers-on, and to give money to them instead of supporting a decent everyday life for millions of human beings.

#Pascal

Yeah. Yeah, I mean, at some point, everything going on right now is, of course, also aimed at keeping these large majorities in the West—especially in the United States—down, right?

#Evarist Bartolo

Yes.

#Pascal

I believe there will come a point when a good number of the really disadvantaged classes in the US will realize they have more in common with people in Africa, Asia, and South America than with their own elites. And that will be the moment it gets really dangerous for the elites—when there's suddenly an awakening that, “Oh, wait a minute, we're being had.” Maybe instead of bombing others, we just team up and, you know, change a few things here and there.

#Evarist Bartolo

It's interesting what you're saying, because even during the slave trade, what really terrified the slave owners was when Africans and white workers in the United States and other parts of the Americas actually came together and realized they had common challenges and a common enemy. That's why, when it came to the slave trade and the way they treated African slaves, it was so vicious and violent—because they wanted to keep them divided. They used to say, “If you're white, yes, we'll punish you. But if you're Black, we'll punish you and even execute you.” So yes, it's the solidarity of the people that the elites are afraid of.

#Pascal

In a sense, the question is how to foster solidarity among the people in the oppressor states and the former enslaving states, and also solidarity with the people in the states that were exploited, in order to finally, once and for all, you know, get...

#Evarist Bartolo

Well, I think what helps, Pascal, is that if you impoverish your own people, they'll feel closer to those who are impoverished in other countries. If you're a beneficiary of exploiting others, you don't have solidarity. But, you know, I think this will come about—especially today, when, at least so far, the new social media and new forms of communication make horizontal communication across countries easier. Though I'm sure the elites who control these systems will try to make sure they inhibit that kind of transversal communication among people who are oppressed in different countries.

#Pascal

Yes, they have to. They must crack down on this horizontal kind of communication. It's the logical next step they have to take to protect these elite circles, right? From the peasants. Exactly—from us. How dare we even have such ideas? I mean, come on. Elon Musk and the others, they sweat a lot. And the billionaires—they're billionaires because they work so much and because they're geniuses, not because they suck the lifeblood out of everybody else. It's a very old story. Is there anything more you think is significant about this story, or did we about cover it?

#Evarist Bartolo

It shows that even though progress moves slowly and in small steps, it's important not to give up. Even in 2026, with what we've managed to do so far, it's crucial to keep pushing and never give up. I think that's the message that should come out of this book.

#Pascal

That's a very, very good way of tying everything up. We'll be in a better place in 2126. So, in 2026, we're just not at the end of everything—we're not at the pinnacle yet. We're just working toward it. This brought a lot of clarity. So, Averis Bartolo, thank you very much for your time today. Thank you.