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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;R</td>
<td>Accountability and Reconciliation Agreement (Uganda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Appeals Chamber (ICC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF</td>
<td>Avocats sans Frontières</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Assembly of States Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CICC</td>
<td>Coalition for the International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPEV</td>
<td>Commission of Inquiry on Post-Election Violence (Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMJ</td>
<td>Comité Mixte de Justice (DRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPP</td>
<td>Director of Public Prosecutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR C</td>
<td>Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDLR</td>
<td>Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>Final Peace Agreement (Uganda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRW</td>
<td>Human Rights Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>International Crimes Act (Kenya 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC/Court</td>
<td>International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Act</td>
<td>International Criminal Court Act (Uganda 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD/Division</td>
<td>International Crimes Division (Uganda and Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-CD</td>
<td>Inter-Congolese Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICL</td>
<td>International Criminal Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTJ</td>
<td>International Center for Transitional Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTR</td>
<td>International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTY</td>
<td>International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCCD</td>
<td>Jurisdiction, Complementarity and Cooperation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLOS</td>
<td>Justice Law and Order Sector (Uganda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSC</td>
<td>Judicial Services Commission (Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNHRC</td>
<td>Kenya National Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPTJ</td>
<td>Kenyans for Peace with Truth and Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA</td>
<td>Lord’s Resistance Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUSCO</td>
<td>United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (formerly MONUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NILD</td>
<td>National Implementing Legislation Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODM</td>
<td>Orange Democratic Movement (Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF</td>
<td>Open Society Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTP</td>
<td>Office of the Prosecutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAJ</td>
<td>Political, Administrative and Judicial Committee (DRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Preliminary Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEV</td>
<td>Post-Election Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>Parliamentarians for Global Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>Pre-Trial Chamber (ICC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Special Criminal Court in the Central African Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STK</td>
<td>Special Tribunal for Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Trial Chamber (ICC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDF</td>
<td>Uganda People's Defence Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVF</td>
<td>Uganda Victims Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRWG</td>
<td>Victims' Rights Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCD</td>
<td>War Crimes Division (Uganda)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREFACE

This book is about the International Criminal Court (ICC), the world’s first permanent judicial body established to prosecute mass atrocity crimes, and the legal transformations its interventions have spawned in three ‘situation countries’ to date: Uganda, Kenya and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Its origins date back to the summer of 2010, a time that, in various ways, marked a turning point for the Court as well as the countries the book traverses.

In June, the first ‘Review Conference of the Rome Statute’ was held in Kampala, Uganda. Billed partly as a ‘stock-taking’ exercise of the ICC’s founding treaty and of the Court’s first eight years of operation, the conference was yet another illustration of international criminal justice’s remarkable ascendance as a post-Cold War political project. The conference provided an opportunity for member states to finally establish an agreeable definition of aggression – the most contentious crime over which the ICC now has (partial) jurisdiction – and an occasion to issue a number of ambitious resolutions. One resolution extolled the impact of an emergent ‘Rome Statute system’ on victims and affected communities, while another noted the ‘importance of States Parties taking effective domestic measures to implement the Statute’ in their own legal systems (as the conference’s host country, Uganda, had just done). The final Kampala Declaration recalled the heady language of the Rome Statute’s preamble – ‘that all peoples are united by common bonds’, whose ‘delicate mosaic may be shattered at any time’ – as it summoned ‘the common bonds of our peoples, our cultures pieced together in a shared heritage’.
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And yet, by 2010, these bonds were being sorely tested. After commencing its first investigations in both Uganda and the DRC (situations that were referred to the Court by those countries’ own governments), the ICC had begun to navigate an increasingly rocky political terrain. Luis Moreno-Ocampo, the ICC’s inaugural prosecutor, had initiated the Court’s first, controversial *proprio motu* investigation in Kenya that spring, following the government’s failure to establish a domestic tribunal for the post-election violence of late 2007. Shortly thereafter, ICC judges issued a second arrest warrant against former Sudanese President Omar Al Bashir, the first sitting head of state to then be charged by the Court. This time the charge was for genocide, the ‘crime of crimes’.

By late July, Kampala was again playing host, but this time to a different summit: the African Union’s (AU) annual Assembly of Heads of State. At this convening, the focus was not on humanity’s ‘common bonds’ but rather on charges of the ICC’s racism and bias. Furious at what by then had increasingly come to be seen as a ‘court for Africa’ – neocolonial in design, imperial in ambition – the AU Assembly rejected the ICC’s request to open a ‘liaison office’ in Addis Ababa (where the Union is headquartered) and accused Moreno-Ocampo personally of ‘making egregiously unacceptable, rude and condescending statements’ in relation to both the Al Bashir case and other situations on the continent. Already a source of animosity, the Court’s relationship with the AU sank to a new low, one with which it continues to struggle.

That same summer, I was packing up my apartment in New York City for a different, though related, destination: The Hague. Host city to an array of international courts and tribunals, including the ICC, my decision to move there was motivated by a desire to better understand an institution that both inspired and intrigued me. A young lawyer and aspiring academic at the time, I made the decision to join a new research project housed at Leiden University’s Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies that sought to explore the Court’s institutional evolution since first opening its doors on 1 July 2002, as well as the domestic legal effects that its interventions had ‘catalysed’, a concept I would come to interrogate closely over the coming years.

---


Living and working in The Hague allowed me to regularly engage with an array of academics, jurists and human rights advocates from around the world, many of whom have made the creation and sustenance of the field called ‘international justice’ their life’s work. Their often single-minded focus on the ICC was remarkable in its sophistication and ambition. Not only was it rooted in the vision of a global institution that could competently and fairly try those accused of international crimes (a formidable task in itself, as the Court’s experience to date has made clear) but one that could also spark the domestic pursuit of accountability in countries around the world.

This book explores the belief in that spark – its origins, capacities and permutations – and offers an assessment of the ICC’s ability to deliver upon it. It comes not only at a time when debates about the Court’s performance and its ‘catalytic effect’ on states increasingly captivate scholars from a variety of disciplines but also at a moment when the ICC, international courts and the human rights project itself face a growing and possibly existential tide of political resistance.

At the centre of much of this discussion lies the principle of complementarity: the idea that the ICC is designed to supplement, not supplant, national jurisdictions.

This appealing idea is at once both straightforward and deeply complex. Originating as a technical admissibility rule for determining when the ICC can ‘admit’ a case within its jurisdiction, complementarity has since become the cornerstone for what is now commonly referred to as the ‘Rome Statute System’, one in which ‘States remain responsible and accountable for investigating and prosecuting crimes committed under their jurisdiction’. A related, core aspiration is that the ICC, through the principle of complementarity, will spur domestic jurisdictions to action. As put by two commentators, ‘The [ICC] is intended to not only investigate and prosecute crimes under its jurisdiction but to act as a catalyst for genuine national justice by applying the principle of complementarity’.

Ultimately, my research led me to Uganda, Kenya and the DRC. Between 2011 and 2012, I travelled to each of these countries on multiple occasions to interrogate the idea of the ICC-as-catalyst further and to better understand what domestic legal transformations the Court’s involvement in these early situations had augured. These ‘field’ trips – as well as my time living in The Hague – attempted to explore both the expectations that attended the Court’s establishment and the effects of its interventions through interviews with international and domestic non-governmental organizations (NGOs), ICC staff, judges, human rights advocates and diplomatic representatives. In the course of those two years, I conducted over sixty interviews with actors based both in-country and The Hague. Three of these encounters are described in the following.

Uganda: ‘We Have to Look Like We Are Doing Something’

The International Crimes Division (ICD) – a special division of the Ugandan High Court’s eight divisions – sits midway up a tall hill in the already hilly city of Kampala, Uganda’s capital. The Division is not easy to reach. The easiest way, if you are without a car and unwilling to walk, is to grab one of the ubiquitous matatus that populate the city. I made three trips to the ICD in the course of my visits to Uganda, but on this sunny day in December 2011, my co-researcher and I were to meet with one of the judges of the Division who was part of the bench then overseeing early proceedings in the trial of former Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) commander, Thomas Kwoyelo, which had already been underway for nearly two years. It was not the first time we were meeting this judge. Only several months prior, she and other colleagues from the Division had come to The Hague for a week-long training in international criminal law that Leiden supported, together with a leading transitional justice NGO.

As it happened, that morning we had also met with the legal counsel for Uganda’s Amnesty Commission. The Commission had certified Kwoyelo’s amnesty petition in January 2010 but was now engaged in a protracted battle with the Director of Public Prosecutions over its validity. Established by the Amnesty Act in 2000 as a way to incentivize defections from the LRA (as well as other rebel movements),

---

7 Interviews with legal counsel to the Amnesty Commission and ICD judge (Kampala, 13 December 2011). My co-researcher refers to Dr Sara Kendall, with whom I conducted most interviews jointly.
the Commission was the Division’s institutional opposite: it granted ex-combatants protection from prosecution, while the ICD was meant to be the putative forum for prosecuting them. Curious, I asked the counsel what kind of impact he thought the ICC had in Uganda. ‘A big one’, he said soberly, ‘The ICC has a lot of powers; it says some of these Africans need to behave’. I also asked the same of the ICD. ‘It has increased international pressure’, he replied, ‘The donors have invested some money in that court, so we have to look like we are doing something’.

One long walk later, we sat before the judge who, over the course of an hour, answered a string of questions. How many judges sit on the Division? (Four, at that time.) When did it change from the War Crimes Division – its name when first established in 2008 – to the ICD? (In 2010.) What rules of procedure would they use? (The rules were not yet created at the time but would have to be originated by the Division, and they would have to ‘reflect the best practices in the world’.) The judge indicated that ICD colleagues had received multiple trainings in subjects ranging from substantive international criminal law and procedure to organized crime and the laws of war. On the subject of the ICC, the judge expressed disappointment that the Division itself did not have any interactions with the Court and stressed the need for more ‘positive complementarity’ – for instance, a proper witness protection program, judicial trainings, even perhaps ‘attaching’ the Division to other ‘courts of complementarity’ in countries like Australia or Canada. ‘I wish the ICC could help with that, but I think it prefers to keep safe’, the judge said, with evident disappointment.

---

Kinshasa, the Democratic Republic of Congo’s dense and sprawling capital city, is known as ‘Kin la belle’, although the description is at times difficult to appreciate. Even as it sits far from the violence that grips the east of the country (where the ICC has concentrated its work), the city’s chaotic rhythms seemed to vibrate with its dense, complex history. Stretching back to the ‘First Congo War’, when Rwandan and Ugandan troops backed Congolese rebel forces in the overthrow of then President Mobutu Sésé Seko, the DRC has remained at the epicentre of one of the world’s most enduring conflicts.

Given this, it was not hard to appreciate the daunting challenge that a country like the DRC posed for a young institution like the ICC. Nor was the Congo’s violent legacy of colonialism ever far from my mind. I thought frequently of my Belgian family’s own particular story with the country (my grandfather worked for many years in the shipyards and rail stations of pre-independence Belgian Congo; my aunt and father were born there), as I engaged in earnest conversations with expats about how to ‘end impunity’ for the atrocities that civilians continued to endure. I wrestled with the idea that a court situated thousands of miles away could do this and about the complicated donor economies that encircled its intervention. Many of the same European countries that were now financing the ICC and other judicial reform projects in the country were the same ones that had been divvying up this continent not so long ago.

Our arrival in June 2011 preceded the DRC’s second presidential elections by several months, although it was clear that their imminence was already consuming most of the diplomatic community’s energies. These elections were the first to follow the arrest of one of the country’s leading politicians, Jean-Pierre Bemba, whose trial before the ICC (for crimes committed in

---

9 See, for example, Kris Berwouts, Congo’s Violent Peace: Conflict and Struggle since the Great African War (London: Zed Books, 2017). There is a vast literature on the conflict in the DRC. Useful texts consulted for this research are Filip Reyntjens, The Great African War: Congo and Regional Geopolitics, 1996–2006 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Jason K. Stearns, Dancing in the Glory of Monsters: The Collapse of the Congo and the Great War of Africa (New York: PublicAffairs, 2011); Michael Deibert, The Democratic Republic of Congo: Between Hope and Despair (London: Zed Books, 2013); and David van Reybrouck, Congo: The Epic History of a People (London: Fourth Estate, 2014). Notably, the ICC’s presence in the DRC is barely mentioned (or mentioned only in passing) in most of these texts; of them, Deibert engages most with Court developments in the context of the continued fighting in eastern DRC.
the neighbouring Central African Republic) had begun in November 2010. On our first day, an interview that had been scheduled with the European Union (EU) delegation provided us, fortuitously, with an opportunity to meet two Congolese human rights advocates whose NGO had been engaged around the ICC’s intervention for several years. Much of their work focused on facilitating the participation of victims in Court proceedings, as well as advocating for the passage of Rome Statute implementing legislation. As they explained, their mandate was to ‘simplify’ the Statute and make it understandable to people – in French, *la vulgarisation* (‘popularizing work’). The advocates were there to brief the EU delegation’s Working Group on Human Rights, a monthly gathering of donor states, but with elections then looming, the long table they were meant to address was almost empty. Except for one representative, no one had shown up.

The Working Group’s loss was our gain: over coffee, we seized the opportunity for a conversation. It quickly became apparent that despite our interlocutors’ support for the ICC’s work in the DRC, they were deeply critical of its performance. They spoke of the poor quality of investigations and of the investigator one of them met who had never even been to the DRC before. How were they selected? How were they vetted? They recalled that the best years for contact with the Court were probably between 2002 and 2005 – the early years of its intervention – and expressed frustration with the many ICC staff changes since then. ‘People leave, and you don’t know where they go’, one remarked. *Il faut que le peu qui est fait, soit bien fait* (‘the little that is done must be done well’) said the other, but, in her view, too much had not been done well. Although there was ‘a lot of hope’ amongst victims in the beginning, it was not as strong now, and people could not understand why the first trial in The Hague (that of Thomas Lubanga, for the recruitment of child soldiers) had gone on for so long.

Towards the end, the discussion turned to the prospects for domestic accountability in the DRC. What about the prospect of a mixed chamber for these serious crimes, of the sort that was then being proposed? They were sceptical. ‘It is not just about the judges – it is about the prisons, the personnel, the system at large’, one replied. It was the need for long-term sustainability within the criminal justice system that concerned them – in French, *la poursuite de la pérennité*. A special chamber would only deal with one category of crimes: it would be an ‘itinerant’ court unconnected to the domestic judiciary. What, they asked, about the rest of the country?

---

10 Interview with Congolese human rights advocates (Kinshasa, 20 June 2011).
Kenya: ‘One Long Game’

On my third trip to Nairobi, I met again with the director of the Kenyan Country Office for a prominent international NGO. Shortly after my last visit, the Office of the Prosecutor (OTP) had issued its summons for the defendants that came to be known as the ‘Ocampo Six’. On this visit, two of those accused, Uhuru Kenyatta and William Ruto, had just announced a new political ticket forged out of the ICC’s accusations: the Jubilee Alliance.11 At the time, however, the Court was riding relatively high. From my very first visit to Nairobi, the sophistication of Kenyan civil society was quickly apparent, as was the jolt that the ICC’s intervention had brought to the human rights community there.12 As the same director said at our first meeting, Kenya had a long history of impunity for political violence, such that, when the Court first arrived, many Kenyans embraced it. ‘They were so used to seeing people get away with things’, he said.13

Indeed, the ICC’s arrival brought with it, for a time, great hope. Members of Kenyan civil society set about supporting the Court’s work in a variety of ways: registering and interviewing victims, supporting an ‘underground’ witness protection system, conducting outreach in conflict-affected communities, gathering evidence and, later, pushing for the establishment of a special domestic tribunal.14 In Kenya, as elsewhere, national NGOs came to serve as a kind of shadow network for the Court. They were its eyes and ears on the ground.

By the time of our second meeting in late 2012, however, that hope had dimmed considerably.15 Two of the ‘Ocampo Six’ had not had their charges confirmed, and there was fear – well founded, as it would soon
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12 On the emergence and accomplishments of modern civil society in East Africa, see Makau Mutua (ed.), Human Rights NGOs in East Africa: Political and Normative Tensions (Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 2009).
13 Interview with Kenyan NGO director (Nairobi, 17 June 2011).
15 Second interview with Kenyan NGO director (Nairobi, 3 December 2012).
turn out – that the other cases would also collapse. Kenyatta and Ruto were on the political rise, it seemed, with ominous implications for the trials that awaited them; indeed, Kenyatta would go on to win the presidency the following year. I asked my interlocutor what kind of impact he thought the ICC had had, despite its mistakes. What had it catalysed? The answer came in two parts. On the one hand, ‘the only time you hear about something being set up [in Kenya] is when the ICC moves’. That was what led Parliament to attempt to set up a domestic tribunal in 2009, to the creation of a special ‘task force’ within the Director of Public Prosecutions office to investigate the post-election violence cases and later to talk about the creation of a special judicial division to try international crimes. But none of that, apparently, mattered. ‘All that has supposedly been done for complementarity’, he said with a long sigh, ‘It has just been one long game’.

***

Much has changed in the years since these encounters took place. The ICC bench is now populated with new judges, while, in 2012, a new prosecutor, Fatou Bensouda, succeeded (and inherited) Moreno-Ocampo’s tumultuous tenure; a third prosecutor will follow her in 2021. The last of the ‘Ocampo Six’ cases was dismissed in early 2016, following a damaging series of missteps by the OTP and significant interference in the proceedings by the Kenyan government itself. In Uganda, one trial of the original five accused members of the LRA has moved forward (following the surprise arrest and transfer of former child soldier Dominic Ongwen in 2015), but the group’s leader, Joseph Kony, remains at large and no new warrants have been issued since. And while the DRC remains the greatest source of the ICC’s judicial activity to date, the OTP’s increasingly fragile record of successful prosecutions has done little to deter ongoing violence in the region, as many had hoped. Meanwhile, amidst the Court’s increasingly uneven performance, new situations crowd the Prosecutor’s docket, spanning countries as diverse as Georgia, Palestine, the Philippines and Myanmar. Repeated threats by African countries to initiate a mass
withdrawal from the Statute have largely not come to pass, but the situation remains tense and uncertain.\textsuperscript{18} After the promise of Rome, the threat of state withdrawal is perpetual.

Much has changed for me in these years as well. Though the dissertation on which this book is based was completed in early 2016, I made the decision to move towards practice-based work when I joined the Open Society Justice Initiative, part of the Open Society Foundations (OSF), in 2013. In that process, the methodology and investments I made in this project have necessarily shifted. For one, I became a member of the same transnational ‘community of practice’ described in the pages that follow, as both the Justice Initiative and OSF more broadly are significant actors in the international and transitional justice landscape. Furthermore, although my work for the Justice Initiative has not directly involved any of the three countries addressed herein, I myself now advocate in support of the ICC and its work. I also engage in other countries where the Court’s intervention is sought. In the course of doing so, several of my former interlocutors have since become valued colleagues and friends. In short, I sit in the privileged, if complicated, position of having become a participant in my own research.

Thus, while this book began its journey as a scholarly pursuit and its insights draw principally from my PhD research, it is also now, inevitably, a personal analytical account. It is not only multi-sited in the geographies it traverses but also multi-positioned in the professional identities I have inhabited.\textsuperscript{19} In his influential ethnography of development practice, the anthropologist David Mosse, himself a former consultant for the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID), aptly describes such research as ‘both social investigation and lived experience’.\textsuperscript{20} While Mosse’s research first drew on his insights as a participant-insider with DFID, for me, the reverse is true: my role as a ‘participant-insider’ in the field of international criminal justice has

\textsuperscript{18} At the time of writing, only two states have withdrawn from the Rome Statute (Burundi, which announced its withdrawal in October 2017, and the Philippines, which deposited notification of its intention to withdraw in March 2018), but many others have threatened to do so, including the three countries examined here. For an analysis of threatened African withdrawals, see Christian De Vos, ‘The Politics of Departure: Africa and the International Criminal Court’ (3 November 2016), at https://theglobalobservatory.org/2016/11/international-criminal-court-south-africa-burundi-gambia/.

\textsuperscript{19} See, for example, George E. Marcus, ‘Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography’, \textit{Annual Review of Anthropology} 24 (1995).

evolved over time. This experience has itself influenced the conclusions I draw from my research. As Mosse writes, ‘Mine is an interested interpretation not a scientific judgment; it adds interpretations to those of actors whose experience I share’.21

Similarly, my experience as a human rights advocate and practitioner has expanded my own interpretations. I have come to see with new eyes and greater appreciation the campaign that was waged to not only successfully establish a permanent international criminal court – a political dream harboured by so many, for so many years – but to also then help transform the meaning and understanding of complementarity itself. These are advocacy victories to celebrate and learn from; they were hard fought and hardly imaginable today. But, as I hope this book illustrates, they have exacted a certain price as well. The expectations these victories ushered in, as well as the ambitions that animated them, appear almost impossibly large in retrospect. Implementation of a catalytic ‘complementarity norm’ has been a challenge for the ICC and its supporters to realize as they struggle, increasingly, to reconcile a political dream amidst a host of growing practical, political and fiscal constraints. This book is a partial exploration into what that dream has looked like in practice and an effort to suggest what should come next.

21 Ibid., 14.