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1. “All Passive – All Guilty” [1]

One of the main objectives of ‘Building a Europe without dividing lines’ is to strengthen active citizenship. This is, today, a particular challenge because of so many alarming signs towards an undesired direction. There is a low and declining interest in representative politics, declining trust in politicians and declining participation in elections in the new member countries and especially among youth. There is the rise of the extreme right with a concomitant increase in attitudes of passive resignation to authoritarian leadership. It seems that the current political structures do not meet the expectations of young people, and accordingly, there is room for extreme parties with authoritarian and intolerant connotations to appeal to a large part of the electorate.

European Union of Jewish Students “recycled” the old “all different – all equal” logo and text when they prepared themselves for an anti-Heider demonstration at the
Council of Europe in February 2000. The result was the black and white logo with slightly changed text: “All passive – all guilty”. This message calls for a common solidarity to construct a civil society, which takes an active responsibility of society. Considering the current state of affairs the way ahead is to have a serious look at how the present forms of participation could be developed and what would the ‘new’ forms of participation be?

But what are the “old” and what are the “new” forms participation? The problem with the word new is that new becomes very quickly old and that people understand differently what the new forms are; for instance are youth parliaments new or old forms of participation? Furthermore, the definition of participation should have a link to the society in which it occurs; the changes of the forms of participation should reflect changes in society. Within this framework I propose to make a difference between ‘established and current’ forms vis-à-vis ‘emerging and future’ forms of participation? In this sense one could rather talk about “modern” forms of participation; representative participation and direct participation with all their current variants, such as NGO based structures, co-management, youth parliaments, school councils, youth hearings, demonstrations, etc. Then one could talk about “post modern”, “emergent and future forms” of participation, like the various types of expressive, emotional, aesthetic, cultural, casual, virtual and digital participation.

I do not want to create a gap between the modern and postmodern forms of participation, saying that we should abandon the former and concentrate on the latter. Of course, the modern ones can surely be developed to meet the needs of today’s youth. A prime example would be schools. The aim of education in all European schools is to prepare pupils for democratic citizenship and to take responsibilities. But in most of the countries there are no structures for the pupils to start learning about citizenship and to start taking responsibilities within the schools themselves! However, while developing these modern forms of participation, we should also look at the postmodern ones. Saying this I do assume that there are emergent forms of participation, which differ from the established ones.

2. Some reflections on modern forms of participation

I would like to start with a presentation in a summary fashion of some of the key modern forms of participation and then go on to discuss the postmodern ones. I will summarize their key benefits and the main lines of criticism. The reality is, of course, more varied than my summarizing arguments and I leave the further debate and development of them to this Round Table. Due to time restraints I am consciously leaving out political participation (consult, for example “Youth Voter Participation”, 1999) and also discussion on the state of affairs of participation in central and eastern Europe, because that will be later covered by Siyka Kovacheva (see also Kovacheva 1999).

2.1. NGO-based participation

The basic strategy is to support youth organisations and provide them structures through which their voice can be heard. On a national level the most developed structures are the national youth councils (composed of NGOs) and youth committee (as advisory governmental bodies). On a European level the European Youth Forum is the most influential lobby organisation comprised of international youth organisations and national youth councils. The Council of Europe Youth structures represent a unique structure called co-management, where youth representatives
decide, on an equal footing with the governments, on the priorities, main budget envelopes as well as on the implementation of the priorities and allocation of the budget. In this case youth participation is real, not theatrical.

Co-management is a way of making a good match between our programme and the expectations of our partners. It is also an efficient learning experience for future decision makers. The problem with this structure is that youth organisations de facto represent only a part of young people. Furthermore, their diverse and heterogenous composition may make it difficult to arrive at common position on controversial policy and political issues. Another question is how can one at the same time be the political decision maker of an intergovernmental structure and take the role of the independent and critical civil society representative.

2.2. **Youth and School Councils, Youth Parliaments**

Another parallel trend has been the establishment of municipal youth councils and local, regional and national youth parliaments, as well as school councils. There are a large variety of applications to these models and they have already been extensively discussed in this Round Table. I will only make a few comments, which rise from the National Youth Policy Surveys, which the CoE has been carrying out in recent years. As a rule youth parliaments, youth and school councils are a controversial model. There are reports on their success. Particularly in small municipalities and small schools they have been able to draw the attention of the decision makers and the teachers on youth priorities and youth issues. Furthermore, the sense of responsibility of pupils in the schools and young people in their municipalities has increased. The negative experiences concern lack of real participation (limited scope of issues to decide on), lacking connection to the electorate and difficulties to recruit active participants. Many school council experiences also report a negative attitude on the side of the teachers and headmasters. Some conferences arranged to include youth participation have not in the end taken young people seriously and there has been little follow up the these proposals (see for example: http://www.ecouncil.ac.cr/rio/focus/report/english/peace-ch.htm)

2.3. **Youth Hearings**

Another recent form has been the organising of youth hearings. The Dutch authorities convene yearly a National Youth Debate gathering different types of young people and their organisations and networks together to discuss current youth policy issues. The French Minister of Youth and Sport has organised various forms of youth hearings to spark off discussion on the concerns of youth themselves. She was also a strong actor behind a European Youth Hearing (called European Youth Parliament) a year ago in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. The Commission is also organising a set of national youth hearings to discuss its forthcoming White Book on Youth Policies.

This strategy raises public awareness on youth issues and provides a forum for youth policy discussion. It also reaches to some extent young people outside “organised youth”. The problem with this type of democracy is the lack of debate and the difficulty to involve the variety of current youth lifestyles and the voices of the marginalised. There is often a strong element of top-down management in these popular consultations; Silvano Mockli (1996) goes as far as saying that “popular consultation continues to be an instrument for the exercise of power by the authorities rather than an instrument for the limitation of that power”
2.4. Things to be developed

To sum up, the key things to be developed seem to be

1) **The link to the electorate**; How to strengthen the communication of these bodies with those they represent, young people, the students and the pupils casting their vote? How to recruit active participants?

2) **Real participation**; Bernard Roudet (2000) concludes his overview on youth participation in France: “Participation is more rhetoric than reality. There is something inherent in our political culture which doubts everything which is not originated by the actual political actors”. This situation most probably concerns all the other partner countries of the Council of Europe, as well.

3) **The social inequality of participation**; The Expert Group on Dutch Youth Policies noted that “Participation structures do not reach genuinely disadvantaged groups”. But it is not only a question for the Dutch youth policy to find out how to involve ‘youth at risk’ or those most in need, to the societal decision-making structures?

4) **How to reflect the variety of youth?** The Expert group on Swedish Youth Policies argue that current youth is becoming increasingly diverse and heterogenous. Given that the above-mentioned forms of participation only reach a part of this diversity, how should one take into consideration these new types of youth phenomena?

3. Towards Postmodern forms of participation

We often assume that young people know what they want – as if we should only need to find the right instruments and structures to channel these expectations. I am not sure. Sometimes the discussion on youth participation is too much concentrated on instruments and structures. Perhaps we should rather ask: do young people have identities and a set of views on society, which they then want to express through the structures? In many cases young people do not have such identities. Rather their identities seem ambivalent, complex, fragmented and under constant change. The issue is complex and goes beyond structures and instruments: the important questions are rather: How do young people develop their identities? How do they express them? How should we react to this scene of diffuse and changing identities?

Instead of seeing participation as a set of standard solutions to the match between youth needs and the structures through which they could be expressed, one could rather see participation as having two elements instead of one: (1) participation as a diverse process of exploring identities and (2) participation as the forms of expressing identities. Instead of talking about the structures of participation one should talk about ‘processes of identification’ and ‘forms of expression’. Of course, when we include in the concept of participation the process of developing identifications, then we are also integrating into the discussion learning, particularly non-formal learning. In this case the ‘development of identifications’ (learning about one’s relationship to a community) becomes inseparable from ‘expressing the identification’ (learning is also about change). Non-formal learning is about creating a personal relationship to a community and involving oneself in changing it. I feel
that much of the discussion about participation has become too much instrument-
and structure-oriented demagogy having lost it’s roots in those processes through
which the reasons and motivation for participation are created; how does the
common young man in organisations and outside them become emotionally and
cognitively conscious of his or her relation to a community? How is this
consciousness worked out?

3.1. Emergent forms of identification and expression

Not only are the emergent forms of identification becoming complex, ambivalent,
fragmented and fluid but also the forms of expressing them are changing. I would
like to outline some of the key dimensions of these changes.

- From fixed identities & commitments to changing, overlapping and even
contradictory identities and commitments?
- From long-term commitments in organised activities to looser forms of
identification?
- Increased diversity of the forms (of identification and expression) ranging
from cultural activities, youth cultural and sub-cultural forms to Cyber
Communities, Cyber Citizenship?
- From rational discourse and its traditional participation formats to emotional,
expressive and aesthetic forms of engagement?

3.2. From rational discourse to emotional, aesthetic and expressive
engagement?

Are we perhaps too dogmatic in thinking that only rational communities are effective,
support moral growth and identity development. Sometimes we seem to be the
prisoners of the old dualism (of Tonnies, Weber and Durkheim) between
Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, between the pre-modern small communities knit
together through traditions and emotions and the modern large communities, which
are based on effective division of labour and rational organisation. The latter has
become to denote a rational, intentional and conscious form of organisation while the
former effectual, irrational and unconscious social organisation.

Current studies on New Social Movements and new lifestyles argue that various kinds
of expressive communities have gained popularity among youth. Melucci talks about
“emotional communities” and Maffesoli about “neo-tribal lifestyles”. Both of them
maintain that emotional and expressive communities can also be moral communities.
“ethical beliefs are not expressed discursively simply through speech and text, but
through the aesthetic marks, or masks of group identification. Feeling and emotion,
the expressive realm, is a realm of belief and value that expresses itself through
stylistic forms of communication and signification.” (Maffesoli 1996).

Kevin Hetherington has tried show that affectual social forms can also be conscious
and value rational and promotes individual self-reflection. He maintains that this is
the organisational form of the New Social Movements, youth cultures and new
lifestyles and, what is most important, shows that “the expressive is not antithetical
to the organisational” (Hetherington, 1998, 99).

Where does this ambivalency, lack of long-term commitment, experimentation,
search for aesthetic expression come from? To try to be extremely brief, the
phenomena seem to be related to insecurity (and, as Alberto Melucci (1996) has
put it, to) **changeability** and **transience**.

The growing economic and social insecurity and polarization has contributed to a perceived lack of control over the future. There is also a growing insecurity and lack of trust of the capacity of the political structures to guide us to a safer future. This leads to increased individualism and disinterest in long-term commitments whereas the term "insecurity" referred to increased "risks". The term "changeability" refers to the experience of young people of drastically increased awareness of "possibilities": everything can be known about, everything can be tried, everything can be changed and everything can be imagined. The term "transience" refers to the transitory nature of the modern world; as a result of quick changes, knowledge, skills and practices of the past lose their meaning, while at the same time future becomes uncertain and unpredictable - the present becomes the most meaningful thing. The overall consequence is that (1) today´s youth lack future perspectives and concentrate on (2) constant experimentation of one´s individual capacities within the new field of possibilities and on (3) experiencing the present. Thus the interest in collective movements, work with "the system" and the engagement in traditional organizations and organizations with longer-term aims is decreasing. The most important thing for today´s youth is now and room for individual manoeuvrability.

If my memory does not fail me Manuela du Bois-Raymond has a few years ago said that there is "a decline of moral, political and ideological citi
dships". In terms of Melucci´s changeability and transience moral, political and ideological citizenships represent structures that change too slowly and which presuppose commitment to fixed values and ideas. Instead young people express themselves increasingly in other types of communities, like cultural and electronic communities.

4. **Identification and expression through culture**

"Young people are artists of life
specialising in the artistry of growth"

*Roger Hill*

Youth is about growth. Growth is about exploring one’s potentialities. Arts, culture and subcultures are sites for such innovative explorations. A recent publication of the Cultural Directorate of CoE "Culture, creativity and the young: developing public policy" (Ken Robinson, 1999) summarizes the relationship between culture and identity development of young people:

- The arts can have crucial roles in the strive for independence, hunger for new experiences and struggle for the sense of identity
- Cultural activities are instruments to achieve social and political goals
- Popular culture is the key innovative field of the identity search of today

Thus arts and cultural activities, particularly that of popular culture, of youth are important arenas of identification (developing an identity) and expression (participation).

The Swedish youth culture researcher Johan Fornes maintains that body, sound and image are the three key vectors of youth identification and expression. One can easily see how important the body, sport, dance, music, visual culture and their combination are to young people today. Of course there are people who maintain
that this field of activities is totally overtaken by commercial cultural production and that the only role for young people is that of the passive consumer. Others (like Paul Willis) argue that it is youth who are manipulating the media and the commercial youth cultures rather than the other way around. It is not so much passive consumption as an active use of them in realizing one’s own personality.

Another critical voice has been to point out that popular youth cultures are apolitical or devoid of political messages. In the youth cultures only style matters not the meaning. The Expert Group of the Dutch Youth Policy Survey maintain that there has arisen “a gap between style and ideology”. I would be much more hesitant. I believe that in most of the youth cultural phenomena there are social and political messages involved – if you can read them. To take an example, rap music, is essentially political and educative – if you can read the message (Richard Shusterman (1996) can).

One might go even further to say – like Richard Shusterman does – that "ethics – the form of good life – becomes an aesthetic project” ..or to put it in other words; people may become morally and politically conscious citizens through artistic activities. And, indeed, through their daily lives. What you eat, how and where you travel, what you buy and what you do with your rubbish are often morally and politically defined choices, increasingly popular with young people. Importantly, this is a position in action, not only in words.

5. Identification and Expression through Cyber Space

Is it possible to develop identity and express it in the Cyber World? Are there social communities – in the net - in which one can identify oneself and through which one can express oneself, endorse changes? What does it mean that young people spend hours and hours in virtual role games (like the MUD)? Is this Virtual Reality just a game or just an escape from reality, or is it something seriously useful? Does Cyber Space increase political participation? Does Internet create new types of political activism?

Within this short time it is not possible to properly address these questions. Instead, I will only make brief comments.

5.1. Virtual Reality, Identity Development and Art

The popular question is: Is Virtual Reality a good place for your children to grow up? As we well know the literature is divided as its reaction to this question. I will use this opportunity to pronounce myself on this subject and promote the "yes" answer. Due to lack of space I will content myself with a few references only. Sherry Turkle, the pioneering psychologist of Internet research, says in her classical book "Life on the Screen" (1997): "Virtual communities offer a dramatic new context in which to think about human identity in the age of Internet". According to her Internet is a fruitful environment to develop the postmodern identity. Denise Dalaimo goes even further: "Cyberspace is the ultimate environment for the nourishment of the fragmented, multiphrenic, contradictory postmodern self. " (Denise Dalaimo, 1995). So it is all about the hectic search for identity, where Virtual Reality, like VR role games (MUD, MUSH, etc), can be an important arena to develop, explore and test new dimensions of self.

But what are the Virtual Reality things like MUD games about? Aren’t they 'just
games’? Aren’t they ‘just an escape from reality’? What kind of reality is Virtual Reality?

I think we need games and we need different types of ‘world-making’. Through these alternative or additional worlds one may overcome loneliness, make friends, experience excitement, expand new horizons, see things differently, develop and test ones identity etc. Sometimes it is not relevant whether the Virtual World corresponds to "the real world", but rather how successfully it helps one to reflect ones own identity. The soap operas are not watched because of their “reality”, because they should reflect reality, but because they are useful fictional images of reality, against which one can elaborate and reflect one’s own values, identity, life-style and world views. More important than the question of reality is the individual use and usefulness of these images of worlds.

Following this logic VR can be useful to young people to become better real-life persons. As a 19-year-old MUD player says: « The more I played, the more I found it was easier to be that person in real life » (Anke Bahl, 1997a&b). One can use the VR to test and develop identities, which then can more easily been transferred to real-life. Much of early childhood socialisation is learning social roles through games – VR provides another (more developed) version for youth to learn roles and identities.

The above discussion on the nature of Virtual Reality has sparked off another interesting discussion between the role of VR and Art. Why are we interested in Art? We are not interested in art because it would necessarily reflect the reality, but rather because it shakes our perception of reality, because it presents a different kind of ‘world-making’ which can help us see things differently, something that can in the end transform ordinary reality (Wesley Cooper, (2000). In this sense Virtual Reality comes very close to ‘Real Art’. Virtual Reality is (like the VR) about redeeming and transforming our awareness of reality. Like Michael Heim (1998), a pioneer in Virtual Reality, says: “Virtual worlds are works of art as much as they are feats of engineering”.

In the above meaning Virtual World activities are forms of identification, which have repercussions to the (so called) ‘real world’. Through Virtual Reality and its games we can see the world differently, develop our identities in them and – maybe – change the ‘traditional reality’ accordingly. If this is not participation, what is?

5.2. Digital Democracy

There seem to be two major concerns which give the new Information Technologies a possibility to change democratic practices. The first concern is the growing perception of mistrust to political institutions and politicians, the second is the perception that economic and cultural change is so rapid that the current structures are too rigid and not well informed about what is going on. Perhaps NIT can help us create democratic models that ensure efficient flow of information and a combination of representative and participatory forms of democracy. Perhaps, a better access to good quality information, establishment of digital networks to reinforce local communities, ‘communities of interest’ and models through which NGOs, political parties, municipalities, governments and international organisations can communicate with citizens, perhaps, will lead to (as Hague and Loader, 1999 say) “to rethink and, if necessary, radically overhaul or replace [current] institutions, actors and practices”?
Experiments and models to promote digital democracy are so far very new and it is too early to draw any final conclusions. However, certain experiences seem to come up constantly.

5.2.1. Will Internet change political participation?

Does better access to information and a quick means to express your opinion create new types of activism? Does Internet particularly promote participation possibilities of non-mainstream actors?

In the short run non- and anti-governmental and non-mainstream groups have been more effective than the governments and the established political actors to make use of Usenet Newsgroups, chat rooms, e-mails and web-pages. In the longer run the Imperium is expected to strike back hard (Hill & Hughes, 1998).

Furthermore it seems that Internet as an instrument does not as such create new political activism nor does it fundamentally alter the political landscape. Politically active people also use Internet actively. Thus the motivation to become politically active remains outside technology. “The ICTs will serve the cause of democratisation only if a prior will for strong democracy is established” (Malina 1999, 16). To conclude: Although virtual reality offers promising possibilities to enhance young people’s participation, the primary need is to promote democracy and involvement at the rational reality of youth: family, community, schools, work place and other social and cultural settings.

5.2.2. Governmental and municipal initiatives

Governments have tried to create ICT structures to facilitate the information flow from governments to citizens and to create citizen feedback and participation models. Hague & Loader (1999) who have recently studied these initiatives sum up: “practical initiatives to date have largely failed to live up to the rhetoric”. The main failures have been the one-dimensional flow of information; from the governments to the citizens. Asking for feedback has been rare and citizens are not invited to set the agendas and participate in the planning phases. There is “the need for governments to develop techniques for ‘mass listening’” (Richard 1999).

The same conclusions seem to go for the municipalities as well. There is not much interactivity, there are very few efforts to activate the citizens; to modify the information, to make it easily found, to present it in an understandable manner and in such a form to evoke interest to participate.

5.2.3. Political parties

Nixon and Johansson (1999) have studied the Internet strategies of Dutch and Swedish political parties. According to the study political parties have a very centralised information strategy that does not favour interaction or dialogue with the local level and the electorate. They “need to adapt the ways in which they interact with the public and indeed with their own members”. The authors suggest that the parties should reform their entire strategy in the information society. They should move towards a ‘discursive democracy’: Peter Waterman (Cybersociology, 5, 1999, p. 14) has analysed the strategies of the labour movement maintaining that there must be a radical change from representing a clientele (ever diminishing) to communicating to a global public the concerns of the labour movement. With this
strategy ICT can be useful.

5.2.4. “Electronic Agora”

There have been numerous attempts to create in the Cyberspace citizens’ fora, ‘electronic agora’, ranging from electronic town halls, citizens channels to local community networks. Perhaps the most famous of them has been Cyber Ville, a New York online society (Stacy Horn 1998), which has been able to activate people to discuss on- and offline the affairs of their community. Other forums of less structured and managed format have not been so successful. In the open agorae like Usenet newsgroups political discussions have not been very encouraging. According to a recent empirical study they are “home to an array of overlapping, short-lived conversations, usually among like-minded individuals” (Wilhelm 1999).

All these initiatives are promising, like the Finnish ‘Netparliamnet’ to be presented in the Round Table, and need to be developed and applied. Perhaps, one should follow a tri-partite strategy: first, work on the motivation, skills and competencies (netpedagogy, netiqets) of the users, second, the technical instruments and their accessibility and, third, find ways of making the political decision makers and administrators responsive to the outcomes of these initiatives.

5.2.5. Online Activism

The net has also become a site for civic action and even civic disobedience. One of the prime examples of online activism is the US –based Electronic Frontier Foundation, which is specialised in promoting the liberty of the Internet (www.eff.org). Despite its success, Jon Lebkovsky – one of the veterans, is well aware of the limitations of such an activism (Cybersociology: http://www.socio.demon.co.uk/magazine/5/5jon.html):

1. In cyberspace, it’s easy to avoid commitment and accountability
   - Expression of opinion and real action are two different things.
2. It’s logistically difficult to organize online
   - It is difficult to run a meeting that lacks the visual cues and the immediate feedback that you have in ‘flesh meet’. Furthermore, it is difficult to make decision online.
3. The promise of global effectiveness is misleading
   - Thinking globally is easier than acting globally.
4. Sooner or later you have to take a stand
   - Online you can afford to be inconsistent in expressing yourself, but to get results, you must decide on what you believe in and stick to it.
5. Money changes everything
   - Action needs funds, but when money is involved it usually changes everything...

To sum up, digital democracy is a potentiality but not a miracle:

- the governments, municipalities, political parties, NGOs and civic action movements must develop a ‘communicative strategy’ towards NIT,
- public authorities, in particular need to develop ‘mass listening’,
- models with strong involvement of local and grass root level are essential, and
• it must be kept in mind that any models are useless unless there is a functional civil society beneath.

6. Conclusions

There seem to be two parallel reasons for looking at ‘new forms of participation’. One is that the current structure of representative politics lacks legitimacy in the eyes of young people. Another reason is that the forms of moral and political engagement among young people are changing. Thus, at the same time, we should develop new forms of participation which would revitalise the interest of young people into democratic decision making processes, and also sensitise ourselves to the emergent forms of participation, new ways of developing and expressing identities.

The current forms of participation - youth councils, youth parliaments, and youth councils at educational institutions, co-management and youth hearings at local, national and international level - have made undisputable success and increased their popularity, but there is also room for further development. One of the problems to be looked at is related to representative democracy in general - missing links between the representatives and the electorate. Another issue is the credibility of the forms of youth participation - is participation for real?

At the same time the forms of youth involvement are changing from fixed long-term commitments to a an ever wider variety of looser, ambivalent and even contradictory commitments, and from ‘rational discourses to emotional, expressive and aesthetic forms of engagements’. These changes are anchored in current cultural, economic and social changes of increased risks, potentialities and the increased pace of change. Young people must concentrate more and more to continuously develop, reflect and experiment their life styles, values and identities. The emphasis is more on individual ‘processes of identification’ than on the instruments of collective expression of them. Young people are looking for arenas of individual every-day development of identities. It seems that cultural and subcultural activities and the digital worlds are such arenas. Young people are mass users of cultural activities like physical culture (sports, dance, etc), visual and music cultures – sometimes as innovators, sometimes as passive consumers. The paper, furthermore, argued that also the Cyber World, Virtual Reality and Virtual Reality Games can be contexts in which to simulate identities, to be then transferred to ‘real life’.

It is necessary that the Council of Europe Youth Sector reflects its role in these new arenas of identification and expression. How can we promote the awareness and transparence of the ways young people use arts, culture, subculture, the virtual worlds and their every-day life to become moral and political citizens? How can we develop these instruments in youth work? How can we combat the negative effects (like commercialisation, americanisation, ‘Cybermania’ etc.) of mass culture and Internet on youth?

New Information Technology has the potentiality to improve information dissemination, citizen feedback and direct democracy. The experience so far indicates that this potentiality still needs further development. And it is not only a question of developing the technology, but more so a question of adapting the strategies of governments, municipalities, political parties, NGOs and civic action movements to reciprocal communication with audiences than cascading down decisions – “communicative strategies’ and competencies of ‘mass listening’.
Finally, citizen channels, electronic Town Halls, community networks, netparliaments and civic action websites are meaningless unless there are not motivated and conscious citizens to use them. The Council of Europe Youth Sector’s main task to vitalize active citizenship remains fundamental.
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