Adventures in Cultural Dynamics

Franz Boas professed that the study of cultural dynamics represented a major priority of anthropology, and Alfred Kroeber (1956:153) has conjectured that Boas might well have originated the phrase. But the study of cultural dynamics was more than just a theoretical interest for Boasians; they also had an interest in the “problems of change, social dislocation, and social disorientation” as they affected “American Indian societies and the underdeveloped and colonial nations of the world” (Garbarino 1977:72). And Herskovits extended his study of cultural dynamics to an entire ethnic population--Afro-Americans--in his classic Myth of the Negro Past, which involves a pervasive analysis of slave history and the establishment of a well-researched cultural baseline against which to measure and interpret change.

In 1938 Melville Herskovits published Acculturation, a book dealing with a concept which he and a social Science Research Council Committee made up of Robert Redfield (Chairman) and Ralph Linton had defined as pertaining to “those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups” (1936:149).

Herskovits’s interest in acculturation, of course, clearly derives from his training under Franz Boas, the intellectual leader of the American anthropological tradition which has been labeled “historical particularism.” Boas approach to ethnography, according to Herskovits, “was that to neglect the historical component, since it involved cutting oneself off from an obvious facet of the human experience, seemed preposterous” (1953:67). It is interesting to note, however, that some Boasians, specifically Leslie Spier, while editor of the American Anthropologist in 1936, raised the issue at a national meeting as to whether or not acculturation studies had any place in the American Anthropologist or whether studies of hybrid cultures should not be left to the sociologists. While a motion was made and seconded to include such studies, the issue ultimately was tabled. From that time onward, however, articles on acculturation appeared regularly in the journal.

No student of Herskovits could possibly have emerged from that experience without a profound interest in and sensitivity to the forces of cultural change. Few Herskovits-trained field workers failed to look for such dynamic forces at work in their society of study as “cultural focus” “reinterpretation,” “syncretism,” and “cultural drift.” And in the general approach to change those of us in the Herskovits (and therefore Boasian) tradition were
constantly aware of the dictum that “cultural change can only be studied and understood as a part of the problem of cultural stability.” It was a principle that none of us forgot, and personally, it established the theoretical frame of reference for my first major publication - Ta’u: Stability and Change in a Samoan Village (1957). The study of cultural stability and change in Ta’u village was actually a by-product of my first adventure in researching cultural change and was necessitated by problems associated with a methodological restudy of the “coming of age in Samoa” research of Margaret Mead. In that study, which I carried out in 1954, I realized that the greatest difficulty I would have in any test of the quality of Mead’s research (carried out 28 years earlier) was to determine whether differences in findings were due to the processes of cultural change or to other personal or methodological factors. It was my belief that in any methodological restudy the time factor had to be handled with great care. One could not assume that just because culture in 1954 was somewhat different from what Mead reported in 1925-6 that Mead was wrong. In most cases things were probably different because of the cultural change which had occurred between 1926 and 1954. Fortunately, the culture period of the mid-19th century had been well documented by a number of prolific and intellectually able missionaries such as George Brown, George Turner, John Williams and J. B. Stair, and this provided me with an excellent traditional base line for purposes of comparison with Mead’s 1925-6 data and my own findings acquired in 1954. There were also observers of Samoan culture contemporary with Mead--such as Peter Buck, William Green, Felix Keesing and Newton Rowe, who had described the culture between the years of 1925-39. Comparisons of the three time periods - mid-nineteenth century, 1925-30 and 1954 were carried out first to document the stability or instability of Samoan culture, and secondly, to provide reality and validity tests for both my 1954 data and for those of the 1925-30 period-principally for Mead. The analysis was applied as follows: where my 1954 ethnographic facts and interpretations were the same as those of the 19th century but did not agree with the 1925-30 data, the factor of change was eliminated and other explanations were sought for the discrepancies. Conversely, where there were agreements between 19th century and 1925-30 data but my 1954 data were different this suggested cultural change or inaccuracies in my data base. These discrepancies could then be investigated by quizzing elderly informants who had lived in the village since Mead’s departure or by checking contemporary data with several other informants. The method worked very well in dealing with the time difference between Mead’s and my research. A much appreciated bonus was the positive reaction of Margaret Mead to my methodology, considering the fact that she had been somewhat hostile to my project from the beginning. In her revised edition of Social Organization of Manu’a published in 1969, she wrote concerning my restudy of her research: “His methodological device was ingenious; the search of the literature and old government documents to establish a 19th-century-base, his own observations and inquiries in 1954, informed, of course, by both the 19th century materials and the materials of the 1920’s, with a degree of agreement between his observations and the 19th-century observations made in between” (1969:224).
My diachronic analysis of Samoan cultural change, although originally carried out as a methodological diagnostic device, resulted in the discovery that since the time of first white contact, Samoa had proved to be one of the few Polynesian cultures which had been highly resistant to change. In fact, when I returned to American Samoa in 1962 for additional research, this time on the local and national political system, I was visited by Ben Finney who had just concluded an extensive research project on one of the more remote Tuamotu islands. It was his first visit to Samoa and he was greatly impressed by Samoa’s cultural conservativism as compared to the area where he had been working. He maintained that in Samoa it was possible to actually observe and describe traditional culture patterns while in the Tuamotus he had found very little he could honestly label “Polynesian.”

This had not come as a complete surprise to me, having made systematic diachronic comparisons. Also, much of the literature referred to the relative stability of Samoan culture. For example, Douglas Oliver had described the island group as “presenting a radically different picture from the usual South Seas spectacle of native peoples cheerfully and unknowingly losing their identity and their heritage in a setting of successful and expanded economy established and controlled by white men.” (1961:220). As early as 1943 Oxford and Cambridge University geographers in the handbook titled The Pacific Islands had singled out Samoans as a “people with such a conservative nature that... new elements (foreign goods, money, Christianity) have never been allowed to sweep the land with the devastating effects to be observed in some other Pacific island communities” (1943:608).

On the other hand, The Pacific Islands records that in the northern Cook Islands, an area where inter-island boats call as seldom a four times a year, “the old types of canoes have completely disappeared.....Houses are now made of sawn timber, and....changes in the culture of the people due to European influence have been considerable” (1943:552-555).

Bengt Danielsson described the Tuamotu island of Raroia in 1956 as having a “material culture....almost wholly Western....The natives use European tools exclusively, dress in the European way and frequently have such luxuries as radios, bicycles and refrigerators” (1956:104). And in places where I have visited, such as Hawaii, Tahiti and New Zealand, it did not take a trained anthropologist in the 1950's to realize that traditional Polynesian culture could only be found in acculturated forms if at all, and then it was most often resurrected only as a tourist attraction. This was not the case in Samoa, particularly in Ta’u village in the Manu’a group where I had carried out my research.

The problem of Samoan cultural stability was a challenging one and one that in Herskovitsian terms could be understood only in the light of the rapid change in other parts of Polynesia. What was it about the nature of those cultures so receptive to change that differed from the Samoan experience?

Felix Keesing had suggested that Samoan conservatism resulted from the islands “smallness, isolation, and tropical climate, together with the political rivalry of the powers and the elements of disunity inherent in the native polity {which} have enabled the native life to stand fairly firm” (1934:477). However, a careful analysis of the data reveals that none of these factors is completely unique to Samoa and a number of them exists in many other highly acculturated societies. Samoa is no smaller in land mass than the Marquesas or
the Tuamotus. In fact Samoa was a very popular area for whaling during the 19th century. History record, for example, that in 1846 seventy-two whaling vessels called at Samoa and many stayed an extended period of time. Traders were also extremely active in Samoa from a very early period, and the largest trading firm in the Pacific, the Godeffroy Company, maintained its headquarters in Apia, Western Samoa, between 1857 and 1878. And Samoa was merely one of many island groups missionized between the years of 1814 and 1836.

F. Allan Hanson concludes in his comparison of acculturation in Samoa and Tahiti that

“The traditional political system of Samoa has been largely retained while that of Tahiti has disappeared....because Samoa experience a relatively long period of independence followed by colonial policies of indirect rule, while Tahiti underwent a colonial policy aimed at assimilating Tahitians to French civilization and French citizenship. While this policy has not succeeded in making real Frenchmen of the Tahitians, it certainly eradicated much of old Tahitian culture, especially the political system” (1973:9).

While the introduction of French civilization and French citizenship may explain pervasive change in Tahiti, it does not explain it in other island groups with similar social and political systems, and it does not explain it in the more remote and untouched (by French nationalism) island areas such as the Marquesas or the Tuamotus. Neither do we find similar political circumstances in highly acculturated areas such as the Cook Islands, Hawaii, or New Zealand.

It is my contention, therefore, that the answer to this problem of differential conservatism between Samoa and other Polynesian islands to the east lies in the nature of the cultures themselves, particularly in regard to matters of social and political organization as well as religious sanction.

This, I believe, is a problem which must be approached from the standpoint of factors initially singled out in the early (1936) statement on acculturation authored by Redfield, Herskovits and Linton. They advised that selection of traits in any acculturation situation depends on economic advantages, social advantages (prestige), and ethical and religious considerations. I believe that all of these must be taken into consideration when attempting to understand the basic conservatism of Samoan culture as it compares with other cultural systems in Polynesia.

In most areas of Eastern Polynesia--Tahiti, New Zealand, the Cook Islands, the Marquesas, Hawaii and the Tuamotus--the traditional social organization was characterized by primogeniture, senior lineages and other forms of stratification. In addition to this, the few elite who profited from this social system were securely protected in their positions of authority and privilege by religious sanctions in the form of manu and tapu. While the bulk of the population may have resented this situation, wherein a select few enjoyed power and prestige, it was difficult to oppose a system which was supported by supernatural sanctions.

When European and America missionaries first arrived in Polynesia their proselytization success was impressive. The white man’s god was usually perceived as more powerful than Polynesian deities even by the people of rank, for after all, this foreign god was able to
provide his followers with magnificent ships, beautiful clothing, strong and efficient weapons, attractive trinkets and useful tools.

The white man’s god held a special appeal for the masses, who up until the coming of Christianity, believed the gods to be the spiritual guardians of the rights of the privileged. Furnas record that in Hawaii, “the commoner was flattered, perhaps stirred, when the white kahuna (priest) finally got around to telling him that any native, of whatever social stratum, had a soul of which Christ was solicitous. Nothing in his pre-white culture had ever led him to consider himself important to anybody” (1948:137).

Homer Barnett has observed that “when cultures meet, the majority of those who switch their allegiances are individuals with the least opportunity for full participation in their society” (1953:404). This was certainly true in much of Eastern Polynesia where power, prestige and privilege went only to the first born in select lineages and classes. In New Zealand, writes Barnett, “the members of ranking families as a group resisted education, whereas those of lesser birth sought it and used it to lay the foundations for a new kind of leadership, one based upon the knowledge of the ways of the foreigner” (1953:405).

The factor which I believe set Samoa apart from all of these eastern Polynesian societies was the nature of the social system, commonly referred to as the matai system. The matai system is one in which extended family heads are elected in middle age to chiefly titles with the responsibility of representing the family unit in the village council. All who are reasonably wise, hard working and loyal to family interests are eligible. But candidates for such leadership roles must also be loyal to traditional cultural values, social procedures and ceremonial obligations. There is no system of primogeniture, no senior lineages and no aristocracy, which can confer status. Each and every male (and in some rare cases, female) is eligible to acquire chiefly status if they will respect tradition and promote the family welfare.

Samoan culture differed sharply from those of eastern Polynesia in that Samoan matai were not sacred. Religion did not provide a sanction for chief authority. And since Samoan chiefs were not sacred, the coming of Christianity did not undercut their authority as it did in areas where chieftainship was a divine right. In fact, in Samoa, matai, particularly talking chiefs, often enhanced their prestige by holding church office or serving as supply preachers. In general it was possible in Samoa for the people to accept the new religion of the white man without affecting the status or authority of chiefs or without undermining the general structure of the society. Samoan speak of sacred fono (village councils) rather than sacred chiefs. The marae in Samoa was a village green where the village council met to decide local or regional issues. The marae in eastern Polynesia, on the other hand, was a holy place where priests conducted religious ceremonies. What was undoubtedly the most devastating influence for change on most Polynesian cultures--the coming of Christianity--had little effect on the social structure of Samoa, since Samoan culture had less invested in religious sanctions. Samoa had always been ruled by the will of men and not by the will of the gods or by men acting for the gods. Since Samoan chiefs had never claimed divine rights, the loss of traditional deities or religious concepts such as mana or tapu did little to alter their role and status within the society.
It is interesting to note that while in many respects life in the contemporary American Samoa appears to differ little from life in the United States—with modern restaurants, color television and VCRs, a high percentage of the population involved in wage labor (primarily for the government or two large tuna canneries), enough automobiles to overwhelm the infrastructure and often produce small village traffic jams—the *matai* system still survives, and with nearly the strength that it had in 1954 when I first encountered it. Young men quit good paying stateside jobs to return to Samoa to compete for family titles; one house of the legislature requires that members hold *matai* titles; and family land, which is associated with family titles, continues to be protected by law and reserved for those of Samoan ancestry. The *matai* system has also tended to preserve gift exchange, ceremonial visits of chiefs to other villages for civic or religious events, family responsibility as evidenced by the ubiquitous *fa’alavelave* (family crisis) requests for money by the matai for almost any familial obligation. The research my wife and I conducted on the adjustments of Samoan migrants in the San Francisco Bay area in 1977 revealed that even in the United States the *matai* system remains viable and in many cases provided greater security for family members than it does in Pago Pago. Not only do Samoan-Americans maintain a strong and supportive family organization, but they often send considerable amounts of money to their *matai* who maintains the family and household property back in the Samoan village from which they come. Compare this situation to that found in most Polynesian societies such as Tahiti, Hawaii or the Cook Islands. In places such as these there is little in the way of a concept of chieftainship or a well-knit family system that ensure preservation of family land and family prestige.

The 1936 “Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation” published by Redfield, Herskovits and Linton stressed the psychological effects of this changed situation in several respects. It called for attention to be focused on the “personality of the first individuals to accept foreign traits;” “the possible consistencies in personality types of those who accept or reject new traits;” “differential selection and acceptance of traits in accordance with sex lines, differing social strata, differing types of belief and occupation;” and “social behavior and different sets of social sanctions” (1936:152).

In his book *Acculturation* (1938), Herskovits commented:

> “The study of acculturation is equally of importance for those concerned with the problems of the development of human personality and culture; and if studies of this type have received scant mention here, this has been because to all intents and purposes they are nonexistent. The psychologists who deal with social phenomena have only in recent years come to stress the force of culture in shaping the human psyche, while psychiatry has likewise tended to overlook the importance of the cultural factor.” (19390:129).

The challenge of exploring these psychological aspects of acculturation phenomena combined with a general interest in an ongoing debate about the effects of culture change on personality structure was the motivating force for my next adventure in cultural dynamics.

In 1962 I tested 68 senior students at the high school of American Samoa with translated versions of the California Test of Personality, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and the Rogers Test of Personality. The tests were administered by a Samoan male teacher
who also provided personal data on academic success, personal relationships with fellow students and general attitudes toward school and authority figures.

Although I did not initially have a great deal of faith in the cross-cultural validity and applicability of the American created measures of personality, the results of these three tests were remarkably consistent and produced a personality profile which, to a great extent, paralleled impressions I had gained during some 26 months of participant observation and interview in American and Western Samoa. The profile characterized Samoans as having strong tendencies toward *Deference* (accepting the leadership of others), *Order* (enjoying organization), *Abasement* (being timid in the presence of superiors), and *Endurance* (keeping a job until finished). But they have weak tendencies toward *Autonomy* (independence in decision-making), *Dominance* (directing the actions of others), *Exhibition* (being the center of attention), *Aggression* (getting angry or disagreeing with others), and *Achievement* (doing one’s best to be successful).

Considering the fact that nine years earlier I had carefully evaluated the reliability and validity of the work Margaret Mead carried out in Ta’u in 1925-26, I was intrigued by the extent to which these test results corroborated the Mead perceptions of adolescent attitudes and behavior.

Finding the use of personality tests to be of great value in the analysis of Samoan personality characteristics, I later utilized the devices in the investigation of another theoretical problem which had intrigued me for several years. In my Culture and Personality courses I had often discussed the fact that there was a major controversy in regard to the effects of cultural change on the personality structure of the societal members involved in that change. Scholars like Hallowell, Spindler, Bruner and others conceived of personality structure as relatively tenacious and that a great deal of change can take place in cultural institutions without a corresponding alteration of the representative, or modal personality. Victor Barnouw and Margaret Mead, however, were arguing that one of the characteristics of modal personality is that it is adaptable to change. For example, Barnouw pointed out that “when the culture of a society changes and it develops new institutions, the members of the society must adapt themselves to the new conditions. Such adaptation may involve changes in personality which may, in turn lead to further changes in culture” (1979:361).

A. Irving Hallowell, on the other hand, believed, on the evidence of a study of 217 Ojibwa subjects using Rorschach protocols, “that in the case of the Ojibwa a considerable amount of acculturation has taken place without any major change in their modal personality structure” (1955:351). George Spindler also maintained that the Blood Indians of Alberta have undergone a great deal of acculturation without a great change in their personality characteristics and he explained the phenomenon by the fact that they already had a psychological orientation compatible with the direction and demands of the cultural change (1968:332). Edward Bruner, in turn advanced his “early learning hypothesis” to explain the impact of acculturation of traditional cultural patterns and personality on the Mandan-Hidatsa of North Dakota. He hypothesized that “that which was traditionally learned and internalized in infancy and early childhood tends to be most resistant to change in contact situations” (1956:194). These views appear to be very compatible with those of the “Basic Personality” adherents—such as Ralph Linton and Abram Kardiner—who in the early 1940's
held that most indoctrination in culturally appropriate modes of thinking, feeling and behaving occurs early in life and that there would, therefore, be great tenacity in traditional personality configurations.

Margaret Mead, on the other hand, stressing concomitant personality alteration with cultural modification in her article “The Implications of Culture Change for Personality Development” in 1947 and in her study New Lives for Old, maintained that “there is a systematic correspondence between the institutions of a society and the character structure of the individuals who embody those institutions” (1956:362). Others, such as Anthony F.C. Wallace, in exploring revitalization movements presented examples of situations where a leader with charisma (but frequently a deviant personality) came to power and established a new order—and usually a new national character, in his followers. Margaret Mead’s study of the village of Peri described such a phenomenon. The non-traditional leader named Paliau came from Rabaul in 1946 and led the people in a deliberate effort to change the entire pattern of life overnight. The revitalized society with new houses, costumes, ceremonies, social organization and laws is reported to have made a major impact on the personality structure of the Manus Islanders as well. Mead writes:

“Today they are friendly where formerly they would have been harshly competitive; they are actively concerned with the prevention of types of behavior which they would formerly have regarded as natural and desirable, they are relaxed and unworried where they would formerly have been tense; they are rearing their children with a kind of indulgence which would have been unheard of twenty-five years ago.” (1956:362).

A number of broad qualitative and impressionistic studies have probed the impact of great historical events even on personality structure. Examples are Jakob Christoph Burckhart’s study of the influence of the Italian Renaissance (1958), Erich Fromm’s analysis of the impact of Lutheranism and Calvinism (1941), David Riesman and others’ examination of American population cycles and national character modification (1950), David McClelland’s study of the psychological manifestations of economic growth in “achieving” societies (1961), and Margaret Mead’s investigation of the psycho-social effects of an American Generation Gap resulting from differential awareness of the realities of nuclear technology (1978).

What has been desperately needed in order to expand our knowledge of the psychological ramifications of change were systematic, controlled, quantitative studies of culture and personality in societies over extended periods of time. I saw my opportunity in 1974 to contribute to our knowledge in this area and thus I initiated a before-and-after (drastic culture change) study of adolescent Samoan personality. On the one hand, I had the results of the psychological dimensions of results administered in 1962 and described above. Add to this the fact that the years between 1962 and 1974 were ones marked by enormous cultural change in American Samoa. The American government had greatly subsidized island development and education. Twenty-six consolidated elementary schools, three high schools and a junior college were built, and educational and entertainment television was introduced. The American governor expressed great pride in his new “American style” curriculum, but critics were calling it “education for export.” There actually was a great deal of migration
to Hawaii and stateside America during this period, and some of the families had returned with young people highly acculturated in U.S. ways. A large hotel had been built on the shores of Pago Pago Bay to encourage tourism, and the airport and harbor facilities had been greatly improved. Two tuna fish canneries were employing large number of Samoans, and with the government employment opportunities, the wage labor force in 1970 numbered 4939 out of a total population of about 28,000. By and large American Samoans had given up agriculture and were importing traditional food from other island nations.

In 1974 I used two of the same personality tests that I had in 1962 with a new sample of American Samoan high school students. Changes had been so great between 1962 and 1974 that I was no longer able to use tests only in the Samoan language. Now an English version had to be used since some of the Samoan students no longer read the native language. With the aid of another Samoan high school teacher I gave Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to 31 subjects and the California Test of Personality to 47 subjects. The results were as follows: The Samoan modal personality had definitely change and in a direction which stressed modern traits more and traditional traits less. Movement toward American norms was noted in 10 out of 15 variables on the Edwards test and on 14 out of 15 variables on the California test. The general tendency was for the strongest Samoan traits--Deferece, Order, Endurance--to persist whereas the weakest tendencies--Autonomy, Dominance, Exhibition, Aggression and Achievement--without exception, moved in the direction of American norms.

It was also during this period of rapid cultural change in American Samoa that sociologist Donald O. Cowgill and I formulated the “aging and modernization” theory. In 1962-3 while investigating Samoan village and national political behavior I had developed a distinct interest in the role and status of the elderly in Samoan society. In some respects the society had characteristics of a gerontocracy. The matai (family chiefs) who comprised village councils were generally well along in years, the elderly were well respected and cared for, and the old people were generally looked upon as the reservoirs of traditional knowledge. While many of my informants, young and old, volunteered that old age was “the best time of life” there was also evidence that conditions were changing for the elderly and that the brave new world of change might soon prove threatening.

The final adventure in cultural dynamics which I would like to address in this paper involve the conceptualization and testing of the theory of “aging and modernization” which holds that as societies become increasingly modern there is a concomitant decline in the status of the elderly and in their society’s commitment to their care and well being. Modernization is a particular kind of acculturation experience involving changes in a culture in the direction of urbanization, industrialization, scientific development, and the establishment of mass education and higher levels of mass communication through mass-media exposure. While modernization is normally thought of as emanating in the West, there are emerging centers of modernization today in Asia, particularly Japan. This hypothesis, put forward in Aging and Modernization (1972) was tested cross culturally, comparing 14 different societies representing various degrees of modernization along a continuum running from preliterate (sometimes called “primitive”) to peasant (agricultural and animal husbandry), to modern societies. Treatment of the elderly in each of the 14 societies was described in detail by anthropologists and sociologists who had worked in those societies for extended periods of
time. A subject matter outline was provided each of the authors but none was told of the theory that was being tested.

Not only did we hypothesize an inverse relationship between modernization and status of the aged but we cited other concurrent realities associated with aging in such a change situation. These dealt with such issues as how old age is defined, how longevity is affected, how modernization influences proportions of old men and women, how dominant economic patterns and family form (extended or nuclear) influence respect for the aged, and how leadership and religious roles are distributed in regard to age in traditional and modern societies.

Although the data generally upheld the hypothesis, a few exceptions--Russia, Israel and Ireland--provided an interesting and unexpected challenge to the hypothesis and served as a warning that in dealing with matters of cultural dynamics one must never lose sight of historical and psychological dimensions. It is clear that how a society develops under the impact of modernization depends a great deal on the values it held previously. A society whose major religion is Buddhism may be quite differently affected by industrialization and urbanization that one operating under a Judeo-Christian tradition. The same can be said for traditional differences in political or economic philosophy. For example, in Japan, with its age-old ideas of family loyalty and filial piety, modernization has brought about drastic social changes in family organization and ethics but it is still possible for observers of that cultural scene to state that the aged have found a way to live with peace of mind and a sense of security seldom found among the aged in the United States.

To date, the “aging and modernization” theory has inspired better that 40 research projects which have tested its validity and applicability in all parts of the world. Valuable insights have been gained and hopefully we are moving ever closer to the knowledge which will allow us to predict the ramifications of change for this segment of society. The mysteries of how cultural change impacts the many cultures of the world will require extensive study and restudy. Theories will have to be painstakingly shaped and reshaped, tested and retested if effective predictability is ever to be achieved. Some of the bits of understanding of the nature of cultural dynamics which I had the good fortune to discover are but mere beginnings, but hopefully they have been steps in the right direction and will qualify as productive and useful adventures in cultural dynamics.
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