Chapter IV

Writing about Blacks

Naipaul wrote *In a Free State*, *Guerrillas* and *A Bend in the River* in England while he lived in Wiltshire. In these works, Naipaul analyses the postcolonial world and his focus is on individuals, their lives, hopes and fears. These works throw light on the fact that insecurity results into violence and tyranny. The main characters in these fictions are those who have fled from their origins and now they have no home to which they can return.

*In a Free State* (1971) describes Naipaul’s travels through Asia, Africa, Europe and the Americas. Naipaul tells stories which are set in a wide variety of places. These different places and nations indicate that the state of freedom is universal and the dangers of freedom exist for most of mankind. Though we are all free, freedom is especially dangerous for those who are isolated from their own communities and live in such a place where order has disappeared and where there are few accepted social and cultural traditions. In such situations, weak are at the mercy of others and there is danger, alienation, failed ideals and illusions. Here, change and disorder are seen as normal, people fight or a new world is imposed by violence.

*In a Free State*, Naipaul attempts to reflect that he has become a man of the world without a home and his subject matter and themes are concerned with the problems and disorders of the post-colonial world. His mixing of autobiography with fiction represents his awareness that in
his exile and travels, he has become representative of the post-colonial world and of the modern human condition. Naipaul accepts that *In a Free State*:

Distills my own experience of coming to a place like England, in a way it is my own life, you know. This is the essence of writing fiction, one doesn’t report one’s experience, one distils it, one tries to find ways of expressing it. The beauty of fiction is that one can do it through other people.¹

*In a Free State*, Naipaul reflects the modern Indian diaspora. In ‘One out of Many’, the Indian servant comes to America, becomes an illegal immigrant and finds no community. He has become free but he is trapped in his conscience. When he lived in India, he had a sense of status and security. Now in America, he has material comforts and money, but socially, emotionally and spiritually he is not comfortable with the new country. He finds himself in the company of the African-Americans whom he considers unclean and inferior. His position can be compared to that of the fallen Adam in *Paradise Lost*. To quote Naipaul:

‘It is for the best, Santosh,’ Priya said, giving me tea when I got back to the restaurant. ‘you will be a free man. A citizen. You will have the whole world before you.’

So I am now a citizen, my presence is legal, and I live in Washington. I am still with Priya. We do not talk together as much as we did. The restaurant is one world, and the parks and green streets of Washington another, and every evening some of these streets take me to a third.²
When Santosh is transferred to Washington, he expects a green card through marrying an African-American. But whenever he recalls his days passed in India, he becomes restless. His situation has become tragic and he does not know how to make use of his liberty. As a result of Indian fatalism and passivity, Santosh considers this world an illusion. He is unable to see his achievement. He finds his own culture similar to that of African-Americans, Africans and black West. Thus, Naipaul tries to mix comedy and tragedy. To quote Naipaul:

I am a simple man who decided to act and see for himself, and it is as though I have had several lives. I do not wish to add to these. Some afternoons I walk to the circle with the fountain. I see the dancers but they are separated from me as by glass. Once when there were rumours of new burnings, someone scrawled in white paint on the pavement outside my house: Soul Brother. I understand the words; but I feel, brother to what or to whom? I was once part of the flow, never thinking of myself as a presence. Then I looked in the mirror and decided to be free. All that my freedom has brought me is the knowledge that I have a face and have a body, that I must feed this body and clothe this body for a certain number of years. Then it will be over.³

Naipaul identifies himself with such characters as the Tramp in the Prologue, Santosh and the West Indian narrator in ‘Tell me who to kill’. He is an expatriate in England, he cannot return to Trinidad or India. He has seen the financial setback and is now destined to live in England. He
will have to roam the world to collect material so that he may survive as a journalist and novelist. He is now too old to start again.

*In a Free State*, Naipaul deals with the contradictions of freedom. On the one hand, there are opportunities for the development of the self, but there always lie dangers – psychological, physical, economical and political. These are the result of the failure of an order to provide security. When people enter a free state, they find that here is jungle like condition and everyone is at war with everyone else and the strong are free to attack the weak. Linda’s husband goes to Africa for better radio programmes but there he is given the job of broadcasting government propaganda and the news. Now if he returns to England he will have no job there. Thus, Naipaul attempts to show that he has become a man of the world without a home.

*In a Free State* represents uprooted individuals in a society which has become disorganized or free and a representative of the nation, the post-imperial and the contemporary world. In this book, Naipaul describes various meanings of freedom. He thinks that to live in a free state socially is to be isolated, alienated, not part of a group and therefore prey for others. Thus, freedom creates a crisis of purpose and responsibility. It brings dangers of insecurity and ruin. Now people are free from guilt of moral right and wrong, but sometimes this freedom brings dangers. A free or independent state can be chaotic, disordered, violent nation in the midst of a civil or tribal war. *In a Free State* starts with the threatened situation of the Tramp, depicts the financial and
emotional insecurity of Santosh and the West Indian narrator in 'Tell Me Who to Kill', and a civil war in the independent African state. Naipaul has discussed freedom with the complexity as in *India: A Wounded Civilization* he discusses *dharma*. To quote Naipaul:

The difficulty, the contradiction, lies in that very concept of dharma...dharma.... Is a complex word; it can mean the faith, pietas, everything which is felt to be right and religious and sanctioned: Law must serve dharma.... Yet dharma as expressed in the Indian social system, is so shot through with injustice and cruelty...It can accommodate bonded labour as, once, it accommodated widow-burning. Dharma can resist the idea of equity.4

Bobby and Linda in *In a Free State* have the class attitudes of the past, but the situation has changed. They are no longer part of an empire, they are neither superior, nor free from dangers. The ship in the Prologue symbolizes this new disorder in which relationship, dignity, identity depend on one's own achievements or by the group to which one belongs. There is no law, the law is the law of the jungle.

The writings of the seventies show a change in his focus. Until the sixties, the historical descriptions and cultural critiques were always exposition on the Caribbean, England and India, but now they are extended to a more cosmopolitan area. *Guerrillas* (1975) is depicted in the Caribbean island but this island is different from the Caribbean islands Naipaul had written about before. Naipaul's writings so far had been intertwined within the Caribbean context, extended to the migratory
placement in England and stretched back ultimately to the peculiarities of the Hindu Trinidadian community and its Indian origins. Naipaul has carefully removed the expatriate Hindu Trinidadian consciousness which he reflected in most of his earlier books. The island of Guerrillas is seen through the expatriate perspective of Roche, the naive English adventuress Jane, the Black Power activist Jimmy Ahmed, the black politician and power broker Meredith, and the white expatriate setter Harry.

In Guerrillas, Naipaul discusses the themes - the inability of small, underdeveloped nations to be truly independent; mimicry; the relationship between whites and blacks. The scenes of Guerrillas take place on a composite English-speaking Caribbean island resembling Trinidad and Jamaica. The murders of Gale Benson and Joe Skerritt by Abdul Malik and his associates in Trinidad in 1972 form the basic of the events depicted in Guerrillas. To quote Naipaul:

She looked at the duplicated sheets in her hand. All revolutions begin with the land. Men are born on the earth, every man has his one spot, it is his birth right, and men must claim their portion of the earth in brotherhood and harmony. In this spirit we came an intrepid band to virgin forest, it is the life style and philosophy of Thrushcross Grange. That was how the communiqué began. But Jane, reading on, found that it soon became what Roche had said: a fairy story, a school composition, ungrammatical and confused, about life in the forest, about the anxieties, dangers and needs of isolated men, about the absence of
water, electricity and transport. And then it was full of complaints, about people and firms who had made promises which they hadn’t then kept, about gifted equipment that had turned out to be defective.\(^5\)

The scene of the novel is a West Indian island, independently governed but in reality it is owned by an American bauxite company. Outside the capital, Jimmy Ahmed has established a commune at a place he calls Thrushcross Grange. He, the half-Chinese Negro, is reputed as a respectable black power leader and his reputation has been imported from England, where he once enjoyed a brief notoriety. But the commune is on the point of collapse: the mysterious disappearance of one member is being investigated by the police; another has sneaked off to see his favourite film, *For Love of Ivy*, with Sidney Poitier. Jimmy is alone with his fantasies and fears. He has disintegrating remnants of an artificial personality created by his own aberrant egotism and consolidated by the over-excited British press. Yet he is acknowledged as a threat by Meredith, the sophisticated politician:

“He’s dangerous because he’s famous, because he has a lot of that English glamour still, and because he’s nothing at all. “Daddy, am I Chinese?” “No, my boy. You’re just my child.” The Chinese don’t have any hang-ups about that kind of thing at all. No encouragement there at all. And ever since then you can do anything you like with Jimmy Ahmed. Anybody can use that man and create chaos in this place. He can be programmed. He’s the most suggestible man I know.\(^6\)
*Guerrillas* is depicted through Roche's experiences in South Africa and depends on an understanding of the Black Power movement which originated in the United States of America (associate primarily with Malcolm X) and gravitated towards Africa. In Trinidad, the 1970 revolution began with the banning of the Trinidad born American Black Power leader Stokely Carmichael, which was followed by the protest groups and violence at the February Carnival. A Black Power demonstration in March nearly of 10,000 was followed by throwing Molotov cocktail bombs at shops and banks, and the use of tear gas on a crowd. The police shot dead Bassil Davis, on 6th April. On 9th April Davis funeral turned into a mass procession. On 21st April a state of emergency was declared and a curfew imposed. During May order was restored. In 1973, there was a mysterious guerrilla movement in the hills outside Port of Spain, led by university intellectuals and students imitating Che and Castra. A few people had been killed by guerrilla and the police killed some of the guerrillas and the movement vanished.

In *Guerrillas*, Naipaul does not treat directly of the political events. These events are described as a kind of communal frenzy on a small politically independent island with a history of racial humiliations and without the means to provide a better life for its people. The events surround the three main characters, Jimmy, Jane and Roche. Naipaul describes how personal protests are taken for revolutionary idealism and how history decides personal behaviour.
In *Guerrillas*, Naipaul criticizes those liberal whites who think that they are freely permitted to interfere in the affairs of other nations. Such people are not satisfied with their society and want to fulfill their emotional needs in the former colonies. Roche, a white South African ex-revolutionary, wants to be a leader of his race, but he is not successful as a revolutionary and a reformer. He wants to obtain money and resources for those causes and people in which he disbelieves. The portrait of Roche is a part of Naipaul’s examination of liberal whites who want to be a part in the Third world distress. To quote Naipaul:

Yet he knew that to so many people around him he appeared as a man given over to a cause. It was understandable, but it was strange; because he had no political dogma and no longer had a vision of a world made good, and perhaps had never had such a vision. If he had a system, a set of political beliefs, it might have been easier for him to have set it aside, to have admitted error, as some of his associates had done, to have blamed the system or to have blamed the world for not living up to the system, and without any sense of reneging to have made a fresh start. But he had had no system; he disturbed systems; he had a feeling of responsibility for what he had done. Responsibility didn’t end with failure, or with the abandoning of beliefs that had prompted certain actions.⁷

Naipaul takes Gale Benson as the historical source for Jane. Gale, a British divorcee in her late twenties, was a white woman. She worshipped Hakim Jamal, the Muslim name of a black American hustler, as God.
Gale was murdered on Michael X's orders. Naipaul regards Benson as the revolutionaries who visit centers of revolution with return air tickets. Jane attaches herself to progressives as the socially and financially secure women are attached to supposed revolutionaries. She wants sexual satisfaction in the violent, primitive man and it seems that she has paid for Jimmy's sexual services by supporting his causes. To quote Naipaul:

It was what he had taught her, what she had picked up from him and incorporated, as words, as a passing attitude, into the chaos of worlds and attitudes she possessed: words that she might shed at any time, as easily as she had picked them up, and forget she had ever spoken them, she who had once been married to a young politician and had without effort incarnated an ordinary correctness, and who might easily return to such a role. She was without memory: Roche had decided that some time ago. She was without consistency or even coherence. She knew only what she was and what she had been born to; to this knowledge she was tethered; it was her stability, enabling her to adventure in security, enabling her to adventure in security. Adventuring, she was indifferent, perhaps blind, to the contradiction between what she said and what she was so secure of being; and this difference of blindness, this absence of the sense of the absurd, was part of her unassailability. 8

The novels written by those from former colonies do not depict sympathetic whites who present their personal dramas against unusual backdrop. Jimmy Ahmed, the half-Chinese Negro plays the part of black Power radical for Whites. Naipaul treats Jimmy with interested sympathy.
He is a victim both of colonialism and of liberal whites. These whites
developed Jimmy into a black power leader in England and used him
sexually and for excitement. In the Caribbean, Roche used him to justify
his place in liberal causes and Jane used him sexually. Jimmy’s attraction
to Jane of the white world is due to his potential for violence, his thrill of
playing with fire. Jimmy is also a writer and uses writing as a means of
working up and reliving his frustrated feelings. Jimmy said:

I’m the only man that stands between them and revolution, and they
know it now, Massa. That’s why I’m the only man they’re afraid of.
They know that all I want in my hand is a megaphone, and the whole
pack of cards will come tumbling down. I’m not like the others. I’m not
a street-corner politician. I don’t make any speeches. Nobody is going to
throw me in jail because I’m subversive. I’m not subversive. I’m the
friend of every capitalist in the country. Everybody is my friend. I’m not
going to shoot me down. I am here, and I stay here. If they want to kill
me they have to come here. I carry no gun.’ He raised his bare arms off
the chair and held them up, showing the palms. The short sleeves of the
drab-coloured tunic rode down his pale, firm biceps and revealed the
springs of hair in his armpits.’ I have no gun. I’m no guerrilla.’

Jane is symbolic of whiteness, the dominant otherness that has
haunted many blacks since the days of colonialism and slavery. In the
well-known study of white-black relations as seen in Dereck Walcott’s
play *Dream on Monkey Mountain* (1967), the white woman is the
Whiteman’s possession. He may possess, love, defile and kill her in the
love-hate psychodrama of the black man's relationship to whiteness and his own self-hatred. Jimmy's attempt of raping and then saving a white woman, of violating her and gaining her love, is an expression of white-black relationships.

Jimmy is, like Metty and Ferdinand in *A bend in the River*, a half breed, a product of the mixing of races as a result of colonialism. He attempts to attach himself to societies - England, the island's Negroes, but the islanders have no belief or interest in Jimmy's supposed revolution by return to the land. He is reputed in England and his black power slogans, rural commune and message of return to the land are part of the new colonialism like the American Bauxite company that effectively owns the island.

It is difficult to conclude who are the guerrillas of the novel's title. Jane is attracted to Jimmy and thinks him as Guerrilla leader, but Jimmy is a gang leader, dependent on Roche. Roche assumes that the commune was a cover for gang. He risked his life for political action. He is he only character in the novel with any claim to be a guerrilla. But he has no clear objectives or plans. His politics of white guilt are like the white women, who pay Jimmy for sexual excitement and services.

The novel presents a society without moral values and objectives that promote stability during change. Though it has become independent, it wavers on the edge of chaos. Instead of a worldwide revolutionary movement, there are merely leaderless individuals each of whom has his or her obsessions as Jimmy writes:
Things are desperate Roy, when the leader himself begins to yield to despair, things are bad. The whole place is gong to blow up, I cannot see how I can control the revolution now. When everybody wants to fight there’s nothing to fight for. Everybody wants to fight his own little war, everybody is a guerrilla.¹

A *Bend in the River* is set in a newly independent Franco phonitic central African state resembling Zaire, governed by a dictatorial former army officer, the Big Man. The Big Man has brought a kind of peace-always endangered by violently destructive revolts and promises that he will offer an African socialism. It will combine the black nationalist demand for cultural authenticity with the taking over of property belonging to such powerless foreigners as Indians, Greeks and Syrians. The setting of *A Bend in the River* is based on Naipaul’s observation of Zaire and East African and the central characters are not protected by imperial power and their lives are in danger because of rapid changes and instabilities of post-colonial Africa. They struggle for their independence and individuality and they are often defeated by their own limitations and bad choices, their life is determined by their circumstances and the society.

In *A Bend in the River*, Naipaul reflects the dangers to those Indians - who are made homeless in former colonies by the withdrawal of the imperial order as a result there is threat of chaos. There is a threat of the modern African state to the traditional ways of Africa. Naipaul describes the small lives of individuals in an obscure part of Africa as
symbolic of the modern condition of living in a free state. Raymond is a famous historian and the Big Man’s advisor but his fame fades as the new generation of historians grows. Now he is not needed as an advisor and struggles to survive. His wife Yvette, who wants excitement and a good life, now has no interest in Raynold and wants someone to whom she may attach herself and remain near power.

Salim, the narrator is a Muslim, whose family, Indian traders, has lived in Africa for hundreds of years. Salim sets up a shop in a town on the bend of the river and gains success, which has no future in a country ruled by the Big Man, president for life. Again Naipaul’s protagonist is an outsider, who realizes that his way of life is almost at its end and eventually he must give up everything. Salim is a rebellion who is conscious of his weaknesses, yet he attempts to go against fate. He does not feel at ease in central Africa. He is passing an isolated life in Africa. He is an east African Muslim and his ancestors belong to northern India. Salim says:

All that I know of our history and the history of the Indian Ocean I have got from books written by Europeans. If I say that our Arabs in their time were great adventurers and writers; that our sailors gave the Mediterranean the lateen sail that made the discovery of America possible; that an Indian pilot led Vasco da Gama from East Africa to Calicut; that the very word cheque was first used by our Persian merchants; if I say these things it is because I have got them from European books. They formed no part of our knowledge or pride.
Without Europeans, I feel all our past would have been washed away, like the scuff-marks of fishermen on the beach outside our town.¹¹

Thus, the people of decolonized country are dependent on Western knowledge. Whatever Europeans have written, is the only source of history. Colonialism has created nationalistic feelings in nineteenth century Indians and Africans. In *A Bend in the River*, Naipaul concentrates on the problems of Indians, which are the result of social and political change just after the withdrawal of the imperial order. At present Ali is neither an Asiatic nor a member of any African tribe and presents such persons who have no group to whom they may attach themselves and which may protect them. Ali joins Salim who has his contacts with a few other aliens, Indians living enclosed lives and cut off from the African world.

The novel throws light on the mingling of races. European and Arab involvement with Africa has resulted in various sexual relationships involving various races, peoples, castes or tribes - Salim and Yvette. The involvement of a man with woman of other caste prevents him from his own fortune and disorders his life as well as the children resulting from these mixed marriages belong to no group and become outcaste.

In *A New King of the Congo*, Naipaul has discussed about the movement led by Pierre Mulele, who wanted to kill everyone in Zaire who could read write or who wore a necktie. The novel concludes with such a vision of violence:
It is going to be very bad when the President comes. At first they were only going to kill government people. Now the Liberation Army say that isn’t enough. They say they have to do what they did the last time, but they have to do it better this time. At first they were going to have people’s courts and shoot people in the squares. Now they say they have to do a lot more killing, and everybody will have to dip their hands in the blood. They’re going to kill everybody who can read and write, everybody who ever put on a jacket and tie. They’re going to kill all the masters and all the servants. When they’re finished nobody will know there was a place like this here. They’re going to kill and kill. 12

Naipaul was sure that there is not possibility of total rebellion or complete withdraw of society, for nobody wants to cut himself completely from his past. One of the themes of the novel is that people are in such a conflict that on the one hand, they expect a traditional culture rooted in the village life of the past and on the other hand they want European technology and a modern Europeanized state. Naipaul gives a view of society in which obedience results from protection. The Big Man attempts to nationalize the business of foreigners and as a result he introduces a disorder and injustice beyond the simple corruptions and violence. Africans are involved in such a business as do not belong to them and their owners become managers and everyone wants to collect wealth as they are afraid of another rebellion.

After the massacre of Arabs in east Africa, Ali joins Salim as a slave and is called Metty for Metis, one of the slaves attached to his
family. This throws light on the facts that English colonialism checked Arab expansion into Africa, that slavery was not new neither to African or to the Arab world, and that African has conflict with the outside world for a long time. When Salim’s business is given to Theotime, for whom he now works, he wants to collect money to escape, for, he thinks that he is vulnerable for others. Salim stops his help to Metty. He says:

I had been growing smaller and smaller in Metty’s eyes, and now I failed him altogether. I could no longer offer him the simple protection he had asked for – Theotime made that plain during the course of the day. So the old contract between Metty and myself, which was the contract between his family and mine came to an end... our special contract was over. He seemed to understand this, and it made him unbalanced. 13

As a result Metty betrays his host and master and informs Police of Salim’s smuggling ivory and shows them his stocks. When Salim is arrested and jailed, he comments:

‘There were many stages in my progress through the building, and I began to look upon Prosper as my guide to this particular hell. He left me for long periods sitting or standing in rooms and corridors, which gleamed with new oil paint.

It was near sunset when he led me to the annexe in the yard at the back......the walls had been a dusty blue, I remembered. Now they were a brilliant yellow, and DISCIPLINE AVANT TOUT, Discipline Above All, had been freshly painted in big black letters. I lost myself
contemplating the bad, uneven lettering, the graining of the photograph of the president, the uneven surface of the yellow wall.  

Naipaul compares the position to that of a hell where the inversion of law, justice and order becomes another form of order in which Satan rules. Now, there are the pictures of the Big Man. Seeing the President’s slogan ‘DISCIPLINE AVANT TOUT, Salim feels damned and mocked by the words. But now he was expected to feel this. Naipaul describes the scenes where prisoners are tortured. To quote him:

The instructors were warders with big boots and sticks; the poems were hymns of praise to the President and the African Madonna; the people being compelled to repeat the lines were those young men and boys from the villages, many of whom had been trussed up and dumped in the courtyard and were being maltreated in ways I don’t want to describe.

These were the dreadful sounds of the early morning. Those poor people had also been trapped and damned by the words on the white jail wall. But you could tell, from their faces, that in their minds and hearts and souls they had retreated far. The frenzied warders, Africans themselves, seemed to understand this, seemed to know that their victims were unreachable.  

Naipaul notes that such tortures were common to the regimes of Amin and Sekou. Naipaul finds that African corruption is a part of social disorder which results from the mixing of various cultures and because Europeans imposed the notion of the state on African tribes. Slavery is
the result of European injustice to Africa and this injustice is so great that it can explain all the problems of Africa and the descendant of the Africans in the Americas. Thus, *A Bend in the River* recalls the long history of slavery within Africa. Thus the notions that all history and cultures are the conquest and exploitations of the weak by the strong run throughout Naipaul’s work. After his separation from Yvette, Salim has an insight:

It seemed to me that men were born only to grow old, to live out their span, to acquire experience. Men lived to acquire experience; the equality of the experience was immaterial; pleasure and pain - and above all, pain - had no meaning; to possess pain was as meaningless as to chase pleasure. And even when the illumination vanished, became as thin and half nonsensical as a dream, I remembered that I had had it, that knowledge about the illusion of pain.¹⁶

The three rebellions in the novel are not only example of African rage of return to former racial and tribal purity but also a part of an endless process of meaningless history. As contrary to these human beings have an insight to achieve, to leave a mark on history, but a man’s ability to make achievements and leave his mark on history is limited by environment and culture.

*Indar*, like *Naipaul*, himself flees from Indian community and joins a famous university in England. He attempts to become independent and cosmopolitan who can understand the problems of Third world. But *Indar* finds that he is dependent on American foundations and feels
homesickness and he is disappointed by his awareness of his dependency. On the other hand Salim wants to settle himself as a businessman in Africa, but later he flees to London to create new life for himself. Thus, in *A Bend in the River* Naipaul makes an attempt to understand the problems that have followed from decolonization. To quote Naipaul:

> And since war is an extension of politics we have decided to face the ENEMY with armed confrontation. Otherwise we all die forever. The ancestors are shrieking. If we are not deaf we can hear them. By ENEMY we mean the powers of imperialism, the multinationals and the puppet powers that be, the false gods, the capitalists, the priests and teachers who give false interpretations. The law encourages crime. The schools teach ignorance and people practice ignorance in preference to their true culture. Our soldiers and guardians have been given false desires and false greeds and the foreigners now qualify us everywhere as thieves. We are ignorant of ourselves and mislead ourselves. We are marching to death.\(^{17}\)

Thus in this book Naipaul deals with the problems of freedom when he was living in a rented cottage in Wiltshire after his return to England. The overall view that emerges from these books about Africa and the Black Power movements reflects the black-and-white colonial psyche of the writer. The author has successfully created the political situations replete with turmoil and volatility, which are the result of transfer of power at the advent of decolonization. It seems that he has condensed the events of several different histories and as a result, his
picture of new African nations seems over-determined. He has presented the actual picture of Africa where there are civil wars, internal conflicts, and the brutal and unnecessary bloodshed, but he has not discussed a deeper awareness of political complexities and economic problems created by decolonization. Thus it seems that Naipaul wants to give a message that such events will repeat in future if the economic and historical factors responsible for their existence are not controlled and if the communities are not able to change themselves.
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