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Abstract
The present paper includes an analysis of the journalistic discourse ethics in the publication Charlie Hebdo, in the light of morals’ defying and its consequences on the public. Though the limits of the freedom of expression are provided in the legal norms and morals, we identify in the journalistic discourse numerous deviations from these principles, insults, as well as ethnical, religious or gender discrimination. On the other hand, the satirical discourse is a social criticism and its purpose is not to make users laugh, but to warn or beckon on crises, like terrorist attacks. Though users know they read a publication of opinion which uses satire through cartoons and which has a certain political and religious ideology, we notice that their reactions in the virtual media are important, as long as there are thousands or dozens of thousands of appreciations, shares and comments for one post.
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Introduction

The terrorist attack from Paris on the 7th of January 2015 resulted in the death of ten journalists from Charlie Hebdo. One year later, the Brussels terrorist attack from the 22nd of March 2016 resulted in 34 deaths and 198 injured on the Zaventem Airport, and Maelbeek metro station. These attacks used techniques and tactics that have been considered as “criminal, unpardonable actions.” It was not only about the number of victims and their intense media exposure, but as well the social media mobilization against terrorist attacks. “Je suis Charlie” is not just a slogan borrowed from the social media pages, but represent the public mobilization against the criminal actions, the cry (‘sluagh-ghaien’) for the human rights and values.

Taking into account that the European values get shaped in the world of discourse and that, at the same time, by means of values, the European society is defined, a careful analysis of the magazine Charlie Hebdo is both useful, as well as necessary.

Ethical principles and the free will

According to Habermas, free will and practical judgement allow us to see the moral community as “an inclusive and self-legislative community of free and equal individuals who are supposed to treat each other like own purposes”. Accordingly, “the act of freedom seems to be connected with the awareness of a unique subject” (Jürgen Habermas: 20-21).
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Although the freedom of expression includes the plurality of opinions, according to European conventions and treaties, it cannot go beyond certain moral limits. It is about the discourses on truth which open free debates, and confrontations of ideas. It does not include defamation, or political, religious or social attacks. The recorded oscillations and slippages regarding certain political, social or cultural subjects in the media, raise the problem of the discourse ethics, situated between the Kantian paradigm and the ignorance veil discussed by Rawls.

The Kant postulate stipulates that freedom is the key to explain the will autonomy through the two aspects of this concept: (1) negative or sterile, where freedom is the property of willing to act independent of foreign determining causes; (2) positive: freedom has its limits and it should follow immutable laws (I. Kant, 2014: 91, I. Kant, 2010: 225-262). As a consequence, morality is included by the author in free will and it serves us as Law, only if we judge rationally or call ourselves rational creatures, endowed with will. Thus, the awareness of freedom is connected with practical judgement and it becomes compulsory; violation of the moral laws is complementary to culpability (I. Kant, 2010: 69). Freedom is or should be complementary with the social responsibility, otherwise, it can generate social or political chaos. Defamation includes public contempt, and ridiculous things “reflect unfavourably morality or integrity” (K. Middleton et alii: 59). According to Rawls’ Theory of justice, „justice emerges if there are no social differences, in negotiations”, stipulating the „limitation of risks” (C. G. Christians et alii: 27-28) and the correct treatment of the parties involved.

Methodology

The research method is the pragmatic approach through which we aim intentions, actions and interactions of emitters (journalists, creators of image, users creating content in digital environment), ideas transmitted beyond the media discourse, the qualitative and quantitative analysis of cartoons and the ethical slippage consequences on users. First, we identified the ethical principles or deviations, as well as the influence of stereotypes in communication, or that of psychology. At the same time, we applied the semiotic analysis of the cartoons and the analysis of the discourse and their consequences on users.

We chose a corpus from the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo, of which we have selected some pages published on November 2, 2011, in order to understand better the journalistic discourse, before the attempted terrorist attack in January 2015. For 2015, we selected articles from the online pages of the agencies Mediafax and Agerpres, and the publications The Washington Post and Daily Mail, which give reference to the texts and images from the magazine Charlie Hebdo, with the mention there were no shares on the satirical Facebook page in 2015, excepting January; for 2016 and 2017, we analysed both journals’ posts (the Facebook page) and users’ reactions and comments. The following questions helped me clarify the analysis approach: is the satirical discourse situated inside the limits of the freedom of expression (observing the ethical principles) or beyond them? Does the ethical slippage in the journalistic discourse represent an effective or ineffective perlocutionary act on users? How much do users blame or approve of norms or of ethical slippage?

The sarcastic discourse between discrimination and insult

The cartoonists’ intention is to satirize aspects from reality or certain famous people, and „emphasize ridiculous situations” (Dan Petre; Dragoș Iliescu: 214-215). At semiotic level, both in the images and in
the text, the meanings in the journal Charlie Hebdo\textsuperscript{28} (2011, 2015-2017) are often negative or insulting and they instigate to hate. Insulting opinions are associated with caricatured people\textsuperscript{29}, through a discourse included into the concept of cartoons, so much appreciated by French people and existing in almost all the pages of the journal. The pamphlet column that is repeated on the same page of different issues, „Le mot de Mahomet”, is an imaginary exercise, a „clown” representation of the prophet. The religious myth is deconstructed through a sarcastic humour, leading to ethical slippage in the journalistic discourse. At the same time, gender discrimination\textsuperscript{30} is found on many pages of cartoons with hints to the Muslim woman’s clothes and intellect (”cet automne, la mode aux imprimés: modèle <70 vierges>”, „burga rentrée dans une chaussette”, „mode spécial - femmes battues”, „en attendant le permis de conduire…tricotez la housse de la smart de monsieur”, 2.11.2011).

Dimitrie Todoran states that humour, print and illustration are intrinsic methods to willingly call attention. A discourse like that is based on suppositions; there is not a real, rational or even empirical evidence, and the abstraction process is emphasized, by taking distance from real facts (Todoran: 71-74). Cartoons include a connection between simple humour, which does not request any evidence, and the sarcastic humour, many times allusive, as rhetorical image. That negative portrayal of (all) Muslims through cartoons might determine a specific reaction of „unlaughter”, as it was called by Michael Billig (in R. Radu: 172). On the one hand, „the joke” is not accepted and it is considered misplaced when it is included in the hate discourse (xenophobia, racial discrimination, etc.); it becomes a media bridgehead for emitters’ hard feelings, and thus, „we do not ask ourselves about the origin of harm, but about the origin of our intention to do harm” (Paul Ricoeur: 38-39). On the other hand, there are also situations when jokes are accepted and users are not searching for real or objective facts, connected with the context represented by cartoon authors. W. Lippman refers to the victims of such influence „when speaking about the judgement of a group, about the French judgement, about the militarist judgement... we might be victims of a serious confusion, if we don’t accept to separate the instinctive ideas from stereotypes”. As a consequence, the influence can be so important that the stereotype „might be considered a biological reality” (W. Lipmann: 104).

The consequences of the satirical communication under the influence of the ethical slippage

After the terrorist attack on January 7, 2015, when 10 journalists from Charlie Hebdo were killed, the editor-in-chief announced they would not publish any more images or cartoons with the prophet Mohamed. Nine months later, on September 18, 2015, after another terrorist attack in Paris, when 130

\textsuperscript{28} Charlie Hebdo is a French satirical weekly journal which assumes a provocative tone; frequently, the journal created polemics, and the most recent ones referred to Islam. The most disputed polemics were those regarding the cartoons depicting the prophet Muhammad.

\textsuperscript{29} „Cartoons represent a biting and aggressive humour, which, before making something ridiculous, criticize and can be the expression of a super-average aggressiveness” (Dan Petre; Dragoș Iliescu: 214-215).

people were killed, the journal published on the cover another cartoon: an individual hit by bullets drinks Champagne and close to him the message: „They have bullets. Damn with them, we have Champagne”\(^{31}\).

On September 11, 2015, cartoons were published with the Kurdish child drowned in the Mediterranean Sea and also with the satirical discourse about the refugee crisis: „Les chrétiens marchent sur les eaux. Les enfants musulmans culent”\(^{32}\). Under the same circumstances, Aylan, the child who died on the beach was represented in a cartoon, near a McDonald’s billboard, together with the message: „Two menus for the price of one. So close to his purpose”\(^{33}\). The positive aspects of the satirical humour which attacks social disorder, foolishness, abuses, etc, have the purpose to convince the audience to sanction social injustice. Satirical humour should generate laugh, not as a purpose in itself, but in order to change unpleasant situations and correct certain social and political abuses. A positive humour, translated into cartoons should be a warning or public awareness, for a situation which deviated from normal conditions and which has to be reformed. However, the referential contexts promoted by the journal and excessively changed through cartoons prove that the satirical or black humour, generally induce laugh, emotion or pleasure into the consumers of macabre humour. Black humour is based on morbidity and absurd; it combines humour and anger (Dan Petre, Dragoș Iliescu : 213). There are also situations when if we regard satire as social signal, the rhetoric of the images blames the social situation of the refugees, the death of the refugee children and poverty as consequences of the political crisis, hence the reference to McDonald’s billboard with the sandwiches and the image of the Kurdish child. As authors Dan Petre and Dragoș Iliescu state, cartoons allow a personal interpretation and they become insults for certain social groups, „even if authors’ intention was different”.

*Charlie Hebdo* published two cartoons about the fall of the Russian civilian plane in the Sinai peninsula, Egypt (November 6, 2015). Dmitri Peskov, the spokesman from Kremlin declared the satirical discourse „a blasphemy” or an insult for the 224 victims of the plane accident. One of the cartoons represented fragments from the plane falling to the ground, together with the text „Russian air force intensifies bombing”, referring plainly to the Russian military campaign in Syria against the terrorist organization Islamic State.\(^{34}\).

After the earthquake in Italy (August 24, 2016), *Charlie Hebdo* published a cartoon where two Italian men were full of blood, meanwhile others were caught by debris.\(^{35}\) The following message was written above the image: “Séisme à l’italienne. Penne sauce tomate. Penne gratinée. Lasagnes”, where the red sauce and the baked pasta represent a visual metaphor of the blood-stained victims and the lasagna is an allusive metaphor for the people caught under debris. The image is a sarcastic reflection on the earthquake victims and instigates to hate, by the hint to the Muslim prophet who might be the cause of the earthquake, as a journalist stated: „300 die after the earthquake in Italy. We do not know yet if the earthquake really shouted Allah Akbar <before shaking >”. There are more than 2 million active users,

---


with comments and share, on the Facebook page of the satirical, political and secular publication. In connection with the same earthquake, on September 2, 2016, another insulting cartoon was shared, where a woman was caught under the debris and said: „Italiens, c’est pas Charlie Hebdo qui construit vos maisons, c’est la mafia”36. In September 2016, the Local Council in Amatrice, the town most affected by the earthquake called to court the publication Charlie Hebdo, for the insulting cartoons about the victims. Another case of insult is connected with the catastrophic floods in North Korea. Charlie Hebdo published (13.09.2016) the message: “La mort c’est toujours tabou (…) il faut aussi parfois la transgresser” and an image was shared with cartoons about Koreans floating on water and laughing; the text inside the image was: „Inondations en Corée du Nord. Des milliers de coréens sauvés par leur estomac vide”37.

One of the most shared cartoons, almost 12,000, with over 25,000 comments, on January 19, 2017, is the visual metaphor of death skiing38, a hint to the problems created by massive snow and the earthquakes in Italy. The text which accompanies the image is Italie. La neige est arrivée. Y en aura pas pour tout le monde”. The users are critical of the back humour displayed by the journal: “Je suis française, mais vis en Italie depuis douze ans et sincèrement aujourd’hui j’ai honte d’être française! Je ne suis pas Charlie”, “C’est absolument honteux. Imaginons un peu l’inverse: un terrible événement en France et des Italiens cyniques sur le fait... cela ne passerait jamais”, ”regrette encore d'avoir dit un jour "je suis Charlie”. Vous pouvez faire la satire sur tout, mais pas sur Les morts innocents!” (accessed on 27.01.2017).

When influence is exercised in both directions „from the majority to minority and from the minority to majority”, we speak about „the one-sided effect on the source and the target” (S. Moscovici: 92). The efficiency of the satirical discourse about the subjects presented in the publication of opinion, Charlie Hebdo, on one side, receives an answer in the users’ confrontation, and, on the other hand, a revolt emerges, at least at discourse level. The revolt is to be measured in series or successions of reactions: a comment posted by a user receives dozens or hundreds of answers which approve of the user’s first intervention and disapprove of the cartoon. Influence moves from the creator of the images to the users’ inter-personal influence. If the user is a receiver of influence, only by posting a reaction which contests the journal opinions, the effectiveness of the journalistic discourse is null, as long as the cartoons do not provoke laugh, but users’ fury, ”unlaughter”. We notice the convergence or the inter-personal consistency in the knowledge of users who blame the image rhetoric, even at metaphor level. In these cases, the process of influence is determined by objective norms” (S. Moscovici: 182); only the objective norms bring about the pressure to behave accordingly. The ethical slippage is complementary to the slippage from the public reality, ”truth” is confiscated and users reject and contest media influence, the meanings of icons and symbols referring to insult and discrimination.

In regards to the analysis connected with efficiency, we notice the same theoretical perspective in J. C. Abric: „the optimal effectiveness is achieved when the representation of the task corresponds to its

objective nature” (J. C. Abric: 184). Thus, in the above mentioned case of the metaphor of death, after natural disasters or terrorist attacks, the dispute about the representation in the media summons up other users who did not answer favourably to the media’s creative representation (minimum control) and a "cognitive conflict” emerged between them and the media.

In their analysis of the satirical and ironical images in the new media, Ana Maria Munteanu and Aida Todi focus on images which „separate text worlds from context changes, from/ and to the „actual” frameworks and mark their reflexion in the social images and discourse”39. Though laugh belongs to a cultural pattern, actual subjects translated through humour are connected with the cultural risk through an every day life perspective „exposed to society-performance and politics-performance”. At the same time, Ana Maria Munteanu mentions the risk of collapse and distrust of local media „markets”, when the meaning of the social and political actuality vanishes, with the effect of „breaking the cultural and spiritual dialogue”, and determining a type of communication „responsible for the ethical slippage at the level of common sense, with consequences in series”. (Ana Maria Munteanu, Aida Todi, 2012). In another study dedicated to the humorous discourse, in regards to Caragiale’s work and the theatre’s reflection in contemporary journalism, Ana Maria Munteanu references the reader’s awareness; the author warns users who seem to be naive in front of the traps in the media, having their own truth as subject of dispute: “Thus the mix and the caricature facilitates the comparison between various distorted results of splitting prospects and editorial frames, a decoding technique to empower an over confident citizen (reader) to become aware of the “disappearance of reality”. Thus a reader might compare, laugh at and learn a media literacy lesson, warning on truth and credibility.” 40 It refers to the same efficient logics connecting theatre and everyday life, which absorbs reality, with the risk of destabilizing mental patterns, through grotesque humour: „the tendency to destabilize mental or social patterns through cvasigraphical, comical, tragical, horror and grotesque pictures, acting the spring regenerator of laughter and self-irony - thus, a counter-movement from structure to antistructure”. (Ana Maria Munteanu, 2013: 15)

Image rhetoric is much more powerful than text, and the meanings of cartoons41 produce strong reactions challenging the public, mostly through a ridiculous misrepresentation of reality and through the redundant usage of the visual death metaphor in all the examples selected from the journal. Umberto Eco says that metaphor appears when a possible convenience or analogy is examined, and that is not a matter of pure imitation, but invention (U. Eco, 2009: 61). Analogies are not common; on the contrary, they insinuate things. At the same time, there is an image of ugliness (U. Eco, 2012: 133), death, pain, suffering, and physical fright, which become admissible for the public who is a fan of black humour and unbearable for the public who does not admit humour under the circumstances of terrorist attacks or natural disasters.

After the analysis of the ironical discourse, we admit that speech is implicit (indirect) because there is a difference between what was said and what the author really intended to transmit to the users.

1. “Italiens, c'est pas Charlie Hebdo qui construit vos maisons, c'est la mafia” – The statement is an implicit illocutionary verdict, though the verb "to accuse" is missing; however, here, the journalist identifies Italians with the mafia and blames them for the ramshackle buildings which did not resist to

41 According to Dex, a satirical graphic where a person, situation, etc are ridiculed, by exaggerating on purpose the negative features, a lame attempt at distorting reality.
earthquakes. The cartoon about an Italian woman caught under debris troubles by the black humour of the graphics which mocks and ridicules a dramatic situation. We noticed that post was shared 27,000 times: 34,000 are comments and 38,000 are appreciations (26,000 like it, 10,000 of them are furious, 876 love the post, 471 laugh, 358 cry and 107 are amazed).

2. "*Inondations en Corée du Nord. Des milliers de coréens sauvés par leur estomac vide*” – The first statement is an implicit illocutionary statement, like news informing about what happened (*I inform you there are floods, I mention or affirm there are floods*). Irony is provoked by the second statement (illocutionary implicit behaviour) correlated with the icons, where the author expresses his content for a dramatic situation and insults by the image of the Koreans floating on water with swollen bellies. The effect of the cartoon is: 744 shares, 263 comments, 5,200 appreciations (of which, 4,000 like it, 768 smile, 209 elected the emoticon with tears, 70 love the post, 63 are amazed and 42 are furious).

3. "*Italie. La neige est arrivée. Y en aura pas pour tout le monde*”42 – Though it looks like a simple announcement about the snow (statement: *I inform you about the snow in Italy and it is not for all*), the statement challenges through the implicit statement, an ironic warning to Italians or even a threat of death, by the visual metaphor of death coming to Italy. The analysis of the post shows it has 12,000 appreciations: 6,300 are angry, 4,600 chose like, 760 laugh, 356 cry, 179 love the post and 76 are amazed.

4. Another perlocutory cartoon 43 represents the consequences of the attacks in Belgium (posted on March 24, 2016): a blood bath in which Belgians seem to drown; one of them asks: "Did anyone see my luggage?", and another says: "*Never on time!*". The sarcastic image challenges through spectacularity and grotesque humor: almost one thousand shares, over 500 comments, and 4,400 appreciations (3,700 like it, 246 cry, 245 laugh, 172 are angry, 46 love the image, and 33 are amazed).

When emotions pass through the rational filter of the moral culture, the public separate slippage and rules. We are not able to learn how many people are indifferent to Charlie Hebdo’s posts; however, we can find the quantity and quality of users’ emotions and the forms through which the public approves of or blames the images and texts, by decoding the emoticons selected by users. R. Barthes admits images might be the object of emotions or intentions, and *to look* (regarder) is one of them. At the same time, Barthes criticizes the shallow subjectivity of the list of tastes, repulsions or indifference: "*I like/I don’t*” (R. Barthes, 2010: 22). According to Barthes, the image *spectrum* is the referent, the target "a kind of semblance" (R. Barthes, 2010: 15). Meanwhile feelings, involvement or the taste for what is represented are called *studium*. When images please or not, but do not hurt anyone they are equivalent to *studium*, "the area of diverse interest, inconsistent taste, I like/I don’t” which summons up half-wish and half-will. The element to break or mark *studium* (image study) is *punctum*, „*leaving the stage like an arrow and comes to thrust me*” (R. Barthes, 2010:29). It is about the moment when posts boil, when they hurt users (for example, *punctum* takes place when the public is furious and cries). Barthes calls that like a vague and plain, irresponsible answer from the public, in comparison with the


punctum which can be moral or non-moral but means "to confess" or have a vivid interest; in this case, the users have a deeper involvement in that matter. (R. Barthes, 2010: 42).

Implicit illocutionary acts – approval or blame, include perlocutionary acts, as answers, both in the text and the icons, represented by emoticons (smiling face, love face, angry face, crying face, excepting like), which are but the punctum of the image. The quantitative analysis of the consequences, in the above mentioned four examples, follows Barthes’ observations, according to which we can extract studium (the like, vague or plain interest which can represent only a notice and not a clear affect like the other emoticons, as well as emoticons showing amazement because we can’t identify here neither approval of nor blame of the cartoon). Of the number of appreciations, we analysed only punctum (smiling face, love face, angry face, crying face). In the earthquake situation in Italy (example 1), there are 10,358 users who blame journalistic discourse (angry face, crying face) and 1,347 who approve of it (smiling face, love face). For the second example, the floods in North Korea, only 251 blame journalistic discourse, while 838 accept it. For the massive quantity of snow in Italy (example 3), 6,356 users blame journalistic discourse and 936 approve of it. For the last example (4), the cartoon with the terrorist attacks in Belgium, 418 users blame the cartoon and 291 approve of the image rhetoric. In conclusion, 17,383 users condemn the ethical slippage, while 3,412 approve of the discourse.

James Rachels makes the differences between moral subjectivism, when „a person affirms something is good or bad, from moral point of view” and nothing more („X is correct/ X is bad), and emotionalism, a more complex language approach, by expressing facts and information which have an influence on speakers’ behaviour (J. Rachels in P. Singer: 465-467). However, the philosopher admits that emotionalism could not justify the “judgement. Thus, Rachels says that, from a moral point of view, the correct attitude is the one approved of by fully reasonable individuals (J. Rachels in P. Singer: 468-470). As a result, we have the following situations, when users oscillate between moral subjectivism, emotionalism and judgement:

1. When users are convinced and approve the subjective appreciation in the cartoons; the purpose is achieved due to the perlocutionary objectives, through the illocutionary discourse, in the publication shares (J. L. Austin: 251-163). The perlocutionary act becomes effective in persuasion, when users approve of the ethical slippage, they enjoy black humour, laugh and react according to the emitter’s intentions.

Examples of comments on Facebook for the above mentioned cartoons: “Pour moi, le moyen d’expression principal de Charlie, c’est la caricature”, „Une chose est sûre en lisant les commentaires: les italiens ne comprennent pas l’humour noir”, “Ce n’est pas le dessin qui me choque...je ne sais pas bien où est l’insulte...Charlie défend la liberté de penser”, ”Excellent! Je suis Bruxellois et je trouve ce dessin parfait. Deux armes sont fatales contre les terroristes: l’humour et un fusil d’assaut”.

2. When the public questions the post and brings accusations to the publication, by acts of illocutionary discourse, a perlocutionary act is achieved (J.L. Austin: 114). However, it is not effective for the emitter because users have opposite reactions to the emitter’s intention (obviously, the perlocutory act is uneffective through the anger icons). The incriminating comments are effective perlocutionary acts among users, through positive answers coming in series and which approve of the comments posted by other users. Only users who militate in the same direction and toward the same moral values have a real cooperation.
Examples of comments on Facebook to the above-mentioned speech: „Vous n’êtes pas la liberté d’expression! Vous êtes la liberté d’insulter, d’offenser, dénigrer”, "Vous n’êtes pas la liberté. Vous êtes manque d’humanité”, "provocateur, irrespectueux, sans valeur. Satire peut et doit être chic, mais pour vous la satire est une blessure”, "On peut pas faire satire sur la mort et sur les disgrâces d’autrui…Honte! Est-ce que je suis Charlie? Pas plus!”, "C’est seulement une forme honteuse de lucre et un manqué de respect envers le peuple italien”, “C’est pas journalisme ça !”.

In the last four examples, the **perlocutionary force** (**studium** and **punctum**) is much more active for the public who blames the ethical slippage (17,383 users), compared to the public who approves of the magazine’s black humour (3,412 users), as it was mentioned in the survey of the comments and emoticons posted by users. The cartoon about the earthquake in Italy has the biggest number of reactions (38,000, **studium** and **punctum**), compared to the four above mentioned cartoons. It is to be noticed the solidarity or cooperation of the users who objected to the journal’s non-moral discourse, through comments which attract hundreds of reactions of approval and which militate for morality in journalism.

**Conclusion**

Although the contexts are increasingly confusing and conflicting the ethical slippage in the magazine firstly refers to the approach of human tragedies in terms of black humour. The death metaphor based on black humour in the situation of the attacks in Belgium and the earthquakes in Italy, posted on its Facebook page, generated protests and anger from the Belgian, Italian and even French public. However, we can also record reactions that approve the magazine’s shares. If we consider humour a defense mechanism, according to Freud’s ideas, as well as a manner of sanctioning political and social injustice, we can find positive aspects of satire, such as that images that describe the refugees’ crisis, death, poverty or the wish for freedom.

Nevertheless, media discourse may become a dangerous environment, when insulting content is published and challenged through psychological and verbal violence, suggesting offence and discrimination of all types. Thus it has to be questioned not only for immediate reactions, but also for its global dramatic consequences. The relevant- but not a simple- question would be: may a huge social and political impact legitimate an ethical slippage?
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