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I. The need to develop a global-minded citizenry: the role and responsibility of English language

In a March 2007 opinion-editorial, the Japan Times, the leading English language newspaper in Japan, spoke of the ambivalence of English in Japan—Japan’s Ambivalent English. They stated unequivocally that “the reality of English as the most commonly used language will continue.” Furthermore, they stated that no language other than English had yet to emerge, and that a great many people in many parts of the world show a comfort with English language. This leads them to further conclude, or at the very least safely hypothesize that embracing English as a lingua franca “is the clearest evidence of a willingness to interact with the world.”

The above-mentioned editorial goes on to report that Japan’s global standing rests to a great extent on its ability to speak and use other languages communicatively. The opinion-editorial maintains that those nations and their people who have the language ability to engage with the world will undoubtedly “prosper most as globalization seeps more fully into everyday life.” Why, they wonder, does Japan continue to lag behind other societies in embracing English as a lingua franca in a number of socio-cultural, socio-economic, and socio-educational life contexts? They conclude that this fear may be due in large part to Japan and its people fearing the loss of their identity. The Japan Times editors remind us of the many studies that have equated a stronger sense of national identity built and developed through contact with other languages and cultures.

Part of this fear is also due to the fact, they further argue, that Japan clings to outdated conceptualizations and resultant practices which continue to perpetuate the myth of the “native speaker,” or the reality, that despite a history of imperialistic outreach by the so-called English-using societies such as Britain and the United States up to and including the late 20th century and early 21st century, it is no longer true that English is owned solely or primarily by English language users from what Kachru calls the Inner Circle—Britain, North America excluding Mexico, Australasia. The definition and reality of “the English native speaker” is, in their estimation, collapsing amid a number of global realities that include international marriages, bilingual and multilingual education, and increased opportunities for people around the world to travel, work, and live in other countries than those in which they were
Japan surely ranks first in the world in sheer numbers of grammar books and electronic dictionaries, not to mention English lessons, yet how often do these help (Japan and its people) to better understand how to live in the world? The diversity of languages is a testament to the beauty and ingenuity of the human species, but the future is likely to rest on humankind’s ability to create an international culture of communication. No country can afford to relish its uniqueness at the expense of working with others.

The present and future vibrancy of a nation-state largely rests on its ability to effectively educate its citizenry to be more globally aware, more globally knowledgeable and empathetic, and more globally capable (hereafter known as holistic global competency). A global-competent citizenry needs to be educated and through education be capable of actively and fully understanding of diversity and also citizen participation in local, regional-international, and global business and academia contexts of social life. Said citizenry also needs to actively contribute to local-regional and international-global development of a nation’s or society’s (e.g. Japan’s) socio-cultural, socio-economic, and socio-political development. An important aspect of this global competency and mobility approach in non-native English speaking contexts such as here in Japan is that citizens be educated or otherwise enabled to participate in a wide variety of glocal (i.e. local-regional and international-global) social life contexts crucially being able to use the business and academic lingua franca of English.

While English language in itself is no panacea for the closer engagement of Japan and Japanese with the rest of the world, whether regionally, internationally, or more globally, it is the recognized lingua franca that nations and their people can use to mutually communicate with. As such it has the potential to bring people and nations closer together in both competitive and cooperative enterprises. Acceptance of English language as an additional medium of contact both within and across national borders can aid in helping the cultures and societies reach out to one another in mutually beneficial ways.

Coyle, Hood and Marsh (2013), Bisong (1995), and Bruen (2005) all argue that globalization invites language and socio-cultural shift, especially in terms of human mobility and migration, which further can lead to the creation and development of dynamic multicultural and multilingual societies. A relevant indicator of how successful a state has been and can be in promoting and supporting its citizenry to be global and mobile is by examining how the State and its institutions formulates and implements educational policies. This examination can also possibly reveal more about the longer-term sustainability of macro educational policy in credibly promoting mobility. Prominent in this discussion, but which is often if not usually omitted from discussion in Japan and many (but not all) of its higher educational institutions HEI, is the fact that English language education conceived in its diversity and global reality, and English language higher education (ELHE) can help provide focus to examining a nation’s or society’s educational policy on the one hand, and can also provide evidence of how a society such as Japan and its HEI conceive and practice not only ELHE, but also issues involved in globalization and business or academic mobility which crucially implicate the use of both a local and global language for communication. English language continues to be quarantined and marginalized in Japan, (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010) and does not connect coherently to the broader citizenry education goals highlighted above.
Macro and meso (i.e. institutional level) ELHE issues will be discussed in this paper and in our presentation in order to demonstrate how poor academic mobility can be a consequence of ambivalent and incoherent policy decisions at the governmental and institutional levels. For the purposes of this discussion, the terminology of language policy and planning (LPP) will be used to describe the collective macro, meso and micro educational environments. At the macro level, Lo Bianco (2013) identifies a major part of language policymaking ‘consisting of the struggle by different socio-political academic interests to have their self-serving interpretation(s) of language problems prevail’ (p.132). Lo Bianco also suggests that changes, and the impetus for changes, in ELHE too often originate within societal, economic and political interests and concerns rather than educational interests and concerns. Gaining a deeper understanding of the methods of LPP helps to develop a critical perspective on the drip down effect of policy at the meso and micro level.

The method of LPP follows a number of stages according to Lo Bianco (2010, p.152). (1) Problem identification (fact-finding); (2) Goal specification (policy); (3) Cost/benefit analysis (costed demonstration of alternatives) (4) Implementation, and (5) Evaluation (comparing predicted to actual outcomes). These five stages are possibly static and could be an over simplification of how LPP is operationalized. However, they do offer hope of giving a basic framework for understanding how policymakers direct strategies in the public domain. Identifying areas of influence for language planning and policy can help to build a better understanding of how decisions are made at both the macro and meso levels.

Lo Bianco recognizes three areas that can provide data for understanding LPP more holistically: public texts, public discourse, and performative action. Policy documents, public discourse and policy shifts can together help with our understanding of how macro policy in a non-English using society is related to how language is viewed and used, whether said language be the dominant L1 (e.g. Japanese in Japan) or a more widely diffused and more globally used and useful additional language such as is English in Japan. Analyzing in greater detail the broader sociological LPP environment in a particular society, or even at a particular institution within that society, allows discussion to focus on contemporary examples of policy implementation by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Science and Technology (hereafter called MEXT) as it seeks to conceive of and then implement policy expanding what is known as the Global 30 initiative in Japan, which we will describe more in detail in the next (II) section of this paper.

A more detailed investigation and analysis of Japan’s LPP can also usefully provide needed data and understanding on how policy is presented as a problem in public discourse in Japan. Moreover, it can also demonstrate how Japanese governmental—and by implication Japanese institutional—ideology is or can be reified through education and educational decision-making, thus preventing or worse marginalizing educational goal(s) from becoming and being more than one dimensional. There continues to be ambiguity, confusion, contradictions, and misguided thinking and resultant practices in Japan as to how English language higher education can usefully help provide and stimulate educational innovations that are or can be supportive of a more international and global, and more holistic and multidimensional, approach to human issues of internationalization, globalization, and academic mobility as these issues are conceptualized not only in Japan but by a variety of nation-states or societies. There unfortunately appears to be no actual cost/benefit analysis—in terms of “payoffs” for the society—to become and be more open and global with the involvement of English language, and this may be consistent with an incoherence of LPP at both the macro and meso levels, a situation exacerbated in part
II. The Global 30 Project and related issues in Japan

An initiative termed “Global 30 Project for Establishing Core Universities for Internationalization” in Japan has as its aims the recruiting of an additional 300,000 international students by 2020 to study in Japan in English, and also aims to send many more Japanese university students overseas than are now studying outside Japan, mainly to what has in Japan been termed native English speaking and using countries, for example, the United States, Australia, Great Britain, and Canada. There is little if any mention of the opportunities afforded Japanese young adults of studying in English at institutions in societies that are not what is known as Inner Circle areas. (e.g. Netherlands, Singapore, Finland, etc.). There are any number of related issues involving globalization, academic mobility, and the development of an active global-minded citizenry through (higher) education that we feel have not adequately either been thought out or embraced, and which may reveal more about the true intentions of the, for example, Global 30 policy and its practical realization, at the meso and micro level.

Global 30 as an idea, as a plan, and as a policy, needs to embrace socio-cultural issues such as diversity and continuity of socio-culture(s), and mutual academic mobility, not only of numbers of people, but also ideas and values. Global 30 as a more than a “quick or easy fix” to a nation’s and society’s socio-cultural problems—for example, a dwindling domestic higher education population—needs to embrace a concept and practice of truly welcoming into Japan people and values and ideas that will help open up its mostly static closed and fully functional and structurally workable society where change(s), risk(s), dissensus and diversity can help lead the society into the emerging global world outside Japan. As it has thus far been formulated and “planned” Global 30 does not yet seem to welcome diversity, dissensus, changed thinking and socio-cultural practices for fear, perhaps, of it (Japan) losing its identity.

Very often, for example, Japan and its governmental authorities and at the meso level its institutional authorities speak of developing global-minded citizens but do not (1) specify to any degree what competencies and dispositions young people may need to be truly globally competent, or (2) include in discussion the necessity of Japan and Japanese reaching outward to the world in any language other than its own L 1 Japanese. Directed by Japanese government policy, MEXT interprets internationalization and globalization as being inextricably linked to how the initiative is economically and ethnocentrically conceived, and its advocacy for how it can be actualized by and for Japanese primarily if not exclusively.

Concepts such as “internationalization” and “globalization”—as they are conceptualized and advocated in the L 1 Japanese language—in Japan and by Japanese educational authorities at both the macro and meso levels, and how they are embraced and practiced, reveal more about the approach of educational agencies in Japan where the Global 30 (G 30) sits outside broader educational policy and agendas. These concepts as conceptualized in Japan in general demonstrate a continuing problematic tendency in Japan to focus on (its) narrow economic benefits that do not contribute enough to a holistic approach to citizenship education. Worse, these conceptualizations and practices reveal more about Japan maintaining distance from any real active involvement and inclusion in a developing global order, where there is movement towards global citizenship that is not solely or primarily economic on the one hand, and which does not, as we will later attempt to demonstrate, serve as a policy to main-
tain inward-looking and what we term “preventive” globalization mindsets and practices.

III. A Conceptual Problem/A Practical Issue

*Kokusaiaka* (internationalization) has become a term that is difficult to disentangle from a complex linguistic and educational reform agenda in Japan. Burgess, Gibson, Klaphake and Selzer (2010) believe that promoting Japan abroad is how this concept of internationalization is or can be understood. Furthermore, they suggest that the conservative conception of this term ‘is less about transcending cultural barriers and more about protecting them’ (p.463). This view is supported by Hashimoto (2013), who suggests Japan has its own understanding of internationalization, and conceptually speaking, it is about self-promotion and a view of the world in terms of a binary and dichotomous Japan and “the Other.” This presents a problem when examining the macro policy agendas of institutions such as MEXT. If promoting Japan abroad through educational exchanges is, first and foremost, a desire to promote national policy and identity primarily or exclusively, this could have repercussions for how LPP has been formulated and can continue to be formulated in respect of the G 30. The global context also has crucial influence over national policies, but, interestingly, is an area where national policy has a more chaotic impact and influence.

*Guroubaruka* (globalization) as a term has in some ways overtaken *kokusaiaka* in respect of Japan’s internal discourse related to global contexts. Moreover, a noticeable difference in the understanding of these terms is that *guroubaruka* is considered as an external and uncontrollable phenomenon, whereas *kokusaiaka* is fully controllable. Whereas the narrow interpretation of *kokusaiaka* above illustrates how Japan, at the national level, identifies internationalization with a protection of cultural barriers: *guroubaruka,* unlike *kokusaiaka*—as a Japanese concept, reveals tensions in Japan, at least as conceived by its ruling authorities, with a global context that is constantly changing and (re) creating global identities. Indeed, external pressures demonstrate these phenomena quite clearly. Recent developments in the Japanese commercial sector highlight this shift in global attitudes and can have serious ramifications for educational policies and institutions.

There is a clear recognition that economic imperatives give much of the educational policies an imbalance and do not offer a more rounded cosmopolitan socio-culturally and politically beneficial understanding of citizenry education. In the Japanese context, a global economic imperative has influenced large Japanese corporations, such as Uniqlo and Rakuten, to demand increased workplace English usage (in Japan) and require more visibly demonstrable English proficiency from a greater proportion of its workforce. This is, perhaps, an indication of a change in attitudes to professional usage of English in the business world context. However, it also highlights a fact that the forces of globalization can offer both ‘opportunities and threats’ for global non-native speakers of English (Yamagami & Tollefson, 2011) in both the business world and the world of tertiary academia.

Fujita-Round and Maher (2008) believe that the logic of internationalization in the Japanese context which does include discussion of the benefits of being able to use more than one language to communicate in a variety of socio-cultural contexts, might mean solely or primarily equipping young adults (i.e. university students) with linguistic armour to compete outside Japan’ (cited in Stewart & Miyahara, 2011, p.15). Gradol (2007) presents a comprehensive survey of global trends in English Language Education (ELE) and outlines a strong economic correlation with the learning of languages. This narrow focus on economic goals is not shared with other conceptions of internationalization.
Different geographical examples reveal a very different conceptualization, in terms of internationalization, around issues of national identity and its relevance to LPP. Byram (2008) questions whether the economic imperative is concerned only with globalization but not with internationalization, since it ignores ‘the domain of private attributes of tolerance and open-mindedness (p.29).’ Using an example of governmental policy documents from Sweden, in reference to internationalization, Byram points out that values of mutual understanding and social responsibility are prioritized over narrow economic interests. This presents a very different understanding and motivation for developing internationalization through macro government policies. Examining the LPP initiatives related to Japanese higher education can provide data that supports or rejects evidence of this private domain approach to holistic approaches to citizenship education.

The economic imperative clearly prioritizes this global discourse of English business practice, but linguistic capital is also valued in the global English academic world (Block & Cameron, 2002). The term glocalization has allowed for a more comprehensive understanding of how the local is connected to the global in a less asymmetrical relationship (Robertson, 1995). Glocalization, in terms of English usage in the periphery, compared to Inner Circle countries such Britain, Australasia and North America (hereafter known as BANA, Holliday, 1994), seems at odds with approaches to language education in Japan that Kubota (2002, p.28) believes represent an ‘isosceles triangle.’ The forces of ‘Anglicization and nationalism’ are pulling in different directions and restricting more ‘diversity’ in the use of English, and other languages, both within Japan, and outside (Kubota, 2013). Both Anglicization and nationalism are present in the conceptualizations of guroubaruka and kokusaika. Anglicization focuses the economic imperative on studying English to do business with native-speaking English countries. This does not reflect the global business reality or the global developments in English as an International Language (EIL), for example, but does indicate how Japan views global hegemony in the world. Diversity does not seem prevalent in the nationalism evident in language policies. Nationalism, reified through kokusaika, reveals a very narrow understanding of the concept of internationalization as Byram argues.

McVeigh (2000) has identified Japanese nationalism as a manifestation of Japanese identity and divided it into three components: ethnocultural, statist and racial. While ethnocultural is the strain of nationalism that most people are familiar with, it is the statist nationalism that has most relevance to the socio-educational context. This has resulted in a hardened ideology of Japaneseness that McVeigh (2000,) claims, ‘is sustained and reproduced by education’ (p.78). At this stage, it is important to note, as McVeigh does (2000), that educational initiatives in Japan are implemented to benefit the state and the narrow economic imperatives outlined above, and not to benefit specifically individual citizens. This has consequences for higher educational LPP at the institutional level in Japan in terms of training for faculty and students.

**IV. Global 30 Revisited: Protecting Japan’s unique identity?**

The Global 30 initiative is problematic, perhaps also flawed, in that it focuses on sending people outside Japan and bringing to Japan students from outside Japan without a considered approach to socio-cultural and political global competency issues. Cross-cultural training and preparation of young people and educators in Japan will actually need to be expanded in order for citizens to become more globally minded. For example, there is no consideration of the teachers and teaching aspect of cross-
cultural global awareness educating where it is not yet sufficiently considered which young people and how young people in Japan as well as young people coming to Japan will actually be educated to be global citizens (i.e. teacher training). The Global 30 Project does not challenge inclusive views of Japan and Japanese society highlighted by McVeigh (2000). Rather than making Japanese society and Japanese academia more global by having regular and on-going global awareness training on Japanese campuses by Japanese and non-Japanese educators working together, the initiative adopts a one dimensional economics-only perspective to fixing problems.

Japan and Japanese society are not opening up to the world and engaging with the world globally or regionally by continuing to have most of its higher education coursework in the local language only, or by having additional language study quarantined, compartmentalized and separated from discipline-study, and by focusing on numbers of students who can economically support the university industry.

Understanding the relevance of industry and its economic, social and political dynamics to higher educational studies is discussed by Peterson (2007), who defines industry ‘as a set of organizations that use or require similar resources or attract similar clients and that produce similar products and services’ (p.151). Understanding the dominance and preponderance in Japan of private educational institutions, and how institutional decisions are still shaped by governmental policy, is a macro point of inquiry for this study. Porter (cited in Peterson, 2007, p.151) highlights a number of potential factors that help to define relationships within an industry such as higher education:

i. The threat of new organizational entrants to the industry
ii. The bargaining power or control of suppliers of key resources
iii. The bargaining power of customers who purchase products or services
iv. The threat of substitute products and services from new organizations
v. Innovations in the core technology of the organizations in the industry

MEXT is a customer in this industry example. The bargaining power of such an organization as MEXT can help and or hinder educational initiatives that can promote genuine broader citizenry approaches of open-mindedness and tolerance. Policies become the innovations at the institutional and organizational level. The various LPP stakeholders together create a social system. A sociological understanding of higher education over a period of time has focused on organizations of higher education as units of study. The significance of organizational theory developed within an open-systems perspective has contributed to an understanding of how broader political and policymaking dimensions play a role in shaping higher educational curricula (Gumport, 2007).

Whereas closed system theory considers the external environment to be stable and predictable not causing interference with the functioning of an organization, open systems theory recognizes the fluidity that exists as workers move back and forth between the workplace and their social groups influencing the organization in the form of its and their values and behaviors (Bertalanffy, 1988). The impact of external influences can be better understood by examining contingencies that exist externally to the organization such as the global developments highlighted above.

Foucault, in his discussion about power and institutions, develops analysis around ‘contingencies’. His ideas reject simple explanations of past events in terms of cause and effect. He believes we must try to analyze the complexities and indeed the confusing nature of past events to identify the prevalence of power relations throughout societies (cited in Mills, 2003). The relevance of open systems
theory is that this better represents an understanding of how society functions and this begins to provide a rationale for how educational approaches to citizenry education could or should progress.

A sociological concept that makes sense of the macro dimensions discussed thus far is the structural-functional sociological societal model from Durkheim (cited in Holliday, 2011). This theory presents society as a solid object. Theories about society are constructed around static parts of this object such as institutions of education. Behavior and values through this understanding of society are fixed and lead to predictable descriptions of future behavior. This concept is supported by some of the discussion outlined above relating to nationalism and Anglicization. This conception of society as a solid unchanging object or organism where behaviors and values are fixed and immutable affects a nation-state’s or society’s capacity to develop its citizenry through its education which can conceivably result in a more complex and open system that promotes tolerance and understanding of local and global similarities and differences.

This is where our overall analysis and argumentation will now turn as we focus on the meso and micro issues surrounding the adoption and implementation of educational curricula as it relates to global citizenry development approaches.

V. The Response: Part One

The promotion of global awareness, attitudes, knowledge, and skills including most critically the “soft skills,” as outlined in the Transferable Skills in Modern Languages Project (2002) rests on a recognition and higher educating of a mutually cooperative/collaborative social sphere consciousness that includes, following Steiner, a three-tiered view of social life: economics, rights-responsibilities, and the spiritual-cultural, where no one sub-sphere dominates or colonizes (Habermas) the other(s). The active implementation of a three-tiered social sphere educating must combine the study and learning of language and communication awareness with, following Bollinger et al. (2003) a one-world ontology of being, where disciplinary or interdisciplinary study and learning (e.g. a sociology of language learning and communication) combines with communication learning in a unified and integrated higher learning.

The function of the spiritual-cultural sphere rests on counterbalancing the economic tendencies that seem to shape or worse control as Steiner argues, educational approaches in most developed or developing economies. Lamb (2008) believes the purpose of the spiritual-cultural approach is to promote human concern and care for other people. Steiner (cited in Lamb, 2008) outlines the starting point for this spiritual-cultural approach, and maintains that it has as its foundation(s) in modern culture a deeper more critical and more multidimensional thinking, or what Mills labels (1959, 2000), the sociological imagination. By deepening and widening our thinking and feeling we can enhance and refine our worldview(s).

The third component of this threefold approach is concerned with rights and by implication political responsibilities. Lamb (2008, p 43) identifies how rights are ‘the middle realm that weaves between cultural life and economic activity: the realm of human rights, including politics, legal affairs and civility.’ The emphasis is on a ‘concern with human relations, in terms of how we relate to one another in all types of situations and activities.’ Finding a balance to this threefold approach requires an education that goes further in the areas of English language, discipline-specialized content, and critical thinking, which combine to produce socio-culturally literate and globally minded citizens.
VI. The Response: Part Two

A CLICL (content and integrated language communication learning) higher educating where academic literacies and discipline-specific content are together prioritized, can provide young adults with the tools and dispositions they will need to be mobile in terms of work, study, play; and otherwise prosper and be mobile and flexible in a number of local, regional and global settings. Developing an approach that reflects a holistic citizenry education needs to focus on a number of areas:

4 Cs Framework:

(1) Content-subject matter
(2) Communication-language learning and using
(3) Cognition-learning and thinking processes
(4) Culture-developing intercultural understanding and global citizenship (Coyle et al, 2010, p.41)

One approach that seems to successfully integrate these dimensions into a coherent practical framework is offered by Benesch (2001, 2007). Her approach fits within a critical approach to academic studies in English. There is particular focus on building a learning and thinking process that connects discipline-specialized knowledge with an understanding of how individual conceptions of rights and responsibilities can help to shape thoughts and feelings about individual identity and interactions with others.

Brady (2010, 2013) has effectively argued that at the micro level it is possible and effective for curriculum to focus on citizenship development where the three social spheres of spiritual-cultural, economics, and rights-responsibilities do work together to help young people attain global competencies.

VII. Preliminary Evaluation

In the discussion that has been presented above, current educational policy is too simplistically focused on economic imperatives and self-serving nationalistic or inward-looking objectives. This has negative consequences for both educators and students. This unbalanced approach is partly responsible for the increasingly smaller number of Japanese students who choose to study abroad. If students do go overseas, they tend to select the study abroad-lite option, where they will only study English, or English-language general amorphous communication and culture study that is quarantined from other important areas of social development as that development relates to more specialized disciplinary and interdisciplinary curriculum concerns. If the Japanese government is serious about promoting young Japanese citizens to be more tolerant and open minded it needs to rethink LPP at the macro level. Macro decisions have implications for meso and micro contexts.
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ABSTRACT

A Japanese government initiative, “Global 30 Project for Establishing Core Universities for Internationalization,” aims to recruit 300,000 additional students from outside Japan by 2020 to study in English, and to send more Japanese students overseas, mainly to English-speaking areas. These and other developments are a response to decreasing numbers of Japanese students studying abroad, and demographic shifts domestically. Gradol (2007), presenting a comprehensive survey of global trends involving English Language education (ELE), outlines a strong economic correlation with language learning. This economic imperative has influenced some Japanese companies to operate in English—such as Uniqlo and Rakuten—and require higher English proficiency from a number of their workforce. This indicates a change in attitudes to the professional use of English in the workplace, but may not be matched by institutions of government and institutions of higher education in Japan. Yamagami & Tollefson (2011) report that globalization forces can offer opportunities and threats for global non-native speakers of English. A higher educational approach promoting awareness and skills necessary to be competent in global contexts and interactions is key to gaining access to predominantly English academic discourse.

Such access can lead to the sharing of common life goals and more specific participatory mechanisms across national boundaries and cultures. The promotion of both global awareness and skills, based on Steiner’s three-tiered model of social life development, involves discipline-specific information exchanges and knowledge-sharing, specific genres, highly specialized terminology, and a high level of expertise (Swales, 1990). Content and language integrated communication learning or CLICL, prioritizing academic literacies and discipline-specific content, provides learners with knowledge, skills, and life values enabling them to be mobile in local and global workplaces, including academia. Our paper provides an account of CLICL, which balances academic literacies and discipline-specific knowledge, skills, and values. We outline the practicalities that nurture CLICL, or lead to its rejection.
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