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1. Introduction

SOLIDARITY economy is a worldwide movement promoting democratisation of economy that embodies a broader definition of economy than the classical economic theories. The narrower approach of neoclassical economics is challenged by recognising economy as a complex space of social relations that creates wealth through many different ways, and with different motivations that include much more than just profit-maximisation. Solidarity economy is commonly combined with the term social economy, and these two concepts together cover multiple alternative practices for organising the economic and social life. As such, the practices of social and solidarity economy are not new, they have been around for a long time as local economic practices.

The terms social and solidarity economy have gained public recognition in recent years as activities and social movements have started to look for solutions to the multiple global and local crises and growing inequality. Solidarity economy organisations themselves have demonstrated resilience in the face of ongoing crises. Therefore it is worthwhile to examine them when thinking about the building blocks for a socially and environmentally sustainable future.

The roots of social economy are in the cooperative movement and it has a history starting in the mid-19th century. Currently, social economy refers to third sector activities that exist alongside the public and private sector and are driven by social aims. As a term, solidarity economy is more recent. It was first used commonly in South America and France around 1984-1986. Solidarity economy can be seen as a more transformative view of the two. It aims at a global change that should cover all the three sectors of economy – public, private and the third sector. Solidarity economy explicitly criticises the nature of the current development discussions by questioning the orthodox definition of economy that justifies capitalist exploitation and the neoliberal idea of development. Instead, solidarity economy demands a sustainable development approach that derives from democratic and participatory decision-making on both economy and politics.

The Intercontinental Network for the Promotion of Social Solidarity Economy (RIPESS) has recognised the systemic and post-capitalist agenda that is explicit within the solidarity economy movement. Social economy may be part of the change but it has to be recognised that some definitions of social economy imply the support of capitalism.

The term social and solidarity economy (SSE) is often used as a synonym to solidarity economy. It is fairly impossible to separate the concepts of social and solidarity economy entirely. Much of the current discourse is embracing the hybrid of the two terms. All actors are not making the distinction between the concepts and might also use them interchangeably. Therefore, this paper includes references to both social and solidarity economy, referred to as SSE, but emphasises the more radical development view of solidarity economy.

2. What is solidarity economy?

SOLIDARITY economy is a worldwide movement promoting democratisation of economy that embodies a broader definition of economy than the classical economic theories. The narrower approach of neoclassical economics is challenged by recognising economy as a complex space of social relations that creates wealth through many different ways, and with different motivations that include much more than just profit-maximisation. Solidarity economy is commonly combined with the term social economy, and these two concepts together cover multiple alternative practices for organising the economic and social life. As such, the practices of social and solidarity economy are not new, they have been around for a long time as local economic practices.

The terms social and solidarity economy have gained public recognition in recent years as activities and social movements have started to look for solutions to the multiple global and local crises and growing inequality. Solidarity economy organisations themselves have demonstrated resilience in the face of ongoing crises. Therefore it is worthwhile to examine them when thinking about the building blocks for a socially and environmentally sustainable future.

The roots of social economy are in the cooperative movement and it has a history starting in the mid-19th century. Currently, social economy refers to third sector activities that exist alongside the public and private sector and are driven by social aims. As a term, solidarity economy is more recent. It was first used commonly in South America and France around 1984-1986. Solidarity economy can be seen as a more transformative view of the two. It aims at a global change that should cover all the three sectors of economy – public, private and the third sector. Solidarity economy explicitly criticises the nature of the current development discussions by questioning the orthodox definition of economy that justifies capitalist exploitation and the neoliberal idea of development. Instead, solidarity economy demands a sustainable development approach that derives from democratic and participatory decision-making on both economy and politics. The Intercontinental Network for the Promotion of Social Solidarity Economy (RIPESS) has recognised the systemic and post-capitalist agenda that is explicit within the solidarity economy movement. Social economy may be part of the change but it has to be recognised that some definitions of social economy imply the support of capitalism.

The term social and solidarity economy (SSE) is often used as a synonym to solidarity economy. It is fairly impossible to separate the concepts of social and solidarity economy entirely. Much of the current discourse is embracing the hybrid of the two terms. All actors are not making the distinction between the concepts and might also use them interchangeably. Therefore, this paper includes references to both social and solidarity economy, referred to as SSE, but emphasises the more radical development view of solidarity economy.

2.1 The building blocks of solidarity economy

Solidarity economy: Commonly shared values

- solidarity and cooperation
- equity and social and environmental justice
- sustainability
- democracy
- pluralism and diversity
- autonomy and self-management
- emancipation
- gender equality


This report offers viewpoints about solidarity economy and its potential for a change towards development thinking that aims at global justice in economic, environmental and social spheres. Chapter two introduces the concepts of social and solidarity economy. Chapter three describes the idea of comprehensive development of solidarity economy through themes that rise from solidarity economy practice. Chapter four briefly addresses main reactions from governments towards solidarity economy and chapter five offers an agenda for networking and advocacy for solidarity economy. In addition, this publication presents solidarities, service-delivery NGOs, alternative networks, service-delivery NGOs, alternative movements that have taken steps to acknowledge these new economies.

The report offers viewpoints about solidarity economy and its potential for a change towards development thinking that aims at global justice in economic, environmental and social spheres. Chapter two introduces the concepts of social and solidarity economy. Chapter three describes the idea of comprehensive development of solidarity economy through themes that rise from solidarity economy practice. Chapter four briefly addresses main reactions from governments towards solidarity economy and chapter five offers an agenda for networking and advocacy for solidarity economy. In addition, this publication presents solidarities, service-delivery NGOs, alternative networks, service-delivery NGOs, alternative movements that have taken steps to acknowledge these new economies.

One of the core goals of solidarity economy is to build a democratised economy based on ethical values that determine the activities and decisions made. Democratic processes happen through active citizenship that reaches all spheres of life. Decentralisation and local development empower citizens to acknowledge the initiatives of its economic approach that combines economic, social, environmental and emancipatory goals.

Solidarity economy puts the well-being of people, communities, environments before profits and capital. It does not believe in the trickle-down effect of wealth but works to activate and redistribute assets to serve the essential needs of people. Economic relations in solidarity economy are also characterised by reinvestment and distribution of wealth and spaces in the global sphere instead of private capital accumulation.

The power of solidarity economy originates from the grassroots activity that has grown into a global movement. Solidarity economy appears in practice as a production of goods and services by many different types of organisations and enterprises that follow certain ethical values, such as cooperation, solidarity and democratic self-management. Solidarity economy initiatives take multiple forms as cooperatives, mutual and insurance associations, foundations, service-delivery NGOs, alternative finance groups, self-help groups, community-based organisations and so forth. However, solidarity economy does not solely comprise of organisations and enterprises; it also includes different social movements that aim at transforming the economy.

The activities have faced expanding in the 2000s in the form of revival of cooperatives, growth of alternative financial services and fair trade and food networks as well as the collective organisation of inform workers.

The variety of actors in solidarity economy reflects another core principle of solidarity economy, the approach values diversity as there is no one-size-fits-all solution for economic, environmental and social problems. In practice, solidarity economy reflects the resilience of diverse practices. The practical activities and decision-making are affected by variation in material and political contexts but also the different types of institutional settings depending on the country. The building blocks of solidarity economy is also inspired by traditional practices and indigenous knowledge of local areas.

In this report, solidarity economy is defined as SSE, solidarity economy puts the well-being of people, communities, environments before profits and capital. It does not believe in the trickle-down effect of wealth but works to activate and redistribute assets to serve the essential needs of people. Economic relations in solidarity economy are also characterised by reinvestment and distribution of wealth and spaces in the global sphere instead of private capital accumulation.

The power of solidarity economy originates from the grassroots activity that has grown into a global movement. Solidarity economy appears in practice as a production of goods and services by many different types of organisations and enterprises that follow certain ethical values, such as cooperation, solidarity and democratic self-management. Solidarity economy initiatives take multiple forms as cooperatives, mutual and insurance associations, foundations, service-delivery NGOs, alternative finance groups, self-help groups, community-based organisations and so forth. However, solidarity economy does not solely comprise of organisations and enterprises; it also includes different social movements that aim at transforming the economy.

The activities have faced expanding in the 2000s in the form of revival of cooperatives, growth of alternative financial services and fair trade and food networks as well as the collective organisation of inform workers. The variety of actors in solidarity economy reflects another core principle of solidarity economy, the approach values diversity as there is no one-size-fits-all solution for economic, environmental and social problems. In practice, solidarity economy reflects the resilience of diverse practices. The practical activities and decision-making are affected by variation in material and political contexts but also the different types of institutional settings depending on the country. The building blocks of solidarity economy is also inspired by traditional practices and indigenous knowledge of local areas.
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Country case 1. Solidarity economy in Brazil

**Social economy in Rojava**

IN BRAZIL, there are around 19,500 solidarity economy enterprises that have up to 1,7 million members, which make up less than 1.5 percent of the economically active population. Solidarity economy initiatives can be found in all possible sectors of the economy. There are 790 cooperatives in the country of which 300 are considered to be part of solidarity economy. In Brazil, cooperatives were initially promoted by the military dictatorship that supported the accumulation of land to the big landowners. Therefore, solidarity economy arose after the military regime in the second half of 1980s as an alternative to bring about ideas of self-management, horizontal decision-making and sharing work, ownership and the economic果实.

Several solidarity economy activities in Brazil are diverse and comprise of produce, consumers, organization distribution activities and financing initiatives in both urban and rural areas. One of the big solidarity economy actors is the Landless movement. In agriculture, solidarity economy offers an alternative to the agribusiness model of that directs the production to the international market, uses a lot of machinery, genetically modified seeds, synthetic pesticides and fertilizers. The agribusiness model also requires very little manpower. The alternative, solidarity farming is usually ecological as the farmers do not have access to expensive machines and pesticides.

The solidarity economy movement in Brazil has had an impact on government’s activities on solidarity economy. In 2003, the government confirmed the establishment of a Solidarity Economy Secretariat that was then founded under the Labour and Employment Ministry.

According to researcher Adriana Cruz, who has worked with solidarity economy for 15 years, the movement and the secretariat have similar views and goals and they use solidarity economy as an alternative to the current social and economic development. However, the Brazilian government is ignoring towards its more comprehensive transition potential and regards solidarity economy solely as a public and social policy for diminishing poverty.

Solidarity economy is alleviating unemployment in a collective manner. People can improve their quality of life and increase the sustainability of their actions by coming together to start a collective enterprise. In practice, these practices are aided through university-based solidarity economy incubators that support founding and developing enterprises through social technologies. The incubators help enterprises to find social technologies that facilitate, for example, the commercialization of their products and therefore make it easier for the enterprises to succeed. The social technologies have an important role in the process of making labour force more significant than the capital. Cruz points out that the government should promote more of this type of cooperative projects that help the existing solidarity economy actors. The resources are of better use in support programmes than in the promotion of new solidarity economy actors as it is the best for the initiative to come from the people themselves to make it accessible.

According to Cruz, globalization does not need to be regarded as a negative phenomenon. Rather, he sees internationalisation as a potential, collective effort to find the best ways we can live better on our common planet. Cruz mentions Fair Trade as an interesting and important movement in this sense but points out it needs to change its functioning logic. The expansion of solidarity economy relies much on the production for the conscious consumer in the context of the market. However, the global transportation of goods is not efficient energy-wise. This would require a change in the mentality in the Global North, as the most sustainable way to do direct resources to local production and transport technologies instead of products. Many useful social technologies are already but they are owned by private companies which make it problematic for the poor and marginalised who lack resources.

**Source:** Cruz 2014b & 2014c.

Country case 2. Social economy in Rojava

**Social economy in Rojava**

**Country case 3. Social solidarity economy in Greece**

**Social Economy in Rojava**

Social solidarity economy in Greece is an interesting example and is worth of the attention when talking about the possibility of social and solidarity economy bringing about change. Rojava is the self-administration area of Kurdishism in Syria. The administration was announced outside the Syrian civil war at the end of 2013 and after that there has been an effort to build a new economic system in an area that has been long spoilt by Baath al-Assad’s regime. According to Ahmad Yousef who acts as the Minister of Finance in the Afrin canton in Rojava, the basic value determining economy is that it needs to be addressing people’s needs. Rojava’s local self-administration is being formed with the purpose of filling the void of governance and securing economic freedom. Yousef points out the possibility of starting out with a clean slate is one of their greatest strengths for the social economy in Rojava.

The target of the self-administration is to establish a popular economy. Solidarity and self-management is in high regard, so that the local needs can be best served. Rojava’s social economy is also focusing on aspects of environmental sustainability and equality. In Afrin, the Centre for Economic Development has formulated a new economic model that has proposed the expansion of some environmentally friendly projects. The self-administration has also gained publicity because of their gender equality efforts. In the administration both males and females have been represented in institutions at all levels. Yousef states that 40-45 percent of the representatives are appointed to such positions because it reflects the very society it is in. Attention is also paid to the representation of different ethnicities in the representative bodies which is important considering the multi-ethnic character of the area.

According to Yousef, one of the main challenges of the area is the migration of the educated. There is a lack of especially engineers and social scientists. This reflects the situation of lack of opportunity that has been created under al-Assad’s regime. Yousef also says being driving force to the people as they do not want to see another war and restart the mistakes of the previous regime.

**Source:** Yousef 2014.

**The financial crisis hit Germany in 2009 and the country was paralyzed by the austerity measures implemented by the International Monetary Fund, European Central Bank and the European Union.** As a consequence all the workers lost many rights and cuts to the minimum wage have been imposed. Youth unemployment has been as high as 64 percent and the general unemployment rate stands 27.3 percent. The austerity policy has not treated all different actors equally as big companies, industries and ship owners still remain tax free. Georgia Bekridaki from social solidarity economy network Solidarity 4 All 20 points out that after the austerity measures, workers have had to be even more flexible than before and many public services, for example healthcare, have collapsed. The unemployed people of Greece have also lost their health insurances after losing their jobs meaning even less people have access to healthcare.

The crisis made the search for alternative income generation population possible in Greece. SSE initiatives and cooperatives existed in Greece before the crisis but they were uncommon and mainly involved people who were politically active. Cooperatives were promoted in agriculture in the 1980s by the socialist party PASOK, but they were merely used as tools to access agricultural land that were only given to cooperatives. The cooperative model remained unprofitable for people, and they did not embrace the socio-political values of the concept.

In Greece, social solidarity economy as such is a relatively new phenomenon that rose with the crisis. The movement is using the concept of social solidarity economy as they want to build a large community around both concepts. There are now 700 social solidarity economy initiatives in Greece that are owned by private companies but research exists about the nature of their activities and working logic in order to determine if they can be characterised as social solidarity economy. The history of cooperatives in Greece has also created some difficulties, as cooperatives were not regarded as a progressive idea. However, states Bekridaki, the crisis created a need for people to argue for alternative ways to organise their lives, and the cooperative ideas started to be discussed again.

The SSE activities have been created locally in every neighbourhood by forming self-organised groups to cover basic needs that are not being met anymore because of the austerity policies. Food distribution centres, tea banks, social pharmacies, culture clubs, free evening classes, and other education initiatives are among some of the activities. Many people have wanted to start cooperatives to earn an income. Many people have started cafes, restaurants and bars that are sourcing their materials directly from the producers, as there were already good service cooperatives to take care from. The first process of forming new initiatives has now created new activities, for example, for commercialisation.

Bekridaki regards solidarity economy as a transformative way to organise economy which is not created only for coexisting with the current system. It is bringing a change that puts the values of cooperative, equality and social justice in the centre instead of profit and selfishness. Participation on people on new topics and viewpoints. However, similarly to the situation in Brazil, the Greek governments during the crisis up to this date have seen solidarity economy merely as a tool for combating unemployment. The government has created a legislative framework for social economy enterprises in 2011 but Bekridaki states that government has so far been unable to try to ensure that it is possible to start businesses.

The state is also leading much of the public discourse on social and solidarity economy. Bekridaki sees that the movement needs to take back some of the leadership in the discussion, so that the new ideas are not questioned and adapted to the current unchangeable system. Therefore, she points out that collective economic activities have to be strengthened through political change and active citizenship. More resources are needed for networking and starting initiatives to promote social and solidarity economy. Some of this work is done by networks like Solidarity 4 All. Bekridaki describes Solidarity 4 All as an actor that creates spaces for all the structures to exchanging best practices, ideas and common visions. In addition, Solidarity 4 All is organizing campaigns and trying to get more people involved in the SSE movement.

**Source:** Bekridaki 2014.
3. Development through Social and Solidarity Economy

SOME OF THE IDEAS that have long been present in SSE literature have only recently been framed now as SSE and as a comprehensive economic idea. Solidarity economy is an attempt to affect the mainstream economic discourse and views, but also an action on behalf of the economy in con-

Framing an alternatives to where the discourse of economic scarcity is governing the decision-making (global) agenda, an alternative discourse that offers the possibility for transition through political empowerment and solidarity is the core in the concept of solidarity economy.

SSE is a more general frame for develop-

talism and economy means pursuing order to make the systemic change. Accord-
tion that political empowerment goes hand in
together and this can happen through political sensi-
cies and political empowerment. In sol-

tunity and transparency approaches to be im-
plemented in international processes like the post-2015 development
dehavior to a large extent of the positive impact can be seen as one of the stronger topics across different conti-

theory and practical experiences and informa-

Specialisation and political empowerment. In sol-

3.1 Towards inclusive and democratic local development

GROWING INEQUALITY has been the driving force for many to start solidarity economy initiatives and organisations. Long road for many has been the path of social economy to improve their economic and social conditions. 12 The SSE-oriented actions are active pro-

3.2 Better work

THE CURRENT ECONOMIC and politi-

dynamics of the world are providing better conditions for work and the necessary number of jobs, which has resulted in more and more informal jobs. Recent work has been seen as one of the main challenges and contributors to global economic growth. The informal economy is prone to for-

better understood in the light of conditions and the uncertainties about what will happen. In many cases cooperative organisations have been resisting the pressure for the informal economy to be a part of the post-2015 development agenda. They make decisions in a participatory manner, plan and manage projects, and support services. They can also improve their connections to the local economy, cooperate with other organisations in the sector, and help to strengthen the capacity of the local economy. In this way, they have succeeded in alleviating the negative social impact of harsh economic conditions.

Informal workers have also found the power of collective action in SSE, and they have sought solutions to the differing conditions, status of employment and social and employment protection. Collective organising of informal workers has been on the rise especially in Latin America and Asia. For example, street vendors, waste pickers and domestic workers have formed collective that have enabled them to facil-

3.3 Environmental and food sustainability

SSE ORGANISATIONS are interested in taking responsibility for the commons environmental, economic, social, and cultural aspects. These cooperative actions are not driven by profit maximisation, they are driven by values and commitment to the environ-

mental costs of their activities. They tend to have been thoroughly reflected and explicit environmental goals and hold biodiversity in high regard. Many SSE organisations, like for-

case of a strong local management role in community-based management initiatives, have been part of creating sus-
tainable livelihoods. Power from the upper layers of decision-making has to be shared with people in the local level. Decentralisation and grassroots decision-making are seen as the key to the engagement of the local authorities in the development of participatory local economic development and planning and creating partnerships between local authorities and SSE organisations. SSE organisations, in many cases have started working in universities since the mid-1990s. The role of the interdisci-

political solidarity economy incubators is to assist groups in questions such as technical, organisational, political and financial issues. The incubators also do research on soli-

darity economy and some of them under-

organic and green urbanisation. It has been suggested that there can be a strong correlation between improvements in the environmental quality and the quality of life of the city. One of the main factors that contribute to this correlation is the quality of urban green spaces. Green spaces offer opportunities for physical activity, social interaction, and aesthetic enjoyment. They also help to reduce air pollution and noise levels, and improve the overall quality of life in urban areas.

In conclusion, the concept of solidarity economy is a powerful tool for addressing the challenges of sustainability and enhancing the well-being of people. It encourages the involvement of citizens, promotes the localisation of economic activities, and fosters a culture of cooperation and solidarity. By focusing on the needs and aspirations of individuals and communities, solidarity economy offers a way forward for building a more just and sustainable society.
3.4 Solidarity finance

THE FINANCE WORLD is particularly threatened by neoliberal ideas and models of entrepreneurship. However, solidarity economy is countering this trend of the international financial institutions by avoiding sin- dustry displayed several shortcomings of 61. There are already some states invest- ing in solidarity currency that are already con- solidarity economy. Conventional microcred- its loans do not reflect the values of sol- idarity economy finance should be 5. Governance’s promotion of SSE: Governments should become involved in promotion of SSE 4. Enacting support: Government efforts are re- quired to guarantee a sufficient level of sup- port to SSE actors. The support mechanisms that might offer some guidelines for pre- servative solutions to economic, social and envi- ronmental challenges and impose cross-cut- ting solidarity economy. The ethos of solidarity, equity and democratic governance can have a transformati- ve impact in any situation and not just in times of crisis.60 This should be long-lasting and ongoing, bringing about an alternative to the domi- nation of capital and the market. SSE needs to be in place to address the crisis that come along the neoliberal model. 

Solidarity economy should be seen different from the popularized mi- crofinance. The advantage of conventional microfinance is that the involvement of banks as a part of the microsystem. Excessively small, high interests and burden of the in- dividuals who were not paying back their loans do not reflect the values of sol- idarity economy. Conventional microcredit- it schemes have also not been able to reach the people that are in the biggest need of ac- cess to finance. Microcredit has been pre- sented as a one-size-fits-all tool for dimin- ishing poverty which might have been a harmful assumption as microfinance has also been used, as a substitute for public s- ocial opening.61

3.5 Emancipation

IN MANY PLACES, SSE activities and ideas have been rising from marginalized groups, like the indigenous peoples. Emancipatory goals, like gender and ethnic equality, are intertwined with SSE activities. SSE initiatives have, for example, shown ability to have an input in gender equal- ity.62 When women have a higher access to eco- nomic and socio-political activities and they are frequently in the core of community forest, initiatives and agricultural self-help and women have gained access to economic ability to have input in gender equal- ity.62 Similarly to any other SSE activities, 3.5 Emancipisation 3. Emancipation

3. SSE and relation to governments

AMONG GOVERNMENTS, there have been various reactions to social and solidar- ity economy. On the one hand, governments in developing countries are focusing on creating social and environmen- tal policies. On the other hand, many governments are merely using SSE as a tool for po- licy reform, employment generation or subcontracting public services.63 Also many governments are focusing their econ- omy towards export-oriented activities and extractive industries, and aim at economic growth. These type of activities conflicts with the ideals of SSE and make the govern- ments hostile towards SSE actors who pro- pose alternative and non-capitalist alternatives and embrace the ideology of degrowth.64

The governments in Greece and Brazil (see country cases 1 and 3) have tried to uti- lize SSE as a quick fix for unemployment. In Greece, SSE has also been as an approach that is useful during crisis but the more growth-oriented type of activities conflicts with the ideals of SSE and make the govern- ments hostile towards SSE actors who pro- pose alternative and non-capitalist alternatives and embrace the ideology of degrowth.64

SSE practices have not always reached the recent areas of the population. The role of the initiatives of an SSE organization 6. SSE and relation to governments

TO BRING ABOUT the full potential of solidarity economy, there needs to be ac- tion from within and outside of the system. SSE is already a global movement but alliances can always be strengthened and more networks and cooperation built. Ut- ting and others state that collective action should be prioritized and more networked in order to create enabling policy settings in local, national and international level. Cross-sectorial alliances can play a role in enhancing the solidarity structures in the practice and can provide the necessary knowl- edge for the future of solidarity economy. For example, the human rights based approach is not endorsed. In both countries, SSE is already a solidarity economy network in Finland and 4. SSE and relation to governments

5 SSE and trendy themes and setting

5. SSE and trendy themes and setting

There are already some SSE networks and collec- tives in and across different countries and continents, for example the European Uni- onal Network for the Promotion of Social Solidarity Economy (RIPESE), the Asian Solidi- darity Economy Coalition (ASICEC), and the U.S. Solidarity Economy Network. There is also a solidarity economy network in Brazil with whom’s mission is to network actors of solidarity economy in Brazil.65 There are also many states invest- ing in solidarity of SSE and to enable SSE entrepreneurship to everyone through recognition and public policy implementation.66 The group will also make concrete suggestions to national and international bodies in regard to SSE.67
SOLIDARITY ECONOMY is working in the grassroots and spreading wider. Some governments have embraced solidarity economy and are using it as a tool to combat unemployment. The need for permanent and sustainable solutions has directed the grassroots level and spreading wider. NGOs, federations, associations, civil society and governments on national, international and local levels have a role in the process of gaining more voice and influence. In the networking process solidarity economy is not co-opted and can have an important role to play in this development in promoting SSE on the international level.
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