Abstract:

Pakistan has been a victim of leadership crisis throughout its history of seven decades. This crisis owes its origin and development mainly to over development of non-representative institutions of civil and military bureaucracy and recurrent experience of military authoritarian regimes. In such a restrictive political atmosphere there rose to the political scene a leader who had will, guts and popular acclaim to challenge Ayub Khan when Ayub’s grip on power was yet firm. This leader was Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who established his political party—Pakistan People’s Party—and developed it into a mass movement during the anti-Ayub campaign which culminated into the downfall of Ayub and his resignation from power in 1969. Bhutto gave his nascent party new heights and was able to successfully contest elections of 1970 with securing 81 National Assembly seats but all from the West Pakistan. The party that won 1970 elections was the Pakistan Awami League which got overall simple majority but almost all seats from East Pakistan (160 out of 162). However, the crisis of transfer of power deepened when Yahya Khan showed unwillingness to transfer power and the political movement in East Pakistan developed into a separatist movement culminating into secession of East Pakistan in December 1971. The Pakistan People’s Party, in comparison to Awami League, was a new entrant but its meteoric rise was, in fact, due to the charisma of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who galvanized the party and achieved stunning success. However, Bhutto’s downfall was also as meteoric as was his rise. There were many factors but his political behaviour—the way he exercised power—contributed enormously in his downfall. This article outlines, first, his formative influences and the process through which he assumed leadership role and was able to leave an indelible imprint on the history of country. Second, while in power he carried out reforms not only those he had pledged in his election manifesto but more: in this way he resorted to broaden his powerbase in transactional and transformational leadership paradigm. Third, having entrenched himself in the power spectrum of Pakistan he started behaving like a typical Sindhi wadera. He resorted to exercising power in a very arbitrary manner and this political behavior, the details of which ensue in this paper, explains his downfall and ouster from power.

Formative Influences:

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto’s downfall was as meteoric as was his rise to power. He stemmed from feudalistic social structure and imbibed feudal idiosyncratic
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personality traits into the marrow of his bones. This was due to his family background and the environment in which he spent his childhood. Although he spent greater part of his formative period of life in the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Karachi, Bombay, California and London yet he could not get rid of some socio-regional traits of politics-“stiasat”. Interplay between democratic politics and authoritarian states has always played its part in confusing both and swinging of the power pendulum from one end to the other and settling always in favour of the latter. The time a political leader tries to personalize the state, the society slips into the ditch of fragmentation and chaos; it becomes antithesis of the democratic spirit. Thus democracy and authoritarianism have been working as reflective of ongoing struggle between dominance and resistance in the case of Pakistan. The cultural roots, traits of his personality and his political behavior are essential indicators for the assessment of his downfall.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was born on 5th January, 1928. He was the son of Shah Nawaz’s second wife, a beautiful young Hindu dancing girl, with whom he had fallen in love. Her name was Lakhbi Bai which was later changed to Khurshid Bibi when she was converted to Islam. Bhutto was deeply attached to his mother who came from a humble background and was not accepted and well-accommodated in the Bhutto family. In the feudal household of Bhuttos, she would not only be treated with condescension but was psychologically persecuted by members of the Bhutto clan because she was not lady of Sindhi ‘ashrafiah’. Since Shah Nawaz, father of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, was acutely aware and conscious that he himself could not get proper formal education, he tried to arrange for the best possible education for his son Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. He was enrolled in Bombay’s Cathedral High School in 1937 at the age of nine. He got higher education from the universities of Berkley, California and Oxford University in London.

Pakistani landlords are famous about their particular political culture. Before and during seventies, many of Pakistani politicians were zamindars (landlords) who were known as wadersas in Sindh. They generally imbibed “traditional lifestyles, including their ways of dealing with adversaries and unyielding subordinates” into their personalities and carried them to their political offices. Since they dominated the legislatures and major political parties of country, their political culture was followed by those who were not land owners. With reference to Bhutto, Anwar H. Syed writes, Bhutto grew up in a feudal social and political environment. His father, Sir Shahnawaz, was a “feudal baron” who accepted the values of his class. Politicians, all of them wadersas, frequented the Bhutto home and Zulfiqar Ali heard and watched them talk and play politics in his father’s drawing room. In these formative years he developed an attachment to the land and understood its traditions. What these traditions, referred to by Syed, were Bhutto himself left a brief statement on this subject in his speech in the National Assembly of Pakistan on July 10, 1962, in which he stated, we suffered and continue to suffer from petty mindedness of feudal rivalry in our province. I too am a part of that society. Perhaps one reason why I am here today as a minister is that I belong to this privileged class…But, Sir, in spite of the advantages that some of us have derived from the system, in spite of the fact that some of us would fight to see it remain, it has many inherent drawbacks. It leads to petty intrigues, it leads to victimization of the people, it leads to callousness towards poverty, and it leads
to lethargy. So when feudal rivals clashed with each other the people remained exactly where they were. There was no development; no factories, no roads, no communication; absolute darkness and miserable poverty prevailed. Only the great ones, the chosen few, prospered.\(^8\)

The essential attributes of feudal (landlord) Sindhi political culture that Zulfikar Ali Bhutto mentioned here are: Intrigue and infighting, oppression of the common people, lack of work ethics, carelessness towards the poor, indifference to improvement and social and economic ineptness. Landlords are conscious of the hierarchical order among themselves as well as in their relation to other classes and groups. They will either be dominant or acquiescent depending on the landlord or person they are dealing with. They expect subservience from small landowners, tenants, labourers and artisans. They make factions and like to play factional politics.\(^9\) Faction leaders draw support from their kinsmen and economic dependents and make alliances with other factions. Jobs and economic benefits are used as leverage to get support from small farmers. But if these do not work, the landlords resort to the use of force as well. Resort to force and violence in the pursuit of power is a part of landlord’s tradition.

For a further description of the behaviour of landlords, M. Masud’s\(^10\) minute of dissent in the Hari Committee Report of 1948, contains the following picture. He has…to maintain his prestige among his retinue and the *haris* who would lose faith in him if they were to know that he was weaker than his rivals. He must, therefore, keep a reputation for *zulm* [cruelty] and *zabardasti* [highhandedness] by spreading awe all around….When a show of power is to be made he sends out a few of his thieves to steal cattle of the rival party… or to fire gun shots to terrify them.\(^11\) Masud observes that working for living is contemptuous for landlord because he has been living a life of leisure for generations. The typical Sindhi landlord has many servants, fine horses and a large collection of weapons. He is fond of pomp and show and keeps expensive cars, goes after women and drinks excessively. He replenishes his dwindling purse by swindling his *haris*. He bribes civil and police officials who reciprocate by overlooking his atrocities.\(^12\)

Bhutto claimed to have got inspiration from Karl Marx and Napoleon. His father, Shah Nawaz, sent a set of biographical books on Napoleon Bonaparte\(^13\) and *The Communist Manifesto* of Karl Marx to him when he was a student.\(^14\) He claimed to be inspired by Jawaharlal Nehru as well. Bhutto perceived Nehru as a man of “mass of contradictions.” He was well-read in history, a patron of the arts and a peerless among Indian intellectuals. Nehru was a liberal by background and education. He was emotionally a socialist and despised bourgeoisie values yet he let capitalism flourish along with public sector in Indian economy. Bhutto wrote that foreign policy was Nehru’s forte and he excelled it “to the point of dangerous perfection.”\(^15\) Zulfikar Ali Bhutto exercised power, at the pinnacle of political system, in the same manner a Sindhi landlord does in his orbit of influence. The party stalwarts who had worked in close liaison with Bhutto and worked day and night to establish and promote Pakistan People’s Party were purged out of it. They were purged even if Bhutto got an iota of suspicion that they were getting disloyal to him or were asserting their independence.
Political Behaviour of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and Exercise of Power: The way Bhutto was brought up and his formative influences had a profound impact on his political behavior. His elite education worked as a leverage to bring him up to the higher rungs of societal and power ladder. His mercurial temperament, strange and odd sudden shifts in his mood and his suspiciousness toward people even close friends and colleagues may be traced back to the inherent incompatibilities of the natures of his over confident father and insecure mother. Along with snobbery and pride which the resistant behaviors include in its fold, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, in his childhood years, experienced through “the primordial link with his mother, the pain, oppression and sense of miseries of the down-trodden”. So it was a unique blend of conflicting and polar qualities: on the one hand he deeply felt with humble heart what was the miserable condition of the poor but on the other hand he had got authoritarian traits entrenched in his person. For example, once with entourage on his way back to Rawalpindi after offering Fatiha at the death of President Fazal Elahi Chaudhary’s father, Bhutto, on seeing workers busy in repairing G T Road under the scorching heat of sun, started literally weeping.

On the other hand, J. A. Rahim—one of the founding fathers of Pakistan Peoples’ Party and its Foundation Documents—was physically assaulted by the Federal Security Force on the orders of Bhutto. Mr. Saeed Khan, Director General of FSF, with his contingent reached at the residence of J. A. Rahim, got him with strong hands, fetched him to Bhutto and J. A. Rahim was forcibly sent out of the country. This was a revenge of Bhutto against Rahim because the previous night Rahim had raised objection to Bhutto for getting very late in a scheduled meeting. Bhutto not only assaulted him but forcibly sent him out of Pakistan although he had been his close fellow and party intellectual.

Bhutto almost started weeding out most of the “radical members of the party” and initiated out to “mend fences with landlords” whom he had strongly denounced in public rallies before his coming to power. Meanwhile, those who had seen in Bhutto a harbinger for some positive change in Pakistan’s governance apparatus became dejected with their expectations. Resultantly many of them deserted Pakistan Peoples’ Party only due to Bhutto’s personalization of party and party politics. For instance, Ahmad Raza Kasuri, a young radical idealist lawyer, who claimed to have devoted himself to the PPP, decided to opt out of it and turned out to be one of Bhutto’s hated opponents. In almost the same manner Law Minister Mian Mahmud Ali Kasuri left the Pakistan People’s Party and joined the opposition. Bhutto used FSF for murdering Mian Mahmud Ali Kasuri because he had delivered a fierce speech in Assembly against the political victimization by Bhutto. Sir Morrice James, a British High Commissioner to Pakistan, wrote very early about Zulfikar Ali Bhutto—Bhutto at that time was Foreign Minister in the cabinet of President Ayub—with an eye for future, Bhutto as an adult had in him a tendency to harbor resentments, a temperamental leaning towards excess, and a streak of cruelty.

I believe that at heart he lacked a sense of dignity and value of other people… I sensed in him ruthlessness and a capacity for ill-doing which went beyond what is natural… Despite his gifts I judged that one day Bhutto would destroy himself…. In 1965, I so reported in one of my last dispatches from Pakistan as British High Commissioner. I wrote by way of clinching the point that Bhutto was born to be
hanged. These were the observations of a foreigner who was, in fact, alarmed by the manner Bhutto use to behave arbitrarily. Since James was the British who had a long tradition of exercising power in a state of laws, the arbitrariness of Bhutto was most likely to have got his keen attention. Another personality trait which Bhutto had developed was his love for sycophancy; he used this to climb up on the power ladder. After completion of education his first leadership assignment was to Geneva in “March 1958 to chair the Pakistan delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea”. It was from Geneva that Bhutto wrote to Iskander Mirza “when the history of our country is written by objective historians, your name will be placed even before than Mr. Jinnah. Sir I say this because I mean it, and not because you are the President of my Country” The latter sentence sounds as if Bhutto himself was not convinced about what he was uttering for President Mirza. Bhutto bestowed praise upon President Ayub Khan comparing him with Abraham Lincoln, Kamal Ataturk and Saladin. These instances indicate that he was adroit at sycophancy for getting benefits but his ambitiousness grew consistently as he got chances to get in the power circles.

Bhutto worked under Ayub Kahn as Commerce Minister and Minister for Fuel, Power and Natural Resources. He got his cherished ambition to become Foreign Minister translated into reality on the death of Muhammad Ali Bogra in 1963. In his new position, Bhutto enjoyed immense prestige and power. Bhutto’s contribution in the re-orientation of Pakistan’s Foreign policy has been immense.

He searched for new avenues of diplomatic ties and did much to liberate Pakistan out of Western Block. During this period he got much of the public acclaim especially as a result of a speech in the United Nations’ General Assembly. However, soon after the war of 1965 and signing of the Tashkent agreement, Bhutto fell away with Ayub government, leveled allegations of failure of Tashkent agreement, and termed it “betrayal by the President”. On 16 June, 1966, he resigned from Ayub cabinet. He journeyed by train from Rawalpindi to Lahore on 22nd June and at the Lahore Railway Station he was given historical welcome by the people of Lahore and he was tumultuously received. So soon after getting the true estimation of people’s resentment which was conversely his support against Ayub regime Bhutto challenged Ayub Khan.

Pakistan Peoples’ Party was founded on 1st December, 1967 at Dr. Mubashir Hasan’s residence in Lahore with its catchy slogan “Islam is our faith, Democracy (Jamhuriat) is our Polity, Socialism (Musawat) is our Economy, All Power to the People”. By the early months of 1969, the opposition against the military regime had gathered paramount momentum. Sensing the situation, Ayub summoned leaders of the opposition and tried his best to reach an agreement but Bhutto—who by now had emerged as a popular figure—refused to cooperate. He knew that “centralization, authoritarianism and corruption produced a crisis of legitimacy for the regime.” Bhutto remained adamant on Ayub’s resignation which was finally tendered on 25th March, 1969 and General Yahya took up reigns of country. An important development the credit for which goes to Yahya was that he held fair elections in December 1970. Resultantly, Pakistan Peoples’ Party won majority in West Pakistan while the Awami League won almost all of seats in East Pakistan. Both parties succeeded in winning majorities but in their respective provinces: it is indicative of the fact that polity was acutely divided on provincial trajectories.
Despite having been on the helms of affair for more than a decade, however, the military regime could not develop a mechanism of succession through which the transfer of power had to be carried out. Consequently, gamesmanship and intrigue started with long delay in resumption of constituent assembly’s work. It seemed as if Military did not want to transfer power to the Awami League and that a deal was being finalized between generals and Bhutto. In the wake of such suspicious circumstances a full-fledged civil war broke out in East Pakistan: the Pakistan army had attacked Dhaka with full strength. This civil war ended in December 1971 in the secession of East Pakistan which emerged as independent country—Bangladesh. Bhutto was sworn in as President and Chief Martial Law Administrator of what was left of Pakistan. The Bhutto era lasted for five and a half years during which the economy was restructured, the public sector was given a great deal of prominence and consensus was developed on the Constitution of 1973.

On the one hand, Bhutto repeatedly pledged to deliver to the people of Pakistan; the manifesto of the Party also contained “All Power to the People”. On the other hand, the manner in which he exercised power was authoritarian and autocratic. He created a Federal Security Force “answerable to him alone” and used it to “terrorize his political opponents even for petty affronts”. This was an elite force equipped with highly sophisticated weaponry imported from China. They would provide security to Zulfikar Ali Bhutto wherever he would go and gone were the days when Bhutto used to mingle with general public and the workers of his party. Though people still had a veneer of belief in their leader-Bhutto but the rapport they had developed with him became increasingly the victim of hostile security and it seemed withered away especially in the last days of his rule- the time Pakistan Peoples Party started campaign for the next general elections.

Because of some of his self-aggrandizing tendencies, Bhutto persistently weakened the power pockets in polity. The former streak in him manifested itself in the form of not only the pompous style of the Premiership under him but also the lavish expenditure on his party from the public exchequer. As a pre-election propaganda, thousands of little red cover books “modeled on the little red-books of Chairman Mao’s wisdom” and titled Bhutto Says: A Pocket Book of Thoughtful Quotations from Selected Speeches and Writings of Chairman Zulfikar Ali Bhutto were distributed widely in Karachi, Lahore and Rawalpindi. Pertaining to undermining of the institutions—civil services, economy, Constitution of 1973, Federalism—he adopted “Fabian approach” and it was due to this strategy that he is regarded by some scholars as Fabian Socialist. After coming into power Bhutto rinsed Army top brass thoroughly. In a campaign of cleansing Army, he dismissed 43 senior army officers who were thought to have remained close with Yahya Khan. The removal of Lt. General Gul Hasan Khan, Chief of Army Staff, and Air Martial Rahim Khan, Chief of Air Staff epitomized “the most dramatic assertion of civilian supremacy over the military.” The constitution of 1973 contained clauses which provided safeguard to the civilian authority. A number of clauses discouraged the intervention of army or subversion of constitution. Apart from these measures, “Bhutto undertook the task of re-structuring of the military high command in order to reduce its long term influence.” By doing this, not only
military powers were dispersed but also the tenure of the Army Chief was cut down to three years.

Civil and military bureaucracy who had been major beneficiary of power and privileges since independence became disenchanted with Bhutto. Before him, every government had to rely on military in case of any grave emergency or insurgency in the country; this practice had awarded undue importance to security agencies such as army and police. Sensing that importance getting out of hands, creation of FSF was severely resented by the state security agencies. FSF was to be used to cow down any insurgency or chaotic situation. This force, however, was time and again misused either for persecution of opponents as a “fascist organization” or to instill fear in the common people. This way he cut across the popular support by which he had come to power. Though rhetorically democratic, Bhutto, in fact, had established a state structure which was highly personalized and centralized: it was due to these factors that by the end of his tenure, Baluchistan and NWFP were seething with discontent and the resultant insurgent forces had to be suppressed forcibly by the state apparatus. This sort of suppression is always counter-productive. In July 1977, when the military overthrew the Bhutto regime, “one of its first acts was to disband the FSF.”

Bhutto established a personalized chain of command in civil bureaucracy through appointment of politically loyal individuals in key positions in addition to “purge of 1300 officers on charges of misuse of power.” More critical affront was induction of ‘lateral entrants’ who were either party favorites or selected by dint of considerations other than their competency. Military was already demoralized because of its crushing defeat in civil war in East Pakistan backed by step-in of Indian forces and it was due only to weakening of military in the polity of Pakistan that transfer of power to Bhutto was carried out. However, Bhutto use to ill-treat army generals though he did much for military as institution- he equipped it, nonetheless, with latest weaponry and laid the foundation of nuclear program owing to which our military boasts of being invincible.

Power was transferred by Yahya to Bhutto on 20 December 1971. Between 23 December and 30 December 1971, the chairman of the National Press Trust, the senior editor of the Pakistan Times, the Chairman of PIDC and the managing directors of Progressive Papers and the National Shipping Group were dismissed under Martial Law Regulations (MLR). MLR-114 Removal from Service Regulation was soon unleashed on thousands of civil servants. Adding further, MLR-114 did not allow the accused the right of defence, something that Ayub and Yahya had conceded. Vaqar Ahmad, the Cabinet and Establishment Secretary, testified in November 1977 that when he advised in favour of a show cause notice for those about to be dismissed Bhutto informed him “that he did not believe in the Anglo-Saxon sense of justice and his Revolutionary Government would not accept any such suggestions.” Bhutto moved against the princes also. Though the motive could be the socialist tendencies of his regime but his move was calculated particularly against, his recent adversary, Ayub Khan who had married his daughter to the son of Wali of Swat. Therefore, using his almost dictatorial powers as president, he abolished the titles, rights, and privileges of the princes through the Abolition of Privy Purses and Privileges Order, 1972. Shortly afterwards, most of the princes were granted what was now called a ‘maintenance allowance’
which was, in fact, the same amount of money they had received as a privy purse. The small, but in many ways significant, change was that the princes no longer had ‘right’ to privy purse, but were granted ‘allowance’ which signified the generosity of the government. As far as center-province relations were concerned, Bhutto used strong-arm tactics towards the non-PPP regimes in provinces of Baluchistan and NWFP (North Western Frontier Province and currently Khyber Pakhtunkhwa). By doing this, he stifled the democratic system and established his authoritarian regime. In a move in 1973, he overthrew governments in Baluchistan and NWFP “charging them with anti-state activities in collusion with Kabul and Delhi.” This was an utter disregard for the autonomy provisions in the constitution of 1973. Moreover, Bhutto got the constitution of 1973 constantly amended by parliament to amass extraordinary powers. His decision to try Wali Khan, the leader of National Awami Party which was coalition partner in Baluchistan and NWFP, was an uncanny replay of Ayub’s Agartala case against Mujibur Rahman and the Awami League.

On the economic front Bhutto is mistakenly believed to have done major damage. But if we take holistic view of his policies in the perspective of prevailing contemporary circumstances, he is absolved of many allegations. To evaluate economic reforms instituted during Bhutto’s time, two important factors must be born in mind: the reactionary and populist nature of his regime and the global tendency towards increased economic nationalization. In the backdrop of deepening regional and class contradictions created during the military regime, he wanted to make economic system more equitable: and he had had mandate for that kind of restructuring and by doing so “Bhutto fulfilled his election manifesto”. Notwithstanding all this, there is no denying the fact the implementation of such policies opened Pandora box of massive corruption, nepotism and favoritism. In addition to the burdens imposed by the public sector enterprises and mismanagement of economy, the growth in non-developmental expenditure, especially defense, was substantial. In 1971, Pakistan had been dismembered through Indian military intervention. To “prevent recurrence of such an happening” Bhutto launched most ambitious project of developing deterrence in the form of nuclear bomb which ate up mammoth proportion of revenue.

The elections of 1977 held under Bhutto regime were alleged by the opposition alliance, Pakistan National Alliance (PNA), to have been rigged and PNA kicked off swear campaign against the government. Ironically, circumstances worsened with passing days. Pakistan National Alliance managed to amass much public support who wanted to get rid of government and it pledged to bring back true democracy and implement Nizam-i-Mustafa. Resultantly, some politicians (Air Martial Asghar Khan being one of them and whose name had repeatedly been mentioned by Zia-ul Haq as well) pleaded their case with the military top brass. According to an opinion by a perceptive scholar, the PNA was also backed by armed forces for “tactical reasons” and that Zia taking advantage of the turmoil in Pakistan was “successful in preventing the opposition from concluding a deal with Bhutto”. Zia used the opportunity to intervene and Military coup was carried out; Army Chief Zia-ul Haq became chief Martial Law Administrator and thus Pakistan had to bear longest span of military rule.

**Conclusion:**
Though Bhutto had had deep understanding of the political problems in Pakistan and had an eye for detail which was, undoubtedly, an unusual in the case of Pakistani political leadership. He was famous for writing detailed notes on the files and documents put in front of him during his premiership. He also galvanized the nation and unleashed a wave of political consciousness in the people. The Constitution of Pakistan 1973, the Port Qasim Industrial Estate, the Pakistan Steel Mills, Fertilizer Plants, the Karakoram Highway, Sports Complex of Islamabad, Taxila Heavy Mechanical Complex and the Kamra Aeronautical Complex are but few examples of his lasting legacies. Yet, he fell victim to what he did in the negative direction and the same politically conscious people turned against him when they became disappointed by their leader and the way he exercised power. It was due to this reason that considerable majority of the people of Pakistan did not come out in the streets to save their ‘savior’ at the time he was hanged. More dangerously, due to his political suppression and victimization, he alienated himself from political forces that could have supported him in times of trial. Bhutto, in his discourse as well as his covenant with the people, stood up with the civil rights and democratic freedom. In practice, however, his regime insulted, humiliated, assaulted, imprisoned and harassed many critics and political opponents. He was the chief inspiration of the people to abide by law of the land because he had crafted first democratically endorsed federal parliamentary constitution of Pakistan. Regrettably, his agents used lawless force against his personal and political adversaries. Even old friends, party workers and comrades were not spared. For instance, Mukhtar Rana died under severe torture while Meraj Muhammad Khan languished in jail. Personnel of FSF broke into house of J. A. Rahim and assaulted him badly.

The yawning gap between what he professed and practiced alienated his supporters. The political behaviour of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto converted his supporters into adversaries and adversaries into enemies. People were flabbergasted that how a well-read, highly educated, trained in most distinguished western universities and apparently urbane and civilized man could unleash massive naked force and arbitrariness? Admitted, college educations in arts and sciences makes a person improve his capacity to understand, interconnect and interpret but it need not teach him democratic political behaviour. Attitudes and values are learnt at home, in family and among friends. The social environment in which Bhutto was brought up taught him feudal ethos. He understood democracy but it could become part and habit of his mind. There were many factors responsible for his downfall but the most important was his authoritarian style of doing siyasat in style of a Sindhi wadera. The bottom line of argument is, in the words of Anwar H. Syed, that Pakistan is not a traditional or a modern but a transitional society, and Bhutto was a transitional leader.
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