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Introduction

If cinema is to take its place beside the others as a full-fledged art form, it must cease merely to record realities that owe nothing of their actual existence to the film instrument. Instead, it must create a total experience so much out of the very nature of the instrument as to be inseparable from its means. It must relinquish the narrative disciplines it has borrowed from literature and its timid imitation of the casual logic of narrative plots, a form which flowered as a celebration of the earth-bound, step-by-step concept of time, space and relationship…(Deren 167)

In dance for camera, choreography is intentionally transformed by film and/or video technology, giving way to a hybrid form with unique possibilities for expression. Through the manipulation of space, time and relationships on screen, the scope and nature of dance, choreography and embodiment is expanded. As a dancer and choreographer, I have often questioned how my somatic training informs my approach to directing, editing and viewing videodance and cinédance. In stage-work, I focus on the body itself as a site of knowledge, memory and research from which perception and communication emerge; when dance lives on screen, the embodied exchange between performer and audience is mediated and redefined by technology—but remains a phenomenological affair. Phenomenology emphasizes that intellectual and conceptual interpretation is rooted in lived, sensory experience. Similarly, the process of producing and viewing dance for camera relies on continual reference to embodied knowledge. Far from being a Cartesian process, the creation of screen dance is rooted in corporeal understandings of space, time and relationships.

This essay will examine the ways in which meaning is constructed in dance for camera, during the choreographic, shooting, post-production, and distribution phases. Drawing on
Marshall McLuhan’s infamous phrase: “The medium is the message,” it will offer examples of how specific techniques and characteristics of the form facilitate communication (xi). Further, it will query how technology functions as an extension of the human body, growing from and reaching beyond phenomenological perception.

**Stage One: Pre-Production - Choreography for the Screen**

Videodance is a site-specific practice, its site being video itself.
(Rosenberg 275)

Choreography for the screen, as opposed to the stage, calls for a re-envisioning of bodies in space and time; it challenges corporeal limits, expanding the possibilities of what constitutes dance, where it may take place, and how it will be shared. Through shot composition, choreographers and directors collaborate to direct attention to specific body parts, actions and inanimate elements that contextualize movement and communicate meaning. In his article “Video Space: A Site for Choreography”, Douglas Rosenberg proposes that the camera itself is the site in which the creation and perception of dance occurs: this site provides context; mediates the viewer’s experience; allows for shifting points of view (both literally and metaphorically); and offers an intimate investigation of movement (277). When filming, he observes that the director is “…creating an architecturally and/or geographically specific site that contextualizes the choreographer’s vision in a way not possible in the theater” (275). Significantly, author Colin Nears describes how “the dancing area of the camera is a triangle in depth, from the lens to the background, narrow at the front, wide to the rear” (43). With video, choreographers can capture performances in vast landscapes and multiple locales; play with depth of field; and explore isolated framing and magnification of movement not visible on stage.
An exemplary piece of site-specific choreography for the screen is director Pascal Magnin’s *Reines D’un Jour* (1996). Throughout the film, the camera reveals dance in each nuanced moment; choreography comes to encompass the shape-shifting sky, breeze combing through blades of grass, and a herd of buffalo battling on the hillside. The versatile movement vocabulary was created and performed by Christine King, Marie Nespolo, Veronique Ferrero, Mikel Aristegui, Antonio Bul and Roberto Molo, and incorporates a wealth of partnering that ranges from sharp, aggressive manipulations to melting caresses. Pedestrian actions such as holding hands or slipping a foot into a boot further contribute to the language, as do local forms of folk dance. The originality and success of *Reines d’un jour* rests on its meticulous attention to detail, framed within a larger landscape. Our interpretation of the movement, relationships and narrative of the film is inseparable from its site-specificity, both in relation to the village setting and the camera frame. In this piece, the disciplines of choreography and video are truly interdependent, breeding a new, hybrid medium for expression.

To make use of the possibilities that emerge in dance for camera, a certain amount of planning and/or storyboarding during the pre-production phase is valuable. In the article “Videodance: Technology: Attitude Shift”, Vera Maletic points out that:

> Transitions between shots are significant compositional junctures, and can… create a more gradual and more contrastive bridge from one shot to another within the flow of a particular action or between several sections of a dance. The planning and pre-editing of transitions in videodance is another significant choreographic device which can be used as a part of the choreographic process. (4)

In addition, with proper preparation, this hybrid medium enables the creation of what Rosenberg coins the “impossible body”—one that can defy temporal and spatial restraints. Through a “recorporealization”, or redefining of physical capacities, videodance broadens the scope for
movement generation (277). While temporal/spatial illusions of embodiment are achieved via camera and post-production techniques, they are often pre-conceived by the choreographer and/or director. Prime examples of bending the relationship of bodies to time and space through screen choreography exist in Maya Deren’s film *A Study in Choreography for the Camera* (1945), in which dancer Talley Beatty steps seamlessly between locations, and leaps through the air free of gravity. According to videodance maker Amy Greenfield:

> In *A Study*, each dance motion is designed for a specific location and for one or more specific (though invisible) cinematic manipulations of that motion. The manipulations create an impossible contradiction between what was actually performed and what is perceived on film—without denying the nature of the real motion. The film is constructed (edited) so that a movement continues across a cut smoothly, but the space “jumps” to another location, thereby asserting the “magical” power of motion over discontinuities of space and time. (22)

Through video and film technology, the rules of choreography change, erecting a new logic of embodiment. The performers are not physically present, but are rather represented in the video form, which we come accept as an alternate reality. Deren writes that: “In certain respects, the very absence in motion pictures of the physical presence of the performer, which is so important to the theater, can even contribute to our sense of reality. We can, for example, believe in the existence of a monster if we are not asked to believe that it is present in the room with us” (156). In the same respect, *impossible* bodies and choreographic feats are made tangible via video techniques, which call on the audience’s embodied imagination for belief. This is not to say that videodance can replace live performance—video documentations and translations of choreography often pale in comparison to the live act. Rather, the intersection of embodiment and virtuality in dance for camera spawns a fresh, hybrid language of expression, transforming the nature of dance and choreography.
Stage Two: Production – Dancing with the Camera

During the production phase of videodance, technology unveils a wealth of possibilities for constructing and perceiving bodies in fresh ways. The camera can extend the capacity of the human body and eye—be it that of the spectator, dancer, choreographer, director, or camera operator—capturing movement from distances and points of view that are inaccessible in a theater context. According to Maletic:

The possibility to direct the viewer’s attention to detail and to penetrate into a small, intimate movement of the body creates movement and dance images which are not perceivable in a proscenium stage dance situation. The sensitivity of the choreographer, performers and cameraperson to spaces between body parts or between the dancer and the environment or other dancers, invites a greater kinesthetic participation on the part of the viewers. (4)

Through close ups, we can more readily feel the strength, tension or relaxation of the dancers’ muscles, as well as their breath, sweat and weight; via long shots, movement is contextualized. A key example of this can be found in the film Touched (1994), choreographed by Wendy Houstoun and directed by David Hinton. Set in a pub, this cinédance is composed entirely of close-ups, revealing relationships one fragment at a time by capturing subtle body language and innuendo, both pedestrian and stylized in nature. Alongside the performers, we experience the tingling whisper of breath into an ear; the sensual circling away and towards a partner; and the warmth between lips nearly meeting. At the same time, the use of fore and background in shot composition situates intimate interactions within pub culture. The ambient music and folly also inform our interpretation, with a mix of atmospheric and bodily sounds. Throughout Touched, attention continually shifts from one detail, angle, and image to the next, eliciting sensory responses that compound to produce an overall understanding. Via video techniques we relate kinesthetically to the dancers, participating vicariously in their world. Thanks to the portability
of the camera and lens in *Touched*, our visual and sensory experience is enriched, allowing us to engage with dance in an innovative way.

In “Seeing with the Camera”, Irving Pichel outlines how the camera can imitate human perception, seeing what a person might if s/he was present at the live event, or, conversely, create the illusion that the viewer is traveling through space with the camera (140). As an extension of the spectator’s eye, camera movement and cuts reflect the imaginative action of the eye as it “seeks out of any occurrence or spectacle the most interesting person or action and follows it to the exclusion of other elements presented at the same time” (139). Similarly, the eye of the camera is selective, revealing and excluding chosen action from the frame. For the crew and/or narrator, the camera offers an omniscience and omnipresence, sharing only desired points of view (141). Choices regarding shifting framing and motion reveal a director’s values and style, making the camera an expressive tool (142). These decisions may be guided by narrative or aesthetic factors, and reflect the artists’ personal viewpoints, as well as social and political influences of the time.

Some film critics such as Kenton Harris and David E. W. Fenner have argued that the selective nature of video thwarts the spectators’ freedom to gaze actively on the choreography as they would in a live situation. In the theater, audience members can peer between details and the big picture, or one dancer to another at will; on screen, the camera and crew make choices for the viewer, cutting between angles, distances, locations, and time periods in a non-linear fashion (70). This issue is of particular relevance in the video documentation and translation of stage work for screen, in which the camera is often expected to act in service to the movement, rather than engaging in a collaborative process (Rosenberg 280). In videodance, the choreography should not exist separately from the screen image, as they are interdependent elements of a
hybrid form of expression. The performers, camera operator and equipment move together, as partners in the creative process. While it is true that the spectator’s eye is directed and extended by video technology, there is always room for interpretation within the composition of and transitions between shots—the rules of engagement for the audience are simply redefined by the medium of videodance, as opposed to video or dance alone.

Further, one never has complete control over what is captured on video during a shoot. Director Maya Deren describes framing as the art of the “controlled accident”, in which spontaneous and natural occurrences are balanced with deliberate action (156). When shooting, she explains: “a scene should be planned and framed so as to create a context of limits within which anything that occurs is compatible with the intent of the scene” (156). Through the interplay of rational planning with intuitive observation, a unique reality of dance on screen comes to life.

When directors and choreographers collaborate, the extent to which a process is pre-visualized, versus emergent, is often a point of tension; while film traditionally favors stringent preparation, contemporary dance makers tend to engage in a more emergent, unpredictable journey. Perhaps it is precisely the meeting of conflicting approaches that facilitates an effective balance of control and accidents within the videodance medium.

In addition, while the role of the performer, choreographer and director are readily acknowledged, is important to note that the technology itself—the camera, lights, post-production and editing software—can also be an active participant in the construction of meaning on screen. Deren observes that at times, “the camera itself has been conceived of as the artist, with distorting lenses, multiple superpositions, etc., used to simulate the creative action of the eye, the memory, etc.” (159). The camera may seem invisible to the audience, but Rosenberg
writes that it “can be an intrusive presence, as it not only records but influences the dance and dancers as well” (280). Further, he explains how “the camera tends to exert a sort of authority that shapes the situation it intended to simply reveal or fix and reinforces the hierarchy that early media artists sought to destroy” (280). To this end, an increasing number of creators such as Nam June Paik have acknowledged the presence of the camera and crew in their pieces, making this dialogue a focus for the audience. In aspiring for a collaborative balance between video and dance, the values of each form must be reconsidered, giving way to a hybrid medium with novel possibilities for expression.

Stage Three: Post-Production – Revising Embodiment in Space and Time

The post-production phase of videodance offers another palate from which to paint moving bodies in new light. Through digital editing systems and special effects, the possibilities for manipulating time and space proliferate. Post-production, and specifically editing, can be seen as an extension of the choreographic process, in which movement is sequenced and revised to reveal unexpected relationships between compositional elements. Further, editing, like choreography, is guided by an embodied reading of the movement material. Choices regarding pacing relate to the editor’s personal sense of rhythm as s/he responds to action on screen. Film director Andrei Tarkovsky challenges this view of editing as subjective, asserting that, “Editing brings together shots which are already filled with time, and organizes the unified, living structure inherent in the film; and the time that pulsates through the blood vessels of the film, making it alive, is of varying rhythmic pressure” (114). He continues by stating, “Editing does not engender, or recreate, a new quality; it brings out a quality inherent in the frames that it joins” (119). While I agree with Tarkovsky that attention to the material at hand is essential to
guiding an edit, I do not believe there is only one, essential structure inherent in the footage. To the contrary, each editor will envision the ideal montage in unique ways, based on personal, historical and cultural experiences; editing is by no means an objective unearthing of meaning. As such, the editing process, like that of performance and choreography, is a subjective practice that relies on embodied experience as a guide for right or wrong decisions. Thanks to non-liner, digital editing systems, artists are now able to experiment with numerous sequences before settling on a composition that resonates for them.

Editor Girish Bhargava, who has cut dance for TV, feels that “it is more important to know where to edit than how to edit” (225). He points out, like Tarkovsky, that a dance has its own rhythm, independent of musical scores, from which the pacing of an edit must emerge (226). He recommends making cuts between steps, so that the edits are seamless and invisible, not detracting attention from the dance itself (226). Obviously the desire for invisible edits is not always called for—at times bold cuts can express meaning in their own right, performing alongside the dancers. For example, a series of jump cuts might induce a quickened heart rate, while gradual dissolves elicit a more calm response. The pacing of movement and editing can be understood as a prime conveyor of meaning in Rosas Danst Rosas (1997), a videodance adaptation of a live piece by Belgian choreographer Anne Teresa de Keersmaeker with composer/director Thierry de Mey. This hour-long cinédance opens with an eight-minute scene accompanied by a driving, repetitive musical beat, to which four women in chairs perform a dynamic, percussive phrase of gestures in an erratic, cumulative canon. At times the film cuts explicitly on the beat, enhancing the sharp, precise hits of the instruments and gestures. As the piece builds, the editor jumps from long shots to close-ups, and between several tight frames, often during and between sharp gestures; this allows for seamless relocations in the position,
proximity and angle of the camera’s eye in relation to the dancers. In *Rosas Danst Rosas* the performers, technical crew, camera, and editor work hand in hand, creating an intensity which in turn causes our pulse to quicken. Composing this film required a kinesthetic awareness of the layers of rhythm present in the choreographer’s intention, the dancers’ performances, and the powerful music, all of which were filtered through the editor’s embodied perception of time. As such, the role of the editor in this film was subjective and significant to the construction of meaning.

In an interview, Pam Wise, the editor of the documentary *Dancemaker* about Paul Taylor, emphasizes the responsibility of the editor to not merely reproduce, but rather interpret videodance footage (Binder 199). Editors pick moments, movements and phrases based on guiding patterns they identify in a piece. For Wise, editing dance for camera is akin to storytelling, as she attempts to establish a through-line or logic for the viewer to follow. She raises an important consideration, that the act of editing—like choices regarding camera motion and framing—is inherently selective. Wise writes that: “As an editor, you do part of the viewer’s job for them. They don’t have to work as hard because you are showing them what to look at, and what to look for. So they don’t have to think as much” (200). This may once again raise concerns that editing infringes on the democratic viewing of dance. I will reiterate however, that there is still space for interpretation of dance on camera—just in a different manner—as the form calls on the meeting of the editor and spectator’s subjective perspectives to construct meaning.

Filmmaker Maya Deren suggests that post-production techniques “…affect not the action itself but the method of revealing it”, leading the audience to perceive movement and bodies in new ways. To illustrate, she explains:

…slow-motion can reveal the actual structure of movements or changes which either cannot be slowed down in actuality or whose
nature would be changed by a change in tempo of performance. Applied to the flight of a bird, for example, slow-motion reveals the hitherto unseen sequence of the many separate strains and small movements of which it is compounded. (153)

Thus, editing has the potential to exaggerate aspects of reality to which our senses do not have access. Conversely, post-production techniques can be used to enhance illusions of time-space fragmentation or continuity. For example, a staircase can be made to stretch endlessly to the sky by editing together shots from different angles, each of which appears to be a new part of the same climb (Deren 160). In relation to transforming space on screen, Deren writes:

Separate and distant places not only can be related but can be made continuous by a continuity of identity and of movement, as when a person begins a gesture in one setting, this shot being immediately followed by the hand entering another setting altogether to complete the gesture there. I have used this technique to make a dancer step from woods to apartment in a single stride, and similarly to transport him from location to location so that the word itself became his stage. (164)

Furthermore, the use of special effects in post-production such as superimposition, retrograde, split screen, stop motion, keying and matting, etc., further complicate time and space on screen. In the videodance Boy (1995) by Peter Anderson and Rosemary Lee, a young boy observes multiple incarnations of himself at play in vast sand dunes at the ocean’s edge; as he materializes from the dust and melts away, the lines between reality and imagination are blurred. Norman McLaren takes the multiplication of bodies to a greater extreme in Pas de Deux (1968), in which two dancers replicate over time through layers of color, merging and disengaging with their real and fabricated selves. In Ghostcatching (1999), Bill T. Jones uses motion capture to trace live choreography, which is coupled with recorded atmospheric and bodily sounds to create an uncanny tension between the absence and presence of the dancers. Through postproduction,
each of these films expands choreographic possibilities to include new constructions of embodiment in space and time that are rooted in yet grow beyond human sensorial perception.

With the advent of digital editing systems (as opposed to the linear cutting of film), arose a heightened potential to connect to the lateral, associative process of human perception, as well as the exploratory process in contemporary dance. According to Rosenberg, “Contemporary dance has been greatly influenced by the languages of video, television and the cinema. This is evident in contemporary choreographic practices that mimic the non-linear, deconstructionist tendencies of media and the cinematic jump cut (275). Through video editing, choreography need not be shared on screen in the chronology in which it was conceived or recorded. The sequencing, inter-cutting, tiling and layering of action can be investigated during editing to create a new logic that may diverge from the initial storyboard or plan. By letting go of an overly methodical approach to sharing dance on screen, more potent and touching elements of the movement may emerge. Ethnographic filmmaker Eliot Weinberger points out that: “It is only elaborated metaphor and complex aesthetic structures that are capable of even beginning to represent human nature and events: configurations of pure imagery will always leave technology behind” (52). This statement is pertinent to videodance, in which editors must take liberty to interpret and reconfigure dance on screen, allowing the original choreography to be “sacrificed in favor of a new creature” (Rosenberg 280). This will allow dance for camera as the medium of expression to effectively construct and share meaning on its own terms.

**Stage Four: Distribution – Dancing outside the box**

Throughout the pre-production, production, and postproduction phases, videodance calls on the embodied perception and knowledge of the choreographer, performers, director,
production and postproduction teams. During the distribution of a videodance, yet another layer of corporeal engagement by the audience influences the construction and perception of meaning. Significantly, the viewing of videodance is an inherently mediated experience, guided by factors such as the choices made by the above parties; video technology; the physical method of presentation; and the context in which a piece is shared. Rosenberg notes that while movies are commonly presented in large cinemas, “video dance is generally viewed on television, or in some cases, projected, but remains a relatively intimate experience” (278). Thus, the many sites of a videodance—including the screen space, shooting location, and venue for viewing—compound to shape each viewer’s reading of a work.

Earlier in this paper it was discussed how camera movement, framing, and editing direct the spectator's eye. This has a two-fold effect: on the one hand, it pre-determines the viewer’s range of vision, revealing and concealing points of view based on an underlying value system; on the other hand, camera movement and editing expands the range of the human eye and senses to move beyond corporeal limits. As such, choreography and embodiment are transformed via the medium of video. When audiences encounter new configurations of bodies in space and time, they must reference familiar, identifiable landmarks of corporeality, from which to take an imaginative leap into the logic of a videodance.

Maya Deren wrote a great deal regarding the personal and selective process of perception in film, emphasizing that “…we begin by recognizing a reality, and our attendant knowledges and attitudes are brought into play; only then does the aspect become meaningful in reference to it” (154). She goes on to say that: “As we watch a film, the continuous act of recognition in which we are involved is like a strip of memory unrolling beneath the images of the film itself, to form the invisible underlayer of an implicit double exposure” (155). Thus, the viewer will
evaluate the nature of a movement as normal or illusory based on reference to their own lived experience. Deepening her explanation, Deren writes:

…reality is first filtered by the selectivity of individual interests and modified by prejudicial perception to become experience; as such it is combined with similar, contrasting or modifying experiences, both forgotten and remembered, to become assimilated into a conceptual image; this in turn is subject to the manipulations of the art instrument; and what finally emerges is a plastic image which is a reality in its own right. (153)

Pichel reinforces Deren’s view, describing how direct cuts require a mental piecing-together by the imagination (still rooted in embodied knowledge), while camera movement “relates itself more closely to the spectator’s capacity for physical movement” (145). It is through phenomenological perception—in which the senses encounter and negotiate reality—that audiences come to experience and interpret dance for camera.

In the constructed reality of screen dance, bodies are reconfigured in space and time to achieve impossible feats such as time-travel, flying, shape-shifting, disappearing acts, and more. Rosenberg elaborates on how this new reality constructs transdimensionality, in which viewers engage in the simultaneous perception of two time frames—the point of creation and moment of viewing—as well as two spatial planes—the three-dimensional action within a two-dimensional medium (278). Thus, the reception of a videodance is simultaneously mediated by humans and technology, whilst leaving space for the subjective, embodied process of perception.

Many authors have proposed that the marriage of dance and video leads to greater accessibility for contemporary dance, both literally, thanks to financial and logistical concerns, and metaphorically, by way of its mediated content (Harris 69). On the literal side, televisions, projectors, DVDs and the internet facilitate large-scale sharing of dance at a much lower cost to artists and viewers. While live performances may attract a specific and limited audience due to
ticket prices (which reflect the exuberant costs of performance), as well as venues (that are often located in urban, upper-class neighborhoods), technology can disseminate contemporary dance directly to people’s living rooms around the world, thus diversifying interest in the form; however, there are limitations to this claim in regards to the accessibility of technology itself. Another important and obvious consideration is that video can preserve dance over time—or at least some trace of it. Choreographer Ellen Bromberg writes:

Part of the beauty and poignancy of live dance performance is its ephemeral nature. Inherent in the very instant of a gesture is its loss, as if it embodies our own temporality. Though film or video can never replace the live experience, these media offer us more lasting images, thereby extending those gestures through time. The camera is a tool that magnifies and reveals the human and corporeal. Like the amplification of an acoustic instrument, it makes available certain pitches and timbres that might fall below the level of perception in a theatrical performance of dance. (244)

What Bromberg articulates so elegantly is the way in which dance is intrinsically transformed when wed with video, and, if this process is purposeful, it can harness immense power for expression. By allowing repeated viewings, video invites a different approach to analysis and interpretation of movement, as compared to the one-off experience of live performance. In addition, the mediated nature of viewing dance on film allows choreographers, directors and editors to direct the spectator’s focus to details of movement that are unusual or uncommon points of interest. Nuanced moments can be framed within unexpected settings, or juxtaposed with unanticipated images, triggering alternative associations and understandings; this can be an educational process for newcomers to dance.

Importantly, the construction of meaning in video is a partnership between the artists’ presentation and viewers’ perceptions, and may morph over time in regards to Rosenberg’s concept of transdimensionality (278). Further, filmmaker Tarkovsky points out: “Once in
contact with the individual who sees it, [the film] separates from its author, starts to live its own life, undergoes changes of form and meaning” (118). Significantly, the dance we relate to on screen is a representation of the live act, and is not a viable substitute for performance—rather, it must have its own, autonomous reality. As stressed by Walter Benjamin in his seminal 1936 essay “Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction”: “Even the most perfect reproduction of a work of art is lacking in one element: its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be” (8). As such, videodance artists must not endeavor to simply document dance (although this has practical value in many situations), but rather to erect relationships between time, space and corporeality that are unique to this hybrid form. In reference to Benjamin’s thesis, Rosenberg argues that many artists such as Merce Cunningham and Victoria Marks have overcome issues of reproduction “and re-inscribed the choreographic aura within the site of video dance” (280). When dance and video fuse into a hybrid media, the choreographic, shooting, production and distribution phases compound to construct new embodiments of space and time, that are grounded in, but stretch beyond human sensorial capacities.

Conclusion

Throughout this essay, I have demonstrated how the creation and viewing of dance for camera is an inherently embodied practice; that is, the autonomous realities constructed in this hybrid form rely on reference to phenomenological experience as fodder. During choreography for the screen, the rules of corporeality in relation to space and time are redefined, widening the scope for movement generation. In production, the mobile eye of the camera, along with assisting equipment, directs and extends the eye and body of the spectator, proposing shifting
perspectives. Post-production opens further avenues for generating *impossible* bodies, through manipulations that heighten kinesthetic response. Finally, in the distribution phase, meaning emerges through the intersection of the artist’s creation with a viewer’s perception, fueling the evolving reality of videodance works over time. As stressed by Maya Deren in the opening quote of this paper, cinema, and by extension videodance and cinédance, must resist merely recording or representing reality; rather, they must erect their own vocabulary, techniques, and logic, that sprout fresh possibilities for expression (167). Through the development of dance for camera over time, conceptions of corporeality, space and time will continue to evolve.
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