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This article discusses cross-national perceptions of gender in France, England and the United States through an analysis of the work and public persona of Max O’Rell as an expression of middle-class mainstream thought. Paul Blouët (writing under the pseudonym of Max O’Rell), a prolific writer and prominent media figure in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, considered himself a cultural mediator between his native French society, England, his country of residence and his most important sales market, the United States. Keen to cater to his tri-national audience, his negative stereotyped depiction of the New Woman reflects a pronounced hostility in either society. Similarly, concessions to feminism in his later writings mirror a general shift towards more progressive gender conceptions at the turn of the century.
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1 O’Rell as a Mediator between the ‘Latin’ and the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ Cultures

One of the most eagerly awaited books of the year 1884 on both sides of the Atlantic was John Bull’s Womankind by a certain Max O’Rell, who had caused a stir in the publishing world with his first title John Bull and his Island, a humorous depiction of the manners and morals of the Englishman by a Frenchman. This time he promised to take on Mrs. John Bull, albeit in a friendly manner. Over the next nineteen years, Max O’Rell churned out several other books as well as numerous articles entirely dedicated to the Anglo-Saxon female. He made himself a name as the French ‘connoisseur’ of British and American women, being married to an Englishwoman and having lived in England and extensively travelled the United States and the British settler colonies, but having never given up his ‘Frenchness’. His real name was Paul Blouêt (1847–1903), a native of Normandy who took on the pseudonym of Max O’Rell because at the beginning of his literary career he was still teaching at a prestigious London boy’s college. His books were simultaneously published in Paris, London and New York and he contributed articles to major publications in all three countries, such as Le Figaro,
The Times and the North American Review.\(^1\) As a humorist and lecturer, he was immensely popular between 1884 and 1903, drawing audiences of up to 2000 for his "causeries".\(^2\) Due to his journalistic and anecdotal style, he was dubbed the French Mark Twain. In contrast to his illustrious American colleague, however, he is now completely forgotten. This is not entirely undeserved, because in contrast to Mark Twain, his writings never managed to transcend their creator’s time, class or gender.\(^3\) A review called him “not deep, but witty” (New York Times 17/11/1887: 4), which sums up his literary legacy.

It is not, therefore, because I want to rehabilitate him as a literary author that I am proposing to unearth Max O’Rell from cultural oblivion. Lacking artistic individuality, he can be regarded as the typical educated middle-class male. His writings can be analysed as an expression of bourgeois mainstream thought: widely accepted beliefs are constantly reiterated and references to popular authors and texts are frequent. Because of his conformity, the French author also provides an intriguing insight into the way in which these conventional views evolved over time. O’Rell exploited the prevailing negative stereotype of women’s rights activists as feminist spinsters, but extended it to the newer socio-cultural phenomenon of the New Woman. However, O’Rell’s initial hostility to the New Woman subsequently diminished, and his concessions to feminist ideas toward the end of his life are indicative of the shift in public opinion at the turn of the century.

Max O’Rell’s status as an expatriate and traveller who tries to explain the mores of one world to the other and vice-versa furthermore makes him the ideal prism through which cross-national cultural influences and stereotyping between France, England and the US can be examined. Through his extensive public presence as a successful writer and lecturer, O’Rell acts as a cultural agent, a mediator between the Anglo-American and the French worlds. His strategy is twofold. On the one hand, he emphasizes patriarchal liberalism as the shared ideological foundation of all three societies. On the other hand, he points out differences of manners and morals in a humorous way, mainly by presenting benevolent national stereotypes. In particular, by presenting himself as a ‘Latin’ traditionalist opposed to changes in the distribution of gender roles, O’Rell consciously sought to appeal to a large Anglo-Saxon audience. He thus contributed a French point of view into the Anglo-American discourse on feminism.

---

\(^1\) See Appendix 1 for list of publications Max O’Rell contributed to
\(^2\) See for instance Atlanta Constitution 20/02/1900: 9
\(^3\) See their covering of a similar lecture tour Twain 1897, O’Rell 1894
2 The New Woman: An Anglo-American Import ‘Unnecessary’ in France?

Max O’Rell’s genial tone turned hostile when speaking about the New Woman, which he considered a phenomenon exclusive to England and the United States. Feminist cultural historians such as Diana Holmes and Carrie Tarr have shown that, although the New Woman in France was an import from England or the US, an increasing number of women in France had been refusing the gender coded separation of the domestic and the public sphere and demanding access to the thus far male dominated professional world. Although small in number, they attracted wide attention by challenging the female dress code, appearing in public events and laying claim to a place in exclusively male domains such as journalism and politics during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. A New Woman did not automatically regard herself as a feminist, as some New Women rejected the idea that their private lives should be put in a public or political dimension. Max O’Rell, however, makes no distinction between feminism and the New Woman, and even includes moral purity activists in his categorisation.

From 1894 onwards, the socio-cultural phenomenon of the New Woman quickly became the focus of an intense controversy in the Anglo-American media: as an object of ridicule in satire magazines such as Punch in England or Puck in the United States or as a cultural image which motivated and rallied many women. In 1896, Max O’Rell contentedly remarks that the New Woman is as yet non-existent in France because gender harmony renders feminism unnecessary: “The woman question will only be solved by the partnership in life of man and wife, as it exists in France […] by the equality of the sexes, but each with different, well-defined duties to perform.” (O’Rell 1896: 103) French liberal ideology identified the ‘well-defined duty’ of the woman in her role as housewife and mother, based on the laws of nature which gave the female the capacity of nurture and self-sacrifice, but prevented her from playing a prominent role in the wider society. Curiously, it was in the same prestigious journal in which the British journalist Sarah Grand coined the term ‘New Woman’, the North American Review, that O’Rell announced the New Woman was absent from France. However by mid-1896, the controversy over the New Woman had reached France, fuelled by the publicity for the international feminist congress in Paris in April 1896, and by caricatures in magazines such as Le Grelot and La Plume (Roberts 23). It is true that compared to Anglo-American societies, the public presence of the New Woman in France was initially much smaller and can be seen as a foreign import (Roberts 6; Holmes and Tarr 12). But O’Rell’s complete elimination of French feminism must be regarded as a mixture of journalistic convenience and ignorance of new social developments.
There is no question as to the absurdity of O’Reill’s affirmation of the equality of the French woman: on several fronts, they faced much greater obstacles than their Anglo-American counterparts. However, it is beyond the scope of this paper to compare the situation of women and the development of feminism in these countries. My aim is to demonstrate how Max O’Reill contributed to the contemporary debate over the emancipation of women, playing on national stereotypes of manners and morals, but also emphasizing the common fundamentals in gender relations.

What O’Reill calls “equality” rather points to his observation of a less pronounced separation of male and female spheres in France and a perceived greater partnership in French marriages. For proof, O’Reill cites the greater mixing of genders in France:

Outside of the aristocracy and of the wealthiest classes, we have practically no club life. We prefer the mixed company of men and women. We take our women everywhere. Our cafés, for instance, are not salons forbidden to the respectable people. They are decent, cheerful places where we can sit down with our wives and daughters and enjoy light refreshments in their company.

(1902: 6)

He argues that unmarried young women in America and, to a slightly lesser degree, in England enjoyed a much greater freedom of movement and expression than French girls. A French woman could gain what he called a certain degree of ‘emancipation’ only through marriage. “When a Frenchwoman gets married, her good time begins; when an Englishwoman gets married, her good time is over.” (O’Reill 1884a: 17). According to him, more widely practiced birth control enhanced not only French women’s ability to gain control over the management of the household, but also their love life. The author asserts that despite (or even because of) their marriages having been arranged, French wives enjoy an erotically more satisfactory partnership, since gallantry and courtship do not end at the altar, as with the English or American couple. “When the wedding ceremony is over, [French husbands] set themselves to win the affections of their wives, whom they scarcely know, and do their best to become and remain their lovers.” (O’Reill 1902: 142). This romanticised depiction of French married life is juxtaposed to the lot of English wives who, according to the French author, spend their first fifteen years of marriage in childbearing (142).

O’Reill echoes other French commentators such as such as Hippolyte Taine and Paul Bourget who argue that the dowry system prevailing in France throughout the nineteenth century, although leading to arranged marriages, gave some married women greater powers since they brought capital into the marriage. The English wife who has married for love and has not contributed financially to the marriage is, they assert, more submissive and relegated to mere household tasks (Taine 79; Bourget 183). O’Reill claims that the dowry gave the wife “a certain feeling of independence and authority on the house. She is somebody, her husband’s equal.” (O’Reill 1884b: 33). Darrow argues
that French domesticity differed from the English phenomenon in that the English discourse insisted on the dullness and self-denial of domesticity, and that the French discourse centred on the wife as the mistress and manager of the house (57).

The ‘good time’, in O’Rell’s terms, of the French wife doesn’t only consist in her emotional and sexual satisfaction, but also in her being an equal partner in matters relating to extra-domestic affairs. In his representation of the French wife who exerts her influence in the household and even in the family business, Max O’Rell seems to echo Emile Zola’s pseudo-scientific social study on women, *Types de Femmes en France*. The naturalist novel writer states here that working class and lower middle class women in and around Paris strongly influence their husbands and in fact manage the finances of the household. They often run small businesses and some of the factories of the Paris suburb have women directors (Zola 1878: 39). O’Rell quotes the example of the widow Boucicaut who became the manager of the famous department store Le Bon Marché after her husband’s death (1884b: 78). He quickly extends these statements to the whole of France: “In France, it is generally the wife of a tradesman who has charge of his books and his cash-box.” The French author asserts that she acts as a counsellor, being usually much shrewder and more business-minded than her husband, the one who really decides on investments etc. (1884b: 87). The *femme-caissière* stereotype is not entirely divorced from reality (Ariès 112). 19th century French commerce was dominated by small family enterprises, run by both wife and husband (or by widows), whereas in England the generally bigger businesses tended to hire male clerks (Tilly 74).

Max O’Rell then corroborates the stereotype of female influence over high-level political and cultural matters without, however, endorsing the trope of “pillow-government” re-iterated by writers from the Goncourt brothers (Bidelmann 24) to Maupassant. The French expatriate, careful to present a counter-image to the stereotype of Parisian vice and licentiousness, excludes the possibility of sexual manipulation in his depiction of the gracious, well-informed and powerful hostess of a Paris salon. English wives were often depicted as waiting for their husbands’ return from his club and left ignorant as to their business and social activities. The prominent English feminist Emmeline Pankhurst attributes the lack of enthusiasm for the suffragist movement in France to her observation that women enjoyed relatively more power and influence behind the scenes (qtd in McMillan 3). This all has to be regarded with caution, as the role of the salons as places for decision-making had greatly diminished at the end of the nineteenth century.  

---

4 See Kale p. 152, 174-75, Darrow
establishment of Anglo-Saxon bastions of masculinity, such as clubs and the stock exchange in Paris, were bemoaned by major French novelists as a regrettable masculinisation of society.  

3 The Strategy of Stereotyping

Max O’Rell creates the stereotype of the French wife who has obtained ‘maximum equality’ and doesn’t need any public display of her acquired position. She exerts her influence discreetly, but overwhelmingly: “[…] in no other country (not even in America) has woman's sovereignty been so supreme as it has always been, and still is, in France.” (O’Rell 1901: 2). With this discourse, O’Rell positions himself within the tradition of Jules Michelet who played down gender problems and depicted a harmonious male-dominated world, subtly guided by an all-pervasive, albeit immeasurable and non-public female influence.  

Like Michelet, O’Rell exalts womanhood as divine and beautiful. The argument that nature has made women morally stronger (if physically weaker) and more beautiful is used not only to justify the caging of women into their role of wife and mother and into the domestic sphere but also to embellish this cage. “In intending women to be mother, God proclaimed the superiority of women over the rest of the creation.” (O’Rell 1903: 54). By using catchy phrases such as ‘Her Royal Highness Woman’, ‘female superiority’ and the ‘Eternal feminine’, he employs the strategy which Sheila Rowbotham calls the ‘fantasy of power’. Creating an illusion of female royal suzerainty meant “convincing the oppressed that they enjoy their actual powerlessness” (Rowbotham 39).

However, the masculinism behind these tactics are revealed when the French expatriate asserts the submission of woman to man as the foundation of every solid social system, creates the dichotomy of man and wife as the possessor and the possessed and defines their respective roles as “the one who will have the battle of life to fight, and the one who will fit him for it, who will encourage him by her tenderness and love, rejoice with him in his joys, and cheer him in times of adversity” (O’Rell 1884b: 10). The borrowings from John Ruskin who, twenty years earlier, conceived an entire lecture in defence of the domestic destiny for women around chivalric metaphors are unmistakable.  

The French expatriate skilfully amalgamates Ruskin’s medieval rhetoric with the sensual biologism of Michelet’s writings on women. He re-iterates Michelet’s ideas of the older man initiating the younger woman into his world, but does not follow the historian’s almost religious ecstasy over the purity and virginity of womanhood (Michelet 1985: 111). O’Rell equally follows in

---

5 For instance (Maupassant 1881: 20) and (Zola 1878: 45)  
6 See Michelet’s *La Femme*  
7 See Ruskin  
8 See Cabanis; Orr
Michelet’s footsteps when justifying the double moral standard. Where Michelet claims that the adultery of the wife kills the husband’s honour (167), O’Rell paraphrases: “An unfaithful wife injures her family; an unfaithful husband injures himself only.”(1902: 251). He believes that the consequences of adultery are so dissimilar that a wife should always forgive, but that this is impossible for the man. Biological determination – the woman’s primary function as child-bearer – rationalizes social gender difference: “Woman should bow to the law of Nature, which has given her responsibilities it has not given to man.” (251). An American reviewer appropriately remarked that “Michelet, after whom the author in a way patterns himself, went deeper though he did worse” (Critic Feb 1902: 30).

Interestingly, in his last publication one year later, O’Rell changes his tune and seems to move towards a single moral standard for men and women:

Marriage will be a failure as long as men are of the opinion that fidelity, patience, devotion, amiability, cheerfulness, and self-abnegation are virtues expected of women only; marriage will be a failure as long as it is a firm, the two partners of which do not bring about the same capital of qualities, as long as what is bad in the goose is not bad in the gander.

(1903: 7)

He goes on to demand that adultery should be condemned whether committed by women or by men. The question remains here if this shift is a concession to a changed public discourse or if personal developments following his move back to Paris made him view things differently.

As a prominent public figure in the 1880s, O’Rell could not avoid discussing the high profile and very public feminist movement in England and America. He dismissed American feminists as follows: “In a country where woman is a spoilt child, petted, and made so much of, who can do and dare almost anything, it is strange to find women who are not content with their lot, but demand the complete emancipation of sex. American women asking for complete emancipation! It makes one smile.” (1889:79).

Mireille Rosello, in her work on the strategies and tactics of stereotyped discourses, talks about the stereotype as an invitation from the enunciator of that stereotype to the audience to join in the celebration of their being “normal”. For her, denouncing the stereotyped group in a derogatory way constructs “a pleasurable form of togetherness” (Rosello 11). Bearing in mind that I regard the public figure of Max O’Rell as a distillation of middle-class mainstream attitudes, eager to cater to the opinion of his audience, it is interesting to note just how the author extends an invitation to his readership. Ridiculing feminists as ugly spinsters, his tone suggests that he assumed not only the approval of the great majority of his male readers, who felt threatened by the New Woman, but also that of many women who for various reasons did not accept the New Woman. He not only endorsed
traditional gender roles but also depicted the ‘Old Woman’ in a flattering manner: “When a woman is beautiful, she is generally content with playing a woman's part; when she is a mother, this sublime role is enough for her. These tedious persons embrace the thankless career of advocates of women's rights because they have never found anything better to embrace.” (O’Rell 1884b: 80). The still prevailing image of the domestic angel as a happy and beautiful woman, contented with her role as dutiful mother and housewife is a Victorian stereotype that could easily be shared across the Atlantic and across the Channel by the British, American and French middle-class. Feminists and the New Woman disturbed this bourgeois ideal, and were therefore mercilessly ridiculed or belittled. In his attacks on the New Woman of the 1880s and 1890s he does not attack Anglo-Saxon women as a group.

His propensity to create stereotypes as quasi-literary characters comes to the fore in an article for the Atlantic Monthly:

The Anglo-Saxon “New Woman” is the most ridiculous production of modern times and destined to be the most ghastly failure of the century. [...] Kindly seek the “New Woman” among what is left-ugly women, old maids, and disappointed wives. [...] thin, sallow complexion, eyes without lustre, wrinkled, mouth sulky, haughty, the disgust of life written on every feature. That woman will join the ranks of every organization which aims at taking the cup of love away from the lips of every happy being.

(O’Rell 1896: 106)

The French writer’s strategy here is to point to attributes such as glasses, age, and a lack of physical attractiveness and to deduce that such a woman is necessarily sexless or sexually frustrated. Let us stress that there is nothing original here. The writer is simply giving renewed expression to the established trope of the blue-stocking. Portraying feminists as unfeminine, as half-man, had been an anti-feminist strategy for a long time, and O’Rell is merely reiterating what more famous literary predecessors, such as Dumas fils in Homme-Femme or Barbey D’Aurevilly in Les Bas-Bleus, had said long before him.

O’Rell goes on to generalise that all women engaged in public social campaigning are unloved and bitter spinsters. It is a fact, however, that many of the prominent feminists of the era were married, often had children, and were in no way sexually unattractive or frustrated (Hause 45). O’Rell also completely ignored the feminist campaigns for universal suffrage and education and concentrated on their temperance and moral purity activities. Not unexpectedly, his comments provoked angry reactions from leading feminists, particularly in the United States. One of his articles in the North American Review was followed by comments from columnist H.P. Spofford, who affirms that Max O’Rell is “behind the age in America” (109). She takes up the example of Frances Willard (1839-1898) to challenge his stereotype of the woman activist as a half-masculine spinster.
Willard, one of the very public figures of nineteenth century feminism, chose not to marry in order to pursue her career as a University teacher and leader of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union. Spectacled and preferring a plain and non-coquettish style of dressing, her twin goals were gaining the vote for women and ending the abuse of alcohol. Spofford claims that Willard “as attractive now, when she is the ‘uncrowned queen’ of a million followers, as when she was a blooming girl, is the welcome guest of drawing-rooms where the most delicate and cultivated women are proud and glad to meet her” (109). Frances Willard herself had earlier dismissed Max O’Rell’s frequent assertions that American women are pampered and domineering, as superficial chatter of an “airy Frenchman” who does not know what he is talking about (712).

O’Rell detests women aspiring to enter the public sphere:

I hate the woman who appears in public. I hate the woman who lectures in public or in private. I hate the woman who rises to make a speech after dinner. I hate the woman who speaks about politics, and would like to sit in parliament as to transform it into chatterment. I hate the scientific woman who lectures on evolution or writes on natural philosophy. I hate the lady physician, the lady lawyer, the lady member of the School Board, the lady preacher, the lady president, the lady secretary, the lady reciter, even the lady who conducts an orchestra. I hate the prominent woman.

(1901: 188)

Clearly, for Max O’Rell the problem lies in the public assertion of the woman. He has no problems with wives exerting influence over their husbands or even managing their husband’s business, as long as appearances are kept and patriarchy is accepted as a principle.

To confine Max O’Rell to a conservative or anti-feminist label, however, is too simple. He is careful not to be read as a misogynist or reactionary, since a considerable proportion of his readership was female. By 1903, in his last publication Rambles in Womanland, a shift toward more progressive ideas can be perceived. Wives should not be confined solely to the privacy of the home:

“No doubt this role of mother and wife is most respectable; it is even sacred; but women's nature demands something else. To restrict her circle of activity and influence to her family is to misappreciate her many faculties, her aspirations, her feelings, which, like those of men, are entitled to respect; it amounts to not recognising that her mission is not only familial, but social also.”

(1903: 49-50)

Max O’Rell concurs with feminist demands for improved education of women and men. He agrees with the leading French feminist, Maria Deraismes, that equal education will help women as a defence against moral corruption by male seducers. In one of his later books, he refers to M. Novicow, the author of a book on women’s liberation, and agrees that women must be independent economically and therefore should be educated to be able to sustain themselves (106). The
educational practices and institutions he witnessed in the United States claim his respect and admiration, although he laments the fact that this egalitarian education might lead to a future lack of respect for the husband. He estimates that middle-class working women have already attained a high standard and respectability. These remarks show clearly that O’Rell, a weathervane mirror of society throughout his life, echoed a shift in public opinion concerning the social role of women. When moving back to France in 1901, he was confronted with signs, from the all female daily La Fronde to the Théâtre Féministe, that the New Woman had reached the public sphere even in France.

Max O’Rell was always more inclined to present generally accepted views than to add a more controversial or individual opinion to the public discourse. Only in his last book on gender issues, *Rambles in Womanland*, does he give a glimpse of his own self: after discussing approvingly the changes in society and the increased access of women to the public sphere he claims to be happy not to live long enough to witness the access of women to all liberal professions (1903: 230).

### 4 Staging the Ideal Couple

As a prominent media figure, Max O’Rell made sure that his public persona corresponded to his writings. The publicity of his own marriage reflected his ideal of the wife as the participating, albeit discreet companion. Madame Blouët, born Bartlett, translated all of Max O’Rell’s earlier work, but had hardly any literary ambitions of her own. An article in the *Ladies Home Journal* echoes what seems to be a carefully staged image of a perfect bourgeois fin de siècle marriage:

> And yet, despite her keen interest in her husband’s work, Madam Blouët’s principal interests are in her home, and for its best interests. She is, in every respect, domestic. The Regent Park home of the Blouëts is of her making, and in it she shines as the wife, mother and hostess. For her husband she makes her home so bright that he is never absent form it out [sic] he is anxious to return to it. […] As a mother, she is the constant companion of her only child, a daughter of sixteen. […] she prefers to entertain rather than to go out in society, and as a hostess she is always successful. […] Much entertainment proceeds, of course, from “Max O’Rell’s” clever talk, and in this respect the wife neither tries nor desires to rival her husband. But a little perception will show how skilfully she adds fuel to her witty husband’s conversation.

(Dolman 3)

The creation of the ideal couple, at least as a public image, was very much at the heart of Max O’Rell’s writing. The French expatriate evokes the tone of Gustave Droz, whose bestseller *Monsieur, Madame et Bébé* he proposes as an antidote to the Anglo-American stereotype, fuelled by novels such as Zola’s *Nana*, of French marriages as mercenary and immoral. Gustave Droz, in his sketched episodes of marital life, popularized the notion of an erotically fulfilled domestic life, a view contrary to the adultery-filled novels of Balzac, Flaubert and Maupassant. In the spirit of Droz, O’Rell
describes a little parlour in his London home, which is set apart for cosy tête-à-têtes with his wife after an evening at the theatre or a ball. Another text sets out an imagined dialogue in which a French lady tells her English friend that she and her husband sometimes meet in a cabinet particulier of a Parisian restaurant. To enhance their love life, they pretend that she is his mistress and that their meeting is clandestine (O’Rell 1884b: 160).

Madame Blouët, apart from translating his work, accompanied her husband on his travels as far as Australia and South Africa. The harmonious union of a traditional ‘Latin’ to a well-educated and relatively ‘free’ Anglo-Saxon girl became a symbol of the combination of French liberal discourse of the domestic role of women with an appreciation for the educational reforms and increased freedom of movement in England and America. How far this ideal conformed to reality is not clear, however.

Equally unclear is how his staging of the ideal couple corresponded to reality. Newspaper notices published after his death claims that Paul Blouët had spent the last years of his life with an actress and was separated from his wife.⁹

5 Conclusion

Max O’Rell consciously situated his writings in a conservative middlebrow tradition of social commentary popularized by authors such as Jules Michelet and John Ruskin. Perpetuating the myth of the French wife, content with her discreet influence over family and business matters and unwilling to explore the possibilities of a more public role, he managed to appeal to Anglo-American as well as French audiences. Given the strong challenges to these established concepts of gender in all three societies, O’Rell’s ability to thus negotiate across cultures is exceptional. The French lecturer defined national differences in a way that flattered his readers, while at the same time insisting on a shared patriarchal ideology. When presenting gender relations in France as his ideal, O’Rell is very careful to ensure the approval of his American and British readership as well. With his stereotypical presentation of feminists as ugly spinsters who destabilize middle-class gender harmony, he defines them as the common enemy of his readership in Paris, London and New York. His increasing moderation towards feminist ideas and demands also suggests that this discourse on gender relations modified over time as women made important gains in the struggle for emancipation at the beginning of the 20th century.

⁹ See Atlanta Constitution 29/05/1903: 6; Chicago Daily Tribune 12/01/1904: 6
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