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Playing in the Dark with Flickering Lights
Using Drama to Explore Sociocultural Conflict

BRIAN EDMISTON

Sociocultural conflict in Northern Ireland
The challenges of using drama to explore sociocultural conflict, especially in a divided society like Northern Ireland, were illuminated for me as I revised this article for publication. Northern Ireland was again in the headlines of the world press when a Catholic postal worker collecting mail in Belfast was shot dead on 12 January 2002 by a Protestant paramilitary gunman. The murder occurred as simmering tensions between working-class Catholics and Protestants in adjacent neighbourhoods about access to a school boiled over into sectarian rioting.

Despite recent events, Northern Ireland, including the capital city of Belfast, looks quite ‘normal’ to visitors. Only five years ago it seemed foolish to hope for freedom of travel on roads without running into British army patrols, shopping in towns without continual searching, or decisions on local affairs being made by local elected politicians in a power-sharing administration. Yet with the political and social developments preceding and following the 1998 Good Friday Agreement, all these changes have come about.

Despite the political changes, I wonder how differently people view one another now than they did before ‘the Troubles’ erupted in 1968 or since the island of Ireland was partitioned in 1921 into Northern Ireland, which remained within the United Kingdom, and what later became the independent Republic of Ireland.

I believe that it is a mistake to regard the experience of deep social and cultural divisions as unique to Northern Ireland. Having lived approximately an equal amount of time in Ireland, in Britain, and in the United States, I see many parallels among the sociocultural divisions in all three places. Characterizing the divisions in Northern Ireland as merely religious is as simplistic as seeing the violence in Israel/Palestine as explainable as Jews and Arabs having always hated one another. Further, as I discovered in talking with the people who attended my presentation at IDEA 2001, and who came from countries as diverse as South Africa, Kenya, Australia, Canada, Norway, and the Republic of Ireland, each person found parallels between the sociocultural divisions in their countries and the place of my birth.
I was born into a Protestant family. 30 years ago, when I left Ireland to go to university in England, I would have identified as Protestant and Unionist. There is no space in this paper to analyze how my identity has become more complex except to note that I now identify (among other things) as an Irish, and British, and American Quaker. Nor is there space to explore how my ideologies affect my teaching. It may be useful to note that in answer to a question about which 'side' I am on, I will often now say that I am on the side of peace and justice for all. I feel that my ethical identity is now much stronger than any particular ethnic, cultural, or religious identity.

In all diverse societies there are deeply felt divisions and parallel, often conflicting, histories of the past. Events that one group may view as progress may be seen by another group as wilful oppression; past or present stories of fighting for 'freedom' can also be interpreted as tales of 'terrorism'. Further, the political and cultural hierarchies in societies ensure that among narratives, the discourses that surround them, and the people who accept them as truth, some are more dominant than others. Institutionalized inequality and competing narratives may not fuel destructive civil unrest as has occurred in the Balkans, the Middle East, the Indian subcontinent, post-colonial Africa, or Ireland. However, in any society with deeply felt divisions, there can be no long-term change in how people on one side view and act toward those on the other side, unless the social, historical, political, economic, and cultural roots of the divisions are recognized and begun to be addressed.

Dorothy Heathcote has long argued that as educators we must recognise and expect sociocultural complexity in classrooms. Heathcote (Heathcote and Bolton 1995, pp. 19-20) provides a conceptualization for making sociocultural sense of interactions by looking beneath the surface to the levels of commitment of a person taking an action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>MOTIVATION</th>
<th>INVESTMENT</th>
<th>MODELS</th>
<th>STANCE/VALUES/ETHICS/IDEOLOGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Fig. 1 Heathcote's sociocultural levels of commitment to action (adapted)*

How we frame and interpret events is affected not only by our social roles (whether these are everyday roles or ones we are trying out in drama), but also by our culture. The motivation for our actions, our investment in those actions, our models for action, and our values are all facets of individual action seen in social and culture terms. The deeper a person's commitment to certain actions, the more these will have sociocultural dimensions.

For example, a stone-thrower in north Belfast who hurls a stone at a crowd of people from the 'other side,' and yells 'Kill the bastards,' performs an action. Actions (which include the words we speak to others) always have short-term motivations. These are immediate goals to be achieved that may be given as the 'reason' for an action. In this case, the stone-thrower may want to hit someone perceived as being hostile toward 'our side', perhaps another stone-thrower.
More long-term aims are our investments in actions. We are invested in what we hope to achieve over time and why this is important to us. If the stone-thrower is Protestant, he may want the Catholics to leave their homes in this area since their presence is felt as a daily antagonism. He could justify his investment by reference to a history of actions that are couched in political or cultural terms. A Catholic stone-thrower could have a similar, though inverse, level of investment.

We may only have shadowy awareness of how our models for actions affect how we behave. We model our actions on the ways the people we look up to have acted. Our models come from the culture that we grow up accepting as ‘normal’. The people we model may include parents, peers, and other revered people in our political and economic community. The stone-thrower is likely to have grown up watching others throw stones, being applauded for their behaviour by people that he respects — many of his peers, perhaps his elders, and even some official, or unofficial, community leaders.

The deepest layer is our stance, comprised of the values, or ethics, that we hold (Edmiston 1998, 2000). Collectively, these values comprise our ideologies. Our values and ideologies are formed over time through the social interactions and discourses that permeate and create the culture in which we have grown up. Unfortunately we are largely unaware of how our ethics and ideologies inform our everyday attitudes and actions.

Our ideologies are not separate from the values, models, investment, motivations, and interactions that surround us, but are rather forged out of them. If we had witnessed and been involved in non-violent action and grown up with people who interpreted such actions positively, then we might have come to believe in non-violent resistance to oppression. However, if we have seen stone-throwing or other violent reactions to perceived injustices regarded and interpreted as justified, then we are likely to come to believe that throwing stones is part of a legitimate reaction to feelings of anger about the actions of other people who are vilified in our community. We are also likely to pick up a stone and hurl it when others do the same. Even though some people may never personally perform such a provocative act, they may condone others who do pick up and throw stones. They may also support those who throw bombs, or pick up a rifle.

George Mitchell (1999), the former U.S. senator who chaired the political talks that led to the 1998 Good Friday Agreement, has noted chilling similarities among the ideologies of most people in Northern Ireland irrespective of which ‘side’ they are on. Much more significant for him than the fact that people tend to look the same and talk with the same accents, was the realisation that people on both sides see themselves as minorities — Catholics in Northern Ireland, Protestants in Ireland as a whole. Both sides also see themselves as victims of oppression by the other side. All people tend to share a dominant ideology of a ‘zero sum game’, an ‘us vs. them’ view where ‘we’ are only those on ‘our side’, and where anything that benefits ‘them,’ must be a loss for ‘us’. Thus, it can be difficult for people to celebrate diversity and to feel good about differences. Further, people operating out of this or any other ideology are unlikely to have examined their own views since ideologies and the values out of which they are created have been internalized over time.

Polarised ideologies result in a tendency to support ‘our’ world view and resist seeing the world as ‘they’ do. Polarization is at the root of sociocultural conflict. Such conflict is not unique to Northern Ireland, though its consequences may be more immediate and more apparent than in the society where you live.

The ideologies related to the deeply felt sociocultural divisions in Northern Ireland underpin
competing views of historical and contemporary events. Because dominant ideologies are dichotomised, they create a tendency both to resist interpreting events from the ‘other’s’ point of view and to critiquing the consequences for others of action out of one’s own ideology. Seeing from another person’s point of view can feel like an erasure of identity when differences from ‘the other’ underscore a person’s identity. If being a Protestant ‘Ulster Unionist’ is conceptualised ideologically as not being a Catholic ‘Irish Nationalist,’ and vice versa, then it is likely to be very difficult to even want to understand the world from others’ viewpoints. Nor will it be easy to attempt the difficult art of listening with humility that is required when genuinely trying to learn how, and why, others view the world the way they do. It may be even harder to critique the dominant discourses and cultural events that over decades or centuries have created and sustained polarized values, ideologies, and thus sociocultural conflicts.

I believe that becoming more aware of our ideologies should be a major aim of education. Though both pupils and teachers are guided by the values and ethics of their ideology, significantly they are likely to only have a shadowy awareness of how these inform their interactions and connect with their motivations, their investment, and the models they uphold. Ideally, we would all become more intentional about our actions, more deliberate about the values we want to promote or question, and more critical of the unexamined positions that we hold.

**Using drama to explore sociocultural conflict**

I have been interested for some time in how using drama might assist teachers interested in exploring the sociocultural dimensions of conflict; and in particular in tackling resistance both to viewing events from others’ viewpoints and to examining facets of one’s own values and ideology.

During the 2000-2001 school year, I visited Northern Ireland several times and used drama with 12 and 13 year-old pupils. I was assisting colleagues at the University of Ulster and teachers in 25 schools, to pilot what is likely to be called *Education for Democratic Citizenship*. Education in what it might mean to be an active and participating citizen will become a compulsory part of the Northern Ireland Curriculum for 11-14 year old pupils in 2004. The hope is that those who teach *Education for Democratic Citizenship* will be more ready and able to deal with controversial issues related to the divisions in Northern Ireland society than teachers previously have been.

I do not have the space to give a detailed account of the aims and history of educational initiatives, including some uses of drama (Fyfe 1996), designed to address some of the roots of the Northern Ireland conflict. However, I must emphasise that the current initiative is pragmatic, well resourced, and not naive about potential difficulties. It also grew out of some bold previous work; it is wisely grounded in the daily experiences of teachers’ classroom lives, and seeks to introduce teachers to interactive and innovative methodologies (www.ulst.ac.uk/faculty/shse/unesco/scpe/).

I was interested in conducting reflective practitioner research to discover more about the potential for using drama in *Education for Democratic Citizenship*. I wondered how drama might help in exploring the core concepts of diversity and pluralism, democracy, social justice, and human rights. Could I use drama to explore and understand some of these social and cultural dimensions of conflict? How might pupils be able to see issues from others’ perspectives? How might they be able to critique dominant values and ideologies that underpin their actions?
Having contacted colleagues at the University of Ulster I was able to plan several visits to Belfast during 2000-2001. I first made contact with schools, teachers, and pupils; and I was then able to work for between one and five hour-long sessions in several classrooms of 12-13 year old pupils. These included five sessions in St. Mary’s, a Catholic school for girls, one session in Carson High School, a Protestant school for boys and girls, and three sessions in Midtown Integrated School for Protestants and Catholics.

My experiences in Belfast drew into sharp relief something that I had recognised before, the implications of which I had not faced so directly. A fictional drama world is always created in parallel to the everyday world, yet the drama world is dependent on the everyday world and does not supersede it. In terms of Heathcote’s diagram, fictional actions may have fictional motivations and investments but they may also have everyday motivations and investments. Further, fictional actions are supported by models and values that predate any drama session by years (or perhaps centuries). Such models and values, and their accompanying ideologies, may lead to significant support of, or resistance to, certain actions or reflections in the fictional world.

At St. Mary’s, the pupils readily imagined that they were in role as 17th century Irish chieftains contemplating signing the Treaty of Mellifont (negotiated in 1603 after a disastrous loss by Irish forces, and their Spanish allies, to an English army at the Battle of Kinsale). I had agreed to use drama in their history lessons on ‘The Plantation of Ulster’, a period of Irish history of which, in factual terms, they knew almost nothing. Though I developed a very positive working relationship with the girls, I also encountered the intensity of a single way of framing fictional events from an imagined role and a significant resistance to shifting roles and/or reframing. For our first use of drama I had suggested the role of Irish chieftains, because they had seemed most interested in them during our initial lively discussion. However, an activity that I thought would take 10 minutes ended up absorbing us for well over an hour spread over three sessions.

In retrospect I would have chosen a different role for the pupils. I also know that I could have structured the work with more finesse. However, what unfolded turned out to be very illuminating for me in terms of understanding more about the relationship between how drama work is structured and its sociocultural dimensions.

Though a few of the girls were prepared to agree to meet with an emissary from the English army, to be represented by me, the vast majority framed the events by rejecting any negotiations whatsoever. Further, the mood of these well-behaved girls was to attack the English army, even when they discovered that they were out-numbered, that their leaders had agreed to stop fighting after enormous losses, and when they imagined explaining their likely deaths to their families. The prevailing shared value was clear — most of the girls reiterated and agreed with one another that they would rather ‘die for Ireland’ than surrender. When I switched roles to support those who wanted to negotiate, the majority accused us of being traitors. The shared ideology of uncompromising resistance to English invasion that I recognised was one thing, but what surprised me was the speed with which it had intensified. Over two sessions I assisted others to articulate other options, and to be heard. All eventually agreed to a more pragmatic outcome: they planned a clandestine strategic retreat to gather support for a later invasion. The girls were delighted to discover that a similar event had actually occurred in 1607.

---

1 All names are pseudonyms.
2 For an excellent overview of role, frame, and distance see Bowell and Heap 2001.
I was struck by the depth and intensity of the uncompromising ideology that underlay the girls’ actions. At the time, I experienced failure, because my skills seemed to be ineffective in moving them. In the work that followed, I was to feel even more inadequate as I encountered resistance to a shift in roles and a reframing of events.

I hoped that the girls could imagine early 17th century Ireland from the competing point of view of the Protestant settlers who had arrived from England and Scotland, not to make war, but to farm. So we invented reasons for families leaving their homes in Britain and imagined their arrival in Ireland as they worked the land. In the final session I felt pleased when all the pupils seemed deeply engaged with an encounter that I hoped would place pupils in a position where they might re-examine the values they had expressed so powerfully. We all interacted as if we were (Protestant) settlers besieged by the superior forces of the native (Catholic) Irish. This was the moment I had carefully planned so that they would be in a position where I expected they would ask for mercy. I had hoped that in doing so, they would experience the desire for another’s compassion in contrast with their previous desire to attack.

Though the girls had seemed to be in role as British settlers, many of them again talked about not negotiating and some added that they would ‘never talk with the British!’ I had assumed that they were imagining from the position of British settlers who only wanted a peaceful life, but in retrospect I think that for most of the girls, their ideology of non-negotiation with a perceived enemy had a much stronger effect on their actions than any superficial role-playing.

Roles, frames, and emotional distance

I now believe that one reason why the resistance of pupils was so intense was because the roles and frames at St. Mary’s did not provide sufficient emotional distance. I had expected that distance would have been provided by the time period of an unknown historical situation, the fact that they were meeting after the battle, the relationship between the roles of chieftains meeting a non-confrontational emissary, and agreeing on a frame of negotiating a settlement. However, as I planned I had been much more concerned with engaging the girls with the material and distancing them from the fictional situation of bloody historical battles than with distancing them from possible current values and ideology that might dominate their reactions.

The drama work at St. Mary’s engaged the pupils deeply, but it seemed to tap into a confrontational ideology rather than create some distance from it. The situation of the Irish ‘rebels’ confronting English soldiers in 1603 must have felt emotionally close to, and not that different from, the girls’ own situation growing up in their area of Belfast. They all lived in a community where support was tacit, if not overt, for the violent and often deadly Irish Republican Army in their ‘struggle’ against ‘British rule’. Thus, on reflection, I am less surprised now than I was at the time, about the depth of the commitment in the room to the role of Irish chieftain that most took on with a frame of armed opposition and rejection of any perceived surrender to the ‘others’ who had invaded. I am also less surprised by their resistance to switching to the role of any other British ‘invaders’ or adopting a frame of asking for mercy.

In comparing my very different experiences at Midtown Integrated School with the work at St Mary’s that I have described above, I realise that the work at Midtown provided pupils with much more emotional distance from current ideology. At Midtown, over three sessions with a class of 12 and 13 year-old Catholic and Protestant boys and girls, I introduced them to Jon Scieszka’s story and some of Lane Smith’s illustrations from The True Story of the Three Little Pigs. The text is a retelling, from the wolf’s perspective, of the traditional folktale, The Three
**Little Pigs.** The wolf’s account gives alternative explanations for the death of the two pigs that he ate, and of his arrest by pig police officers. I worked with the pupils to create ‘photographs’ of current and past conflicts between pigs and wolves, as well as to develop a history for the fictional towns of Pigsville and Wolfish Town. The pupils considered how historical events can explain current anger. We created and compared reports of wolf-pig conflict in the two newspapers (The Daily Pig and The Daily Wolf), depicted these, and discussed how different local papers in Belfast can have conflicting accounts of the same events. We represented the wolf in prison and I wondered with them under which circumstances the wolf could receive a fair trial (a ‘wolfish’ right under the Universal and European Declarations of Human Rights). We began a discussion about police conduct that was picked up again later when they invented and later interpreted and responded to the partisan actions of pig and wolf police. Finally, they took on the role of people in a secret society (who were committed to justice for all) and who were planning how to respond to the injustice by police officers that they had witnessed.

The drama worlds created in both St. Mary’s and Midtown were concerned with violence, and in both cases pupils imagined themselves in roles that were directly involved in conflict between two opposing sides. In both classrooms we frequently stopped to talk about the work out of role. Most significantly, I believe, was the fact that whereas at St. Mary’s the pupils were for long periods in one role (chieftains) with one frame (resistance to invasion), at Midtown the pupils for short periods of time moved among multiple roles and frames. The Midtown pupils viewed the emerging drama world in various roles: wolf and pig citizens, family of the wolf, wolf and pig neighbours, journalists, police officers, and local officials. They also all agreed to frame situations differently. For example, at first they showed the photographs that pig journalists would use to represent the conflict that arose after the arrest of the wolf, then they showed the photographs that they choose not to print in their newspaper, and finally they repeated the structure showing the photographs in the wolf newspaper and those omitted.

There was intensity of engagement at Midtown, but this did not work against switching roles and frames as happened at St. Mary’s. From the beginning, at Midtown the pupils were able to identify with different and competing viewpoints of both wolves and pigs on events in the divided society in which the animals lived.

**Drama world as metaphor**

Though realistic role-play has been useful in dealing with playground conflict in Northern Ireland, as it has elsewhere (for example the IDEA sponsored ‘Drama and Conflict’ DRACON Project), I knew that realistic role-play could not easily address the sociocultural dimensions of conflict. My previous experience with developing a drama world as a metaphor to allow a mixed race group to examine racism in the United States had been successful, and I planned on using the same approach in Northern Ireland.

I chose the story by Szieska and Lane because I wanted a narrative that could develop into a metaphor for the divided society of Northern Ireland. It was highly successful as a metaphor since the pupils from opposite sides of the divide were able to make connections between the events in Pigsville and those on the streets of Belfast.

However, it had also been my intention with the work on the Plantation of Ulster to use it as a metaphor. The folktale-like setting and characters of Pigsville helped to provide emotional distance even though the parallels with contemporary Belfast were much more obvious than
were the parallels between 17th and 21st century Ireland. My struggle to understand why I was largely unable to achieve emotional distance at St. Mary’s has led me to apply positioning theory to the drama work.

**Positioning sociocultural conflict**

The concept of ‘positioning’ has been proposed by sociologists as an extension, and critique, of the conceptualizations of role and frame (Davies and Harré, 1990, Harré and Langenhove, 1999). Davies and Harré argue that role theory is insufficient for understanding a social situation because in addition to recognizing people’s social roles we need to be aware of the significance of prior institutional and personal interactions, as well as the specific social and ethical dynamics of each particular exchange. The terms role and frame conceptualize more static ways of making sense of situations. Once we adopt a role and frame a situation (whether in everyday life or in drama), sociologists (and drama practitioners) have assumed that we basically continue a particular way of presenting ourselves and of making sense of situations until we might switch role and/or frame. The social reality of interactions is more dynamic.

When people make meaning with others across time they use the power of language to legitimize their own and others’ moral and sociocultural authority to interpret particular past, present, and future events. Participants’ use words and gestures to position themselves, and to position other people. In turn, each person is positioned by others. Schools are notorious for positioning pupils as powerless, ignorant, and incompetent. Using drama can be effective at promoting engagement because teachers can position pupils as powerful, knowledgeable, and competent.

In a drama world, role is the person that you imagine you are. Frame is an agreed viewpoint that roles have of a situation and concern, and a shared relationship with them. In addition, as you interact, relative to how you view the situation and concern, you position others, and yourself, and you also respond to how others position you. Put differently, role is who you are in a social situation, frame is how you view and relate to those social situations, and positioning is how you use social interactions in a situation to align your stance relative to others.

Positioning is an inherent aspect of all interactions. As people interact, they show how they stand relative to other people in their interpretations of social situations. The positions that they adopt, and how they align themselves relative to others, can be interpreted for their social, cultural, political, historical, or ethical dimensions. Thus, positions are rooted in and revealing of ideology.

**Aligning positions with others**

What may seem like talk and action that is consistent with a particular social role and frame may shift along a continuum from complete alignment in positions to polar opposition. Face-to-face dialogue can be understood as a back-and-forth parrying in which some positions become more dominant, while others get subverted, amended, withdrawn, or silenced. Interactions can range along a continuum of flexibility. At one extreme is harmonious agreement between how people view the world. At the other extreme are oppositional exchanges that resemble a fight where there is no listening and positions are hardened. In between is dialogue between positions that resembles a dance: it may be heated, yet it is respectful with differing degrees of accommodation of other positions because of the differences encountered. Thus, to differing degrees, inter-
actions can lead to an amendment of one person's prior positions to accommodate others' positions. Such changes in positions promote new possibilities for critiquing the values and ideologies that underlie existing positions.

Positioning can be observed in every interaction in Northern Ireland. Polite conversation can have alignment, but these will be agreed positions over, for example, the state of the weather. To avoid confrontations people may delicately dance around how to interpret a recent event so as not to cause offence. Public political exchanges can be highly oppositional ranging from using sarcastic or accusatory language to position others. Frank but respectful dialogue in which people accommodate others' positions is unusual.

Everyday/fictional positioning

When we use drama, we interact simultaneously in two worlds: the everyday world and the fictional drama world. In the classroom I try to look, not only for how pupils position one another, but also for how I am positioning them. I strive to position students in their everyday world as knowledgeable, competent, and as deserving and needing to show respect. In drama worlds I can play with alternative ways of positioning.

In a drama world, in addition to our fictional roles and fictional frames we may experience fictional positioning. As we imagine how we might interact in a situation we are able to explore new positions as if they were actually happening and we may perhaps amend prior positions. Just as participants in drama work can agree on fictional roles and frames, they can also agree on representing fictional positions.

As positions get established over time I see that I need to pay attention not only to what pupils say and do but also to how one exchange builds on another in terms of how they establish a way of positioning one another socially, culturally, and ideologically. Such positioning occurs in the drama world as well as in the everyday world of the classroom. Who are positioned as leaders and who are positioned as followers in this group? Is there a culture of listening, or of silencing certain people? What values are implicitly shared and which are contested?

Drama worlds allow us to play with positioning. Pupils can express positions that they hold but with more intensity than normally. They can also express, experience, and reflect on positions that they would not adopt in everyday life. Significantly, in imagination they can shift positions to get outside and evaluate one way of positioning others.

At St. Mary's, for most pupils one position seemed to ossify quickly into the expression of a rigid ideology, and there was little opportunity for pupils to try out new positions. I suspect that this was because I unintentionally positioned the pupils to adopt the very position that was hardest for many of them to question: no surrender to invaders. Each subsequent interaction actually strengthened this position making it harder for them later to shift their position in the fictional world.

At Midtown I positioned the students to hold competing positions from the beginning, which worked against anyone over-identifying with one position. Further, I structured the work so that the pupils adopted and played with multiple positions. In doing so, the pupils were also able to get outside positions and evaluate them. For example, pupils in the role of pig journalists (who had agreed to a frame of taking photographs to represent the conflict in their newspaper) adopted a powerful position that was a dismissive view of wolves as the ones who caused all the trouble for pigs. Yet within minutes, the same pupils had evaluated the photographs from the wolves' point of view and had critiqued their previous position as stereotyping and intolerant.
## Turning the lights off and on

The lights are always flickering in classrooms. I remember going into this project thinking that because I had used drama successfully in classrooms elsewhere that it would not be too difficult for me to use drama in Northern Ireland. I need to remember (for the next time that I am in any classroom) that my awareness of what is happening is always incomplete. I may also always know that in reflection, I can always ‘turn the lights on’ and examine what actually happened (as opposed to what I wanted to happen). In doing so I can learn more about how we might use drama to explore sociocultural conflict.

Drama work may tap into and actually intensify pupils’ everyday ideology to the point that they may resist and/or barely identify with a different role or frame. Conversely, drama work may lead to pupils shifting among several positions through which they may begin to critique the ideology of one position. I am only beginning to recognise how to structure drama to promote the latter and minimise the former.

Though using drama is fraught with difficulties as well as possibilities, when the difficulties loom, I recall some words attributed to Eleanor Roosevelt, “It is better to light a candle than curse the darkness.”
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