***Another London*, Another Point of View: The Use of Defamiliarisation to Elicit Empathy in the Reader for the White Working-Class Protagonist in *Another London* and their ‘Real-World’ Equivalents**and and and and

In literary fiction, white working-class characters are often represented as part of a homogenised group, complete with stereotypical behaviours and characteristics. Using Fredric Jameson’s theory of the ideologeme to identify representational tropes of white working-class characters, this article analyses the juxtaposition of free-indirect discourse and first-person narration in *Another London* as a defamiliarisation technique to expose the ideologemes of white working-class literary representation. It then examines how, using practice-based research methodologies, the novel attempts to elicit empathy in the reader for the protagonist - an individuated white working-class character – and by doing so challenge the reader’s assumptions about the lifestyles of members of this group. The reader’s literary experience can translate into ‘real-world’ changes in their perception of, and assumptions about, the behaviours and lifestyles of members of the white working class, thereby challenging stereotypical representations in mainstream media and politics, as well as literature.

*Another London* is a novel written as the creative component of a PhD Creative Writing. Set on a council estate in East London, it follows the social and psychological development of a white working-class boy into adulthood as he lives through fictionalised parallels of real-life events, which force him to confront his own ethnic and class identity.

Keywords: working-class; white; defamiliarisation; first-person; narration; empathy

No potential conflict of interest reported.

*Another London* is a novel written by Jonathon Crewe (2017) as the creative component of a PhD Creative Writing. Set on a council estate in East London between 1991 and 2011, it follows the social and psychological development of Dean, a white working-class boy, into adulthood as he lives through fictionalised parallels of real-life events, such as the London terrorist attacks in 2005 and the London riots of 2011. At eleven he witnesses a racially-motivated murder that affects his relationships with his friends, family and local community[[1]](#footnote-1). Unable to find a job, he turns to a violent gang for work. Influenced by far-right political party rhetoric, the gang begins to perpetrate hate crimes, which forces Dean to confront his own ethnic and class identity.

The genesis of the project came from having grown up in a white working-class family and living in predominantly white working-class communities, and witnessing the way this group is represented in media and politics, especially when these portrayals appear to caricature and ridicule people known personally by the author - family members and friends - people who have very little opportunity to represent themselves in the public arena, or even the right to reply to such typified representations. In line with the UK Research Excellence Framework's definition of impact beyond academia as 'an effect on, change or benefit to...an audience, community, constituency, organisation or individuals' (REF 2018, 83), the intention of the thesis is to open up wider public debate about the right to democratic access to channels of self-representation for members of the white working class, and by extension every marginalised group.

To fulfil this goal and deliver meaningful impact, it was necessary to identify a research method that allowed the thesis to bridge the gap between traditional research in the social sciences, which tend to reside in the academy, and the general public, who are the main stakeholders in the project's potential outcomes. Whereas social scientists may work with and theorise group or community identities, individuals do not experience these groups per se, rather they experience interactions with other individuals who may be members of a group. It is this dilemma that motivated a practice-based research approach in the form of a creative writing project. Fiction facilitates the portrayal of, and access to, complex and nuanced interiorities through relatable characters' lived experiences, presenting 'people and situations in their contexts with multidimensionality...as a method of disrupting dominant ideologies or stereotypes by...[describing] social reality and then [presenting] alternatives to that reality. One of the main advantages of fiction as a research practice is the...[ability] to promote empathy, build bridges of understanding across differences, and stimulate self-­reflection' (Leavy 2014, 298). Through its characters, *Another London* strives to de-homogenise the concept of the white working class, to individuate members of this group and to show that as individuals they are not so different to any other individual from any other ethnicity or class. It consciously acknowledges Barret's claim that 'the innovative and critical potential of practice-based research lies in its capacity to generate personally situated knowledge...and [externalise] such knowledge while at the same time, revealing...social and cultural contexts for the critical intervention and application of knowledge outcomes' (2010, 2). Thus, the novel works to explore the 'human process of making meaning through experiences that are felt, lived, reconstructed and reinterpreted,' and this includes both the writing and the reading of the novel, where 'meanings are ‘made’ from the transactions and narratives that emerge and these have the power and agency to change on an individual or community level' (Sullivan 2009, 50).

Creative writing allows the researcher access to the individual through the creation of relatable characters, but also to go beyond the personal whereby the 'methods *and* theoretical ideas as paradigms may be viewed as the apparatuses, or procedures of production from which the research design emerges' (Barret 2010, 138, original italics). Practice-based researchers, similar to more traditional researchers, develop their methods and techniques in relation to the existent and recognised practices of their predecessors and contemporaries (Harper 2008; Barret 2010; Haseman 2010). In this case, the novel attempts to individualise members of a marginalised group through its portrayal of characters from this group, in a similar way that Monica Ali (2003) does it for Bangladeshi immigrants in *Brick Lane*, Courttia Newland (1999) does for black working-class teenagers in *Society Within* and Caryl Phillips (2003) does for asylum seekers and illegal immigrants in *A Distant Shore*, by providing ‘a textual space…[where the writer] can produce a representative voice by adopting the marginalised position’ (Bentley 2008, 85).

*Another London* juxtaposes free-indirect discourse and first-person narration as a defamiliarisation technique intended to jar the reader into different ways of understanding the characters and their socio-cultural background (Leavy 2014). In doing so, it attempts to expose the ideologemes of white working-class literary representation and therefore challenge the stereotypical representations of the white working class in mainstream media and politics. Ideologemes, in this context, refer to Fredric Jameson’s definition as ‘the smallest intelligible unit of the essentially antagonistic collective discourses of social classes’ (Jameson 2010, 61). Both a conceptual construction and narrative sign, they incorporate concepts such as beliefs and opinions as well as minimal units of socially symbolic narrative acts (Jameson 2010). As such, they can be seen as the inherited units of representation upon which the process of writing and rewriting through interpretation bases its narrative construction. As Jameson puts it, ‘by their respective positions in the whole complex sequence of the modes of production, both the individual text and its ideologemes…must be read in terms of…the ideology of form, that is, the symbolic messages transmitted…by the coexistence of various sign systems which are themselves traces or anticipations of modes of production’ (Jameson 2010, 61).

HH Although creative writing allows the researcher and reader unique insights, alone 'it cannot deliver the theoretical and contextual reflections that are an integral part of the research journey' (Glade-Wright 2017, 91). A practice-based researcher must maintain a discourse between the artefact and the exegesis to exploit findings and outcomes in order for wider impact to be realised (Barret 2010; Carter 2010). As such, the creative writing process works in dialogue with continued critical and contextual analysis. In *The Political Unconscious*, Frederic Jameson argues that ‘the production of aesthetic or narrative form is to be seen as an ideological act in its own right’ (Jameson 2010, 64). Therefore, the process of writing the novel can be analysed in terms of it being a socially symbolic act, whereby the inclusion and usage of ideologemes can be exposed and interrogated. Narrative texts are not individual entities but exist within the wider body of the literary canon, reflecting the social order in which they were written (Jameson 2010). An understanding of this suggests a duality for the creative writing researcher whereby a 'double movement occurs, of decontextualisation in which the found elements are rendered strange, and of recontextualisation, in which new families of association and structures of meaning are established' (Carter 2010, p15-16). Analysing *Another London* in this way allows us to identify, expose and interrogate recurrent ideologemes within the discourse between the deconstruction, through critical analysis, and reconstruction, through the writing of the novel, of media, political and literary representations of the white working class.

Given the construction in media, politics and literature of white working-class lifestyles and behaviours as culturally inferior (Crewe 2017; see also Haylett 2001; Tyler 2008; Skeggs 2009; Sveinsson 2009; Jones 2011; Open Society Foundations 2014), *Another London* consciously acknowledges, and works to counter, assumptions about white working-class characters held by the reader. As Wayne Booth (1983) claims in *The Rhetoric of Fiction*: ‘*If* an author wants intense sympathy for characters who do not have strong virtues to recommend them, *then* the psychic vividness of prolonged and deep inside views will help’ (377-378, original italics). In other words, the individualisation of a marginalised voice moves the character beyond the sociological and into the psychological, the point where representational meaning can occur in narrative, in the sense that ‘the psychological impulse tends toward the presentation of highly individualised figures who resist abstraction and generalisation, and whose motivation is not susceptible to rigid ethical interpretation’ (Scholes et al. 2006, 101; see also Currie 2010 and Jameson 2010). The novel’s conscious attempt to shift perceptions from a typified reading of white working-class characters to a de-homogenised, individuated reading, works to exploit Jameson’s concept of rewriting texts through the interpretation process, whereby any given literary text cannot be viewed as independent and autonomous in itself, but rather as being ‘rewritten’ as part of a set of traditional interpretative functions during the process of its reading (See Jameson 2010; Crewe 2017). The reader’s ‘real-life’ assumptions about the lifestyles and behaviours of white working-class groups are exposed and challenged through their own interpretation of the characters’ lifestyles, behaviour and choices within the ‘fictional-world’ of the text.

Howard Sklar (2013) claims that emotions, in particular sympathy and compassion, felt by a reader in response to a fictional character can have ‘ethical implications beyond the experience of reading itself…[Although] directed towards imaginary individuals, they may lay a foundation for emotional and ethical sensitivity in real life’ (9; See also Hakemulder 2004; Kuiken et al. 2004). This process allows the reader to recognise the emotional and psychological experience of a character, providing a route to identification and re-evaluation of pre-existing assumptions about a person/character from a particular excluded/’other’ group. Although readers will possess existing ‘interpretive frames and experiences to the reading of a given text, the narrative itself provides its own counterweight to personal presumptions by “persuading” readers to feel and to evaluate characters in particular ways’ (Sklar 2013, 59). According to Gregory Currie (2010), this re-framing of the reader’s interpretive perspective will not only involve a re-evaluation of a character’s behaviour and lifestyle choices, but also a re-evaluation of the reader’s systems of belief in relation to the character’s social group. As with Booth and Sklar, Currie (2010) argues that ‘sustained imaginative engagement with a vividly expressed and highly individuated mental economy through a long and detailed narrative can…be expected to have…finely-tuned imitative consequences, with correspondingly powerful results in terms of framing’ (104). Narratologists have regularly pointed to focalisation[[2]](#footnote-2), ‘seeing’ from a character’s perspective, as a technique to achieve this re-framing effect, inducing the reader to view the narrative from a perspective that is not their own (Sklar 2013; See also Bal 2009; Fludernik 2009). Sklar (2013) suggests that this re-framing effect is similar to the process of defamiliarisation, where readers are forced to reassess their ‘familiar’ assumptions about the fictional/real world as a result of shifts in perspective of the narrative’s focalisor, which ‘may challenge readers to re-construct their representations of that character’s feelings or attitudes’ (69). Kuiken et al. (2004) discuss a set of phenomenological studies they undertook to investigate how defamiliarisation can lead to what they call ‘self-modifying feelings’ in the readers of literary texts (See also Miall and Kuiken 1999[[3]](#footnote-3)):

At times, readers of literary texts find themselves participating in an unconventional flow of feelings through which they realize something that they have not previously experienced—or at least that they have not experienced in the form provided by the text. When this occurs, the imagined world of the text can become unsettling. What is realized (recognized) also may become realized (made real) and carried forward as a changed understanding of the reader’s own life-world (Kuiken et al. 2004, 268-269).

*Another London* uses a shift in perspective from third-person to first-person narration to complement and augment this effect[[4]](#footnote-4). Firstly, as discussed above, the prolonged access to first-person, psychologically-motivated internal narration gives the impression that the character has a more highly developed sense of self-determination, distancing them from the external perspective, in the sense of being the product of an author (Currie 2010). Secondly, the changes in perspective induce defamiliarisation from the reader’s real-world experience and expectations, forcing them to re-evaluate their pre-existing notions of the character. This is achieved through the formalistic shift in point of view, but also as a result of the shift in focalisation from the ‘dual-voice’ narrator of the third-person perspective to the individualised voice of the first-person character-narrator[[5]](#footnote-5).

A parallel example of this process can be seen in Caryl Phillips’ novel *A Distant Shore* where the story of Solomon/Gabriel, an African asylum seeker, is narrated in both the first and third-person. The formalistic shift augments the defamiliarisation that is induced by the sympathy and compassion that Phillips’ elicits from the reader by shifting their perspective/assumptions about asylum seekers’ lifestyles, morality and choices from the external to the internal, thus forcing the reader to re-evaluate their pre-existing notions about real-life asylum seekers. In the extract below, Phillips uses the first-person narration of Solomon/Gabriel to invoke empathy in the assumed middle- and upper-class reader and to align the protagonist’s perspective on the white working-class characters with that of the reader’s:

Up ahead I see a group of four boys walking towards me. For a moment I consider turning about-face, but I do not wish to turn my back on them for I know they do not desire to use me well. It is better that I can see them. After all, I recognise them. They are strangely almost hairless, with egg-shaped heads and blue tattoos on their bare arms. They all wear polished boots…, but the rest of their clothes are ill-matched (Solomon/Gabriel describing his murderers in *A Distant Shore*, Phillips 2004, 282).

The signifiers of the white working-class subject are explicitly conflated with intrinsic violent racism, which later in the novel culminates in the racially motivated murder of Gabriel/Solomon. In the above extract, not only does Gabriel/Solomon ‘recognise them’ as a potential threat, Phillips expects the reader to as well. Phillips uses the defamiliarisation technique of narrating an ‘outsider’ character in the first-person to shift the readers empathy away from the white (working-class) British characters to the black asylum seeker/illegal immigrant. Thus, Gabriel/Solomon, a member of a marginalised group, is individuated in the eyes of the reader, shifting the readers own understanding of the lives, thoughts and feelings of members of this group, which in turn can elicit ‘real world’ empathy with, and potential repositioning of attitude towards, members of this group.

In *Another London*, recognition of type also plays a central role in exposing the ideologemes that contemporary literary and media texts use to construct the white working-class identity. Dean’s first- and close third-person narration allows the implied middle- and upper-class reader to observe how members of a group they are likely to associate themselves with *recognise* Dean as white working class and how they respond to the associated negative characteristics they assume him to have. The following extracts from the novel highlight moments that Dean is profiled as white working class by his appearance and therefore deviant, dangerous and racist. In the first extract, a group of women *recognise* Dean:

He heard some chatter from inside the Eldon Brickworks gate and watched as a group of three girls came out onto the main road. They were dressed down in jeans and T-shirts, their blonde hair let loose across their backs. They were playful and giggling, bouncing along the road arm in arm…One of the girls caught his gaze and pulled the rest in line. They threw him silent cautious glances and then hurried off along the street with their heads down (Crewe 2017, 110).

In the next two extracts, Dean avoids the National Defence League (NDL) march by taking a back street where he is confronted by both a lone Muslim woman and a People Against Fascism (PAF) protest. Although not part of the NDL march or in any way sharing the NDL’s ideology, Dean is recognised as being associated with racism and far-right support. The PAF and the Muslim woman identify Dean through the visible signifiers of ‘inferior’ consumer choices with regards to clothing and general appearance. The chav figure becomes emblematic of aggression, racism and inferior cultural choices (Crewe 2017). As such Dean is a symbol of fear for the lone Muslim woman and a symbol of disgust for the members of the PAF, one of which exhibits class contempt by spitting at Dean’s feet. Dean is recognised by his appearance and categorised instantaneously into the dangerous, deviant and inferior white working class, rather than judged as an individual:

She’s staring right at me…She doesn’t move…I take a step forward and the girl shudders, a proper flinch…I look closer and see that she’s breathing quickly. In fact it’s her whole body. It’s shaking. I can see shivers all through her…She looks really freaked out…Her hands are grabbed together so tight I reckon the bones are going to pop out. (Crewe 2017, 222)

More and more people are staring at me as they walk past…The ones on the other side of the alley are still shouting stuff I can’t make out, but all the others are giving me the proper evil eye…In the middle of the group a tall skinny young one slows down and he’s giving me a proper eyeballing…The skinny bloke pushes his way through towards me and some of the others are egging him on and whispering shit to him…Matey has got proper close now and is looking right down his nose at me…He snorts…, bends forward and spits on the ground in front of me (Crewe 2017, 223-224).

Using similar defamiliarisation to Phillips’ *A Distant Shore,* *Another London* attempts to elicit empathy for an ‘outsider’ group - white working-class individuals - through the internalised first-person narration of the protagonist, Dean. A clear example of this can be seen towards the end of Part Five of the novel, occurring just after the events of the preceding two extracts. The accusation of intrinsic violent racism is made based on Dean’s physical appearance and dress, thereby profiling Dean as sharing, or at least complicit in, the NDL’s belief system. Immediately after this insinuation, Dean sees himself in a mirror and identifies the markers that determine his perceived socio-cultural value. He recognises the group that he is consciously and unconsciously associated with and rejects the idea that it represents him:

I’m so fucking white. Blotchy pink and white. Look at that crew cut hair. I scrape my hand over my head. It feels good, tight and cushioned. But it looks…I don’t know. I do know. It looks like all them other ones…I’ve even got the same polo shirt and grey trackie bottoms. Even me white trainers ain’t different…The reflection holds me. It’s the face…The eyes are slant and the cheeks are puffed and pointy at the same time. And the mouth. I see my lips curl up to one side like an Elvis quiff. I’m sneering…The face stares back at me and I know who it is. It’s Phil Harris. It’s all those fuckers in the NDL…I’m them. I look like them and everyone in the whole fucking world sees me like it too…But I’m not like them. I’m not fucking like them…He isn’t me (Crewe 2017, 226).

The imagined reader is from the socio-politically dominant middle- and upper-classes, who make up the majority of the production / distribution / consumption cycle of the literary novel. As Jameson remarks: ‘the centre of the naturalist narrative paradigm is the perspective of the bourgeoisie and its vision of the other (lower) classes’ (Jameson 2013, 149; See also Jameson 1988; Carey 1992; Tew 2007). As such, the imagined reader’s interpretive framework for reading literary texts is formed by the dominant, normalised and desirable, socio-cultural behaviours and lifestyles which they see themselves as, and the white working class as not, adhering to. By narrating these scenes from Dean’s internalised first-person perspective, *Another London* works to force a re-evaluation of the pre-existing assumptions about the white working class that the reader may hold. Firstly, as it does throughout the book, the narration has shifted from third to first person. This provides a technical augmentation of the defamiliarisation that the scene, as narrated from Dean’s perspective, creates in the reader. The implied middle-class reader associates themselves with an anti-racist stance (Ahmed 2004; Crewe 2017[[6]](#footnote-6)) which in the context of the fictional world is in line with that of the PAF members. By narrating from Dean’s ‘outsider’ point of view, the reader is positioned outside of their familiar ‘real-world’ perspective and distanced from the group they assume to share, in part, a belief system with. This shift from the third-person ‘dual-voice’ to the first-person character narration also works to distance the reader from their implicit identification with the third-person narrator/author, who is seen to occupy a similar position to the reader in the socio-cultural hierarchy. This process alters the way the reader interacts with the narrative, from spectating the third-person narration to identification with the character in first-person narration (Oatley 1999; See also van Peer and Pander Maat 1996 [in Kruez and MacNealy, eds. 1996]). Identification with an individuated character can elicit emotions of sympathy and compassion from the reader, enforcing them to re-evaluate their judgements of the character within the fictionalised world - one of the key strengths of practice-based research (Leavy, 2014). Creative writing takes us 'to where we've never been, to see what we've never seen...[then brings] us back... [to] look again at what we thought we knew' (Sullivan, 2010, 62). These self-modifying feelings can instigate changes in the reader’s attitudes to parallel/comparable real-life situations.

In the case of *Another London*, the reader’s assumptions about white working-class communities, as depicted in the typified representations of the white working class, are exposed and challenged, forcing the reader to re-evaluate their pre-existing beliefs and assumptions about the lifestyles of the white working class, and, as a result, interrogate the systems that maintain socio-cultural, political and economic inequality. Being able to ‘see’ and ‘feel’ the scene unfold from Dean’s point of view provides the reader with an alternative, defamiliarised perspective of the situation as ‘seen’ and ‘felt’ by a member of a marginalised group. As opposed to typified representations of white working-class characters, such as the protagonist, Keith Talent[[7]](#footnote-7), in Martin Amis’s *London Fields* (1989), the character of Dean is self-aware with a nuanced interiority that allows him to question his own behaviour, his position in society and the world around him. He is neither feckless or lazy, but rather a hardworking, responsible father who exists as best he can within the socio-economic landscape that he is born into, rather than the assumed ‘normal’ and ‘desirable’ socio-economic world of the middle and upper classes from which he is restricted access to. Thus, Dean becomes an individual, distanced from stereotypical generalisations, and the imagined reader re-evaluates their previously held assumptions about people from white working-class communities, insomuch as their socio-economic exclusion is a lifestyle choice, rather than a result of systemic inequality. In addition, readers from the white working-class community may well be able to relate to Dean as an individuated character, rather than a caricature used in relation to a middle- and upper-class worldview.

As discussed above, *Another London’s* shifting perspective between third- and first-person narration augments the defamiliarisation process. It has also been argued that first-person narration creates stronger identification between the reader and the character as opposed to when a character’s thoughts and ‘feelings are reported by someone else (usually an invisible narrator) who implicitly claims to have access to the character’s inner world’ (van Peer and Pander Maat 1996, 144 [in Kreuz and MacNealy, eds. 1996]). The second of these points also contains a further reason for the novel’s use of both third- (more specifically, free indirect discourse[[8]](#footnote-8)) and first-person narration, that of the author/narrator’s implied claim to intimate knowledge of the character’s thoughts and feelings.

Jameson (2013) argues that free indirect discourse is misleading in its proclaimed objective omniscience, and that it reifies, unavoidably, the existing hegemonic social order (see also Richardson 2006). Another criticism of free indirect discourse, centred around the assumption that the third-person narrator is able to know and imitate a character’s voice, thoughts and feelings in order to create identification and emotional response in the reader, is made by Gregory Currie (2010) who argues that the author/narrator’s implicit claim that character-orientated narration in free indirect discourse has a direct emphatic effect is potentially false: ‘it is not universally true that character-oriented narration raises to salience the point of view of that character; it may have the effect of raising to salience the perspective of the other character, the one we empathize with[[9]](#footnote-9)’ (145). Following the discussion above, that a reader’s emotional interaction and response to a literary text can have implications beyond the fictional world of the narrative, Currie’s argument could also be extended in a similar way. The author/narrator’s ability to shift the emphatic effect onto another character whilst seemingly appearing to imitate/have intimate knowledge of the protagonist’s voice, thoughts and feelings can have the effect of reinforcing an opposing point of view to that of the main character. This becomes important when the protagonist is a member of a marginalised group and the shifting emphatic effect may end up reproducing and reinforcing ‘familiar’ and ‘normalised’ feelings towards that character, and by extension their (‘fictional’ and equivalent ‘real’) social group, which in turn works towards the ‘maintenance and legitimation of dominant power and ideologies’ (van Dijk 1993, 125 [in Mumby, ed. 1993]). British literary fiction is disproportionately dominated by the middle and upper classes (Crewe 2017). Therefore, the use of free indirect discourse when depicting characters from a marginalised group will disproportionately result in the (conscious and unconscious) reproduction of ideologemes that reinforce the existing socio-cultural and politico-economic order. As such, *Another London*’s combined use of third- and first-person narration works to undermine this process by exposing the class-based ideologemes found in free indirect discourse through the foregrounding of techniques that induce defamiliarisation in the reader.

*Another London* exploits the nature of realist fiction by portraying aspects of a world familiar to the reader that are ‘perceived as part of a conceptual frame and ultimately integrated into the world the readers know’ (Fludernik 2009, 55). Its narrative meaning is established though the relationship between a reader’s response, the author’s conscious and unconscious intentions, and the stylistic construction of the literary text itself (Nunning 2008 [in Phelan and Rabinowitz, eds. 2008]). In this way, the novel works to create a connection between its fictional world and the real world of the reader. Literature is a unique medium, compared to other narrative forms such as film or theatre, in its ability to portray thoughts and feelings from directly within the character through first-person narration, which create identification with a marginalised, ‘outsider’ character, forcing a re-evaluation of a reader’s beliefs and assumptions about that character, and, as result, the fictional and real socio-cultural group to which the character belongs. As Miall and Kuiken (1999) conclude from a number of empirical studies: ‘during literary reading, the perspectives that we have, perhaps unthinkingly, acquired from our culture are especially likely to be questioned…This points to the adaptive value of literature in reshaping our perspectives…, especially by impelling us to reconsider our system of convictions and values’ (127). This observation supports practice-based research as consistent with more traditional scientific methodologies as they 'bear intrinsic similarities in their attempts to illuminate aspects of the human condition...and work toward advancing human understanding' (Leavy 2014, 3). Through the de-homogenising of an excluded group and the individuating of characters from that group, *Another London* aims to reshape assumptions, challenge stereotypes and ideologies, and to force a re-evaluation of how that group fits into the socio-cultural and politico-economic hierarchy of a purportedly democratic country.
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