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FOREWORD

To contribute to an understanding of, and the improvement of educational practices related to, cognitive learning by children and youth is the goal of the Wisconsin R & D Center. Of primary concern are the learning of concepts and the nurturing of related cognitive skills. Conditions within the learner and conditions within the learning situation are also relevant areas of research and development.

In the study of children's learning of political concepts, Professor Dennis and his assistants have compiled an extensive bibliography of published and forthcoming works as a first step in the synthesis of the existing knowledge in the developing area of political socialization research. The value of the bibliography alone to researchers and curriculum developers is considerable. By introducing the bibliography with a survey of political socialization research in which he identifies ten basic problem dimensions and uses existing empirical hypotheses to illustrate the dimensions, Professor Dennis emphasizes the extent of research that has been completed while giving the political and social scientist an introduction to the emerging field of political socialization and a foundation for use of the bibliography.

Herbert J. Klausmeier
Co-Director for Research
The forms which synthesis of existing knowledge may take are many, ranging from isolation of grand, unifying principles to the cataloguing of tested hypotheses. The present work attempts neither of these tasks, although it could serve as a first step toward their eventual accomplishment. What is attempted here is to give an indication of the main currents of a newly developing academic area. It consists of two parts: (1) a general survey of the major substantive problems of political socialization research, (2) a bibliography of published works on political learning and socialization including those about to be published. The preparation of the general survey has been the sole responsibility of the principal author. In the preparation of the bibliography, however, considerable assistance in investigating items of potential relevance has been given by Irvin H. Bromall and Margaret Colvin Tropp. Less extensive, but nonetheless valuable help has been provided at various points by Keith R. Billingsley, Reid R. Reading, and Sondra Thorson.

J. D.
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The newly developing research field of political socialization can be defined in terms of studies which focus upon individual acquisition and intergenerational transmission of political orientations—particularly orientations which bear upon stability and change of the political system. The field has experienced remarkable growth in roughly the last fifteen years. Evidence of this growth is found in the bibliography presented herein. In addition, ten basic problem dimensions emerge from this literature, only a few of which have been explored in any but preliminary fashion. These dimensions are illustrated by some of the existing empirical hypotheses. Most of the work of the field still remains to be done; nonetheless, there has been a substantial degree of activity of which even the practicing researcher in this field is unlikely to be fully aware.
SURVEY OF THE POLITICAL LEARNING AND SOCIALIZATION LITERATURE

In the political and social science of the last decade has emerged a new specialization—the study of political socialization. It represents a shift in direction of scholarly interest in the relation of the educational system to the polity. The great philosophers of politics and education of the past—Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau, Mill, de Tocqueville, Freud, Dewey and others—had provided a rich lore of speculation about the induction of new members into the political system and their learning of politically relevant concepts, values, and expectations. But it is only recently that investigation of political socialization has begun to transform this speculation into a reliable understanding of what these phenomena are actually like.

This is not to say that the present empirical emphasis is without its forerunners. Precordatory efforts occurred as early as the turn of the century, but none made any immediate or lasting impact upon scholarship. They served neither to focus the field of inquiry, nor to provide points of embarkation for subsequent research. The one series of investigations made before World War II which might have turned investigation in its contemporary direction was the series on civic training led by Charles E. Merriam. But these studies lay dormant in scholarship for over a generation. Social scientists were too preoccupied with other matters to follow the lead of Merriam and his colleagues.

Part of the latter preoccupation was pertinent to recent progress, however—particularly the development of new research methods and the growth of greater interdisciplinary awareness and cooperation. With new maps and machinery, what had for centuries remained an area of philosophical speculation began to be changed in the last decade into a field of knowledge.

Progress has not yet gone very far. Nevertheless, advances have come about of which both the student of politics and the learning specialist are apt to be unaware. It is the task of the present survey and bibliography to communicate the developments that have appeared. It is hoped that this guide to the literature will enable the student to trace the progress made through 1966 and thus encourage new initiatives.

The study of political socialization as presently conceived is a natural meeting ground for a number of social and behavioral disciplines. It blends the perspective of the behavioral political scientist with that of the general learning theorist. It depends also upon contributions from political sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, and specialists in a number of educational and psychological specialties, such as child development and social studies curriculum development.

In part, this richness of cross-disciplinary interest complicates life for anyone who attempts, as here, to overview the field. Some indistinctness of boundaries occurs no matter how the area is defined. It is difficult, for example, to say just where general socialization stops and political socialization begins in many concrete instances. There is a general assumption underlying much of this research that political learning can be to a large degree separated from other learning and that it may proceed in ways unlike concept development in mathematics, grammar, or other subject fields. In the published data there is much to suggest that this assumption is tenable in that the young American child in the elementary school, for example, has already learned many things about the political system that are quite removed from his ordinary daily experience and probably unconnected to other subject areas that he is learning about.

To assert therefore that political learning is worth studying in its own right makes necessary a specification of its scope and limits. This is especially important for a task such as the present one. This introduction will give an "operational" definition of boundaries by specifying what is to be included in the field of political socialization research and thus
what is to be studied about political learning. This delimitation will involve three steps: (1) defining what is meant by "political socialization"; (2) discussing other criteria of inclusion which are relevant to this compilation of studies; and (3) outlining the major problem dimensions of the field of political socialization research as it is developing, including with the outline some illustrative hypotheses from the existing studies.

DEFINITION OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

At the broadest level, "political socialization refers to the way in which society transmits political orientations—knowledge, attitudes or norms, and values—from generation to generation. The term socialization encompasses more generally the special set of teaching and learning processes which serve to make the member—especially the new member—fit for cooperative group life. It entails adjustment of the socializee's orientations and behaviors to conform to the needs of an ordered social system, to other special demands of the culture, and to the individual's roles in society. Thus, the content of socialization is culturally defined and societally approved. It assumes that new members do not automatically make their adjustment without society's help, and it assumes that it is dysfunctional to society and to the individual for him to attempt to make a fresh adjustment every time a new social role must be played. The great emphasis is upon change, growth, development, or learning of behavior patterns over time. This learning may serve to preserve traditional patterns and values, which is its usual societal effect, or, when the young are brought up to a set of expectations different from those of their forebears, it can be a primary vehicle of social change.

In order to include studies which bear upon political socialization from the above perspective, the present survey is focused especially upon research on development, growth, or the process of attainment of political orientations and behaviors. The change, for the individual, from uninitiated to initiated member of the polity is crucial. A discussion of such development necessarily encompasses portions of the "youth" literature on politics because youth is a period during which political expectations and values develop rapidly and widely among many sectors of the population.

Development does not stop on the threshold of adulthood, however. Political maturation and resocialization continue through the life span of the individual. Because of this, political socialization research must attend to more than formal citizenship education and early political learning in the family. The great emphasis throughout this literature is upon the variety of formative periods and possible influences on political behavior.

To define socialization thus takes us some distance in specifying criteria of inclusion. We still need to know what is meant by political, however. The working definition which has been employed here is that of Easton, viz., "the authoritative allocation of values for a society." The objects and relationships which bear upon this allocation in some fairly direct way—including both formal and informal institutions and processes of the political system—are included by the formula. It includes most of the things we ordinarily think of when we talk about politics in the wider political system—whether international, national, state, provincial, local, or even those more functionally specialized systems such as school districts and supra-national, limited political systems like the European Community.

One trichotomization of these system objects and relationships which Easton provides is important for the present identification of the orientations and behavior to which political socialization is directed. These three levels of the political system are the government (or authorities), the regime, and the political community. The authorities are the day-to-day occupants of the more important political roles. The regime is the structure of authority—the form of the political order including norms and rules of the game which determine the character of authoritative roles. And the political community consists of a shared division of political labor among a group of people who settle their problems peaceably and in common.

In the bibliography below, items bearing on each of these three major areas of political content are included. Hyman's synthesis, for example, bears mainly upon governmental level orientations, e.g., party identification. The two Easton and Dennis studies, "The Child's Image of Government" and "The Child's Acquisition of Regime Norms: Political Efficacy," illustrate research relative to the regime level. The Piaget and Weil article on "The Development in Children of the Idea of the Homeland and Relations with Other Countries" deals with recognition of the political community. These three levels are a
primary part of the overall definition of the content of political socialization as conceived here; thus they are essential to the task of detecting contributions to the field of inquiry. A major reason for this emphasis is that these three levels of the system (and of orientation) are closely connected to a central theoretical problem of political socialization research: how the content and circumstances of intergenerational transmission of political values, beliefs, concepts, and attitudes affect support for the system at each level. The natural interest of the political scientist is in supportive or disruptive influences upon given and assumed patterns of political organization. A central class of questions, therefore, concerns what it is about political socialization that constitutes either supportive or disruptive influence on government, regime, or political community. These factors may have to do with political socialization's content, patterns of individual development, agencies, or a variety of other things that will be spelled out below. Students of politics are interested in most of the questions other social scientists would be concerned with in studying these phenomena, but a primary political perspective is upon how collectivities of individuals growing up in a political society become adjusted or unadjusted to existing patterns of political organization and provide, therefore, conditions which bolster or undermine the persistence and stability of the political order.

OTHER CRITERIA OF INCLUSION

It is hoped that this survey will serve the purposes and concerns of others in addition to the political scientist. In surveying the journals and other works from 1950-1966 (and the journals surveyed are listed in the Appendix), the works chosen for inclusion are of special interest to political science, even though political scientists working with a well-developed concept of political socialization did not produce the majority of them. On the other hand, there has been an attempt to expand definitional horizons enough to take account of interests in this subject outside political science. While a major purpose of the compilation is to inform political scientists about progress in this field, it is hoped that it has utility for other social scientists as well.

In general, items have been excluded which concern nonpolitical socialization, although a few of these topics such as growth or orientations toward authorities in quasi-political contexts are included. Also excluded is a subject closely connected to the study of political socialization in the minds of political scientists, viz., political recruitment. It is not always possible to disentangle the two in specific pieces of research. Many works on political elites deal with both topics more or less simultaneously. The approach here has been to exclude the recruitment research except for studies containing separate sections distinctly concerned with the processes of political learning.

There has been an attempt, furthermore, not to bias the collection either in favor of mass-oriented or elite-oriented literature. The systematic empirical work done in the field favors the former; however, it should be noted that the field is weighted on the side of studies of youthful political learning, moreover. Thus, one finds relatively few pieces on adult, activist, or elite political socialization except for rather informal, biographic, and impressionistic types. The dross rate in the latter was too high, it was felt, for inclusion here.

The main interest has been throughout in quantitative empirical studies—those using accepted social science methodology to arrive at generalizable and reliable conclusions. A few more speculative pieces are included, but mainly because they advance empirically testable, theoretically worthwhile propositions or they summarize the empirical findings of others.

This compilation like any other, therefore, will not serve equally well the interests of everyone who uses it. But, given some bias toward the special interests of the political scientist, it should be of some help to everyone who is interested in seeing what has been accomplished to this point.

THE MAIN AREAS OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION RESEARCH

In collecting this literature, it has proved convenient to identify the major problems of political socialization research. This identification has been made in part from the topics the researchers have chosen, in part from other attempts to lay out the field, and in part from an attempt to define more broadly the scope of the empirical endeavors. Ten present, major questions or problem dimensions are identified. Except for the tenth—which has come into focus more recently—these have been spelled out in greater detail elsewhere.

Thus, description of them here can be brief.
They are presented because it is believed that their recognition will aid seeing how the many bits and pieces of research in this area could at some future time add up to a cumulative and more general understanding. The ten areas are:

1. **System-relevance of political socialization**
2. **Varieties of content of political socialization**
3. **Political socialization across the life cycle**
4. **Political socialization across different political systems**
5. **Political socialization as it varies between subgroups and subcultures of a society**
6. **The political learning process**
7. **The agencies of political socialization**
8. **The relative effects upon different individuals or the extent of political socialization**
9. **Specialized (especially elite) political socialization**

A given piece of research may fall into several of these analytically distinct areas. For example, a study which attempts to trace the age-related development of particular orientations (say political issue sensitivity) falls into Categories 2 and 3. If it then considers, in addition, sex or social class differences in this age-related development of orientations, it is included also under Category 6.

**System-Relevance**

The most important aspect of political socialization for many political scientists is its effects upon the rest of the political system. They ask, "What impact does it have upon political life?" One of the general hypotheses relative to this basic question is that "no system can attain or remain in a condition of integration unless it succeeds in developing among its members a body of shared knowledge about political matters as well as a set of shared political values and attitudes."15 Another quite general hypothesis of this same species is that "all political systems tend to perpetuate their cultures and structures through time, and that they do this mainly by means of the socializing influences of the primary and secondary structures through which the young of the society pass in the process of maturation."16 These two are linkage hypotheses of a most general type.

A third, more limited hypothesis which makes this connection is one proposed by Converse and Dupeux. They say, relative to French political socialization:

Partisan attachments appear therefore to be weakly developed within the less politically involved half of the French electorate. While undoubtedly a large variety of factors, including the notoriety which the French parties had acquired in the later stages of the Fourth Republic, have helped to inhibit their development, more basic discontinuities of political socialization in the French family appear to be making some persisting contribution as well.17

Together these three hypotheses typify significant generalizations connecting political socialization to the rest of the political system. This kind of proposition may serve either as a premise or as an ultimate goal of analysis of political scientists who carry on this research. So far, such propositions have served more as theoretical frames of reference than as objects of empirical research.

**Content**

A second broad dimension of political socialization research concerns its content. What is transmitted from generation to generation? Which values, attitudes, beliefs, expectations, concepts, motivations, skills, personality traits, etc. are articulated or rearticulated in the orientations and behaviors of new generations of members? There are two central aspects of this content: the kinds of objects and relationships to which orientations or other learning refer and the types of learning—knowledge, perceptions, evaluations, etc.

For example, one type of primary object of political learning is political authority. The new member learns about the relationship he is expected to have to chief executive officers of the state, members of representative organizations, law enforcement officials, administrative officials, judicial authorities, as well as to authoritative institutions such as the U.S. Congress or to the whole political order represented, for example, by "the government."

An illustrative hypothesis in the context of childhood socialization would be:
The New Haven findings may be summarized as follows: children are at least as likely as adults to perceive high political roles as being important; they seem to be more sympathetic to individual leaders (and, in general, to politics) than are adults; in at least some cases their actual images of political leaders are qualitatively different from the images one would expect adults to hold, especially in the emphasis on de-ignancy; and most important, the widespread adult political cynicism and distrust does not seem to have developed by eighth grade. 18

As one can readily understand, a great variety of objects and relationships serve as foci of political socialization, ranging from the most general—e.g., the whole system, its fundamental levels, its input, output, or conversion processes—to the most specific—politician x or local issue y. Several types of political learning come into play, ranging from general organizations of orientations as in political ideology, personality, or culture to specific psychic phenomena—attitudes, cognitions, images, and the like. Only a few of the most important of these learning types have been explored to the present. But, relative to most other dimensions of the overall problem, this is one of the areas where knowledge is presently richest.

Maturation

A third dimension is that of individual development across the life cycle. If the circumstances of political learning are likely to affect greatly its character and relative transience or permanence, then the developmental staging of political socialization comes to be of primary scholarly interest. The kinds of questions that are usually asked in this regard are "When does political learning begin?" "How rapidly does it take place?" "What are the most crucial developmental periods?" "When, if ever, does it terminate?"

Some hypotheses that have come out of developmentally oriented research include the following:

Our pre-testing suggests that, as with regard to the political community, in a relatively stable system such as the United States firm bonds are welded to the structure of the regime quite early in childhood. By the time children reach the 7th and 8th grades, most of them have developed highly favorable opinions about such aspects of the political structure as the Presidency, Congress, or "our government" in general. 19

Children clearly are first aware of federal and local government; understanding of state government ordinarily does not come until sixth grade and even among sixth graders there is less awareness of who occupies the governorship than there is awareness of the incumbent president and mayor among fourth graders. The federal level is the first at which there is "full" understanding in the sense of awareness of both the executive (the President and his duties) and legislature (Congress). 20

These are but two examples of a wide range of findings on the developmental sequence of political learning, another area where knowledge is beginning to accumulate.

Generations

A second temporal dimension of political socialization is generational variation or similarity. Whereas maturation refers to the individual person's development of orientations throughout his life, generational variation is concerned with shifts in the state of the political system which become reflected in the adjustments to politics made by different age groups or cohorts. Generational differences come about because of differences in experience of members of society who are born at diverse points in history, and these differences become incorporated into the stream of political learning.

Such differences may in part overlap with other factors so that the generational effects per se become difficult to untangle. This is particularly the case for such aging or life cycle phenomena as "teen-age rebellion." Such rebellion, if it occurs, does so both within the context of differences in experience between the generations and within the domain of the life cycle, e.g., the loosening of familial bonds by the adolescent as part of growing up. It also overlaps in this case a social agency relationship, that with the socializee's family.

The literature dealing with generational phenomena per se—partialing out effects of life cycle or family relationships—is fairly sparse at this point, but some hypotheses have been put forward. One is: "Probably there are (in the U.S.) fairly significant genera-
tional effects in the area of partisan affiliation that result from the impact of the Great Depression and New Deal. Another similar hypothesis is: "The fact that the student group with which we are concerned has come of age politically in a conservative period whereas their parents came of age politically in a liberal period should operate to differentiate the two generations." This is one of the areas of political socialization research where least is known.

Cross-Cultural Differences

One of the "spatial" aspects of these phenomena is their variability across different political systems. Cross-cultural differences and similarities are perhaps one of the most readily fascinating features of political socialization for the political scientist. If systematic differences among nations are found, then, on the more general theories relating political socialization to system stability, change and persistence, an account can be given of subsequent variations in behavior of these systems.

The cross-cultural differences or similarities may be of many kinds—in fact, they could vary on all of the other aspects mentioned above and below. In some societies political socialization may play a greater supportive role relative to other means for allowing the system to persist than in others. The content of political learning is likely to be different across societies as well. Equally, some systems may put great stress upon early, school-related learning—which appears to be the case in the U.S.—whereas others—say Britain—appear not to do so.

An illustrative hypothesis from the limited, cross-cultural literature would be the following: "In the United States, Britain, Germany, and Mexico, on both levels of educational attainment, and in Italy among those with primary education, remembered participation in school discussions and debates is related to an increased sense of political efficacy." Hypotheses of this kind which have an empirical base are as yet difficult to find in the political socialization literature. This is one of the areas, therefore, where most of the work still remains to be done.

Group Differences

Another type of variation of substantial interest to political scientists who are concerned with the role of different status or geographical groups in politics is that of subcultural or group differences in political socialization. Evidence has been generated, for example, that the sexes in the U.S. exhibit different patterns of political learning, which are apparently reflected in later disparities between male and female political behavior. Socio-economic, religious, ethnic, regional, or other groupings could also serve as bases of continuing variation in politico-cultural transmission. Fred Greenstein reports findings of sex differences in political socialization from his New Haven study:

Here we see that sex differences in political response of the same sort which have been reported since the turn of the century were still present in 1958, in this group of urban, Northern children. Not all of the questionnaire responses differentiate between boys and girls; but on those that do, boys are always "more political."

There are many differences among various strata or groupings which have apparent political consequence; but only a few, including sex and social class, have been given much attention in the published work on political socialization.

The Learning Process

Another potential area of concern is the more amorphous and untouched problem of how political learning takes place. It is not so much the question of which agencies are responsible for which kinds of content at which point in the life cycle or across generations, societies, or subgroups, so much as it is the question of what the processes of teaching and learning look like relative to other subject matters. Do people learn politics in the same way that they learn arithmetic, spelling, or grammar? What kind of model describes this learning's progress—a gradual, incremental model or one showing abrupt changes? Is it something which proceeds in set fashion; or is it essentially a random process? Are affective and cognitive learning processes quite different and separated in this area, or is there similarity and simultaneity between them? Is there simple transference from nonpolitical learning (e.g., about authorities) to the political realm? Is learning mostly indirect, latent and unconscious, or the reverse? A host of questions are present here. The literature unfortunately leaves most of them unanswered.
One hypothesis that has been advanced is that several different learning models are involved for a complex area of learning such as this. Robert Hess proposes three major models—"unit-accretion," "interpersonal-transfer," and "cognitive-developmental"—and suggests that each applies to different types of political learning. He suggests that the unit-accretion model would apply, for example, to the acquisition of information about the political system, that the interpersonal-transfer model would pertain to patterns of interaction with authorities, and that the cognitive-developmental model would apply to more abstract institutions such as the Supreme Court. Elaboration of and testing such models is still at an early stage.

The Agencies

"Who teaches the political lessons learned?" has been of foremost concern in this research. Those who transmit the political culture are inevitably in a strategic position to influence its content, sequence of presentation, reinforcement, and the like. Everyone who has thought about the problem has generally regarded the family and the school as among the most basic and influential forces acting upon the new member's inculcation in political values. The other agencies which are also often considered include peer groups, relatives, friends and neighbors, the mass media, secondary groups of many kinds, and even the government itself as it acts out its more dramatic roles as in presidential elections in the U.S.

A classic hypothesis about the relative role of various agencies is Hyman's: "Foremost among agencies of socialization into politics is the family." A somewhat opposing hypothesis is provided by Jennings and Niemi. From analysis of their national sample of American high school seniors and their parents, they propose:

Parent-student correspondences differ widely depending upon the values considered, with party identification standing highest, though even that value represents a distinct departure from perfect transmission. Parent-child congruences for other values taper off from this high, ranging from moderate at best to very low. This is true of attitudes on specific issues, ratings of socio-political groupings, political cynicism and political cosmopolitanism.

As we see, progress has been made here, but a great deal needs doing on this issue as well as on a number of other agency-related questions.

Extent

A ninth general set of issues concerns what we might term the " politicization" aspect of political socialization. The basic question here is how great is the impact of the political system, its agencies, or external events upon individual members. Many continua of effects could be postulated: highly socialized—unsocialized—alienated; parochial—subject-participant; etc. We could ask in this connection about the relative intensity of political socialization (between different members, societies, agencies), its coverage in terms of the numbers and types of political orientations, its spread over segments of the population, and the like. It has been hypothesized that some societies such as the U.S. or the U.S.S.R. expend considerable resources in formal citizenship education whereas others seemingly spend little, e.g., Great Britain. A comparison of the U.S. and U.K. on participant orientations reveals, however, only a small difference in the respective outcomes, even though the U.S. does tend to show slightly greater politicization in these terms. The general problem, of course, is to connect intensity and scope of training (or other socialization) to individual and aggregate outcomes. So far, this has remained essentially implicit in these researches.

Specialized Political Socialization

A final area that can be distinguished for present purposes involves the transmission of knowledge and expectations to prospective occupants of less general political roles, especially in elite socialization. Students of politics from Plato to modern day public administration specialists have concerned themselves with the question of leadership training and motivation. Empirical perspectives upon this specialist training as it either meshes with or differs from general political role socialization is very sparse, however. One of the few works of direct relevance was the early Eulau, Buchanan, Ferguson, and Wahlke study on the political socialization of American state legislators. They concluded the following:
What do our data tell us about the political socialization of state legislators? In general, it seems that a great many sources are operative in initiating political interest. Perhaps the most significant finding is tentative support for the hypothesis that political socialization—the process by which political interest is acquired—may occur almost at any phase of the life cycle, even among men and women whose concern with public affairs is presumably more intense and permanent than that of the average citizen. But it seems to take place more often at a relatively early age.

Although a few recent contributions such as Barber's or Kornberg's and Thomas' have carried this inquiry forward, in general it is one of the least developed areas of political socialization research.

CONCLUSION

Like any new field, the research area of political socialization exhibits boundary indeterminacies. For all of its blurriness, it nevertheless has quickly come to be regarded as an important area of research for political and other social scientists. Although probably none of the other workers would define and specify the field's major problem dimensions in precisely the way presented here, it is hoped that there is enough commonness of purpose to make the bibliography which follows generally useful.

NOTES

1. See, for example, some of the early studies on exemplars cited by Fred Greenstein in Children and Politics (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1965), Chapter 7. Another example would be the two 1902 studies edited by Earl Barnes (cited below in the bibliography) concerning the development of children's political ideas.


4. See, for example, Greenstein, op. cit., or the reference in note 5 below.


7. See, for example, Easton and Dennis, op. cit., or Greenstein, op. cit.
13. It should be noted in this connection that some students of politics have a rather broader definition of political socialization than the one employed here. See, for example, Richard Rose, Politics in England (Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown and Company, 1964), Chapter 3.
14. See Jack Dennis, op. cit.
15. Easton and Hess, op. cit., page 228.
32. Ibid., page 312.
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