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ABSTRACT: Apartheid is claimed by many to be over. The ideology has been largely abandoned. The apartheid legislation is being repealed. Yet political, economic and social structures, constructed during the four decades of apartheid, remain. Inequalities associated with apartheid are shifting, with new inequalities emerging. The ending of apartheid is experienced differently by different groups leading to different perceptions of the current situation. For many the ‘ending of apartheid’ has shifted nothing.

‘Mastership and baaskap are stained
Stained into the mind and soul
Since the day of conquest
Till nowadays
Hard to erase’
(Modikwe Dikobe, 1983)

South Africa’s participation in the Olympic Games in 1992 marked, for many people, the official world recognition of the ending of apartheid. Nelson Mandela’s presence for the opening ceremony in Barcelona seemed to endorse this. During 1992 there were other signs of international recognition that things were changing. Some commercial sanctions had been withdrawn. Sporting links were increased. Visitors to South Africa are told again and again that ‘apartheid is over now’. Not everyone shares this perception. There are some who feel that the participation of South Africa in world sporting events is giving the world a misleading impression and that it should not take part in them yet. In mid-1993 the cultural boycott continues. The oil and arms embargo continues. Some trade sanctions remain, e.g. the trade in gold coins. For some, apartheid is by no means over. This article sets out to explore the contradictions of these views. Is apartheid dead? Is it dying? Or is it very much alive?

Meanings of apartheid

One reason for the confusion is that the term ‘apartheid’ is used in many different ways with different meanings, not just in the simple textbook definition of ‘separate development’. Some of these meanings are attached to the ideology of apartheid. The word was coined by the Nationalist Party, which came to power in 1948, to describe their policies. The word itself is an Afrikaans word meaning separate-ness or apart-ness. The term apartheid has been attached to Nationalist ideology and theories ever since, even though these have been modified during the past few decades. The central features of this ideology have been variously interpreted over time to encompass: racial segregation; separate development of the different groups; preservation of white Afrikaner identity; white political domination; exploitation of cheap black labour; or the maintenance of the capitalist system. As the emphasis of the ideology has shifted so has the meaning of the word. Which aspects of this ideology need to disappear before apartheid can be declared dead?

The term apartheid has also been commonly used to mean one or more of the thousands of apartheid laws, passed between 1948 and 1988, which determined who could live, work, eat, travel, play, learn, sleep and be buried, where and with whom. If these laws are removed from the statute book is that the end of apartheid?

The apartheid laws have been interpreted and implemented. Their implementation has altered the spatial, political and economic structures of the country. For some, apartheid means the visible surface of these structures, the visible realities of these laws in everyday life. Others are more aware of the deeper structural features of the political, economic and social life of the country and of the inequalities sanctioned by apartheid legislation.

Lastly, the meaning of apartheid varies according to experiences of it, which are different for different groups of people in South Africa and different again for visitors. These experiences over four decades have changed the way people think and talk.
This article refers to all these layers of meaning. It focuses on four aspects of apartheid and the recent changes related to them: classification of people; apartheid on a national scale; apartheid at the urban scale; and apartheid at a local scale. It will then discuss how these changes appear to different groups of people.

**Classification of people**

_We have been defined as black people and when we reject the term non-white and take upon ourselves the right to call ourselves what we think we are, we have got available in front of us a whole number of alternatives, starting from natives to Africans to kaffirs and bantu to non-whites and so on and we choose this one [black] precisely because we feel it is the most accommodating_ (Steve Biko, 1978).

One of the elements of apartheid ideology has been the preservation of the identity of the white Afrikaner people. The idea of the distinctness of different groups of people underpins the classification of the people of South Africa. The Population Registration Act of 1950 required every person in South Africa to be classified and registered as belonging to a particular group. There was a broad classification into native, White, and Coloured groups. (The term ‘Native’ was later changed to ‘Bantu’ and more recently to ‘Black’). Coloureds were sub-categorised into two major groups: ‘Coloureds’ and ‘Asian’, sometimes referred to as ‘Indian’). The classification took place within seven days of birth, by which time the child had to be registered. Later, at the age of 16, the classification appeared, in a code number, on the identity document that everyone has to possess, regardless of classification. The identity card numbers are stored on computer in Pretoria.

The Population Registration Act in itself did not cause people to refer to people by ‘racial categories’ or to treat them differently. This had been taking place in some form for centuries. What it did do was to attempt to force the complex reality of the South African population into rigid, defined categories so that different classified groups could be treated differently under the law. It is not surprising that the Population Registration Act has been called ‘the cornerstone of apartheid’ and ‘the mother of apartheid laws’ (SAIRR, 1992).

It has now been repealed. Since June 1991 the law has not been on the statute book. If people are no longer classified, is that the end of apartheid? It is not as simple as that. The legislation applies only to those born after 27 June 1991. Those born before that date remain classified on the population register. This is because some of the discriminatory laws still apply, most notably the right to vote. Under existing legislation those classified as White can vote for members of the House of Assembly, those as Coloured for the House of Representatives, those classified as Asians for the House of Delegates. Those classified as Black can only vote for officials in their black townships or their so-called ‘homelands’.

The remaining apartheid laws are increasingly contested. One example is the requirement that all men classified as White have to do military service at 18, then spells of military service at intervals. There have been several cases of white people refusing to do military service, claiming the law is discriminatory.

So although the Population Registration Act has been repealed the political and military structures which were essential to the apartheid regime remain. They are not expected to last much longer. It may be, however, that some racial classification will continue in order to facilitate the protection of minority (‘white’) interests.

What is likely to remain, however, is the way the classification of people is built into attitudes. It structures people’s thinking. Many white groups in South Africa always use the ‘racial’ categories when referring to groups other than their own. When they talk about people, or a man, or teacher, etc. without the racial description they are talking about white people. For instance, if they say, ‘most people in South Africa have swimming pools now, most people support this or that… ’, they are talking about white people. The other groups are quite separate in their minds.

Black people frequently experience the impact of this classification. They can be asked to go to the back of a queue, are referred to with insulting terms, just because they are black. Very
occasionally the classification which was introduced to control the black population is used against the white population. In August 1992, a white garage owner shot dead one of his employees in Umtata, Transkei. Word spread round Umtata quickly and street demonstrations involving hundreds of people followed. White people who happened to be walking in or driving through the streets were attacked, because they were white.

How long will it be before the categories disappear in people’s minds? Will there come a stage when most people will see others in South Africa as people rather than categories? One of the six textbooks published for the new South African geography curriculum does try to do this (Carr et al., 1991). The chapter on population mentions age structure, and the distribution, but makes no mention of classification. Nor is it mentioned throughout the book. The pupils, of course, will know which groups are being talked about when they study the ‘homelands’, or maize farming. But they are being encouraged to think of everyone as just ‘people’. This may seem unrealistic and idealistic. It certainly challenges ingrained thinking.

This article, while not accepting the distinctness of different groups in South Africa, nevertheless uses the apartheid terms of Black (limited in this article to mean Black African, although it is often used in South Africa to include Asian and Coloured), Asian, Coloured and White. It seems impossible to write about apartheid without using its terminology.

Apartheid on a national scale: grand apartheid

‘Where you stand the grass is rich and matted, you cannot see the soil. But the rich green hills break down. They fall to the valley below, and falling changes their nature, for they grow red and bare; they cannot hold the rain and mist and the streams are dry in the kloofs’ (Alan Paton, 1958).

Apartheid on a national scale is most clearly seen on Figure 1. It shows South Africa’s land is divided up and allocated according to ancestry and language groups. These divisions on the map of South Africa were based on divisions constructed well before the Nationalist Party came to power and before the apartheid laws were established. The Black Land Act of 1913 and the Development and Trust Act of 1936, had already restricted most rights of the Black African population to these parts of the country. The Nationalist government used these existing boundaries to construct a system of 10 ‘homelands’ for the black population, although far more than 10 separate areas of land were involved. Each black person was allocated to a particular homeland. The Bantu Authorities Act of 1951 established separate administrative structures for the ‘homelands’. The next major step in the construction of apartheid on a national scale came in 1959 when the Promotion of Bantu Self-government Act was passed. The Act took the concept of racial and ethnic identity and expanded it into a system of separation and control. The theory of apartheid was that the homelands would develop towards independence, its citizens would be stripped of their South African citizenship and leave ‘white’ South Africa as a white state. The division of the black population into separate ethnic groups and separate homelands diffused and fragmented power. Black people were allowed to buy land and property only in 13 per cent of the land which was contained in these homelands: 87 per cent of the land was for the white population and white ownership.
This article is using the past tense. In June 1991 60 laws which limited the rights to live in and own land in particular areas were repealed in their entirety in one Act, the Abolition of Racially-based Land Measures Act. One cabinet minister said that it was the government’s firm intention to turn apartheid into ‘a political dodo’. In repealing the laws, President De Klerk said that apartheid did not work, ‘it was an experiment gone wrong’ (SAIRR, 1992).

It is clear from government statements that the grand theory of apartheid, as far as separate development is concerned, has been abandoned, even if that abandonment is stated in such casual terms. Most of the laws have been repealed. Is this, then the end of grand apartheid? Not quite. Not yet.

For a start, the map remains the same. The so-called ‘homelands’ still exist and will continue to exist as legal entities with their own administrative structures until the new constitution is established. What will happen then is uncertain. Between 1976 and 1981, four homelands (Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei – sometimes referred to as the TBVC states) had moved so far along the road of separate development that they were granted ‘independence’ by the South African government although this independence was not recognised by any other countries. South Africa has no legal powers under the existing legislation to incorporate them into a new South Africa against the will of their leaders. It is likely however, that Transkei and Venda, under their present leadership, would want to be re-absorbed. The present leaders of Ciskei and Bophuthatswana are likely to want to keep their present powers, possibly within some federal structure. They could be hampered in their
wishes by their lack of financial independence from South Africa. Ciskei receives two-thirds of its income from South Africa and Bophuthatswana receives about a quarter. It is possible that they would suffer financial penalties if they did not acquiesce to South Africa’s plans.

The other six homelands had been given self-governing status under the Self-Governing Territories Act of 1988. This increased their powers to set up their own administrative structures, without giving them legal independence. It seems likely that these six self-governing homelands will be re-absorbed into South Africa, although the present administration of Kwa Zulu would argue for retention of some separate powers within a federal structure. Other remnants of the separate development ideology remain on the extreme political right. A group of Afrikaners is arguing for the setting up of a separate white homeland, a ‘Volkstaat’, located in Transvaal and the Orange Free State.

Although the theory and laws have mostly disappeared and although it is likely that the boundaries will be redrawn, other impacts of the grand apartheid will persist for many years. The inequalities in land distribution will remain. There are no plans for the redistribution of land except via the market, in which Blacks have limited purchasing power. 87 per cent of the land is at present under white ownership. The homelands, under African ownership, amount to only 13 per cent of the land area. Not only is the land in black ownership smaller in area, it is poorer in quality. Much of it is overpopulated, overgrazed, eroded and on the whole less suitable for agriculture. Whites own land containing better farming land, most of the country’s minerals, most of the roads and railways and all the main ports. There are marked visible differences between the land in the homelands and the land in ‘white’ South Africa (see Figures 2 and 3). While inequalities in land distribution and population distribution continue these boundaries in the landscape will continue to exist even when the fewer border posts, indicating a homeland boundary, have been removed.

Figure 2: Natal. Boundary between part of the ‘homeland’ of Kwa Zulu and ‘white’ South Africa, showing contrast between overgrazed eroded land of Kwa Zulu and the less populated ‘white’ land.
In addition to the evident unfairness of land distribution there is continuing bitterness from the struggles and confrontations which were part of the process of implementing the homeland policy. Just over a million black Africans who had worked on farms in the white areas were moved from the land to their homelands between 1960 and 1983. A further 600,000 Africans were compulsorily moved from ‘black-spots’, an official term used to describe African freehold land acquired (before the Black Land Act of 1913) in areas which were later declared for white occupation only. Each removal from a black-spot is a story of struggle and bitterness, with very few successful outcomes for the black farmers. Most ended up transported to homelands up to 300 miles away, and settled in areas where they were provided with tin toilets, and some land for cultivation, but insufficient land for grazing. In addition to the settlements of people moved involuntarily, settlements grew ‘voluntarily’ as black people chose to build homes in areas in homelands ‘as close to the cities as grand apartheid allowed’ (Lemon, 1991). One of the largest areas of black settlement in a homeland is Winterveld in Bophuthatswana, a sprawling settlement with a population estimated to be approximately half a million (Smith, 1990), within commuting distance of Pretoria in ‘white’ South Africa. One of the legacies of grand apartheid is the large number of settlements of desperately poor people involuntarily resettled or ‘voluntarily’ settled in homelands. They provide a pool of cheap labour willing to commute considerable distances to earn an income or to apply for 11-month contracts to live and work apart from their families in ‘white’ South Africa. Most school textbook accounts of migrant labour in South Africa fail to mention that the migrants first migration was an involuntary one into the homelands, making their second migration into the urban areas necessary.

Another legacy of grand apartheid is the continued confrontation and struggle as some resettled groups try to reclaim their land. The White Paper on Land Reform of 1991 did not address the issue of black land dispossession. The land which black farmers were forced to leave has in most cases been bought by white farmers who have no intention of releasing it now. Communities which have tried to reoccupy land taken from them at, for example, Brakllegte, Machaviestad, and Doornkop have all experienced difficulties. In parliament it was stated that those blacks who had been removed had already been compensated (SAIRR, 1992). Nevertheless, members of 60 dispossessed communities are planning a national campaign to press their claims to land expropriated under apartheid legislation.¹

**Apartheid in the urban areas**
‘South of a city is a city’
Another aspect of change is in the urban areas. During the last decade both the theory of apartheid in urban areas and the laws enforcing it have disappeared. One part of the theory, which was developed well before the Nationalist Party came into power, was that ‘the native should be allowed to enter the urban areas ... when he is willing to minister to the needs of the white man and should depart therefrom when he ceases so to minister’ (Transvaal, 1922, p. 47). A series of laws since the 1920s had restricted the rights of black people, controlling their employment and where they could live. Residentially they have been restricted to ‘locations’, now called townships, situated apart from towns, separated by a buffer zone. Some lived in shacks; some lived in rented accommodation. Others lived in single-sex hostels, either for males or females, without their families.

Several changes over the last decade have signalled the decline of the theory. From 1978 Blacks were allowed to buy their township houses on a 99-year lease. Since 1986 they have been allowed to buy the freehold. The pass laws were repealed; black people no longer had to have a work permit to be allowed to be in an urban area. These changes were the beginnings of official acknowledgement that black people, although still denied the vote, were being regarded as permanent residents in the urban areas.

Another significant change, described by Chief Buthelezi as ‘another nail in the coffin of apartheid’ has been the repeal of the Group Areas Act of 1950. Since 1950 there has been legislation to divide up all urban areas into residential areas each for the exclusive use of one racial group (Figure 4). The 1950 Act mostly affected Coloureds, Asians and a few Whites as Black Africans were already separated in their own townships. Urban apartheid was constructed by the removal of thousands of people from their homes. The Surplus People’s Project estimated that between 1960 and 1983 approximately 860,000 people were moved as a result of the Group Areas Act (Platzky and Walker, 1985).
Now things have changed. To some extent legislation has followed events. For over a decade some white areas had become increasingly mixed as people of different groups ignored the law and moved in. For example, Hillbrow in Johannesburg was already mixed by 1980. Such areas became known as ‘grey areas’ and were officially acknowledged in the Free Settlement Areas Act of 1989, which applied to a few limited areas. More recently, wealthy Black Africans and Indians started moving into more exclusive white areas. The repeal of the Group Areas Act in 1991 acknowledged the increasing breakdown of the law and removed the widespread remaining legal restrictions on who could live where.

Thus in some senses apartheid in urban areas is finished. Those who can afford to and who wish to are moving into ‘white’ areas. In some areas, e.g. Leondale, near Johannesburg, the process is quite rapid. Once a few Black families move into an area, more are likely to follow. White people then start selling their property and moving elsewhere. In some areas there is movement in the other direction. As the recession bites, some white people have been pleased to be able to buy houses in a ‘coloured’ area near the centre of Cape Town at half the price of similar white houses (SAIRR, 1992).

Although the theory and the laws have gone, the urban settlement patterns with their ‘starkly differentiated housing stock’ (Smith, 1992a) and their buffer zones dividing the group areas of the past, will persist for decades. The inequalities in housing will remain. The divide between those who live in superior and inferior housing will have shifted slightly away from a division
on grounds of racial classification to a division based partly on income. There has been little
class change in residential areas so far (Simon, 1989).

Some of the bitterness associated with past struggles to resist removal will also remain. One
of the most notorious struggles was in District Six in Cape Town, at the foot of Table Mountain
and close to the central business district. This area had long been settled by ‘Coloured’
people, who were forcibly moved between 1966 and 1982 to settlements in the Cape Flats
some 10 miles away. Following the outcry about the removal there has since been very
limited development in the area, renamed Zonnebloem. The area, which had an estimated
population of 38,000 in 1965, now has fewer than 4000 (Lemon, 1991). The virtually derelict
area and the relocated settlements on Cape Flats remain as legacies of apartheid.

**Apartheid on a local scale**
Alongside the legislation affecting residential areas there have been changes affecting
schools, with attempts made to reduce the inequality between them. Since 1991 financial
pressure has been put on white schools to become multi-racial. All schools had to raise a
certain amount of their income from fees, with white schools having to raise the most. The
amount to be raised by fees was substantially less for those white schools agreeing to admit
Black, Coloured and Asian pupils. Most white schools agreed to change their intake so
access to school is not now determined solely on grounds of colour, but by ability to pay fees.
The inequalities are shifting; a new black middle class is emerging. Huge inequalities of
accommodation, equipment, and staffing remain between the schools in different group
areas, but they are being slowly reduced (Table 1). The task of removing them completely is
‘formidable’ (Van der Berg, 1991).

**Table 1**: South African per capita expenditure on school pupils by racial classification, as a
percentage of white expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black African (including homelands)</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979/80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/90</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the visitor the most obvious signs of apartheid used to be the notices about separate
amenities for different groups. The whole Durban sea-front was divided up into separate
beaches for Whites, Asians, Coloureds and Blacks. Notices made it clear who could sit on
and swim from which beach. The Separate Amenities Act of 1953 had required municipal
authorities to make separate provision for different groups. The Act has now been repealed.
The beach notices have disappeared and those beaches which had been for the exclusive
use of white people are used by all groups.

Another example of what came to be known as ‘petty apartheid’ was the separate provision
for different groups on trains. Whites travelled first class, Blacks travelled third class. Not only
were the trains segregated, but the ticket office and the bridges in some stations. The
difference is now that anyone who can afford it can travel first class. So many of the first-class
passengers are Black, Coloured and Asians. The commuter trains of Johannesburg epitomise
the new inequalities in South Africa; there is a shift from separation according to racial
classification to separation according to income.

The repeal of the Separate Amenities Act has been welcomed by most black people and by
many white people. In many areas there has been tolerance and acceptance of the changes.
In some traditional Afrikaner areas of the Transvaal and Orange Free State, however, there
has been more resistance. Municipal authorities have found ways of circumventing the
changes. In Piet Retief, for example, non-residents were required to pay an annual fee of
R500 (about £100) to use the municipal library, while residents could use it free (SAIRR,
1992). Townships are outside towns.

There are no laws against restricted entry to *private* facilities and discrimination is common.
Petty apartheid is dead, but unequal treatment continues daily.
Perceptions of the changes

‘H.G. Wells might have invented such a place: a country where people occupy the same space but live in separate time frames, so that they do not see one another and perceive different realities’ (Alastair Sparks, 1984).

The perception of different realities continues in relation to the changes described in this article. People in South Africa have totally different experiences and perceptions of the current situation.

For many white people the changes have been enormous. Everything that they associated with apartheid has gone. They hear the National Party denouncing the theory. They know the laws have gone and they experience change. The public amenities they use are now all mixed. They are likely to sit next to people from different groups in the cinema, on the beach or in a café. They are aware of the growing Asian and African middle class, very evident in towns in shops and businesses. They see Black and Asian people moving into their suburbs. They see mixing of groups in their schools. They are aware of the presence of far more poor people in their town centres. Many feel that apartheid has gone.

Their views are shaped by their experiences, but there is much of their country they do not see and experience. The ‘social cleavages’ of apartheid (Smith, 1992a) restricted social mixing by white people with people from different groups. For many Whites their only visits to the homelands are to travel to other parts of the country along the roads which go through them or to visit one of the casino and hotel complexes built on their margins. Very few have ever visited a black township. The roads they are likely to use do not take them through any of them. Townships are not even marked on most maps. The South African AA tourist maps do not show them, apart from Soweto. A spokesperson for the South African AA said that he did not think such omissions were a problem since ‘blacks prefer someone to give them directions in the form of landmarks and streets rather than to use maps’.

Atlases published in Britain also have what could be considered apartheid maps of South Africa. The names of settlements in which 26 million black South Africans live are not marked. Not all atlases mark Soweto which has over a million inhabitants. Other settlements such as Winterveld, Crossroads, Sharpeville, Boapatong are not marked. This is not because of their size. Some amazingly tiny white settlements are marked on atlas maps. The arguments used against marking them do not stand up. They are not suburbs of white settlements. Black people who live in Tembisa do not think of themselves as living in Kempton Park, nor do they have Kempton Park for their address. If there are too many settlements to be marked, why are only white settlements selected to be shown? If marking them gives recognition to apartheid, then what about the other uncomfortable realities which are marked on atlas maps?

The perceptions of the white community of the ending of apartheid is shaped by its experiences, which for the majority are limited by the structures which apartheid has constructed, and by the invisibility of much of black experience and existence.

For middle class black and Asian people much has changed. They have far greater access to land, housing, health, education, and amenities than before the repeal of the apartheid legislation. They still wait for the vote on a common electoral register.

For poor black people, living in townships or in the homelands, little has changed. They remain poor. Poor black people are harder hit by recession, inflation and unemployment. Their homes remain inadequate. Their schools remain overcrowded, with large classes, poor buildings and few resources. They still have to commute large distances from settlements established during the apartheid decades to seek work. They continue to take up opportunities for migrant labour in the towns. They continue to farm the eroded lands of the homelands. The ending of apartheid has changed nothing in their lives. They are expected by some to be grateful for the right to do things, such as eat, swim, live and work where they like in their own country. They are expected by some to be grateful for the opportunity, if they had the money, to share the facilities Whites have enjoyed for decades. Many Blacks, far from feeling grateful, feel bitter about their past experiences; they feel impatient that things are not
changing, and angry at the everyday violence which is unequally concentrated in black areas. Their perceptions are totally different from those of most Whites.

Apartheid, in many of its meanings, is disappearing. The theory and ideology have been discarded. Only a small minority cling to the old ideology. In April 1993 the National Party, anxious to distance itself from its apartheid image, changed its colours. De Klerk, unveiling the new colours, spoke about scrapping apartheid, opening its doors to all South Africans and breaking ‘with that which is wrong with the past’. The apartheid laws have mostly been repealed. Those remaining on the statute book will be removed with the new constitution. Geographical divisions, apartheid patterns on the landscape, and unequal structures, will remain. Some Blacks, Asians and Coloureds have become part of the more privileged group and more will follow, but inequalities between rich and poor are greater than ever. The attitudes and feelings developed by different groups during the apartheid decades will be slow to change. The changes in South Africa raise the greatest expectations, provoke the deepest fears, and provide a huge challenge to a new government. This is only the beginning of the end of apartheid; there are so many inequalities to shift.

Author’s note
In July and August 1992 I visited South Africa for a period of six weeks. During this period I stayed with ‘white’ relations and friends in Cape Province, Orange Free State, Transvaal and Natal and with ‘black’ friends in Transkei and Bophuthatswana. I visited many other ‘white’ and ‘black’ homes and discussed the changes taking place in South Africa with most people I met. I also visited schools and had the opportunity to discuss the situation with both ‘black’ and ‘white’ teachers and pupils. The perceptions of different groups referred to in this article are based, it is recognised, on access to a limited number of people during a limited time. They represent an opportunistic sample at a time of change. The general thesis of the Longman Lecture, which has been modified slightly to form this article, was checked again and again with different people and modified accordingly.
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