Chapter II

Social Development: A Conceptual and Theoretical Critique
"Civilization is a matter, not of quantity of possessions, but of quality of life". It is to be judged, not by the output of goods and services per head, but by the use which is made of them.

(R.H.Tawney)

Development has acquired a prominent place in the ideals and aspirations of all human societies. The lucrative value associated with this process is to raise socio-economic standard and the life style of its citizens. In today's world the process of development is used to fulfil the Kernel needs of all the members of a society. Therefore, ideally and practically, the major concern of development should be to improve the quality of life and guarantee social justice. The functional aspect of development demands constant planning and programming in order to harmonise the desired objectives with the available resources of a society.

Most of the developing countries gained independence in the Late 40's and early 50's of this century. The predicament in which these countries found themselves at that time in respect to economy polity, society and culture was invariably such that the reconstruction of the society to facilitate the promotion of the well-being of the marginalised groups was of utmost importance to them. In
order to improve the lot of the masses, these countries like others, followed the path of planning. But the experience of last 45 years reveals that the goals of improvement in the quality of life and social justice in these countries are still a mirage. To quote, "In translating these goals into reality, they experienced a lot of difficulties, more particularly in the realm of social reconstruction." The failure to achieve these cherished goals even after 45 years of developmental planning can mainly be attributed to the problems relating to the choice of development models by these post-colonial nations. Quite often, it meant the uprooting of the existing traditional values and replacing them with new ones as envisaged in the new models. It would be of theoretical significance to place in proper perspective the models adopted for socio-economic development and to look critically at the prospect and relevance of these models to what Tonnies calls *gemeinschaft* (communitarian) societies.

In the light of four and a half decades of development experiments in developing countries, one comes across three main models and strategies adopted with a variety of ideological promises informing and inspiring them. Most of these newly independent countries adopted the western paradigm of modernization which was in spirit and content much like the capitalist model of growth, except for some modifications made by them in order to suit their local
conditions. Others chose the revolutionary path to nation building. They were inspired by the ideal of soviet socialist reconstruction and, later on, by the peoples Republic of China and other post-world war socialist countries. These experiments derived their inspiration from a common ideological source, but the operational strategies varied according to the specific national contexts and situational choices. At the same time a handful of countries tried to develop indigenous models based on democracy (e.g. mixed economy in India) and so forth. In most cases, these efforts represented a legitimization of the prevailing power structures, and their efforts to pursue an independent line often lacked authenticity. They could not therefore sustain on their own and in the process tilted towards either of the above mentioned dominant models, however, more inclination was shown towards the western model of development.

WESTERN OR CONVENTIONAL MODEL OF DEVELOPMENT

Western model is primarily based on the premise of the economic interpretation of development. The belief that social wellbeing would be improved out of economic surplus can be traced to the well-known thesis of Simon Kaznets, among others. Karzn (1955) argued that socio-economic inequalities would narrow down as economic development progressed. More specifically, economic development in poor
countries would produce long term distributive consequences analogous to those experienced in Europe and North America in the 19th and 20th centuries. Lured by the success of such thesis in Western economic conditions in terms of per capita income, the standard and cost of living, levels of consumption, distributive mechanisms and the production processes, the people at the helm of affairs in the developing countries pursued the western model in order to ameliorate the pitiable state of their people. This thinking grew out of the tremendous progress made in this direction in some of the western societies. It was firmly believed that once an improvement is affected in economic sphere, people will automatically change in other spheres of life, under the compulsion of the attraction of economic uplift (Lakshmanan, 1975). As a consequence of this belief, economic development became a major thrust area for planners. Economic development was recognised as the single measuring rode of the development of society. During the past years of planning in India, generating income became main concern, and the G.N.P. (Gross National Product) was considered as the symbol of development. There was an implicit assumption that the benefits achieved by the nation will percolate somehow to entire population. The concept of growth rate in terms of identifiable economic variables dominated the planning efforts. Following Malinowski's distinction between instrumental imperatives and integrative imperatives, the planning effort until recently has been in
the area of instrumental imperatives, that is attempting to fulfill the basic needs of life such as hunger, sex and security. The shift towards integrative imperatives is of recent origin and was focused when the economic planning could not account for some of the undesirable consequences witnessed subsequently. Gunnar Myrdal warned against this narrow view as early as 1968. According to him:

"Development must be understood as the movement upwards of the whole social system, including besides the growth of production. Along various lines, the conditions of production, distribution of the produce, consumption of different types in different social and economic strata and other living conditions, institutions and attitudes, particularly the political, social and economic stratification and finally policies as they are applied, indeed everything which is significant for the individuals' lives and for social relations generally between individuals and groups."

The above remarks about development buttress the argument that it is not the economic gain alone which moves the vehicle of development but the social and cultural aspects are much more important. While pre-occupied with notion that the social change will stem from economic development, planners and policy makers did not take into consideration the aspects like distributive justice, equality of opportunity etc. As a consequence, substantial chunk of the developmental gains were cornered by the small upper crust of society and concentrated in a few countries of the world. As a response to this state of affairs, launching of two development decades under the auspices of United Nations could not rescue the majority from this
distressing state the gap between Developed and developing countries, between classes and individuals continues to widen. For the sake of illustration, during the second development decade, the Pearson committee on international Development reported that 34 percent of the world population had more than 87 percent of the world's output (Simon 1975). Similar conclusions were drawn by the Brandt commission when it observed that "with 600 million people, India has a G.N.P. Two fifths the size of that of the United Kingdom, which has 55 million people 1980).

The incidence of human problems due to widening gulf in terms of poor health, illiteracy, high mortality, growing hunger and so forth, could well be cited as the evidence of the failure of conventional models of development.

Yet one more significant feature characterising such development is it has helped a thin minority become richer in a society where the majority are poor. To quote Kurick (1976), an Indian economist, cogently argues that:

"While one half of all Indians live in abject poverty, those in the upper half, especially those in the top layers (10 percent), have made a substantial material gain. And the eyelash has become too true in India: Two decades of planned economic development has led to the rich becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer."

This situation has been further confirmed by various world bank reports on developing countries. According to
one such report.

"The bottom 30 percent of families received a 7 percent share of the National income in 1971, but only 5.5 percent in 1980. In contrast, the top 5 percent of families increased their National income share from 24 percent to 30 percent over the same period. In terms of the average real income, that of the bottom 30 percent, poor families, dropped by 20 percent while that of the top 5 percent rose by 30 percent".

The above analysis brings out that benefits of economic development have gone into the pockets of rich and the power elite in the developing societies. Until the economic interpretation of development with no consideration of distributive justice continues, there is hardly any hope left for the teeming millions. The undergiven remarks by Hyung Shik Kim (1985) seem to aptly enlightening in this regard.

"Economic development in Asia will remain, as it has in the past, an elitist phenomenon. It will be done by the elite for the people, and not by the people for themselves, since it is an ideology supported more by the institutionalised interests of the powerful few, than by the choice of the large majority."

One consequence of this interest ideological hoarse is that many Asian countries are undergoing the experiences of developed countries. For the sake of example, Titmuss (1988), while discussing "social policy and economic progress" was to accept that Britain\(^6\) over estimated the potentialities of economic growth by itself alone to solve the problems of poverty, economic, educational, and social.\(^7\)
The above discussion illuminates one's mind to rethink the models that have penetrated the lives of the people in our society. Accordingly, there is a pressing need to critically evaluate the impact of economic development upon social structure and social problems, which may have direct implications for social development. The social losses as well as gains should force us to identify the social debts of economic progress (Kim, 1985).

**SOCIALIST MODEL OF DEVELOPMENT**

This model of development was adopted by countries that chose the revolutionary path. Following the basic teachings of Marx and Lenin, these countries attempted to dismantle the class base of power and rebuild their societies on socialist lines. This model is primarily based on the state intervention in order to minimise the dependency syndrome. Neo-Marxists stress the adverse effects of foreign aid, emergence of multi-national corporations, and the transfer of technology, creating increasing dependency and perpetuating underdevelopment (Frank, 1970). In order to do away with such fallacies, it was referred that how the socialist countries have characterised themselves with the state initiatives in order to help in the transformation of the economy and in the promotion of industrialisation. It was also emphasised that the state could introduce development through well chalked out plans.
Though the concept of planning has been predominantly introduced by the developing countries and has been adopted in a variety of economic systems. However, many economists like Frederick have questioned the very pre-mise of planning. For example he felt that "innumerable decisions regarding production and working of the economic system which are taken by a few individuals who assume responsibility for planning." it has also been criticized that the suppression of decisions of individual producers and consumers by a few planners is the surest way to serfdom. However, such a radical rejection of the very concept of planing has not found favour with the intellectuals. A section of intellectuals have pointed out that in this scientific age, a society must consciously guide its economic future in such a way that the desired goals can be attained. The discussion, therefore is centred not around whether the plan should be there or not but rather as how planning for development should be attempted (Dubhashi, 1987). Our planning and decisions ought not be arbitrary but suited to the ground realities in our society. Beckerman and strumpels (1976) remarks are aptly relevant in this regard as they argue.

"A correspondence between economic development and the quality of life should not be taken for granted, as assumed by many political leaders and development planners; it should be recognised as an empirical question suitable for investigations".

One important point to be highlighted here is that both
the above discussed models of development shared certain common fallacies because of which their relevance in developing countries became doubtful.

(a) Developing strategies based on conventional view of development inevitably result in an elitist form of development. The western model propagates that the economic growth of a nation will benefit everybody equally. It recognises the importance of those who own means of production and make the majority dependent. On the other hand, socialist model calls for state intervention in order to achieve distributive justice. This means that the role of minorities has to be recognised as capable of taking decisions about the future of the majority. This premise recognised that some people have institutional right to decide what they think about the majority of the people. Thus, both these apparently opposite strategies have a common purpose of primarily benefiting a small class at the top that owns and controls the resources and means of production.

(b) When development is equated with the rate of growth of national income, it inevitably acquires a quantitative character and qualitative considerations tend to get neglected. Under both the models, the decision-makers tend to regard quantitative improvements as important
because they can be measured. In the process, they neglect qualitative losses because they cannot be measured. In course of economic development, there is a measurable improvement in the quality of capital equipment and material goods. In the absence of distributive justice, this economic development results in various problems as pollution, human misery, congestion, crime and environmental degradation. Since these are largely qualitative changes, they tend to be overlooked. Our obsession with the growth rate of national income causes us to divert attention from the non-material developments, relating to health, education, housing and social welfare. As a result, while India is at the forefront of nuclear and space research, it has stubbornly high rates of illiteracy, infant mortality and persistent incidence of such recurring diseases as cholera, tuberculosis, malaria and leprosy that have practically disappeared in more affluent countries, while at the same time nearly fifty percent of our population live below the poverty line (Charles, 1993).

(c) The conventional paradigm of development pleads that the maximum economic growth can be achieved by allowing easy access to various countries of the world in trade relations. In order to derive the benefits of international trade, developing countries are urged to
open up their boarders to increased trade and flow of foreign capital. To remain competitive and increase their exports, the developing countries are encouraged to cut expenditures on social welfare programmes, education, health and are asked to keep low wages. The greater role of foreign capital in the economy and the increased reliance on market forces lead to increasing external indebtedness. It accentuates inequalities of income and wealth in the developing nations.

As the developing countries become plagued by privatization, deregulation, the inflow of foreign capital and international trade, they are becoming much more trapped in debts from developed countries and far from foreign savings coming into these countries, resources are actually flowing out of them. According to a report of international monetary fund (1990), the total debt of developing countries has risen from US $ 850 billion 1962 to US $ 1240 billion in 1988. Contrary to popular belief, net transfers of resources are from developing countries to the developed ones, and not vice versa. For example, these figures for 1988 were US $ 43 billion as against 18.2 billion in 1982. Increasing psychology of consumerism in developing countries for the foreign goods has become one of the major social problems these days. These countries are becoming more and more dependent on the world capitalist system. The objective of self reliance is missing in these
countries today.

(d) Conventional approach primarily focussing on economic and material gains has encouraged the developed nations to find out markets in developing countries and earn profits by overt or covert means. This has been often achieved by fostering conflicts among developing nations. Therefore, militarization is the inexorable logic. The supposed concerns for increasing economic power, political influence, and security issues compel the poor countries to spend major chunk of their budget on purchasing more and more arms. For example the figures revealed by Mehbubul Haq confirm this.

"Since 1992, arms spending has declined by 4 percent in the industrialised countries. In contrast, developing countries accounted for 18 percent of the global military spending in 1990, compared to 5 percent in 1960. Over the last five years, military spending has gone up fivefold in Africa compared to social and health spending. India and Pakistan, two of the world's poorest nations, spend US $ 20 billion each year on defence. Together, they bought twice as many arms over the last year from the global arms bazar than did Sudia Arabia, which is 25 times richer than these countries."

Specifically speaking, barely a quarter of century ago India spend 3 percent of its national income on defence and internal security today the corresponding figure is a 9 percent. The third world's defence spending rose from three percent of its collective G.D.P in 1955 to twelve percent in 1975. Meanwhile, of the 17 million people who have died in war and war related situations since 1945. The overwhelming
majority have been from the Third World (Chales, 1993). The important question which confronts one's mind is that who shares this burden of this huge defence spending? It can easily be argued that the poor, women and children are the most sufferers in this process. The money which should have been spent on meeting the needs of these groups, is being diverted for defence. According to the Human Development Report (1990), there are 800 million people living under gruelling poverty, half of them suffer from the ravages of famine, hunger and malnutrition. Less than 50 percent of the world's population has access to safe drinking water and over 40 percent are illiterate. The problem is much more grave in South Asia. United Nation's South Asian Report (1994) confirms this:

"Participation of states in the social services is low. The reasons responsible is that much resources are being diverted for arms. This is more true in case of India and Pakistan, where from 1989-92 much of the budgetary chunk has been spent on arms. For example India purchased mig-16 Juj Planes from Russia during current year and this amount would have beared the expenses for the education of 3 crore children." (United nations, 1994).

From Economic Development to Social Development

The foregoing discussion brings out that the conventional approach to development has associated development with economic growth. In return, it has benefited a few and deprived a majority. This can mainly be attributed to the elitist character of planning and
development. Marx's argument seems to be more relevant here when he says that "The ruling ideas of a society are the ideas of its ruling classes". Objective conditions in capitalist societies favour the conventional definition of development because maximization of economic growth will ensure the maximization of private profits. In Socialist countries, the need to achieve socialist goals and, later, the need to ensure their survival from attack by capitalist countries led to an identification of development with economic growth" (Charles, 1993).

Instead of solving the problems, conventional paradigm of development has adversely affected the welfare of masses and has caused major environmental problems. There is an immediate need for a radically different conception of development. This new approach should definitely be a united one, putting the people at the centre of its nerves. It was in 1977 that UNESCO drew the attention of the nations towards the need for such a unified approach in its resolution during a discussion on International Development Strategy. The resolution laid down:-

"The strategy was not content merely to lay emphasis on the social objectives of development. There is a need that social objectives (sustained improvement in the well being of individual) which may entail qualitative and structural changes in the society are both determining factors and end results of development and that they should therefore be viewed as integrated parts of the same dynamic process and would require a unified approach".
Such a changing perception about development therefore, adds a new dimension to the process of development and that is that the development is a holistic and multi-dimensional concept. It is centred around qualitative change in the lives of people, a process through which a liberating environment is created for the balanced economic, social, cultural, physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual progress of human beings. People should be the masters of the forces which determine their destiny. This has further been confirmed by United Nations:-

"Development is a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political process, which aims at the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all its individuals on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of benefits resulting therefrom".

(United Nations, 1986).

From the above observations of United Nations we come to conclude that the concept of social development is inclusive of economic development but differs from it in the sense that it emphasises the development of the totality of society in its economic, political, social and cultural aspects. In this sense social development approach is not concerned exclusively with the planning for social services, any more than it is with the exclusively planning of economic growth. There are many areas, apart from social or welfare services, wherein the social perspective has a relevance. Prominent ones among these are areas relating to population policy, policy relating to urbanization, l
industrial location and environmental pollution, policies relating to regional development, income growth, income distribution and land reforms, policy governing administration and people's participation in planning and in the implementation of plans (Gore, 1973). It should not go unmentioned that a social development perspective cannot permit propositions in which economic development comes first and is latter followed by steps to ensure distributive justice through a modified income policy or provision of an extended network of tax supporting social and welfare services, as is found in developed countries. In this sense social development, as distinct from conventional approach, involves planning for simultaneous development on many different flanks.

Thus we can conclude that social development fits in what Malinowski has called integrative imperatives of development planning. It is a process of empowering the people to control the forces around them. Therefore, goals like eradicating poverty, increase in employment, reduction of inequalities of incomes and wealth, curtailment of pollution and preservation of the environment, improvement of health, education, housing and the social welfare of the people at large become of primary concern. In other words, human needs are central in the implementation of social development objectives to the extent that it can be used to incorporate criteria for evaluating the performance of
development programmes (Kim, 1985). The superficial conception of development held by conventional economies is abandoned and the energy, intelligence, creativity, skill of people fuel a more balanced development process which definitely culminates in a surge of economic development. A new trend has developed in which social costs of economic development has acquired major concern. It is being held that both economic and social aspects are interdependent and ought to be given equal importance. For the sake of example one can say that by organising resources for health and education we indirectly contribute to the economic development i.e. a healthy individual can work effectively for a considerable period of time which will contribute to economic gains. Similarly education widens the capabilities of an individual to think it is here that his/her experience and skill can be better used for more economic development. (Myrdal 1968).

As mentioned earlier that quality of life of people has become testimony of a true development and growth rate of GNP is being considered as a narrower measuring rod. It is difficult to measure the changes in the quality of life but such developments are perceptible and can be measured in terms of degree of inequality of income, the percentage of the population living below the poverty line, infant mortality rates, life expectancy, total literacy rates and female literacy rates. The experience of many countries
clearly shows that improvement in the physical quality of life can be brought about even at low levels of per capita GNP. High level of per capita GNP does not necessarily bring about improvements in the physical quality of life. For example oil producing countries have high infant mortality rates and low female literacy as compared to the countries in South Asia, though the per capita income and GNP in oil producing countries is much higher than South Asian Countries. Similar trend is per capita income as compared to others but the quality of life has not improved with the rise in incomes. For example Kerela has a per capita income of Rs.1560 as compared to Punjab's per capita income of Rs 3658. But so far as the quality of life is concerned Punjab is lagging behind Kerala. The literacy rate was 70.4% (Kerala) and 40.9% (Punjab) in 1981. Similarly the life expectancy is 68.4 (Kerala) and 63.1 in Punjab, the infant mortality rate is as low as 17 per thousand as against 55 in Punjab. The sex ratio in two states is also at variance and it is 1032 females per thousand males in Kerala and 879 females per thousand males in Punjab.

Environmental degradation due to heavy industries is now becoming one of the main concerns for development planners and policy makers. Since, under the auspices of conventional model of development, economic gain was the main concern at the cost of any kind, there was unlimited
industrialisation in order to raise the per capita income. This approach resulted in the ecological imbalances, resource depletion and social disintegration. A sustainable model (Social development) of development recognises the need to set a definite limit to large scale industrialisation and to promote eco-friendly development units. The unlimited path of industrialisation is more lucrative for the rich while the resources depletion and ecological damage destroys the environment and harms the health and wellbeing of the people.10

Development Models and Women and Children

The lust for economic gain has mainly affected women and children. Prior to 1970 it was believed that the conventional model of development has affected men and women in the same way. Since, productivity was equated with the cash economy and so most of women's work was ignored. When it became apparent that economic development did not automatically eradicate poverty through trickle down effects, the problems of distribution and equality of benefits to the various segments of population became of utmost importance in development theory. To quote Momsen (1991):

"The early 1970's model of integration based on the belief that women could be brought into existing modes of benevolent development without a major restructuring of the process of development, has been the object of much feminist critique. The
alternative vision recently put forward, of development with women, demanding not just a bigger piece of some one else pie, but a whole new dish, prepared, baked and distributed equally. International development has been challenged to transform itself into a process that is both human centred and environmentally conventionist. 

In response to this changing perspective world community came out with a declaration which reads out: -

"In both economic and social terms, the most productive policies and investments are those which empower people to maximise their capacities, resources and opportunities. Social and economic development can not be recalled in a sustainable way without the full participation of women and equality and equity between women and men is a priority for the international community and as such must be at the centre of economic and social development". 

The world community further resuscitated its commitment as: -

"at the national level, we will review the impact of structural adjustments programmes on social development, including, where appropriate, by means by gender sensitive social impact assessments and other relevant methods, in order to develop policies to reduce their negative effects and improve their positive impact, the co-operation of international financial institutions in the review could be requested by interested countries" interest in maximization of profits and taxes without shedding tears for the consequences it produces for women's destination. For example despite so many legislations for banning liquor sale, the laws are hardly implemented, simply for the reason that governments earn tax through it. But who is the ultimate sufferer? Men drink liquor and it affects family income, shatters family life, makes women vulnerable to tortures by men and also affects the future of children.

On the other hand, there is no limit for industrialisation, multinational companies, IMF and the World Bank are encouraging building of big projects and dams
in the developing countries. As a result, environment is degraded, trees are cut and lands are used for such lubricant booms. This adversely affects women and children e.g. due to ecological imbalance there is no rain and no water and the women in a place like Rajasthan where they already had to cover miles to get a bucket of water, now have to go fartherest places in search of water and wood. Consequently, women lose energy and health. This also eclipses the health of the child. Women are all the time in search of these scarce goods, and get very less time to take care of their babies.

The above discussion leads us to argue that the new approach (Social Development) should be unified in character and have a balanced view of development while giving due recognition to the culture and values of respective societies, equal participation of sexes and equal contribution of countries. But some scholars have already warned about the success of such an approach to be properly implemented due to the counter forces at work both at the national and international levels. Therefore, it may be too naive to hope for the implementation of a unified and integrated social and economic approach which would run counter to the interests of the rulers, governing elites and privileged classes.14

The above remarks seem to be relevant even when we
analyse the commitments made at the Copenhagen social Summit (1995). The very commitment number one contain, certain references which reveal the hoarding of interests by the international financial gamblers. The commitment says that:-

"at the national level, we will promote dynamic, open, free markets, while recognising the need to intervene in market to the extent necessary, to prevent or counter act market failure promote stability and long term investment, ensure fair competition and ethical conduct and harmonise economic and social development, including the development and implementation of appropriate programmes that would entitle and enable people living in poverty and disadvantage, especially women, to participate fully and productively on the economy and society."

The above declaration contains references like free market, necessary intervention in the markets, market failures long term investments, and fair competition. From this we can infer that a group of elites will decide when and how the intervention is required by declaring that the state has failed to stabilise the market. On the other hand, international agencies will define the efficiency of indigenous markets and create a room for the open competition inorder to declare that only certain countries, agencies and individuals are capable of delivering services with efficiency. This has become a reality for countries like India. By introducing the economic reforms, government is trying to minimise the state intervention and encourage privatisation in the name of efficiency of services. Even governments, do not hesitate to privatised the basic social
sectors namely education, health etc. Latently, this shows a reverse shift from state intervention to laissezfaire. This kind of policies encourage the maximisation of profits where have can maximise it and have nots would become dependents upon them. In the process it is the women and children who are most suffers. When the government for example in India is talking of empowering women by giving concessions, reservations etc. in jobs, to women, at the same time the job market is being shifted from public to private hands. The private sector bosses often impose certain conditions which prevent women from joining private sector.

On the other hand international institutions like IMF and World Bank decide for countries like India when and where to start projects financed by such agencies, without caring about the masses who are affected by environmental damages which these projects usually cause. The recent examples are Narmada Dam, Tahri Dam, Enron Power Project and others. In all the cases local population and sincere intellectuals (including environmentalists) have shown a strong resentment against this. People in such places are compelled to migrate to new places. In such alien places women and children suffer most. Since people, are already adjusted in one atmosphere and when they are forced to migrate to other places, they are faced with new socio-economic and environmental conditions. Sometimes the new
conditions contain elements to which women and children are not accustomed and become easy prey to harsh weather and displacements. Children's health get affected because sometimes the foods available at newer places do not suit them till they become habitual. Many new born babies lose their lives in this process of transition.

The above analysis emphasizes that care is needed while adopting any particular model for development. It has brought truth back home that in developing countries there is a lack of communication between the planners, decision makers and those who have a better understanding of latent as well as manifest consequences of such models on the people, their culture, their values, and their day to day life. There is a need to recognise the role of social scientist to critically evaluate the models and concepts relating to development and their role in decision making should not be undermined under any circumstances. Finally these models should be more "people oriented". When we say "people oriented" it means that it should serve the interest of general masses and not only the interest of elites.
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