FAMILIES OF THE IMAGINATION: 
MYTHS OF SCOTTISH FAMILY LIFE IN 
SCOTTISH CHILD WELFARE POLICY

These children look upon the heads of the family as their parents and the younger branches as brothers and sisters; the best feelings of the heart are engaged, the affections are cherished and drawn out, not smothered in the child’s breast as if among strangers. The endearing terms ‘father’ and ‘mother’ are used and believed in by the younger ones, and though as they grow older this relationship is better understood, yet the attachment is formed, and has a beneficial effect in after life ... they appear with a buoyancy of spirit, a confidence of manner, and happiness of countenance which shows that they are at home, are happy and well cared for.¹

In 1864 Glasgow city parish parochial board celebrated 100 years of ‘boarding-out’ children who had been made homeless. There was no equivocation in the policy for another 100 years. On the eve of the First World War almost 90% of Scotland’s pauper children were placed in foster homes; in 1945 this proportion had not changed. Placing a child with a foster family was always deemed preferable to institutional care, for the family occupied a central place in the worldview of the new middle classes who populated the public and private child welfare agencies. But, the family of the child savers’ imagination was not the family experienced by the majority of working-class children who passed through the care system. This article examines the ways in which ideas about the ‘Scottish family’ influenced child welfare policy in Scotland in the period before 1945.
The nineteenth-century family, according to the Swedish novelist and dramatist August Strindberg, was ‘home of all social evils, a charitable institution for indolent women, a prison workshop for the slaving breadwinner and a hell for children.’ Strindberg was a fierce critic of the patriarchal bourgeois family which, by 1900, had become the ideal model of family life across Western Europe, not only for the professional and commercial middle classes but for countless individuals and institutions who sought to reform and restructure social life. And it is especially interesting that children featured in Strindberg’s critique since middle-class family models invariably centred on the child. The family was a child-focused unit. Children ‘were now central to all those occasions on which the family represented itself to itself’; that is on ritual occasions such as birthdays and religious ceremonies. According to John Gillis, ‘children were never allowed to leave the mental worlds that families now inhabited’, so much so that by the twentieth century ‘middle-class families could no longer imagine themselves without children’.

It is this tension between the idea of the child as the jewel at the heart of the family and the family as a ‘hell for children’ that forms the focus of this discussion of social policy and practice in the field of child welfare in Scotland before the Second World War. Families are places of the imagination as well as concrete collections of individuals. They have become one of the main ways by which people experience and understand their world and as a result, at least since the early nineteenth century, the family has functioned both as an indicator of social stability or tensions and as the key institution by which society might be reformed. Indeed, during the Victorian age, tremendous symbolic weight was placed on the family, since the home and domestic intimacy were regarded as key sources of strength for the nation and the empire. The result was a tension between ‘the way families are and the way we would like them to be’. Because the family ‘we live with’ so rarely lives up to the ideals of the ‘family we live by’, which takes on the characteristics of a timeless or mythic ideal, ordinary families and homes become the focus of anxiety and attempts at reform. Children are the linchpins in both of these ways of thinking. They were both the victims of so-called dysfunctional or broken families and the promise of
the future. Children were the key to the breaking and making of families in modern Scotland.

Child welfare policy in nineteenth century Scotland was informed by a number of familial discourses. These discourses - on the rural family, the urban working-class family and the middle-class family - were used to legitimise invasive and disciplinary strategies in respect of poor communities. Scottish policy on homeless children - that is children who were orphans, had been deserted by or separated from their parents by poor law boards - was to remove those children from their environment and to place them with substitute families, either elsewhere in Scotland or overseas. By 1900 around 10,000 Scottish children at any one time were being cared for outwith their natural families. The vast majority, never fewer than 75%, were boarded out with foster families. The rest were housed in children’s homes and up to 10,000 of these were emigrated overseas between 1870 and 1930, mainly to Canada. The overwhelming majority of children placed in the care system were not orphans in the strictest sense of the word; that is they still possessed one or sometimes both parents. This was particularly the case after 1885 when parish authorities were given greater powers to separate children from parents reliant on poor relief ‘in the case of children whose parents or other near relatives are of the depraved or criminal classes, and where the contact of the relatives with the children would be manifestly injurious to the latter…’ The term ‘orphan’ was an emotive one however, used to good effect by child welfare workers and ‘child savers’ to elicit sympathy and support for their actions. Thus in many cases where a child was ‘rescued’ and removed into care by the local authority or one of the child saving charities a surviving, if fragile, family was torn apart.

The key to understanding policy and practice in the field of child welfare at this time is to imagine a competing set of family models. The middle-class domestic ideal, encompassing the maternal mother, the breadwinner father and dependent children, represented an idealised ‘imaginary family’ for those working in the field - poor law officers, local authority welfare agencies and child savers belonging to a range of charitable organisations like the Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. The characteristics of this bourgeois
ideal were used as measuring sticks by which to judge those families which attracted the attention of the state or voluntary sector on account of poverty, unemployment, drink, child cruelty and so on. This idealised model of the bourgeois family was centred upon the notion of a community of parents and children, based on affection and intimacy, the sexual division of labour and, at its heart, the private, sacrosanct world of the home.9 Thus, this middle-class family was distinguished from the notion of ‘household’ which encompassed production as well as reproduction and, it was believed, a different set of relationships governed more by economic than emotional considerations. However, in Scotland, and particularly in the cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, these middle-class family values were certainly aspired to but not necessarily attained.10 In Glasgow, for instance, more than a quarter of households in some well-to-do neighbourhoods were headed by unmarried or widowed females and in many professional homes the separation of home and work was difficult.11 Notwithstanding the realities of middle-class family life, the Glasgow city authorities, long opposed to institutional care and committed to boarding-out homeless children with foster families, demonstrated their adherence to this romantic, intimate concept of the family. In 1872 one of their visitation superintendents commented in his report:

   Indeed, it would be highly gratifying to any philanthropic and rightly constituted mind to witness the strong love and mutual attachment that subsists between the great mass of these children and their foster parents. The state of affairs must be very gratifying to the [Children’s] Committee … in as much as they all have fostered and encouraged the engrainment of the outdoor nursing system on the domestic tree which has hitherto proved so eminently successful.12

   Constructed in contrast to the middle-class ideal was the urban working-class family and, to a lesser extent, the poor rural family. Social reformers, local authority officials and philanthropists universally characterised the poor working-class family as dysfunctional requiring surveillance and discipline if it was to be prevented from destabilising society through
its reproduction of ‘racial, sexual and social degenerates’. Underpinning this analysis were the undeniably awful social conditions for the industrial urban working class and its rural counterpart. Scotland was a country in which the social consequences of industrialisation, urbanisation, rural depopulation and poverty were of unparalleled intensity. This was a low-wage and seasonal economy, experiencing high mortality rates, and intense overcrowding. By the 1840s the speed of urban expansion and the failure to provide the most basic of civic amenities combined to herald an unprecedented social crisis in Scottish towns and cities. By 1850 almost one third of Scots lived in towns with 10,000 inhabitants or more and by 1911 the four cities of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dundee and Aberdeen contained 30% of the Scottish population.

One of the most distinctive features of Scotland’s transition to an industrial economy was the level of overcrowding experienced by the urban working-class population. In 1901 around half of Scots were housed in dwellings of one or two rooms and 11% lived in just one room. The notorious ‘single-end’ - one small room in a four-storey tenement containing kitchen and sleeping accommodation - was roundly condemned as a breeding ground for immoral conduct and ill health, but continued to house a large proportion of Glasgow families. Twenty per cent of these single-ends were occupied by five or more persons in 1911 and the vast majority of their inhabitants shared sanitary facilities. In Scotland as a whole 45% of the population lived in overcrowded housing which was five times the proportion of in England where 9% suffered similar conditions. Tenement living typically provided less space than the standard English terraced house, especially for activities such as washing, drying, working and playing. Tenements facilitated close communities and neighbourliness but they were crowded, dark and unhealthy. Rural areas were similarly beset by poverty, poor housing, overcrowding and ill-health. Housing in the Highlands and Islands after the Clearances was frequently insanitary and tuberculosis was a common cause of death attributed to appalling domestic conditions.

Such low standards of housing in Scotland inevitably had a deleterious effect on child health and development. Overcrowded accommodation with deficient lighting, ventilation and
sanitation produced children more prone to ear, nose and throat defects, respiratory diseases, visual impairments and specific urban conditions such as rickets; indeed a whole series of acquired as opposed to congenital deformities were ascribed to poor housing quality. The infant mortality rate was also highest in overcrowded housing conditions. Thirty-two per cent of all infant deaths in Glasgow in 1905 were of babies in ‘single-ends’. Even as late as 1935 in Glasgow the areas with the highest concentration of overcrowded housing had correspondingly high infant-mortality rates which saw little improvement until after World War Two. The worst general mortality rates in Scotland were to be found in Glasgow too, with deaths from cholera and typhus, for instance, far higher than in comparable English cities. And all the attendant ills of the industrial city: drunkenness, gambling, violence and crime, affected not only Glasgow, Edinburgh and Dundee but many of the smaller ‘frontier’ towns such as the steel centres of Airdrie and Coatbridge, Greenock and Port Glasgow on the Clyde, and colliery towns such as Methil in Fife. By the 1870s and 1880s such urban ‘vices’ were being explicitly linked to family disintegration, indigence and inevitably child neglect and headline cases of individuals prosecuted in the courts - such as a Govan metal worker who appeared in court for drinking on credit when his children were barefoot - served to amplify the apparent connection between urban conditions, moral decline and the fate of children.

Contemporary commentators’ descriptions of squalor, overcrowding and insanitary conditions were a powerful argument legitimating the removal of children from their homes at a time when arguments that linked social behaviour with environmental circumstances were widely accepted. Measured against the middle-class ideology of domesticity which emphasised the safety and cosiness of the hearth, the sight of working-class children of both sexes sleeping several to a bed and roaming out of doors in the courts, wynds and closes because there was no room for them indoors, appeared ‘demoralising’ and corrupting. These children, it was thought, could not be said to experience family life in any real sense of the word. However, historians have contributed to the acceptance of this argument by reifying contemporary observations with statistics on overcrowding, infant mortality, deaths from infectious disease and wage levels, hence
serving - if unconsciously - to bolster the impression that poor social conditions have a direct impact upon the nature of family relationships.

Few labouring families conformed to the bourgeois family model at this time but the reasons are not necessarily to be found in adverse social conditions. The critical discourse on the poor working-class family was not a discourse constructed from within, and it was not at all sensitive to the economic and cultural differences that informed the structure and functioning of working-class family life. Historians who have studied so-called ‘deviant’ or alternative family structures and practices in France and Germany have concluded that flexible family forms, and in particular the acceptance of cohabitation and illegitimacy point to working-class men and women adopting functional strategies for emotional and economic survival. In Scotland, too, there is evidence to point to alternative strategies for the care of children outwith the nuclear or conventional family form. In rural Aberdeenshire, for instance, illegitimate children were regularly cared for by maternal grandparents which benefited the mother, who was able to return to paid employment, and the grandparents who obtained help around the house and on the farm once the children were old enough to be useful. In the towns, though, the extended family was less likely to be present to care for children at moments of crisis, and the employment market did not cater to lone working mothers or fathers. When death, debilitating illness or unemployment struck a family, the children were the most noticeable victims: boarded out to relatives or neighbours, placed in institutions for short periods, or, in extremes, removed by child savers or the state.

It is this removal of children from families that constitutes the point of departure in both Scottish welfare policy and family policy. This is not to say that before the onset of industrialisation and urbanisation that children were not cared for outwith their natural families - of course they were and families continued to be permeable, to adopt flexible living conditions in order to deal with crises. But it is noticeable that as the middle class family increasingly became sacrosanct and impermeable to outside interference, the working class family became the subject of legitimate inquiry and intervention by voluntary and state agencies: poor law inspectors, health visitors, education officials.
and, as a result of the emphasis on the child at the heart of the family, multiple organisations and individuals concerned with the welfare of the child. Public health officials, school attendance officers and child savers gained entrance to working class homes to enforce vaccination, school attendance and ‘children’s rights’. The nineteenth century saw increasing regulation of working-class children’s lives as an idea of childhood which centred upon domesticity and the safety of the home was disseminated. The ‘proper’ place for a child was deemed to be within a ‘family’, protected and dependent. Families not seen as capable of providing sufficient protection or able to shelter their children from the labour market were marked out as unable or unwilling to discharge their familial responsibilities and thus might be relieved of their charges.

At the same time those parents who found themselves in genuine difficulties were encouraged to give up their children to others who might provide ‘better’ homes. Lone mothers and fathers were especially vulnerable. Widowers left to care for small children were not expected to be able to cope since they were deemed to lack ‘mothering’ skills. A family could not exist without a mother. By the nineteenth century children became part of the female domain and fatherhood became associated with financial provision and the maintenance of order and discipline within the home. Lone fathers were encouraged to place their children in an orphanage in the absence of female relatives to fill the gap. ‘Motherless bairns have a special claim upon us’ remarked the director of a small children’s home in Stirling. ‘A widower is perfectly helpless with children. He cannot mother the bairns and be the breadwinner too; while he tries to do a father’s part, the children miss their mother. In helping such cases we have not only rescued the children, but raised the father, and kept him from sinking under his great burden and heavy loss.’

Lone fathers were treated with sympathy but lone mothers were a different matter. Mothers were especially vulnerable to being judged against the middle-class domestic ideal. In this model the moral wife and mother occupied the heart of the family, spreading her moral influence through her nurture of her children and her creation of a private haven to counter the vice and immorality of the city. The most vulnerable woman in this scenario was the mother of the illegitimate child. Usually alone,
tainted by her status, she had difficulty fulfilling her responsibilities to her children as well as providing for them financially. By 1884 parishes were permitted to forcibly separate illegitimate children from their mothers and place them in foster care ‘in the interests of both parties’ according to the authorities. The child would be removed from a pauper’s environment and the mother would be free to search for stable employment. This separation was most often a permanent arrangement since the aim was to sever contact between mother and child. The consequence of these judgements was, in Scotland at least, a massive experiment in social engineering whereby thousands of children were removed to the countryside to live as boarders in foster families, or were placed in orphanages often to be emigrated to one of the overseas Dominions.

The imaginary, idealised bourgeois family was used as a benchmark for intervening in working class families, yet it was not the model used for their reform. The rural family was considered the most appropriate place for a child removed from urban squalor. By removing children from what were regarded as unstable or dissolute families and using them to create new families - whether in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland or the prairies of Canada - social practitioners in the fields of poverty and child welfare consciously attempted to create idealised families founded upon evangelical ideals of hard, honest labour, thrift, temperance and God-fearing respectability. Areas of Scotland most favoured for these qualities were the crofting, farming and fishing counties where fresh air and healthy food was in abundance and where children who were the ‘offspring of profligate and abandoned parents’ and who were ‘full of disease’ could benefit from ‘the salt water air to breathe, sweet milk to drink and the heathery hill to romp upon.’23 Moreover, children boarded in the country, it was said:

acquire the habits and feelings of the persons amongst whom they are brought up; they see the struggles of the family to maintain their own independence; they see the kind of feeling that is entertained in reference to paupers … they are well educated and ultimately they melt into the population, so that you cannot find a trace of them, and
they are not distinguishable from the people who have been brought up in independence.\textsuperscript{24}

Thus, it was believed such children would cast off the taint of the working class. In contrast, mining areas were avoided as potential homes for pauper children on account of the colliers working night shifts resulting in men being at home and in bed during the day.\textsuperscript{25} An inspector’s report on the condition of boarded out child Alex Keith in the mining village of Cowdenbeath in 1889 commented, ‘This is a collier’s house, and like all the others of its class it is neither clean nor comfortable ... Fife colliers [are] notoriously a class apart, and stand very low in the scale of civilisation.’\textsuperscript{26} Indeed, manufacturing towns and the suburbs of cities were also regarded as problematic since children were exposed to temptation to loaf and ‘contamination of low associates’.\textsuperscript{27} Certainly it was widely concurred that ‘the house of a crofter with his bit of land and cow is the best place for a child.’\textsuperscript{28} It was a view summed up by one inspector after a visit to children residing in the city north of the Clyde in 1883:

Altogether we cannot report so favourably as to the general appearance of the children here as compared with those boarded with strangers in the country... a few of the children are boarded with grandparents who are aged and infirm, and consequentely unfit to take proper care of those under their charge. They are also exposed to the many evil influences and examples seen in a large city like this, and more especially in the crowded localities. The same healthy, robust, and cheery looks of the children boarded in the country is here absent, and a few of the children wore that peevish, languid look which plainly told the rearing up in a polluted and confined atmosphere, and the evil of too much tea drinking...\textsuperscript{29}

The emphasis on the physical environment and children’s physical condition was indicative of a romanticised view of the Highlands which contrasted with the image of the wicked and disease-ridden city. This anti-urban rhetoric owed much to nineteenth-century evangelical preaching on the immorality of
the industrial city. Thomas Chalmers, the inspiration behind the Free Church, was the leading proponent of this view in Britain. For Chalmers the city, with its culture of dependence (on poor relief), its profligacy and heathenism, stood in stark contrast to the pre-industrial rural community based on the ecclesiastical and moral unity of the parish. The countryside of course, and especially the Highlands, was almost free of temptation. Public houses were few and far between and the strict presbyterianism of the Free Church which dominated in many Highland communities ensured that children would be reared to be hard-working, God-fearing citizens, lessening the possibility that they would become paupers in later life.

Children were believed to be in safe hands with these uncomplicated, hard-working, righteous, law-abiding, God-fearing folk who would take the children into their hearts and their homes. By the early nineteenth century the crofter had been rehabilitated in the eyes of the Lowland Scots. The image of the rough, papist Highlander had been replaced by the sympathetic victim of the Clearances and famine, and a strict Presbyterian to boot. In hailing the advantages of boarding with crofting families, the oatmeal-eating inhabitants of the Highlands were favourably contrasted with their Lowland and especially English cousins. ‘The frugal and provident habits of the northern parts is a household word’ opined J.J. Henley in 1870. ‘Education has also made the northerner, if not a better man, at least a more intelligent being.’ It was said that such a class of people was virtually unknown in England.

Instead of making families in the middle-class image, child welfare workers used ‘rescued’ children to help create or sustain families which accorded with an idealised image of the rural labouring household. Rural foster families were rarely vetted for suitability by impartial observers and ironically, single females - unmarried or widowed - were welcomed as potential guardians, even for children who had been removed from a lone mother in the city. It was not unknown for a black taxi full of children from one of the cities to arrive in a village and announce that homes were required for the children inside. One woman sent to Tiree from Glasgow recalled how ‘people just came out and shook their heads and went away again’ as the taxi toured the island. The local authority inspection system was inadequate and hap-
hazard. There was no person in the parish where the child had been placed to take responsibility for his or her welfare. Instead, inspectors would travel from the child’s parish of settlement or local authority and this was supplemented by a reliance on community self-policing. ‘It is very improbable that any harsh treatment of any child should occur without being well known to the entire district’ commented William Peterkin in his report on the boarding out system in 1863.34 Sadly, this naïve belief in the inherent safety of rural communities was misplaced.35

The same policy was pursued overseas, and especially in Canada where, it was said, the honest, rural way of life was founded upon the same principles of sobriety, hard work, and presbyterian morality. Canadian society was idealised in ways reminiscent of the romanticisation of crofting communities and thus it took no great leap of the imagination to believe that Scottish children could be successfully transplanted to a country where so many Scots ‘kith and kin’ had already made their home. Canada, and to a lesser extent South Africa and Australia, was represented as an unspoiled version of Scotland before industrialisation and urbanisation created the vice and degeneration evident in the histories of the homeless children.

Of course, the imagined rural family - whether in the Scottish Highlands or Canada - was as much a myth as the idealised bourgeois family or the degenerate working-class family. Poverty in the crofting counties was endemic and, following the famine years 1846-7 and the Clearances, crofting communities became depopulated owing to seasonal and permanent migration. For all the talk of the benefits of fresh air and wholesome food, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the boarding out of children to the Highlands and Islands met another objective: repopulation and the provision of labour and an additional income for crofters from the allowance paid for each child. In the case of the considerable number of children boarded on the island of Arran it was noted in 1862 that ‘the crofters and small farmers in Arran are not only benefited by the cash payments on [the children’s] account, and enabled to pay their rents more easily than they could do without them, but have also a present and prospective supply of servants and labourers, whose wages are at the lowest’.36 Guardians were instructed that ‘the children who had been deserted by ‘worthless parents should be taught to cultivate
industrious habits’ while not being overtaxed with labour. Officials recognised that guardians did not take in children for purely philanthropic reasons. ‘You see’, commented one observer, ‘the possession of a family is a valuable thing for a working man; [the children] become wage earners very early; and so long as they remain under his roof it all adds to the family income.’ It is clear to see that the standards applied to boarded out children were somewhat at variance with the dominant construction of childhood as dependent and engaged in full time education.

In Canada the terms of the relationship between guardians and children were weighted even more towards economic rather than welfare concerns. The superficial resemblance between rural Scotland and rural Canada promoted by the advocates of child emigration like William Quarrier, founder of one of the largest Scottish children’s homes, carried little weight with those child migrants who became indentured labourers on farms. Denied the protection of British legislation aimed at extending and safeguarding childhood - such as the Education Acts, factory legislation and the 1908 Children Act - the child migrants over the age of twelve quickly became adults on Canadian soil, subject to demands that would not have been tolerated in their former home. Farmers who applied to take a child were obliged to pay the child a regular wage, provide board and lodgings and ensure he or she attended church and Sunday School. However, there was no requirement for these children to attend school and for many their arrival in Canada marked the end of formal education. ‘When I was in the fields working’ recalled one man who arrived in Canada as a young boy, ‘I could see all the children going to school with their lunch pails. The feeling of utter loneliness would be hard to describe. Actually, I ceased to be a child at the age of ten.’ Once more, safeguards to protect children from exploitation and abuse were inadequate. Those responsible for the children’s welfare were loathe to question the system in which they had placed so much faith and in some cases were more likely to blame failures on the ‘wilfulness’ of the children themselves.

For most of the last two centuries in Britain, family policy has been guided by the objective of achieving a balance between parental rights and children’s rights. In the nineteenth century
the balance shifted firmly in favour of the latter if one listens to the discourse of the child savers. In Scotland the wholehearted endorsement of the middle class child-centred family ideal found expression in the solutions to the problem of the homeless child. And yet, rejection of institutional care and endorsement of boarding out and emigration, two policies which aimed to place children in families, only appeared to be child-centred. In fact there was never any intention to give working-class children the same rights and protection as middle class children. Evangelical philanthropists assisted by municipal authorities used boarding out and emigration schemes as efficient means to pursue the permanent destruction of thousands of Scottish working-class families. Child savers and welfare workers were intolerant of the models of family life which predominated in working-class communities. It was at this point in the process that the middle-class family model was brought into play and used to justify condemnation of alternative family styles. Once the child had been removed or ‘rescued’ then his or her sponsor often lost sight of the child’s interests and rights which could result in a catalogue of physical and psychological mistreatment and longer term difficulties in seeking to understand their experiences.42
The social experiment encompassing the movement of children from their blood relatives and own cultures and religions to alien environments, either at home or overseas, was carried out in the name of anti-urbanism and the idealisation of the rural family masquerading as the protection of children. The rights of homeless children to protection from exploitation and to an education were subordinated to a broader project which aimed to maintain class and racial hierarchies. The way working-class families were in nineteenth century Scotland bore little relation to the way social reformers wanted them to be - which was industrious, sober, God-fearing, moral and independent, modelled not on the domestic middle-class family but the ‘classless’ rural crofting or farming family; a family of the imagination.

It was not until 1946 and the findings of the Clyde Committee on Homeless Children that there was any fundamental critique of boarding out:

We strongly deprecate the boarding out of city children on crofts in very remote areas where they
have no real contact with other children, where they have no facilities for learning a trade … or where the living conditions are bad. Investigation of conditions in Highland crofts has shown that the lack of sanitation and the absence of facilities for training the children in cleanliness and personal habits make it inadvisable to board out children in remote crofts in the Highlands, where economic conditions are such that the practice of taking in children is regarded as an industry, and the labour obtained therefrom often enables the guardians to maintain their crofts.43

There had been a sea-change in attitudes by this time. Now, the health benefits of rural life and the desire to erase a child’s background were deemed less important for children’s development than a good education and a range of work opportunities suitable to an individual’s interests and abilities. Perhaps most important was the recognition amongst child-care professionals of the parent-child bond and the psychological needs of children who had been separated from parents. By 1945 the commitment to foster care was as strong as ever but welfare agencies were beginning to apply to homeless children the standards, privileges and rights they expected for their own.
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