It is a particular pleasure for me to be able to present this volume by Drs. Goodman, Henney and Pressel. These three studies were first prepared as doctoral dissertations in the Department of Anthropology at The Ohio State University. As the authors' dissertation adviser and as the director of a research project of which these studies were an outgrowth, their publication is a matter of personal satisfaction to me. The research project, the Cross-Cultural Study of Dissociational States, provided the context and the framework in which the field work was conducted, and the findings analyzed. Since the context in which these investigations were carried out may help readers in their evaluation, it may be useful for me to sketch in their common basis in the work of the project, and, indeed, the background of the project itself.

In 1962, in collaboration with a physical anthropologist, Dr. Louanna Pettay, now of Sacramento State University, and a psychiatrist, Dr. Adolf Haas, I proposed a cross-cultural comparative study of what we have come to call possession trance. My interest in this subject goes back to my own predoctoral field work in Haiti, where possession trance plays a key role in the AfroCatholic religion known as vodu. My Haitian research had raised a number of issues and had made me aware of a significant dearth of comparative studies that might help to resolve them. Following Robert Lowie's dictum, it might have been said with reference to the phenomenon of possession trance that we do not understand ethnographic materials until we understand their distribution. Among the unresolved issues was that of the normalcy or pathology of the possession trance state. The Haitian physician J. C. Dorsainvil (1931) for example had seen such behavior as an indicator of neurosis, hysteria, nervous instability. Professor M. J. Herskovits, the pioneer of anthropological research in Haiti, consider possession trance "normal" because it was clearly culturally learned. Within the context of Haitian culture it was appreciated and valued. Yet
if it was learned, how was it learned? Such learning would appear to be different from that which is acquired consciously and intentionally. Are only certain people capable of such learning? Surely there was something physiological that occurred in an individual whose behavior and whose sense of personal identity was so radically transformed during a period of time. What was it that occurred, and what could we know about it?

In time, indeed, Haitian possession trance has come to acquire a certain notoriety in the anthropological literature. It has been compared to trance in Bali, which Jane Belo (1960) and Gill and Brenman (1961) also compare to the behavior of hypnotic subjects. It has been compared to behavior in the zar cult of Ethiopia by M. Leiris (1958) and both that author and A. Métraux (1959) speak of the histrionic, theatrical aspects of spirit possession states.

Just what was one to make of this discussion? Is spirit possession belief, linked to dissociational states (or trance) a world-wide, unitary phenomenon, the same in Bali, in Ethiopia and in Haiti?

The project, which eventually lasted five years, appeared an excellent means for clearing up some of these questions.

The goal of the Cross-Cultural Study of Dissociational States was outlined in our original grant application to the National Institute of Mental Health in the following terms (Bourguignon and Pettay, 1962): "The aim of the present study is the mapping, on a world-wide basis, of institutional types of dissociational states interpreted in native terminologies as due to possession by spirits." And again: "the project plan involves the development of a scheme for analyzing institutionalized [dissociational] states along various parameters..." The parameters to be included were biological, psychological, socio-cultural and historical. We saw the significance of this research as, among other things, providing "the basis for problem oriented field work in this area"
and also to "provide research training for graduate students in anthropological methods and techniques."

It should be remembered that our original proposal was written in 1962. Much has happened since then which places our research into a new, and at that time rather unanticipated, context. In 1962, we were able to say that "in Western societies, dissociational states are usually discussed in a pathological and clinical context; in many other societies, such states are both institutionalized, and culturally rewarded." And while we noted that in the preceding ten year period psychiatrists, psychologists and other behavioral scientists had developed interests in the effects of drugs on behavior, in the therapeutic uses of hypnosis, in brainwashing and related phenomena, we did not suspect the coming of the psychedelic revolution, the new charismatic movements in various sectors of Christianity, with their trance states and speaking in tongues or the rapid growth of a new wave of Hinduderived religious sects, such as the Krishna Consciousness Movement or Transcendental Meditation. Nor did we anticipate the drug epidemic of the late 60's and early 70's. And yet, the signs were all about us. There was then a brief period of experimentation with glossolalia in the Episcopal Church. Timothy Leary and his associates launched the International Federation for Internal Freedom, which, in 1963, undertook to sponsor and publish the first issue of the short lived Psychedelic Review. IFIF asserted its "main purpose" to be "to encourage, support and protect responsible investigation with psychedelic substances (e.g., LSD-25, psilocybin, etc.)" (IFIF 1963). At the same time, the Harvard Review published a special issue on Drugs and the Mind, featuring Richard Alpert's and Timothy Leary's article on the politics of consciousness expansion. Psychedelic substances were hailed as providing the basis for a new "internal freedom" for man.

In the approach of Leary and his group, synthetic versions of American Indian drugs were
brought together with Tibetan and Hindu techniques of meditation in the context of our
twentieth-century technological society. Their experimentations had been preceeded by those of
A. Huxley and H. Michaux.

Much has happened in the intervening years, and what started for us as an attempt to bring
order into the dispersed anthropological knowledge on certain types of "odd" beliefs and practices
has become of direct relevance in the contemporary scene. As our research developed, as our
collection of data increased and as we began to take stock of our comparative knowledge, it also
became clear that what we were dealing with had direct bearing on what was happening on the
campus and in the world around us. The subjects of altered states of consciousness (a word barely
in use in 1962) and of spirit possession appeared to be everywhere: in religious groups, in the
popular books students were reading--such as those of Castaneda-- in the movies and in television
programs. Students wanted to learn about drugs, about trance, about what they thought was the
occult.

Our initial plan was a relatively small two year study centering on a comparative review of
the literature. This was followed by a more ambitious three year project, including several field
studies. Three of these are reported on in the following pages. In the summer of 1962, while the
research proposal was being developed, a graduate seminar in anthropology on the comparative
study of trance and possession beliefs was held to explore some aspects of the cross-cultural
literature. Dr. Pressel was a member of that seminar group which formulated some initial
questions on the basis of a literature survey. In 1963, when the project was funded, Dr. Henney
joined us as a Graduate Research Associate and remained with the project for the duration of its
existence. She was thus intimately associated with several aspects of our work, particularly the
development of our outline (to be discussed below) and the ooding of a substantial portion of the
cross-cultural literature. In a second phase of her work with the project she carried out field work in St. Vincent and analyzed her field data. These formed the basis of her dissertation and of the materials presented in the following pages. Dr. Pressel formally joined the project as a Graduate Research Associate in 1966, participating in some of the comparative research, familiarizing herself with our findings to prepare for field work in Brazil. Under the auspices of the project she carried out field work in Sao Paulo and returned to analyze her data. Dr. Goodman spent several short periods with the project in 1966, '67 and again in '68. She helped us first by translating source materials from various languages into English for our collection of comparative data. When Dr. Henney returned from the field with tapes of glossolalia as produced by members of the Streams of Power congregation she had encountered in St. Vincent, I wondered whether Dr. Goodman might put her linguistic training to use to develop an approach to these materials. Her extensive work on glossolalia since then and her field work in Mexico to pursue this subject followed as an outcome of this initial attempt to work with materials acquired in the course of our research. Unfortunately, the project was no longer able to support Dr. Goodman's field work in Mexico. Nonetheless, it is a direct and organic outgrowth of our earlier work.

In starting our research in 1963, we began by an extensive review of the ethnographic literature, which eventually covered sources on over 1100 societies. Information on about a third of the societies proved inadequate, but we amassed data on the presence and sometimes the absence of altered states of consciousness and possession beliefs for some 800 societies. Of these, 488 were societies for which coded data on various societal dimensions were available in Murdock's Ethnographic Atlas. Our statistical analyses were focussed on this smaller group. In order to proceed with our survey of the literature, we developed an "Outline for the Cross-Cultural Study of Dissociational States (Trance) and Beliefs in Spirit Possession." [This
outline went through a number of versions before it reached the form in which it has been included in the Final Report of the project (Bourguignon 1968). It was originally intended as a guide for coders of the literature and eventually as a checklist to be utilized in field studies. [As such, it provided some common guidance, orientation, and structure to the studies presented here.]

A few words about the Outline may be in order here because of the influence it exerted on the field work by alerting observers to certain features of the elements under investigation and, perhaps, by stressing some concerns more than others. The formulation of the outline, it should be remembered, was the result of two principal sets of influences: the interests and qualifications of the project members who developed it, and the type of data present—or too frequently, absent—in the ethnographic literature. To begin with, then, our Outline was divided into I. a General Summary, II. a section of Belief in Possession by Spirits and III. a section on Trance.

If we were to devise such a coding outline now, we would wish to distinguish in the section on belief in possession by spirits those beliefs which are manifested in altered states and those not so manifested and, in the section on trance, those states and behaviors linked to a belief in spirits and those not so linked. Furthermore, since many societies have more than one possession trance complex or more than one type of belief in possession by spirits, as well as also some form of trance not interpreted as spirit possession, which we came to term simply "trance," the coding of more than one Outline would be required per society. We did, however, in our general summary section, distinguish between trance, as interpreted as spirit possession (possession trance) and as not interpreted as spirit possession (trance). And also, we separated spirit possession expressed in trance (possession trance) from that not expressed in trance (possession). In the literature, we found unfortunately all too often that trance was mentioned but the accompanying beliefs were not specified. And similarly, spirit possession belief might be
mentioned, but the linked behavioral manifestations were not clearly specified. In such cases, where the information could not be inferred from the descriptive materials, we had to exclude the society from our sample. Furthermore, we defined "trance" for ourselves in its overall sense as a general term comporting a variety of possible altered states of consciousness. We attempted to ascertain from the literature which of the following were in fact being reported on: dissociation, fugue, loss of consciousness, physiological collapse, obsessive ideas and/or compulsive actions, hallucinations (visions). In the second section of our Outline, we turned to possession beliefs and here we wished to know what kind of behavior these beliefs purported to explain. Here we differentiated between "trance" (as subdivided in turn into the six categories noted above); physical or mental reactions such as physical illness, subnormal mental functioning, abnormal mental functioning and misfortune; sleep phenomena including somnambulism, sleep talking and dreams; mediumistic behavior; and finally, impersonations in language, which we referred to as glossolalia. In the case of mediumistic behavior we were interested in the sex of the medium, in whether or not the medium's message was interpreted by another person, and, if so, in the sex of the interpreter. These questions arose directly out of the various descriptive materials found in the literature. Thus, the shaman among the Nuba as described by Nadel (1940) was a man; his message was not interpreted. The Delphic Pythia (Defradas 1968) and the medium among the Hadjeraï (Fuchs 1960, Pouillon 1964) were women and their messages were interpreted by men. We hoped to collect data on the political role of mediums and the influences of the sexes in this field either by being mediums or by, in fact, controlling the utterances of mediums. The question of mediumistic impersonations led directly to a consideration of the utterances. Here we utilized the categories proposed by L. C. May (1956) in his review of glossolalia and differentiated between the following eight categories: phonations frustes (mumbling, gurgling, groaning);
pseudo-language; verbal fabrication (neologisms), xenoglossia; spirit language; sacerdotal language, sleep talking and vernacular speech. This is of course a purely formal, static labelling of possible forms of glossolalia. It does not deal with the subject of the vocal dynamics and psychological processes involved. However, for the analysis of data from written sources, it turned out to be frequently too refined to be effectively applicable.

We were, next, concerned with the time depth of possession theories as either traditional or recent in the culture under investigation. Assuming the presence of some manifestations of possession according to whatever the local theory required, we wanted to know whether there was a change over time in the frequency with which phenomena interpreted as possession were being reported. Were they said to be unchanging in frequency or, indeed, did the source simply contain a single case report? Having disposed in this manner of what might be considered the necessary background information, we wanted to know about the cultural context in which possession behavior occurred: was it part of a diagnostic procedure? And if so, who was possessed during this procedure: the diagnostician, the patient (or deviant, or suffer) or both? Was it part of a therapeutic procedure? Or did it instead (or additionally) occur in quite different ritual contexts: ancestor cult, spirit cult? Did it indeed occur in a non-ritual context, that is, were certain sick people or deviants considered possessed, outside a ritual context? Or was spirit possession of some sort thought to be a matter of entertainment? An example of this, which might at first appear an unlikely category, is found in the animal possession performances of Java, called djaran kepang (Pfeiffer and Darmadji, 1969).

Having located possession behaviors in their cultural context we wanted to know who the possessed were: by roles, by sex and sex roles, by age, and for each of these categories we wanted to know the relative participation. By concerning ourselves with roles we asked, do the possessed
act as medium-diviner-diagnostician-shaman? Prophet? Curer? Exorcist? Priest-cult leader? Patient-suffer-deviant? Patient and potential shaman? Potential cult initiate? Initiate or member of a cult group? and finally, visionary? With respect to sex, we wanted to know whether the possessed in a given society were men, women, transvestites and if of more than one sex, which predominated, and similarly for the participation of members of one or more age groups. Furthermore, what was the age of first possession? And then, who were the possessed, by group status? Were they of high or low rank? Members of minorities or persons with special characteristics: physical, psychological or moral—and were these attributes positive or negative—were they sinful, or, on the contrary, pure?

Having attempted to identify the possessed persons, we sought to identify the possessing spirits: Were they human or animal? Could they inhabit objects other than human beings? And were the theories concerning possession by these spirits part of the total culture or of some subculture? We went to great length trying to identify the possessing spirits and differentiated a dozen categories of spirits of the dead by criteria of social organization, and another dozen of other spirits, including the creator god. We sought to categorize the intentions of the spirits (benevolent, malevolent, etc.), their individual characteristics, if any, their attributes and their equipment.

The Outline continues with a series of other headings concerning the relation between spirits and the persons they possess, behavior during possession, etc. However, we may stop here for a moment for a few observations. It is clear, for example, how much these types of questions are influenced by familiarity with Afro-American and African, particularly West African, possession trance cults. The questions are relevant to Dr. Pressel's study of Umbanda, where, indeed, there are numerous spirits of the dead, with various characteristics and attributes, where a
single person can be possessed by several spirits at varying times, and so on. Umbanda possessing spirits speak largely in the vernacular, they diagnose illness and give advice, they may perform therapeutic functions, i.e., it is the spirit medium who is in possession trance, not necessarily (or ever?) the patient. On the other hand, most of these categories are quite irrelevant to the two, rather different, enthusiastic Christian churches described by Dr. Henney for St. Vincent and by Dr. Goodman for Yucatan. The possessing spirit is the Third Person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit. A large number of persons are possessed by the same Spirit simultaneously; there is no impersonation of the spirit. The Vincentian Shakers say "the Spirit shakes you," the Streams of Power adherents speak in tongues and then translate the message by stating "Thus sayeth the Lord," and the Yucatecan Pentecostals say the Spirit "changes your language." Who are the possessed? Among the Christians, those of low status--but, and our categories do not provide for this,--they acquire a new status within the groups they have joined, or formed. In Brazil they are many different kinds of people--middle range in status, of many ethnic) racial and even religious backgrounds.

And what are the special characteristics of those possessed? Here the Outline appears to switch, or be uncertain, as to whether we are looking for -emic or -etic categories--categories of the participants, that is, or categories of the observers. Are the people who are possessed people of special psychological characteristics? Psychological bias would suggest they are likely to be. Of special physical characteristics? In these studies there appears to be no clear cut evidence on this point. Moral characteristics? The Christians say that possession is a sign from the Holy Spirit--a purification. But conversion may come to the sinful as well as to the pure, or best, to the repentant sinner. In Umbanda we read of previous lives and karmic illness, of the "need" to develop one's mediumship, but our categories do not seem to provide well for any of this.
I find, as I attempt to apply our categories to the data presented in this volume, that there are some difficulties in such a process of application. And this difficulty is of crucial importance and significance for anyone wishing to develop a guide for problem-oriented anthropological field work or to develop a set of universally applicable coding categories for a sizable body of comparative materials. The more specific the categories are, the more they are tied to the particular configurations of a specific culture or type of culture. Cultural variability and relativity rears its head and as we move into unfamiliar societies or unfamiliar aspects of known societies, we find ourselves with native categories and patterns of experience, which cut across those which we have derived from our own knowledge or from familiarity with the societies and cultures which we have studied. In every ethnography there is always the new and the unexpected and thus there is the danger that a set of pre-established categories will cause us to overlook what is before our eyes or will cause us to force the data, if we cannot escape discovering them, into the Procrustean bed of our comparative framework, our hypotheses and our code sheets.

A good example of what I have in mind refers to certain aspects of our Trance Outline. Here there is much overlap with the Possession Outline for we needed to know how trance was interpreted and who the trancers were and what the cultural context of trance was, etc. Here it would have been better to separate Trance and Possession Trance, for in the case of Possession Trance, as in the three studies before us, one finds oneself responding to the same questions under the heading of possession and the heading of trance. A new dimension is reached, however, when we wish to investigate the physical manifestations of Trance: how is it induced, what observable changes occur in the individual, how is the trance state terminated, and what sequels does it have, if any? Concerning the induction of trance, we did not find use of drugs of any kind in our three studies. But there were other processes at work, some of which we foresaw. For example, Dr.
Pressel found the presence of "whirling, spinning" in the induction of possession trance in Umbanda; she has described this in great detail and has linked it to the process of learning possession trance behavior. And yet, while we foresaw a variety of categories for observation, we remarkably neglected (the literature tells us little about this) a process of learning. Learning looms large, too, in the work of Dr. Goodman and, in a different manner, in that of Dr. Henney.

In listing another group of inducing factors, we recognized the possibility of sensory deprivation as a means of inducing an altered state, yet no further guidelines for observation and questioning are provided by the Outline. Dr. Henney found that sensory deprivation was a significant factor in the inducing of hallucinatory trance. And here, the difference which we came to appreciate, between hallucinatory trance, glossed and conceptualized as a spiritual journey on the one hand and possession trance on the other came to loom large.

Our observers, then, were led to look for certain possibilities—sensory deprivation, which appears in one of the three studies, "glossolalia," which appears in two of the three, "spinning and whirling" which appears in one. We were primarily looking for possession trance, yet hallucinatory (or visionary trance) occurs in all three contexts. The differences among them are instructive and the Outline prepared us only minimally for them In St. Vincent, among the Shakers, Dr. Henney reports a full-fledged visionary trance complex, termed "mourning," induced under conditions which present striking similarities to sensory deprivation experiments. The "mourning" ritual has its rules and procedures, its dangers and its rewards. The visions are evaluated by the participants and by the leader and are a basis for a change in status of the participants. Such a formal ritualization of hallucinatory or visionary trance does not exist either in the Yucatecan Apostolic church or in Umbanda. Yet both Dr. Goodman and Dr. Pressel tell us about hallucinatory experiences among their people. In Yucatan, at the height of the "upheaval,"
some people "saw" the Devil. These visions were not part of a ritual procedure, they surely were not sought, but the belief system of the church members had a place for such experiences; they could easily be integrated into the ongoing process of the "upheaval." Dr. Goodman links this phenomenon of hallucinatory trance to the great arousal of the glossolalia experience and of the religious movement in which the Apostolics were engaged. The experience came at a time of crisis for given individuals and for the group as a whole. Dr. Pressel also tells us of visionary experiences. In Umbanda visionary experiences are not part of ritual. Yet the informant who tells of having seen certain spirits in her kitchen reports the matter calmly. There was nothing "wrong" with seeing spirits—it was not a sign of psychopathology—it was, however, a sign that she needed to take certain steps, to join Umbanda. The sign came to her from the outside, from the world of spirits, it was a sign of helpfulness, not a symptom of personal disorganization, as such experiences might be interpreted in a psychiatric context. Thus, while there is no visionary trance ritual in either Umbanda or among the Apostolics, in both instances there is an ideology, a set of sacred beliefs, into which the experiences are integrated. They are thus "ritualized" and "institutionalized," for they fall within the expected pattern, no matter how frequent or how rare they might be in actual statistical incidence.

In another sense too, our Outline did not prepare us for our findings. The literature, as well as my Haitian experience, had oriented us toward stable religious institutions, although we were aware that culture contact might lead to an increase in the incidence of altered states even in such stable institutions. This may well be the case for Umbanda. However, we had not been prepared for a religious upheaval such as that Dr. Goodman encountered. Indeed, only by visiting a particular group over a series of field seasons, and only by exceptional good luck does one catch, as it were, a movement such as this in statu nascendi. And only by extraordinary good
fortune does one have the opportunity of observing such a movement run its full course from
preconditions to full-bloom to after-effects. There are few cases in the literature of such a report
on a complete cycle.

The studies reported here were influenced by the existence of our literature survey. The
field workers were alerted to certain observations and to the asking of certain questions not only
by familiarity with the ethnographic literature concerning their particular areas, but also
specifically by the Outline, which served as a set of questions concerning which answers were
sought. Some items could easily be answered, others easily dismissed as irrelevant and still others
could be pursued and, perhaps most importantly, could lead to the discovery of new and
unanticipated questions.

The extent to which the resultant studies are different from one another is as important as
the fact that they deal consistently with a basically common set of questions. The differences
among them clearly reflect not only the individualities of the three anthropologists, but perhaps
more importantly, the differences in the three cultures. It is the cultural differences and the
dynamics of the different situations, which lead participant observers to consider certain
questions, to follow up certain leads, to discover the unanticipated. The importance of serendipity,
of alertness to research opportunities must ever be appreciated if anthropological research is to
reveal other worlds of experiences and of "reality" to us. For we are not interested only in the
specifics of behavior, which can be observed objectively. We must also be interested in the
subjective aspects of behavior: what is its cultural meaning? And how is it experienced by the
individual?

Religion has frequently been discussed by anthropologists as involving belief and behavior,
mythology and ritual, or, in A. F. C. Wallace's terms, as ritual rationalized by mythology. It should
be added that there is a third dimension, the dimension of experience which validates mythology
and ritual for the individual and the group and without which both would remain dead letters.

The three studies before us show the diversity of possession trance in terms of the
behavior exhibited, the beliefs to which it is linked, the subjective experienced involved, and the
cultural and societal contexts in which it occurs. They also indicate some of the underlying unity
of the phenomenon.

There is, for example, clear evidence in all three studies of the importance of learning in
the acquisition of the possession trance behavior. Yet the specifics of the physiological processes
are not as yet clearly understood. In the three examples at hand a variety of mechanisms of
induction are used. There is in all some similarity to hypnosis, but the mechanisms of hypnosis too
are not as yet clearly understood, so that reference to hypnosis in an explanation of possession
trance is tantamount to attempting to explain one "unknown" by reference to another.

The people and groups described in the following pages differ importantly from most of
those which we used in our statistical sample: they all represent part societies, subcultures within
larger complex and heterogeneous societies. Membership in the possession trance groups is an
option, an alternative, a personal decision open to Vincentians, Maya and Brazilians. Indeed, the
particular group they join in each case is only one of several which holds such options for them. In
St. Vincent, Shakers and Streams of Power compete, to some extent, for membership. In Brazil,
there are many syncretic religious groups with varying patterns of possession trance, including
Pentecostalists. And even among the Maya, the Apostolics are only one of several churches which
offer baptism in the spirit. With respect to such alternatives and to the complexity of their internal
differentiations, these societies are quite similar to that of the United States, where a great variety
of religious groups and movements of this type are currently available to the seeker after
supernatural experiences. How does all of this compare to the rest of the world?

As I noted, our sample of 488 societies is taken from the *Ethnographic Atlas* and is, for the most part, made of simpler, less differentiated societies. And for the most part, too, we have attempted to focus on stable societies, not on religious movements. In this sample of societies, we found that 90% have one or more forms of institutionalized, ritualized altered states of consciousness, that 74% have some belief in spirit possession and that 51% have possession trance. The societies described here are thus not at all atypical in having such beliefs, practices and experiences. The "odd" societies apparently are not those which have patterned trance and/or possession trance. The "odd" societies appear to be those that have not. These three studies by Dr. Goodman, Dr. Henney and Dr. Pressel should make clear the variety of religious patterns and experiences in three developing countries, the forms they take and the roles they play in the lives of individuals and societies. They add a significant dimension to our understanding of the place of religion in the total fabric of society; they highlight the uniqueness of each culture while pointing to the common human basis of these practices, beliefs and experiences. They hold up the mirror of comparative explorations to the student of the contemporary American scene as well. Here, as in the three countries discussed in this volume, syncretic, ecstatic religions are flourishing. How similar is their appeal to Americans to the appeal of Umbanda to Brazilians? Of the Shakers and Streams of Power to the Vincentians? Of the Apostolics to the Maya? Can we, too, expect to see religious upheavals? To what extent and in what way do these religious beliefs and practices reveal the basic stresses in each of the societies under discussion?

This book contains some answers. It raises a good many more questions.
Notes

1The project was supported in whole by PHS Research Grant MH-07463 from the
National Institute of Mental Health, during the years 1963-68.

2A major portion of the statistical data has been reported in Bourguignon 1968, 1973, as
well as Greenbaum 1973.
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