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About the Contributors
Recent research has overturned the conventional wisdom that long portrayed people of African descent as uncreative laborers in the making of the North American landscape. According to that orthodoxy, enslaved blacks provided the brawn while Europeans, especially white men, provided the brains. Slavers seized some 12.5 million Africans between 1501 and 1866, selling them into slavery to work, often to their deaths, for plantation owners, miners, ranchers, and others in the Americas (figure 3.1). Of the estimated 389,000 or so enslaved Africans who survived the infamous Middle Passage to disembark in North American ports, approximately 15,000 came in the seventeenth century, nearly 296,000 over the eighteenth, and another 78,000 in the nineteenth, mainly before U.S. and British acts of 1807 rendered the transatlantic slave trade illegal (Lachance et al. n.d.). The vast majority, about 211,000, disembarked in Charleston and Savannah, destined for rice and cotton plantations (Eltis, Morgan, and Richardson 2007, figure 11). Another some 129,000 went to the ports of Chesapeake Bay, with many sold to tobacco planters. Northern ports such as New York and Boston received another nearly twenty-seven thousand. And gulf ports, principally New Orleans and Biloxi, disembarked about twenty-two thousand, who mainly ended up on sugar and cotton plantations.

Decades ago a few iconoclastic historians began countering the belief that blacks had provided only labor with evidence that blacks actually played creative roles in the colonial emergence of novel types of places in North America, such as the landscape of tidewater rice plantations in the South Carolina Low Country during the eighteenth century (Wood 1974; Littlefield 1981). Because they relied on archival documents alone, however, those pioneer revisionists had little impact on the conventional wisdom. Racially biased whites, after all, had created most of that documentation; they emphasized their own roles and provided little direct evidence of black ideas and creativity. Moreover, most scholars demanded exactly that—namely, direct evidence—to overturn their indurated assumptions that useful knowledge generally had originated in Europe and diffused to the
Figure 3.1. Overview of the transatlantic slave trade, 1501 to 1866, showing general flows and selected ports, with an emphasis on North America.
colonies, that slavery so disempowered people that enslaved blacks had played passive social roles, and that whites had therefore dominated in terms of initiative and creativity (Blaut 1993; Sluyter 2002).

Geographers have recently been able to advance the revisionist case, however, convincingly demonstrating that blacks actively contributed to the transformation of at least some places. Use of diverse primary sources—such as landscape vestiges, oral histories, and material culture—that complement archival documents has proven essential to that success (Carney 2002; Carney and Rosomoff 2009, Sluyter 2012). The emergence of the digital humanities has also contributed greatly, especially data bases that facilitate analysis of the regional and ethnic origins of enslaved blacks and therefore of the types of African ideas and skills they might have carried across the Atlantic: for example, the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database [Lachance et al. n.d.] and the Afro-Louisiana History and Genealogy database [Hall n.d.]. Conceptually, the advent of Atlantic history has opened up scholarly debate on how actors of African, European, Native American, and mixed origins jointly participated in a hemispheric mobilization and hybridization of knowledge and materials through which distinctly North American places emerged (Eltis, Morgan, and Richardson 2007; Eltis et al. 2010).

The two case studies that follow exemplify how geographers have contributed to that major revision of our understanding of the past. The first case treats an aspect of the open-range cattle ranches of the West—namely, lassoing cattle from horseback—from their earliest beginnings south of the Rio Grande during the sixteenth century through a brief florescence on the Great Plains in the nineteenth century, before barbed wire closed the range (Sluyter 2012). The second case involves the establishment of rice plantations along the southern Atlantic seaboard during the eighteenth century (Carney 2002). Jointly, the two case studies span several centuries and much of the continent. They illustrate a spectrum of complementary primary sources. And they demonstrate that blacks played significant creative roles in establishing production systems so fundamental to the environmental and social relations of the colonies that their consequences persist through to the present.

OPEN-RANGE CATTLE RANCHING

A large body of scholarship explicates the general process through which open-range cattle ranching became established in the Americas but largely ignores any active role for blacks (figure 3.2). The cattle from the Canary Islands that Christopher Columbus disembarked on the Caribbean island of Hispaniola in 1493 during his second voyage multiplied as rapidly as the population of native people declined, the herds expanding across an open range of tropical savanna and moribund agricultural fields (Sauer 1966; Crosby 1972). Over the next four centuries, their offspring, together with subsequent introductions, went on to graze other ranching frontiers throughout the Americas (Crosby 1986; Jordan 1993). In North America, cattle and herders from the Caribbean reached the Gulf coast of New Spain, in what is now Mexico, in the 1520s. From that beachhead they moved
Figure 3.2. Relevant places and areas of open-range cattle herding in the Atlantic world over the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries.
inland and northward until ranching had become well established along the colony’s northern frontier, stretching from Texas to California, during the eighteenth century. Cattle from the Spanish Caribbean reached Florida in the sixteenth century, but ranching only became established in the seventeenth. As other European countries also colonized Caribbean islands and enclaves along the North American coasts, cattle ranching reached British South Carolina late in the seventeenth century and French Louisiana early in the eighteenth. The South Carolinians drove their herds southward into northern Florida, westward along the Gulf coast toward the Texas-Louisiana borderlands, and across the Appalachian Mountains into the Bluegrass Basin of Kentucky. Such ranching frontiers proliferated through the nineteenth century before a major retreat in the twentieth due to an expansion of cropland and intensification of beef production.

Each of those frontiers differed in particular ways, but they shared the general characteristics of open-range cattle ranching (Slatta 1997). All emphasized raising large herds of cattle for beef, hides, and tallow to the virtual exclusion of crops. All privileged cattle ownership over land ownership. All had an open range, sometimes held as common property and sometimes not but always undivided by fences. Ranchers sometimes kept other livestock, such as sheep and pigs, but cattle dominated. Brands rather than fences differentiated ownership of the mobile property. As the herds roamed over the open range for much of the year without human contact, control of breeding, or castration, they became feral and grew imposing horns to protect themselves against predators and herdsmen alike. At roundup time, the cowboys had to ride horses to chase down and manage those wild cattle.

While those general processes, patterns, and characteristics seem clear enough, the role of blacks does not. The conventional wisdom has long maintained that “slavery and ranching did not mix” because it “was obviously impractical” to allow slaves to herd cattle without close, constant supervision by whites (Strickon 1965, 242–43). Even those who recognized that blacks had labored as cowboys argued that no evidence existed “of meaningful African influence in the cultures and adaptive systems of the various American cattle frontiers” (Jordan 1993, 311). The pioneering research of Philip Durham and Everett Jones on the Great Plains certainly demonstrated the active roles of many blacks on that frontier; yet that frontier emerged nearly four centuries after the one on Hispaniola, rendering their conclusion quite parochial: “Thus the story of the Negro cowboys began in Texas and the Indian Nations before the Civil War. There thousands of Negroes, most slaves, some free, learned to ride and rope and brand” (1965, 19; emphasis added). No doubt, many blacks did learn to rope on that frontier, so did many whites. That practice, however, involving a cowboy mounted on a horse casting a rope with a running noose around the heads or legs of cattle, did not begin in Texas, even though it became iconic of that frontier. Other cattle herdsmen invented lassoing from horseback on an earlier frontier, someplace and sometime between Hispaniola in 1493 and the Great Plains in the nineteenth.

Because the practice of lassoing from horseback did not exist in Europe or Africa during the colonial period, cattle herdsmen must have developed it in the Americas. In the Atlantic fringe of Europe, pedestrian herdsmen characterized most of the regions of open-range cattle herding, such as the highlands of Britain and
Ireland, Brittany, and the Auverge. Only the herders of the Marismas in Spain and the Camargue in France managed cattle from horseback; however, they used pike poles rather than lassos to control the herds. They did use lassos while dismounted, for example, to free cattle from mudholes by placing the running noose around the trapped animal’s horns, tying the other end to their horse’s tail to absorb the strain, and then leading the horse forward. In Senegambia, where the cattle-herding belt that stretches across Africa just south of the Sahara meets the Atlantic, herders used lassos to restrain rebellious bulls but did not manage cattle from horseback at all. They cast their lassos while standing or running and allowed a heavy piece of wood tied to the tail end of the lasso to tire the bull until they could approach to subdue it.

Neither did the herders of the earliest ranching frontiers of the Americas, on the islands of the Caribbean, lasso cattle from horseback. Those vaqueros, or cowboys, chased down the feral herds with dogs and the desjarretadera, a pike pole tipped with a crescent hocking knife, for their hides and tallow (figure 3.3). The mounted herders would pursue an animal until able to sever its hamstrings, drop the animal in its tracks remote from any settlement, take the hide and perhaps the tallow and some meat, and leave the bulk of the carcass for the dogs.

On the mainland, herders initially continued to rely on the desjarretadera but ultimately abandoned it for less lethal means of catching feral cattle. On the Pampas of South America, gauchos developed two methods to manage the herds from horseback, both derived from the precolonial hunting practices of native peoples. The primary method employed bolas, three stone balls connected by cords, whirled over the head, and thrown at the legs of fleeing cattle in order to

Figure 3.3. Use of the desjarretadera in the sixteenth-century Caribbean. Reproduced courtesy of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
entangle them. The lasso became a secondary method, its tail end secured to an iron ring low on the light gaucho saddle. In order to prevent the jolt of stopping a large bull from breaking the rope or tearing the saddle off the horse, gauchos had to work in pairs, one throwing the lasso around the horns and the other around the hind legs to distribute the force between the two horses. In contrast, the vaqueros of New Spain and later the cowboys of Texas and the Great Plains lacked bolas but used a stiffer, heavier saddle with a horn on the pommel to cinch the tail end of the lasso in order that a single horse and rider could absorb the jolt of roping cattle (figures 3.4 and 3.5).

That distinctive saddle and its use to lasso cattle from horseback emerged in New Spain sometime between the mid-seventeenth and mid-eighteenth century. The earliest evidence that vaqueros were developing the technique comes from

Figure 3.4. Historic saddles used for cattle herding in the Camargue, Mexico and Texas, the Pampas, the Marismas, and Hispaniola.
Figure 3.5. Use of the lasso in nineteenth-century New Spain.

an engraving and description of an equestrian show in Madrid in the 1640s [figure 3.6]. The image portrays a vaquero from the Americas demonstrating an innovative lassoing technique. Similarly to the Marismas, the rider tied the tail end of the lasso to the tail of the horse but, dissimilarly, remained mounted while using a pole to place the running noose over the horns. By the mid-eighteenth century, travelers from throughout New Spain, including the northern frontier that stretched from California to Texas, were describing saddles with horns and lassoing from horseback as a fully developed and common practice.

The text associated with the illustration of the lassoing demonstration in seventeenth-century Madrid provides some direct evidence that black vaqueros played a major role in that process of invention and refinement. Although the image portrays the rider with pale skin, its caption reads, “Some creole slaves from the Americas demonstrated the next skill” (Tapia y Salzedo, caption for plate 11).

The ordinances of the Mesta, the association that regulated cattle ranching and sheep herding in New Spain, reveal some circumstances that explain why blacks took the lead role in transforming the lasso from little more than a rope with a running noose into a highly efficient method of rounding up feral cattle from horseback. The municipal council of Mexico City founded the Mesta in 1537 to regulate conflicts among livestock herders and others with a code of seventeen ordinances, preserved in Mexico City’s Archivo Histórico del Distrito Federal and published in Dusenberry [1963]. In 1574, Viceroy Martín Enríquez de Almanza promulgated a much expanded code of eighty-three ordinances that applied to all of New Spain, preserved in Mexico’s Archivo General de la Nación.
The racially biased penalties that the Mesta imposed for violations of its ordinances provided a strong motive for nonwhite vaqueros to develop lassoing from horseback as an alternative to the desjarretadera. Although the ordinances banned its use generally, only nonwhites were fined or punished simply for possessing one: "That there be no desjarretaderas, nor any hocked livestock . . . any
native, mulatto, black, or mestizo . . . cannot carry or possess a lance or desjarretadera for any reason, under penalty of twenty pesos . . . and he who incurs the said penalty and does not have the means to pay will be given a hundred lashes in public” [Ventura Beleña [1787] 1991, vol. 1, pt. 2, 41–43]. Given that enslaved vaqueros did not receive wages, the severe public lashing would have been the default penalty. Even free black and mulatto vaqueros received such low wages that twenty pesos de oro de minas equaled a year’s salary. Whereas white vaqueros could continue to use the desjarretadera without fear of a ruinous fine or a brutal public lashing if caught, the 1574 ordinances compelled black vaqueros to develop an alternate technique to catch feral stock.

Blacks had not only that powerful motive but ample opportunity to innovate with the lasso. Many vaqueros in New Spain were of African origin—for example, the two hundred enslaved blacks working the herds of a cattle baron named Hernán Ruiz de Córdoba in the 1570s. Another ordinance of the 1574 Mesta code reveals that, preferring free and enslaved blacks over whites as majordomos because they were “genuine and trustworthy,” ranchers allowed them to direct daily ranch operations and gave them thus the freedom to experiment with herding practices [Ventura Beleña [1787] 1991, vol. 1, pt. 2, 43]. Some ranchers were themselves free blacks, such as Benito el Negro and Juan el Negro, with even greater latitude to introduce and refine new practices such as lassoing from horseback.

Significantly, many of the black vaqueros came from Senegambia, African open-range cattle-herding belt meets the Atlantic between the mouths of the Senegal and Gambia Rivers. The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database records that 35,430 Senegambians disembarked between 1531 and 1650 in Spanish Central America, about 17 percent of the total number of enslaved Africans to arrive during that period (Eltis and Richardson 2010). As the volume of the slave trade increased, so did the number of Senegambians: from 1,607 over 1531 to 1550 [about 85 per year], to 9,704 over 1551 to 1600 [some 198 per year], to 24,119 over 1601 to 1650 [about 494 per year]. The proportion of Senegambians among the total arrivals decreased just as steadily—from 85 percent for 1531 to 1550, to 20 percent for 1551 to 1600, to 15 percent for 1601 to 1650—as the focus of the slave trade shifted southward. Nonetheless, hundreds of the black vaqueros of New Spain would have been experts in Senegambian open-range cattle-herding practices and quite capable of introducing those African ideas as well as innovating to suit the new context. They would certainly not have been novices who needed Spanish ranchers to “teach them the ropes.”

One idea those Senegambian vaqueros brought to New Spain involved the saddle horn. While Senegambians and other West Africans did not use horses to herd livestock, the military and social elite did ride using saddles with horns that served as a rest for the rein hand and as a hanger for bags (Law 1980). Twentieth-century ethnographers and nineteenth-century explorers report such saddles as early as the 1820s, and they likely have a much greater antiquity (figure 3.7). They also bear a striking resemblance to those developed by the vaqueros of colonial New Spain. In contrast, the Spanish vaqueros of New Spain, even those who had herded cattle from horseback in the Marismas or on Hispaniola, definitely had no such antecedent knowledge of the saddle horn.
Blacks had antecedent knowledge of saddle horns, lassos, and open-range cattle herding; they had a substantial presence on ranches in New Spain, sometimes as majordomos and owners with the consequent latitude to innovate; and they had a strong motivation for inventing and refining a nonlethal alternative to the desjarretadera to avoid the racially biased sanctions of the Mesta ordinances of the late sixteenth century. No wonder, then, that in Madrid in the mid-seventeenth century, enslaved black vaqueros staged the demonstration of the earliest phase in the process of transforming the lasso from a rope with a running noose into a technique for rounding up feral cattle from horseback. Blacks would continue to develop that technique until the saddle horn allowed them to reliably catch cattle from horseback and sort them by age, sex, and brand before driving the males to the slaughter yard. By the late eighteenth century, the desjarretadera had become an anachronism; the lasso had become the preferred technique that all vaqueros, black and otherwise, used to round up cattle as far north as Texas,
California, and other places along the northern frontier of New Spain that in the mid-nineteenth century would become part of the United States.

RICE CULTIVATION

The case for a significant black role in establishing the landscapes of rice plantations along the Atlantic seaboard similarly rests on a combination of complementary primary sources. The conventional wisdom long maintained that British planters introduced rice from Asia soon after founding the South Carolina colony in 1670 and, by the early eighteenth century, had developed techniques to produce it successfully as a commodity on large plantations using unskilled, enslaved African laborers. By the eve of the Revolutionary War, rice plantations extended along the coast from the Cape Fear River in the north to the St. Johns River in the south, and the South Carolina colony was exporting 60 million pounds of rice per year. By the eve of the Civil War, some one hundred thousand enslaved blacks cultivated about 175,000 acres of rice, annual exports had doubled to 120 million pounds, and Charleston had become one of the wealthiest cities in North America. The conventional wisdom also maintained that the Portuguese had introduced rice from Asia to the African Rice Coast and taught blacks to cultivate it in a primitive manner to provision the Middle Passage of the slave trade.

The evidence assembled by Judith A. Carney (2002), however, has overturned both aspects of the conventional wisdom, beginning by demonstrating that rice had been a staple in West Africa since long before the Portuguese arrived in the fifteenth century. Africans domesticated a species of rice (Oryza glaberrima) distinct from Asian rice (Oryza sativa) at least two thousand years ago. Along with millet and sorghum, rice became a staple in West Africa, with dozens of precisely bred varieties with different tastes and cooking properties attuned to the varied soil moisture and acidity, water depth and salinity, growth period and season, and other conditions across several environmental zones. Farmers typically used hoes to till their fields, whether saline estuaries along the coast, freshwater wetlands inland, riverine floodplains, or hill lands. Coastal rice fields in river estuaries were the most intensive system, requiring the largest labor investment in return for the highest yield. Farmers cleared the mangroves and built systems of embankments, canals, and sluices to reduce the salinity of the fertile estuarine soils. During the dry season, they opened the sluice gates to admit brackish water that also deposited sediments rich in nutrients. As the rains returned, they closed the sluice gates to allow the fields to flood with freshwater that leached the salt out of the soil. After opening the sluice gates at low tide to drain the fields, they transplanted rice seedlings from seedbeds into the fertile, desalinized soil. Farmers used the same infrastructure to regulate the depth of accumulated rainwater in the field in order to control weeds and irrigate the crop over the growing season.

This highly productive rice agriculture supported the densely settled population that attracted European slavers. The slave trade devastated the societies of the Rice Coast, population declined, and rice production contracted and became
less labor-intensive. The infrastructure of embankments, canals, and sluice gates deteriorated until the visual evidence of the moribund landscape supported the belief that Africans cultivated Asian rice introduced by the Portuguese with primitive, unproductive methods.

Although no direct evidence exists that blacks first established rice cultivation in South Carolina, the substantial number of Africans enslaved along the Rice Coast who disembarked in Charleston brought with them the accumulated expertise of many generations of rice farmers. The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database estimates that 187,000 enslaved blacks arrived in South Carolina directly from Africa between 1701 and 1808, an astounding figure even if a mere 1.5 percent of the total 12.5 million Africans who endured the Middle Passage [Eltis and Richardson 2010]. Moreover, about 40 percent of those who disembarked in Charleston over the eighteenth century had embarked along the Rice Coast (figure 3.8). Rather than being the unskilled laborers of the conventional wisdom, they knew how to grow many different varieties of rice in diverse environments; make and use a range of implements to cultivate, harvest, and mill it; and modify landscapes with embankments, canals, sluices, and other features to regulate soil moisture, salinity, and fertility. The European planters of the colony, in contrast, had little if any experience with rice cultivation.

Many aspects of rice cultivation in South Carolina resembled that of the Rice Coast. The tidewater plantations, for example, that developed after 1750 were the most productive and dominated rice exports until the Civil War. They were located in estuaries, where freshwater river discharge meets the saltwater of the Atlantic, and employed a system of embankments, canals, and sluices to regulate the salinity and depth of water in the fields (figure 3.9). Enslaved blacks would open sluice gates during the flood tide to admit freshwater, which is less dense and floats on top of the saltwater, then close them as salinity increased. When

Figure 3.8. Newspaper advertisement for an auction of 250 enslaved Africans, including some from the Rice Coast, in Charleston in the mid-eighteenth century. Reproduced courtesy of the Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress.
Figure 3.9. Plan view illustrating the layout of rice fields on South Carolina tidewater plantations, with areas of former tidal marsh between the river channel and upland enclosed by ditches and embankments pierced by sluices. The cross section through a sluice shows how a hollow tree trunk with a plug in one end functioned to regulate the flow of water into and out of the field.
the rice had been submerged for the requisite period, they opened the sluice gates at low tide to drain the fields. Not only was the entire system similar to that used in the estuarine fields of the Rice Coast, so were specific elements, such as the sluices called “plug trunks.” Although replaced by more elaborate “hanging trunks” over the eighteenth century, the early sluices consisted of hollowed-out cypress logs similar to the hollowed-out palm logs used along the Rice Coast. The sluice gates consisted of a wooden plug fitted into a hole drilled across the axis of the trunk, which “acted on the same principle as a wooden spigot to a beer keg” (Doar [1936] 1970, 12). Agricultural implements such as the hoes used for tilling and the fanner baskets used for winnowing also echoed those employed in the Rice Coast (figure 3.10).10

The evidence of a long history of rice cultivation in Africa, the number of blacks enslaved along the Rice Coast who disembarked in Charleston, the probability that some of them were experienced rice farmers, the relative lack of similar experience among the white planters, and the similarities between the

Figure 3.10. Hoeing rice in South Carolina, ca. 1900. Reproduced courtesy of the Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress.
systems of rice cultivation on both sides of the Atlantic, as well as between specific elements, all counter the conventional wisdom. Blacks provided both the brawn and the brains that founded the tidewater plantations of South Carolina.

CONCLUSION

Such research expands our historical understanding of North American places well beyond an acknowledgment of the role of blacks in the history of musical genres such as jazz. Rice plantations and open-range cattle ranches established patterns of land and life so fundamental to the colonial economies and ecologies of North America that their material effects linger to the present in the landscapes and societies of the South Carolina Low Country and the West. The discursive effects also persist, albeit more insidiously, such as in the political rhetoric asserting that life for African Americans was better before the Civil War than now: supposedly, puerile blacks lived peacefully and labored passively under the wise tutelage of beneficent masters. A related area of research also has begun to counter that discourse, deconstructing how museums represent the historical roles of North Americans of African origin (see chapter 15).

People of African origin have lived in many parts of what became the United States and, to a much lesser degree, Canada since the sixteenth century. By one measure, the greatest potential for research on their roles in creating the places of North America seems to pertain to those regions dominated by slave-based economies, especially the South. After all, just three years before President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, 98 percent of the 3,953,761 enslaved Americans, out of a total population of about 31 million enumerated by the 1860 federal census, lived in the thirteen states that would secede to form the Confederacy (NHGIS n.d.). Nonetheless, regions and places that did not have large populations of African origin might nonetheless yield equally significant revisions to our understanding of the North American past. So while the part played by blacks in establishing cattle ranching in South Carolina certainly demands further research, so does their role on the ranches of the coastal valleys of California.

NOTES

I thank Judy Carney for her thoughtful feedback on a draft of this essay.

1. For examples of that conventional wisdom, see Conzen (1990), McIlwraith and Muller (2001), and the publications cited therein.

2. The figure is based on Eltis, Morgan, and Richardson (2007, figures 6 and 11).

3. The mandated brevity of this chapter dictates that the following sections economize on facts, examples, and citations to the secondary literature and primary sources; for much fuller presentations of the cases and citations beyond the principal literature and sources of illustrations and direct quotes, see the monographic treatments Carney (2002) and Sluyter (2012).
4. The figure comes from a copy of Molina [1582, pt. 2, bk. 1, ch. 37] in the Laurence Roberts Carton Hunting Collection, Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

5. Figure 3.4 is based on sketches made in rural museums as well as on field observations and illustrations in such sources as Diderot and Le Rond d’Alembert [1751–1772, vol. 25, plate 22]. Figure 3.5 comes from a copy of Sartorius [1859, plate following 181] in the author’s collection.

6. The figure comes from a copy of Tapia y Salzedo (1643, plate 11) in the Laurence Roberts Carton Hunting Collection, Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

7. The figure is based on illustrations in Denham and Clapperton [1826, plate following 269] and Boyer [1953, figure 21].

8. The figure comes from the Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Reproduction number LC-USZ62–10293.

9. The figure is based on a description and figures in Carney [2002, 95 and figures 3.3 and 3.4].
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