In dysfunctional states, armed forces are usually weak, both in terms of training, discipline, equipment and morale. The army is frequently dragged into political conflicts, demoralised by participation in frequent coup d’etat attempts or punitive expeditions against civilians opposing the government. There is a rule that who controls armed forces has power, and the loss of control of the army is tantamount to the loss of power. Military forces do not protect the country’s interest, and neither are able to defend its borders and population. The thesis of the article is that the army and the police forces in dysfunctional states in Sub-Saharan Africa are weak. In consequence, such states have trouble with maintaining their internal and external security. The research problem around which oscillates the analysis presented in the article is related to the question of security in dys-
functional states. According to the author’s assumption, there is a correlation between the crisis of statehood in Sub-Saharan Africa and the chronic weakness of the military and police forces in states that experience such crises. These forces are only an external attribute of statehood because in fact neither they can protect the state’s territory and borders nor provide security for its citizens. In consequence, non-state actors emerge on the state’s territory or penetrate it from the outside. The military is usually poorly trained and poorly armed. In addition, the governing elites of many African countries appropriate the state apparatus in order to serve their individual interests. Permanent use of military forces for subsequent coup d’état attempts does not have positive influence on the morale. Consequently, when a moment of a trial comes, which was the case during the Séléka rebellion in Central African Republic, the army is not able to effectively carry out military activities, and actually disintegrates. Frequently the army oppresses the civil population, and soldiers are perceived as not a lesser evil than rebels. In this case, however, the line is quite blurred due to the fact that as a result of frequent coup d’état attempts and civil wars rebel units become the government army after their leader takes power, and former soldiers of the losing government army organise rebel units.

What may exemplify such a situation it is the recent events in Central African Republic, where as a result of the 2012 civil war the power was seized by the Séléka. This group created military forces on the basis of its units. Such a situation has taken place in Sub-saharan African countries on numerous occasions. Former rank-and-file soldiers and officers have no other option but to join the armed opposition after the fall of the leader of the country in whose army they served, in particular, when they are from his ethnic group. Sometimes it is the only chance not only to earn a living, but also to stay alive. After overthrowing President Milton Obote in Uganda, Idi Amin liquidated about 2/3 of the officer corps of the Ugandan army during the first year of his rule, suspecting it of loyalty towards his opponent; rank-and-file soldiers were also executed. The place of the executed soldiers in the army and officer corps was filled by Amin with people from his home region – Western Nile and Nubians.1

Another perfect example is also found in Central African Republic. The country’s armed forces (Forces Armées Centrafricaines – FACA) play the key role in taking and retaining power in the country. During the short history of CAR, the army has been frequently implicated in political conflicts, and has taken part in nearly all coup d’état attempts. The subsequent presidents Dacko, Bokassa, Kolingba, Bozizé and Djotodia came to power as a result of a coup d’état, supported either by the native army or by foreign mercenaries. Out of six presidents three used to be army chiefs of staff. The first president of Central African Republic, David Dacko, was overthrown by army chief of staff Jean-Bédel Bokassa. In 1979, he returned to CAR as a result of a coup d’état supported by French commandos sent by Paris as part of ‘Baracuda’ operation. In 1981, he was overthrown again by another army chief of staff – General André Kolingba. The only president who came to power through a democratic election (1993) was President

Ange-Félix Patassé, who quickly became very unpopular among military men. In the years 1996-1997, badly paid soldiers incited a number of rebellions in the country, and in 2001 an unsuccessful coup d'état attempt took place. Unable to rely on loyalty of the native army, Patassé requested Libya and Democratic Republic of Congo for help. Accusing the army chief of staff of ambiguous behaviour during the rebellion, in 2002 he tried to arrest General Bozizé. After fierce fighting, Bozizé with a group of 300 loyal soldiers fought its way to Chad, in order to return to CAR after a few months in charge of Chadian mercenaries and units of rebels recruited mainly from the northern part of the country.2 Some units from the CAR army, which were dissatisfied with the rule of the incumbent president, went to the Bozizé side very fast. In that situation, Patassé asked the Congolese and Libyans for help again, and the country plunged into a civil war, during which units of foreign mercenaries wreaked havoc, looting, raping and murdering.3 The situation repeated in 2012, when President Bozizé was overthrown by the Séléka, which was headed by Michel Djotodia. The Séléka units mainly consisted of Chadian and Sudanese mercenaries.

The use of ethnically alien troops in internal fighting is a frequent element of the reality in African countries, used both by contenders who want to seize power, and incumbent leaders of the countries, who try to retain it. Apart from the above-mentioned Central African Republic and Democratic Republic of Congo, the most famous examples include Uganda under president Idi Amin, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Chad and Mali.

When the Séléka rebels took power in the capital, and after a few days seized the country’s whole territory, they became the actual CAR army, which resulted in dramatic consequences for the population. Missionary priest Mirosław Gucwa from the town of Bouar describes the ‘new army’ in the following way: Many of them come from the neighbouring countries, mainly from Chad and Sudan. They mainly use Arabic and in vast majority don’t know French or Sango. While taking power, there were over 5 thousand of them, and currently their number increased as much as five fold. After a few days of training, new recruits receive arms, uniforms and are conscripted into the Central African army. Not having much idea about military discipline and soldier’s honour, they commit numerous abuses, such as theft, rapes, extortion of fees at road barriers, shops, markets and many other places. Such abuse is perpetrated with explicit or implied consent of the officers in charge, whose morale also leaves a lot to be desired. In fact, even the military ranks they assign to themselves have been earned ‘for services’ in rebel campaigns in various African countries, and not after a long period of service and training.4

Currently, the military forces of Central African Republic are still weak and depend on external help. The country’s army consists of 4.5 thousand soldiers armed mainly with light weapons and basic equipment (in 2016 the CAR army had at its disposal only four

---

2 Each mercenary was promised about FCFA 7 million (approx. EUR 10 thousand) reward if General Bozizé succeeds in seizing power. R. Wieczorek, Pęknięte serce Afryki, Kraków 2008, pp. 250-251.
4 Based on the account of missionary priest Mirosław Gucwa, Bouar, Central African Republic, 27 November 2013.
obsolete tanks). The CAR military forces have been actively supported by France, which provides army instructors, and keeps an 800-soldier strong garrison in the capital.

During the last phase of President Mobutu rule in Democratic Republic of Congo (formerly Zaire) unpaid soldiers were, in fact, encouraged by superiors to loot and sack. In other words, regular troops ceased to be a well-disciplined formation which operates within the limits of the law and serves the state, and it would be difficult to distinguish them from private paramilitary groups. The situation aggravated even further when they became fragmented, frequently as a result of an intentional policy. In such a situation, apart from regular troops, units of e.g. president’s personal guard or other units which are allowed to operate unrestricted by the applicable law are created. At the end of the Mobutu rule, the only unit he could actually rely on was his personal guard. Currently, what exemplifies such a unit is, for example, the guard of President Yoweri Museveni in Uganda (one thousand soldiers), headed by the president’s son, Brigadier-General Kainerugaba Muhoozi, trained at the prestigious Royal Military Academy in Sandhurst.

What is equally dangerous is an army suddenly deprived of its leader. The same was the case after the death of President Laurent-Désiré Kabila, who was shot at the presidential palace in Kinshasa by one of his bodyguards. The chaos which engulfed the capital after the assassination led to anarchy in the streets. The worst were soldiers who looked for culprits in the streets of Kinshasa, and, at the same time, looted everything they could. Most commanders and officers connected with Kabila did not come from the province in which Kinshasa is located, but from Katanga, where the president came from. They were not even able to communicate in the language of the local population. Those soldiers, being far from their homes in a situation in which their leader had been murdered, were scared, nervous and very aggressive.

According to a UN report, the authorities of South Sudan allow the militia units which fight on their side to rape women. It is a form of ‘compensation’, since the government is not able to pay them. The scale is so huge that according to the report in the period from April to September 2015 as many as 1,300 such cases were reported.

Even the armies of the regional military superpowers, such as Nigeria, prove to be inefficient in a dysfunctional state when they are put to the test. The activity of the armed terrorist group Boko Haram in that country is a telling example of that problem. This organisation conducts terror attacks, organises executions and with impunity kidnaps

---

young women from public institutions, such as schools, and it happens in a country which has one of the strongest armies in Africa.  

In Zimbabwe, the military forces are fully controlled by the president and his party, ZANU-PF, and the selection of army members is conducted by means of the party key. As early as during the Rhodesia period, the forces of the black population which fought for the independence consisted mainly of representatives of the two biggest ethnic groups: Shona and Ndebele. Each of them had its political party and military forces. The Shona people were represented by Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), whereas the Ndebele people by Zimbabwe African People’s Union (ZAPU). After regaining independence and creation of Zimbabwe in 1980, both guerrilla armies were merged into one national army with the former Rhodesian army. However, each of the former guerrilla armies kept its hidden stash of weapons, and since the very beginning there was no trust between both the politicians and soldiers of both tribes. Over two years ZANU, led by Robert Mugabe, significantly strengthened its position in the power structures, and with the help of North Korean military advisers created the 5th Brigade, which was independent of the remaining army units. Only representatives of the Shona people participated in the process of creation of that unit. The brigade was perfectly equipped and used different weapons and equipment than the rest of the army. Its command structure was organised in such a way that it was controlled only by Mugabe and the generals he trusted. In 1982, top-ranking officers of ZAPU, including the deputy commander of the national army, were arrested on the charges of treason and alleged planning of a coup d’etat. Then, it was turn for lower-ranking officers and soldiers who were liquidated, arrested or thrown out of the army. Finally, the 5th Brigade rolled into action, and its task was to pacify the Ndebele population, which inhabited the south of the country. The military operation led to the death of approximately 20,000 people, and as a result of it Mugabe and ZANU-PF took all power in Zimbabwe. Once Mugabe took power, the military forces were continuously used to pacify his political opponents. The situation which most clearly exemplified army’s dependence on ZANU-PF and Robert Mugabe took place during the 2002 presidential election. At that time, the generals announced that the army would not recognise as the president a person who would not be accepted by the army. Furthermore, top-ranking officers officially supported Mugabe, and soldiers were used to threaten the opposition. Currently, Zimbabwe’s army has 30 thousand active soldiers and 20 thousand reservists, and according to Global Firepower is the 8th strongest army in Sub-Saharan Africa. It is an obedient policy tool in the hands of President Mugabe and his political party. 


A similar problem as the one described about the military forces in the dysfunctional states of sub-Saharan Africa concerns the police, which is even more corrupt and dependent on political influence. The police is often more preoccupied with supporting the ruling party than with protection of the public order, and citizens associate it with forcing various types of bribes. During his research, the author on numerous occasions was asked for a bribe by the police or customs services. Those situations took place in Central African Republic, Cameroon, Mozambique and Senegal. The police is often also organisationally inefficient and poorly-equipped, which is why it is the army that is entrusted with protection of important events. There is no need to use examples of the most dysfunctional states to show weakness of police units, as it is sufficient to give the example of a country which is considered to be quite stable for African conditions, i.e. South Africa, where the police is not able to deal with organised crime or prevent frequent attacks against white farmers.

It should be pointed out that in dysfunctional, post-conflict states both the army, and the police are a patchwork of various units which used to fight as rebel forces against the government or against other armed groups. Usually as a result of the agreement which ends a civil war these units in the so-called reconciliation process and building the peace process are included in the law and order apparatus, as well as are given a possibility of fulfilling public service in the country. However, the practice shows that it is difficult to turn a rebel into a good policeman. There is no way out of this situation, as no rebel unit will agree to be completely disarmed and rely only on the agreement signed on paper, under which its fighters would be at the opponent’s mercy. Inclusion of the armed forces of the opposing parties in one military and police structure is a safeguard in the case in which obligations are not fulfilled, so the awareness of such a situation also has a huge influence on the morale of the military and police forces. Such situations took place in South Africa, after the fall of the apartheid, in Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Namibia, Angola and Mozambique.

It is a standard that in the countries of sub-Saharan Africa, in particular during periods of tension and unrest, an important role is played by informal armed groups organised by tribal leaders or even by groups of mercenaries brought from abroad. Recently, such a situation has taken place in Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ivory Coast, Sudan or Mali. During the 2001 civil war in Central African Republic, President Patassé used mercenaries from Chad and Democratic Republic of Congo. President Bozizé also used Chadian mercenaries who formed his personal guard. During the 1999 civil war in Ivory Coast, both parties to the conflict used help of mercenary units from Liberia, whereas during the civil war in Mali Tuaregs were supported mainly by mercenaries who used to be former soldiers of Muammar Gaddafi pushed out of Libya. A standard example showing how the line between military men and civilians is blurred was the civil

war in the 1990s in Sierra Leone. In that conflict, classified as a so-called new war, the distinction between armies and armed groups practically ceased to exist.¹⁵

What may exemplify the use of armed groups by the government to fight a rebellion are Janjaweed units in Sudan. Both the victims of the repression and international monitors emphasise that during the war in Darfur those units were not chaotic bands, but rather well-armed groups formed and supported in terms of resources and logistics by the government in Khartoum. Activists from international organisations, such as Human Rights Watch, indicated that the Sudanese army openly recruited mercenaries, promising them a rifle and monthly salary in the amount of USD 100 in exchange for joining the Janjaweed units. International Crisis Group claims that the central government’s consent for looting of villages by Arab militias additionally motivated them to treat the civilian population in a particularly brutal way. The Janjaweed raids were preceded with air strikes conducted by the Sudanese Air Force against villages which were recognised as hostile, and the unit commanders were quartered in the garrisons of the Sudanese army located in the biggest cities.¹⁶ The government in Khartoum officially denied those accusations, suggesting that those groups formed as a response to attacks by non-Arab population of Darfur. In an interview for the British newspaper The Guardian, one of the Janjaweed leaders, Musa Hilal, said: The rebels disseminated the word ‘Janjaweed’ as if it meant some organisation. The term ‘Janjaweed’ doesn’t exist as some specific political group [...] it doesn’t mean anything, and is used to describe everything.¹⁷ He also decisively denied that he took part in ethnic cleansing, admitting that he only responded to the government’s call to fight the rebellion in Darfur. The government presented a programme of arming all people. I summoned my sons, and told them to become soldiers.¹⁸ In fact the Janjaweed were a part of the so-called Popular Defence Forces (PDF) – paramilitary forces created by the Sudanese government to act on behalf of the security authorities. It means that thanks to establishment of PDF the Sudanese state handed over part of the monopoly for the use of force, and, consequently, the paramilitary units became the government’s tool for using repressive measures against some citizens.¹⁹

The 50-year-old history of the countries of sub-Saharan Africa is full of examples of rulers using mercenaries’ services. It usually took place in weak states with a high degree of dysfunctionality, torn with internal conflicts, and whose leaders, fighting with the rebellion, were no longer able to rely on their own army, or when they were not sure of their presidential guard. In fact, not only governments, but also secessionists hired mercenaries, as was the case with Katanga in Belgian Congo or Biafra in Nigeria. Mercenaries became popular by a book written by Frederic Forsyth The Dogs of War,

¹⁵ M. Kaldor, New and Old Wars..., p. 186.


¹⁸ Ibid.

and then a film made on its basis, which is set in sub-Saharan Africa. The most well-known companies which offer military services (officially, security firms) include Kellogg, Brown & Root, Defence Systems Limited and, not operating any longer, Sandline International and Executive Outcomes. Apart from perfectly trained and equipped commandos, being usually former soldiers of special units, these companies offer their clients also state-of-the-art military technologies, including planes and helicopters. Services of these companies were used by the USA and European countries to protect their diplomatic posts in failed states, whose governments were not able to ensure security of diplomatic representatives. For example, Defence Systems Limited protected the embassies of the USA, UK, Sweden, Switzerland, Italy and South Africa in Democratic Republic of Congo and Angola. To a significant extent their services are also used by big international corporations, e.g. Amoco, British Petroleum, Chevron, De Beers or Exxon. The most famous operation connected with participation of contract security firms in sub-Saharan Africa is the operation of Sandline International and Executive Outcomes during the civil war in Sierra Leone and Angola, when their units protected diamond mines (1997-1998). Also the Nigerian state, which is unable to effectively protect the installations of oil corporations in the Niger Delta, is supported by Shell, Exxon, Chevron, Total, Elf or Agip. Thanks to their financial support, a special police force has been established – Rivers State Internal Security Task Force, whose task is to protect oil infrastructure against armed units’ attacks. Furthermore, international corporations help purchase military equipment and finance training for the Nigerian army stationed in the Niger Delta.

As it has already been mentioned on numerous occasions, the end of the Civil War had significant consequences for the countries of sub-Saharan Africa, which depending on the side on which they were before the Cold War were protected by western states, mainly the USA, former colonial powers or the USSR. Provided with money, arms and instructors by their patrons, they were able to hide the security deficit for the duration of that conflict. Once it came to an end, the regimes left on their own started to crumble, and the local armed forces proved to be so inefficient that they were not able to protect the state against the internal rebellion. What deteriorated the situation further were economic and social problems. The dramatic increase in the number of conflicts in the region of sub-Saharan Africa was its external manifestation. Thus, the space appeared for the security services provided by private companies, which are, in fact, corporations of mercenaries. On one hand, those companies have perfectly trained soldiers, mainly former members of elite units, and, on the other hand, their business is run by people connected with the world of finance, who e.g. run businesses connected with the diamond
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or arms trade. Thus, the security firms somehow represent on the ground their own interests, in particular in countries rich with natural resources. The use of military companies by the governments of weak African states has the other side to it. Hiring foreign entities which provide military services, people in power, who do not hold in regard the skills of their own soldiers, give them to understand how little trust the government has for their skills and loyalty. (It is assumed that since the beginning of the 1990s, the military firms have protected over one hundred presidents and prime ministers of African states). Thus, the distrust between the two parties grows, and foreign mercenaries, who are frequently better paid, are like a slap in the face of the local military men. Private companies also recruit local soldiers, choosing the best ones and paying them a few times more than the government. It happens, as was the case in Sierra Leone, that soldiers left the army to get employed at a contract company which at that time provided services to their government. Worst still, those companies often employ people from one ethnic group, which, for example makes communication in a given language easier, but leads to tensions with the local army, as was the case in Democratic Republic of Congo. Finally, when a given company leaves the country after performing the contract, its former local employees often form irregular units which act independently, and become well-trained robbers. What is worth presenting is the example of Equatorial Guinea, where in March 2004 a failed coup d’état took place, which was organised by former employees of Executive Outcomes. The aim of the putsch was to overthrow dictator Obiang Nguema, and replace him with Severo Moto, who was in exile in Spain. At that time, the incumbent president was protected by security firm MPRI. Obviously, in the background there were the interests of rival oil companies.24

The above-mentioned Military Professional Resources Inc. (MPRI) since the beginning of the 21st century focused its operation mainly on Africa. Its first contracts on this continent were in 2000 for the governments of Equatorial Guinea, Angola and Nigeria, as part of which the company created defence plans, organised coast protection and trained units to protect government buildings. As part of the African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA), it trained the armies of Benin, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi and Senegal.25

At the end of the 1990s, the above-mentioned South African contractor firm Executive Outcomes (EO) was the real heavyweight in the area of military services in Africa. As early as after its first operations in Namibia and Angola, it became clear that soldiers from government units of African states stood no chance in a direct confrontation with well-trained and equipped with state-of-the-art military gear commandos of that company. That reputation was confirmed by further EO operations in Mozambique, Malawi and Zambia.26

Interestingly, some African leaders are connected with military contract companies

25 Ibid., p. 96.
26 Ibid., pp. 103-104.
as they have a stake in them, e.g. the former president of Kenya – Daniel Arap Moi and his family held shares of Ibis Air (Strategic Resources Corporation – SRC), in Uganda the president’s stepbrother, General Salim Saleh held a 45% stake in Saracen Uganda (arms trade).  

Table 1. Dysfunctional states and the strongest armies in the region. The countries of North Africa have been bolded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own compilation the basis of Global Firepower Index 2016, 28 Fragile States Index 2016, Global Peace Index 2016. 29

27 Ibid., p. 107.
Finally, it is worth providing the data on the relationship between the countries’ estimated military strength vs. their internal weakness. As the table above shows, according to the Global Firepower 2016, out of the 19 African states which are among the 100 countries with the strongest army in the world, 14 are from sub-Saharan Africa, but as many as 12 of them are among the most dysfunctional states of the world in FSI rankings, and as many as 6 of them are in the ‘very high alert’ and ‘high alert’ group: South Sudan, Republic of Sudan, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Nigeria, Zimbabwe). Consequently, in the reality of the states of sub-Saharan Africa the state’s military force does not guarantee its stability. Furthermore, in the Global Peace Index the countries which are considered to be strong in military terms in the region are at the bottom of the ranking of stable countries.

To conclude, the military and police forces in dysfunctional states of sub-Saharan Africa reflect the condition of those states. All problems they face, such as poverty, corruption, lack of competence, ineffectual organisation, and tribalism are reflected in the condition of the military and police forces. An insufficiently armed and trained army is neither trusted by the political elite nor by society. Also its influence on the state through participation of high-ranking army officers in the political life (it is reflected, for example, in the number of African leaders with a long-standing career in the army), as well participation of military forces in numerous coup d’état attempts which have swept through African states does not raise the morale of those services, or increase trust in them. It has to be pointed out, however, that even the African states which have large armies (Nigeria, Ethiopia, Kenya) are not able to deliver adequately on their potential in crisis situations or when fighting rebels. Military forces are also used in internal fighting during which human rights are repeatedly violated, and crimes against civilians are perpetrated (Sudan, Chad).

It needs to be pointed out, however, that over the last years the situation has not improved. This lack of improvement is, to a significant extent, connected with the fight with international terrorism, which more and more often also affects the states of sub-Saharan Africa. The response to that threat is a wide-ranging military assistance programme for African states, conducted mainly by the USA and European Union states, but the coming years will show whether this trend will continue.
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