She was moreover forthcoming about the aspects of violence that she understood as inherent to family life. She attested to using physical modes of discipline with her children and said this was influenced by her own violent upbringing. As a young girl she experienced physical abuse from her uncle and described being hurt any time he ‘got mad.’ She detailed being hit by logs that left splinters behind, having to kneel on rock salt whilst balancing heavy items in her arms and being put into a rice sack, tied to a tree, and beaten.

These instances of severe family violence were, for Li, linked directly to the way she parented her own children. She admitted to physically hurting them, particularly the older ones, but after having learnt about child rights and positive discipline, reportedly discontinued her violent approach. She further lamented the intergenerational and long-term nature of intrafamily violence, reflecting that physical abuse as a form of discipline gets passed down generation by generation. She attributed her uncle’s behaviour to his own childhood experiences in tandem with her own violent behaviours as a result of abuse. The acknowledgement of this painful cycle was not an easy cross to bear for Li, as she admitted to the emotional pain she suffered through hitting her children, as it reminded her of what she had experienced at the hands of her uncle. She lamented the long-term traumatic legacies of these forms of violence while reflecting upon the different forms abuse could take.

**Family ACE**

E was an adult male who lived with his wife Ma, 49, eldest daughter Ed, 28, Ed’s partner and two children, their second-born Em, 23, Em’s partner and child, and a youngest daughter. Ma and Ed manage a convenience store. They all lived together until E and his brother were summarily executed for his perceived connection with the drugs trade. Notably, this is the only family identified in our participant group where the involvement of the victim with drugs is not denied.

After the death of their father, pre-existing rivalries between Ed and Em escalated, and several conflicts have been documented. Ma believed the source was jealousy from Ed, who was raised by her grandmother, whereas Em grew up with her parents. Ed believed Em (since she already has a family of her own) should no longer receive or ask for support from Ma and this was why she continued to confront her. These older conflicts had, according to Ma, been able to escalate in the absence of fear from the disciplinary role their father used to play. Ma, now a single parent, disliked her husband’s use of violence as a mode of discipline and refrained from it after his passing. She remembers all too well his use of harsh and painful words as well as physical assault and revealed that these instances caused her to fear him. The fear of E was later confirmed by Ed when she detailed her father’s return to the use of drugs. After apparently stopping using drugs after the birth of Em, the daughters were shocked when the drug abuse recommenced around a year before his death. In their words, it was due to mutual fear of their father that they did not address the issue.
Family S
Eme, 49, and her husband Jo have 10 children. Jo has no stable employment and often works different jobs in construction sites. At the time of the interview he was without employment. Their eldest child has a family of his own and no longer lives in their household, whereas the rest of the children do. This includes their daughter An, 24, her partner and their three children, as well as the second-born and his partner. The total in the household is 16. The constitution of the household very much reflects the family ideologies expressed by both Eme and An during interview, namely that families have ‘complete’ members, that they each help each other with responsibilities, especially financially, and that they support each other whether having a new family or not.

Eme and An recount the experience of losing their son and brother respectively to the war on drugs. He was a 16-year-old student in secondary school, the fifth-born in the family, and was fondly remembered by the community as one of the family’s most obedient and responsible children. His killing was for them another case of ill-fated circumstance, a case of mistaken identity and collateral damage, as he was not known to have any use or involvement with illegal drugs. He was killed while hanging out with his friends on a school night. An explained that her brother’s killing has had a devastating effect on the entire family. Her younger siblings face stigma at school and she and her mother have become preoccupied with seeking justice. Due to their increased political activism, new rules for the family regarding safety and security have emerged to prevent further victimisation. These rules involve ensuring that all family members always know each other’s whereabouts, especially the children. Consequently, when An and Eme are engaging in their political activities, an adult relative always remains in the house to attend to the children. Additionally, since the killing the children are no longer allowed to leave the house after 8pm.
Family B

B, 21, lives in Cow Factory, a slaughterhouse in Monrovia. Despite her tender age she has four ‘children’ – two male and two female – aged 34, 23, 20 and two. The toddler is her only biological child yet owing to her ability to provide for the others, she is considered their mother. This is a common familial constellation in Liberia: the ability to provide is aligned with parentage. ‘Bra B’ meaning big brother, ‘Big Sis’ meaning big sister and ‘our ma’ or ‘our pa’ meaning mother or father are the main expressions used within the Liberian population that are associated with conditional/situational family relatedness. This is particularly salient in the case of B in that she is currently the beneficiary of an apprenticeship programme where she is learning to be a hairdresser; she has no great claims to fortune. The relative instability of B’s socioeconomic status, and the fact that she has taken in so many dependents, speaks to the depth of poverty in Liberia.

B has been chosen as a case study as she resembles many other cases in our data set: she is young; she has lost family to Ebola; she has spent time in the ETU, and she has struggled with the stigma of being associated with the disease. While other cases not outlined here are, arguably, marked by more extreme forms of violence – rape, police brutality and physical intrafamilial violence, for example – we wish to be explicit in our endeavour to avoid trivially pushing forward the ‘worst’ or ‘most violent’ of cases. B in this sense, although experiencing extraordinary difficulties, can be said to represent many young women in this study who have been indirectly or directly affected by Ebola: she engages in transactional sex, has had dealings in illicit street life and has fallen into illegal substance abuse.

B previously lived with her biological parents alongside her brother and sister. However, during the Ebola crisis in 2014 both parents perished, and B had little option but to drop out of school owing to the loss of parental support. Furthermore, as a result of her parents’ death, she was required to spend 21 days in quarantine. After her return from the ETU, B experienced considerable stigmatisation due to her associations with Ebola: she was not welcomed back into her home by her siblings owing to their fear of contamination. Her living situation with her siblings was thus strained and after several instances of violence (she was once severely beaten) and calls to leave the home by her sister (when she refused to sell goods at the market) she left home and rented a room in the community. She subsequently started smoking, stealing and engaging in commercial sex to get by. She had a relationship and bore a child with a man at some point but lost the child due to illness. Despite the iterations of violence at the hands of her family, B laments a happier time when she graduated from sixth grade and her family bought her gifts. Although her brother and sister banished her from the house, she still hopes that someday she will return to the family.
Family D
D, 21, is an Ebola survivor who lives in Marchland. He is one of four siblings; he has two sisters aged 29 and 30 and a brother who is 31. All of them are in school. He has a daughter, 2, who is largely within his care. During the week she stays with his sisters and goes to kindergarten while he works informally as a ‘wheelbarrow boy’, and on the weekend she returns to him. The mother abandoned the family and he has not heard from her since.

Between the ages of seven and 15, D attested to being repeatedly victimised by his own family. He was then living with his mother and uncle (his mother’s elder brother) in his uncle’s house. This uncle took on a fatherly role and was a harsh disciplinarian; D was often beaten, starved and verbally abused, being called ‘a dog’. Thus, his abuse took many forms; on several occasions he was thrown out of the house and on others he was kept indoors without food. When the Ebola crisis hit, D lost his mother and the uncle who had abused him as well as contracting the disease himself. Although surviving, when D returned to his community from the ETU the stigma was so intense, he was forced to leave. He became a drifter, moving through his precarious social environment largely alone. The exact form of his stigmatisation is not detailed but it is noted that he joined his peers in the use of marijuana and cocaine in Monrovia’s ghettos. For his engagement in these activities D was arrested, jailed and beaten by police. As a result of his incarceration, D was required to pay a sum of money for his release. Family and friends attempted to come to his aid but were unable to raise the fee. Ultimately a woman from the community, whom D often helped by fetching water, paid the fee and he was released from jail.

Family F
F, 34, lives with her husband and three children, aged 18, five and two. Her eldest child is biologically her niece, but owing to her cohabitation with the family she is considered a daughter. F is a high school graduate who now works as an informal street trader, selling goods to earn a living. Despite the relative stability of her current situation, F’s past has been marked by extreme forms of violence. During the 1990s she resided in Lofa, a county in the northernmost part of Liberia, with relatives she considered parents despite not being biologically her own. The area was attacked during the civil war by a rebel group of which her stepbrother was a member. This group captured and killed her relatives. F, who was also captured during the insurgency, was raped by her stepbrother (who was forced to do so in the presence of the group or else F would have been killed). She later fled to safety in Monrovia with him.

Once in the capital the two siblings lived together briefly, but the shame and trauma drove them apart and they felt compelled to live independently from one another. F then moved into her own place in the community near to where her biological parents lived (separately, owing to divorce). During this period, her father was particularly helpful to her. However, during the Ebola crisis, and shortly after the natural death of her mother, her father fell victim to the disease and died. After his death F experienced great deprivation as he had been a great source of support to her. However, F’s sister, who had left for Europe before the onset of the crisis, was able to send her remittances. Owing to this support, F and her family are now able to live in relative financial security.
South Africa

Family 1
A lives in a small shack in Mzinti with her two sons, nine and 11 years old. The boys’ father is not present in their lives despite A’s best efforts to encourage his involvement. He has another family and A has lost hope of his return. However, he threatens to take the boys away from A and leave them with his parents, seemingly as a power play. Both her sons are bullied at school and this is of great concern to A.

A was raped when she was eight years old – a similar age to her youngest son when he initially experienced bullying. She is very protective over her sons; her intense worry about the bullying is possibly in reaction to the lack of response from her family about her first rape incident. Since her first rape, she experienced further traumas in the form of rape and torture. These cases are not detailed but she attests to having abusive relationships with men and is currently being sexually harassed by someone at work. Her boys stay with her mother during the week alongside their cousins. Despite this arrangement, A has a conflicted relationship with her mother and sister, who live together and separately to her. Her mother denies her experience of rape and her sister, who has a job, constantly belittles her and questions her parenting. A’s rape has never been discussed in the family.
Family 2

J is an adult male who lives in Mzinti with his uncle. He is married to P who also lives in Mzinti but separately with her own mother and her and J’s teenage daughter. J and P have both had individual counselling as well as couples counselling. P is partially blind and has severe narcolepsy and as a result receives a disability grant from SASSA, the SA Social Security Agency, which helps with the financial strain. J has previously been unemployed and worked as a voluntary policeman. Currently he has a temporary job building roads.

J and P are having parenting problems with their daughter, 17, who was raped by a police officer. Since they reported the rape, the family has been subjected to harassment from the officer’s family. The officer, despite indications that he has committed other rapes in the community, has been released from custody and the court date is repeatedly postponed. The challenge of parenting has been addressed during therapeutic interventions with J and P and they point to their daughter’s ‘teenage narcissism’ and penchant for partying and causing conflicts. They are afraid that these behaviours, alongside her uniform that is ‘too small’ and revealing, will elicit further victimisation and they are working towards boundary setting to ensure her safety.

J carries a sense of guilt and responsibility for his daughter’s victimisation as he was raped at a similar age. He was tortured by police at the age of 14 and has been in counselling for two years. CSVR has referred him to the local clinic for ongoing counselling as he continues to exhibit signs of depression and alcohol abuse. He is emotionally and verbally abusive when drunk. He keeps a gun in the house but claims that both his friends and his sense of self-control have stopped him from shooting his daughter’s perpetrator. He admits he may use it should his family’s safety be jeopardised.

Family 3

Al, 49, lives with his wife L, their child, three, his stepdaughter T, 17, T’s three-month-old infant Le, his niece, 28, and her 11-month-old son. Al is a torture survivor who struggles with a severe psychotic disorder as a result of his experiences. He was tortured in about 1994 when he was 24 years old, either the day before or the day after his mother was necklaced (executed by fire using a rubber tyre doused in petrol), because the police were looking for him and he was out of the house.

He has since been diagnosed with schizophrenia and subsists on a SASSA grant while L works in Pretoria during the week. Al has been continually harassed and mocked by members of the community for his mental health problems and interventions have centred on his ability to cope with these instances. L has considerable health issues of her own. She has severe burn scars on her chest where boiling water fell over her at the age of three during a domestic dispute between her parents. She was in hospital for seven years for the burns. Before meeting Al she was in an abusive relationship with a man named I, with whom she had a daughter and who would beat her in front of his policeman friends, his drinking buddies. In 2001, when the baby was nine months old, she and her daughter were placed in jail for a night. This, she believes, was arranged by I and the police refused to help her owing to their association with him. Despite the severity of the trauma in their pasts and the current challenges facing Al and L, they and their family appear to have a stable and secure family life and show affection for each other and the grandchildren.
Themes of violence in families

From the preceding case studies, several themes have been identified for further inspection:

- Gendered Family Relations and Hierarchies of Victimhood
- Legacies of Violence
- Perpetration and Protection

As stated above, these themes are not applicable in equal measure for each of the cases; indeed, some contexts appear to have greater representation in certain areas over others. However, the themes provide a basis for us to generate some questions that may be helpful those working with families and trauma in the future. Methodologically, we generated the themes from the data in a bottom-up process where we discussed each of the cases in relation to one another and the literature. Letting the data speak is not always straightforward. While family and its features are often not spoken about directly, what we can detect from our notes is the inference of family, or rather an outline of it, which is alluded to. In examining how the participating families detail violence and not necessarily how they articulate family – a kind of collective reading between the lines – we are able to determine the dominant normative ideals that influence family constellations.

Gendered Family Relations and Hierarchies of Victimhood

In examining the data across South Africa, the Philippines and Liberia it is apparent that each of the families emerge as distinct in articulation and practice, demonstrating the existence of different normative and practical models of family. In South Africa, there seems to be a preference for nuclear forms, as demonstrated in A’s struggle to regain the involvement of her estranged partner in their son’s life. However, the cases also demonstrate several other models or constellations. This resonates with literature on South African families where apartheid, labour migration systems and lately HIV/AIDS fundamentally reshaped family lives (Budlender & Lund 2011). Both data and literature confirm the precarity and reconfigurations of cohesive family life in the face of systemic, physical and structural forms of violence.

In Liberia, what emerges are family models flexibly formed in the ashes of war. Here, family relatedness is less associated with biological notions of descent than predicated on financial ability to provide. In this sense, the consequences of both the civil wars and Ebola are clear to see in family formations, with sometimes only the husks of familial assistance remaining. Relationships predicated on financial ability to support become important and those with the capacity to care for and provide are often the ones heading newly formed households. This is apparent in the case of B, the 21-year-old woman with three dependents who are senior to her in age and biologically unrelated. Similarly, with the case of D, it was not his family who bailed him out of jail but a woman for whom he fetched water. Additionally, F grew up in a household of relatives she considered parents who were not related to her biologically. This speaks to the fluidity of family life in Liberia and the importance placed on both relatives and non-kin for survival in circumstances of extreme socio-economic hardship.
Of the three contexts the Philippines emerged as the most explicit in terms of privileging strong notions of normative family ideals. Here, iterations were expressed more clearly regarding the sanctity and centrality of families as well as the strength of its nuclear ideology. It is also here that we find the most clearly expressed gendered notions of family and patriarchal ideals regarding how families should look. Such findings could arguably be attributed to the different method of data collection but it is more likely to be related to the broader embedding of family life into the Filipino socio-political economy more generally and its absolute centrality in all aspects of social life.20 In these cases, families are predicated on the union of a man and woman in marriage; they live together in multigenerational, blood-related households; they operate financially as units and help each other with child-caring responsibilities.

Social obligations within our Filipino families can be epitomised by family S, particularly in Eme and An’s characterisation of families as having ‘complete members’ each helping each other with their responsibilities, particularly financially. The notion of being ‘complete’ illustrates the strength of normative ideals. These family portraits are echoed by Li in family AS, who stresses the importance of family in shaping society, and the growing responsibilities towards the family taken on by children as they grow older. In much literature on families in the Philippines, these responsibilities are discussed as sacrifice with strong religious connotations (Jensen 2018; Parreñas 2005). As such, an ideology of boundedness, togetherness and mutual support is apparent in these cases. This is not to say, however, that these families are devoid of violence or that these models are not contradicted, as when Li’s husband engages in extramarital relations and subjects her to violence.

As we have seen, normative family models in the Philippines, and indeed South Africa and Liberia, are constantly threatened by ongoing forms of violence. However, we also observed that the way families organise themselves through the machinations of violence was something that changed often. These changes were temporally constituted and had both immediate and long-term effects. In the Philippines, for example, according to a widow the loss of a patriarch allowed household tensions to grow in the absence of discipline (in the case of family ACE). It also elicited changes in justice-seeking measures from relatives left behind and a reconstituting of family rules regarding safety. In South Africa, long-term changes as a result of circular migration, the rise of mineral capitalism, the HIV/AIDS epidemic and the legacy of apartheid has left many families struggling for survival. The introduction of social grants has both alleviated extreme forms of poverty in South Africa and changed family dynamics in African townships like Mzinti and rural homelands (Ferguson 2015). For one thing, the traditional patriarchal model of family roles, whereby men are the designated breadwinners, has been challenged as men have struggled to find a meaningful role in a formal economy with one of the highest unemployment rates in the world.

Similarly, the coming of Ebola in the wake of the civil war has had both immediate and long-term effects on family constitutions in Liberia. The inability of families to support diseased members and the climate of fear surrounding the virus resulted in the scattering of girls and women across the streets of Monrovia. These girls and women, overwhelmingly represented in our broader Liberian data, were largely left alone to fend for themselves, partaking in illicit street activities and surviving economically through their engagement in transactional sex. In this sense their experience of Ebola is explicitly gendered. While they hang on, it seems clear that their practices do not conform to
normative ideals about family life. Only F, living with her husband and two children, surviving on selling goods in the market and remittances from a sister, lives a life in accordance with normative ideals. However, we may gauge the ideals in the kinship structures that exclude the girls. In many ways, they seem to conform to patriarchal models of blood-related families. We shall return to this below.

Gendered notions of family norms also animate how violence is validated or assessed. Extrajudicial killings of men in the Philippines attract the most direct interest from the outside, while women’s sense of problems fade into the background as functions of male suffering. This obscures female suffering, rendering it less visible, often inside the home, as a secondary form of victimization.21 Hence, normative family models not only structure the assessment of what is the ‘right kind of family’ – complete, as one Philippine mother noted – but also how different forms of violence are assessed in a gendered hierarchy of victimhood.

Legacies of continuous violence

Across the three contexts, violence is continuous and pervasive. While the war on drugs in the Philippines inaugurated a shocking new level of violence with damaging effects on the ability of families to sustain life, the war also expressed forms of violence that could not be reduced to the war itself but fed on stereotypical notions of the urban poor that, in earlier times, had also often been used to justify violent displacement and resettlement. Furthermore, as argued elsewhere (Jensen and Hapal 2018; Curato 2016; Kusaka 2017), state and residents’ concerns with the illicit drug economy had led to both communal and state violence in the past. Likewise, in the South African cases, selected due to family members having experienced torture and ill-treatment at the hands of the apartheid state decades ago, forms of interpersonal, communal and state violence were still part of everyday life during our data collection, with families experiencing harassment and violence from the state and the surrounding communities as well as violence within families. Finally, while the Liberian cases were selected due to Ebola-induced trauma and subsequent violence, all participants and their families had experienced severe violence during the civil wars. Negative coping mechanisms are often passed on to younger generations and many Liberians have become parents after being abused at a very young age with very limited experience and capacity in their own families to draw on. Hence, in one case a woman had been raped by her own stepbrother during the war only to experience her father die of Ebola less than a decade later.

These continuous forms of trauma were often narrated as separate instances of violence or trauma. However, the cases also illustrate what we can talk about as intergenerational or transgenerational forms of trauma (Prager 2016; Isobel et al 2019; Mucci 2013; Bezo and Maggi 2015). In the case of Li in the Philippines, she directly links her use of violence in disciplining her children to her own extremely violent experiences at the hands of her uncle, forcing her to kneel on salt and being put in a bag, tied to a tree and beaten. In the case of Family 2 in South Africa, J laments his inability to protect his daughter from rape perpetrated by a police officer and relates this directly to his own experiences of sexual trauma at the hands of apartheid security forces. In this way, his hopes of having survived past the trauma were dashed as similar forms of violence were visited upon his daughter in what we can think of as the circulation of violence across generations. These two examples differ in that in the first case, violent upbringing may
beget violent parenting; and the second case, similar forms of violence target several generations. However, they both illustrate the extent towards which we need to think of violence across generations.

Across all contexts, state (or in Liberia, state-like rebel) organised violence has been a constant worry and source of destruction of family life. Torture, sexual harassment and extrajudicial killings have been normalised to the extent that they have been folded into the texture of everyday life (Das 2006). However, the cases also illustrate the need to understand how different forms of violence across different scales in the social ecology relate to each other. For instance, in the case of Family 2 in South Africa, J and P attempted to control their daughter and her behaviour in order to protect her from violence from the outside, especially in the aftermath of sexual violence. While this is an understandable reaction, some of the Philippine material suggests that fear of state violence or involvement in gangs and drugs lead to rather violent forms of parental disciplining. In this way, parental violence, while not condonable, must partly be seen as attempts to protect rather than to hurt. Hurting is deliberate and purposeful – justified by the intention to protect. It may also be suspected to be an aggressive projection of a fear emanating from a sense of being powerless to control external factors that threaten the perpetrators’ capacity to defend themselves. This clearly feeds on a widespread belief in the benevolence of corporal punishment as a tool of discipline and hence the normalisation and justification of intra-household violence, but it also illustrates the ways in which state violence is folded into and entangled with violence against, for instance, children (Auyero & Berti 2016).

Communal forms of organised violence in the form of, for instance, vigilante justice did not feature directly in any of our cases except one:22 the case of Al’s mother being necklaced due to suspicions of her being a spy. However, the three contexts have known their share of communal violence and retribution. Many killings in the war on drugs are rumoured to be carried out by vigilantes (Jensen & Hapal 2018); non-state crime fighting and vigilante violence have long been staple elements in everyday policing in South Africa (Buur & Jensen 2004) and in Liberia, crime, especially theft, is often dealt with by community members (Larsen et al 2018). However, several of the cases relate directly to the effects of community stigmatisation of ‘bad’ behaviour. All informants tainted by Ebola have been marginalised and excluded; communal and neighbourly doubts about the innocence of those targeted in the war on drugs have lingering effects for families in the Philippines, and in the case of Al in South Africa, his trauma-induced mental health problems led to social marginalisation. Both the stigmatisation and the direct violence form part of what above we called authority-based or law-maintaining violence in which dominant notions of morality and order animate the ability of families and people to survive. Sometimes the dominant forms of morality are indeed also visible inside families in modes of disciplining in what some talk of as the normalisation of violence (Bourgois 2001). However, it also illustrates how violence moves across and connects different levels in the social ecology.

Resonating with feminist and intersectional approaches, the cases clearly illustrate the extent to which violence itself, as well as its effects, are both gendered and structured by generational concerns. As we write above, there is a hierarchy of victimhood in which the violation of men somehow is seen as more important or visible than the victimisation of women. Hence, while advocacy groups in the Philippines, including Balay, have focused on the implication for women and children, much more attention has been paid to
the extrajudicial killings themselves than the social costs of, for instance, families losing their breadwinner. As critiqued by Lotte Buch Segal (Segal 2016), this is often unproductively conceptualised as primary and secondary victimisation. Furthermore, the cases also indicate how differently violence affects men and women, with sexual violence disproportionately affecting women and murder equally disproportionately affecting men. Every single young woman in our Liberian material had experienced rape, whereas those killed in the Philippines were men. Furthermore, in the Philippines, evidence from Balay’s work suggests that women experience coercive sex at the hands of police in exchange for their own freedom or the freedom of their relatives.23 Finally, men and women were disciplined differently and in different places, with women more often suffering violations inside their family. This suggests that women are policed differently than men as part of defending patriarchal social orders, something that is corroborated by the literature on interpersonal violence (Kelly et al 2018; Horn et al 2014; WHO 2010; Vinck & Pham 2013; Hindin & Adair 2002). As our cases with young women in Liberia illustrate, the social sanctions meted out to young women who cannot or do not want to conform to dominant gender norms can be severe in the form of exclusion from families or disciplining violence inside families.

For all informants there existed an intimate relationship between violence and survival where often the latter took precedence, especially for surviving women in the Philippine drug war. While violence was mentioned in the first few conversations, in subsequent conversations they focused more on financial difficulties, economic struggles (finding ways and means to sustain daily living), and on safety and security concerns after having lost a husband, brother or father. In this way, violence significantly impacts on the ability to survive. Furthermore, the ability to cope with violence also depends on economic status. Hence, in the Liberian material F was clearly better off due to the remittances sent by her sister in Europe and thus better able to deal with trauma that in objective terms was no less significant than that suffered by participants who subsisted mostly on illicit economic activities and transactional sex. Consequently, while violence affects the livelihood of people, as the World Bank notes (Skaperdas et al 2009), the economic resources of affected populations also inform the ways in which they can handle crisis and violence. Again, as our cases suggest, both the effects of violence and the ability to cope with it are thoroughly gendered.

Perpetration and Protection

Families across the three contexts have the propensity to both protect against and perpetrate violence, and it is this binary that we seek to critically engage with here. Families may shift to protect against communal forms of violence by internalising communication, emphasising rules and accountability, and ensuring curfews to protect against violent incidents from the outside, as we see in the Philippines. They may equally disintegrate; fracture under the pressure of oppressive structural violence and pervasive disease stigma, leaving only the outline of family once known and informal networks of care to depend upon. Families may also uphold or sustain the kinds of violence orbiting local moral worlds, the cycle of trauma continued within a culture of blame and anger. As such, the forms and dynamisms of families are multifarious and complex, with no one model of mutually constitutive ‘support’ universally applying to all.
The ways in which families cope with violence is of interest here. By ‘coping’ we do not necessarily mean in the positivist or productive manner with which the term is associated in much literature.24 Some families do not ‘cope’ in any substantial sense. Rather, we explore what families do to mitigate violent conditions. As such it is important to remain cognisant that ‘doing’ may at times be counterproductive; acts may emerge out of desperation or exhaustion and families may not always display the kind of resilience associated with productive ways of coping. Examining ‘doing’ in this way involves considering how families attempt to break the cycle of violence and sustain the integrity of family life through a number of mechanisms, for instance blame, exclusion, violence and silence. As such it is important to remain cognisant that ‘doing’ may at times be counterproductive; acts may emerge out of desperation or exhaustion and families may not always display the kind of resilience associated with productive ways of coping. Examining ‘doing’ in this way involves considering how families attempt to break the cycle of violence and sustain the integrity of family life through a number of mechanisms, for instance blame, exclusion, violence and silence.

Commencing with silence, we see within South African Family 1 how the silence between family members has a continuous traumatic effect. The denial of A’s rape by her mother and sister, for example, has a sustaining effect on the violence she experienced, as well as exacerbating the worries she has regarding her own young sons. Here the mechanisms of silence and denial are employed by A’s mother and sister to sustain the idea of the moral family through the express erasure of a violent past. They strive to live in the present and uphold a sense of family normalcy through expunging the trauma. This can be seen also through A’s sister’s critique of A’s mothering in that it suggests an ideal form of family that must continuously be aspired to.

We have identified blame as another mechanism to uphold the sanctity of family, specifically the relegation of blame to that which is outside of the family. This can be gauged within the Philippines context, where maintenance of the moral family is upheld through insistence on the innocence of the deceased family member. All but one of our Filipino families denied the involvement of their loved one in the drugs trade. Indeed, most killings were narrativised by families as ‘collateral damage’ or cases of ‘mistaken identity’. Such iterations do two things: first, they cast out blame for the splintering of the family upon the state and second, they maintain the image of moral integrity of the normative family ideal. In this way, families protect against communitarian notions of danger and moral decay said to be caused by so-called drug personalities and users through underlining the honour and integrity of family members. Furthermore, the persistent innocence attributed to the deceased family member speaks not only to the upholding of the immediate moral family but also to a generalised acceptance of the Duterte regime’s moral affront on communities (see also Kusaka 2017; Curato 2016). In upholding a family member’s innocence through the narrative of obedience and responsibility, some families make statements about the legitimacy of the WOD: that is, the war is justified but misdirected.25 This is not general, however, and one family was actively engaged in mobilisation against the war on drugs, often at their peril.

In some ways, Ebola and the war on drugs represent very different forms of violent affront, and as such they elicit an equally different set of responses from families. What appears representative across our Liberian data is a mechanism of deliberate helplessness and remorseful exclusion. The stigma associated with Ebola was so great
and felt like such a threat to life that family members deliberately distanced themselves from one another, ring-fencing and protecting themselves against isolated members associated with the disease. We see families being helpless and unable to assist one another owing to their own difficult circumstances. Responsibility towards one another becomes precarious, unknown and unanchored to former moralities. We see families attempting to survive by pushing out the unwanted members, who are no longer part of the moral family whole, thus arguably shedding a part of itself to stay alive. During the war situation, members of families were forced to harm each other, such as a brother forced to have sexual intercourse with his sister. Both Ebola and war time experiences left prolonged and excruciating remorse, anger and revenge tendencies within families.

Stigmatisation around the time of the Ebola crisis and its aftermath should not be underestimated when trying to understand exclusionary responses to the disease. Experiences of abandonment and difficulties of reintegration upon people's return to communities cannot be captured purely within the language of perpetration. The trauma of being inside an Ebola Treatment Unit as well as the potential loss of friends, relatives and wider social ties can have a profound effect on the psychological wellbeing of individuals, not to mention the intense community fear (Venables 2017: 36). The subjective experience of Ebola has been documented by many (for an intimate account see Igonoh 2015) and the horror of its course should not be underestimated. It is within this climate of fear that our families are embedded and it is important to be cognisant of the fact that the stigma of the disease not only attaches itself to the dangers of infection but is linked to fears relating to experiences the person had within the ETU (ibid: 39). A strong discourse of distance thereby exists due to the threat of contamination and health messaging surrounding touch inscribed with the deadly risks associated with physical contact. Fear is particularly heightened due to its recognition of the disease as ‘transmissible, imminent, and invisible’ (Pappas et al 2009: 744). It is thus everywhere and nowhere at once; the climate of fear surrounding Ebola is omnipresent and no one escapes suspicion. Additional to this environment of unease are the structural hazards that press up against families that are forced to struggle with the everyday difficulties of insecurity. As such they are placed in an almost unimaginable bind: accommodate a family member and risk exposure to the same tragic fate or create distance and protect what remains. It is this tragedy that complicates the notion of protection and perpetration and invokes the image of the family as something striven for and simultaneously threatened.
Revisiting Perpetration and Protection

In this chapter we have explored nine case studies from South Africa, Liberia and the Philippines in order to analyse how they understand and practice inherently gendered notions of family and how over time violence has affected the ability to uphold family life as well as what families do in order to protect themselves, including how this might lead a family to assume perpetrative roles. What is clear from these cases is the extent to which violence is multisystemic and part of everyday life. Many of our families live in communities where violence permeates the everyday, invading homes and neighbourhoods and saturating all levels of social life. This is made visible by the fact that in South Africa, 41,498 rapes and 20,938 murders were recorded in 2019 alone, and that intimate partner violence is widely justified by both men and women as a normal and expected part of an intimate relationship in Liberia (Olayanju et al 2013; Uthman et al 2010). ‘Beating as a sign of love’ within relationships has been documented within the Liberian context as a prevalence that is not necessarily socially condoned but is nonetheless widespread (Abramowitz 2014). These examples are explicitly gendered, and this speaks to the pervasiveness of violence against women. Alternative intersections also play a part in these incidences of violence, however; for example, studies have found that low levels of household wealth in urban residences are associated with higher likelihood of intimate partner violence in the Philippines (Hindin & Adair 2002).

The analysis of the families has been rather bleak. Violence and perpetration are clear to see across our participating families and most families in the study face dilemmas and challenges that may seem insurmountable. However, there were also important instances of bravery and kindness. Despite the challenges, one of the families in South Africa had a loving and caring relationship - that of Al and his wife L. B in Liberia had assumed responsibility for a range of strangers, often older than her. Families in the Philippines stuck together amid communal and state suspicion and one family even found the strength to participate in mobilisation against the drug war. There are quite evident patterns of protection that demonstrate attempts to break the cycle of violence, for example in the fact that Li in the Philippines no longer wishes to use corporal punishment on her children. Similarly, family S bind together and create new domestic practical measures to ensure the remaining family’s safety. In Liberia, F’s sister sends her remittances and A’s family attend her graduation despite conflicted relations. In South Africa, J keeps a gun to protect against external violence and attends counselling to deal with his own substance abuse and anger. These are all ways in which we might imagine families using the tools at their disposal to protect against ongoing forms of violence. Furthermore, in noting the ways in which families respond to violence it is perhaps pertinent to note that each of the participating families engage directly and in concrete ways with the interventions and programmes implemented by each partner organisation. In this way they are positively enlisting themselves out of violence: in CSVR in a therapeutic sense through psychosocial interventions; in Balay in a therapeutic sense, but also advocating for human rights protection and seeking accountability; and in LAPS in a practical way through attempts to gain new skills for future survival.

What each of the above instances allows us to observe is that perpetration and protection are complex and that they often exist alongside one other. As such, family members may be perpetrators, protectors and victims, often at the same time.
CHAPTER 6: FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

In this final chapter, we briefly sum up the main conclusions of the report before discussing how these conclusions relate to practices around working with families in violent contexts. While these contexts were quite different, as peri-urban areas they are marked by particular forms of exclusion, marginalisation and state violence. The study does not intend to provide detailed templates or blueprints for action. The data does not support such an endeavour and it was not our intention, as it would compromise the independence of organisations and the partnership on which the data collection relies. Rather, we seek, based on the different contexts, to identify some of the central dilemmas and challenges that the organisations may encounter and questions their members may want to ask when they work in these violent contexts through and with families.

Summary of findings

In the report, we explored how families and kinship relations protect against, perpetrate and/or suffer from violence. We asked this question within a framework stressing the importance of understanding families and violence within an intersectional social ecology where families must be seen as gendered and generational institutions that are embedded in a larger ecology including not least communal, state and non-state authorities. This social ecology is structured by strong normative ideals about what families should look like, what constitutes moral comportment and what forms of violence are perceived as legitimate. In this way, we argued that specific configurations of roles, power and statuses produced specific forms of normative and practical notions of family life. Furthermore, we suggested that across all contexts, legacies of violence, along with poverty and marginalisation, animated family life and the ability of families to cope. Along with the temporal dimension, the study suggested that we cannot necessarily see internal family violence (domestic violence, intimate partner violence or child abuse) as separate from violence visited upon the family from the outside (vigilantism, extrajudicial killings and torture). Instead, the study illustrates how different domains of violence across the social ecology fold into family life. This analysis led us to explore critically how families perceive the functionality of violence based on a situated consideration and justification whether it is appropriate, legitimate, or necessary in a non-judgmental way. It was clear from the research that most of the families were struggling – not only to survive and cope with violence in its different forms but also with being a family.

While all the respondents felt significant pressures and tensions in fulfilling their own expectations of family life, we also identified important instances of bravery, resistance and generosity – resilience in an oft-repeated formulation. However, rather than focusing on these forms of resilience as positive ways of coping, we focused on what families did to survive and to protect themselves and (some of) their members. These practices included exclusion of some members of the families to protect the integrity of the remaining family. In other instances, we noted that violence, or the effects of it,
were silenced in ways that putatively allowed the family to go on living. Finally, blame for violence was deferred out of the family. In their different ways, these practices worked but they came with a price. They might even have been counterproductive. For instance, by suggesting that the Philippine police had wrongly targeted members of a family, blame was placed outside while the premise of the war – that drug addicts must be killed – often remained largely uncontested. While this is certainly true, it remains equally true that in the circumstances of serious state repression and communal stigmatisation, this was the strategy available – even if it was potentially counterproductive. The same reservations can be made about all the other strategies of protection, even the most violent ones. While they may be counterproductive and violent, they must be understood within the given social ecology.

**Implications for practice**

This report emerges out of interventions under the Global Alliance to address violent implications of what we have referred to as authority-based or law-maintaining violence. In this way, there has always existed a close link between interventions and research. All interventions have thus been evaluated and monitored for accountability and learning purposes. However, by formulating and establishing a specific knowledge-generating project, we have been able to ask new questions and gain new insights into how families cope with violence. Rather than assuming, we have been able to explore their practices and composition as well as better understand the strain they are under in dealing with violence and crisis. Furthermore, and central to the Global Alliance ideals, the team has been composed of intervention and research staff across the four member organisations in a way that stressed common ownership and collaboration in all phases of the project, from conception to final drafting. While this is not action research – we identified the issue of families through our practices – it stresses the importance of ownership and collaboration in knowledge-generation as a crucial element in development and human rights partnerships. Furthermore, we deliberately designed the project to further South-South collaboration as one of the criteria of success.

Beyond the innovations in research collaboration, the analysis has identified ten dilemmas, challenges or questions that may be useful to consider when and if organisations want to work in violent contexts through and with families. In the following section we discuss them in turn. Central to all of them is the need to suspend easy moralistic – even legal – judgments in order to understand the often incredibly difficult contradictions and tensions the families in our study are caught up in. We formulate each challenge with reference to dominant frameworks of intervention.

- **Critical engagement with binaries of protection and perpetration**
  Often interventions engage with issues of protection as opposed to perpetration of violence in a binary manner. Whether an act qualifies as perpetration or protection is a matter of perspective, where for instance the protection against drug and criminal gangs has led to violent actions against those who are seen as endangering safety. One person’s protection may also be another’s threat, as when a police officer protects his position by victimising others. Hence, there is a real need to reflect on what we mean when we talk of protection and perpetration in specific contexts.
• **Understanding the complex structures of violence locally**
  Often interventions work with rights-based approaches that run the risk of compartmentalisation; in other words domestic violence and child abuse are seen as separate from state or communal violence. However, our data illustrates that families are embedded in complex structures (that we call the social ecology of violence) in ways that defy neat categorisations. Such a view is necessary to ward off stereotypical notions of poor families as inherently violent, brutal and unfit to raise children.

• **Seeing how state and communal violence are folded into family life**
  Along similar lines, our data illustrates that state and communal violence intimately relate to domestic violence when, for instance, mothers violently discipline their children to protect them from greater dangers on the street. Perpetration can sometimes be protective, as many police officers would argue. However, for us, this relates to the serious pressure that communal and police violence exert on family life and its ability to survive. We need to understand the dilemmas that face families in a non-judgmental manner and enable them to deal with the dilemmas in productive rather than unproductive ways.

• **Legacies of violence**
  Human rights violations are often seen as one-off events. However, in each of our three contexts, we appreciate the long-term effects of violence where layers of violence are sedimented upon older layers. Hence, trauma is seldom a singular event; rather, it is a component of a continuous crisis. We see intergenerational forms of trauma when a mother beats her own kids after having suffered at the hands of an uncle in the Philippines or the effects of apartheid violence in experiences of present-day rape. In Liberia, people have lived through civil war only to be devastated by Ebola in ways that also speak to continuous trauma and the legacy of violence. For instance, young people lack good role models on which to base their own relations, as their parents not only became parents at a very young age but also suffered from negative mental legacies of the conflict, such as a predisposition to use violence to solve problems. When engaging with families, it is necessary not to be confined to singular events of violence and to understand how violence has emerged as a condition of life or as a long line of traumatic events.

• **Pervasiveness of violence in everyday life**
  Human rights interventions are based on the premise that violence is excessive and destructive and should be countered. While this has been a strong principle, it also goes against the grain of how many of the people with whom we work see violence as necessary in disciplining. Human rights organisations need to engage in serious conversations with people on the topic rather than harbouring assumptions about violence. Conversations and collective agonising over difficult questions work much better than judgment. Organisations and institutions often see this as a normalisation of violence that potentially stereotypes poor people. For instance, in South Africa, it could be argued that ‘normalisation’, as used by human rights organisations, has desensitised the emphasis behind the concept.
• **Gendered hierarchies of victimhood**

   Increasingly, human rights and development organisations focus on gender issues. However, rather than simply counting the presence of women, there is a need to ask different questions about gender. Echoing the literature, our data illustrates that violence affects women and men differently. However, as the Philippine case illustrates, attention has been focused more on the killings that affect men and less on the social repercussions of violence, which is often borne disproportionately by women and children. This suggests a hierarchy of victimhood – the lingering suspicions that those left behind must face and the fact that their suffering can only be understood as functions of male, primary victimisation.

• **Individual violations and continuous crisis**

   Many human rights and torture interventions focus on specific human rights violations with less attention to the pervasive and continuous crises where the violation is just one of many challenges, including not least poverty and inequality. Liberia, as one of the poorest countries in the world, is a stark illustration of this. Indeed, one of the cases from Liberia illustrates well that relatively good fortunes allow people to cope better with crisis. At the same time, violence and violations also produce poverty, as we can see from the Philippines where the loss of breadwinners sends families on a downward spiral. Hence, organisations (and funders) need to pay acute attention to the ability of families to engage productively with a violent onslaught, whether from the state, non-state perpetrators or something as impersonal as a contagious disease. Such a focus could lead to better support for families in this endeavour through psychosocial and poverty-reducing interventions.

• **Communal stigmatisation**

   Many human rights organisations find it difficult to deal with community stigmatisation and violence. While communities and neighbourhoods can be protective, they can also be the scene of violent disciplining in the form of vigilante activity. While it is not very explicit in our data, vigilante violence is part of the local ecologies of violence. Communal stigmatisation is present in our data as neighbours negatively evaluate survivors of the war on drugs in the Philippines, torture in South Africa and Ebola in Liberia. Human rights organisations need to appreciate how families are embedded in communal ecologies, find ways to mobilise communities in the protection of vulnerable groups and help victimised families engage with their communities to prevent the perpetuation of violence.

• **Normative and practical models of family**

   Interventions often work with simple definitions of what constitutes a family and all cases testify to the importance of families. However, it is also clear that families can look very different. For instance, one 22-year-old Liberian woman assumed maternal responsibility for a 34-year-old man to whom she was not blood-related. Several South African families worked along practical models of family life that had been developed over a century of racial capitalism, which conformed in no way to nuclear family ideals. However, at the same time it is also clear that these models do exist as cultural and normative ideals of what families should look like. These normative, often deeply moralistic, notions are at least sometimes deployed as parameters for ‘real’ family life that seldom resonate with living models of family life. Local frameworks and policies might even exacerbate this difference. In the Philippines, a national law goes as far as to describe that only
a male and female bonded in marriage would be considered as a family. Hence, interventions must reflect carefully about practical models as well as normative ideals about family life, within respective local frameworks, and how the two are sometimes difficult to reconcile, especially in crises. Furthermore, except for specifically queer-sensitive interventions, many organisations work with heteronormative ideals of family. However, echoing intersectional and feminist analyses, families are often deeply patriarchal in how family members and society envision normative models. Our data illustrates that most informants reproduce these gendered and generational notions of authority. Families are not ‘complete’, as one Philippine woman put it, without both a mother and a father. However, the lived reality and practices often rub against these ideals, not least in times of crisis as in the Philippines or Liberia. While women (and the young) must increasingly fend for themselves, communal and social norms work against them, rendering it difficult to survive. In this way, there are powerful reasons that the commitment to gender and generational issues must be realised substantially and that it must be based on an intersectional analysis transcending ‘more women’.

• **Complex mechanisms of family survival**

Our data illustrates that families deal very differently with violent crises. In all three contexts, our data testifies to the fact that families can be the answer to a violent crisis. Despite hard odds stacked against them, they find strength in each other and their families to go on. Indeed, some families are heavily involved in mobilising against violence. However, while this suggests that families clearly are part of the answer to addressing violence, it is sometimes conditioned on difficult choices made in the families. In Liberia, it seems as though some families exclude members seen to endanger the family unit or undermine its ability to survive. Hence, except for one case, all our Liberian interlocutors lived alone or in precarious conditions after having been affected by Ebola or being associated with drugs. To our knowledge, none of the Philippine families excluded family members because they were associated with drugs. However, most of their narratives worked through understanding the killings as based on ‘mistaken identities’; that is, blame was ascribed to something outside of the family. In other cases, family integrity was maintained through silences where family survival depended on lack of recognition of a rape, as in one of the South African cases. Finally, in some of the cases, it seems that violent crises have fundamentally undermined families to the extent that they seem to disintegrate. While such disintegration seems to be more prevalent in Liberia, both South African and Philippine families are racked with internal strife and conflict. Hence, interventions need to take these complex survival mechanisms as their point of departure to be effective and sustainable. These reflections do not constitute a blueprint for interventions. However, they do suggest certain avenues for intervention, as well as outline some of the dilemmas the partner organisations faced in relation to including families in human rights interventions. Such reflections are, we suggest, imperative if we are to take into account local context and the ambiguous relationship between families and violence that posits them as perpetrative and protective as well as victims of violence.
ENDNOTES

1 These efforts have been documented in a number of publications detailing the experiences and challenges of grassroots activists such as psycho-social interventions, community organising and social works approaches. See https://dignity.dk/en/publications/


3 Although the term was coined in the 1990s, the intersectional analysis of social phenomena preceded its official reification with black feminists in the 1960s and 70s using the epithet "black feminist" for example (Collins and Bilge 2016: 55). With growing dissatisfaction with race or gender-only approaches to violence against women in the 1980s, African-American scholars and activists sought a new way of analysing their experience outside of these binaried forms (Collins 1998). Consequently, from within multiracial feminism the birth of intersectionality as a theoretical framework was established, allowing for multiple inequalities to be recognised (Burgess-Proctor 2006).


5 See for instance the report of Special Rapporteur on Torture on domestic violence and extra-custodial violence. For a discussion, see Choudhury, Jensen and Kelly, 2018.

6 The local projects were designed to enhance risk groups’ ability to become functional members of families and communities in order to prevent authority-based violence. See https://dignity.dk/en/dignitys-work/prevention-of-urban-violence/protection-of-local-communities/

7 As the data collection project did not attempt to capture all experiences from all families within the three projects, these insights happened within the bounds of the narratives offered by the community partners involved in the data collection. Other families may offer other insights or interpretation on their situated relationships and encounters with violence.

8 Most killings during the period of 2016-2018 took place in poor urban neighbourhoods in Metro-Manila (Warburg and Jensen, 2019).


15 Reported murder and rape rates compared to Katlehong, another East Rand township with a reputation of violence. Katlehong is about eight times the size of Mzinti. https://www.crimestatssa.com/provinceselect.php?sortorder=&ShowProvince=Gauteng&go=1&Precincts%5B%5D=157&Precincts%5B%5D=307&Crimes%5B%5D=Murder&Crimes%5B%5D=Sexual+Offences&Years%5B%5D=2018&Years%5B%5D=2019&Submit=Submit
This exercise is used as a method to get people to reflect critically but also sensitively upon their lives. It requires the participant to chart their life’s course so far through the imagery of a river, attending to the shape, bends, turns, obstacles and flows. This symbolic contextualisation allows for a reflection upon the events, relationships and time periods that have come to shape the trajectory of life thus far.

This is a colloquial term for a person whose work is pushing a wheelbarrow to transport people’s luggage.

The SASSA grants have developed out of a grant system that under apartheid was restricted to coloureds, Indians and whites (Jensen, 2008; Ross, 2010).

This can be seen in family-based elites and businesses that dominate economic and political spheres in the country (McCoy 2009). The intimate relationship between family and state is uniquely constituted in the Philippines, that is, the patrimonial features of the state or ‘patron-client factional framework’ (Kerkvliet 1995) renders the Filipino political economy dominated by familial relationships and alliances. These family connections between the political and personal realms are further exemplified within Filipino constitutional arrangements, with the Family Code, written into Filipino jurisdiction in 1988, inscribing, for example, a joint responsibility between husband and wife for the support of the family and management of the household (Feliciano 1994: 558). Similarly, the Child and Welfare Code instructs parents to give their children affection, moral teachings, religious guidance and discipline in order to ensure good character formation (Concepcion 2011: 364). The state inscription of both heteronormative and nuclear ideals can further be seen in Article 149 of the code, which states, ‘The family, being the foundation of the nation, is a basic social institution which public policy cherishes and protects.’ (ibid: 555).

Within the field of psychology, secondary victimisation refers to victimisation that individuals suffer through victim blaming, for example by police and/or health care officials after the initial trauma. This is certainly applicable in how we think of ‘secondary’ suffering in that, in a psychosocial sense, women in the Philippines fall victim to ‘secondary’ forms of violence in that they too are the subjects of community surveillance and suspicion. However, the point we try to make is that the relative visibility of EJK obscures the suffering of women, rendering them ‘secondary’ victims within a hierarchy of suffering, and this, as Lotte Buch Segal (2016) suggests, is problematic.

This refers to the case studies chosen for illustration purposes here and is not representative of the wider data. Another case study, not herein described, includes a woman who witnessed the mob lynching of a community member. That is to say that collective violence through service delivery and vigilantism happens often in SA.

We have documented similar processes in Nairobi, where extra-judicial killings are rampant and women face demands for sex in exchange for the release of their male relatives from a potentially lethal arrest (Gudmundsen, Hansen and Jensen, 2017).

In the Philippines, one emic way to describe this is ‘pagtitiis’ – to endure. This is the struggle to bear a burden however difficult it is, or to simply accept the situation with the thought that the ordeal will end someday, and that divine justice will eventually fall upon the perpetrators when the time comes.

The cry of innocence might also be understood as a coping mechanism or response to the significant and widespread stigmatisation surrounding the WOD. Being associated with the drugs trade brings momentous consequences, not least the danger of being fatally marked but also in its rendering of participants as symbols of national corrosion. The far-reaching communitarian notions of danger as well as overall endorsement of Duterte’s vision (Dressel and Bonoan 2019: 134) from the general population has meant that any association with the trade has grave consequences.
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