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Abstract

The framework which governs special education in Ontario is complex, with the present structure a result of almost four decades of legislation pursued and implemented by successive governments. This chapter will examine the evolution of Ontario’s special education policy from 1968 until present, demonstrating that this development has been characterized by periods of both major and minor reform. Throughout this examination, attention will be devoted to the context in which legislation was developed, and the accompanying effects this had on the provision of services for students with exceptionalities. In this regard, particular consideration will be given to the social, economic, political and ideological forces which impacted the progression of special education in the province of Ontario.
Introduction

In reviewing the framework which governs special education in Ontario, it is clear that it is complex, formal and legalistic. Essentially, the *Education Act*, Regulations, Ministry of Education Policy/Program Memoranda, Department of Education Guidelines and the Education Ministry’s Funding Formula provide the basis for the provision of special education services in the province, guaranteeing that all students with exceptionalities receive public education appropriate to their unique needs (Tymochenko, 2002, p. 214).

This present structure is a result of several decades of development in the legislation pursued and implemented by successive governments. In large measure, at least until the late 1970s, special education remained an area grossly lacking in regards to a comprehensive policy. In fact, it was not until the 1980s that Ontario, like other jurisdictions in Canada, began to actively pursue and develop meaningful guidelines for dealing with students with exceptionalities. Since then, the province has been actively engaged in adapting and modifying special education to better meet the needs of its clientele.

This chapter will examine the evolution of Ontario’s special education policy between the years 1968 until present, demonstrating that this progression has been characterized by periods of both major and minor reform. Throughout this examination, attention will be devoted to the manner in which legislation was developed, and, the accompanying effects this had on the provision of services for students with exceptionalities. Further attention will be devoted to the evolving needs and philosophies which impacted the progression of special education in Ontario.
While the frame of reference for this paper has been limited to the preceding twenty-eight years, it is necessary to lay the foundation for this discussion by offering a brief overview of special education prior to 1968, underlining the salient policies and themes prevalent within Ontario society. Since it is impossible to divorce the present from the past, before proceeding to the crux of the argument, it is necessary, if not imperative, to commence with this brief historical outline.

**The Origins of Special Education in Ontario**

As Nathalie Bélanger (2001, pp. 343-344) points out, the earliest programs aimed at students with exceptionalities were established in the late 1800s and early 1900s, and generally centered around the creation of separate schools for “slow learners”. For instance, a residential facility for the developmentally disabled which opened in Orillia in 1876, and similar schools which were subsequently established in other parts of the province, served as prime examples of these separate schools. In essence, the provision of special education in the early 1900s must therefore be viewed as a service ancillary to the regular school system (Momporquette, 1985, pp. 33-34).

It is generally acknowledged that this arrangement was aimed at providing students easily identified as having an exceptionality with job-related skills. Those whose needs were more difficult to understand and detect were generally neglected by the education system, and, as a result, dropped out of school at early ages.

However, demands for reform that would incorporate a system of segregated classes into the normal school setting for those less severely handicapped began to circulate in and around 1905, largely in response to the perceived inadequacy of the separate schools. The *Special Classes Act* and *Auxiliary Classes Act*, passed respectively in 1911 and 1914,
empowered school boards to create special classes; yet, in the years immediately following, most of Ontario’s school boards devoted little attention to the needs of students with exceptionalities (Momborquette, 1985, p. 35).

The reluctance on the part of boards to provide services for these pupils was a clear reflection of the philosophical tenets of eugenics, which was dominant in the early 20th century, and which argued that those students deemed exceptional were best served outside of the school system (Weber & Bennett, 2004, pp. 7-9).

As such, by the mid 1900s, the prevalent notion of special education in the Western World was the highly conservative position that the classroom be a place of learning for “normal” students. As stated in the 1950 Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario, chaired by John Andrew Hope, in Recommendation 39(A): “…each local education authority be responsible for the education of all children under its jurisdiction during the period of their compulsory school attendance, excepting only those deemed by competent authority to be ineducable” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1950, p. 380).

Thus, by the late 1950s, there existed no specific legal responsibility for the schools to provide for the needs of students with exceptionalities. This is not entirely startling, given the fact that “children with marked physical, mental, or emotional difficulties were considered to be outside the purview of the school system” (Gidney, 2002, p. 152). Add to this the concerns associated with the costs of providing special education, and, it is not surprising that the government at this time was quite reticent to enact any type of legislation directed at students with exceptionalities.

However, by the 1960s, a shift in thinking was beginning to occur within educational circles. Progressivism, with its child-centered influence, gradually began to replace
conservatism as a dominant ideology. At the same time, the eugenics movement was being discredited, new and improved methods of screening and identifying exceptionalities were being advanced, parents of students with exceptionalities were becoming increasingly active, and lobbying efforts were being undertaken by organizations such as the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada and the Ontario Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. Also, the normalization principle, which argued that individuals with an exceptionality had the right to live in an environment as close to normal as possible was gaining in credibility. Each of these factors, when combined, served to foster a conviction that the existing system was inadequate (Weber & Bennett, 2004, pp. 9-11). “Rather than viewing special education as a subordinate concern of the regular school system, increasing numbers sought to have special education incorporated as a service available to all of Ontario’s children” (Momborquette, 1985, p. 38).

The 1968 Report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives in the Schools of Ontario, chaired by the Hon. Justice E.M. Hall and Lloyd A. Dennis, embraced many of the criticisms of the status quo, and, as a progressive document, advocated that mainstreaming become the norm for the treatment of students with exceptionalities. As stated in the Report: “every child in Ontario has the right to stand with dignity beside everyone else in the human parade. The handicapped child, whether seriously or mildly affected, must be given the chance to learn like any other. No child, by reason of geographical location, religion, or any personal circumstances, should be denied access to such help” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1968, p. 119). Thus, it was vital that all children receive an education within the regular classroom and only as a last resort should
an exceptional child be placed in a separate class or institution. Of course, this position advanced in Hall-Dennis reflected the larger societal debate raging over segregation versus integration, and the prevalence of the latter within educational circles (Shipe, 1969, p. 107).

**The Growth of Special Education in Ontario**

By the time the Hall-Dennis Report was released, much progress had been made in the provision of services for students deemed exceptional. Shying away from the earlier position that these children were best served in separate facilities, the progressivism of the 1960s advocated that students with exceptionalities be educated in regular classrooms with their peers.

The Ministry of Education was also committed to this proposition, creating a branch of the ministry in 1968 to promote special services, and in 1969, “boards were mandated to assume responsibility for all but the most severe cases of mental retardation. Above all, there was school board consolidation, intended, among other objectives, to ensure that boards had the resources to sustain a full range of services for children with exceptionalities” (Gidney, 2002, p. 153). Thus, school boards would now be required to improve their existing special education programs, and, at the same time, take on many of the duties of other social welfare agencies.

However, the provision of special education would be a very costly undertaking, requiring not only adequate facilities and equipment but trained personnel such as social workers, psychologists, and teachers specifically trained in special education (three part courses authorized by the Ministry of Education and offered by teachers’ colleges and school boards were the most common methods of professional development at this time).
These needs coincided with a decade of fiscal restraint in which the government was forced to curtail its spending. As a result, there was a constant pressure to maintain an uneasy balance between the need for financial retrenchment, and the necessity of improving special education services for the disadvantaged. The solution was to refine the system of allocating provincial education grants to school boards through “weighting factors” or special allowances, which were introduced in 1972, and designed to cover extra costs in areas such as special education (Momborquette, 1985, p. 69).

Initially at least, the reforms such as school board consolidation and changes to provincial funding appeared to pay credence to the pursuit of equal educational opportunity for all students. Throughout the 1970s, the Ministry of Education claimed to give high priority to dealing with students with exceptionalities, and in 1973 the Minister’s Advisory Council on Special Education was created, with members being drawn from a variety of sources such as teachers’ associations, school boards and children’s advocacy organizations (Momborquette, 1985, p. 70).

In spite of the progress and development in the provision of services for exceptional students, by the late 1970s, there were significant variations in the level of service delivery for special education across Ontario, due in large measure to the fact that the level of expenditures in special education was entirely at the discretion of the school board. In fact, the entire decision as to whether special education programs would be offered or not rested at the local level. As stated in the 1978 Education Act, Section 147(1)(40): “A board may establish, subject to the regulations, special education programs to provide special education services for children who require such services” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1979).
In fact, it was reported that of 104 boards in the province, 80 had operational special education programs, while 24 did not (Keeton, 1979, p. 67). As a result of these discrepancies, and the fact that there were some 15,000 students waiting to receive specialized service, and an additional 15,000 children who had yet to be diagnosed, many observers believed that the government would have to enact mandatory special education legislation and provide boards with the resources to implement these reforms (Federation of Women Teachers’ Associations of Ontario, 1983, p. 7).

**A Major Reform of Special Education in Ontario**

Despite the obvious deficiencies in the late 1970s in regards to the provision of special education in Ontario, there existed within the Ministry a sense of complacency. The general consensus was that even with its shortcomings, the system was still superior to those found in other parts of Canada. As well, continuing fiscal restraint in government spending, and a reluctance to add further financial burdens to school boards, prevented the passage of any legislation aimed at making special education mandatory (Momborquette, 1985, p. 73).

Yet, it was clear that special education, in a very real sense, was the “wave of the future” in education policy. A seminal piece of legislation was enacted in 1975 in the United States, Public Law 94-142, *The Education for All Handicapped Children Act* (now known as the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*). This mandated that all exceptional students would be entitled to receive a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment.

Public Law 94-142 was immediately lauded as a monumental piece of legislation which, for the first time, guaranteed that students with exceptionalities would receive the
services they rightly deserved. Consequently, increasing media attention directed
towards the weakness in Ontario’s special education policy began to surface. As well,
the lobbying efforts of parents and advocacy groups became more amplified. As a result
of support from the opposition Liberal and New Democratic Parties for some form of
mandatory special education legislation, the Conservative Government, who held a
minority of seats at Queen’s Park, recognized that an innovative policy which had wide-
spread support would be politically beneficial. At the same time, unless some type of
government action was taken, there was a danger that special education standards could
erode in many areas of the province (Momborquette, 1985, pp. 74-75).

Thus, in 1978 the government announced its intentions to pursue major reforms to the
province’s special education legislation. A draft bill will was prepared by the Ministry
and circulated to school boards, professional associations and parent organizations.
Certainly, the amount of input from outside parties into the development of this piece of
legislation was unprecedented, and, in large measure, resulted from a growing awareness
by politicians and bureaucrats of the importance in taking into account the voices and
concerns of those who would be directly and indirectly impacted by the policy. At the
same time, beginning in 1979, boards were required to offer an Early Identification
Program, and provide educational programs for students with learning difficulties

As such, by the time the proposed legislation, in the form of Bill 82 (the "Education
Amendment Act"), was introduced at Queen’s Park, school boards were already
undertaking special education reform measures. Following debate and further revisions,
the Bill officially became law in December of 1980. In announcing the legislation,
Education Minister Bette Stephenson praised the fact that at last, “…all children, condition notwithstanding, would be enrolled in a school. No longer would retarded children be enrolled after an assessment procedure established in law which has in fact denied universality of access. All children would now have a basic right to be enrolled” (Pistor, 1985, p. 1).

Regarded as a watershed in the evolution of special education in the province, the Education Amendment Act and its associated Regulations guaranteed that exceptional pupils would now be guaranteed free services. School boards were also vested with the responsibility of establishing Identification, Placement and Review Committees (IPRCs), whose responsibility was to identify exceptional students and recommend a placement option for that student. However, parents were entitled to be involved in the IPRC process, and, an appeal process was available if they disagreed with an IPRC decision.

In order to meet the demands associated with Bill 82, school boards were provided an additional $75 million in funding to assist with the implementation. As well, they were also given five years to meet the requirements of the Education Amendment Act, but most boards had complied with this directive before the deadline (Costiniuk, Potts & Snider, 1990, p. 145).

Through evaluating the implementation of Bill 82, it is worth noting the relative ease with which special education became a natural part of Ontario education. Despite the fact that many services had to be developed from the ground up, boards and personnel worked diligently with government officials to construct the necessary structures. As well, teachers with little or no training in special education undertook, quite willingly, a process of learning on the job, and, were aided by the Ministry and universities who
offered a mass professional development drive. Equally important was the need for resource and support personnel, and, in this regard, community colleges actively developed education programs for teacher assistants (Weber & Bennett, 2004, p. 12).

Despite the lack of opposition associated with the implementation of Bill 82, this is not to imply that there were not difficulties, as various court challenges were launched questioning the legality of the legislation. For instance, in the 1985 case of *Dolmage v. Muskoka Board of Education and the Ministry of Education*, the Ontario Court of Appeal affirmed a school board’s right to refuse a parent’s choice of a special education program. As well, the landmark case of *Eaton v. Brant County Board of Education*, which initially stemmed from a parental challenge to a board’s IPRC decision, wound its way through the judicial system over the course of several years, culminating in the 1997 Supreme Court of Canada decision which upheld Ontario’s special education legislation.

**Minor Reforms to Special Education in Ontario**

With the passage of Bill 82 in 1980, Ontario had taken an important step towards recognizing the inherent equality and dignity of all human beings. This was and is an important recognition, because in 1982 the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* was enshrined in the Canadian *Constitution*. The *Charter*, especially section 15(1), guaranteed that mental or physical ability would no longer be an acceptable grounds for discrimination. Although this legislation was enacted at the federal level, its impact on provincial policy is noteworthy in the sense that from 1982 onward, all governments must ensure that their actions are in accordance with the stipulations contained within the *Charter*. 
In spite of the fundamental impact which the Charter had and continues to have on Canadian society, the post-Bill 82 period has generally been characterized by relatively minor policy revisions. Typical of this was the 1984 Ministry of Education statement which defined twelve categories of disability, under five headings (intellectual, communicational, behavioral, physical and multiple) which boards were now required to use when filing their annual reports (Jordan, 2001, p. 353).

As a result of Ontario’s sub-par ranking in the 1991 International Education Assessment, increasingly stinging critiques of public education, and a 1988 report by George Radwanski, renewed calls for a revision of the education system to reflect the economic and social consequences of globalization and the emergence of new technologies were beginning to be advanced. In sum, the dissatisfaction with current practice, and the accompanying public outcry for stricter education guidelines and a practical knowledge and skill based curriculum, led to the establishment of The Royal Commission on Learning chaired by Monique Bégin and Gerald Caplan (Gidney, 2002, pp. 172-175). The Bégin-Caplan Report, as it is commonly referred to as, advocated in principle full inclusion, but, also stressed that where appropriate, students with exceptionalities should be provided special services outside of the regular classroom.

In 1995, Ontario, along with many other provinces and countries, undertook educational reforms designed to make schools more accountable for both student achievement and spending. Among the most important pieces of legislation impacting special education was the 1997 Education Quality Improvement Act, which transferred decision making power to the Ministry of Education and established a centralized funding regime. Under this formula, which still remains intact, all boards receive a Special
Education Per Pupil Amount (SEPPA) based on total enrolment, and an Intensive Support Amount (ISA) aimed at supporting costs incurred by students requiring costly equipment and services. As Tymochenko (2002, p. 218) points out, this funding regime, which accounts for an annual special education grant to school boards, has brought a consistent level of funding throughout the province.

A further reform implemented in 1997 was Regulation 187, which stipulated that in order to be recommended to the Ontario College of Teachers as a special education teacher, a candidate would have to complete an additional qualification in special education. Further advanced certification could be achieved through completing supplementary required and elective courses. Certainly, with an increased emphasis on accountability, it is hardly startling that teachers would be among those targeted, and, through forcing teachers to upgrade their basic skill level, it was believed that students would benefit from improved classroom instruction.

In addition, Regulation 181, which was introduced in 1998, increased the responsibilities of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee. It also required a written plan for students with exceptionalities, and further solidified the rights of parents (Weber & Bennett, 2004, p. 17).

Finally, in 2003, Regulation 209 stipulated the maximum enrolment numbers allowed within special education classes, ranging from 8 to 16 students, depending upon the degree and nature of the exceptionalities of those within the class. Certainly, since special needs students require a great degree of assistance and instruction, legislation which limits student numbers is extremely important, and, may provide special education teachers with the time needed to adequately support all those within their charge.
The Current State of Affairs

As the preceding discussion has demonstrated, there have been reforms of the special education system since the passage of Bill 82, but, they have been relatively minor in scope. In fact, the essential features of the *Education Amendment Act* continue to serve as the basis for the provision of services for those nearly 300,000 identified and non-identified Ontario students deemed exceptional. For example, all school boards in the province are mandated to maintain special education plans, and provide or purchase from other boards educational services for all students with exceptionalities free of charge. As well, the Identification, Placement and Review Committee continues to serve as the primary mechanism whereby students are deemed exceptional, and, a program of study to meet their individual needs is developed. At the same time, the right of parental appeal has been maintained within the regulations governing the IPRC process. Finally, boards must develop Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for all students identified as exceptional, and, at their discretion, may develop plans for those not formally identified. The IEP, as a legal document, provides a blueprint of the services provided to an exceptional student to allow him or her to maximize their learning potential. As such, while Bill 82 is more than twenty-five years old, its impact on the educational landscape in Ontario has not diminished.

In looking at the delivery of special education service in Ontario, it is abundantly clear that the overall thrust is that of inclusion. “The philosophical basis for inclusive education…is a belief that all students should be included within the regular classroom, and that any removal of a student to other educational settings must be justified on the
basis of individual learning needs” (Andrews & Lupart, 1993, p. 44). Even though it has been stipulated by the Ministry that inclusion should be the norm in Ontario schools, it is interesting to note that there is no official policy which explicitly states this. Still, although no legislation has yet been brought forth dealing with inclusion, it is in effect, the way special education works in the province today. As such, while the notion of inclusion does not have *de jure* status, it does, in effect, represent *de facto* policy.

In examining the principle of inclusion in regards to students with exceptionalities, it seems clear that it has ceased to be a truly controversial issue in the field of education. In fact, the once vociferous denouncements have now been replaced by a general acceptance and recognition that the vast majority of children classified as exceptional can be provided with an appropriate education within a regular classroom.

In fact, the most pressing issue for educators today is not the acceptance or rejection of the principle of inclusion, but, rather, what must transpire for inclusion to work in today’s classroom. In this regard, while inclusion is seen as preferable, there is a recognition both within the policy and the practice that some children, because of their exceptionality, require services which cannot be adequately delivered in the regular classroom. As such, Ontario employs what is often referred to as the cascade model of service delivery. According to this model, a range of placement options are available to students to meet their specific needs, such as resource assistance, self-contained classes, or special schools. Part of the appeal of this model is its lack of rigidity in the sense that students may move from one placement option to another depending on the degree and nature of their particular condition. Certainly, there is overwhelming evidence to support the notion that the needs of exceptional children wax and wane, and, these various
settings allow front-line workers the flexibility necessary to allow all students in school to learn.

Another area of service delivery in special education that receives scant attention, but which is nevertheless important is that of English second language (ESL) and English skills development (ESD) programs. While these do not fit neatly into what is typically defined as special education, there is general recognition that indeed, programs such as this do fall under the purview of special education, and, as such, must be addressed. By way of a historical backdrop, Canada, having fully embraced the concept of multiculturalism by the 1990s, was truly a country quite diverse, with immigrants entering from every corner of the globe. As a result of this increased diversity within the general population, policy makers began to pay close attention to this unfolding reality, especially given the importance attached to it in the Bégin-Caplan Report. As stated in Recommendation 32: “that the ministry make it mandatory for English-language school units to provide ESL/ESD, and French-language school units to provide ALF/PDF, to ensure that immigrant students with limited or no fluency in English or French....receive the support they require” (Ministry of Education, 1995). As such, the Bégin-Caplan Report was quite explicit in the view that school boards ensure that immigrant students receive the type of instruction and assistance which would allow them to develop a linguistic competency required to both live as well as prosper within Ontario.

Of course, the provision of specialized services for exceptional students requires a significant monetary contribution on the part of government. In an era of financial accountability and retrenchment, it is hardly startling that some segments are demanding that expenditures in the area of special education be increased. As was pointed out
previously (see pages 13-14), the funding regime used in special education, which is highly centralized, resulted in 1.9 billion dollars being allocated to school boards in 2005-2006. In examining recent funding trends in special education, the data reveals that between 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, funding increased 1 per cent, and, in 2005-2006, it increased an additional 6.8 per cent (Ministry of Education, 2006, p. 7). In looking at the numbers, it seems that the Ministry is committed to stable long-term funding necessary to provide specialized services for those students classified as exceptional. However, it also appears likely that the demand for balanced budgets will remain, and, when coupled with calls for increased expenditures from various segments of the public, the likelihood of achieving a balance between these competing interests is problematic.

This has been evidenced recently by litigation surrounding the issue of providing specialized services for children with autism spectrum disorders. In the 2005 Ontario Superior Court case of Wynberg v. Ontario, and Deskin v. Ontario, Madame Justice Frances Kiteley ruled that by failing to pay for highly specialized services such as Applied Behaviour Analysis and Intensive Behaviour Intervention for these children after they reached school age, school systems had violated the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. However, the initial enthusiasm by supporters of this decision dissipated in July of 2006 when the Ontario Court of Appeal reversed the decision of the lower court.

As a result of the decision by the Court of Appeal, the question as to who should provide the funding for specialized services for children with autism remains largely unresolved. What does seem clear is that while tremendous gains have been made in the provision of special education services, because the field is so broad, and, owing to the fact that the sheer numbers as well as types of exceptionalities is ever increasing, policy
makers will be faced with ongoing dilemmas. While compromise is always preferable, undoubtedly, there will be issues which will require the intervention of the courts to settle ongoing disputes. Thus, increased litigation, with all that entails, will remain as a feature of Ontario’s special education policy.

**Summary**

In evaluating the evolution of special education legislation in Ontario, it is clear that the origins of the system were based upon the dominant thoughts and beliefs that those deemed exceptional were best served by separate facilities. As such, the provision of special education in the early 1900s must be viewed as a service ancillary to the regular school system, which was reserved for those deemed “normal”.

However, by the mid-twentieth century a shift in thinking was beginning to occur within educational circles, as progressivism began to emerge as the dominant ideology. According to the tenets of this approach, rather than viewing special education as a subordinate concern of the regular school system, special education should be incorporated as a service available to all exceptional students in Ontario.

By 1969, the Ministry of Education had legislated that boards of education provide programs for all pupils except those classified as severely disabled. While this arrangement was a major advancement in special education, since there was no mandatory requirement placed on boards to comply, service delivery remained quite varied across the province. In order to address this discrepancy, in 1980, the Ontario legislature “…passed an amendment to the *Education Act*, widely known by the title Bill 82. The amendment required all school boards in the province to provide special
educational programs and services for pupils designated as exceptional” (Wilson, 1989, p. 81).

Even though there have been minor revisions to special education policy over the twenty-six years since the passage of Bill 82, the essential features of the legislation are still intact. The fact that relatively few facets have been revised illustrates that, generally speaking, it works well. However, as is the case with most aspects of the education system, there are various factors which continue to spark interest. Since there is no official legislation dealing with inclusion, and, in actuality, this principle exists simply by convention and not according to any prescribed legal entitlement, critics and advocates continue to voice their position that a policy should be developed to address this quandary. Also, special education services continue to be rather costly, and, in an era of increasing financial restraint, there is the constant danger of under-funding. As a result, even though expenditures in the area of special education have been increasing, there always exists the possibility that a deep and austere slashing of provincial spending will be undertaken, which may seriously hamper the ability of boards to provide adequate special education programs. The question of how to educate in the most beneficial but financially responsible way will continue to be an issue of extreme importance in the foreseeable future.

As a final note, it is important to recognize the tremendous gains which have been made in special education. Each of the policies which have been pursued are reflections of the social, economic, political and ideological forces dominant in society at the time of their development. As such, legislation was not developed in a vacuum.
In appraising policy documents, there is a general tendency to evaluate them in terms of our own contemporary frame of reference. By employing this logic it would appear that past acts, statutes, regulations and bills are irrelevant and outdated. Yet, it must be stressed that in regards to policy analysis, this approach is seriously flawed. What is required is that we treat each piece of legislation in regards to its own particular context, avoiding the temptation to impose our own frame of reference. By doing this, we ensure that we arrive at an objective interpretation, void of personal biases and predilections, which will allow us to see how special education is, in essence, a series of polices which, through adaptation, have built upon one another to create the system we have today.
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