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1.

The International Conference entitled: „Theory and methodology of physical education and sport: the legacy of the founders and development perspectives” has been held in Russia this year (26 – 28th May 2010), hosted by the Russian State University of Physical Education, Sport and Tourism in Moscow (RSUoPェaT). The conference was dedicated to the 85th anniversary of the birth of one of the founders of the integrative theory of physical culture, PhD. L. P. Matveyev.

Since he could not personally participate in the work of the international conference, the author of this book review aims to contribute to learning about the professional and scientific community in the area of physical education, with the person and work of one of the doyen of physical culture in the world, through his last work which crowned his creativity.

2.

Leo Pavlovich Matveyev was born in August 22nd 1924. After graduating from high school, he voluntarily went to the front, where he fought, was wounded twice, and was awarded military decorations and medals for his bravery.

He enrolled at SCOLIPC in 1946. Upon completion of the Institute, he enrolled the post graduate studies at the Department of Theory and methodology of physical education. He defended his Master thesis (so-called “candidates dissertation”) in 1955, and his PhD thesis in 1965. He is PhD of pedagogical sciences, a professor of the University, the scientist credited with RF, an honorary doctor of science and professor credited a number of domestic and foreign universities, the Head of Department of Theoretical and methodological basis of physical culture and sports at RGAFK.

Lev Pavlovich Matveyev has worked at the University for more than 55 years.

Professor Matveyev has authored over 450 publications, monographs, textbooks, programs, scientific research papers, and in this sense, he is the first writer and official college textbooks writer of the general theory and methodology of physical education, physical education and sports, which have been translated in more than 40 states. Leo Pavlovich Matveyev is widely acknowledged founder of modern integrative theory of physical culture and sports.

Under the scientific leadership of P. L. Matveyev, a multitude of scientific research papers have been completed, and in that sense he managed over 100 PhD. papers (80 candidates and 20 doctors of science pedagogical sciences). This large number of trained research and university staff, led by L. P. Matveyev demonstrates the formation of scientific school of L. P. Metveev, and his disciples later established departments and schools in over 30 countries worldwide.

He received a high degree of honorary doctorate at the German College of Physical Education and the University of Sao-Paulo, Brazil. He was awarded the Medal of John Amos Comenius Medal in Czechoslovakia and „services rendered” medal in Bulgaria. Together with his other awards and invited lectures, he left a deep mark in other countries: Brazil, Spain, China, Cuba, Poland, Yugoslavia and others.

Let it be noted in this occasion that under his leadership and a number of experts from Serbia has been trained: Srdjan Saric (a doctor in sports), Ma. Ivan Stanojevic, Ma. Jože Ropret, Vladimir Zaric (official in the sport), PhD. Julian Malacko, PhD. Bozo Bokan, PhD. Vladimir Koprivica.

For his overall activity and contribution, L. P. Matveyev has won many state medals, the highest medal being „For merits before the Homeland,” and has won numerous gold medals in the profession „For the best scientific research work in physical education and sport”.

Leo Pavlovich Matveyev died at the age of 82, 21st July 2006.

3.

The textbook THEORY AND METHODOLOGY OF PHYSICAL CULTURE (TaMPC) was presented on 543 pages of the text, in B/5 paper format, hardcover, with 21 table, 24 charts, 16 images, 20 diagrams, 132 footnotes and 171 bibliographic units (specifically selected for each section). It represents a real wealth in pictures and words, especially in understanding and meaning.

TaMPC textbook is made up of two main parts, which represent separate units, while each unit has a number of sections and subsections:
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE THEORY OF PHYSICAL CULTURE

1.1. The starting concept of TPC.
1.2. Subject outline of TPC.
1.3. Methodological assumptions, methods and logic of research building in TPC.
1.4. Physical education as a social phenomenon and its social functions.
1.5. Creating systems and principles of physical education practice in society and its incorporation into the national system of physical culture.

2. GENERAL THEORY AND METHODOLOGY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

2.1. Target orientation, means, methods and principles of physical education activities.
2.1.1. Concretization of the central categories of TPE and some marginal explanations.
2.1.2. Target postulates in physical education.
2.1.3. General characteristics of devices and the method of directed effect in the process of physical education.
2.1.4. The principles that regulate activities in physical education.
2.2. Theoretical and methodological basis of training and improvement in physical education process.
2.2.1. Basics of motion activities training.
2.2.2. Improvement of motion-coordination skills.
2.2.3. Improvement of power, speed and complex abilities of speed-strong character.
2.2.4. Endurance improvement.
2.2.5. Directed activity in the process of physical education onto posture, flexibility and some properties of physique
2.2.6. Interactions/ connections of different types of training in the process of physical education.
2.3. Forms of organization of activities, planning and control in physical education.
2.3.1. Forms of organization of activities.
2.3.2. Planning and control in physical education.

4.

In order to initiate any meaningful discussion about this publication, some background information and insights into the issues discussed would be necessary. Therefore, at the very beginning, we should take a look back at some of the basic work of Professor Leo Pavlovich Matveyev, which will be of interest for further presentation:

1. Матвеев, Л.П. (1964): Проблема периодизации спортивной тренировки. „Физкультура и спорт“, Москва
2. Матвеев, Л.П. и Новиков, А.Д. (ред.) (1976): Теория и методика физического воспитания. Том 1 и 2., „Физкультура и спорт“, Москва.

From the above list of some basic works of Leo Pavlovich Matveyev, it can be determined that he dealt with the basic theoretical and practical problems of the following areas:
1. General theory of physical culture.
2. Theory and methodology of physical education.
3. The theory and methodology of sports.
Starting from the basic theoretical problems he has dealt with, the determinant of the latest book of P. L. Matveyev, "The theory and methodology of physical education" remains unclear, since in the basic theoretical setting, the term "physical education" is used as a basic starting point for both "physical education" and "sport". Bearing this in mind, THE GENERAL THEORY OF PHYSICAL CULTURE in this sense could not have its own methodology, but its narrower disciplines: physical education and sport have a special methodic. Since the general theory of physical culture and methods of physical education have been explained in the most recent textbook, consequently the appropriate title of the book should be: "The Theory of Physical Culture and Theory and Methods of Physical Education". Why this error has occurred to a coryphaeus of thoughts in physical education remains unclear, but further presentation will suggest some possible answers.

5.

Another observation that needs to be done before the analysis of the work, is the fact that the material presented in this publication, is, in fact, a revised and refreshed version of two key parts of L.P. Matveyev’s: Introduction to the Theory of Physical Culture (1983) and co-author’s work Theory and Methodology of Physical Education, volumes 1 and 2 (1976).

The basic ideas presented in these works have not substantially been changed. There has been a change of these parts of the text that are a consequence of historical and evolutionary changes that happened from the time of these works’ creation in 1976 and 1983. The factors that brought about the changes of text from the previous period are:

• Transformation of the State Union of the USSR to the Russian Federation;
• Evolutionary change of the name of the Faculty NIPE, SCIPE, SCOLIPC, RSAPC, RSUPC, RSUoPESaT, i.e. curricula, which have brought about the changes of textbook that has been adapted to these changes and
• New professional and scientific knowledge.

Bearing the previous remarks in mind, it can be said that these are modernized thoughts, professional and scientific understanding of the general theory of physical culture, as well as of the theory and methodology of physical education, which are compliant with the new curriculum of RSUoPESaT.

6.

The thing that has not changed in the theoretical understanding of P. L. Matveyev compared to the first edition of "Introduction to the Theory of physical culture" (1983:22), is the definition of this area which remained the same, except that at the beginning of this new edition (2008:36), a previous widest definition of working on this theory has been added:

"The GENERAL theory of physical culture (its general basis), is an integrative system of scientific knowledge about the essence of physical education, taken as a whole, about the general regularities of its functioning, directed usage, and further development especially in the system of education factors, social formation of personality and optimal development of vital forces of a man .."

By adding the prefix „general“, essentially, the broadest possible basis of the theory of physical culture as an ontological basis for the entire system of teleological physical activities is being emphasized. In this sense, a closer term („its general basis“), which was there in the definition in 1983, now becomes redundant, since its previous definition of „general“, the meaning of the generality of this theory is being duplicated (in linguistic terms, there has been a „pleonasm“).

The term of generality of the theory of physical culture, and its relationship to other molded parts of the broadest theoretical branches of Physical Education, has got its graphic formula that is familiar to all theoreticians who deal with this thematic field. In this sense it is important to remind ourselves of his original scheme of the relationship between GTPC ("General theory of physical culture") and its profiled parts and professional special disciplines (Scheme 1).

It could be said that, from a holistic point of view, a theoretical system of physical culture is unique and indivisible, but for reasons of better understanding of the structure of the theory of physical culture, it is tentatively divided into three parts:

1. GTPC – The General theory of physical culture.
2. Theories of medium range:
   1.1.1. TPE – Theory of physical education
   1.1.2. TS – Theory of sport
1.1.3. Other parts of TPC (Theory and methodology of productive physical culture, Theory and methodology of daily-life PE, Theory and methodology of health PE etc.).

Professional special discipline (Theory and methodology of gymnastics, Theory and methodology of elementary games, Theory and methodology of light athletics, Theory and methodology of various types of sport).

In the schematic view it is clearly stated that natural and human sciences have an important place in the study of theoretical systems of physical education, without which it would be impossible to acquire the complete knowledge of physical education. This fact is important in integrative connecting and study of phenomena in physical culture, which obtains it, in the ontological definition of scientific belonging, an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary character. Critical mass of information and scientific facts, and theories and laws formed out of them, erase the boundaries of the need of defining individuality, as an professional discipline, and emphasizes the need for a comprehensive integrative science, which actually is the general theory of physical culture, that has remained as a constant of L. P. Matveyev’s thinking, in the first source (1983: 22), as well as in the latest one (2008: 34):

„Such a gradation of disciplines, which study physical education, corresponds to different levels of generalization, so that this growing generalization would be in the way of its knowledge. The essential thing is that higher levels of generalization do not indicate summation of knowledge relating to the previous level (to more partial disciplines), but INTEGRATION - unifying separation of their common sense, without which it is not possible to understand the whole. This core unit is never reduced to a simple sum of its component parts, therefore if we restrain ourselves only in the areas of knowledge, in „details”, the essence of the whole remains unknown (“unable to see the forest because of trees „)."

Besides the generality and integrity, L. P. Matveyev emphasizes the scientific side of the general theory of physical culture, with which he dispelled the skepticism of some authors who claimed, and still claim, that „the theory of physical culture is not also the science of physical culture” (2008: 34):

„The general theory of physical education actually deals with showing (manifestation) of the essential general, which characterizes physical culture as a whole, which targets to design its fundamental general features, properties and regularities, striving beyond the boundaries of individual branches of Science. Along with individual special disciplines, profiling parts and boundary disciplines of social and natural character, GENERAL THEORY OF PHYSICAL CULTURE AS A SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE serves to comprehensive knowledge of the essence of physical culture. „

The thing that in the structural view of theory of physical culture systems is different compared to other authors is a specific understanding of the third mid-theoretical level that L. P. Matveyev defines as „Other parts of TPC”, into which he includes everything that the theorists in the West would briefly name as „The theory of (sports) recreation.” Obviously, L. P. Matveyev made a fine distinction among numerous OTHER forms of physical culture (Theory and methods of production physical culture.; Theory and methods of everyday-life physical culture., Theory and methods of health physical culture. et al.), which are beyond physical education and sport, while other theorists have simply called them recreation.

7.

Evolutionary change of the name of one of the oldest faculties of physical education in Europe, the Russian Faculty, which was founded under the name NIPE in 1918, and changed its name to SCIPE, SCOLIPC, RSAPC, RSUPC, to the present name RSUoPEaT, it can be seen in parallel with the theoretical understanding of the profession in the most general sense.

In this regard, it should be noted three key changes of the faculty name, which could be called: „From The Institute, through the Academy, to the University”:

- **NIPE** (1918), **SCIPE** (1921), **SCOLIPC** (1934) - („National Institute of Physical Education”, „State Central Institute of Physical Education”, „State Central Order of Lenin Institute of Physical Culture”)
- **RSAPC** (1993) - („Russian State Academy of Physical Culture”)
- **RSUPC** (2002) and **RSUoPESaT** (2007) - („Russian State University of Physical Culture” and „Russian State University of Physical Education, Sport and Tourism).
Starting with the interpretation of the name INSTITUTE (institution, department, research institute, the school...), through the Academy (College of Science and Art...), to the University (high school, university, the highest educational institution composed of many faculties...), it becomes clear that the development path of one of the oldest institutions of physical culture in Europe was: „From school, through high school, to university”!

The development of institutions for training staff in physical education from its origins as an institution or simply „school” which educates staff, through „academy” that educates both in scientific and artistic forms, to the „university” which integrates different professional profiles in physical education, but out of the same ontological core, oriented to the same profile of cultural activity that is devoted to the holistic study of body and soul - it is a logical path of development of this high education institution.

During the whole 92-year period of existence, this high education institution carried the primary name associated with the essence of its being, and that is PHYSICAL CULTURE. With the change of socio-political situation, it has adapted itself and added the attributes of statehood to its basic name („central”, „State”, „name of Lenin”, and the like). The last change of the name meant that, in 2007, in addition to „university” to its general part called „physical culture”, it was added „sport” and „tourism” for the first time. Since „sport” as one of the entities has always been considered as a structural part of physical education, it has remained such from the perspective of its ontological basis of movement and culture, but in its operating sphere it was made a separate unit which was highlighted in the name of the University as well. Regarding „tourism”, it is a complete novelty in the Russian theoretical school, since in previous debates it has never appeared as a separate entity. In the general theoretical concept of P. L. Matveyev, the phrases „Other parts of TPC” or „recreational activities of citizens” appeared, but not „tourism”.

Although some middle-European countries (Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland), or Western European countries (France, England) developed a special tourist industry and consequently the need for education of such an educational profile, such efforts have not been present at all in the former Soviet Union. Only in recent years with the disintegration of the USSR, and the formation of the Russian Federation there has been a rapid penetration of a utilitarian conception of the West and the growing of using the term „tourism”, until his enthronement in the name of a high education institution.

(Figure 1, 2008: Front page of the Monograph on the occasion of 90 years of RSUoPESaT)

Figure 1 Jubilee publication issued on the occasion of 90 years of RSUoPESaT
The proportion of general fundamentals of physical culture theory and its profiled segments and special-subject specialist disciplines (2008:35)

Scheme 1

Tags:

OTFK – general theory of physical culture; TFB – theory of physical education; TC – theory and methodology of sport; Dr. otрасли ТФК – other profiled segments of the theory of physical culture (theory and methodology of productive physical culture, daily-life PE, health PE, and other forms of physical culture); ЧСД – separate specialist disciplines (theory and methodology of gymnastics, elementary games, light athletics, other parts of sports, etc.).

On the scheme (on the upper right and left) the contact points with the general theory of PE, as well as parts of the humanities and natural sciences are also indicated. At the bottom of the scheme the object itself – physical culture is indicated (with conditional division on some of its larger components).

Therefore it has explicitly been shown that the names of institutions are not changed as a result of the developed theoretical systems, but under pressure from the utilitarian way of life that is often stronger than the theory itself. And then many questions are opened up: What do the theories serve to, if they are often destroyed in practice by revolutionary over-turns done by quasi-theoretical approaches? Why are there new theoretical paradigms and “The structure of scientific revolutions” (Kuhn, 1974), if they are destroyed in practice by the old paradigms and counter-revolutions? Why did Popper (1973) advocate for “The logic of scientific discovery” and critical rationalism, when they are crushed by positivist...
orientation in practice? Why is still radical empirical philosophy as a representative of the traditional philosophy of science not withdraw in front of the efforts of critical rationalism, as a modern approach in contemporary philosophy of science (Sindjelic, S., 2009)? These are all open questions that are put to the scientists in the field of physical culture in Russia, and the echo of these is also reflected in our professional and scientific reality.

8.

From the first part of the book would be interesting to mention a well-known structural scheme of different types of physical culture components (Scheme 2, 2008:75). However, before proceeding to this structural analysis, it should be mentioned that L. P. Matveyev is one of few scholars who speaks about the functions and forms of physical culture, as necessary dialectical relations, on the basis of which the components of physical education are comprehended more clearly.

Under the functions of physical culture L. P. Matveyev (1983:54) includes:

„Objectively present properties of human action to a man and human relations by which certain needs of a personality and the society are met and developed.”

In his new textbook, L. P. Matveyev (2008:72) keeps the first part of the functions definition, but at the end he adds to it an important property that structurally links it to social trends, and therefore gives to physical culture the importance of universal cultural and social activity:

„Objectively present properties of action to humans in certain relations, by which the orientation towards the manifestation of its properties needs to a person and the society are satisfied, are conditioned by its role in the complex of social phenomena.”

This bold addition significantly strengthens the functions of physical culture in the direction of emphasizing its social role as a universal cultural phenomenon, as Hodan B. (2001) states: “Physical culture is a component of general culture”.

The thing that is in the new edition of „The General Theory of Physical Culture”, increasingly stressed by L. P. Matveyev is the knowledge that the functions cannot be realised by themselves, but mainly through the direct action aimed at the adoption of certain values. This is the main reason why L. P. Matveyev associates functions with the forms of physical culture, which are mutually conditioned, and which have remained determined in understanding as well as in the first edition (1983:55):

„The term ‘form’ means the thing that structurally characterizes certain aspects or areas of physical culture, i.e., their structural determination”.

In the textbook that was published in 1983 („The Introduction to the Theory of Physical Culture”), L. P. Matveyev elaborated in detail the basic components and forms of physical culture. That part is omitted in his new textbook from 2008 („The theory and methodology of physical culture”), but the relationship between certain aspects of physical culture and its processing characteristics is much more apostrophized. Because of this, it will be of interest for all specialists in physical education to briefly recall the basic aspects or forms of physical culture, as they „are seen” by L. P. Matveyev.
It is necessary to emphasize immediately that there are certain differences in the structural view, which are mainly the consequence of changes in the faculty name, curriculum, as well as in certain utilitarian changes in the Russian Federation that led to these changes in the structure of physical culture. (scheme 3, 1983:63).
in pre-school and general education institutions and aims at setting the basis of general physical education: motion skills, habits and the appropriate knowledge, physical fitness and associated psychological features, and optimization of health. Pedagogically organized multiyear process of expressing basic physical culture is called The process of primary (basic) physical education by L. P. Matveyev. The second form of basic FC is so called «Bazov-prolongirûûšaâ FC» - «Basically prolonged physical culture» (process types: general-physical preparation, fitness training, athletics, gymnastics, running, biking, etc.), which
are implemented through the various extra-curricular activities or through independent forms of physical exercise.

SPORT as a component of FC – In the textbook from 1983, Sport is in the upper part of the ball shown as the third part, and together with other forms of physical culture represented an upgrade to the Basic physical culture. L. P. Matveyev divided this segment of FC into: Basic Sport („the process of training and competition in a massive system of competition in sport”) and Sport of higher achievements („the process of sports training and competition, aimed at record achievements”). In the textbook published in 2008, L. P. Matveyev called that part SUPER SPORT („Супердостижения спорт”) – super achievements in sports, and he placed it on the top of the ball, by which he wanted to show his profile is on maximum achievement in a picturesque way. In explaining this part of FC, L. P. Matveyev says that often, and not exactly true, the division in sport is in „the mass sports” or „sport for all” and „a great sport”. In further text, he believes that a better division is into „widely spread (ordinary) sport” and „sport of higher achievements”. In this sense, „widely spread sport” can be related to any part of FC, while the „sport of higher achievements” in modern conditions is separated into two main parts for a smaller number of talented athletes: „sports-specialized - professional sport” in terms of maximum achievements, and other „professional and commercial sport” in terms of the entertainment industry and business. Since this matter is separately studied in another curriculum, L. P. Matveyev (2001) presented it in another publication: „Общая теория спора и ее прикладные аспекты”, Copyright edition, Moscow.

SPECIALLY-APPLIED PHYSICAL CULTURE („С-ПФК“ – „Специализированно-прикладная физическая культура”) - specially-applied (mostly professionally-applied in the process of work) physical culture, has retained the identical meaning in both sources, provided that in the new source in 2008, the prefix „specialy-applied FC”, was added, while in the spring of 1983, it was referred to as the „professionally-applied FC”. As noted above, these changes are the result of transformation of the State Union of the USSR into the Russian Federation, the transition to a market economy, changing curricula, and so on.

HEALTH-RELATED AND REHABILITATION PHYSICAL CULTURE („ОФФК“ – „Оздоровительно-реабилитационная физическая культура”) - has retained the identical meaning in both sources, since through the historical development and the relationship of physical education and medicine there was no doubt about the interdisciplinary field that has long been called HEALING PHYSICAL CULTURE („Лечебная физическая культура”).

MARGINAL-BOUNDARY PHYSICAL CULTURE („ФФК“ – „Фоновая физическая культура”) - “marginal or boundary” physical culture. In the textbook from 1983, L. P. Matveyev divided this part of FC into two parts: „hygiene” (under the regime of everyday life) and „health and recreation”. In the book published in 2008, the division was slightly changed to „recreation” and „home-life” (in small forms).

- “marginal or boundary“ physical culture („recreational” and „home-life” components (or subsections) of physical culture.

Comparing continuity of the ideas of P. L. Matveyev on the structure of physical culture in the last 30 years, we can say that his basic idea has remained unchanged. Structural forms of physical culture in their global manifestation are still present, and have only slightly changed their expression depending on the social changes and the reflection of the social tendencies to revise the curriculum. The new curricula have conditioned adaptation of textbook material for students of all forms of specialization in higher education. The Bologna process has inevitably affected the Russian Federation, and despite some „good” intentions, has brought a range of utility solutions that are not in accordance with the theoretical determinants built by a pleiad of top experts for almost a century, among which one of the most respected was L.P. Matveyev. How these processes will continue to reflect on practice and theory of physical culture, remains to be seen in the period ahead.

9.

The second part of the book is entitled „THE GENERAL THEORY AND METHODOLOGY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION”, and as the name suggests, it is dedicated to theoretical and methodological issues in PHYSICAL EDUCATION, as a basic entity of physical culture.
The main difference between the editions of 1976 and this edition in 2008 is that the first work was co-author one, and the latter is the single author’s work. The textbook from 1976 was done by L. P. Matveyev and A.D. Novikov, and his author’s contribution was given by many prominent experts: V.M. Zaciorski, A. M. Maksimenko, S. V. Jananis, A. Maznicenko, A. M. Slemina, V. M. Kolokolovsky, V. G. Podolsky, B. I. Zagorski, A. A. Gubanova, B. A. Sirotkina, M. V. Yakovlev, B. S. Gramenicki and J. M. Sychev.

This latest work of Professor P. L. Matveeva is the single author’s work and is edited by an expert with 55 year old professional engagement, which was reflected in a number of research and professional and theoretical works related to theory and methodology of physical education. Therefore it cannot be said that he did not deal with the issues of physical education, but the fact that he formed this work independently, on the way his technical, theoretical and scientific instinct guided the design of this publication. In that sense, this work is different from the one in 1976 because an excellent scholar, teaching expert and methodologist has given to it his own special deductive form.

In the treatment of basic issues related to the theory and methodology of physical education, L. P. Matveyev has given everything that many writers of similar books had also described, but he has now offered a unifying synthetic treatment of these issues in the following way:

- Target orientation, means, methods and principles in the field of physical education;
- Theoretical and methodical basis of education and training in the process of physical education;
- Forms of organizing activities, planning and control in physical education.

L. P. Matveyev has added enormous research experience to all this, which is in the form of new knowledge, once more built in tutorial in synthetic form, which is essential reading for the profile of professionals who will work in educational institutions as physical education teachers.

10.

At the end of the preview of this publication it should be said that one of the leading experts in the field of physical culture had gone into eternity, but that he left the physical culture of eternal values for eternity. The new generation of experts in physical culture shall embed new knowledge, but that generation will keep returning to the source of knowledge left behind in his rich career by Leo Pavlovich Matveev.

For the works that he leaves to the world of science in the field of physical culture, all who are familiar with his work must pay tribute to him. For those unfamiliar with the integrative theory of physical education, they must be aware that a deductive knowledge of physical education is not possible without holistic theoretical and philosophical concepts of Leo Pavlovich Matveev. Hegelian demiurge that „burned” in the person of Leo Pavlovich enabled him to possess cognitive aspects that hardly anybody had in physical education. Probably because of that many have not yet reached the cognitive pathways he had set in the world trends of thought in physical education. This is one of the key reasons why many who do not understand theoretical trends are moving into the utilitarian change of practice, because it is easier and more accessible to an inductive approach of thinking and reasoning.

For all the personal satisfaction that I had the opportunity to become acquainted with the ideas of Leo Pavlovich, I remain grateful to him for everything he has done for me and for a pleiad of experts who have studied at the source of his ideas and who further continue to develop his ideas worldwide. Many thanks to Leo Pavlovich, and may he rest in glory.
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