The evolution of the theory of the interrelationship between landscape and ethnos in scientific and geographical research
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Abstract. The ethnic problems of the interaction between nature and society are not sufficiently updated and studied. The scientific statements made by well-known scientists and necessary for determining the parameters of the influence of the geographical environment on the stereotype of human behavior, the economy profile, the forms of life, the material and spiritual culture that determine the distinctive features of ethnic groups, as well as the inverse degree of impact on the natural environment of public communities, depending on their ethnicity are often disregarded and not used in the applied context. Thus, the ideas about the relations between ethnic communities and natural environment, the peculiarities of peoples’ life support in natural and socio-cultural conditions, the natural environment usage by ethnic groups and their impact on it, the biological and socio-cultural adaptation of various peoples to the landscapes that host them, trigger a comprehensive generalization and analysis. The article’s subject is a retrospective of the evolution of scientific and geographical ideas about the relation between landscape and ethnos. In this regard, the article’s purpose is an analytical assessment of conceptual and theoretical approaches to the problem of interrelationships in the landscape-ethnos system, clarification, concretization, axiological interpretation of the most significant provisions and critical remarks of theoretical and conceptual-terminological ideas related to nature management ethno-geographic aspects and ethnic groups interaction with the natural environment.

1. Introduction
An important component of scientific geographical and geo-ecological research is the study on the ethnic specifics of the interaction between nature and society, which allows us to determine the most optimal form of coexistence and life activity of different peoples in the natural environment. It is ethnic groups that are peculiar phenomena in which the interaction of nature with industrial activity with the entire material and spiritual people’s culture is carried out. It is inconceivable to consider the geographical environment for the necessary reforms implementation without considering and studying the impact of these transformations on the peoples living in the environment, as well as their cultural and economic skills and work processes which make one of the main objects of ethno-geographical and ethno-ecological study.

The impact of the surrounding landscape is one of the most important factors. At the same time, this factor that determines the ways of thinking, life, culture, economic activity and lifestyle of human communities is not studied enough. The need to fit into the surrounding landscape forces people to
develop specific habits sets that add up to a special landscape behavior pattern. That becomes a person's "second nature" and the main distinguishing feature of their ethnicity [1].

The problems of the ethnic side of the interaction between the surrounding landscape and human activity are not sufficiently updated and studied. The scientific statements made by well-known scientists that are necessary for determining the parameters of the influence of the geographical environment on the stereotype of human behavior, the economy profile, the forms of life, the material and spiritual culture that determine the distinctive features of ethnic groups, as well as the inverse degree of impact on the natural environment of public communities, depending on their ethnicity are often disregarded and not used in the applied context.

The topic relevance is also conditioned by the need to define the influence parameters of geographical environment on a person's behavior pattern, the activity types, life forms, material and spiritual culture of the ethnic groups defining characteristic, as well as the reverse impact on the natural environment and social communities depending on their ethnicity. Regional policy issues, integrated development of territories of various taxonomic levels, local self-government, ensuring natural resources rational use require significant changes in the existing management system taking into account the regions’ "ethnic specifics". Thus, the ideas about the relations between ethnic communities and their natural environment, the peculiarities of the peoples’ life support in natural and socio-cultural conditions, the natural environment usage by ethnic groups and their impact on it, the biological and socio-cultural adaptation of various peoples to the landscapes that host them, trigger a comprehensive generalization and analysis. In this regard, an important scientific and geographical research task is the analytical assessment of conceptual and theoretical approaches to the problem of interrelationships in the landscape-ethnos system, clarification, concretization and addition of theoretical and conceptual and terminological concepts related to the ethno-geographic nature management aspects and the interaction between ethnic groups and the natural environment, in particular within the steppe ecosystems.

2. Materials and research methods

2.1 Research materials

The research materials were the works and publications of well-known researchers on the issues of ethnic specificity of the interaction between nature and society, the classic S. Montesquieu and I. Herder’s works on the deterministic influence of the natural environment on the peoples’ life, works of the late 19th and early 20th century researchers (P. V. de la Blache and F. Ratzel, A. I. Voeykov, S. M. Shirokogorov). The researches of foreign and Russian scientists of the second half of the 20th century who made a significant contribution to the study of ethnic ecology problems, the relations between ethnic communities and their natural environment (Iu. V. Bromley, D. Steward and E. Huntington), the works of the authors of the concept of economic and cultural types (M. G. Levin and N. N. Cheboksarov), the "anthropogeocenoses" theory (V. P. Alekseev), the ethnogeocenoses concept and mechanisms of interaction in the landscape-ethnos system (L. N. Gumilyov), the ethnic ecology conceptual apparatus (V. I. Kozlov) have also been studied.

2.2 Research methods

The synchronistic method based on the information comparison was chosen as the main study method. It is typical for both the humanities and natural sciences, where it is especially important to establish links between facts and use methods of landscape analogues, comparative geographical and system analysis of the problem of interaction in the landscape-ethnos system on the synthesis of sciences: history of science, geography, landscape studies, ecology, sociology, economics.

3. Findings and Discussion

The theoretical basis of scientific problems in the system of landscape-ethnos interaction was formed under the influence of well-known Russian and foreign scientists’ researches – the representatives of
various synthetic sciences, containing an analysis of the main problems of ethnic specificity of the interaction between nature and society.

3.1 Analytical assessment of the main provisions and results of scientific research of scientists of the 18th-first half of the 20th century

The most meaningful scientific views on the problems of the relationship between nature and society appeared in the 18th-19th centuries. The classic research papers on the priority determination of the natural environment in the life of peoples written by I. Herder, Sh. Montesquieu who believed that many manifestations of the ethnic way of life (spiritual and material culture, economic specialization, behavior stereotype, etc.) are determined by the natural environment of territories inhabited by different ethnic groups [2, 3].

At the beginning of the 20th century, the study on the influence of the surrounding natural landscape on the emergence and development of forms of social life organization taking into account ethnic characteristics is most fully reflected in the papers of scientists of the French and German scientific schools. According to the French scientist V. de la Blache, the factors of the natural specifics of Europe led to the formation of the largest variety of local spheres, individual centers, small communities with their own "mode of life", which were in constant interaction in the European space [4]. In the famous treatise of the German scientist F. Ratzel (Anthropogeography) presented the main ideas about the close connection of anthropogenesis with natural conditions. He considered the territory of different countries as a biosocial organism in inseparable connection with the peculiarities of the ethnic group inhabiting it [5]. Pointing out the factors of the natural environment that affect the material and spiritual culture of the peoples, the researcher could not determine the degree and vector of this influence. It bypasses the issues of ethnic classification, the economic activity dynamics depending on the adaptation forms of ethnic groups in the surrounding landscape.

In Russia, the pioneering scientific conceptual constructions in the field of aspects of interaction in the landscape-ethnos - nature management system belong to A. I. Voeykov and S. M. Shirokogorov. A. Voeykov explained the variety of economic activity ways associated with the use of land resources and its territorial differentiation not only and not so much by climatic factors, but by the ethno-cultural features of the economy and life of each people that have developed as a result of interaction with the surrounding landscape [6, p. 23]. S. Shirokogorov distinguishes the natural environment as a substantial basis to which the ethnos adapts "becoming a part of this environment, its derivative" [7, p. 122]. The theses of the scientist about the ethnic specifics of adaptation to the environment and its adaptation to itself are important in this research. On the migration of ethnic groups along the "lines of least resistance", which implies that when moving certain ethnic communities to other regions, the choice of conditions that best correspond to the previous adaptation to the surrounding landscape [7, p.126-129].

The most reasonable conclusions about the geographical landscape influence on the ethnic component of a public organization are made by L. S. Berg. According to the scientist, the surrounding natural landscape "acts forcibly" on human collectives, forcing them to adapt in a "certain direction", thereby "putting a special imprint" on the patterns of human behavior. Thus, according to the scientist, the forms of adaptation of human communities, depending on the features of the landscape and the special impressions of the geographical environment, are perceived as the ethnic diversity of humanity [8, p. 180-181].

In the 20-40s of the 20th century, attempts to consider the connections between ethnic communities and their natural environment were touched upon in the works of A. A. Kruber, V. G. Bogoroz-Tan, R. M. Kabo, and E. Huntington. R. M. Kabo analyzed the geographical distribution of peoples, the peculiarities of their settlement and territorial relations with other peoples in close connection with socio-economic, political and natural factors. As a result of the study, the scientist came to the conclusion that the nature of the settlement of peoples in a certain natural environment is directly related to human ecology and, above all, to ethnic ecology, which determines the variability of the interaction of different ethnic groups with the surrounding landscape [9, p.25-27].
The American geographer E. Huntington’s theory on the origin and development in proto-ethnic behavioral groups called “Kits” is in some ways promising from the point of view of the behavior forms diversity and adaptation of “Kits” peoples groups depending on the characteristics of their surrounding environment. As examples, the author cites the nomads of Arabia, the Mongols, the Persians of Central Asia, European immigrants in America, and others. The formation of the so-called "behavioral groups", according to Huntington, is based on the selection phenomena, that is, the ability or not the ability to optimally adapt to the natural environment, an action to which the author attaches crucial importance in the processes of developing both biological and social characteristics of these groups. The author cites two selection laws: "elimination due to migrations of specific individuals" that are not adapted to these conditions of existence on the one hand, and the disappearance of those mores, customs, forms of life and economic specialization that are inadequate for the entire "behavioral group" due to its adaptation to the surrounding natural landscape [10]. By these selective processes, Huntington explains the biological and cultural differences between sedentary and nomadic peoples. Paying tribute to the important position of the Huntington on the impact of the environment on the ethnic pattern of behavior, it should be noted arguable absolute natural selection and getting used to the new conditions of most gifted ones with maximum adaptive abilities of the human groups that appear to be simple interference of biological evolution on the evolution of ethnic processes.

A well-known proponent of the neo-evolutionist concept was another American scientist, Julian Stewart. He proposed the principles of classification of human communities by cultural types based on the ecological and technological factor, which depended primarily on the surrounding conditions of the natural environment (cultural and ecological approach). According to Stewart, all cultures develop in the same way, according to the same laws. The reason for the fact that cultures are not similar to each other, according to the scientist, is in the specifics of natural and climatic conditions that formed different adaptation practices, in the process of which there was a spatial specialization of cultures [11].

One of the directions of studying the relations between ethnic communities of people and their natural environment is the concept of economic and cultural types (ECT) put forward by M. G. Levin and N. N. Cheboksarov. Subsequently, it was developed and modified in more details in B. V. Andrianov’s researches. In his currently accepted interpretation, "economic and cultural types are historically formed complexes of economy and culture, typical of peoples of different origins, but living in similar geographical conditions and being at approximately the same level of socio-economic development” [12, p.18]. According to this concept, which substantially echoes Stewart's ideas, peoples living in similar natural conditions and at approximately the same level of socio-economic development are engaged in similar types of economic activities. In this regard, such peoples have many similar elements of material and to a certain extent spiritual culture [13, p. 4-5], [12, p. 18-19]. The authors determined the relations nature of ethnic groups with their natural environment, emphasized the influence of the surrounding landscape on the economic specialization, culture and life of the peoples. Along with the positive provisions of the concept as a whole, its "heuristic value" is low. Comparative typological principles are put forward to the fore, and the issues of interaction with the natural environment of ethnic groups in the process of their life support are not clearly formulated. In addition, the influence of the natural environment does not always explain the presence of similar features in the material culture and economy of peoples, even if they are at the same level of socio-economic development and live in approximately the same geographical conditions, which to some extent contradicts some provisions of the concept of scientists.

3.2 Analytical assessment of the main provisions and results of scientific research of scientists of the second half of the 20th century

Russian scientists - V. P. Alekseev, Yu. V. Bromly, L. N. Gumilyov, V. I. Kozlov as well as their foreign colleagues, such as R. Dubé (France), A. Farnham and S. Bochner, K. Oberg (USA) contributed a lot in researching ethnic ecology, relations between ethnic communities and the natural environment in 70-80 years and continue doing it nowadays.
Problems and mechanisms of interaction with the natural and anthropogenic environment, taking into account the peoples’ ethnic history, ecological life aspects of ethnic groups, their settlement, are widely presented in the works of the famous anthropogeographer V. P. Alekseev [14], [15], [16]. In the 70s, he put forward the "anthropogeocenos" theory, as a regionally limited system interaction between the economic collective of people and the surrounding landscape. According to Alekseev, a person carries out his life activity exclusively at the expense of nature, being with his biosocial mode, an element of geobiocenos, while forming an anthropogeocenos – a system of various relationships and interactions with the surrounding geographical environment. As a result of this interaction, a person develops a specific image and way of life that is adequate to the natural environment, especially cultural and economic skills. Under the influence of the landscape the human body acquires optimal features of adaptation to the surrounding landscape which are expressed in the formation of certain forms of human interaction with the natural environment. In this regard, the main features of anthropogeocenos are mosaicism, which shows the diversity of human collectives interacting with the surrounding natural environment in different ways, and versatility, which determines the biological, social and ethnic components in each human individual [16].

Considering the anthropogeocenos as a structural unity of three components: the ethnic collective, its production activities, and the territory used, the scientist raised the question of the importance of ethnic parameters of interaction with the natural environment. Considering the differences between economic collective, the scientist noted not only for their distinctive features according to the degree of human impact on the natural environment and the intensity of that exposure, but the levels of their "information field", as the amount of knowledge, ideas, skills, cultural values, traditions with ethnic overtones [16, p. 368-371]. According to V. Alekseev, the anthropogeocenos is not a closed, but an open system that exists only in contact with other systems of other anthropogenocenos. Thus, the "information field" of the economic collective is a dynamic system and is subject to transformation, since along with the ethnic level (the stock of cultural values, traditions, religious and magical ideas), it contains knowledge and ideas that are associated with the contacts of this anthropogeocenos with other similar or vice versa opposite types [14].

In the context of a specific empirical study, the Alekseev’s opinion on the "reserve of adaptive variability" as a real phenomenon that determines the adaptive capabilities of ethnic populations, i.e., the "margin of safety" when faced with an unfavorable and alien environment is of particular value. In relation to the ethnic side of human interaction with the natural environment, it means that each nationality has its own reserve of adaptive variability [15, p.9-10]. This conclusion is of great importance for studying the migrations causes, their final results and the degree of anthropogenic impact on the natural environment.

Along with the significance of Alekseev's work in the field of studying the problem under consideration, the ethnic level genesis of the "information field" of the economic collective is not entirely clear. How is the "ethnic mode of behavior" formed? The reasons, methods and forms of transition to a different system of economy and life support of ethnic groups and changes in ecological niches associated with changes in the surrounding anthropogenic and natural background are ignored.

The issues on the relations in the landscape-ethnos system in separate positions are presented in the papers of the famous ethnographer Iu. V. Bromley. The scientist recognizes the influence of geographical environment on "the formation and functioning of ethnic communities", which manifests itself in various ethnic components, such as material culture, nature of work, the specialization of the economy, the settlements types, peculiar features of a dwelling, clothes, etc. He does not deny a certain influence of natural environment peculiarities on "certain aspects of the spiritual culture and mental makeup of the ethnic group", which is embodied in "certain specific habits, customs, rituals", which manifest a special everyday color of the people associated with the characteristic features of their environment. It also recognizes the geographical environment influence on the "biological and physiological parameters of populations associated with ethnic groups". The conclusion about the role of the natural environment as a bioenergetic source of functioning of ethnic groups is important. But to
a greater extent, he correlates the dependence of bioenergy with the specific historical conditions of ethnic communities existence [17, p. 163].

Bromley concludes that the interaction of man with the natural environment of each nation has its own characteristics, which the researcher reduces to manifestations of "polymorphism of ethnic culture". The relations between the ethnics and nature, in his opinion, are two-sided. He objectively defines the ethnics and its habitat as an integral ethn-ecological system [18, p. 215-225]. The economic specialization of each ethnic group is determined by two factors: the socio-economic development level of the ethnic group and the nature of its habitat. He explains the strength of such an ecological and economic system by the stability of socio-economic life and the natural environment, as well as by the inertia of the established tradition of the economic system. With the general objective argumentation of the approaches, the author's statements about the primacy of social factors in the formation of ethnic groups and their dynamics, in the interaction of ethnic communities with the geographical environment, are the most contradictory. He denies the close relationship in the system of ethnics and landscape and considers ethnogenesis to be more of a social phenomenon.

3.3 Analytical assessment of the main provisions and results of scientific research in the works of L. N. Gumilyov and V. I. Kozlov

The most significant contribution to the study of the interaction between ethnic communities and the natural environment was made by the famous scientist L. N. Gumilyov. In his works, he proposed an original interpretation of the geographical aspects of the evolution of ethnic groups, presented scientifically based ideas and mechanisms of interaction in the landscape-ethnicos system. The scientist introduced a methodological novelty in the study of the component part of the biosphere of the anthroposphere, which from a geographical point of view is a mosaic of different peoples. L. Gumilyov considers it as a combination of dynamic, "systemic ethno-landscape integralities", as an ethnosphere – one of the shells of the Earth that constantly interacts with the landscapes of the planet, but in different ways, taking into account the differences in the interaction of ethnic groups with the natural environment [1, p. 17].

L. Gumilyov also refers to the well-known position of L. S. Berg about the forced influence of the landscape on ethnic groups, which forces ethnic communities to adapt to its ecological features in a certain way. Getting everything necessary for their life from the natural environment, ethnic collectives are inextricably linked with it due to active economic activity. The scientist defines this relationship in two directions: "the adaptation of oneself to the landscape and the landscape to oneself". Thus, anthropogeocenosis given the ethnic identification of L. Gumilyov is an "ethnocoenosis" – as a holistic ethno-ecological system, a component of the dynamic unity of the human collective with containing landscape [1, p. 58]. Constantly interacting with the surrounding landscape, members of the ethnic group learn certain specific rules of behavior-sterotypes, which, according to Gumilyov, are formed as adaptive features, as ways of adapting the ethnic group to the geographical environment. The scientist proves that the stereotype of behavior is the only universal criterion for distinguishing ethnic groups from each other. This particular behavioral language is inherited, but not genetically, but through the mechanism of signal heredity based on a conditioned reflex, when the offspring imitates behavioral stereotypes from their parents and peers, which are both adaptive skills [19]. Thus, Gumilyov established one of the reasons for the diversity of ethnic groups, associated with the geographical diversity of landscapes. The natural environment mosaic nature determines the variability of adaptation forms that form specific behavioral patterns, which indicate ethnic diversity.

L. Gumilyov most convincingly justified and formulated the concept of a dynamic system - "landscape-ethnos", which develops in the process of interaction between nature and society, the relationship in which he presented the formula landscape – form of adaptation – method of production – profile of the economy – material and spiritual culture – behavior stereotype (mentality) – ethnos. It is extremely difficult to consciously change the established form of interaction between an ethnic group and the landscape. To do this, it is necessary to change the behavior stereotype, but the vast
The majority of people are not ready for this in a conscious age. The act of conscious choice is conditioned by such significant restrictions that all these actions negate the results of changing the established way of life in the established ethno-ecosystem [1]. By influencing the landscape, changing its natural components, a person must simultaneously adapt to its new quality or migrate. Modification of the natural environment is one of the reasons for migration. But at the same time, migrant ethnic groups retain many of their original features, and tend to choose a geographical niche, a landscape that resembles their homeland as much as possible, similar to the one they left, or mostly choose an urbanized technosphere. The peoples’ migration to the usual conditions is the desire to preserve themselves as an ethnic system [1]. According to the scientist, the most stable ethnically and socially are the peoples who inhabit monotonous and monotonous landscapes. They are more conservative in the perception of others and changes in their lifestyle, as well as to change their "place of development". Such ethnic groups form a single whole with the natural environment in which they lived for a long period of time. The sphere of industrial activity of these peoples is most adapted to the peculiarities of the land shaft, as well as the landscape to it [1].

The main, unique discovery of L. Gumilyov that directly affects the interaction of man with nature is the so-called "X" factor, the effect of which at the ethnic level of the organization of the biosphere is described by the scientist as the passionarity phenomenon. He argues that the landscape, despite its close and indissoluble connection with the ethnos, is not the cause of ethnogenesis and "does not give itself rise to new ethnic groups". The factor that leads to the emergence of new ethnic systems is an energy impulse, a passionate push that occurs as a result of exogenous excesses, according to L. Gumilyov's hypothesis, by the action of "variable cosmic radiation", which leads to fluctuations in the biosphere, causing micromutations in the human body that affect the behavior [19]. A passionate shock that occurs briefly on certain areas of the earth's surface leads to a change in the established pattern of behavior in the area of the shock. Thus, it causes adaptive syndromes that lead to new forms of interaction between ethnic groups and the geographical environment. Due to the passion impulse, people are able to engage in increased activity, which is integrated into the ethnogenic and landscape processes. Affected by the energy effect of the biosphere, the ethnic group rebuilds its attitude to the landscape, develops a new mechanism of adaptation corresponding to its new behavior pattern, generates anthropogenesis and population migration. According to the scientist, the passionate excess, like the landscape, acts forcibly without regard to natural and socio-economic conditions, forcing the newly formed ethnic groups to look for new ways of adaptation. In the process of ethnogenesis, due to the environment resistance, there is a "waste of energy of the received impulse". Thus, the structure and stereotype of an ethnic group behavior are dynamic quantities and change depending on the phases of ethnogenesis. Consequently, L. Gumilyov established the variability of the relationship of one and the same ethnic group with the surrounding natural environment, which changes over time in the process of ethnogenesis [19].

L. Gumilyov's ideas concerning the ethnic relationship between nature and society are extremely original and heuristic. He proved his conclusions on the basis of classification and systematization of the observed facts. He created a global concept that explains the development of the ethnic appearance of the planet in interaction with the geographical environment. For the first time, the author made significant adjustments in the interpretation of the problems of the relations of ethnogenesis with the biosphere and the sociosphere. Some of L. Gumilyov's ideas are hypothetical and not strictly proven, but there are no facts contradicting them. The most controversial and open questions are the question of ethnogenesis in an artificially created technogenic, urbanized environment, which makes up a significant part of the territory of the planet on which certain peoples live, what their connection with the geographical environment is like, what the adaptation mechanism when changing the behavior pattern, and whether they will merge into a monolithic ethnosphere or not.

L. Gumilyov was further developed in the publications of A. A. Chibilev. Basing on historical and geographical material, he presented analytical data on the impact of nomadic peoples on the landscapes of the steppe belt of Eurasia. According to the scientist, these landscapes were natural and
anthropogenic complexes, formed as a result of cultural and economic activities most adapted to the peculiarities of the natural environment [20].

From a geoeccological point of view, the V. I. Kozlov’s researches are particularly valuable. Continuing to study the problems of adaptation of ethnic groups to the natural environment, he considered the material and spiritual culture of the peoples as a mechanism for implementing such adaptation. He uses a geographical rather than a cultural approach to the study of ethnic ecology (V. Kozlov is the term’s author). He emphasizes the importance of considering the natural conditions in the formation of the life support systems of the ethnic groups that can speed up or slow down the development of distinct ethnic communities, and how "of using ethnic groups of the natural environment and their impact on the environment", which form the ethnic tradition of nature [21, p. 72]. [22, p. 8]. The scientist believes that people adjust or adapt to the natural environment of their habitat not only in biological way, but also by the organization of economic activities and the related culture. Culture (especially material) as the main mechanism of life support and adaptation of a person to the natural environment of his habitat always has an ethnic specificity.

Thanks to V. Kozlov’s research, it became possible to give visible contours to an integral, multifaceted approach to the study of ethnic ecology, which combined the achievements of biologists, geographers, ecologists, cultural scientists, and psychologists. With the help of culture and economic activity different peoples not only adapted over time to a particular natural environment ("ecological niche"), but also transformed this environment to a greater or lesser extent, creating "cultural landscapes", "agricultural landscapes", etc. [23, p. 26]. Complementing the author's conclusions, it can be noted that in these transformed landscapes, ethnic practices of adaptation were more or less visible.

4. Conclusion
A comprehensive analysis of Russian and foreign researchers’ scientific studies related to the problems of landscape-ethnos relationships raises the issue of rethinking the degree of the "ethnic factor" influence on the interaction between society and natural ecosystems. This aims to clarify such human activity aspects that are detrimental to the landscapes that host ethnic groups, which will allow us to determine the behavior line necessary to establish the most optimal life form for various peoples in the natural environment.

Thus, scientific ideas about the relations between people’s ethnic communities and their habitat natural environment, the features of the life support of peoples in natural and socio-cultural conditions, the natural environment usage by ethnic groups and their impact on it, the biological and socio-cultural adaptation of various peoples to the landscapes that host them are of considerable practical importance. Taking these ideas into account in the society life will mean a certain "ethnoecosociologization" of the country’s and its regions’ spatial development.
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