A dialogue on the life and work of renowned psychologist/methodologist Lev Vygotsky

by Lois Holzman

"At the 1989 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, attended by over 8,000 educators, psychologists, anthropologists, and other social scientists, there was a symposium on the topic, "Extending Vygotsky: Culture, Cognition and Communication," and I had the opportunity to present a paper. Unfortunately, I had to leave the meeting early due to illness, but I was able to attend part of the symposium. The papers presented were quite diverse, and I was impressed by the range of topics and approaches that were being explored.

One of the papers that stood out for me was by Jay P. Meehan. In his paper, "The Development of the Vygotskian Approach to Education," he discussed the historical context of Vygotsky's work and the evolution of the Vygotskian paradigm. He also highlighted the importance of considering the cultural and social context of educational practices.

Another paper that I found particularly interesting was by Victor A. Kolesnikov, who presented "Vygotsky's Theory of Development and the Role of the Teacher." Kolesnikov emphasized the role of the teacher as a mediator in the learning process and the importance of creating a supportive and inclusive classroom environment.

Overall, the symposium provided a valuable opportunity to celebrate the life and work of Lev Vygotsky and to explore the ongoing relevance of his ideas in contemporary educational research and practice. It was a privilege to be part of this gathering and to learn from the contributions of such a talented group of scholars."
where Vygotksy was so important and being in-involved in research helped in making connec-connections and elaborating my understanding. So it was directly through the involvement in research.

Christine L. Cervia: I first heard of Vyotsky in graduate school at Teachers College, Columbia University. It was a class on human development and it was focused on the philosophy of science. The professor concentrated on Thomas Kuhn’s work examining paradigm shifts in the history of science. We studied the work of Piaget and Vygotsky and how they understood learning and development, human behavior and their impact on the scientific community. We read Mind in So-ciety and excerpts from Thought and Language. It was difficult reading — intellectually demand-ing. I loved it. I felt that Vygotsky’s method, the whole sociological approach to develop-ment of science, was in contrast to Kuhn’s work. I wasn’t fully able to articulate this at the time — all the material was very new to me — but I had a strong sense that Vygotsky was a Marxist methodologist and, at the time, I was anti-paradigmatic! In contrast to Piaget, whom I found rigid and overtly determined by categories, Vygotsky was talking about hu-man interaction in the process of -- or maybe the educators this was exciting and fascinating to me. It was counter to my experience of the social sci-ences — diagnosing, labeling and objectifying the individual. At the time I was beginning to learn about social therapy which is influenced by Vygotsky’s work. I was participating in group therapy at the Institute for Social Research, which, among other things, builds environments that were non-abusive and non-repressive — where people could get help with their emotional problems. I could see the limitations of Vygotsky and social therapy. In the therapy people were related as producers of change — there was no diagnosis. I learned through my participation that emotionality and learning were social — that one’s emotional life is something one produces with other people.

Holzman: And you found Vygotsky’s work dealt with these issues?

L. Cervia: At the time, I was a special education teacher working with children with learning disabilities. I wanted to apply what I was learning in the classroom to do learning in a different way. Even though I didn’t quite know what I was doing when I started working with children with learning disabilities I began to see learning as an activity of production and so the ability to be an active participant isolated — as a force of production. Vygotsky’s and social therapy opened up all kinds of possibilities for what we could do. Students who you would think would be at the bot-tom of the barrel were the ones who would par-ticipate the most and provide leadership on how we were doing learning. I kept asking the kids: how do we show this? How can we build the conditions so everyone can learn? They became methodologists themselves. I think in many ways I could practice this new methodology much better than I could articulate what I was doing. I was self-consciously using my new understanding of learning as social, the new understanding of learning in ad-advance of children’s developmental level but I couldn’t grasp the totality of what I was doing — I was trying to create learning environments. As teachers we’re trained to focus on the product, not the activity of production.

Changing how we produced learning in the classroom recognized the totality of what was going on there. Using the specific histories of my students to build collective was very radical. Again, I didn’t understand it at the time. I just followed the students’ reading scores went up two to three grade levels. Kids who couldn’t write a sentence were working to-gether to write three paragraph essays. It was a struggle for me not to view this as some magical process but a process of learning science. What was critical was that I stopped focusing on the in-dividual to begin to build a collective zone of proximal development. It seemed like a contra-diction to me at the time. People said, “But if you relate to the collective, you don’t care about the individual kids.” Special Education is supposed to be individualized. But in fact, what I began to find was that the more atten-tion I paid to building the group, the more I was able to use the strengths of the individual stu-dents instead of responding to their weaknesses. Vygotksy was a way out of the nightmare of special education classrooms. I could not have continued on with my traditional training. I found it oppressive. Vygotsky gave me the tools to de-velop new possibilities.

David Bakhost: I go back to the days when I was an undergraduate student in England studying philosophy and Russian. These subjects were taught in complete isolation from one another. So I set out to try to put the two together to try and get a broader picture of the Russian, particularly the Soviet, philosophical tradi-tions. In the course of trying to find something about Vygotsky, I went to the USSR and met a philosopher who struck me as extraordinarily interesting, a man called Felix Mikhailov who was much more interesting than anything I had read previously about Soviet philosophers, which had been just the standard Marxist-Leninist text-book orthodoxy. This was 1980. On the strength of the discussion with Mikhailov and reading his book, The Intellectual and the Ontological Subject, I decided to go back to Moscow for a long period in order to pursue the things we had been talking about. During 1982-3 Mikhailov introduced me to a lot of very interesting people.

It seemed to me there were three camps in Soviet philosophy. One was philosophical es-tablishment — orthodox Marxist-Leninist and holding most of the positions of power in the academic world. Then, there were philosophers of the “C. I. Group” which I had heard of. They were descended of the German classical tradition in philosophy — very much Hegelian Marxism — and were in a very uneasy rela-tionship to the philosophical establishment. They were too Marxist for those who were guardians of the credo.

Holzman: You said they were Hegelian and also Marxist?

Bakhost: Yes. There’s a certain species of Marxism which thinks Marx owes a tremendous debt to Hegel, particularly in relation to method-ology. There’s a section in my thesis on “the dia-lectics of the abstract and the concrete” which is all about philosophical method, something which the Hegelian Marxists think is tremen-dously important. You have to understand the dialectic as a way of conceiving of philosophical method and its relation to science, which is sim-ply absent from the orthodoxy.

Finding that there was an intellectual culture that existed from the 50’s onwards and we needed to find a way into it because it’s one which is sus-tained by an oral culture as much as by pub-lished philosophical writings. And it seemed that a good way into this culture was to focus on a philosopher who was well thought of among this group (although they wouldn’t conceive of themselves as Marxists). He was Yakov Il’enkov, was tremendously important, and I re-solved to try and write an account of the Soviet
philosophical tradition which was focused on
him because important things were brought together in his work. One of the
important things was the conception of the mind which owed its origins to Vygotsky or at least to
these traditions within the intellectual cul-
ture of which Vygotsky is an excellent repre-
sentative. That’s why I felt in order to under-
stand Ilyenkov I had to understand the Soviet psycholo-
gical tradition which I believe informed his work.
It’s very difficult to trace the lineage of all these scholars because Soviet writers, despite
their insistence upon history as paramount to
your discipline, never write their own history be-
cause of the political difficulties in so doing. To
write history, to critically confront the past, was
difficult to do in the Soviet Union until very re-
cently. So you find in Ilyenkov no references to
debates of the 30s even though, in my view, his
work reproduces many of the central themes which were discussed in those years — includ-
ing Vygotskian psychology. So it’s very difficult
to say if Ilyenkov is a direct disciple of Vygotsky
or whether both of them are expressions of a
certain kind of Marxist tradition which runs
through the Soviet philosophical and psycho-
logical traditions. They are both derived from
the same source and hence the similarity or the
complementarity of their views is not a question of one influencing the other but of both being
immersed in the same base. So that’s what led me
to Vygotsky.

In Vygotsky there are a lot of the details con-
cerning issues Ilyenkov deals with. You find in
Ilyenkov, for example, a commitment to a certain
kind of theory of the mind, one in which the idea
of the mind as socially constituted is paramount,
you find certain kinds of philosophical argu-
ment which suggest that’s the way you have to
go. But you don’t find, as it were, the details of
what such a theory would look like if you want-
ed to apply it to Vygotsky. Hence, there’s a very interesting complementari-
ty between Ilyenkov and Vygotsky; in some re-
spects, Ilyenkov provides some philosophical
guns and Vygotsky complements that with some fine
detail, such as there is.

Holzman: Both of them, as Marxists, would take
learning and development to be social since ev-
everything is socially constructed. What Vygotsky
did was give some details about how you go
about showing the mechanisms of the social-
ness, and then he actually did illustrate some of
the mechanisms in relation to learning and de-
velopment, in relation to language and thought.

Bakurst: Yes, that’s a way of seeing it. Much
current philosophy and psychology still works in
a framework from the 18th century; there are
some who might find it difficult to take the idea
of our social being seriously. Ilyenkov repre-
ets one of many voices seeking to rethink the
philosophical framework in which we need to
think about what it is to be a person, what it is to
have a mind; what it is to have thoughts, and so
on. To a certain extent, that is also Vygotsky’s
project, but their orientations are rather differ-
ent. I hate to say one’s philosophical since psy-
chology is philosophical, and, further, that is in
a sense to use categories which neither of them
would adhere to, but ...

I think Ilyenkov’s agenda was to revise
Marxism after Stalin. He was writing in a post-
Stalin period, and in a sense it was a very
hard time for the Soviet tradition, with a
new generation of Soviet philosophers getting
back to Marx. In the course of that Ilyenkov
reintroduced certain aspects of the Soviet philo-
sophical tradition which were suppressed dur-
ing the Stalin period. One of them is the extent
to which Marx’s method owes a debt to Hegel.
another is the extent to which the theory of
objectification had to be a central part of a Marx-
ist theory of culture; and another is the extent
the individual as socially constituted. All of those
things were around throughout the Soviet trad-
ition but as slogans or mere assertions, whereas
Ilyenkov’s point of view was to give them real
philosophical content. So that’s what he engages.
In the course of that, he made some philosopphi-
cal moves which were very congenial to
Vygotsky.

Guillermo Blanck: I finished my university
studies at the University of Buenos Aires as a
physician and during my college years I prac-
ticed in the city’s psychiatric hospitals. So my
first approach — that I continue to this day —
was working in psychiatry, mainly psycho-
therapy, something that you could call cognitive
behavior modification. That is one part of my sci-
entific life. The other is my interest in the theo-
retical aspects of psychology. I have been work-
 ing in that for perhaps the last 20 years. My ap-
proach was to study all the different schools in
psychology and its history. Among them I found
the historical-cultural approach of Vygotsky,
amply through the work of Luria at the end of the
60s. Later I started to study Vygotsky’s work.
Now I have read almost all his work.

Holzman: In Russian?

Blanck: I can handle Russian a little bit, but I
have almost all his work translated for me into
Spanish. I have reached some conclusions about
psychology that are very similar to the ones
Vygotsky arrived at (I’m not trying to compare
myself to Vygotsky, of course — he was a ge-
nius). I always thought that psychology was a
great mess, that there is no clarity at all about its
task, its subject, its method, etc. When I read
Vygotsky’s “The historical meaning of the crisis
of psychology,” I realized that for years I thought
more or less the same things that he had written
50 years ago, e.g. the necessity of a theoretical
framework that can embrace all the available
knowledge in psychology.

In 1984 I presented a paper in English at the
International Congress of Psychology held in
Acapulco, where I defended Vygotsky’s system
as the most valuable theoretical framework for
psychology. It was the 50th anniversary of
Vygotsky’s death. Vera John-Steiner and I or-
ganized a symposium in honor of Vygotsky for
which I published a book I had edited especially
for the event, containing about 100 pages of my
writing and famous articles by Toulmin, Cole
and others, and even some Argentine, which I be-
lieve it was the first book — at least in the West-
ern world — covering all the different aspects of
Vygotsky’s theory. Later came much better
books — more sophisticated and profound —
but they didn’t cover the whole of Vygotsky’s
work. The forthcoming book by Rene van der
Veer and Jan Valsiner will be the most complete
of all.

In the 80s, I was chairman at the University
of Moron, taught Vygotsky there for five years and
wrote a lot of articles and chapters about
Vygotsky. In 1989 I was named chairperson of a
Vygotsky postgraduate seminar at the Univer-
sity of Buenos Aires, in the department of educa-
tion. This was an important seminar in Argenti-
na, the first one about Vygotsky in my country.
Now there are more.

Holzman: Is Vygotsky’s work becoming more
popular in Argentina?

Blanck: What is popular in Argentina now is to
try to regulate what kind of streets we are gong
down into hell! People are very worried about
other things. But yes, Vygotsky is a bit more pop-
ular. Piaget is the most important view in the
field of education, but Vygotsky is entering with
great strength.

Mariane Hegdegaard: I read Vygotsky in a course
developmental psychology in Copenhagen in

“He rejected the methodology
and results of Freud, but be
held in high esteem the kind
of work Freud was doing.”

— Guillermo Blanck
1965 and found him central to my interests in the development of thinking and knowledge. Later on, as I became more focused on the educational aspects of these developments, I was introduced to the work of Davydov on teaching mathematics. The translations of Vygotsky at that time were so selective; I could see that something was there, but there were so many gaps, especially concerning practice. In Davydov I found the practice. Then I could go back to Vygotsky and get much more out of it. Davydov laid everything out but very generally; Davydov helped me see what Vygotsky.

David Jersovsky: For me, as an historian interested in the history of ideas, science is a testing ground. I've been studying the history of 20th century science for a long time. I wanted to examine the influence Marxism had on the Russian Revolution and vice versa. In the course of investigating the conflict among Soviet philosophers in the 1920s-30s, I found they were arguing quite a lot about natural science. I'd written extensively on the conflict between science at large and the ideological establishment, focusing on the natural sciences — the Lysenko affair for example. Then there was the question of how it was that the establishment was throwing support to Pavlov even though Pavlovian ideas were out of step with science at large.

I approach Vygotsky from the historical view, placing him in the context of Russian history, to get a picture of what he and others were doing both before and after the revolution. I found that both his literary criticism and his Marxism have been ignored for the most part.

Jim Wertsch: I had a long term interest in the Soviet Union and Russia even when I was a kid.

Holzman: Where did that come from?

Wertsch: Probably from Sputnik. I don't know; there is no family connection. I was a mid-western WASP on a farm. But there were no Russians within a hundred miles. But I did have an interest in the Soviet Union; I learned a little Russian when I was a kid, and I took Russian as an undergraduate. My interest developed mostly after that. I first went to the Soviet Union in 1967 as a tourist. For my last year of graduate school I got a fellowship to stay there — it was for social scientists, not Soviet specialists — and then a junior faculty exchange for the year 1975-76, which was my first long stay in Moscow. I've gone back just about every year since.

In 75 and 76 my advisor in Moscow was Alexei Leonov's, with Michael Cole's help and other connections that year I met Luria and I worked a lot with him. Later met Zinchenko, Zapolrotsz and El'konin, the whole group. The next year, at Luria's request, I returned but unfortunately he died a month before I got there. Then the year I talked with all those guys, the more central Vygotsky became in understanding what they were doing. So I moved more and more into looking at Vygotsky's work and translating it, reading it, collecting it.

Holzman: What was your attraction to that work as a psychologist?

Wertsch: I started out as a psychologist but, during that '75-'76 year I realized that there was this missing link that we knew very little about, and that was activity. So, it was during that year that I started translating all those pieces that came out in The Concept of Activity in Soviet Psychology. It is more typical to start with Vygotsky and move to activity. — I kind of did, the opposite. But the more I went into activity theory, maybe because of my background, the more I thought that Vygotsky was really ingenious, insights about language, culture, semiotic mediation, in general, had not been appreciated by the activity interpretation of his work and that that's where its unique power for psychology lay. My work became much more focused on Vygotsky after that.

There were a lot of really world-class scholars in Vygotsky who I thought Vygotsky was just a different experience, it always was for me. This guy just always has something to say, even when he seems to be saying the same thing.

Holzman: I know. I feel the same way.

Wertsch: He certainly had a stronger intellectual mystique for me at that point as well. Again, it might have had to do with my own background being in language. It became a major attraction to try to come into contact with such a fantastic mind. It was always teaching you something in print, in this dead print way even, let alone if you would have met him. That really just pulled me in, in a way that made me focus on him for a long time. I feel more that way about Bakhtin now. It's not that Vygotsky's less smart than I thought but there's just so much you can do with one figure. Bakhtin now for me has the same kind of mystique, I guess.

Sieben Miedema: I'm not a Vygotsky expert. I haven't gone in depth into his work. I've read a little of his work and some about Vygotsky that has to do with the work that my colleague Rene van der Veer — he is one of the Vygotsky experts in that generation of people, but reading Vygotsky is just a different experience, it always was for me. This guy just always has something to say, even when he seems to be saying the same thing.

Holzman: I know. I feel the same way.

Wertsch: He certainly had a stronger intellectual mystique for me at that point as well. Again, it might have had to do with my own background being in language. It became a major attraction to try to come into contact with such a fantastic mind. It was always teaching you something in print, in this dead print way even, let alone if you would have met him. That really just pulled me in, in a way that made me focus on him for a long time. I feel more that way about Bakhtin now. It's not that Vygotsky's less smart than I thought but there's just so much you can do with one figure. Bakhtin now for me has the same kind of mystique, I guess.

Sieben Miedema: I'm not a Vygotsky expert. I haven't gone in depth into his work. I've read a little of his work and some about Vygotsky that has to do with the work that my colleague Rene van der Veer — he is one of the Vygotsky experts in that generation of people, but reading Vygotsky is just a different experience, it always was for me. This guy just always has something to say, even when he seems to be saying the same thing.
What is this revival about? What led up to it? Where is it going? Which leads to two other questions. One has to do with what I see coming out of this period as a well-developed debate about who Vygotisky was. It seems that what's new in the past year or two is a change from the problem of categories — was he Marxist, more a psychologist than a methodologist, etc. — to exploring who he was in his own right. While the debate is still often framed as if it were that, a Marxist, a Leninist, etc., there seems to be something more emerging. A contribution David Javorvsky makes is that he's trying to get at who Vygotisky was, while the work insists on categorizing him. Do you see it that way?

Bahkurst: I think what you say is very fair. I think in part it's simply a consequence of our developing understanding of Vygotisky and his world. Look at the situation in which Vygotisky was brought to the West: he was brought at a time in which his own works had just been re-published in the Soviet Union after being black-listed from 1936-56. When he first appeared in the West he appeared as a very mysterious figure and the work he had to be packaged for Western audiences. The first edition of Thought and Language was heavily cut; in retrospect, one could look back and say, "How silly — didn't they realize that all this methodology was not buildable; it was actually somehow essential to the work." But on the other hand, you could sort of understand how that came about. Vygotisky was known by that first Thought and Language for a long time: It wasn't until 1976 that Mind in Society and a few more articles were published. If you think of that situation, what natural questions are there to ask in order to challenge whatever conception it is that is emerging? This guy is writing in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution, an incredibly fertile time, at least in the early part of his career, and that doesn't seem to be present in these works. He looks more like someone who is arguing with Piaget to some extent and speaking to a debate which is very familiar to us — that's prime facie grounds to believe that we haven't got it right — where is the Marxist? It was cut out of the original version.

Wertsch: I think what benefited people like you, Lois, and me ten years ago was not just that Vygotisky was a great man that we discovered him, but that we discovered him at an opportune time. Because in psychology there was, at least at a theoretical level, increasing recognition that individuality really pulls you down certain paths from which you can't answer questions. More specifically, for example, in response to Chomsky's kind of Cartesian, nativist claim about strong linguistic hypotheses, there was the literature on mother-child interaction showing that in fact language is not a messy corpus that the kid "runs in to"; it's hypothesis need not be that strong in order for a child to sort out the appropriate well-formed utterances. The Piagetian paradigm was also running into problems in areas of cognitive development. Piaget had identified social correlates of cognitive development, but Vygotisky represented a quite different view on it. I think that as soon as those things started to open up a little bit, to make room for a new demand, a new perspective, Vygotisky appeared on the scene. And Vygotisky just makes a lot more sense and gives a lot more hope — to people in teaching and in clinical work for example — than do these other theories. Teachers hear Vygotisky and say, "Yes, that's what goes on; now I see why it works, and there I was trying to teach a Piagetian curriculum."

Anyway, Piagetian curriculum, at least in America, is kind of a pessimistic outlook. There's nothing you can do 'til the kids are ready and if they're not, then there is nothing you can do ever. It can be summed up in a nice thing Nikolaiitch Alexei Leon'tev once told Urie Bronfenbrenner; I'll paraphrase: "The fact that you say Americans is you and me. I think it is the only way to determine where the kid has been, and we're trying to figure out where the kid can go." That's what Vygotisky was after. Vygotisky really is a critic of naïve assumptions and the anthropocentric epistemology that at least an American interpretation of Piaget adheres to. So one of the major reasons for its sprouting ten years ago, with things like the publication of Mind in Society, is that we were ready for a change, we were looking for something. The same attempt at publishing, the same group of people, might have had much less impact at a different time.

I don't think it had that much to do with the 60's; we were already too far past it at that time. If anything — it's ironic — we were moving into a more conservative time when Vygotisky became popular. There is, as you just said, a critical mass that has been building, but then, this explosion — I think it's kind of a delayed one — people saw a space to really get going. You're talking about Soviet emigres, for one thing, like Alex Kozulin and Jan Valins. They saw the acceptance of the earlier versions of Vygotisky's book and took advantage of it.

Moll: Frankly, I'm baffled. Almost the opposite occurred to me. I was so immersed — putting together my book [Vygotisky and Education, ed] and trying to understand the social-historical aspect, as well as my own research — that when I went to other places to talk I was always surprised that no one knew what the hell I was talking about, and very few people had read Vygotisky. Being in San Diego you tend to assume — erroneously of course — that a lot of people are reading Vygotisky. So I'm still not sure there's been a proliferation of the ideas and the work.

In my own area of research there's not so much a shift as an increase in ethnographic importance and other qualitative methods, and researchers in that vein are attracted to some of the Vygotaskian processes — his emphasis on the importance of social relationships, social interactions — so that it becomes a nice match to the work you're already doing. Now that is both an advantage, because you become interested in this research, and a disadvantage, because I think many researchers are using Vygotisky in the way that Vygotisky criticized; many writers are using Vygotisky as sort of a tag on because it relates to something they're doing and they can go on.

There are also the specific social conditions. In my case it's easy to pinpoint. I'm interested in the education of Latin students. The kids and their families are at the bottom of the social order. So that when we seek interpretations of what's going on in school we always want to look beyond the classroom and beyond the school to the broader social conditions to try to make sense of what we're studying. In my case, these are the specific conditions that make Vygotisky attractive.

Now in the field in general, if there is indeed a proliferation, what broader social-historical factors contributed to that — I'm really at a loss. Joan Simon from Great Britain, who was one of the first ones to make Vygotisky available in the British, wrote a review of Jim Wertsch's book [Vygotisky and the Social Formation of Mind, ed] and started out by asking the very same question, "Why is this guy — a Marxist psychologist — becoming so popular in the US of all places?" There's really no satisfactory answer.

Holzman: Using Vygotisky as a tag on is a way to keep going in the direction you're going without making a radical change. Qualitativists have entered psychology and shown the limitations. The international political climate is changing so rapidly. All those categories that we

"I think many writers are using Vygotisky in the way Vygotisky criticized; many writers are using Vygotisky as sort of a tag on because it relates to something they're doing."

— Luis Moll
For those looking to lose weight, the importance of exercise cannot be overstated. Regular physical activity can help maintain a healthy weight, boost mood, and improve overall health. However, it's important to consider the benefits of different types of exercise and choose an activity that you enjoy and can sustain over the long term. Some popular options include walking, running, cycling, swimming, and strength training. It's also important to incorporate regular physical activity into your daily routine, even if it's just a short walk during lunch or a quick stretch before bed. With a bit of effort and the right mindset, you can make exercise a natural part of your daily life and enjoy its many benefits.
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We are the proud owners of a beautiful old house in the country, surrounded by fields and forests. The house is a century-old structure with wooden beams and stone walls, which gives it a unique charm. We have managed to preserve its original beauty and have added some modern touches to make it functional for our needs.

One of the most charming features of our house is the wrap-around porch, which we have transformed into a cozy outdoor living space. We have added comfortable seating, a fireplace, and a grill, making it the perfect place to relax and enjoy the beautiful views.

The garden is another highlight of our property. We have a mix of vegetable and flower beds, which we tend to throughout the year. We also have a small pond and a herb garden, which provides us with fresh ingredients for our meals.

We host occasional gatherings and events in our garden, and it is always a pleasure to see our friends and family enjoying the outdoors.

Overall, our house is a true haven of peace and tranquility, and we are grateful for the opportunity to call it home.
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