

ŠTÚDIE

E. MAZÚR

GEOGRAPHY OF TODAY AND ITS PERSPECTIVE

Under influence of steadily increasing amount of studies on pages of geographical and non-geographical journals even of several book publications of last years devoted to the theoretica-methodological questions of geography, a quite satisfactory impression might arise concerning the situation of present geography. The until lately relatively frequent statement of a crisis within this science might purport less credibly, at least in a perspective sense, from the viewpoint of development trend in geography. An integral view of its quite recent past and at last even its present situation as a science and its position in social practice, however, affords a less gratifying picture.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESENT GEOGRAPHY

Present geography is characterized by some external and internal marks. Of the external the increase and widening of geographical research compared to the past, the growing of publication activity, the introduction of geography to a considerable number of universities and scientific institutions, the increase of employment of geographers as experts in practice and in non-geographical scientific institutions and the like can be quoted. These features are shown favourably, however, only in a mechanical comparison with the past at an isolated view of geography. In the context with other sciences, for instance, with specialized geo-sciences (several of them even have grown from the bosom of geography), with biological and technical sciences, with social sciences, e. g. economy, sociology, psychology and the like, to say nothing of physics and mathematics at all, the trend of these apparently favourable marks in geography is quite painfully slow. In reality it means a delay and loss of geographical positions both in the scientific sphere and even in the social practice.

Of the internal marks of present geography in comparison with the past the following ones are shown: the dichotomy of the object of geography has deepened to a strict dualism, theoretico-methodological even organizational, and further to an extreme specialization of the research problems. Present geographical investigation is concentrated mainly to narrow problems thematical, regional, comparative, to technologico-methodical questions of the gathering and evaluation of factological material, is a considerable measure also to theoretico-methodological considerations and constructions above all for the creation of analytical schemes, eventually for the interpretation of the individual

elements of the geosphere or at most of some groupings of elements, physico- or economico-geographical.

The steadily greater and greater specialization of geographical research is for geography as a science of a multivocal incidence. On one hand, it means a precisioning of earlier methods and technologies, a vast increase in amount of various data and, generally, of the factological material, both from the viewpoint of quantity and quality, from the steadily wider scale of elements of the geosphere, it means a widening and precisioning of the experiment and comparison, an improvement in evaluating the data, the subject analysis and, of course, even a re-formulation of various earlier theories or a creation of new ones. Whole this process is strongly influenced by assuming and adapting the formulas, technological processes, models, and theories from other sciences being rapidly developing, beginning with mathematics and with cybernetics ending. We think of what is not quite justifiably called quantification or exactization of geography.

The positive qualities represented by this development are indisputable. But on the other side no small negatives are to be mentioned.

The deepening specialization of the research in geography and often a mechanical, epigonic taking over of the technics from other sciences has brought a considerable progress as mentioned above, especially as far as the matter in concerned the factological material, the technology of analysis and some partial theoretical approaches, but very little has shifted the making of the basic theory of geography. The specialized investigation often moves on the border of geography, even many times it crosses it. The investigation, at least in physical geography, remains prevailingly on the phenomenological basis, whereas in the branches of economic geography the diffusion of information from other sciences strongly accentuates the structural-functional aspect. The specialization leads gradually not only to the interremoval of physical and economic geography, but even to the further differentiation within both these branches, it may be said, to the atomization of geography, with unfavourable consequences, especially in the communication of information and hence, of course, even in searching for and formulating the basic integrative theory of geography, above all geographical synthesis.

The synthetical geographical researches are relatively rare and whilst they appear, they are built mostly on the principles of traditional geography, at most with some improvements.

The recent years only suggest here some turn stigmatized with several hints at the need of constructing the new basic integrative theoretico-methodological principles of geography and even the attempts at them. We shall revert to the evaluation of this latest trend still in another connection.

If we summarize, it may be hardly expressed another conclusion but that geography of today has come to a little favourable state, whether from the viewpoint of its inner development as a science or of its position in the society.

Under the light of developmental trend up to the present, the assertion of united geography becomes nearly a trivial phrase. The internal disintegrating, the atomization of geography has spread even to the organizational structure of geographical institutions, most frequently in a dualistic form, but not rarely even in a further particularization. Not even the supreme world's organization of geographers, the IGU, eventually its commissions and sections did avoided that state, unfortunately.

The open even less open assertions and discussion of a crisis in geography did not arise by chance and without being founded. Many attempts appeared to explain this state, to search for a chance, to search for the ways of further direction of geography.

In this study, we shall try proceed to the evaluation of present state of geography from the aspects seem to be not adequately taken hitherto into consideration. It is namely the context of geography with science generally, with its laws and dynamics of development (theoretico-methodological aspect), and the context with the society (practical aspect).

HISTORICAL ASPECT OF THE POSITION OF GEOGRAPHY AMONG SCIENCES AND IN THE SOCIAL PRACTICE

From the previous lines an apprehension could arise that present geography is in a depression or perhaps in an impasse. In the following pages we shall show that such an apprehension need not be founded within the context as pointed in the latest lines of the previous passage. On the contrary, the state of present geography — no matter how unfavourably shown — is or at least it can be only a phase of development in its historical aspect as of a science.

The developmental line of any science is very complicated, namely due to many and at the same time variable dynamical bonds with the social sphere (whose component it is), with other sciences, even with the features of its own objects of study.

In dependence upon the dynamics of these multilateral bonds the internal development of any scientific branch, consequently even that of geography passes the phases of prime, but also stagnation even crisis. According to general laws of science every scientific branch develops in two lines: the analytical-empirical and the synthetical-theoretical ones being narrowly connected and influencing each other (36, 37). If in some periods these two lines go too far from each other, whether from the viewpoint of subject or time, it shows within the development of a given science unfavourably. On the contrary, an even and symmetrical development of both these directions is reflected in an intensive development of the theory of given science and outwardly it strongly shows both directly, and indirectly in the social practice. The history of the internal development of a science passes hand in hand with the history of its practical and social application.

Geography as one of the earliest sciences at all reached its first summits from the viewpoint of recognizing the earth and had a considerable social importance as early as in the course of the 16th and 18th centuries.

Its scientific-recognizing media corresponded, of course, with its period (with the niveau of its science, philosophy, even social and practical needs). Of course, these media led to the results of a descriptive nature strongly marked by subjective approaches. Yet geography of that period does not appear as a science with its own special theoretical and methodological basis.

The constitution of geography as a modern science with a specific scientific conception is a matter of such late period as the 19th century, when it reaches its culmination even from the viewpoint of social application (exploration voyages, rise of the great geographical societies — British, French, German and so on).

For understanding the conception of geography of that period we can correspondingly to W. K. D. Davies (1966) lay stress upon the fact that A. v. Humboldt and C. Ritter died in the same year, when Ch. Darwin published his „Origin of Species“. The conception of their works laid, of course, upon the prevailing philosophy of science of the pre-Darwin period and bore the marks of interpretation of the nature's basic unity. This unity in manifoldness stood upon the teleological conception. Their approach

to the study of object, inductive in substance, was tributary for that period, too (confr. Davies).

In the second half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries under the influence of Darwin's evolutionary thesis a new philosophy penetrated from biology even to other sciences and showed expressively even in geography within the deterministic conception. Deduction and generalization stand out to the foreground.

The influence of possibilism in geography arising against the deterministic conception bore up as shown by W. K. D. Davies next to the positive features, especially from the methodological viewpoint even many negative ones. The considerations of a single object as well as the personalization of space (region) did not allow the application of logical analysis and experiment (confr. also W. Bunge, 1966). The scientific conception of the basic aim of geography, the spatial synthesis was reaching a deadlock by means of those theoretical and methodical media that were at disposal to geography.

In the further we consider for necessary to point out briefly a further important moment in the development of the scientific conception of geography, namely the bond of the above mentioned two lines, analytico-empirical and synthetico-theoretical.

The formulation of the basic geographical principles of the 19th and early 20th centuries is namely in a close connection with the state of factological knowledge. These ones were from the cartographical viewpoint relatively good, although not complete and not sufficiently detailed. The observations were, although, let us say, global already, but at the same time very uneven, occasional. The descriptions were qualitative in substance, strongly subjective and various statistical data one-sided etc. In a word, the niveau of the analytico-empirical line hardly allowed a theoretico-methodological generalization of another niveau than formulated at that time.

This very outlined evaluation of geography and of its scientific approaches does not want be, in any case, a condemnation of the past. On the contrary, we should like to show that geography has had since long ago its theoretico-methodological conception corresponding and developing within the context with the development of science and philosophy generally.

W. O. Thornburry's motto of the pioneers in geomorphology formulated as "... in his own day and way" in his book *Regional Geomorphology of the United States* (1965) can be applied even to the creators of the conception of geography in last two centuries.

It is necessary to mention the third aspect more, namely the position of geography in the social practice. This reached its summit in the 19th century and only slowly decreased in early 20th century. The strong industrial development of that period, the need of raw materials and markets, endeavour to control the till that time under-used regions of the world, military reasons, in a last but not least turn the longing for recognizing of new countries etc. needed such information from geography as geography was in the state to render it. The niveau of geography corresponded to the practical needs of that time.

The intensive development of natural, technical even social sciences, which to a such positive measure influenced the development of geography in the 19th and early 20th centuries, accelerates even further on in this century, even the industrializing process accelerates and at the same time even social changes and new demands on science occur. The reflection of this process is in geography above all the differentiative trend inwards geography. A closer and closer specialization appears up to a gradual becoming independent as to its individual disciplines.

The trend of inner differentiation in geography reached its height in mid this

century. An extraordinary deepening in the theories on the landscape elements, further the experimentation, the making of experimental stations, the mathematization and the like, in a word the exactization, but in the differentiated or narrowly specialized direction as outlined. What we named geography consisted often of an uncontinuous mosaic of partial disciplines beginning with geomorphology and ending with the individual branches of economic geography. The regionally syntetizing approach to studying the landscape receded in that period strongly back.

Stronger and stronger was shown assymetry in the development of synthetico-theoretical and analytical lines in geography, in a strong backwardness of the former. While the basic theoretical propositions of general and regional geography formulated as early as the late 19th and the early 20th centuries have not been nearly further developed, the study of individual elements of the landscape as well as the level of their analysis have acquired an unprecedented size both from quantitative and qualitative sides, especially during last 3 — 4 decades.

The reflection of backwardness of the synthetical-theoretical line of geography is, of course, a disharmony of the theory of general and regional geography with partial analytical pieces of knowledge. Along a further deepening of specialized researches, this situation led up to a skepticism as regards geography as a unitary science, to an atomization of geography to a whole series of disciplines associated with traditional-formal elements. With that is, of course, connected the stagnation of regional geography as the syntetizing science of landscape as well as of its theory. The specialized geographical researches began exceeding the terms of geography and on the contrary several natural and social branches entered the field of regional geography, even there began their forming some new ones aimed at the regional problems (e. g. regional science).

This fact had a considerable influence upon the position of geography even in the social practice. By the deepening specialized research, geography has acquired on the one hand some new positions in practical life of the society (applied geomorphology, erosion of soils, pedogeography, geography of settlements, of population, of industry, and further economicogeographical disciplines), but on the other hand geography „has almost vacated the field“ as a syntetizing science of the landscape in the social practice. The regional studies and textbooks built in substance upon the principles formulated some decades ago cannot correspond to the contemporaneous analytical knowledge, nor to satisfy the practice. Although the notion of „geographical“ or „of geography“ has become a very used one in the common practice, it is conceived in substance as a formal notion without the real contents in the full sense of word. The decrease of significance of geography, especially of regional one, in the social practice is reflected even in its evaluation. Geography becomes gradually an academical and school subject more and more, without its social-practical hinterland.

GEOGRAPHY AND THE CHANGING WORLD

Let us analyse at least roughly present society, namely from the aspect of structural changes running in it and often being included under notions as scientific-technical revolution, population explosion and the like. The notion of population explosion is often reduced to the relatively accelerated increase of population on earth in comparison with the backward production of foodstuffs. Very significant are, however, even further realities. The geographical distribution of population becomes on the one hand more and more uneven, on the other hand, however, the settlement of the earth's surface is

gaining a continual structure. The unprecedented development of scientific-technical knowledge gives to man the means for a literal girdling of the globe with various kinds of means of communication, for a steadily accelerating exchange of information even removing of people and products. Man fills the landscape with various kinds of technical structures more and more, directly even indirectly more and more man interferes with environment that he lives in. That necessarily leads to a relative reduction of space, to a thickening of interacting elements of the social system. Even the inner structure of this system changes, namely in a very large scale of attributes, whether economic, sociological, or spatial-geographical and the like. Let us mention, for instance, urbanization processes, the changes in production-economic sphere and their reflection in the professional structure of society, increase of the tertiary sphere, the change of living style etc. The process of the changes outlined does not get settled, on the contrary it accelerates.

The outlined aspects of the scientific-technical revolution would be still very onesided, if we did not mention at least roughly the progress proper of science and technics in present time. In the structure of society as a system, there appear these elements in a permanent interaction with the above mentioned and further ones. Science and technics provided man with basic conditions for the expansion outlined. It was, above all, the phenomenal, highly specialized research, which led as far as splitting atom.

Since the birth of modern science in the 19th century a systemical increase of the significance of phenomenal research, a gradually greater and greater specialization of sciences accompanied by an astonishing development of exact analytical methods may be followed.

On contrary the syntetizing, integral disciplines strongly lagged theoretically even in the social-practical significance. The outlined evolutionary trend of scientific research fully satisfied the industrialized society and reflected in a certain hierarchization of sciences from the viewpoint of social-practical significance. In foreground emerged the narrowly specialized technical disciplines, further physics, chemistry, mathematics, of geo-aimed and biological sciences mainly monothematical branches, similarly like some narrowly aimed social-scientific branches as well. Deeply beneath them stood the syntetizing disciplines, whether from the viewpoint of theoretico-methodological level or of social-practical significance. The steadily greater and greater splitting of science becomes gradually a retarding moment, namely not only in consequence of the inflation of information, but even of the differentiation of scientific language as far as mutual misunderstanding (cfr. 6, 11).

If for science or society, let us say, in the quite recent past, was enough to be acquainted with phenomena or the qualitatively founded syntheses based upon an accidental, subjectively constructed or intuitively conceived correlation of phenomena were sufficient, today science tries to find a chance by constituting general theories founded exactly, a common language of science or a philosophy of science for further progress of scientific recognition are being searched for (cfr. 7, 8, 11, 4).

In accord to the inner need of science there appears even a social-practical requirement of the integrational approach to solving the problems emerging from the changes of the social system. The scientific-technical means given and being given by a narrowly specialized science to man's hands, in consequence of the relative even absolute thickening of social system, call for a creation of an adequate regulative mechanism, if they are not to be turned against man himself. What above called as relative reduction of space and acceleration of development of the social system, intensified penetration of man and of his creations into the geosphere, into the landscape, in

practice stands for the extreme process of urbanization with further development of industrialization, with technization in agriculture, forestry, shows by overcrowding of intraurban traffic, of daily and weekly commutation to work, by regular even seasonal congestion of communications by the stream of transportation means, stands, however, even for air pollution in steadily larger and larger areas, increase of noise, contamination of water sources, but even increase of requirements for new water sources and the like. The change of living style and existential regards bring steadily greater and greater crowds of people into the movement to the oases of silence and rest, in other words the requirements for new areas of recreation increase, new demands on the sources of foodstuffs, raw material etc. appear. As contrasted with it, there is the limited globe, the geosphere. By the parceling into state and national systems it is limited even more. Here the phenomenal or singularist scientific approach merely for solving the tasks is not sufficient more. Necessary becomes the multisided integrating approach of synthetical sciences and inter-scientific cooperation.

The scientific-technical revolution shows in the field of science by changes whose import is not so far fully understood and estimated. The changes reflect both in the theoretico-methodological platform, partly even in that of problems (rise of new scientific disciplines), and necessarily they must show even in the hierarchization of social-practical importance of sciences. Several synthesizing branches held until lately for out-of-date, non-practical, non-exact, educational, academical and the like (which was regarding their often qualitative, subjectivistic approach to a considerable extent even substantiated) are strongly changing even at keeping their traditional studying objectives. Of the classical disciplines may be mentioned here, for instance, philosophy, economy, sociology, psychology, demography, ecological biology, logic and the like. The objects of their study remain roughly the same as in the past, however, with a far thickened, variable and dynamical contents. Revolutionarily, however, changes their theoretico-methodological platform, thanks to the immense development of exact sciences, especially mathematics, physics, chemistry, even to a great amount of analytical material gained by the specialized branches of natural, technical and social sciences, due to the increase of technical means for experiments and the like. The absorption of these informations and their synthetical, integral, theoretico-methodological interpretation open to classical and newly-rising synthetical disciplines new horizons for an integral system-like approach to studying their object from the theoretical side even from the practical point of view (cfr. 7, 8, 26).

It shows apparently more and more, that what had been held as known, from the viewpoint of further research for perspectiveless, is in the sense of the new integrating approaches oftentimes a terra incognita.

What do we know about the geosphere, about the landscape as a whole, about the spatial system? And do not let us go to Africa, nor to primeval forest of the Amazon, or to the areas of poles, but let us remain in the old cultural Europe, at home. We know much about the relief, soils, climate, waters, vegetation and fauna, about the population and settlements, industries, agriculture, transportation, distribution etc. We are informed about them both by the various branches of geography itself and by specialized geo-aimed and human disciplines. But about the landscape from the spatial-synthetical (integral) viewpoint we know about them very little. Under the light of present knowledge, especially of the general theory of systems, we do not put more the question, whether the landscape (geosphere) is the sum of the above mentioned and further components (elements) or whether it is something more. The landscape as early as in traditional geography, especially in the French school and in others, was something

more, when even adequate means of expression for this „more“ might be missing. In the landscape the individual components (elements) appear mutually related (interacting) in a new reality, functional even structural. In this sense we hold it to be an objective reality.

As the landscape (geosphere) was the object of traditional geography, as remains and should remain even the object of present and future geography. It is true, in the integral (system-like) concept the landscape is no static, but dynamic and developing one. The matter is here, perhaps, not only the changes conditioned by variations of relations (interaction) of the constant elements of landscape, but even and mainly the changes conditioned by the quality and quality of interacting elements.

The landscape (geosphere) was formed at first, in fact, by physical (abiotic) elements, with the appearance of life on earth new elements enter the system, the landscape becomes a physical-biotic system, and with the appearance of man it gradually slowly changes into a physical-biotic-social system. It is to be mentioned that with the change of number (with increase) of elements of the landscape system even the changes in development rate of the landscape system are connected. The biotic elements largely dynamize the original physical system, the social ones, in turn, accelerate the previous physical-biotic system.

THE CHANCE OF GEOGRAPHY IN PRESENT TIME

As it follows from the previous text, geography is being backward to a considerable measure behind the generally very fast development in present science, above all from the viewpoint of philosophy of science. The enormous amount of new knowledge on a high level of analysis, with an increasing quantitative trend, is without an adequate interpretation and generalization, in a word, the synthetico-theoretical line is strongly being backward behind the analytico-empirical one. The reflection in the social practice is a relatively small importance and application of geography. The scientific media of geography are not sufficient till now to conceive and interpret the object of its own study, the geosphere, adequately, in its complexity and dynamics.

In spite of this little agreeable state of geography, we do not consider it for an exceptional, chanceless, but for one the normal developmental phases. The development of geographical thinking of a few last years indicates that the matter is perhaps a key-phase with a perspective of a new rise in geography.

Whole a series of geographers, no doubt under the influence of the immense growth especially of the so called exact sciences and technics as well as of the exactization or quantification process in sciences in general, arrive in present time at searching for a way out even in geography.

We shall not consider here, of course, of the studies taking over mechanically and epigonically advance of other sciences, namely prevailingly in the individual specialized branches of geography within the analytico-empirical line. Such a so called mathematization or exactization is situated in a deadlock. It shows that quantitative aspect and mechanical transfer of various procedures, attempts to create models and the like are little successful simply for the reason that the geographical elements that are handled, are above all from the viewpoint of classification and systematics of traditional geography mostly fully unsuitable for such „modern“ operations. Let us mention as an example the innumerable attempts to unify the legend of geomorphological map. Similar picture is shown even in other branches of geography.

The way out should be searched for on a far wider basis, in progress of the synthetico-theoretical line, in transfer of the philosophy of present science, of its theoretico-methodological conceptions, in transfer of mathematical logic and reasoning, and not only in transfer of formulas and technological procedures. In the diffusion of knowledge from other sciences the object of ours, the geosphere, should be always kept in view, namely as an object rapidly developing, to a great measure differing from the object of geography of the past. The object remains the same, but its contents changes strongly. In convergence of knowledge of the individual branches of geography to the fundamental problems of geographical reality lies the perspective present state to be overcome.

For disproportion between the analytico-empirical and synthetico-theoretical lines to be removed, it is necessary the repeated evaluation of the latter regarding the accumulated facts and knowledge of the former as well as a construction of a new conception in the context with present state of science. The opinion that one of the substantial features of modern science is it to be a cumulative and progressive one (confr. W. K. D. Davies, 1966), points at a possibility and need to remove the disproportion outlined above.

As also W. K. D. Davies (1966) has pointed out, an improvement in relations with modern science has taken up its place in geography, with a quickened steps, roughly just in last ten years. Even when geography had its conceptions in the past, with a changing aim in the different time, Davies stresses the need of new approaches and formulations. It is to be stressed, however, again, that the conceptions of traditional geography built on knowledge based on the phenomenological approach to the study and led into the endeavour to define and conceive the unique. Already E. Jones (1956) and especially W. K. D. Davies point out mainly the influence of physics and chemistry upon the change from the approach in studying from the phenomenological basis to the approach structural.

A critical evaluation of the significant representatives of the conception of traditional geography, A. Hettner and R. Hartshorne, from the new positions, appears already in F. Schaefer (1953), then in W. Bunge (1962), B. J. Berry (1964), W. K. D. Davies (1966) etc. Above all the relatively extensive work by W. Bunge should be emphasized, with a wide scale of worked up theoretical problems in geography with a non-traditional approach, especially the spatial-structural aspect. It is necessary to mention even several works endeavouring to search for a new philosophy of geography, partly with the traditional, partly with non-traditional approach, as by V. A. Anutchin (1963), H. Bobek — J. Schmithüsen (1957, 1967), H. Carol (1963), E. Neef (1967) and the like.

As a basic new theoretico-methodological approach, or philosophy of science, General System Theory strongly penetrates to sciences since mid this century (L. v. Bertalanffy — 1956, 1960, W. R. Ashby — 1958, A. D. Hall — R. E. Fagen — 1956, K. Boulding — 1956, V. G. Afanasyv — 1967 etc.), in substance on the basis of revived holistic philosophy (J. C. Smuts — 1967). Not an attempt to create a mathematical base for it misses (O. Lange — 1966). As the generalized ears (K. Boulding — 1956) for convergence of scientific information it is accepted by B. J. L. Berry (1964), already before him by R. J. Chorley (1962) in geomorphology, further by A. D. Howard (1965), by J. Urbánek (1968) etc. Of course, the process of discussion of the new basic theoretico-methodological problems in geography is not limited only to the question of mathematization or of system-like theory, but necessary it reaches even the further fields by diffusion from logic, systematics, biology, economy, sociology, cybernetics etc. (confr. E. A. Ackerman — 1965, D. L. Armand — 1964, R. J.

Chorley — 1964, R. Domański — 1964, 1965, 1967, J. R. McDonald — 1966, K. Dziewoński — 1965, D. Grigg — 1965, T. Hägerstrand — 1967, P. Hagget — 1965, J. Kostrowicki — 1967, S. Leszczycki — 1965, J. Paulov — 1966, B. B. Rodoman — 1965, E. O. Stone — J. Dugundji — 1965, Z. Wysocki — 1965 etc.). We can observe even some critical calling to the application of system theory (see M. Chisholm — 1967).

CONCLUSION

Closing these remarks and considerations, it can be, perhaps, stated, that present geography is situated in a nodal point of its development. The diffusion of knowledge of present science gives all the predispositions, at an adequate adaptation to the object of geography, for the progress in development of the synthetico-theoretical line of geography and for removing the disproportion towards the analytico-empirical one. The trend of geographical literature of last years indicates here a way out in searching for suitable media for conceiving the dynamic and at the same time heterogeneous inorganic-biotic-social object of geography as an integral spatial system. The system-like approach allows studying the individual elements of the geosphere individually or within various combinations (e. g. physico-geographical landscape, economico-geographical landscape, system of relief forms and the like (as partial systems on various taxonomic level. The handling of systems as abstract structures makes a suitable space for quantification, it makes possible the adaptation of approaches in physics, chemistry, biology, cybernetics, economy, sociology etc. Of course, at the same time, it calls for an adequate classification and systematics of elements, and here geography cannot do without formal logic and mathematics. The very broad and heterogeneous object of study in geography calls for a wide, multilateral approach.

The basic aiming of modern geography at spatial synthesis may put this science into the position that can give scientific basis for territorial settling of economy, for creation of suitable living environment etc. and gain an adequate import in the social practice again. Studying the system of natural elements and elements of the socio-economic sphere within the interrelation of space and time, with an aim to attain a setting bounds to territorial systems (geosystems), is even of an extraordinary theoretical significance for all science. Not divergence, but convergence, cumulative and progressive geography has a chance, theoretical even practical.

From the Slovak translated by A. Krajčír

REFERENCES

1. Ackermann E. A., *Where Is a Research Frontier?* Annals of the Ass. of Am. Geogr. Vol. 53, No 4, 1963. P. 429—440. — 2. Afanasyev V. G., *O principach klassifikacii celostnykh sistem.* Voprosy filosofii, 1—6, 1963. P. 31—43. — 3. Anutchin V. A., *Teoretické problémy geografie.* Praha 1963. — 4. Ashby W. R., *General Systems Theory as a New Discipline.* General Systems Yearbook (Ann. Arbor. Mich.) v. 3, 1958. P. 1—6. — 5. Amand D. L., *Logičnosť geografičeskich klassifikacij i schem rajonirovania,* Izdatelstvo Nauka, Moskva 1964. P. 33—53. — 6. Berry B. J., *Approaches to Regional Analysis: A Synthesis.* Ann. of the Assoc. of Am. Geogr. vol. 54, 1964, P. 2—11. — 7. Von Bertalanffy L., *General System Theory.* General Systems Yearbook (Ann. Arbor. Mich.) v. 1, 1956. P. 1—10. — 8. Von Bertalanffy L., *Problems of Life.* New York 1960. P. 205—211. — 9. Bobek H., *Gedanken über das logische System der Geographie.* Mitteilungen d. Geogr. Ges. Bd. 99,

H. II/III, Wien 1957. P. 122—145. — 10. Bobek H. — Schmithüsen J., *Die Landschaft im logischen System der Geographie. Zum Gegenstand und zur Methode der Geographie*. Darmstadt 1967. P. 257—276.

11. Bouldig K., *General Systems Theory. The Skeleton of Science*. General Systems Yearbook (Ann. Arbor. Mich.), v. 1, 1956. P. 11—17. — 12. Bunge W., *Theoretical Geography*. Lund Studies in Geography. S. C. No. 1, Lund 1966. — 13. Carol H., *Zur Theorie der Geographie*. Mitteilungen d. Öster. Geogr. Ges. Bd. 105, H. I/II, Wien 1963. P. 23—38. — 14. Chisholm M., *General Systems Theory and Geography*. Inst. of British Geogr. Trans. No. 42, London 1967. P. 45—52. — 15. Chorley R. J., *Geomorphology and General Systems Theory*. U. S. Geol. Survey Prof. Paper 500—B, 1962. P. B1—B10. — 16. Chorley R. J., *Geography and Analogue Theory*. Ann. of the Assoc. of Am. Geogr. vol. 54, 1964. P. 127—137. — 17. Davies W. K. D., *Theory, Science and Geography*. Tijdschrift v. Econ. en Soc. Geogr. 57. Jg. No. 4, 1966, Rotterdam. P. 125—129. — 18. Domański R., *Procedura typologiczna w badaniach ekonomiczno-geograficznych* (Typological Procedure in Geographic-Economic Research). Przegląd geograficzny, t. XXXVI, z. 4, 1964. P. 627—660. — 19. Domański R., *Problematyka metodologiczna ogólnej przestrzeni ekonomicznej*. Przegląd geograficzny, t. XXXVII, z. 2, 1965. P. 195—311. — 20. Domański R., *Konstruowanie teorii w geografii ekonomicznej* (Construction of theories in economic geography). Przegląd geograficzny, t. XXXIX, z. 1, 1967. P. 85—102.

21. McDonald J. R., *The Region: Its Conception, Design and Limitations*. Annals of the Ass. of Am. Geogr. Vol. 56, No. 3, 1966. P. 516—528. — 22. Dziewoński K., *Zagadnienia integracji analizy kartograficznej i statystycznej w badaniach geograficznych*. (Problem of integration of statistical and cartographical analysis in geographical research). Przegląd geograficzny, t. XXXVII, z. 4, 1965. P. 585—597. — 23. Grigg D., *The Logic of Regional Systems*. Annals of the Ass. of Am. Geogr. Vol. 55, No. 3, 1965. P. 465—491. — 24. Hägerstrand T., *The Computer and the Geographer*. Inst. of British Geogr. Trans. No. 42, London 1967. P. 1—19. — 25. Haggett P., *Locational Analysis in Human Geography*. London 1965. — 26. Hall A. D. — Fagen R. E., *Definition of Systems*. General Systems Yearbook (Ann. Arbor. Mich.) v. 1, 1956, P. 18—28. — 27. Howard A. D., *Geomorphological Systems — Equilibrium and Dynamics*. Amer. J. Sci., Nr. 4, 1965. P. 302—312. — 28. Jones E., *Cause and Effect in Human Geography*. Annals of the Association of American Geographers vol. 46, No. 4, 1956. P. 369—377. — 29. Kostrowcki J., *Zagadnie specjalizacji i integracji w geografii ekonomicznej* (Problem of specialization and integration in economic geography). Przegląd geograficzny, t. XXXIX, z. 1, 1967. P. 13—32. — 30. Lange O., *Celek a vývoj ve světle kybernetiky* (The Whole and Development in the Light of Cybernetics). Varšava 1962.

31. Leszczycki S., *Zadania regionalizacji ekonomicznej* (Tasks of Economic Regionalization). Przegląd geograficzny, t. XXXVII, z. 2, 1965. P. 273—293. — 32. Neef E., *Die theoretischen Grundlagen der Landschaftslehre*. Gotha, Leipzig 1967. — 33. Paulov J., *Niektoré problémy a aspekty exaktizačného procesu v geografii*. Geografický časopis, r. XVIII, č. 3, 1966. P. 252—268. — 34. Rodoman B. B., *Logičeskie i kartografičeskie formy rajonirovanija i zadači ich izučeniija*. Izvestija AN SSSR, s. geogr. No. 4, 1965. P. 113—126. — 35. Schaefer F., *Exceptionalism in Geography: a Methodological Examination*. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, vol. 43, 1953. P. 226—249. — 36. Sorokin P. A., *Sociological Theories of Today*. New York—London—Tokyo 1966. — 37. Spencer H., *Principles of Sociology*. Vol. I. London 1885. — 38. Smuts J. C., *Holism and Evolution*. London 1927. — 39. Schumm S. A. — Lichty R. W., *Time, Space and Causality in Geomorphology*. Amer. J. Sci. 263, Nr. 2, 1965. P. 110—119. — 40. Stone R. O. — Dugundi J., *A Study of Microrelief — Its Mapping, Classification, and Quantification by Means of a Fourier Analysis*. Eng. Geol., 1/2, 1965. P. 89—187. — 41. Urbánek J., *Zosuny a teória systémov* (Slides and System Theory). Geografický časopis, r. XX, č. 1, 1968. P. 18—33. — 42. Wysocki Z., *Zagadnienie taksonomii geograficznej*. Przegląd geograficzny, t. XXXVII, z. 2. 1965. P. 313—339.