TRAN. INST. INDIAN GEOGRAPHERS Vol. 23 No.1&2 2001

Indian Geography : An Encounter with Reality

R. D. DIKSHIT*

The purpose of this address is to review and diagnose the status of geography in India both as a branch of learning and as a profession contributing to the task of building a better society. Every living discipline is required to engage in such a soul searching exercise periodically in order to asses what direction it is moving in and what are its achievements and failures in relation to the rapidly evolving technology and societal perspectives; and to see how far the practitioners of the profession have kept pace with the ongoing changes in the discipline's philosophy and methodology. One hardly needs to state the obvious: The geographical profession in India over the past half-century has failed to keep pace with the progress in theory and practice of geography internationally. Such a failure had posed little problem before the mid-century when "region" and regional geography reigned supreme under the Richthofen-Hettner-Hartshorne dispensation until 1950– be it as areal–differentiation or areal organization (Platt, 1957) or the French tradition in regional geography built around the concept of genre de vie. During the whole of this period the pace of conceptual progress was slow, and the changes were seldom transformational in nature, so that lagging behind in conceptual advance did not make much of a difference.

All this had suddenly changed around the mid-century following all round questioning of the traditional wisdom about the "region" (Kimble, 1951; Schaefer, 1953), which was now decried as exceptionalist and, therefore, antitheoretical and anti-science in ethos. By the mid-1950s geography had changed focus from **area** (areal differentiation and areal organization) to **space** (the study of distance–based relationships–social, economic and political). This implied change over from absolute space to relative space: thus paving the way for the change-over from description to analysis, and from the study of places as unrepeatable entities to the study of areal/ spatial phenomena as particular cases in the manner of the systematic sciences, so that the mathematical mode of reasoning began to be insisted upon.

This was the beginning of the Quantitative Revolution. The pace of progress was so rapid that, according to Burton (1963), the revolution was over by the early 1960s. The frequency with which new ideas came into currency was so rapid thereafter that within the span of a decade we had three different "revolutions"– behavioural, humanistic, radical-Marxist– following one another in quick succession. Whereas the humanistic perspective had focused on the role of human agency, the radical-Marxists concentrated on the role of structural relationships in the explanation of the man-environment system. Thus, to begin with, the two perspectives were treated as alternative ways of looking at man's relationship with the environment. However, following the convergence between the spatial and the historical materialist perspectives in the late 1970s-early 1980s, and the coterminus end of the conceptual barrier between society and space, that had so far separated the spatial from social (and thereby had stood between geography and the rest of social science), the humanist and Marxist perspectives on the man-environment system now began to be treated as mutually complementary view-points.

The convergence between the spatial and the historical materialist perspectives marked the change of focus in the study of geography from the earlier emphasis on **relative space** to **relational space**, so that by the end of the 1980s human geography had become increasingly focused on the **study of the spatiality of human**

* Presidential address XXII Indian Geographers' Meet Shantiniketan, 9th January 2001.

life in all its manifestations–social, economic, and political–thereby raising the status of human geography as a core social science discipline: one sharing active research frontiers with every other social science discipline–whatever its subject of study–since every aspect of human organization, inevitably, is spatially rooted. Thus, as we enter the twenty-first century, geography stands out as an open-ended field of inquiry, in the truest sense of the term.

Most of this conceptual progress has passed Indian geography by, so that as a body of professionals we currently lag behind by almost a quarter of a century in terms of our discipline's over all concepts and theory. The result is that Indian geography has ceased to matter, both as a community of scholars at the international level, and as a useful social science profession contributing to the task of building a better society at home. It is high time that we face the reality and initiate urgent steps to redeem the situation.

The most essential step in recreating Indian geography is to open up the intellectual horizon of our students through a sound programme of training in the discipline's philosophy and methodology, as it has evolved over the past 50 years, through a truly contextual perspective on the course of this development, in order that the technological, intellectual, and societal cross-currents that had necessitated the successive transformations in theory and practice of geography, are suitably underlined. Only a thorough grounding in the philosophy and methodology of the subject can help to awaken students' consciousness about the status of geography as a socially useful discipline. Only such a broad-based perspective can stimulate the student to engage in socially challenging research.

The next most important step in the reconstruction of the discipline (and the profession) pertains to a logical restructuring of syllabi at all levels but most particularly at the Bachelor's and the Master's level incorporating the latest thinking on the spirit and purpose of geography. Part one of this paper presents a brief review of the progressive transformations in the spirit and purpose of geography over the past half century, whereas the second part is focused on the problem of recreating Indian geography as a lively field of inquiry.

The Changing Philosophy of Geography

A review of progress since 1950

From the very beginning, modern geography as a field of scientific learning has occupied an anomalous status between natural and physical sciences–focused on particular types of natural processes or circle of facts–on the one hand, and the social sciences–focused on particular types of societal functions and phenomena–on the other. The root of the problem lay in that under the prevailing concept of science in 18th century Europe, it was believed that any field of scientific study could either be man-centred or nature-centred, but not both. Geography studied neither man nor nature for its own sake. On the contrary, its subject matter was focused on the earth as the world of man. Thus, as a discipline focused on the study of man's relationships with nature in particular segments of the earth surface, geography represented a cross-breed discipline that kind of belonged neither to one nor the other. The result was that geography remained completely isolated from the mainstream intellectual discourse both in the natural and the social sciences, since the intellectual climate of the 18th and 19th century Europe was dominated by a fragmented perspective on natural vis-à-vis social reality.

The German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) had fully appreciated this epistemological difficulty regarding the status of geography in the classification of fields of knowledge, so that he presented a two fold grouping of the ways of acquiring knowledge : one logical and the other physical.

The former grouped individual items into separate classes on the basis of morphological similarities in the processes of their origins. This was the basis of the division of knowledge about earth phenomena into a series of natural systems (systematic sciences). In the course of time they found their parallel in social, political and economic system each of which became the focus of separate social science discipline. Such a scheme of classification ignored consideration of place and the time of occurrence of the concerned phenomena or processes. This aspect was taken care of in Kant's physical classification, which grouped phenomena that belonged to the same place and/or to the same time. Grouping of phenomena in terms of time is history (or historical science, of which geology is the other example); and that in terms of space is geography (spatial science, of which astronomy is the other example). History studies phenomena that are arranged vertically in a time sequence (historical periods), whereas geography studies phenomena that are arranged horizontally on the earth surface as a whole and its particular parts (called places and regions). Thus while history is narrative, geography is descriptive in approach. The two together fill up the entire circumference of human experience. Unlike the systematic sciences, neither history nor geography is a subject discipline. By virtue of their conceptual structure, both geography and history focus on the study of phenomena of diverse origins existing together: in terms of time periods in the case of history, and in terms of spatial segments (regions) in the case of geography. As such, both are perspective disciplines; each representing a particular way of looking at problems and things–called temporal in the case of history, and spatial in the case of geography. Accordingly, both history and geography are integrating in approach.

In everyday experience time and space are inseparable: The one cannot be imagined without the other. However, in their over-enthusiasm to emulate the nineteenth century model of science as pre-eminently an analytical mode of thought, geographers began to view time and space–history and geography–as mutually unrelated and independent of each other. The proponents of both areal-differentiation and post-Schaefer spatial science schools of thought had insisted on separation of time from space, so that the spatial context was treated independent of, and unrelated to, the temporal context. By divorcing space from time–the being of the diverse phenomena under investigation from the process of their becoming–the geographers unwittingly restricted their vision to here and now of the landscape in the given areal segment and, in that process, completely ignored the explanation of how the landscape in question had come into existence, and how it had been progressively transformed into a different kind of landscape, through the varying impact of the ongoing changes in resource utilization.

The reason why geography became isolated from the other fields of systematic study, both natural and social scientific, is easier to explain. Geography could not become a universalizing discipline in the manner of the other physical and biological sciences, since it lacked a well-defined subject matter of its own that could be isolated and analyzed in the way it is done in the other experimental sciences. Likewise it failed to develop as a social science since there was no focused attempt to mould the discipline in that direction until our own time, so that space was treated independent of time and social organization in which it was embeded. Insofar as isolation from the social sciences and history was concerned, the most important reason was that, from around 1880 to the end of the First World War, a series of sweeping changes in technology and culture had given rise to distinctive modes of thinking about, and experiencing, time and space : "Technological innovations including the telephone, wireless telegraphy, X-ray, cinema, bicycle, automobiles, and airplane established the material foundation for this orientation;

independent cultural developments such as the stream-of-consciousness novel, psycho-analysis, Cubism, and the theory of relativity shaped consciousness directly. The result was a transformation of the dimensions of life and thought" (Kern, 1983, pp. 1-2).

For reasons yet to be fully explained, the period between 1880 to 1920 was also marked by progressive consolidation among social science theorists of an interpretative prioritization of time over space, so that : "from ontology (how we define the nature of being in the abstract) and epistemology (the study of how we know or accumulate knowledge about the world) to the explanation of empirical events and the interpretation of specific social practices, the historical 'imagination' seemed to be annihilating the geographical" (Soja, 1889, p. 323). The tendency towards historicism of theoretical consciousness had become so pervasive by around 1920 that it remained almost unquestioned for the next half century, so that historicism became the central motif of the newly emerging social science disciplines as well as the current Marxist discourse. In such a scenario modern geography was "squeezed out of the competitive battleground of theory construction and attempt to make sense of the dramatic changes affecting then contemporary society and social life" so that : "the once much more central role of the geographical analysis and explanation was reduced to little more than describing the stage-setting where the real social actors were 'making history'. Social theorization thus came to be dominated by a narrowed and streamlined historical materialism, stripped of its more geographically sensitive revisionisms (e.g. the utopian and the anarchist socialisms of Fourier, Proudhon, Kropotkin, Bakunin)" (Soja, 1989, p. 323).

As Soja (op.cit., p. 324) has noted , there was considerable sensitivity to geographical issues in the writings of Lenin, Luxembourg, and others, especially to the complexity and possible necessity of geographically uneven development (and imperialism) in the survival of capitalism. However, all through this period Marxism had remained overwhelmingly historicist in perspective and approach, so that in Marxist analysis and discourse, the motive force behind uneven development was viewed as quintessentially historical–representing the process of making history through the struggle of social classes. The Marxists viewed the geography of this process as an external constraint or an incidental outcome. The result was that: "the instrumentality of space was increasingly lost from view in political and practical discourse. The politics and ideology embedded in the social construction of human geographies and the centrally important role which the manipulation of these geographies played in the survival of capitalism seemed to become increasingly invisible and mystified" (Soja, 1989, p. 325). Pointing to the inherent inadequacy of the current Marxist social science discourse arising out of it aspatial perspective, Lefebvre (1976, p. 21) wrote: "Capitalism has found itself able to attenuate (if not resolve) its contradictions for a century, and consequently, in the hundred years since the writing of Capital, it has succeeded in achieving 'growth'.... **by occupying a space, by producing a space**". Lefebvre asserted: "Space has been shaped and moulded from historical and natural elements, but this has been a political process. Space is political and ideological. It is a product literally filled with ideology" (Lefebvre, op. cit., p. 31). The growing realization about the missing link in the Marxist perspective in the analysis of social relations paved the way to according a greater role to spatiality in the study and analysis of social organization, so that the 1970s witnessed considerable fusion between the historical materialistic and spatial perspectives in interpreting human organization and societal relations. The rise of Marxist geography and the renewed call for social relevance in geographical research in the 1970s were byproducts of this fusion.

Another important factor in the disciplinary isolation of geography during this period was

that in the closing decades of the 19th century and the first twenty years of the twentieth, under the influence of the social Darwinist thought, as reflected in the works of Ratzel (1844-1904) and others, geography had become so closely identified with environmental determinism (even though modern scholarship is convinced that Ratzel was more of a probabilist than determinist in perspective) that with the rejection of environmentalism and physical-external explanations of social processes and formation of human consciousness, human geography was thrown out of the bathwater of environmental determinism.

Another source of isolation lay in the modernist political strategies current during this period :

Those seeking the demise of capitalism... tended to see the spatial consciousness or identity–in localism, regionalism, nationalism–a dangerous fetter in the rise of a united world proletariat or a deviant utopian "fetishism" of territorial society, equally necessary to combat especially at the level of the capitalist state. Those seeking reformist solutions saw in a similar phenomena an uncontrollable inefficiency, over-eager rebelliousness (when in opposition to national patriotism) and a possible threat to the especially benevolent power of the state and instrumental social "science" (Soja, 1989, p. 326).

Another source of disciplinary isolation was that through a faulty interpretation of Kant's scheme of the division of knowledge, since around 1920 until the end of the 1960s, geography had favoured a goal of investigation independent of the goal of other sciences, so that : "In our search for a solid footing...many of us tried to separate ourselves from other sciences...and some of us saw geography as an end in itself rather than in the broader context as a contributor to a larger scientific goal" (Ackerman, 1963). Owing to this, geography stood separated from both the specialized disciplines of the social sciences (where construction of social theory was taking place) as well as history, its co-equal partner in filling up the entire circumference of human perception (as Kant put it). The tragedy of geography lay in that under the influence of Marxist thought, putting phenomena in a time sequence had become much more significant and revealing to the social theorists of every stripe than putting them beside each other in space. The result was that :

The historian as a social critic and observer, history as a privileged interpretative perspective, became prevalent and accepted in academic and popular circles. In contrast, geography and geographers were left with little more than the detailed description of outcomes, what came to be described as the areal differentiation of phenomena...It was almost as if a high wall had been raised between time, being, and society on one side, space on the other, keeping human geography and social production of space apart from history, its making and its makers....[So that] Modern geography was reduced primarily to the accumulation, classification, and theoretically innocent representation of factual material describing the areal differentiation of the Earth's surface–what in more contemporary terms might be called the outcomes of geographically uneven development.....[This had continued until late 1960s, since] with post war recovery and economic expansion in full flow throughout the advanced capitalist (and socialist) world, the despatialization of society was at its peak (Soja, 1989, pp. 327-328).

The rapproachment between spatial and the historical materialist perspectives through the initiative of Western Marxism in the late 1960s and the 1970s (partly reflected in the Marxist geography of that decade) eventually led to the rise of a new critical human geography around 1980. Such a development shook the foundation of value free geography of the spatial science tradition. But the hold of positivist thinking was so strong that despite

this development, spatial analysis had continued to be business as ever well into the 1980s, so that human geography remained unsettled in its critical stance. Nevertheless the scope of theoretical interface between modern geography and the spatially sensitive Western Marxism had continued to expand, leading to the flow of ideas in both directions, and resulting in a critical debate on the appropriate theorization of space, focused on the spatiality of human life. Out of this two-way flow of ideas came a compelling call for reformulation of social theory. The convergence between the spatial and historical materials perspectives had brought about a radical change in the ways we look at, conceptualize, and interpret not only space but the whole range of relationships between space, time, and social well being; and between human geography, history, and society. Thus the stage was set for "the making of geography" to be combined with "the making of history", and for the development of more whole-some interpretative framework for the study and analysis of social consciousness, social structuring, and social action (Soja, 1989, pp. 318-319). Such a cross-fertilization of ideas has marked the birth of what has been described as "postmodern critical social theory" incorporating the best of modern geography and Western Marxism. Such a social theory is both spatial and historical materialist at the same time, so that David Harvey (1985, p.144) wrote that, "the historical geography of capitalism has to be the object of our theorizing, historico-geographical materialism the method of our inquiry".

Close on the heels of the breaking down of the impasse between the spatial and historical materialist perspectives, had followed the fall of the barrier between space and society, that had previously separated geography from sociology. Geography and sociology are both parasitic in nature, in the sense that both the disciplines depend on the other sister disciplines for the raw material of their research. In the case of sociology, its autonomy is diluted by the fact that there are a multiplicity of perspectives on society, so that the sociological concepts and propositions cannot be easily demarcated from commonsense concepts and propositions. Owing to this it is difficult to establish some kind of progressive research programme in sociology. Accordingly, sociology specialises in theoretical innovations about social structures and relations which may often originate in discourse outside sociology itself. Thus, one of the primary functions of sociology is to promote inter-discursive debate and confrontations of theoretical nature on questions relating to the social dimensions of human life. Sociology, therefore, is an open ended discipline where there are few prescriptions about do's and don'ts. In geography, however, until recently the discourse had been more centralized in nature, owing to the geographers' conceptualization of space (and the spatial) as something independent of, and unrelated to, time and process–physical, social, economic and political. Under the circumstances, in the period between 1920 to the end of the 1960s, the sociological element impinged on the geographical only in the sense that much of the subject matter of geography as the study of the earth surface as the world of man, is focused on spatial organization and distribution of social (human) phenomena. But still there was conflict over the exact degree the character of social relations should enter into either the description of what was being explained, or into the processes which were required to explain the phenomena in question (Urry, 1989, p. 296). This is where the opening of geography to Western Marxism proved crucial in bringing about rapproachment between the sociological and the geographical imaginations. The marriage between the two perspectives was facilitated by the fact that the central concern of geography is the relationship between man (human being) and nature; this is also the basic concern of Marxism. Thus, since around the middle of the 1970s social relations became progressively more central

to geographical discourse. "There have been numerous ways in which constructive overlap has recently developed between sociology and geography. Perhaps the best illustration of this is found within the writings of 'sociologist' Giddens and the 'geographer' Gregory and their mutual interest in post-Marxist social theory and Hagerstrand's time geography" (Urry, 1989, p. 304).

The logical futility of attempts to separate the spatial from temporal and systematic–from time and process–was underlined by Blaut way back in early 1960s, when he drew the geographers' attention to the basic distinction between "absolute" space–"a distinct, physical and eminently empirical entity in itself", representing a place or spatial structure in which the phenomena are rooted–and "relative" space, which represents "merely a relationship between events or an aspects of events, and thus bound to time and process" (Blaut, 1961). David Harvey advanced this line of thought further when he noted that the problem of conceptualizing space "is resolved through human practice with respect to it", and added: the question 'what is space?' is therefore replaced by the question "how is it that different human practices create and make use of distinctive conceptualization of space?" (Harvey, 1973, pp. 13-14). This represented the **relational view** of space, according to which "space is contained in the objects in the sense that an object can be said to exist only insofar as it contains and represent within itself relationships to other objects" (Gregory, 1994a). Thus, distinction is sought to be drawn between **social space** and **objective space**. Thus, human geographers today maintain that social construction of space and social implication of space (**spatiality**) should be grounded not in objective space (or objects in space) but in man-made space (place or locale) within which social practice takes place. Thus, human geographic analysis of social space today is increasingly focused on relations of class, ethnicity, and gender "which are inscribed in (and in part constituted through) its places, regions, and landscapes. In this sense, spatial analysis has indeed become social analysis and vice-versa" (Gregory, 1994a), since "Place...always involves an appropriation and transformation of space and nature that is inseparable from the reproduction and transformation of society in time and space" (Pred, 1984, p. 279).

Thus, since around 1980, a considerable convergence between spatial and sociological perspectives in the study of social structuration or **The Constitution of Society** (Giddens, 1984) has taken place. The British sociologists Anthony Giddens' (1979, 1981, 1984) concept of social structuration–a theoretical perspective to account for the ways in which people learn about and transform social structures; an attempt that underlines the falseness of attempts at drawing a distinction between social relationships and spatial structures, since spatial structure is the medium through which relations are produced and reproduced–has been the source of many new ideas and perspectives in current human geography (most particularly the much talked about locality debate in British geography, which represented an extension of the concept of structuration to the explanation of spatial structures and the process of restructuring economies) so that Doreen Massey (who pioneered the movement toward locality research in Britain through her influential work, **Spatial Division of Labour**, 1984) urged that an understanding of areal variations in social, economic, and political change was important in any scheme of restructuring of regional economies in Britain (as elsewhere).

With the adoption of structuration as a spatio-social process, both by sociologists and geographers alike, the barrier that had supposedly separated the spatial perspective from the social, economic, and political spheres of man's life upon the earth surface, could no longer be sustained. This heralded the end to the almost three-quarters of a century old academic isolation of geography from the rest of social science. Today it is a universally

accepted premise in social science that every aspect of human organization–social, economic, and political–is spatially constituted. As Castells (1977) wrote: "Socially speaking space, like time, is a conjuction, that is to say, the articulation of concrete historical practices". As Soja wrote: "Spatiality and temporality...intersect in a complex social complex process which creates constantly evolving sequence of spatialities, a spatio-temporal structuration of social life which gives form not only to the grand movements of social development but also to recursive practices of day to day activity". This change-over in perspective from the earlier segmented and exclusive concept of space to an all-inclusive and open-ended view of space as the medium of intersection between social, economic and political, was essentially a reflection of the changed societal perspectives in the face of globalizing and post-modernist context of the late 1970s and 1980s. The 1960s and 1970s represented a period when social equilibrium was the conventional wisdom, so that conventional solution to societal problems was sought in social engineering, incorporating inputs from science and technology, that supposedly held the key to all problems. In the changed contexts of the 1980s this could no longer suffice, since the changed scenario called for both a greater focus on human agency as well as on structural imperatives of societal relations. Thus, along side the fall of conceptual barrier between space, society, and history, the 1980s also witnessed rapproachment between the humanist and the historical materialist perspectives, so that by the end of 1980s it had come to be widely believed that the study of human geography raises theoretical questions as to the nature and relationship between the individual and society, and that human agency and social structure are equally integral to social and spatial understanding (Harris, 1989).

Human geography's current focus (since late 1980s) on the inherent spatiality of life–human spatiality or socio-spatial dialectic–has contributed to relocate the geographical way of looking at problems at the centre of social science theory and practice. With such a changed perspective on place and space, geography has now been transformed into an all-inclusive and open-ended field of inquiry focused on the inherent spatiality of human life in the total context of the man-environment system, thus making it simultaneously both an environmental and a social science discipline, in the true sense of the two terms. This is a long distance away from the man-environment relationships tradition of late nineteenth and early twentieth century, or from the "geography behind" tradition in the study of political, economic or social geography in the manner of A. E. Moodie (5th edn. 1963). In such a geography there is no dichotomy between the physical and social aspects of the discipline, between moral and material, and between time and space–so that questions of do's and don'ts have become meaningless. Geographers today are amply alive to the central reality that progress in any branch of knowledge–particularly so in the social sciences–is far from an autonomous, disembodied process with its own internal and inexorable logic. We need to remind ourselves that disciplinary progress in any subject represents a history in which we are implicated, both as members of a profession and as aware citizens. Thus, as part of the social science fraternity, geographers are concerned to discover not only the world in which we are living, but also to discover, as geographers, how we inhabit, reproduce and change that world (Kobayashi and Mackenzie, 1989, p. 1).

Toward Rebuilding Indian Geography

The new found awareness regarding centrality of space to social organization and social relations among intellectuals at large has opened up a great opportunity before geographers which we must seize upon, and adjust our disciplinary perspectives

accordingly. From the earliest beginnings of geography as a formal discipline, representing a definite body of literature and a course of study, two sets of objectives have guided the selection of its content and method. One is concerned with providing an introduction to geography as a branch of learning, and is focused on the nature of geography as a field of study–the kind of data geographers deal with, the types of questions they ask, and the methods by which they try to seek answers to those questions. All through the ages scholars have been busy evolving progressively better ways of accomplishing the task of introducing the nature of geography through clearer and more illuminating exposition of its basic premises and concepts. Traditionally the next most important disciplinary objective has been to provide a useful image of the contemporary world as the human habitat, in the widest connotation of that term. In drawing this image, geographical concepts are used to highlight the present day conditions in different parts of the earth surface, both physical and human, so that the drawing of the image includes due attention to the socio-economic and political problems faced by the resident population in particular places, and seeking ways and means of resolving those problems with a view to facilitating the task of planners and public administrators. The primary purpose of this objective, for a long time, was focused on the role of geography as a core discipline in liberal education aimed at preparing the younger generation as informed and responsible citizens. Strabo's geography was the classic example in the writing of geography to fulfill this purpose.

Until the 1960s geography was pre-eminently a descriptive discipline. By the end of that decade, however, social engineering had caught the imagination of geographers, so that the new generation of geographers began to focus increasingly on the social scientific role of their discipline. This contributed a third major objective of geography which, beginning with the search for social relevance in geographical work in the early 1970s, has since concretised into an explicit focus on the spatial constitution of society and, therefore, on the inherent spatiality of human life.

While the first objective represents the theoretical face of geography as a branch of learning, the second and third relate to its practical and utilitarian aspect. The three are interdependent and inseparably interlinked. However, this was not always so. In the period following the Age of Humboldt (1790-1859), the first two objectives were treated as mutually incompatible: one could choose one or the other, but not both, so that general (systematic or theoretical) and special (regional) geography became competitive rather than complementary. Under the leadership of Hettner and Hartshorne regional geography, focused on each area as a singular assemblage of piece of land and a group of people, became the dominant focus of the subject, so that conceptual and theoretical (including systematic and topical) aspects of the discipline suffered neglect.

Dissatisfaction with such an idiographic focus in the study of regions had led, in the 1960s, to the rise of "new geography" now focused on topical and systematic study, with an explicit theoretical focus. Simultaneously the central focus of study shifted from areal organization (interrelation between diverse elements in particular places) to spatial interaction (distance base relationships). This had marked a major break in the purpose and methodology of geography. Until around 1950 geography had focused on description of the observed world: It had focused on each spatial (areal) segment as a singular assemblage of diverse phenomena organized into functioning whole (which geographers called region), which geographers believed, was not repeated elsewhere.

Early in the 1950s, the notion of singularity associated with the concept of region was rejected. The critics emphasized that the

regions were not singular but unique. A singular phenomenon is one that cannot be accounted for by any set of general principles. A unique phenomenon, on the contrary, represents a particular interaction of general principles; it can, therefore be accounted for by understanding what those general principles are, and how they have been combined in that particular case. If regions are unique (and repeatable), then theory and generalization become as relevant to the study of regions as they are to any other phenomenon. Such a change in perspective represented reincarnation of geography as a "science"–spatial science–emphasizing the "where" part of the general question: "What, Where, How and Why" that science addressed. However, it was soon realized that the scope for theory and generalization was far too limited if one restricted attention only to "where", so that attention quickly shifted to "how". The argument was that to understand form (or pattern) it was necessary to understand mechanisms–the process–through which form was created. It was contended that on this basis geographers could identify the laws of spatial form–pattern laws–to explain arrangement of phenomena on the earth surface. Following from this was the idea that, likewise, it was possible to identify laws of human behaviour producing those forms. It was argued that a combination of the separate set of laws obtained in the course of such a programme of study, should help explain the whole complex–thus the complete spatial organization–of the regions or places under investigation. Such a belief reinforced the trend toward dividing human geography into a series of specialized branches, each focused on particular aspect of human organization. Thus, the three broad divisions of human geography, focused respectively on the social, economic and political, were further subdivided to create superspecialities. Thus, economic geography soon lost its original identity, as the focus now shifted to agricultural, industrial, and transport geography etc. The net outcome of such a splitting and superspecialization was that the new generation of geographers soon lost sight of the core concern of geography focused on the study of places as organized wholes.

Thus, until the mid-1960s we had a common identity as geographers–physical or human. By the end of that decade the picture had completely changed. Almost overnight we were transformed into specialists without (in most cases) understanding the rationale of that specialization. By the early 1970s, all of a sudden, we had become spatial scientists, even though the overwhelming majority was innocent of the ongoing debate (since the early 1950s) on the philosophy, methodology, and content of geography. The result was that until almost the end of the 1980s the terms "areal" and "spatial" were used interchangeably; place and space were treated as one and the same thing, since we had failed to distinguish between absolute and relative space; and the concept of relational space was hardly ever referred to until the second half of the 1990s. Thus, Indian geography has, by and large, remained stuck with the concept of geography as a discipline that was prevalent elsewhere in the 1960s.

Until the mid-1960s the general pattern of postgraduate syllabi in Indian univeristies had comprised courses of study on Geomorphology and Climatology (sometimes only a single comprehensive course on Principles of Physical Geography), Human Geography (informed by predominantly ecological perspective on man-land relationships, including contributions of Blache, Brunhes, Huntington, Semple and Griffith Taylor, as also rudiments of settlement patterns). Regional Geography of selected continents (usually Asia, Europe and North America, though often times only the latter two, since Asia was covered at the undergraduate level), India, and Economic Geography of the World. In some university departments the regional component was shortened to accommodate a general course on World Political Geography. Besides there

was Practical Geography and Map Work–one comprehensive course in each of the two years of postgraduate study. The terms philosophy and methodology of geography were virtually unheard of until the end of 1950s (as had been the case in most university departments in Britain, where most of the leading lights of our profession in the 1950s and 1960s had been trained).

Toward the end of the 1960s, the new wave of specialization had caught the imagination of Indian geographers in a big way, so that those who had written their Ph. D. dissertations on landuse now began to call themselves agricultural geographers (sometimes applied geographers). Likewise there had emerged new specialists by the name of urban geographers (though not rural geographers, since the village could not be chosen as a subject of dissertation in the manner the town was), and population geographers. Simultaneously the more substantive branches such as social, economic, and political geography had almost disappeared from the scene. Before long, urban geography (focused on urban morphology in the style of A. E. Smailes) went out of fashion since pursuing urban geography in the social scientific (sociological) mould now called for wider exploration in unfamiliar regions; and there was no readymade model to copy and fill in the gaps, as was the practice in the case of agricultural (landuse) and population geography.

Around this time, regional languages had become the preferred medium of examination (even if some teachers still insisted on lecturing in English), since by this time the standard of linguistic competence in English had rapidly declined. By the end of the 1960s, the westward march of scholars for higher training in Europe and America had also stopped, so that opportunities for imbibing fresh ideas and keeping pace with current developments in the discipline, had completely dried up. The new graduates seeking enrolment for doctoral research now look for topics that could be pursued with the minimum linguistic ability in English (which continued to be the medium at this level), on which readymade models were available to be copied as framework, to which the process data could be fitted. Although the research content of such dissertation was thin, the so called quantitative revolution had made this kind of research exercise fashionable. Besides the work could be completed within the minimum prescribed period. By the mid-1970s, yet another manageable topic in the quantitative mode had appeared in the form of the geography of elections, focused on quantitative manipulation and mapping of published data on party performance (Dikshit, 1995). Hardly any substantive research on social and economic geography (apart from those on population and landuse) was reported during the period. In such a scenario it may appear somewhat strange for political geography (which had almost disappeared as an active field of study and teaching in most universities in the 1960s) to stage a come back and emerge, by the second half of the 1970s, as a sought for option at the postgraduate level. But here again, notwithstanding the enthusiastic reception accorded to The Political Geography of Federalism (Dikshit, 1975), no substantive research has so far been reported. There are, however, definite signs of better quality work to come in the future (Das, 1996, 1998; Chaturvedi, 1996).

Late in the 1990s the profession appeared to have become somewhat self-conscious about the philosophical and methodological stagnation of the discipline, so that research interest in the quantitative mode in population, agricultural and electoral geography had rapidly declined, though substantive research has yet to begin. The real tragedy of Indian geography today lies in that no serious attempt is underway to diagnose the underlying cause of this all round stagnation. The fact of the matter is that such a thorough diagnosis is not possible without a sound grounding in the cross-currents of geographical theory and practice over the past three decades. As Preston James (1969) noted, before the mid-

century the pendulum of conceptual structure of geography "used to swing back and forth with intervals of many decades. [Since the early 1960s]...the pendulum...[had started] producing new geography almost every year with thoroughly confusing results". Fortunately, stable conditions now prevail since the 1990s, so that it is easier to look back and learn. This address represents an insider's assessment of what ails our profession, and how to rebuild it.

The fundamental difficulty with the approach which had stressed upon the concept of geography as spatial science, in the 1960s and the 1970s, was that it was misconceived within human geography in the sense that it gave space an autonomous status as an independent variable separately influencing human behaviour. As humanist geographers were to note later, the practitioners of human geography as spatial science had failed to appreciate the basic point that space is in fact a human creation which is continuously constructed and reconstructed to fulfill the progressively changing societal needs in the face of ever-changing technology of resource use. While granting that people create spatial forms both in their minds and in the empirical world, the humanist thinkers denied the need for spatial analysis–mathematical and statistical analysis of data relating to points, lines, areas and surfaces–since, it was contended that, focus on form detracts from the real task of understanding (Johnston, 1985a, p. 18). This explains why the geographers' engagement with spatial disparities in regard to data relating to agriculture, population and party performance in electoral contests and the like, over the past three decades, has failed to contribute to our understanding of everyday reality, so that as a discipline we failed to prove our worth as a useful profession. Another reason for the failure of such systematic studies to contribute to understanding lay in that the systematic specialist had continued to follow the empiricist tradition of the pre-1960 regional geography. But whereas the traditional regional geography was exceptionalist–it emphasized the singularity of each place–the new systematic geography was positivist–it focused on generalization and universalism. It sought to develop geography as science by focusing on the development of laws of spatial behaviour and forms. It was assumed that human behaviour is subject to the operation of general laws of cause and effect, which can be identified through the process of hypothesis testing. Thus, description of particular situations were frequently interpreted as case studies of processes, which could be extrapolated and used as the basis of generalization about other places. Borrowed in human geography from the natural sciences, the positivist model had contained a strong universalist element, so that behaviour observed in one place was assumed to be typical of all behaviour. As Johnston (1985b, pp. 329-330) wrote: "Whereas this may be entirely justifiable as a foundation for studying physical and biological (non-human) sciences, its relevance to the study of human societies, characterized by their cultural and historical depth and decision-making of intelligent beings, is dubious".

In the 1980s such a universalist assumption came under increasing criticism from geographers of a variety of philosophical pursuasions who were convinced that such a n approach is invalid. The emphasis since the mid-1980s is on promotion of geography as a discipline. "Which recognizes the variety of human responses to environment, space, place and people and which presents the world as a complex mosaic of different places, not as a series of examples of some general models of behaviour" (Johnston, 1985b, p. 330). Over the past thirty years our teaching and research had failed to catch up with the rapid pace of the overall development in the philosophy and methodology of geography. It is high time that we make up for the deficiency. The need for restructuring the discipline is all the more urgent in view of the revolutionary changes in communication technology contributing to transform the world into a

virtual global village, so that the old ways of looking at time and space are proving inadequate in the pursuit of understanding the volatile present.

How Should Restructuring Be Done?

Indian geography today urgently calls for a thorough overhaul at every level–from the lowest to the highest. This paper, however, is addressed only to the problem of rebuilding geography at the postgraduate level–the actual training ground for professional geographers.

As a discipline focused on the study of the earth surface as the human habitat, geography must necessarily be concerned with both the physical as well as man-made elements of the landscape, which together constitute our environment. Physical and human geography, therefore, are equally essential components of the discipline. However, since the beginning of the twentieth century, "increasingly, the problems with which geographers deal are those relating to men in society and less to those concerning the physical characteristics of the earth" (Ginsburg, 1969). That, by no means, downgrades the importance of physical geography as a basic component of the discipline. It only means that focus in research has generally shifted away from it. The fact remains that without a sound grounding in the knowledge about the earth environment, it is difficult for a geographer to justify fully his professional identity, which is inescapably tied to the study of places and regions as well-defined ecological entities, born out of a series of intricate relationships between a piece of land and a group of people, who have transformed that physical entity into a human creation. Besides each place or region is studied in the context of the whole of the earth surface as a single physio-social system of which it is a subsystem. Concern with environment has now become so specialized, following the threat to global ecological balance in the face of overexploitation of resources beyond the natural capacity of such resources to renew themselves, that–owing to superficial attention given to the teaching of physical geography in India over the past 30 years–geography is today in danger of losing its identity as an environmental science.

However, in any scheme of restructuring of courses of study in the discipline we must bear in mind the central reality that man is the measure in geography, so that we study the physical earth not for itself (as other branches of physical science do), but primarily as the human habitat. Accordingly, the central objective in the study of physical geography, since the beginning of the twentieth century, has been to develop an understanding of the earth's environment and resources with a view to developing the ability to appreciate the problems, potential, and prospects of development as posed by the local environment in different parts of the earth, besides developing understanding of the earth environment as a single system. Such a perspective on physical geography had also been necessitated, at least partly, by the nature of student intake in our universities and colleges: He is a rare student (and a rare teacher) who was trained in physical or biological science at the undergraduate level. Thus, in view of the current structure of geography as a discipline, physical geography remains a relatively smaller component of our structure, especially at the postgraduate level where our primary task is to develop geography a socially relevant (useful) discipline–one whose graduates are suitably equipped as trained professionals ready to rub shoulders in the task of resolving societal problems of various kinds by contributing to illuminate the problems under investigation from a socio-spatial and ecological perspective.

Any disciplinary restructuring must begin with the fundamental premise that a discipline is a field of study, an organized body of information, and a method of inquiry–the three things rolled into one. The term "field of study" refers to the nature of the data studied, and

the kind of questions asked by the practitioners of the field. Indeed, a discipline's data and its boundaries are defined by the type of questions it tries to seek answers to. Secondly, every discipline is an organized body of knowledge, so that the structure of the field refers to the way in which facts and concepts are related. Disciplinary structure includes the concepts, generalizations, and theories of the field, which give focus and direction to inquiry: The concepts are the tools of inquiry, so that they differ from discipline to discipline. A thorough grounding in disciplinary theory–the philosophy and methodology of the field–is therefore the foremost priority in professional training. In this context, it should also be noted that disciplinary structures keep evolving progressively, as new information is added, and existing concepts are modified or changed to cope with it. Change also occurs following the development of new and improved techniques of collection and analysis of data which was previously considered beyond the power of the discipline to study.

Geography in India is one of the rare examples of an established discipline in which little attention is paid to the students' training in disciplinary structure. Since around 1970 most university syllabi at the postgraduate level include a course on the history of geographical thought, essentially structured in the style of Dickinson's **Makers of Modern Geography**–focused more on the makers than the thing made. Besides, the narrative seldom goes beyond the so-called quantitative revolution, so that there is all round illiteracy in respect of the post-1970 developments in geographical theory. Indeed, at no stage in his training, from the school to graduate level, is the student ever taught the basic concepts and methodology of geography. Partly this is a legacy of the British system of education, wherein geography had developed as part of a liberal system of education, and was focused on providing information about the distribution of phenomena on the earth surface, and some limited knowledge about the processes in the physical environment. Teaching of geography in the British universities was aimed at producing graduates to teach in secondary schools. Accordingly, the focus was on content rather than on philosophy and methodology. This had continued well into the 1960s. The situation was quite different in case of Germany (the home ground for most conceptual developments in geography until the 1930s), France, and the United States. In Britain, concern with theory and methodology began in a focused way only with the publication of **Frontiers in Geographical Teaching** (Chorley & Haggett, 1965), which was a prelude to the two editors highly influential **Models in Geography** (1967). The trend to include a course on the History of Geographical Thought in our syllabi, around 1970, was influenced by the winds of change blowing over British geography at the time. This source of inspiration was soon to end as we closed the window on English, so that, conceptually speaking, Indian geography had stopped growing over the last thirty years–some exceptions here and there notwithstanding. Serious attention to the students' training in theory and methodology of geography should, therefore, be our first priority.

In order to do justice to the subject matter philosophy and methodology, three one semester courses, devoted respectively to: (1) Concepts and Methods, (2) Evolution of Geographical Thought from Ritter and Humboldt to 1970 (including a short introduction to the earlier developments), and (3) Evolution of Geographical Thought: Post-1970 Developments, should be introduced. The first part may later get incorporated into B.A./B.Sc. syllabi. As regards the second and third, the approach to the history of geographical thought should be pronouncedly contextual, wherein each contributor, and each episode in conceptual development, is placed in the social political, and intellectual context of its time; so that the inherent continuity through change in the theory and practice of geography is duly impressed upon the mind

of the student. In the case of the annual pattern of teaching and examination, each part should form a separate half-paper of three hours duration, and the courses should be imparted one after the other in that order.

Another essential aspect of the training of the geographer as a professional relates to toning up of his consciousness about geography as an environmental discipline, focused on the study of and in society. Other specialists in the social sciences identify the geographer as some kind of man environmental specialist–one with adequate appreciation of environment related problems of the day. A comprehensive course on environmental appreciation, prepared and imparted in collaboration with specialists in the relevant disciplines, need therefore to be urgently introduced. A compulsory two-semester course (or two half-papers in the annual pattern) may include, in the first part, nature and processes of environmental change; whereas the second part may be focused on India's environment, and the course may be designed on the basis of Anil Agrawal's volumes on the subject. The basics of physical geography should be fully covered at the plus-two stage, and much of what is being taught in the name of physical geography at the postgraduate level currently, can be more gainfully accommodated in the undergraduate syllabi.

A third compulsory component of the postgraduate syllabi should focus on cartography, map interpretation (including the study of aerial photographs and imageries), theory and practice of social survey, and field work. The current state of affairs in this regard is dismal. In my experience, this is one sector of geography in which the average quality student of a quarter century ago was better quipped than the best of today. While emphasis on traditional aspects of cartography–distribution maps, cartograms, map projections etc.–has been considerably reduced, the study of S.O.I. topographical sheets is completely neglected in the name of photogrammetry and remote sensing, though the actual teaching in the last named topics is more of a ritual. I am not aware of exceptions, if any, in this regard. Our courses in cartography and practical geography should be thoroughly recast.

The three set course taken together, should take care of the first objective of disciplinary training referred to in the beginning. The rest of the syllabi may focus on actual content of the subject. The second objective of geographical education relating to preparation of the students as responsible citizens, by making them aware about the land and people in different parts of the globe, is best attended to at the school and colleges level, so that at the postgraduate level our primary concern should be with the training of student as a professional, specializing in the spatial aspects of the problem of human organization–social, economic, and political–and /or those relating to the local and regional environment, in order that at the end of his training the student is fully equipped to engage in socially useful research. The course content may be channeled into two parallel streams–human and physical. Owing to the nature of geography as a perspective disciplines, focused on looking at phenomena of diverse kinds from spatial and ecological perspective, professional training of the geographer poses a far more complex problem of organization and course design than is the case with subject discipline each focused on a particular process and/or a well-defined circle of facts. For the grooming of the geographer as a professional social scientist, it is necessary that every student imbibes a focused research perspective on the whole complex of human organization–the central concern of all social science, traditionally organized into the three fundamental disciplines of economics, sociology and political science. It is necessary, therefore, that on the human geography side each student takes one comprehensive course each on economic geography, social geography, and political geography. Likewise, on the physical side, three basic courses on

applied geomorphology and selected aspects of physical oceanography, applied climatology, and applied aspects of biogeography may be introduced.

The above six courses–three basic compulsory for all students, and three ones on the human and physical sides respectively–out of the usual ten at the M.A/M.Sc. level should provide a reasonably sound grounding to the student to prepare him to take up specialized research. The rest of the syllabi may, therefore, be devoted to imparting training in specialized research in one or more of the three basic disciplines on either side of the physical/human divide, through specialized courses and fieldwork-cum-dissertation in selected aspects of the concerned branches.

The course of study in each of the systematic branches should be so designed that the part of the syllabi in each course is focused on conceptual/theoretical aspects of geography's interface with the relevant systematic discipline, e.g. economics, sociology, or political science; whereas the second half should be focused on detailed study of India on selected aspects of the relevant sector of human behaviour, e.g. agriculture, industry, transport and trade in the case of economic geography. Only through such a home territory based regional perspective can the student develop a really useful practical and utilitarian focus. The detailed case study of India shall provide the student with a kind of functional laboratory wherein the theories and concepts learnt in the first part could be tested. In the case of human geography, the traditional focus on the "where" part of the general question: "What, Where, How, and Why" will not suffice at this stage of the students' training. The focus should now explicitly shift to the study of "how" and "why" of the problem under investigation. Only through such a change in perspective shall the student be able to appreciate the factors and processes that lead to the diverse social, economic and political problems facing society. Without adequate understanding of these the search for solutions cannot begin.

Another critical aspect of the problem relates to improving the availability of literature. Experience shows that the most well-intended attempts at disciplinary restructuring in the past had failed to bear fruit simply owing to non–availability (or the lack of easy accessibility) of suitable reading material for teachers and students. The problem has become all the more complicated and serious in view of the massive lateral expansion of postgraduate teaching in geography in a large number of remotely located colleges having hardly any library resource worth the name. Even a large number of university departments are deplorably ill-equipped, especially in regard to research journals, so that the sources of new ideas and research findings are completely blocked. The standard texts and reference work published abroad are so highly priced in terms of the Indian currency, and the readership for English language books is so limited, owing to wholesale switch over to regional languages, that the academic establishment with a narrow utilitarian perspective does not consider the investment in books worth their cost. There is, therefore, a pressing need for affordable textbooks and reference manuals authored/edited by leading scholars in the respective branches of the discipline. In view of the considerable time-lag in the conceptual and theoretical status of Indian geography vis-à-vis what is currently prevalent in the countries that are at the forefront of geographical research, the surest way to improved standard is to launch upon a programme of carefully structured and meticulously edited volumes of selected reading in each major branch of geography. This should help in opening up of our window to the wider world of scholarship, and provide the much needed basis for indigenous effort at evolving suitable textbooks.

Postscript

It may be objected to that the scheme of courses of study outlined here neglects regional geography defined as the study of lands and peoples on the earth surface. As stated in the course of this discussion, this is deliberate: Not because I under-rate the value of regional geography (focused on spatio-ecological study of diverse places and peoples) but because I remain convinced that a thorough grounding in world regional geography should form part of the basic foundation of the geographer's education before he embarks upon the course of professional training at the postgraduate level. The basic function of regional geography in the education of the student as an aware citizen of his own country and of the world, is to raise the student's consciousness about the overwhelming variety of environmental situations accounting for the great variety of contexts–physical and human–within which the different groups of people live and respond to the day to day problems of life. Such a consciousness about the diversity of environmental and social context in which peoples and nations live and respond to events, promotes an attitude of tolerance for inter-cultural differences by underlining why everyone is **not** like us, and thus helps to prevent the development of xenophobia (morbid dislike of foreigners) and contributes to promote inter-regional and cross-cultural understanding. So defined, regional geography provides the basic foundation of knowledge for life in world society, and should be accorded due weightage in school and college curriculum

References

Ackerman, E.A. (1963) : Where is a Research Frontier?, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 53, pp. 229-240.

Blaut, J.M. (1961): Space and Process, *The Professional Geographer*, vol. 13, pp.1-7.

Burton, I. (1963): The Quantitative Revolution and Theoretical Geography, *The Canadian Geographer*, vol. 7, pp. 151-162.

Castells, M. (1982), (19) : *The Urban Question*, London, Edward Arnold.

Chaturvedi, S. (1996) : *The Polar Regions: A Political Geography*, Chichester, John Wiley.

Chorley, R.J. and Haggett (Eds) (1965) : *Frontiers in Geographical Teaching*, London, Methuen.

Chorley, R.J. and Haggett (Eds) (1967) : *Models in Geography*, London, Methuen.

Das, R.J. (1996): *Local Politics, The State and Uneven Development: the Case of India*, Ph.d. dissertation submitted to the Ohio State University, Columbus.

Das, R.J. (1996), (1998) : The Social and Spatial Character of the Indian State, *Political Geography*, vol. 17, pp. 787-808.

Dickinson, R.E. (1969) : *Makers of Geography*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Dikshit, R. D. (1975) : *The Political Geography of Federation: An Inquiry into Origins and Stability*, London and Delhi, Macmillan; New York, John wiley.

Dikshit, R. D. (1995) : *Georgaphy of Elections: the Indian Context*, Jaipur, Rawat Publications.

Giddens, A. (1979) : *Central Problems in Social Theory*, London, Macmillan.

Giddens, A. (1981) : *A Contemporary Critiques of Historical Materialism*, London, Macmillan.

Giddens, A. (1984) : *The Constitution of Society*, Cambridge, The Polity Press.

Ginsburg, N. (1969) : Tasks of Geography *Geography*, vol. 54, pp. 401-409, reproduced as "Task of Geography as a social Science", pp. 41-45, in R.D. Dikshit, Ed. (1994) *The Art and Science of Geography*, New Delhi, Prentice-Hall of India, 1999 reprint.

Gregory, D. (1994a) : Space in Johnston, R.J. Gregory, D. and Smith, D.M. (Eds). *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, 3rd edn, Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 573-575.

Gregory, D. (1994a) : Regional Geography in Johnston, R.J. Gregory, D. and Smith, D.M. (Eds). *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, 3rd edn, Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 510-513.

Harvey, D. (1973), (1985) : *Social Justice and the City*, London, Edward Arnold.

Harvey, D. (1973) : The Geopolitics of Capitalism, in Gregory, D. and Urry, J. (Eds). *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*, London, Macmillan, pp. 126-163.

James, P.E. (1969) : The Significance Of Geography in American Education, *The Journal of Geography*, vol. 68, pp. 474-483.

Johnston, R.J. (1985a) : Introduction: Exploring the Future of Geography, in Johnston, R.J. (Ed.), *The Future of Geography*, London, Methuen, pp. 3-26.

Johnston, R.J. (1985b) : To the Ends of the Earth, in Johnston, R.J. (Ed.), *The Future of Geography, London*, Methuen, pp. 326-338.

Kern, S. (1983) : *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880-1918*, Cambridge (Mass.) Harvard University Press.

Kimble, G.H.T. (1951) : Inadequacy of the Regional Concept, in Stamp, L.D. Wooldridge, S.W. (Eds), *London Essays in Geography*. Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press, pp.151-174.

Kobayashi, A. and Mackenzie, S. (1989) : Introduction: Humanism and Historical Materialism in Human Geography, in Kobayashi, A. and Mackenzie, S. (Eds), *Remaking Human Geography*, Boston, Unwin Hyman, pp. 1-14.

Lefebvre, H. (1976) : *The Survival of Capitalism*, London, Allison and Busby.

Massey, D. (1984) : *The Spatial Division of Labour*, London, Macmillan.

Moodie, A.E. (1957) : *Geography Behind Politics*, 5th edn., London, Hutchinson University Library.

Platt, R.S. (1957) : A Review of Regional Geography, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol.47, pp. 187-190.

Pred, A. (1984) : Place as Historically Contingent Process: Destructuration and the Time Geography of Becoming Places, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol.74, pp. 279-297.

Schaefer, F.K. (1953) : Exceptionalism in Geography: A methodological Examination, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol.53, pp. 226-249.

Smailes, A.E. (1953) : *The Geography of Towns*, London, Hutchinson University Library.

Soja, E. (1989) : Modern Geography, Western Marxism, and the Restructuring of Critical Social Theory, in Peet, R. and Thrift, N. (Eds). *New Models in Geography*, vol. 2, London, Unwin Hyman, pp. 317-347.

Urry, J. (1989) : Sociology and Geography, in Peet, R. and Thrift, N. (Eds). *New Models in Geography*, vol. 2, London, Unwin Hyman, pp. 295-317.

Dr. R. D. Dikshit
5/244, Viram Khand-5,
Gomatinagar,
Lucknow-226010