CHAPTER 1

CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES ON GEOGRAPHICAL SPACE

Karl W. Butzer
University of Chicago

Paradigms of Geographical Inquiry

Self-analysis is a periodic ritual of academic disciplines. The nature of intellectual endeavor dictates that phases of analytical progress are first followed by integration of new information into broader and often holistic frameworks. Eventually the promethean advances of the human mind give way to introspective reassessments of the validity of results, if not of underlying concepts. These inevitable reevaluations frequently trigger a radiation of new research directions. Novel fields of inquiry evolve that are intended to derive more valid conclusions. For a time the new field is conveniently compact and coherent, but ultimately it too is subject to centrifugal trends. Several intellectual generations later the daughter fields of study remain basically interrelated, but their methodological components and approaches vary. They differ as much among themselves as they all differ from the ancestral discipline.

Much of the problem of defining geography has been one of attempting to retain a strict patrilineal tradition between classical and modern geography. In fact, the discipline has been repeatedly metamorphosed by quantum evolutionary changes. Geography today is related to the geography of Strabo[1] no more or less than Homo sapiens is linked to some Tertiary primate ancestor. However, geography is also related to a disparate host of contemporary fields such as geology, meteorology, anthropology or sociology, in much the same way as various members of a family are interrelated. A century after Darwin's The

---

[1]The Geography of Strabo (translated by H. L. Jones; 8 vols.; Heinemann, London, 1917-32). See, also, Fred E. Lukermann: The Concept of Location in Classical Geography, Annals, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 51, 1961, pp. 194-210; Clarence Glacken: Traces on the Rhodian Shore (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1967).

Descent of Man, people are no longer embarrassed by the facts of biological evolution, having become increasingly aware of the nature of their own identity. The expansiveness of geography since 1960 has also provided a greater sense of confidence. Analytical advances have been rapid in response to diversification or improvement of technology, and one may even sense that a new conceptual framework is just on the horizon. It can be claimed that the so-called quantitative revolution has not only generated a new methodology but has also whetted a critical awareness of process, form, and function. Also within the 1960's, a groundswell of public interest in environmental quality has served to redirect the attention of geographers from introverted concern with human artifacts towards the overarching problem of man as part of the ecosystem.[2]

New configurations are difficult to discern in a time of flux. But a fresh sense of identity may well be emerging among the broad spectrum of geographical practitioners. If this assessment is correct, such a sense of identity may owe much both to an improved ability to articulate traditional problems, and the application of a more sophisticated technology, acquired from the physical and social sciences. I emphasize traditional, but not in rhetorical affirmation of patrilineal continuity. The idealized apposition of "man and nature" espoused by Ritter,[3] Marsh,[4] and Richthofen[5] remains the crucial ingredient. However, the modern concept of "society and environment" differs in more than words, by suggesting complex interaction--involving all components and several hierarchies. The leading geographers of the 19th century anticipated these goals but ultimately found the prerequisite tasks of earth description all-consuming. This primal effort of basic recording and analysis also brought into being those

---

[2]Marvin W. Mikesell: Geography as the Study of Environment: An Assessment of Some Old and New Commitments, in Perspectives on Environment (edited by Ian R. Manners and M. W. Mikesell; Association of American Geographers, Washington, D.C., 1974), pp. 1-23.

[3]Carl Ritter: Einleitung zur allgemeinen vergleichenden Geographie und Abhandlungen zur Begründung einer mehr wissenschaftlichen Behandlung der Erdkunde (Berlin, 1852).

[4]George Perkins Marsh: Man and Nature; or, Physical Geography as Modified by Human Action (1864) (edited by David Lowenthal; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Ma., 1965), chap. 1.

[5]Ferdinand v. Richthofen: Aufgaben und Methoden der heutigen Geographie, Akademische Antrittsrede, Universität Leipzig, 1883; Vorlesungen über allgemeine Siedlungs- und Verkehrsgeographie (edited by Otto Schlüter; Reimer, Berlin, 1908).

sibling disciplines, such as geophysics and anthropology, that have shared this burden with geography. A century later, geographers are fortunate that they are far better prepared to approach once again the fundamental question of society and environment.

Change calls for extra circumspection. Geography must look forward if it is to regain its former prominence in the intellectual ferment of the times. But I feel that it should also search its past for virtues and legacies that can be usefully applied today. It should be axiomatic that a new and better paradigm include the best of tradition while optimizing on the experience of cognate disciplines. By exploiting these vertical and horizontal planes, geography may be better able to maintain the identity of its goals and to profit from the pluralism of its practitioners.

Towards a Broader Spatial Paradigm?

The surface of Earth comprises the totality of geographical space. Such space includes physical, cultural, and economic attributes and can be examined from both ideographic and nomothetic viewpoints. Each of the three thematic attributes has dominated the prevailing paradigm of a generation of geographers: the physical from Richthofen[6] to Davis,[7] the cultural from Schlüter[8] to Sauer,[9] and the economic since the implementation of Christaller's[10] and Loesch's[11] spatial concepts within geographical research. This succession of thematic

---

[6] Ibid. (1883).

[7] W. M. Davis: An Inductive Study of the Content of Geography, Bulletin, American Geographical Society, Vol. 38, 1906, pp. 67-84.

[8] Otto Schlüter: Die Ziele der Geographie des Menschen (Oldenbourg, Munich, 1906); Die Erdkunde in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Natur- und Geisteswissenschaften, Geographischer Anzeiger, Vol. 21, 1920, pp. 145-152, 213-218.

[9] See, for example, Carl O. Sauer: The Morphology of Landscape (1925), in Land and Life (edited by John Leighly; University of California Press, Berkeley, 1967), pp. 315-350; Foreword to Historical Geography, ibid., pp. 351-379. Also Philip Wagner: The Human Use of the Earth (Collier-Macmillan, New York, 1960); and P. L. Wagner and M. W. Mikesell, Readings in Cultural Geography (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962), pp. 1-24.

[10] Walter Christaller: Central Places in Southern Germany (1933) (translated by C. W. Baskin; Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1960).

[11] August Loesch: The Economics of Location (1940) (translated by W. H. Woglom and W. F. Stolper; Wiley, New York, 1954).

orientations, as well as the traditional dichotomy of topical and areal dimensions,[12] has served to promote the organic growth of geography. Each conceptual trend, within its own time context and motivated by its own group of adherents, has been developed with enthusiasm and conviction, sometimes to its logical extreme. Ultimately hypothesis leads to antithesis, as the limitations of a dominant paradigm are perceived.

There are indications today that many geographers have recognized the intellectual limitations of the economic paradigm of spatial organization. Edward Taaffe forecast a return to "cautious and pragmatic pluralism,"[13] urging that the spatial view be better articulated with ecological and chorological approaches in geography. Similarly, Sack[14] has argued that the spatial and chorological views are complementary rather than irreconcilable. Unnecessary fragmentation and occasional excesses of quantification are not the only issues. At the very time that many geographers have turned their concern to pressing social questions, mathematical exuberance has reduced the human component to dot maps of artifacts or clusters of people. Considered in strictly numerical terms, artifactual aggregates or material attributes lose much of their cultural or symbolic value. Unlike anthropologists, many geographers have tended to overlook that people do not generally act as individuals, but as members of a community. It is the community that collectively shapes attitudes or makes fundamental decisions,[15] the result of which are the material components that most commonly lend themselves to successful computerization. Communities in their turn are the integral components of the pervasive but heterogeneous matrix that constitutes cultures.

The prevalent spatial-economic paradigm in geography has developed within the experiential framework of European and North American society, one in which it is axiomatic that social forms emerge from the practical activities of individuals.[16] However, in the traditional values systems of "developing" or

---

[12]See Richard Hartshorne: Perspective on the Nature of Geography (Rand McNally, Chicago, 1959), especially chap. 9.

[13]Edward J. Taaffe: The Spatial View in Context, Annals, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 64, 1974, pp. 1-16.

[14]R. D. Sack: Chorology and Spatial Analysis, Annals, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 64, 1974, pp. 439-452.

[15]Robert Redfield: The Little Community (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960).

[16]Marshall Sahlins: Culture and Practical Reason (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1976).

non-Western societies, production and material effectiveness are often of subordinate importance. It would seem that many leading geographers have failed to appreciate that cultures also are idiosyncratic or particularistic, that the imprint of culture on the landscape includes factors other than profit and loss, or distance decay, and that culture, by definition, is cumulative.

Intellectual communities are maintained by a salutory system of checks and balances, and even a very casual review of the broader field during the last decade or so shows that a refreshing number of geographers has remained duly sensitive to the pervasiveness of culture. In part this can be recognized in what might be described as a humanistic resurgence, emphasizing symbolic values,[17] aesthetic norms,[18] the artistic component of landscapes,[19] or even existential phenomenology.[20] Symptoms of the rapid growth of interest by geographers in these seemingly esoteric pleasures can be identified in the massive attendance of the Landscape in Literature session at the 1974 geography meet-

---

[17]David Lowenthal: Geography, Experience, and Imagination: Towards a Geographical Epistemology, Annals, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 51, 1961, pp. 241-260; Yi-Fu Tuan: Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes and Values (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1974); Space and Place: Humanistic Perspective, Progress in Geography, Vol. 6, 1974, pp. 212-252; R. D. Sack: Magic and Space, Annals, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 66, 1976, pp. 309-322.

[18]David Lowenthal and H. C. Prince: The English Landscape, Geographical Review, Vol. 54, 1964, pp. 309-346; Lowenthal and Prince: English Landscape Tastes, ibid., Vol. 55, 1965, pp. 186-222; Lowenthal: The American Scene, Geographical Review, Vol. 58, 1968, pp. 61-68; Gerhard Hard: Arkadien in Deutschland, Die Erde, Vol. 94, 1965, pp. 21-41; D. W. Meinig, Environmental Appreciation: Localities as a Humane Art, Western Humanities Review, Vol. 25, 1971, pp. 1-11. For the counterpoint of blighted environments, see P. F. Lewis, D. Lowenthal and Yi-Fu Tuan, Visual Blight in America, Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, Resource Paper No. 23, Washington, 1973.

[19]See, for example, Herbert Lehmann: Formen landschaftlicher Raumerfahrung im Spiegel der bildenden Kunst, Erlanger Geographische Arbeiten No. 22, 1968, pp. 1-24; R. L. Heathcote: The Artist as Geographer: Landscape Painting as a Source for Geographical Research, Proceedings Royal Geographical Society of Australasia, South Australian Branch, Vol. 73, 1972, pp. 1-21; Ronald Rees: Geography and Landscape Painting: An Introduction to a Neglected Field, Scottish Geographical Magazine, Vol. 89, 1973, pp. 147-157; Rees: Landscape in Art, this volume.

[20]Ranging from Yi-Fu Tuan: Geography, Phenomenology, and the Study of Human Nature, Canadian Geographer, Vol. 15, 1971, pp. 181-192, to Anne Buttimer: Grasping the Dynamism of Life-world, Annals, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 66, 1976, pp. 277-292.

ings in Seattle,[21] in the revival of the periodical Landscape, in the urban vignettes of the Comparative Metropolitan Analysis Board,[22] and in the Atlas of American Culture project. Simultaneously, there has been extensive exploration of the realms of perception, as pertinent to several directions of geographical research.[23] Collectively these complex strands of subjective and often humanistic writing can perhaps be interpreted as an implicit criticism of many fundamental assumptions in a "scientific" geography[24] increasingly preoccupied with the formulation and testing of "laws" or the generation of systems models.

The founders of the spatial school certainly did not subscribe to blatant materialism. Christaller explicitly saw his own work as complementary to traditional regional studies,[25] and his triad of central-place organizing principles included an administrative factor with no necessary economic rationale. More recently, spatial concepts have been increasingly incorporated into cross-cultural and even anthropological studies. So, for example, spatial models for nomadic mobility patterns have been explained from ecological and cultural premises.[26] At the systematic level, Christaller's model has been expanded to

---

[21]C. L. Salter and W. J. Lloyd, eds.: Landscape in Literature, Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, Resource Paper 76-3 (Washington, 1977); Salter: Signatures and Settings: One Approach to Landscape in Literature, this volume.

[22]M. P. Conzen and G. K. Lewis: Boston: A Geographical Portrait (Ballinger Publishing Co., Cambridge, Ma., 1976).

[23]Including cultural, social and economic perspectives. See, for example, H. C. Brookfield: On the Environment as Perceived, Progress in Geography, Vol. 1, 1969, pp. 51-80; Joseph Sonnenfeld: Geography, Perception, and the Behavioral Environment, in Man, Space, and Environment (edited by P. W. English and R. C. Mayfield; Oxford, New York, 1972), pp. 244-251; Sonnenfeld: Resource Perceptions and the Security of Subsistence, this volume; T. F. Saarinen: Environmental Planning: Perception and Behavior (Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1976).

[24]See J. N. Entrikin: Contemporary Humanism in Geography, Annals, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 66, 1976, pp. 615-632.

[25]Christaller, op. cit. [note 10], p. 9.

[26]D. L. Johnson: The Nature of Nomadism: A Comparative Study of Pastoral Migrations in Southwestern Asia and Northern Africa, University of Chicago, Department of Geography, Research Paper 118, Chicago, 1969, pp. 1-200; Johnson: Nomadic Organization of Space: Reflections on Pattern and Process, this volume; for other examples of this incipient fusion of traditional concerns with spatial concepts, see Marvin W. Mikesell, Tradition and Innovation in Cultural Geography, Annals, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 68, 1978, in press.

do better justice to the organization of space in developing countries by E. A. J. Johnson,[27] who explicitly recognized 5 key organizing principles: market hierarchies, administrative or military control, juridical institutions, and sacerdotal groups. The long-neglected role of ritual and cosmology in defining sacred space has been explored in some depth.[28] Attempts have also been made to apply central place theory to prehistoric settlement patterning.[29] Most recently, a group of cultural anthropologists has collaborated to provide an impressive compendium of papers that utilize spatial concepts in analyzing regional economic and social systems.[30]

These examples may serve to show that spatial theory has both greater flexibility and broader applicability than some of its proponents or opponents may have anticipated. In fact, the value of spatial concepts for the organization of materials and formulation of hypotheses in cultural geography, anthropology, archeology and, of course, economics, has proven to be substantial. This suggests that an even more effective integration of economic, cultural, and ecological perspectives within a more broadly conceived paradigm of spatial organization is not only possible but desirable. Such a paradigm must be multidimensional in its approach to the organization of space, in order to provide linkages for the several trends of geographical research, and above all to stimulate more productive conceptualization in the broader realm of the social sciences.

---

[27]E. A. J. Johnson: The Organization of Space in Developing Countries (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Ma., 1970), chap. 1.

[28]Mircea Eliade: The Sacred and the Profane (Harper, New York, 1959); D. E. Sopher: Geography of Religions (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1967); Paul Wheatley: City as Symbol (Lewis, London, 1967); Wheatley, The Pivot of the Four Quarters (Aldine, Chicago, 1971); R. H. Jackson and R. L. Layton: The Mormon Village: Analysis of a Settlement Type, Professional Geographer, Vol. 28, 1976, pp. 136-141; Jackson: Religion and Landscape in the Mormon Cultural Region, this volume; Yi-Fu Tuan: Sacred Space: Explorations of an Idea, this volume.

[29]So, for example, Waldo Tobler and Samuel Winesburg: A Cappadocian Speculation, Nature, Vol. 231, 1971, pp. 39-41; for a thorough review, see G. A. Johnson: Aspects of Regional Analysis in Archaeology, Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol. 6, 1977, pp. 479-508. Spatial dimensions to prehistoric cultural innovation are suggested in K. W. Butzer: Environment, Culture and Human Evolution, American Scientist, Vol. 65, 1977, pp. 572-584.

[30]C. A. Smith, ed.: Regional Analysis, Vol. I: Economic Systems, Vol. II: Social Systems (Academic Press, New York, 1976). Emphasis is primarily on central place theory (including rank-size ordering and primacy), rural exchange and marketing systems, and the application of regional analysis concepts to social systems.

Perspectives on the Nature of Space

Perception studies have already suggested more refined views of space to a number of geographers, so for example, the distinction of geographical, operational, perceived and behavioral environments proposed by Sonnenfeld.[31] On a far more abstract level, the architect Norberg-Schulz, inspired in large measure by Parsons[32] and Piaget,[33] envisaged a different, essentially psychological hierarchy of pragmatic, perceptual, existential, cognitive, and logical space.[34] Norberg-Schulz's paradigm has been recently applied by Wheatley to improve comprehension of the traditional Islamic city.[35] A more explicitly socio-environmental approach has been suggested by Erik Cohen,[36] who attempts to integrate Parsons's four subsystems of society (economy, polity, pattern maintenance, and community)[37] into an elaborately structured paradigm of social ecology that incorporates both institutional and functional perspectives. Four societal orientations to "environment" are identified, representing a spectrum of socio-environmental attitudes ranging from the materialistic to the abstract. They are:

(1) instrumental, as a matter of resources;

(2) territorial, as military or political control;

(3) sentimental, in terms of attachment, whether as emotional "belonging" or for purposes of social prestige; and

(4) symbolic, evaluating the significance of environmental features by the degree to which they are aesthetically enjoyable or in terms of their proximity to the sacred or the extent to which they symbolize it.[38]

---

[31] Op. cit. [note 23].

[32] Talcott Parsons: Societies: Comparative and Evolutionary Perspectives (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1966).

[33] Jean Piaget: The Psychology of Intelligence (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1950).

[34] Christian Norberg-Schulz: Existence, Space and Architecture (Praeger, New York, 1971).

[35] Paul Wheatley: Levels of Space Awareness in the Traditional Islamic City, Ekistics, Vol. 253, 1976, pp. 354-66.

[36] Erik Cohen: Environmental Orientations: A Multidimensional Approach to Social Ecology, Current Anthropology, Vol. 17, 1976, pp. 49-70.

[37] Talcott Parsons: Systems of Modern Societies (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1971).

[38] Cohen, op. cit. [note 36], Table I in particular. The discussion com-

Cohen uses "ecology" and "environment" as a sociologist, not as a biologist or geographer. Yet his basic concepts implicitly or explicitly include spatial organization, perception, symbolic landscapes, and other approaches or themes that were either first developed or subsequently adapted within the field of geography. The instrumental or economic perspective, most familiar in Western and Marxist societies, represents the basic subject matter of most geographical research into spatial organization. The political view has repeatedly received the attention of geographers,[39] while military landscapes have also been characterized.[40] The sentimental and symbolic dimensions of space were explored in seminal studies by Lowenthal and Tuan,[41] and even sacred space and aesthetic landscapes have become objects of geographical concern.[42]

Such orientations or perspectives are overlapping rather than mutually exclusive.[43] Their value lies not in the creation of categories or formal intradisciplinary structures, but in drawing attention to distinctive components that are, to some degree or other, inherent to all geographical phenomena. They can, furthermore, provide a point of departure to explore attitudes to and conceptual dimensions of geographical space.

Space as a Set of Available Resources

Depending on technology, organization, and subsistence modes, space provides a set of natural resources. These are perceived differently by hunter-

---

ments that follow Cohen (ibid., pp. 62-68) suggest that the majority of anthropologists will remain wary, if for no other reason than that conceptual approaches are frequently confused with empirical propositions. The merits of several criticisms offered to Cohen's analytical framework or conclusions are beyond the purpose of this paper.

[39]So, for example, E. W. Soja: The Political Organization of Space, Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, Resource Paper No. 8, Washington, 1971, with references to earlier work.

[40]E. A. J. Johnson, op. cit. [note 27], pp. 3-8.

[41]See note 17. Not surprisingly the social-sentimental and symbolic are less clearly differentiated in geographical than in sociological or anthropological writings.

[42]See notes 18 and 28.

[43]It is relevant that Parsons's societal subsystems are believed to interact constantly (op. cit., 1971 [note 37]), while Cohen (op. cit. [note 36], especially Table 2) envisages an elaborate matrix of conflicts that actually serve to maintain complex interactions.

gatherers, by agricultural communities, or by industrialized societies, so affecting their perceived value and potential exploitation.[44] Furthermore, these resources are not distributed uniformly, but are commonly found in local concentrations or as extensive zones of low-level dispersal, only in part coincident with other resources. The distribution of the aggregate of perceived resources, their relative values, and the related inter- and intra-group competition will help to determine horizontal settlement arrangement and, in economically-differentiated complex societies, vertical or hierarchical settlement patterns as well. The interrelationships between the complex of human communities and their available resources constitutes the ecological adaptation. Such adaptations commonly but not necessarily are cumulative rather than momentary, since they may reflect all local environments in which a human group has previously learned and in which its predecessors have learned.[45]

To some degree or other an economic-environmental orientation has been fundamental for all societies at all times. Yet the nature of the resulting economic matrix is highly variable from one complex culture to another.

Space as a Matter of Control

Particularly in the case of sedentary societies, space (as an aggregate of human constructs and natural economic potentials) may become an object of military and/or political organization. Settlement sites are selected with an eye to defensibility and specific locales are deliberately converted into settlements or fortresses because of their strategic value. Implicit or explicit boundaries are drawn and political aspirations are made by groups, classes, or individuals as to limited control or general authority. Complex delimitations within the countryside may attain the intricacy of Medieval Europe, with space variously controlled by several hierarchical institutions (king, secular nobility, religious potentates and orders, chartered cities or companies, individual landholders) and according to different privileges (secular or religious suzerainty, military and juridical control, right to exact taxes or customs).

---

[44] See Brookfield [note 23]; D. A. Davidson: Terrain Adjustment and Prehistoric Communities, in Man, Settlement, and Urbanism (edited by P. J. Ucko, Ruth Tringham, and G. W. Dimbleby; Schenkman, Cambridge, Ma., 1972), pp. 17-22; Sonnenfeld, op. cit. [note 23], and Resource Perceptions and the Security of Subsistence, this volume.

[45] P. L. Wagner: Cultural Landscapes and Regions: Aspects of Communication, Geoscience and Man, Vol. 10, 1974, pp. 133-142.

The overall effect of a sufficiently complex overlay of socio-political controls is a spatial organization determined less by available resources and their proximity, than by spatial fragmentation as imposed by socio-political boundaries and the resultant economic privileges. In an extreme case this would not only affect settlement patterning and hierarchies, but could also favor social, religious, or ethnic segregation within settlements. The degree to which such political organization of space assumes prominence depends on cultural attributes such as sedentariness, social organization, class differentiation, and the nature and complexity of authority. It would tend to assume greatest significance in multitiered, urbanized civilizations, but may also be important among simpler agricultural or pastoral societies.

Space in Terms of Social Identification

In the words of Erik Cohen:[46]

> Primordial attachment finds its most fundamental concrete expression in the sense of belonging: points in the environment or spatial features gain intrinsic significance for an individual or a group, independently of either their instrumental value or their extrinsic symbolic meaning. This sentiment is expressed in an emotionally loaded notion that one possesses roots, has a place in the world, or belongs to a community or a neighbourhood which is one's home . . . The individual comes to identify more intensively with some points or areas in space and less intensively with others.

Consequently, by encouraging solidary relationships, the sense of place serves an integrative function in society: "it provides an emotional anchorage to individuals and groups."[47]

Social space also stimulates differentiation as places or areas acquire prestige in the process of social evaluation, particularly as a result of the social status of the people who live there. In effect,

> The hierarchy of prestige areas represents the spatial component of social stratification . . . (leading) to integration between dissimilar groups through the institutionalization of spatial segregation and distance between them, expressing their social distance.[48]

The close relationship of prestige with class or craft suggests that this mechanism of differentiation would be best developed in urbanized societies, whereas the primary, emotional attachment to space would probably play a more significant role among most rural societies.

---

[46] Op. cit. [note 36], p. 55.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid., p. 56.

Space in Terms of Symbolic Value

In broad terms, a landscape is created by a society in its own image[49] and serves to express that society's ideal environment, no matter how imperfect. As expressed by Wagner,[50]

> Its forms, proportions, orientation, and properties are meant to be the very map and pattern for correct, harmonious behavior, and to give the model by which such behavior may be learned . . . A place or a landscape declares its underlying intent, or its ideal meaning, when living people activate it and actualize it . . . (An) intimate fourfold relationship . . . binds together time, place, act, and man--making each, in good degree, the function and expression of the other three reciprocal determinants.

In the end, "the landscape which a society has created may become its most enduring memorial."[51] A society's impact is recorded in place names, visual symbolisms, structures, and observances, so much so that "the forms of landscape and the norms of behavior are congruent."[52]

Conversely the landscape can mold the culture. As Wagner has argued,

> The roles of landscape content in symbolic discourse, and as part of what defines behavior, are of major consequence. Landscape, like and with behavior, instructs and informs. . . .[53] As even now, in former times expressive artificial features of environment played a part as well in education; but their range and reference was of vastly different magnitude. The settlement itself, the fields and gardens, houses, tools and weapons, costumes and paraphernalia, amplifying learning, brought the individual into contact with the work of vanished craftsmen and builders, the ancestors, whose presence thus, and through renown, weighed heavily on the living.[54]

Further, in many societies such as our own, the values and content of such cultural landscapes are abstracted and reformulated by painters and writers for transmission to the public.

Not all points within the landscape are of equal value on a scale of sacredness. Instead,

> Points in space and environmental features are evaluated in terms of their nearness to the sacred or the extent to which they symbolize it. . . . At one extreme are the cases in which places become sanctified through a slow, nondeliberate process, as, for example, wells, trees, hills, mountains, rivers and shrines in many societies acquire sacredness in "time immemorial."

---

[49] Lowenthal, op. cit., 1968 [note 18].

[50] Wagner, op. cit. [note 45], pp. 135-136.

[51] G. C. Homans: English Villagers of the Thirteenth Century (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Ma., 1941), p. 12.

[52] Wagner, op. cit. [note 45], p. 136.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid., p. 137.

> At the other are the explicit, formal processes of sanctification, typically rituals of consecration or inauguration. . . . In the cosmologies of primitive people and traditional religions, the sacred, by endowing the world with moral-religious meaning, provides it with a fundamental order and thus separates the ordered "cosmos," focused on a sacred "center," from the surrounding orderless and hence meaningless and threatening "chaos."[55]

In this sense the moral-religious institutions of a society are articulated with the landscape and expressed as sacred space. It is thus, at several levels, that the landscape provides stimuli for symbolic evaluation and identification. These are images, real or perceived, that are transformed into sources of meaning.[56]

Some Advantages of a More Explicitly Cultural Approach

These different perspectives on the nature of geographical space suggest that a multidimensional and more explicitly cultural approach would have considerable methodological and empirical utility within geography.

The social and symbolic components of space complement prevailing economic and political attitudes. Potential integration of these viewpoints into a pluralistic paradigm of spatial organization would reduce the increasing polarization between the "materialistic" and "humanistic" as well as the mathematical and nonmathematical schools. A centripetal paradigm would help to reunite the quantitative, economic, social, and cultural strands of geography and refocus them to the common goal of people. This human axis, if defined in sufficiently sophisticated terms, would intersect with that of the physical environment to define a realistic sphere of ecological investigation. It is on this plane that geographers may most readily recognize their traditional, central concern: the human use of the earth.

The implementation of a pluralistic spatial paradigm that does proper credit to the true complexity of culture would allow a fresh articulation of what exactly constitutes a "cultural landscape." This concept, so basic to what geographers do, has nonetheless proven to be elusive and, in the long run, centrifugal rather than a point of integration for geographical concerns.[57] A dynamic and integrated approach to the multiple configurations of spatial organization

---

[55] Cohen, op. cit. [note 36], pp. 56-57.

[56] See Sonnenfeld, op. cit., 1972 [note 23].

[57] Marvin W. Mikesell: Landscape, International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 10, 1968, pp. 575-580.

would contribute to more successful analysis and formulation of human landscapes.

Geography's attempts to deal with some of the more pressing contemporary issues have not been particularly successful. In predicting social change in large conurbations some of us have relied more on extrapolation of mechanical trends rather than on an organic understanding of the behavioral and psychological components that condition social response. In urging a more equitable reallocation of resources or opportunities some of us have ignored the reality of the community as the arbiter of response and possible change. In dealing with seemingly deadlocked constellations of modern society some of us have been oblivious of the time dimension of culture or the cumulative nature of social sentiment and symbolic value, e.g., among minority groups. Many of us have begun to despair over the attitudinal controversies and practical contradictions in the search for new economic solutions or in the development and implementation of environmental law.[58] This is but an example of the inherent conflict generated by contradictory social orientations within all societies. A broader perspective might well help generate more effective strategies to reach solutions.

Last but not least, a specifically cultural paradigm would allow a more sensitive appraisal of "society and environment" in cross-cultural terms. Societies view nature "through a screen composed of beliefs, knowledge, and purposes"[59] that is based on the cultural sharing of experience that varies from one society to another. Environmental adaptation is not based on economic optimization, but is conditioned by political, strategic, sentimental, social, aesthetic, and symbolic factors. Depending on the relative values placed upon these possible orientations, the configuration of subsistence and settlement patterns, and even of the society itself, will vary. The mix of potentially conflicting, environmental purposes[60] will create many distinct sets of environmental attitudes. As a result, the land ethic of different cultures will vary, however subtly, with equally diverse ecological impact.

---

[58]T. O'Riordan: Environmentalism (Pion, London, 1976).

[59]R. A. Rappoport: Nature, Culture and Ecological Anthropology, in Man, Culture and Society (edited by H. L. Shapiro; Oxford, London, 1971), p. 246.

[60]Cohen, op. cit. [note 36].

Acknowledgement.--I am grateful to Marvin W. Mikesell for suggestions during the inception of this paper, and to Kenneth Foote for discussion of an interim draft. The related research was facilitated by a Guggenheim Fellowship.