

Geography in the American Academy:
A Microcosm in Search of a Role That Already Exists
(アメリカの教育における地理学：
既存の学問意義再確認の一例として)

Simon R. Potter*

SUMMARY IN JAPANESE: 地理学とは、自然科学、社会科学そして人文学それぞれからの知識を統合した学問分野である。たとえそれがすべての原因ではないにしても、このことがアメリカの学問の世界における地理学の存在を正当化するのをこれまで難しいものにしてきた。かつて1980年代の初めに米国内の大学で地理学の必要性を疑問視する声が高まったことがあったが、同じような疑問の声がいまひとたび浮上する可能性があるのではないかと思われる。1980年代に地理学が危機を迎えたときは、特に社会科学と人文学を中心に学者たちが大学の窮状を嘆いていた時であったが、最近の地理学の存在への危惧の高まりは、全米の教育の質の低下を政治家たちが懸念し始めたことと時を同じくしている。本論のPart Iでは、まずこのことに注目し、Part IIで地理学を取り巻く恒常的な諸問題を検証する。Part IIIでは、確かにそういった問題があるにしても、それが過大視されているということを指摘する。最後にPart IVで「地理学研究に必要な基本知識」の欠如及びアメリカの教育で地理学が果たす役割について述べ、結論とする。

* Foreign Lecturer, College of Liberal Arts, Saitama University, Saitama, Japan.

I. Opening Remarks

Education has in recent years become a hot item in the United States, including to the point of being an important issue in the last presidential campaign. An impression given was that the leadership of the United States has recognized fundamental inadequacies, and the sitting president seems inclined to do something about the problems of educational quality. Although both presidential candidates expressed concern over primary and secondary education, it must be remembered that achievement at these levels influences achievement both in general society and in tertiary (higher) education, and that these in turn influence education at the primary and secondary levels. The problems are therefore widespread, symptomatic of a form of cultural decadence, so it is not likely that one presidential administration and its concurrent Congresses will be able to change much. Some problems are simply too ingrained to be solved quickly, and a piecemeal approach suggests that some problems will linger and, partly because of the strains of reforms and their legal implications, new ones will inevitably emerge.

Still, in light of the perception that the states are not delivering a satisfactory product, it does seem correct for the national leadership to provide meaningful direction. The idea floated by the sitting president of teaching fundamentals through methods known to succeed within reason (as in phonics for reading), and thereby to ditch the experimental and honor-thy-existence approaches which have apparently become too common, is a step in the right direction, that of getting meaningful results in regard to skills and knowledge. This is not an easy task, especially when it is considered that the last couple of generations of educators have tended to put a premium on personal expression (developing an opinion and, when necessary or convenient, supporting it with facts that might not be correct) at the expense of cultivating knowledge and intelligence (learning facts and reasoning about them). One reason for this, and hinted at during the presidential campaign, is that there are many teachers who are inadequately informed in the subjects they teach, which seems to be more applicable in secondary education than in primary. American society has condoned this through the fat-dumb-and-happy ideology that has flourished over the last three decades, if not longer, yet the supposed guardians of knowledge and scholarship—the “professors” within the academy¹—have either gone along with it, provided conducive models, or reluctantly suffered through the declining quality of and expectations for education.

Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind*² was a notable attempt to draw attention to deficiencies in American education, specifically at the universities where young people might train for a profession or, through study, learn how to apply knowledge and wisdom to their lives. One message which might be drawn from this treatise is that cultivating the intellect, through knowledge and reasoned thought via substantial reading, has been sacrificed for simply meeting requirements for professions, certificates, or degrees. Whereas it is lamentable that competent professors who seem to offer very little in regard to "practical" work are marginalized, it is not necessarily bad that the universities prepare students for real-world careers. The problem is that they do not necessarily do it properly, as quite often a graduate employs little of what had been studied and/or the undergraduate degree came too easily so that a graduate is not capable of functioning as well as ought to be expected. The latter would account, for example, for the insufficiently knowledgeable teachers who are alleged to flourish in the American schools.

While speaking in generally favorable terms about the natural sciences in American universities, Bloom despaired about the social sciences and the humanities. The source of the troubles appears to be the political environment that has influenced the American academy since the late 1960s, attributable partly to national policy and associated legislation and partly to intellectual fashion and how professors have been going about their business. Because there is no political ideology in America that inhibits research into and teaching of (essentially) absolutes in the physical world, natural science has been able to continue according to its methods and goals that emphasize objectivity. The social sciences, although often pretending to honor objectivity by applying similar methods, and the humanities have however drifted dangerously into the realm of subjectivity and political fashion, including to the point that analyzing the writer on a subject is more important than investigating the subject itself. Needless to say, it can be very difficult in such circumstances to evaluate for knowledge and capacity to reason, or to apply whatever might be learned, hence it is not surprising that similarity of opinion seems to be the criterion for entry into the academic profession, and that university graduates who go on to teach in the schools are not as knowledgeable as they ought to be.

It is of course difficult, perhaps impertinent, to generalize like this, but such perceptions must be founded in reality for scholars, journalists, and politicians to comment on them. The social sciences have certainly come to play a very

important part in undergraduate education, and thus in influencing the behavior and thought of many Americans who drift into the main stream of society in need of work, and Bloom comments briefly on five—sociology, economics, political science, psychology, anthropology—as well as the humanities subjects of philosophy, literature, and history (the last possibly being also a social science). Their common denominator is what people do or have done, that is the non-physical human being, and there can be substantial overlapping of what each covers, the main difference being what is emphasized and how it is explained. Perhaps, from the point of view of content, because a scholar in one field might make the transition into another relatively easily, defenders of the disciplines have felt it necessary to isolate cores and to emphasize special techniques so that selected initiates can earn a living within esoterically prescribed barriers. This scholarly form of protectionism seems to be sufficiently ingrained that, for example, sociologists are most likely to study the work of other sociologists and historians of other historians. The implicit contract is to honor the core and special techniques of one's discipline, so if substantial numbers of scholars within a discipline break it, they invite sanction which can attack their very existence.

This has been the case with what might arguably be considered the most useful academic discipline, geography. It does not have a place in Bloom's book, possibly because it never occurred to somebody at Cornell University that it even exists. Yet, this is the discipline that synthesizes the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities, and which ought to be well positioned to bring meaning back to the "uni" in "university" if the academic community were to be so inclined. The reason it is not is that it has been perceived to have broken the contract: its identity is questioned (infamously by geographers), too many geographers seem to be doing work that is either not geography or only marginally so, maps are no longer as integral to the discipline as they used to be, and some geographers refer to themselves as anything but, evidently because geography has lost its prestige. Although the questions of what geography is and how it is to fit in within the academic community have haunted geographers in America throughout the twentieth century, it seems that by 1980 challenges to its existence had become real and that despite being granted a reprieve throughout the latter 1980s and the 1990s due to interest in computerized mapping and environmental issues, they are surfacing again. Why this came about is perhaps instructive, more so to nongeographers than to geographers who are painfully aware of the issues, so the present article assesses the problems within the discipline that have been identi-

fied by geographers in America and essentially argues that they are overrated. The final section includes some remarks on geography and education in America, concluding with a suggestion for how concerned geographers might think unconventionally to provide an improved, viable niche for their discipline in American education.

II. Geography and Its Problems in the United States

A. What Is Geography?

The word “geography” was created from the Greek words “gea” (γ ε α) and “grafo” (γ ρ α φ ω), which are interpreted respectively to mean “the Earth” or “the world” and “to write” or “to draw.” This was taken literally by Claudius Ptolemaeus (ca. 90-168 A.D.), a scholar based at Alexandria in the Nile delta and considered to represent the culmination of Ancient Greek cartography, as his *Geography* is a collection of maps of the world and its parts, and it laid the foundation for the scientific component of cartography in the “West.”³ The main thrust of geography in Europe and eventually America since the time of Ptolemaeus until, say, ca. 1950 was to find out about the world and its parts and to map them.⁴ This heritage—running through scholastic Christians, the cartographers and “geographers” of the intercontinental European empires, and such scientific thinkers as Alexander von Humboldt, Karl Ritter, Friedrich Ratzel, and Elisée Réclus—was not created through a longstanding formal, conscious attempt to do “geography,” but is rather a compendium of outstanding works that fit the description of writing about and drawing the world. The *Geography* of Ptolemaeus, the writings of the European explorers, and some treatises of a geographical nature by scientists and philosophers from the late eighteenth century to early twentieth century would qualify as “great books” in Bloom’s terminology, yet they are hardly known by geographers today, let alone studied by them.

Dismissing the heritage of geography seems to have started in America sometime after the Second World War, and by 1989 it was possible for the editors of a thick survey of geography as “practiced in the 1980s” to get away with this: geography “is not characterized by a discrete subject matter or method or even philosophy,” and an “easily articulated definition of Geography, consistent with the traditional notions about how the pursuit of knowledge should be compartmentalized, simply does not exist—nor should it.”⁵ It does not take a hard-core,

perfectly logical philosopher in search of the absolute Truth to realize that this spells trouble, and when it is considered that the book with this assessment was sanctioned by the Association of American Geographers (AAG), a predominantly academic club of geographers that is interested in promoting the discipline and prolonging its existence, it would seem that something had gone terribly wrong. Keeping in mind that geographers in America generally fancy themselves as scientists armed with logic and the scientific method, and that the authors of these quotations are geographers, it is reasonable to assume that since geography is not and ought not be defined easily, it is not and ought not be. Although there might be some twisted minds to agree, and some geographers to provide the evidence, it is not likely that such a sentiment is pervasive among rational scholars and educators, or even among the general public. Rather than having usefully assessed geography in the 1980s, it seems that the editors in question let the diverse, eclectic research of geographers confuse them into believing that that was geography, and this confusion might still exist.

To get a reasonable idea of what geography is, it is necessary to turn away from thinking about the “narrow” research and seminars to considering what “geography” has meant in regard to general education. Here are two definitions from dictionaries that could have been used by high-school and college students in the 1970s, just ahead of the uneasy decade of the 1980s:⁶

[1] the science dealing with the areal differentiation of the earth's surface, as shown in the character, arrangement, and interrelations over the world of such elements as climate, elevation, soil, vegetation, population, land use, industries, national and political entities, and of the unit areas formed by the complex of these individual elements.

[2] The study of the earth and its features and the distribution on the earth of life, including human life and the effects of human activity.

These are from similar dictionaries published in the 1990s:⁷

[3] the science dealing with the areal differentiation of the earth's surface, as shown in the character, arrangement, and interrelations of such elements as climate, elevation, vegetation, population, and land use.

[4] The science that describes the surface of the earth and its associated physical, biological, economic, political, and demographic characteristics,

especially in terms of large areas and the complex of interrelationships obtaining among them.

Obviously both before and after the 1980s there were general consensuses as to what geography is, and they clearly coincide along the lines of a comprehensive account of the world and what happens on it. This is likely to conform to the image of geography among reasonably informed Americans, and it would seem to be a perfectly healthy interpretation.

Geographers themselves sometimes need to define geography, and the following examples from recent textbooks for introductory courses at colleges and universities, publications that explain the discipline and provide a general overview of knowledge within (part of) it, demonstrate that geographers can concur with general linguists:⁸

[5] Geography is the study of where things are located on Earth's surface and the reasons for the location.

[6] As a modern academic discipline, [geography] is concerned with the explanation of the physical and human characteristics of the Earth's surface.

Once geographers stop writing for people who are presumed not to know, such as students in introductory courses, and start addressing one another and perhaps other scholars, the explanations seem to drift from simple, comprehensible statements about "geography" to convoluted attempts to capture the summation of work by scholars who are called "geographers." The most notorious assessment, within the common domain and therefore not requiring a scholarly citation, is that "geography is what geographers do," a tongue-in-cheek observation which has circulated at least since the 1970s and acknowledges that geographers have been confused by what goes on inside the discipline. On a more prosaic level, and to give but one example, Will Graf wrote during his presidency of the AAG (1998-99) that "geography is defined by its spatial perspective, its emphasis on space and place, regions, networks, flows, and society-environment interactions."⁹ Missing of course is a reference to this world, the Earth, causing one to wonder if this were written so as not to exclude those very few geographers who apply their knowledge and skills to analyzing the other planets and their satellites. Furthermore, if some thought were given to the components of this definition and their relevance to other disciplines, it could become difficult to separate geography into

something distinct.

A catchy expression that has been around for some time to distinguish geography as a valid discipline within the academy is "spatial analysis," by which is predominantly meant an ability to condense and arrange data into relatively simplified diagrams called maps, as well as to use them, other diagrams, statistics, other mathematical expressions, and words to explain things that exist in two or three dimensions. The maps in particular are what truly distinguish geography from other subjects, yet geographers do not seem keen to advertise the discipline in such terms as "map work," "mapmaking," and "map explanation." "Spatial analysis" is more exotic, mystical, sophisticated, and in the same vein rather meaningless. At the profane level it is easy to point out that everybody does spatial analysis, generally satisfactorily although not always consciously or with maximum competence, while applicants of higher intelligence who are not geographers do it as well in their specialist ways. Physicists, for example, work with vectors and changes in velocity that require space to be analyzed, astronomers examine outer space and think deeply and categorically about what is out there, economists consider markets and activities that have spatial expressions, and historians explain events for which territory (space) was meaningful. Seldom is there a need to ask a geographer for advice on a spatial matter, let alone for an analysis of it.

The message is that scholars, the academic peers who have a say in what might go on in the various institutions of the academy, should be able to call the bluff when confronted with expressions such as "spatial analysis" or "society-environment interactions," and as long as geographers forget, in word and importantly in deed, that geography is the study of this world, they are inviting trouble. Specialization in graduate study and in research, perfectly fine and useful, has played a great part in the drift of geographers from holistically approaching and practicing their discipline, and the urge to quantify almost anything with the aim of making geography appear more scientific contributed to a declining interest in maps, surely the special essence of geography, and to a proliferation of abstract, internally comparative maps of almost no interest except to whoever published them. By the end of the 1970s and certainly beyond, it was not uncommon to find geographers stuck in a minor division of the discipline for research and most teaching, spouting statistics at anybody who might be listening and thinking about how to "number crunch" the next article, and reluctantly teaching an overview of a major division of the discipline (and very rarely of the entire disci-

pline).¹⁰ Precious few had a meaningful understanding of the past, the heritage of geography.

By 1980 the writing must have been on the wall. The University of Michigan had, for example, a vibrant interdisciplinary program in Russian and East European Studies with no need for grade inflation and all that, and in 1981 the university discontinued its department of geography. Studying the Soviet bloc flourished while study of the world perished, and this was an important event to send ripples of anxiety throughout the geographical community. In the 1960s and 1970s geography at Michigan had been considered among the very best in America, and as of 1980-81 it was still a very good program, yet Michigan felt compelled to join its assumed rival Harvard (“the Michigan of the East”), Yale, and other high-profile American universities by not having geography. Geographers in America took note, as apparently did the rest of the academic community which had been alerted to a confused, perhaps purposeless, discipline in their midst.

Discontinuance, trimming, and a fear of their possibility hovered over the discipline throughout the 1980s, and something obviously did happen. Reginald Gollidge, as president of the AAG (1999-2000), noted that in the period of “1970-73 there were 1,225 programs and 3,600 faculty” members and that “in 1993-96 there were 625 programs and 2,400 faculty” members in American colleges and universities,¹¹ meaning that half of the programs and a third of the geographers disappeared from the American academy in the roughly twenty years spanning the 1980s. Assuming that the threat of successful litigation protected relatively inactive or scholastically questionable professors with tenure, it would be a fair guess that the losers are to be found among the generally young scholars who earned doctorates in geography throughout the 1980s and had to give up the business because the universities could not accommodate them. It does not take a genius to figure out that a lot of geographers who might be held responsible for the decline of geography by 1980 stayed on while, at least in regard to geography in the academy, some of the promise of the 1980s languished. Today’s information would seem to argue that the situation has stabilized with the number of earned doctorates in recent years essentially matching the number of entry-level jobs being offered,¹² perhaps a message that retirement is finally taking its toll on the guilty. To demonstrate this, but more to point out that geography does face some chronic problems, it is insightful to note similar problems within the discipline that were identified by 1989 and in 1999-2000.

B. Problems Facing the Discipline as of 1989

Geography in America is a thick volume that was published in 1989 to explain the discipline as it existed inside the American academy throughout the uneasy decade of the 1980s. It is this thick book which has the insalubrious remark that “geography” cannot and should not be defined easily, and in the same article is a brief, yet importantly critical section entitled “Challenges Facing American Geography.” Without going into great detail, it classifies “several disturbing trends” that faced the discipline by the end of the 1980s into five groups of interrelated problems, rearranged here to facilitate discussion.¹³

[1] changes in emphases that have taken place over the last three decades [= 1960s-1980s]. Human geographers have increasingly looked to the allied social sciences and humanities for inspiration Physical geographers ... have become even more like their colleagues in the physical and natural sciences.

[2] the decline of international and regional interests and expertise among American geographers.

[3] the diminishing spatial scales at which most American geographers conduct their research.

[4] the prevalence of geographic illiteracy.

[5] an undercurrent of intolerance for approaches to geographic inquiry that differ from tradition, and a resistance to change in general.

The first, probably the most transparent to observers inside and outside the discipline, resulted from the tendency since the Second World War for scholars to specialize in both their research and their teaching. Although not unique to geography, and while certainly useful for expanding knowledge or at least the body of disciplinary literature, this trend eventually made it virtually impossible for an academic geographer to be competitively knowledgeable, first, in both physical geography and human geography and, later, in only one of these. The pure volume of good writings which had come onto the scholarly geographical market by the mid 1980s was enough to discourage deep study of the entire discipline, while professional specialization pressured an individual not only to be very familiar with the content of a minor division but also to be aware of the right names to drop and to keep right up to date with what others in the same specialty were publishing, or even preparing. In such a neurotic atmosphere, it is

not surprising that the discipline had become dangerously fragmented by this time, and that it would be difficult for a “geographer” to comprehend the discipline sufficiently to be able to define its summation. Perhaps in the run-up to the Michigan fiasco, nobody truly stopped to consider the potential negative ramifications, and therefore to push toward appropriate integration and a meaningful, common scholastic identity, but then again there would have been the rather unappetizing question of motive and logistics. As, for example, geomorphologists in geography became more like geologists and economic geographers pushed deeper into economics, it would not have been unfair for a critic to note that “geographers” did not want to be geographers, and nor would it have been unreasonable for scholars in the cognate disciplines to argue, not entirely from a protectionist point of view, that many geographers were not quite prepared to join them. The idea of not being able to fit into other departments ought to have sufficed for a motive, but changing might have required an enormous amount of reeducation and fighting the prevailing trend of specialization within the entire academy.

Although listed separately, the second and third trends are so closely entwined that they might be treated together. This observation from *Geography in America* might have been enough to question the existence of geography within the academy:

Somewhat akin to their increasing topical specialization has been a trend to focus upon increasingly smaller regions. For example, geographers typically work at community, urban, or ecological scales. One consequence of this small-scale bias is that few American geographers work at national, continental, or global scales.¹⁴

Although this does not take into account the fact that most geographers in the American academy taught introductory, worldwide-based geography courses and that some of their upper-level topical courses could have been of a worldwide scope, it would have been reasonable to agree with this assessment in regard to research and publications. In a community of competitive specialists, it would have been dangerous however to try a thorough study of the world, and textbooks and books on regions and countries might have been perceived as generalist, thus below the dignity of avant-garde scholarship. Important is the implication that the “geo” in “geography” had been discarded, as if to say that “the study of the world” no longer was the study of the world, which might have been true for some

“geographers” or inferred from geographers having had trouble explaining their discipline simply. Needless to say, geographers neglecting the world begs trouble, as would historians neglecting the past or economists the markets.

Still, geographers can contribute to understanding the world by investigating large areas of it or by researching versions of the same phenomenon scattered throughout it, something that the second and third trends demonstrated was in decline. Dismissing the pathetic “reduced government support” which is given in *Geography in America* as a reason for the decline of “international and regional interests and expertise,” there is however a disturbing claim that “regional geography” was not perceived to be “as challenging as some other specialties.”¹⁵ The best that ought to be made of this is that “geographers” had made “regional geography” less challenging, perhaps because of their own insufficient competence or lack of interest, a regional specialty in itself generally not having been a means of entry into the academic community as of 1981. To understand a region well, and thus to be able to teach and to write about it, implies knowing quite a bit about its history, topography, climates, soils, vegetation, animals, populations, economics, politics and government, religions, languages, and other aspects of culture—exactly what might be expected of a geographer. Only ignorance of what true regional study, or even of one country, entails can explain why geographers might have considered regional geography to be less challenging. That would have been a bad message to the rest of the academic community, and it could have been remedied (although legally not possible in far too many cases) by requiring sitting geographers to have completed, with a grade of B or better, two years of advanced study in a challenging area studies program.

Related to this are the observations listed under “geographic illiteracy,” the fourth “disturbing trend.” Although the authors mentioned the expected “inability” on the part of Americans “to correctly recite or locate geographic features”—the general application of the term, as discussed in section IV—they mainly applied this catchy expression to “deficiencies among professional geographers that tend to support perceptions that Geography is a ‘soft’ discipline”: insufficient training in the “physical and natural sciences,” quantitative methods, and foreign languages that inhibited meaningful or sophisticated contributions to scholarship.¹⁶ It is not clear why the social sciences and humanities were omitted, but an impression given is that despite having ventured into narrow specialties and relevant cognate disciplines, geographers had been doing so halfheartedly. Although this might have seemed to be true from the perspective of scholars in other

fields (who probably were similarly weak in their own ways), it ignores the fact that geographers should have had exposure and training where other scholars had not, namely into more than one academic discipline and in making maps. It does reveal, however, a belief that geographers had become ill-prepared to contribute well to scholarship that required more than a passing knowledge of one or more natural sciences, as might have been the case with analyses of the human being in the natural environment, as well as to benefit directly from works published in foreign languages. Of the three listed deficiencies, geographers were only interested in teaching quantitative methods to their students, while teaching and generally applying the sciences and foreign languages were to be done outside the discipline. Strangely, a geographer with a knowledge of abstract statistics and advanced mathematical techniques could legitimately have been given a course in quantitative methods as part of a normal teaching load, but a geographer with a very good command of a foreign language could not have had a course for teaching or applying it. If it were true that by 1989 there were not many American geographers worth a scrap in foreign languages, it is rather easy to explain the bias against regional geography. Observers of the discipline might legitimately have wondered which is easier, in regard to acquisition and application of skills, number-crunching a small piece of territory near one's base, or working with foreign-language materials to explain a distant empire. In most cases, besides, it is not even a question as to which has greater significance to most scholars, to the general public, to overall education, or to national well-being.

The final "disturbing trend" is slightly confusing, partly because intolerance of those who differ from traditions and resistance to change are in the domain of human nature, and partly because it is tricky to pin down disciplinary tradition in geography, especially in regard to research. Without changes and the means to disagree, American geography conceivably would have remained an enterprise of scholars and students roaming the countryside to write up physiographies in the spirit of its "father," the geomorphologist William Morris Davis. By World War II geography in academic America had moved away from its original dependence on the natural sciences, in particular geology which mainly investigated the depths of the Earth to try to understand its past, and more toward the social sciences with history as a sidekick.¹⁷ A central question seems to have been the relationship of humanity to the natural environment, and the method of argumentation—reason based on evidence and delivered via a sophisticated form of prose accompanied by relevant maps, diagrams, and other illustrations—followed the lead of

European thinkers from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Anybody who is reasonably educated and linguistically competent can make sense of the geographical writings of such scholars as von Humboldt, Ratzel, Davis, and many lesser-known figures even today, and if this is the "tradition" of geography, it started to unravel in the first two decades after World War II.

Perhaps the two most important factors of this "postwar" change were the proliferation of human geographers, who numerically had taken over the discipline well before 1989, and the "quantitative revolution" which evidently was intended to make geography more scientific, yet not all geographers have bought into this.¹⁸ Although geographers were still supposed to be inclined to examine the relationships of people to their natural environments, it is clear that through specialization geographers came to study one or the other, often with little thought given to relationship, and that the bulk of the work which was produced focused on the activities of people. At the time, of course, "technology" had come to be seen as the panacea for society's problems, so it might not have been unusual for forward-looking people to have felt that nature had become less relevant, and for geographers to have paid more attention to human possibilities. Quantification, however, changed the form of delivery for a substantial number of geographers, and by 1989 a lot of esoteric mathematics was in the geographical record, arguably in some cases for its own sake. Also, by the mid 1980s computerized mapmaking—a spin-off from general technological changes as well as the quantitative revolution—had made sufficient inroads to change the look of maps and other geographical diagrams.

The point is that geography had experienced important changes and had had its traditions challenged. It seems that the fifth "disturbing trend" was more of a rhetorical than substantial problem, as the accompanying prescription that "geographers should be open to promising new methods, theories, and philosophies"¹⁹ attests, and it is certainly one that is difficult to believe given that the other "disturbing trends" themselves suggest that significant challenges to disciplinary tradition had been occurring (less interest in regions and globality, more interest in small-scale areas, and "changes in emphases" in the direction of the social sciences and humanities, with the concurrent appearance of physical geographers to be nongeographical natural scientists). The key word in the fifth "disturbing trend" would therefore seem to be "intolerance," which might very well have pertained more to the "geographers" who upheld the new "traditions," or whose existence might have been threatened by questions about the identity of

“geography,” than to those who appreciated the more comprehensive spirit and purpose of geography that had been pushed aside.

C. Similar Problems Facing the Discipline as of 2001

The situation does not seem to have changed dramatically since the publication of *Geography in America*, one cycle in the Chinese zodiac having now passed. Given recently published commentary in the monthly *AAG Newsletter*, a forum for discussing the state of the discipline among other things, a “Snake” surveying the scene for 2001 might be inclined to believe that the “disturbing trends” identified in 1989, and relevant even in 1977, are chronic and likely to be around in 2013, that is they are being consolidated as integral to the academic tradition of geography in America. Substantial evidence can be found in the *AAG Newsletter*, and some of this from 1999-2000 has been presented elsewhere,²⁰ while supporting evidence could be found by an in-depth study of books and journals within the discipline.

First, the disciplinary schism of physical geography and human geography continues to exist, as acknowledged by this introductory explanation:

geography consists of two subdisciplines Each of these ... consists of several fields. Physical geography incorporates such diverse fields as climatology, geomorphology, aspects of biogeography, glaciology, and much more. Human geography ... includes, among other fields, cultural geography, economic geography, urban geography, and political geography. Rarely is any of these fields studied in isolation.²¹

In a sense it is a yin-yang relationship that ought to benefit those who study geography, but it becomes increasingly irrelevant as an individual develops into a professional scholar, and hence into either yin or yang, or even a part of one or the other, because specialization discourages a truly holistic approach. It might be noted that although such a situation is not terribly astonishing, given that other disciplines have their own major and minor divisions and foster specialization, some geographers do not see it in a favorable light. Graf, as president of the AAG, used the insightful expression “dysfunctional discipline,”²² something which might also have applied in the run-up to 1981, and fragmentation of the discipline and competition among its parts would seem to explain a lot of the dysfunctionality. Not only do physical geographers and human geographers have problems com-

municating across their divide, but so also do experts in the minor divisions who allegedly tend to aim their discourse only at similar(-minded?) specialists, as if the normal course of business is to try to exclude as many people as is possible.²³ While wondering if this is a fair assessment of the entire discipline in America, it is however reasonable to assume that problems of intradisciplinary communication are widespread and mask anxieties about existence.

For evidence of the second and third “disturbing trends” as living phenomena, it is helpful to consider three points: a relative failure of geographers to take advantage of environmental issues and of “globalization,” the minor importance attached to regional geography as shown through the job advertisements in the *AAG Newsletter*, and the propensity for articles in the flagship journals of American geography to focus on small units of territory. The first is discussed elsewhere,²⁴ and the key points are that geographers could not keep environmental science or ecology within their domain and that “globalization” has not generated as much interest in geography as might have been expected or at least desired. This might be explained by the fact that by the mid 1980s, when popular as well as academic interest in environmental issues took off, specialization and declining interests and expertise in large regions and the world meant that there were few geographers in America who were prepared to handle environmentalism and globalization, and it might be suspected that the discipline was slow to cultivate such interests. Nowadays specialties that fit into environmental science are reasonably represented in entry-level academic jobs advertised in the *AAG Newsletter*—roughly estimated at 20% (about 110 of approximately 560) for 1999-2000—but a regional specialty is seldom cited as the main requirement for such a post. In the same period, about 30 (less than 6%) sought a regional geographer, and of these about half specified one and only one region. Given that a regional interest was generally at best of secondary importance for a job, and that generally an advertisement would not restrict candidature to one region only, it might safely be assumed that regional competence, let alone expertise, remains a side-show in contemporary American geography. This can further be supported by the fact that the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* and *The Professional Geographer*, journals published under the auspices of the AAG and which purport to convey cutting-edge scholarship, have not showed great interest in large regions or the world. In 1999-2000, for example, nearly 80 of the approximately 170 articles in these two journals focused on rather small-scale units of territory, while about 30 did for large countries or regions and possibly

twelve did for the entire world. It would seem that the bias against regional and global study in favor of small areas remains alive and well.

The fourth “disturbing trend” from 1989, “geographic illiteracy” as applied to geographers, also continues to flourish. Again in the capacity of AAG president, Graf argued that geographers tend to be deficient in knowledge of relevant cognate disciplines as well as in relevant analytical skills, writing, and public speaking.²⁵ The first is intriguing because it insinuates that geography is not capable of taking care of its own and, by placing a premium on knowledge from other disciplines, reinforces the impression that geography is “soft” in that it alone is not much of a challenge. Similarly, the others might raise eyebrows within the academic community where scholars are supposed to be trained properly. If geographers are correct in recognizing that geographers generally do not analyze well and/or do not convey their information and ideas as well as scholars should, then it is easy to rationalize that their work need not be taken too seriously, and it would be reasonable to ask how such inadequate souls have managed to get in and to stay in the academic community. Still, being the organizational man, Graf seeks the remedy rather unimaginatively in “the education community,” which should be a boost for other disciplines but begs the question of how deficient geographers are to know the difference among the up and coming scholars, and even among established geographers. Two of the areas of identified general deficiency—the natural sciences (for physical geographers specifically) and mathematics—were also identified in 1989, and a bit of reflection might very well have caused the social sciences, humanities, and foreign languages to be tacked on.

Intolerance and resistance to change or “tradition,” the fifth “disturbing trend,” in a sense has not died out. As an example, the “quantitative revolution” has created a new tradition of number crunching that, because it contributes to the scientific image of geography, has virtually become a dominant culture within the discipline. There might be many geographical mathematicians who would support Graf’s suggestion that all geographers undergo special training in mathematical techniques,²⁶ although they are clearly not necessary for everybody’s research or scholarly well-being. Another new tradition is computerized mapmaking, known since the end of the 1970s as GIS (geographic information systems), and there does seem to be an undercurrent of belief that this is necessary for all aspiring geographers,²⁷ supported by many entry-level job advertisements in the *AAG Newsletter* citing GIS as a requirement or preference. It is not clear how vocal or strong the opposition is, but the fact that GIS has been coopted by

applied computer science and has led to a proliferation of technically inferior maps,²⁸ let alone the fact that there are already so many other things for geographers to know and do, should imply that many geographers do not welcome it, at least in its popularized form. The “postwar” tradition of separating geographers into “physical” and “human” obviously continues, perhaps to the dismay of some, but the older tradition of geography being a synthesis to investigate the relationship of people to their environments seems to have been revived, albeit slowly and perhaps reluctantly, but not allowed to define the focus of the discipline. Although a careful researcher would likely be able to provide much more substantial, even more persuasive, evidence than this, it ought to be clear that whenever changes are occurring within the discipline, resistance accompanies them and almost anything with some years behind it might classify as a “tradition.” As for “intolerance,” the unflattering words of Graf couched around the expression “dysfunctional discipline” might serve as a fitting departure from this section, “we” being “geographers,” an apparently defensive breed who might not like one another:

We sometimes exhibit behavior patterns that are destructive of geographic unity. When we criticize each other ... in an overly aggressive fashion, we engender emotional, strident responses rather than thoughtful intellectual debate and discussion. When we ignore our colleagues and refuse to engage them in informative communication, or when we abandon them altogether and eschew our identity as geographers, we create a dysfunctional discipline. The question now is will we find new ways to take advantage of our diversity, or will we allow the centrifugal forces to prevail, and become so strong that we find ourselves without a discipline of geography in the United States?²⁹

III. Relevance of the Problems Facing Geography

Learned observers of the United States and its academy might very well see some traits in all this that reflect not geography, but America, a culture that is characterized, for example, by problems of identity and the competition between unity and diversity, adversarialism which encourages nastiness in pursuit of a winner and a loser, a proletarianism in which specialization is simultaneously

admired and despised, an individualism that provokes a search to explain how an imperfect person is to fit in with a perceptibly monolithic society and to seek its approval, an uncomfortable balance between status and supposed egalitarianism, complaints about the competence of colleagues and the quality of goods and services, and dramatic exaggeration. It does not take much for such an observer to look at the five “disturbing trends” and to note dryly, and validly, that only so much can reasonably be known and done by any one scholar, and such trends as specialization and fragmentation exist in other disciplines; that seldom has an individual scholar in any discipline been able or willing to tackle what would be a voluminous enterprise, and research is typically incremental in nature; that no scholar in any discipline knows most, let alone all, of its aspects well; and that anybody can be classified as intolerant or an obstacle to “progressive” forces. It would not therefore take a sophisticated philosopher, armed with efficient multi-step logic, to realize that the problems facing geographers in America are in essence common to other scholars and can in their permutations be projected onto most people in other walks of life, in America and elsewhere.

In this context it is very difficult to appreciate the “disturbing trends” as much of anything beyond a subset of scholars wearing their hearts on their sleeve, of trying to display their dirty laundry (yet dreading that somebody might clean it). An outside observer might rightly wonder what all the fuss is about: geography, after all, is a very useful subject for children and adults alike, and to maintain its usefulness it requires scholars to preserve the knowledge, to expand it and to refine it, and to pass it on. The problem is that geographers perceive their discipline to be chronically under attack within the American academy, and this has led to a defensiveness that is manifested in anxiety over the image of geography and the resulting competition and occasional nastiness that contribute to its dysfunctionality. The message from 1989 and 1999-2000 seems to be that geographers as a whole (as “geography”) and individual geographers are waging a battle for survival, although perhaps an exaggerated one and one which might strike scholars outside America as somewhat weird. Yet there is something in this struggle that is very revealing about the American academy and where it is headed.

Probably nobody has bothered to state this briefly and in plain language, but geography is essentially a college of the arts and sciences, a mini-academy. As mentioned earlier, it incorporates the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities, thereby implying that it provides an excellent opportunity for exploring several subjects, synthesizing such knowledge, developing a multifaceted

intellect, and engaging in research in any or any combination of them. Trends and prejudices about geography in the academy therefore reflect trends and prejudices about the arts and sciences in general, hence questions about the discipline of geography might be projected outward as if to wonder whether the affairs of geography are symptomatic of what might happen to the arts and sciences, and even to universities, in America. Davis, the geomorphologist and “father” of American geography, postulated that landforms went through a sequence of youth, maturity, and old age, an analogy that ought easily be understood here, and it might be no coincidence that some geographers had been worrying about the future of geography at the same time that some scholars such as Bloom were worrying about the future of the universities. They had, and have, much in common.

Both the universities and the character of its scholars changed in America during the twentieth century. In regard to geographers, the following remarks by Davis in 1909 are enlightening:

As a result of the [difference] between school geography and professional geography, our professional geographers [= topographical surveyors, cartographers, explorers, teachers, and writers] are all self-made men. They have had to bridge over the gap from their school studies to their professional labors in such ways as they could best devise. They have consequently had to begin their higher work with preparation inferior to that which they should have had; and they have generally concluded it without coming personally, or through their writings, in close contact with our teachers of geography, who, of all persons in the community, should be most promptly supplied with everything which is new concerning their subject.³⁰

The key word here is “self-made,” implying that the earliest academic geographers in America had to be creative, reasonably independent and adventurous, and truly interested in what they studied. They observed, collected information, and wrote about it, most likely as they saw it and with intelligent reason as their main weapon of analysis, and it may safely be assumed that there was sufficient respect within the academy for their work, and that of their students who became scholars, for geography to have become established as a subject at the universities. The long run of the “middle” of the twentieth century provided a relatively

large demand for training of a geographical nature (e.g. surveying, mapmaking, planning, war-making) that teachers and researchers in geography enjoyed a comfortable market place in which to maneuver and to prosper, and the peak would have been sometime in the 1960s when geographers would have fed off the boom of World War II, the early rivalry between America and the Soviet Union, and the rush to suburbanize. Things started to change, however, as more and more machinery decreased the need for personal skills, large-scale war-making became unfeasible, almost everything had been surveyed and mapped, there was little of great significance left on this planet to explore, and geographers had begun to live off the past. No longer were geographers "self-made" or reasonably independent, and their adventurousness and "creativity" came to be restrained by the existing literature and academic specialization and expectations, while professional opportunities became dependent upon appropriate documentation, a form of the certification cult which has become too commonplace, and personal considerations primarily within the discipline. By the 1970s it would seem that "professionalism" (role-playing) had become more important than being creative, and despite the shake-around of the 1980s, "professionalism" continues to be important today,³¹ as is the related endeavor of trying to improve the "image" of the discipline. The stage of necessary creativity had given way to that of development, and then to that of preservation or prolongation with the inevitable question of how to breathe fresh life into an aging organism.

Geography is not however going to die out in the American universities until the American universities themselves pack up operations. Individual geographers might not get the type of academic employment they had or will have trained for, but they will find other things to do. Tenured professors need not worry much about the fate of the discipline, and most probably do not, unless they cynically dread not being remembered in the future, and some of them are going to be around for quite some time, while others will join them. An important question regarding the fate of geography in the American academy is therefore not whether geography has entered "old age," and is thus headed toward its end, but what will be the direction of the academy in general. If the pendulum is moving in the direction of intellectualism, excellence, and elitism, then geography might have a serious problem, but if the recent trend of promoting relatively broad-based education with something resembling potential training for a career within general society continues, then geography ought to be safe. The problems facing geography as a discipline within the American academy are therefore relevant to the

extent that they are conditioned not so much by geographers as by the trends within the academy, the role(s) that universities are to play for society as a whole.

IV. Comments on Geography in American Education

The expression “geographic illiteracy” has been around for quite some time now, and despite “literacy” apparently meaning a combination of knowledge, skills, and competence, the expression is primarily used to acknowledge the widespread ignorance in America of the country and the rest of the world, principally, in regard to locations. Some geographers have latched onto this as a reason for promoting their discipline, simultaneously using “geographic illiteracy” to argue that geography has an educational mission to accomplish, for which geographers in the academy have a role to play, and engaging in “narodnik” tactics by going to the schools to demonstrate living geography and otherwise drawing attention to it as an important subject.³² It would seem rational for geographers to want to do this, and maybe to be forgiven for exaggerating the situation, but as with the “disturbing trends” or problems facing the discipline, this “illiteracy” is just one permutation of the widespread ignorance and incompetence in basic matters that flourishes in America. It is a part of the general crisis in educating Americans that the two main candidates for the presidency recognized in 2000, and which the current president would like to do something about.

Things must of course be put into proper perspective. A geographer might normally be expected to lament about popular ignorance and incompetence in regard to geography, but scholars in other fields would be justified to do the same about their disciplines, as would professionals outside the academy about related disciplines inside it. This surely would not be new, nor would have been in 1989 or 1980 for example, yet the fat-dumb-and-happy culture has become sufficiently established and, through a cheap means of existence and low-intelligence entertainment, encouraged that most Americans have little need for much in regard to literacy (real meaning here), numeracy, visual competence, knowledge from academic subjects, and skills that might be acquired in schools and colleges. The educational community has gone along with all this, as have the governments that were supposed to guide and to monitor the schools in particular.

Specialists in education and appropriate governmental personnel might understand the depths of the problems, but they apparently cannot solve them in some

places in America. The greatest reason would seem to be public acceptance, indeed comfort, with the status quo, but a variety of other reasons might be found within the domain of education per se. Among these are short academic years, applying misguided theories and experimenting, tolerating ignorance and incompetence by easily passing students, insufficiently trained or motivated teachers, lack of respect for teachers and other personnel in education, heavy textbooks with lots of colorful illustrations and boxed information to accommodate limited attention spans, tests that rely on guessing games, a lack of effective means to punish trouble-causers, and legislation and threats of law suits. Still, there are schools and school systems that did not and/or do not fare poorly at accomplishing their task, and there must be many which do a reasonably good job within the confines of community standards. Rather than lamenting the overall unsatisfactory level of achievement by the summation of children in American schools, it would seem more important to complain with the intention of making sure that the children are provided with good possibilities in education, and of creating conditions for those who might benefit from those possibilities to do so. Compulsory periodic testing of students throughout the country might be a useful step toward accomplishing this.

When it comes down to it, though, the most important unit in education is the individual, and that individual chooses what to learn. Stimulation might come from different angles, but it need not affect interest or results, and education—including academic education—does not have to take place in the schools and other “recognized” institutions for learning. Too many educators and scholars are preconditioned by their own experiences and, generally, success in schools and universities to realize such things, and they have come to value diplomas, certificates, and degrees as “union cards” within the educational professions (there is, for example, no equivalent of a country-wide or even state-wide “bar examination” for prospective school teachers or scholars in the universities). A manipulative individual can figure out how to acquire the appropriate credentials and then to play the prescribed role, while a passionate, competent student might not, or might not care to, there being so much that relies on a social matrix which can work to the disadvantage of a promising individual not only in the schools but also in the universities. Yet, any individual can learn whatever that individual takes a fancy in, and possibly become very good at it, without a care about mainstream, institutionalized education and its system of accreditation.

What this means for the geographers who fret about widespread “geographic

illiteracy" in America is that it really does not matter. An individual who is interested in learning geography and/or how to use or even to compile maps will do so, while forcing geography on individuals is not necessarily going to make America any the better. At most it might create a few more jobs for teaching geography, something that would last only until, say, political scientists or historians have successfully pleaded their case for improvements in teaching the likes of national and state government and civics or world, American, and state history. Mainstream education in America has become, in essence, a standardized business that does not always deliver a satisfactory product, so responsible, competent, devoted geographers might want to reconsider if geography ought to invest much in it. By accepting the fact that most Americans are likely to be "geographically illiterate" in the future, although they will be able to do their own versions of "spatial analysis," geographers can think more clearly about how their discipline might better contribute to the education of young people in America.

Here are three pertinent observations for geographers in America to chew on:

- [1] there has been a reasonable interest in "home schooling" in America because some parents value the fruits of education, and the schools cannot meet their expectations;
- [2] two animated series on television that children in America are familiar with today are about Dexter and his scientific laboratory and about the globe-trotting Johnny Quest; and
- [3] travel is still stimulating (for children and adults).

The message might not be instantly clear, but by considering them and thinking unconventionally, geographers ought to sense a good opportunity. First, it must be recalled that geography is a mini-academy, a discipline that is intertwined with the various natural sciences, social sciences, and subjects in the humanities, and study of geography is enhanced through skills in mathematics, foreign languages, and one's native language as well as (for field work and mental agility) physical conditioning. Second, natural science, mathematics, and computer science (Dexter in [2] above) as well as exposure to different parts of the world (Quest in [2]) are promoted as adventures for children, and there is still a popular interest in going to different places and even learning about them. Third, as home schooling acquires more support, there will be increasing interest in it and an increasing pool of parents, even children, who would likely be interested in a promising alterna-

tive between the free public schools and the expensive private ones. This is not the forum to discuss it, but “geography academies” or true “schools of geography” as alternatives to secondary (junior high and senior high) schools or even colleges might be quite productive. Under the auspices of geography, the study of this world, other subjects might be taught and learned.

Notes

- 1 In this essay no distinction is made between the ranks of professors, lecturers, and instructors, and “the academy” is synonymous with “academe” or “academia.”
- 2 Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York etc.: Simon & Schuster, 1987).
- 3 For a very good survey of Ptolemaeus and his work see O. A. W. Dilke (with additional material supplied by the editors), “The Culmination of Greek Cartography in Ptolemy,” in J. B. Harley and David Woodward, eds., *The History of Cartography*, Volume One, *Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient, and Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago, 1987), 177-200. Facsimiles of printed versions of his *Geography* may be found in Japan at the National Diet Library (Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan) in Tokyo.
- 4 A useful survey of the history of geography is Geoffrey J. Martin and Preston E. James, *All Possible Worlds: A History of Geographical Ideas* (New York etc.: John Wiley & Sons, 1993). Chapters 2-13 (pp. 13-290) treat the European heritage and 15-17 (pp. 302-86) the American experience.
- 5 Gary L. Gaile and Cort J. Willmott, “Foundations of Modern American Geography,” in Gaile and Willmott, eds., *Geography in America* (Columbus etc.: Merrill, 1989), xxiv-xxv.
- 6 See Laurence Urdang, ed. in chief, *The Random House College Dictionary* (New York: Random House, 1973), 552 for entry [1]; and William Morris, ed., *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* [High-School Edition] (Boston etc.: Houghton Mifflin, 1976), 551 for entry [2].
- 7 See the *Random House Webster's College Dictionary* (New York: Random House, 1991), 558 for entry [3]; and the *New Illustrated Webster's Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: Pamco, 1992), 405 for entry [4].
- 8 See James M. Rubenstein, *The Cultural Landscape: An Introduction to Human Geography* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1996), xiii for entry [5]; and H. J. de Blij and Alexander B. Murphy, *Human Geography: Culture, Society, and Space* (New York etc.: John Wiley & Sons, 1999), R-19 for entry [6].
- 9 Will Graf, “Who We Are, and Are Not,” *AAG Newsletter* 34, 3 (1999): 2.
- 10 The two major divisions of geography are physical geography and human geography. Each of these is further divided, examples being climatology and soils in physical geography and political geography and urban geography in human geography, and even those divisions can be divided as in agricultural, industrial, and transportation geography within economic geography.
- 11 Reginald G. Gollledge, “What Will the Discipline of Geography Be Like in 50 Years?,” *AAG Newsletter* 35, 3 (2000): 3.

Geography in the American Academy

- 12 See Philip W. Suckling, "The Academic Job Market in Geography: Available Jobs Versus Supply of New Ph.D.s," *AAG Newsletter* 35, 3 (2000): 7-9 and 11. According to figure 3 (p. 8) and the corresponding text, the employment situation would have been most unpromising for those who received doctorates from 1980 to 1985.
- 13 Gaile and Willmott, "Foundations of Modern American Geography," xxx-xxxii (the quotations are on the first two pages).
- 14 Gaile and Willmott, "Foundations of Modern American Geography," xxxi.
- 15 Gaile and Willmott, "Foundations of Modern American Geography," xxxi.
- 16 Gaile and Willmott, "Foundations of Modern American Geography," xxx-xxxii.
- 17 For a survey of geography in America from around 1880 to ca. 1990, see Martin and James, *All Possible Worlds*, 302-86.
- 18 On the latter, viz.: "in the wake of geography's demise at Harvard and the ensuing sense of disciplinary marginalization in an increasingly specialist academy, numerical language was adopted by practitioners lusting after scientific credibility" in David N. Livingstone, *The Geographical Tradition: Episodes in the History of a Contested Enterprise* (Oxford, England and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999), 326.
- 19 Gaile and Willmott, "Foundations of Modern American Geography," xxxi.
- 20 Simon R. Potter, "Another Closing Frontier? Observations on Geography in American Academe," *The Japanese Journal of American Studies* 13 (2002), in the section "Geography Besieged?"
- 21 De Blij and Murphy, *Human Geography*, v.
- 22 Will Graf, "Three Impertinent Questions about Pertinent Issues," *AAG Newsletter* 34, 6 (1999): 2.
- 23 See Potter, "Another Closing Frontier?," for relevant citations.
- 24 Potter, "Another Closing Frontier?"
- 25 Will Graf, "Not Clueless, Just Skill-less," *AAG Newsletter* 34, 1 (1999): 1-2. See also Potter, "Another Closing Frontier?"
- 26 Graf, "Not Clueless," 2.
- 27 See, for example, Reginald G. Golledge, untitled "President's Column," *AAG Newsletter* 34, 9 (1999): 2, in which another former AAG president is cited as recommending that "all geographers should be exposed to GIS," a statement that might enjoy widespread agreement.
- 28 For example, in Alan M. MacEachren, *Some Truth with Maps: A Primer on Symbolization & Design* (Washington: Association of American Geographers, 1994), i: "One important outcome of the ... widespread use of geographic information systems and computer mapping software is that many individuals with little or no formal experience in cartographic design are now engaged in mapmaking. ... The products of some of the original computer software for making maps were often discounted by professional cartographers because they did not measure up to accepted standards of cartographic design even though they may have provided some measure of satisfaction to the software users."
- 29 Graf, "Three Impertinent Questions," 2.
- 30 William Morris Davis, "The Need of Geography in the University," in Davis, ed. by Douglas Wilson Johnson, *Geographical Essays* (New York: Dover Publications, 1954), 146 (the citation) and 156-60 (about the "professional geographers").

Simon R. Potter

- 31 For guidelines on professional behavior as a geographer, see "Statement on Professional Ethics," *AAG Newsletter* 34, 3 (1999): 31-35.
- 32 For example, see Martin and James, *All Possible Worlds*, 379; and Reginald G. Golledge, "Community Outreach," *AAG Newsletter* 34, 10 (1999): 1-2 and 9.

