WILEY

Review

Author(s): Sten De Geer

Review by: Sten De Geer

Source: *Geografiska Annaler*, Vol. 4 (1922), pp. 218-220

Published by: Wiley on behalf of Swedish Society for Anthropology and Geography

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/519752>

Accessed: 26-06-2016 21:09 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Swedish Society for Anthropology and Geography, *Wiley* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Geografiska Annaler*

On the other hand, one remark which seems to me to hit one of the principles in the Davis body of doctrine is the criticism of Davis' one-sided insistence on the deductive method. The present reviewer, in his morphological investigations, in connection with the cycle conception, has not been able to follow the deductive method to the extent that Davis seems to desire, but has preferred to go the way of analysis. In the future also I shall do the same, because our knowledge of morphology is still so defective, and views are so divergent, that one cannot come to results which can count upon an acceptance by any circle of readers without some analysis and exposition of the different premises. As an example it suffices to mention the hanging tributary valleys. In the opinion of the present reviewer, such valleys are not all caused by the overdeepening of the main valley by the glacial ice, and cannot therefore be taken off hand as criteria of such and be mentioned without commentary in the form-complex of the glacial cycle. Thus, for instance, most of the hanging tributary valleys in Hardanger Fjord, which Davis regarded as genuine, are in the reviewer's opinion false and have nothing to do with overdeepening. The deductive way of presenting things may be an object to aim at, but as yet it is a far distant one. A deductive summary of analytic investigation, on the other hand, may be justified by the fact that, if rightly used, it gives more clearly than other methods a synthesis of the region treated.

Accordingly, even after the perusal of Hettner's book, the present reviewer retains the opinion of the cycle theory that he has long entertained: Davis' body of doctrine, based on the exceptional observation of things large and small and developed with logical clearness, is a new and valuable contribution towards a continually increased knowledge of topography; the cycles that have been described, especially in "Die erklärende Beschreibung der Landformen", form no completely finished scheme applying to everything everywhere but are a first attempt towards a summary view of the natural development of forms — a summary which must be expanded, supplemented and amended as our knowledge advances; and the same applies to the terminology. The doctrine as to the geophysical processes must be given far greater scope, and greater attention should be devoted to structure and tectonics. Analysis and induction have their proper place alongside of deduction.

Many thankofferings will assuredly be made, especially in Germany, in honour of Hettner's criticism of Davis. To the present reviewer the value of his book will be not the critical character of the many wise things that are said in it, but those wise things themselves as a positive addition to our knowledge of the cycles and the author's insistence on geomorphology as the fundamental part of geography.

HANS W:SON AHLMANN.

NEVIN M. FENNEMAN, *The Circumference of Geography*; »The Geographical Review«, New York, 1919, pp. 168--175.

With American audacity and lucidity Fenneman has treated in a few pages the question of the scope and essence of geography, and in doing so he has dwelt on the great importance of regional synthesis or »land-knowledge« and also pointed out the character of geography as a science of distribution. He starts from an ingeniously designed circular diagram (Fig. 1), which expresses »the fundamental conception that sciences overlap and that each one of the specialized phases of geography belongs

equally to some other science.» — »In a loose way the central residual part of the circle may represent regional geography.»

Against the very suggestive diagram it can only be objected that astronomy is not one of the sciences that give any very extensive raw material to geography and that the boundary between geography and astronomy is of quite a different nature from the boundary between geography and other sciences, inasmuch as both geography and astronomy study the conditions of situation and distribution.

»The central residual part» of Fenneman's great geographical circle seems approximately to correspond to the study of the actual problem of distribution by theoretical geography, while, in the opinion of the present reviewer, the whole of the great circular area represents regional geography. After all, that therein is, has been well mixed up together, the geography of the various regions could be expressed on the diagram by sectors of the same great circular area.

Fenneman points out by way of introduction that the copious discussion of the content of geography, especially in America, has been due to the fear that geography would not be able to maintain its individuality and independence, a question which seems to him to be a burning one only in America. »Geography of the European brand has no such concern for its own parity or fear of being absorbed . . .», as appears from the fact that geographical treatises of European origin may even contain »long lists of botanical names, or geological descriptions . . .» — »To many American geographers,» he adds, »this would seem like betraying their cause and selling their birthright.»

Fenneman emphasizes the need of »a synthetic areal science,» of a comprehensive science of distribution, and says expressly, »It is the areal relation, after all, that makes geography» (p. 171). He defends the borrowing of material from other sciences and compares the geographer to »the great insect that carries pollen from field to field.» Descriptive geography is also necessary. »Description bears the same relation to geography that narration does to history. There can be no sound philosophy in either based on faulty narration or description. But data thus assembled from diverse fields do not remain inert. They react on each other like chemicals to produce new compounds, that is, new truths.»

What is most indisputably geographical is the study of regions, which are conceived by Fenneman also as syntheses of distribution phenomena: »the one thing», he says, »that is first, and always, geography and nothing else, is the study of areas in their compositeness or complexity, that is, regional geography».

Within the border regions only the specialized study of distribution is geography: »but without the touchstone of areal studies,» he says, »there is nothing to make physiography other than geology, ecology other than botany etc.»

»It should, however, be noted that the study of the distribution of any one element by itself falls somewhat short of that distinctive geographic flavour which comes only when the various elements are studied in their inter-relations.» The to Americans repellent mixture of geography with its neighbour and auxiliary sciences has provoked

Fig. 1.

a reaction, which causes Fenneman resolutely to direct his interest and his defining work to the centre of geography, the study of distribution. »Presumably, enough has been said to show that a science cannot be defined by its circumference. We may designate the center, that should be enough. So the center of geography is the study of areas.»

It is true that one may regard, as Fenneman seems to do, the synthetic study of distribution by preference as the kernel of geography; but this does not exclude the delimiting of geography in reference to the circumference. For if one extends one vision so that it embraces the study of distribution in its entirety — apart from the vast expanses of astronomy, and those phases of time which have not done much to determine the nature of the present — we find, in the opinion of the present reviewer, a theoretically tenable limit for the circumference of geography.

STEN DE GEER.

SÉANCES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ SUÉDOISE DE GÉOPHYSIQUE.

Janvier — maj 1922.

Séance ordinaire du 15 février 1922. Monsieur A. WALLÉN fit une conférence sur l'institution météorologique projetée à Gothembourg ainsi que sur le service météorologique actuel et les annonces des tempêtes. Le conférencier fit d'abord un rapide exposé du rapport et des propositions qui ont été présentés concernant l'institut météorologique de Gothembourg par le comité nommé à cet effet par le gouvernement. Ensuite il parla du service météorologique et de la méthode employée actuellement pour les annonces des tempêtes.

Séance ordinaire du 9 mars 1922. Monsieur A. ÅNGSTRÖM fit une conférence avec projections lumineuses sur la gelée et les annonces des gelées. Il rendit compte d'une série de recherches sur les facteurs qui déterminent l'abaissement de la température pendant la nuit et amènent les gelées. Il exposa les méthodes établies par le Service Météorologique et hydrographique de Suède pour l'annonce des gelées. Le conférencier présenta aussi des cartes montrant l'exactitude des pronostics.

Ensuite monsieur C. G. ROSSBY fit une conférence avec projections lumineuses sur l'observatoire aéronautique de Lindenberg.

Séance ordinaire du 27 avril 1922 (tenue en commun par la Société de géophysique et la Société suédoise pour l'exploitation des chutes d'eau). Monsieur HESSELMAN fit une conférence sur l'action exercée par la régularisation des lacs sur le sol des forêts environnantes. Le conférencier montra à l'aide de tableaux et de diagrammes comment une augmentation occasionnelle et passagère du volume d'eau dans un lac affaiblit la forêt jusqu'à une certaine hauteur au-dessus du niveau du lac, tandis qu'un certain renforcement paraît se produire dans les limites d'un certain niveau. A plus de 0.5 m. environ au-dessus du niveau de l'eau, aucun changement n'a pu être constaté avec certitude. Une discussion suivit concernant les récentes expériences sur les méthodes appliquées à la régularisation du débit des eaux; prirent part notamment à la discussion MM. SVEN LÜBECK, JOHN EKLUND et M. SERRANDER.