

GEOGRAPHY AS HUMAN ECOLOGY

Component-I (A) - Personal Details

Role	Name	Affiliation
Principal Investigator	Prof. Masood Ahsan Siddiqui	Department of Geography, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi
Paper Coordinator, if any	Dr.Taruna Bansal	Department of Geography, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi
Content Writer/Author (C	Dr.Taruna Bansal	Department of Geography, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi
Content Reviewer (CR)		
Language Editor (LE)		

Component-I (B) - Description of Module

Items	Description of Module
Subject Name	Geography
Paper Name	Geographical Thought
Module Name/Title	Geography as Human Ecology
Module Id	GEOG/31
Pre-requisites	
Objectives	
Keywords	

GEOGRAPHY AS HUMAN ECOLOGY

Taruna Bansal

Introduction:

Geography has always been 'vibrant science' which makes it inevitable that there would be diverging options about the nature and scope of geography. As time has passed, there are many children of geography, among them are astronomy, botany, zoology, geology, meteorology, ecology, and anthropology. In addition, geography works repeatedly with new obligations because the frontier areas. There are new centers for research, and have "added" the complexity and extent of their domain. In other words, its boundaries expanded in a few quarters, even; they contracted among others, thus in the recent past, the geographical domain has changed.

In the words of Hartshorne (1939) geography seeks to acquire a complete knowledge of the areal differentiation of the world. Geography as a discipline is concerned with the ways in which men occupy the surface of the earth organize themselves spatially and utilize the world's resources in spite of being unevenly distributed (Ginsburg, 1954). This viewpoint is typically geographical in nature; if considered from the point of view of ecologists human geography emphasizes on the physical environment and man's reciprocal relationship with the environment (Theodorson, 1959). Many ecologists have elaborated the relation between geography and ecology. These two disciplines do have some common aspects but still have their differences. Geography has its main interest to study the correlation between habitat and social factors that is the so called direct relationship between man and his environment; while ecology focuses on human communities and concentrates upon man and his habitat. That means for geography place as a central concept is important but for ecology process in time holds central position. The concept of region also varies in two disciplines. For ecologist region is a unity in physical environment while for a geographer region is a product of contact and division of labour. The above discussion therefore clearly proves that human ecology is something different from human geography.

The Relationship between Geography with other Subjects

The concept of geography is in the form of human ecology, which seems to help physically help in addressing the problem of the alleged overlap with some other topics. To show the interaction

between humans and a particular ecosystem, geography will be able to deal with various elements of land forms, soil, climate, vegetation and similar premises through the familiar list.

However, this will not be the business of geography, which explains the origin, character and event of these environmental facilities, nor their relationship, one; another, but the responses of individuals are considered in them, individually and in combination. It has never been clear in my mind that a body of facts and principles is transferred from one science to another. In any event, geography will not be defined as human ecology; it will not be related to the origin and development of forms of land in particular or in general, but with the adjustment of man for forms in the form of elements of the natural environment. In other words, the interests of geology and geography in the forms of land will be mutually exclusive. Similarly, geography as human ecology will not be concerned with the description of the character and distribution of the various seasons of the world, but with the human relations of the climate, usually only as an element of an environment complex. Then, geography will not deal with the relations of plants and animals in their physical environment, but will affect the plants and animals as well as the elements of the natural environment that affect humans. In essence, treating geography as human ecology will not adhere to physical science, meteorology, botany, and physics, climatology, plant ecology and animal ecology but will see them as independent sciences only.

Human Ecology as a unique field of geography

The modern scientific American geography that has recently emerged began with the splendid work of Davis, Gilbert, and a few others in physics or physical geography. It is a singular fact, which may be recalled in passing, that geography, though it is the mother of geology, has, in the recent period which has witnessed its revival in America, as a subject of higher study, been fostered by geology. In one university after another work in geography has been offered first in the Department of Geology. As this work increased, in some cases the official title of the department was changed to "Department-Geology and Geography". Hardly a physical geography was established, an insistent demand arose for what is called "human geography". But as already stated human geography is different from human ecology.

Geography treats men and their activities in their visible aspects and so far as they may be regarded as distributed phenomena. It does not concern, except incidentally, the interrelations among men. Human ecology, which is also interested in the relations of man to his geographic environment, fastens its attention upon the human interdependences that develop in the action and reaction of a population to its habitat. In other words, while geography views the adjustment

of man from the standpoint of modifications of the earth's surface, human ecology makes a detailed analysis of the process and organization of relations involved in adjustment to environment. This brings us to a second point of distinction between the two disciplines. Geography involves a description of things as they are at a point in time; its interest is in distribution rather than development. Ecology, on the other hand, is evolutionary. It undertakes to describe the developmental process as well as the form of man's adjustment to his habitat (Hawley, 1950).

An ecological conception of geography had appeared much earlier, of course, but it failed to attract many enthusiasts at any point in the development of geography as a discipline. *"Ratzel, taking his clue from the biological use of the term 'ecology,' once suggested that anthropogeography is, in effect, human ecology. From his point of view, as from that of biology, human ecology would be defined as the study of the interaction of man and environment; i.e., it would be that phase of animal ecology which is particularly concerned with the human species"*(Nelson, 1936). The doctrine was further strengthened by Barrows in 1922 when in his presidential address before the American Association of Geographers he emphasized that in geography human ecology is the guiding concept. In the words of Barrows (1923) – *"Thus defined, geography is the science of human ecology. The implications of the term "human ecology" make evident at once what I believe will be in the future the objective of geographic inquiry. Geography will aim to make clear the relationships existing between natural environments and the distribution and activities of man. Geographers will, I think, be wise to view this problem in general from the standpoint of man's adjustment to environment, rather than from that of environmental influence. The former approach is more likely to result in the recognition and proper valuation of all the factors involved, and especially to minimize the danger of assigning to the environmental factors a determinative influence which they do not exert."* Further while defining geography as human ecology he stated *"geography is the science of human ecology. . . . Geography will aim to make clear the relationships existing between the natural environment and the distribution and activities of man."*

The Nature of Human Ecology:

Human ecology is a relatively current development; the first use of the term in the literature was in 1921. The first book with title as ecology appeared in 1935 and interestingly was the work of a botanist. In this brief span of time, the discipline of ecology has evolved quite rapidly. When concerned with human ecology one can relate to Mackenzie's (1931) definition which states that

Human ecology deals with the spatial aspects of the symbiotic relations of human beings and human institutions.

Human ecology, in so far as it is concerned with a social order that is based on competition rather than consensus, is identical, in principle at least, with plant and animal ecology. Society, as ecologists have conceived it, is a population settled and limited to its habitat. The ties that unite its individual units are those of a free and natural economy, based on a natural division of labour. Such a society is territorially organized and the ties which hold it together are physical and vital rather than customary and moral. Human ecology has, however, to reckon with the fact that in human society competition is limited by custom and culture. The cultural superstructure imposes itself as an instrument of direction and control upon the biotic substructure. Reduced to its elements the human community, so conceived, may be said to consist of a population and a culture, including in the term culture (i) a body of customs and beliefs and (2) a corresponding body of artifacts and technological devices. To these three elements or factors-(i) population, (2) artifact (technological culture), (3) custom and beliefs (non-material culture) -into which the social complex resolves itself, one should, perhaps, add a fourth, namely, the natural resources of the habitat. It is the interaction of these four factors-(i) population, (2) artifacts (technological culture), (3) custom and beliefs (non-material culture), and (4) the natural resources that maintain at once the biotic balance and the social equilibrium, when and where they exist. The changes in which ecology is interested are the movements of population and of artifacts (commodities) and changes in location and occupation-any sort of change, in fact, which affects an existing division of labor or the relation of the population to the soil. Human ecology is, fundamentally, an attempt to investigate the processes by which the biotic balance and the social equilibrium (i) are maintained once they are achieved and (2) the processes by which, when the biotic balance and the social equilibrium are disturbed, the transition is made from one relatively stable order to another.

A number of human geographers accept the definition of human ecology as the study of mutual relations between men and environment, but in practice they have limited its application to a specialized field of geographic study. Some geographers-for example, Barrows, Renner, and White make human ecology synonymous with human geography. Barrows, the first geographer to publish this point of view, has written as follows: . . .*the center of gravity within the geographic field has shifted steadily from the extreme physical side toward the human side until geographers in increasing numbers define their subject as dealing solely with the mutual relations between man and his environment.* . . . White and Renner, whose volume is entitled ***Geography, an Introduction to Human Ecology***, limit this field to a study of the direct relations

between men or groups and their environments. This specialized field of study investigates problems of man's relation to his environment, both individually and in groups, such as (i) the effects of climate upon human health and energy; (z) the influences of resources and topography upon human occupations, homes, institutions, and inventions; (3) influences of natural routes and barriers upon social isolation and contact; and (4) possible effects of natural surroundings upon customs, attitudes, and beliefs. Thus these human geographers, who define human ecology as a specialized field of science, obviously disagree with Bews who regards it as an inclusive synthesis. Human ecology, like other specialized sciences may be defined and delimited in terms of the basic abstractions it makes. In particular, human ecology abstracts (i) a distinctive type of ecological interaction and (ii) a distinctive aspect of community or regional structure that arises out of this interaction.

To sum up human ecology may now be defined tentatively as a specialized field of analysis which investigates (i) those impersonal sub-social aspects of communal structure- both spatial and functional-which arise and change as the result of interaction between men through the medium of limited supplies of the environment, and (ii) the nature and forms of the processes by which this sub-social structure arises and changes. The value of human ecology depends upon the validity and significance of its own specialized abstractions and not upon its service in supplying indexes of social life.

Conclusions:

The old geography, although it has lost many specialties, still tries to cover too much ground and it will obviously benefit from physics, climate science, plant ecology and animal ecology as these organized sciences when will mingle with geography will make it more specialized. Relationships between man and earth, which are the result of their efforts to survive, are generally the most direct and intimate; most of the other relationships are established through these. Human ecology provides space to study spatial organization rather than areal differentiation which became a dominant doctrine within the discipline of geography. This is a positive outcome as but at the same time has its short comings. According to Chorley (1973) the traditional ecological model is inadequate in answering the raised questions especially as it does not give man it's due place rather casts it in the role of a subordinate. The Hagerstrand's time-space geography gave recognition to this approach when he talks of "*web-model of space-time interaction*" where he suggests that this approach incorporates certain essential biotic and ecological predicates within human geography and seeks to bridge the gap between human and biological ecology.

Geography as human ecology has confined the scope of geography as it totally ignores the social and cultural environment as well as man's relation with this environment. It only centers on the components of physical environment and man's relation with it. Kirk (1963) that if this approach encompasses both ecological and social sciences than may be it would initiate a discussion which can be relevant in understanding man and environment relationship from their point of view.

References:

- Adhikari, S. (2010) *Fundamentals of Geographical Thought*, Chaitanya Publishing House, Allahabad.
- Barrows, H.H. (1923) Geography as Human Ecology, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp.1-14.
- Park, R. E. (1936) Human Ecology, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 1-15.
- Quinn, J. A. (1939) The Nature of Human Ecology-Reëxamination and Redefinition, *Social Forces*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 161-168.
- Schnore, L. F. (1961) Geography and Human Ecology, *Economic Geography*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 207-217.