

METHODOLOGICAL CLASHES IN MOSCOW

THE leaven of genuine controversy is all too often hard to detect in the main body of the geographical literature. One perennial area of latent controversy centers around the search for the elusive common denominator which binds the subject into a meaningful entity. Since whole-hearted argument on this topic rarely comes to the surface these days in our own professional literature, it has been interesting to watch a battle royal over it which has recently enlivened the Soviet periodical literature and shown that the Russian tradition for argument in the grand manner has far from expired.

The immediate occasion for the flaring up of theoretical fires that had been smoldering for some time was the publication of a book, *Teoreticheskie Problemy Geografii* (Theoretical Problems of Geography),¹ which, for the first time in Soviet history, set out to investigate the theoretical basis of geography as a whole through historical and philosophical analysis. Like Hartshorne's *Nature of Geography*² and similar works, it was bound to set off a chain reaction of criticism, and doubly so, since the author, V. A. Anuchin, is an academic junior whose views were already considered heretical in some influential quarters.³

Anuchin's book is hard-hitting, and possesses the valuable, if vulnerable, asset of coming to definite conclusions about what geography is and where it should go from here. As a result, it has had an astonishingly mixed reception by

the important people of the Soviet geographical profession.

The "Grand Old Man" of Soviet geography, N. N. Baransky, who is regarded with a unique mixture of respect and affection by most of the profession, thinks that "It is a courageous and at the same time, a deeply scientific work . . . one of whose merits is its strict consistency of exposition and its precision of language," and adds "Let us hope that Anuchin's book will be much in demand, both in the Soviet Union and abroad. . . . its great value is completely obvious."⁴

Yu. G. Saushkin, one of the most influential and prolific of Soviet geographers, in a similar review observed that "It required a great deal of boldness to write such a book, since very authoritative scholars, periodicals and publications have spoken out sharply against a 'unified geography,' dubbing it theoretically 'shameful'" and concludes "However, that is the aim of the book—not to appease our scholars, but to arouse a lot of interest in theoretical matters, create an orderly theory of geography, and make such theory a powerful tool for practical work. Yes, Anuchin, this book is a disturber of the peace, and that's not such a bad thing to be!"⁵

On the other hand, this same book was submitted for the "doctorate of geographical sciences" at the University of Leningrad, and after a lengthy discussion it was announced that "staff members of the departments of Physical Geography and Economic Geography in the Geographical Faculty of Leningrad University came to the unanimous conclusion that Anuchin's book *Theoretical Problems of*

¹ V. A. Anuchin, *Teoreticheskie Problemy Geografii* (Moscow: 1960), 264 pp.

² R. Hartshorne, *The Nature of Geography*, 1939, 1946. Originally published in the *Annals*, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 29 (1939), pp. 173-658; reprinted by the Association, and available from the Central Office, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C.

³ E.g., Bureau of the National Committee of Soviet Geographers, "The Development of International Scientific Contacts and Their Importance for Progress of Soviet Geography," *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 1, No. 5 (May, 1960), p. 83; and M. I. Albrut, "Let Us Clear Up, Once and for All, Differences on Methodological Questions in Economic Geography," *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (March, 1961), pp. 23-26.

⁴ N. N. Baransky, in *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 8 (October, 1961), p. 83.

⁵ Yu. G. Saushkin, "Pervaia sovetskaia kniga o teoreticheskikh problemakh geografii" ["The first Soviet book on theoretical problems in geography"], *Geografiia v Shkole* (1961, No. 4), pp. 90-92; *idem*, "Krupneishii sovetskii geograf" ["A great Soviet geographer"], *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta, seriia geografiia* (1961, No. 3), p. 5; *idem*, "Economic Geography in the U.S.S.R.," *Economic Geography*, Vol. 38 (1962), p. 36.

Geography does not meet the requirements of a doctoral dissertation."⁶

One of the professors in question here, S. V. Kalesnik, a distinguished physical geographer⁷ and co-chairman of the Section on "Methodology and Bibliography" at the 1960 International Geographical Congress, found in the book "a great many external and internal faults . . . a great many qualifications, arbitrarily strained interpretations, internal discrepancies and contradictions"⁸ and concludes "Certainly Anuchin's book will spur geographers once more to think about and check their own theoretical positions. However this is the sum total of its positive significance."⁹ O. A. Konstantinov, a well-known Leningrad economic geographer and demographic analyst, feels that the book "must be admitted to be harmful" and cautions that "readers who are not thoroughly experienced in theoretical argument or who do not possess very firm theoretical views, may take Anuchin's book seriously. Public condemnation of the book would help to unmask it as unscientific and anti-Marxist."¹⁰ B. N. Semevsky, an expert on American economic geography who has himself recently been hauled over the coals for superficial treatment of the United States,¹¹ compares Anuchin's ideas, in what seems to smack of "guilt by association," with those of people like Bowman, J. Russell Smith, Hartshorne, and William Morris Davis, protagonists of a "unified geography in which the development of human society is subjected to the operation of natural laws."¹²

Hard on the heels of these critical forays there appeared in late 1961 a biting pamphlet, "On Criticism of the Unity of Geography,"

⁶ *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 10 (December, 1961), p. 32.

⁷ C. D. Harris, "A Soviet Viewpoint on the Nature and Laws of Physical Geography," *Geographical Review*, Vol. 50 (1960), pp. 120-121.

⁸ *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 10 (December, 1961), p. 21.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 24. Konstantinov has made a simultaneous attack on Anuchin's book in another article: "A Methodological Jumble in Theoretical Problems of Geography," *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 10 (December, 1961), pp. 12-17.

¹¹ See *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (March, 1960), pp. 56-58.

¹² *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 10 (December, 1961), p. 30.

in which Anuchin dissected minutely some of the more adverse of his critics.¹³ In the foreword Baransky explains that the decision to publish this and perhaps future controversial tracts in pamphlet form arises from the denial of a forum for truly egalitarian discussion in the major geographical periodicals. In imputing a measure of dishonesty to some of Anuchin's critics he avers that "criticism must always be conscientious—otherwise it has no place in print in the Soviet Union" and quotes a leading article from *Pravda* as laying it down that "no monopoly by particular persons or groups, nor any attempts to impede scientific criticism and the constructive discussion of theoretical questions, can be tolerated in science." He castigates not only "those who defend obsolete ideas" but also those who "prefer to stand aside from sharp discussions."¹⁴

Part of Anuchin's pamphlet is devoted to providing chapter and verse for "distortions" of the text of his book, notably in the reviews by Konstantinov, whom he accuses of substituting intimidation, exorcism, and guilt by association for scientific criticism. In the course of this, and elsewhere, he attempts to clarify many of the ideas and proposals of the original book, which will be outlined after a consideration of its historical bases.

ANUCHIN'S VIEW OF THE PAST

The first half of the book, and by no means the less interesting half for non-Soviet readers, is devoted to a critical survey of the history of geographical thought and practice, reaching back to the ancient world, but mainly concerned with the philosophers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The Marxist system of thought inevitably pervades this survey in a general way but less obtrusively and dogmatically than has hitherto been customary. A recurring theme throughout is the struggle between "materialistic" philosophy (*ipso facto* "correct"), which is equated with the unified or monistic view of nature and society, and "idealistic" philosophy, which is identified with the separation of these two and the growth of both "indeterministic" and environmentalist ideas. The

¹³ V. A. Anuchin, *O Kritike Edinstva Geografii* (Moscow: 1961).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

writings of Lenin and Plekhanov can be quarried with rather more success on this particular theme than Marx himself.

The "philosopher-idealist" Kant has many pages devoted to him, and some of the "subjectivist" ideas which have bedeviled "bourgeois" geography are laid at his door, notably the space-time dichotomy and the denial of "a material object of study in geography." However he is portrayed in many ways as a good man gone wrong and "one of the most complex and contradictory phenomena in the history of ideas."¹⁵ He is credited with introducing some "basically materialistic concepts which furthered scientific progress,"¹⁶ for example the view of the natural environment as affecting society *through productive activity*, rather than merely physiologically—a "step forward" (to Marxism). Some of the "most reactionary aspects" of his philosophy are put down to the influence of David Hume, and Anuchin deplors the fact that only the "idealistic side of his (i.e., Kant's) teaching" was taken up by his followers. This influence he traces not only in "bourgeois" geography today but in the attitudes of those Soviet geographers who advocate the separation of the natural and social aspects of the subject.¹⁷

In 1959 the centenary of Humboldt's death was marked by several eulogies in the Soviet geographical literature (and even by a special issue of a postage stamp—surely the first time a geographer has been so honored!). Anuchin joins in the praise for him, linking him philosophically with Varenus rather than Kant and commending him for attributing to geography a "tangible object of study," and a greater belief in process and the idea of development in general.¹⁸

Ritter, on the other hand, was notable by his absence from the 1959 commemorative literature in the Soviet Union (he also having died in 1859). In spite of this, Anuchin accords him a prominent place, and quotes with approval the statement of D. N. Anuchin, a universally respected pre-Revolutionary Russian geographer, that "[Ritter] brought a new meaning and life into geography, as a subject

straddling natural science and the humanities, and attempted to link up the march of world culture with geographical factors."¹⁹ On the other hand he was one of the first "proponents of idealism in geography" and this influence apparently made itself felt in the work of Russian "anthropogeographers" like V. P. Semënov Tian-Shansky as well as the French school of "Géographie Humaine." "Retouching geographical determinism with dialectical idealism, they conclude that society is influenced by the natural environment, but social life is depicted as a harmonious, classless unity."²⁰ Anuchin makes it clear, however that these groups of people stopped short of the "reactionary conclusions" of Ratzel, whose role as a founding spirit of environmentalism and *Geopolitik* he emphasizes.

Hettner is represented as a fundamentally sound geographer who simply failed to rid his mind of Kant. "In the field of concrete investigations [he] almost invariably took a materialistic stand. . . . Hettner the empiricist rebelled against Hettner the theoretician."²² Anuchin emphasizes and approves Hettner's convictions on the unity of the subject, quotes his assertion that "it is only from history that we can understand the present," and approves his "struggle against indeterminism," but says that "they cannot compensate for the scientific worthlessness of Hettner's theoretical conceptions as a whole."²³ However, he ridicules a 1951 Soviet description of Hettner, the "bugle-boy of the misanthropic ideas of imperialism," as "departing far from reality."²⁴

Anuchin's assessments of the roles of individual twentieth century Western geographers are frequently wide of the mark, even when all due allowance has been made for terms and concepts which sound ambiguous to Western ears. For instance, Mackinder is seen only in his relation to *Geopolitik*, and it is claimed that he "did not try to develop regional geography" and viewed "the unity of geography as brought about by the fact that all geographical problems . . . are subordinated to the influence of politics." Further, A. Strahler is represented as adopting "Mackinder's view that physical

¹⁵ Anuchin, *Teoreticheskie Problemy Geografii*, p. 51.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 60-62.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 83-84.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

geography provides [the politicians] with basic scientific knowledge of the world for strategic and tactical planning, so that it can be called a political science."²¹

In general Anuchin tends perhaps to be more lenient with the great molders of geographical thought in pre-Soviet Russia than with their foreign counterparts, a rather natural human failing which is noticeable in many branches of Soviet science today (though not confined to the U.S.S.R.). V. V. Dokuchaev and D. N. Anuchin, widely respected and quoted in Soviet geography today, and almost above criticism, have been powerfully and justifiably used in the book to buttress the arguments for geographical synthesis. A. I. Voeikov, perhaps the most wide-ranging and internationally minded of all these great Russian scholars has, oddly enough, hardly been brought into the discussions.

Among non-Marxist, non-Russian geographers, Anuchin's hero seems to be Elisée Reclus. "He . . . understood the historical character of the influence of the geographical environment on the life of society . . . his regional study was written with a great love for man and his work. It is free from racialism and wholly directed toward the future. He showed talent and regard for truth in his account of the struggle between man and nature and of the changes which are taking place in nature and in society as a result of that struggle. Reclus was not a Marxist. Moreover, like L. Mechnikov [a nineteenth century Russian geographer also especially praised by Anuchin for his balanced approach, D. H.] he attacked Marxism and adhered to views which were essentially anarchist. Nonetheless, his *World Geography*, filled with a mass of factual material, presents many aspects of the interaction between nature and society with surprising correctness."²⁵

DIAGNOSIS AND PRESCRIPTION FOR SOVIET GEOGRAPHY

Anuchin's book is not only a unique Soviet attempt to provide a critical survey of the development of geographical thought. It represents a passionate affirmation of the rightness

of the monistic, and the dangers of a fragmented, approach to the subject. The second half of the book is taken up with discussion of a number of topics ranging about this central theme, such as the concept of environment, the problem of determinism, and the theoretical framework for regional studies. In contrast to the historical survey, these arguments are woven together almost exclusively with the threads of *Soviet* geographical theories and disputations, interlaced with references to some of the Marxist philosophers. This is indeed unfortunate, but it is in line with the mission set out in the book, which involves the construction of a theoretical framework for a unified geography of a "Marxist-Leninist" character, *ipso facto* distinct from any "bourgeois" version.

This kind of declaration may seem to Western geographers to be rather meaningless, and indeed it is difficult to pin down anything exclusively Marxist in the arguments. Be that as it may, the reader gets many interesting sidelights on the internal Soviet controversy over whether geography is one or many subjects, which seems to be the prime theoretical bone of contention among Soviet geographers.²⁶

Anuchin diagnoses the major current disease of Soviet geography as a galloping centrifugal tendency, fostered mainly by workers in the "frontier" branches (e.g., geomorphology) and he laments that "geographers are beginning to understudy geologists, biologists, physicists, economists, etc., at the same time *failing to fulfill their own tasks*" (his italics).²⁷ He is not concerned to deny the legitimacy of the "historically formed" systematic branches of the subject, but maintains that the geographical method is shown up to best advantage in the study of "territorial complexes." Further, this means that geographers must specialize in regions as well as topics since each region is a more or less unique "complex" and a regional geographer therefore cannot successfully be as "footloose" as say a hydrologist or

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 79-80.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

²⁶ See, for example, D. J. M. Hooson, "Some Recent Developments in the Content and Theory of Soviet Geography," *Annals, Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 49 (1959), pp. 73-82; and R. A. French, "Geography and Geographers in the Soviet Union," *Geographical Journal*, Vol. 127 (1961), pp. 163-64.

²⁷ *Teoreticheskie Problemy Geografii*, p. 103.

climatologist.²⁸ Thus he (Anuchin) is concerned to establish the theoretical legitimacy, indeed necessity, of "general geographical research," straddling the conventional physical-economic border, and, especially, comprehensive regional studies.

He defines the all-encompassing object of study in geography as the "geographical environment." However he uses this term with an unusually expanded connotation, making it mean not only the "landscape envelope" within which man lives, and on which he has made his imprint, but also "society" itself. This apparently all-embracing definition of the field has probably drawn more critical fire from both the physical and economic "sides" than any other specific points in the book.²⁹ To Anuchin it follows logically from his thesis about the wholeness of nature and society, but to his critics it is seen as a posterously diffuse "*omnium gatherum*," as "idealist illusion" which blurs rather than sharpens the focus of the field. The general arguments of the book do not stand or fall by the validity or clarity of this sweeping definition. However, since a major theme, strongly pressed, is the necessity for a proper and thorough consideration of the "role of the geographical environment in the development of society," involving a two-way relationship, the lack of a clear distinction between the two terms is a serious drawback, to say the least.

In his strivings toward a thorough study of interaction between man and nature, long neglected in the Soviet Union, Anuchin is concerned to wage a war on two fronts. The first, against "geographical determinism," is regarded as a dying issue and involves chiefly the ghosts of certain Western geographers. The second, which brings into action the real cutting-edge of Anuchin's polemic on this issue is against "indeterminism" or even "fatalism." Here certain Soviet geographers, both physical and economic, are accused of deliberately ignoring or belittling the importance of the specific features of the geographi-

cal environment.³⁰ This battle against an unholy alliance of "inhuman" physical geographers and "unnatural" economic geographers (seen as leading inevitably to the disintegration of the subject) has long been waged by Baransky.³¹ As for these erring economic geographers, their state of mind can be traced back to the so-called "Leftists," who in the nineteen-thirties attempted to transfer economic geography to economics.³²

Paradoxically, perhaps, although Anuchin's book is highly theoretical and can be criticized for its poverty of specific practical illustrations of its precepts, much of the prescription boils down to a plea for more specific study of precise characteristics and interacting processes as the basis for a true understanding of particular, and necessarily unique, places.

The most persistent immediate justification made for this general prescription is the practical gain in terms of eradicating "stereotype" in Soviet planning, and the inevitable increase in the productivity of Soviet society which would follow from a more accurate assessment of the many-sided realities of the geographical environment.³³

Thus we come back, through the practical need for more rounded and complete studies of regions, to the necessity of constructing a valid framework of theory (at present lacking in the U.S.S.R.) into which such practical work can be fitted. Anuchin argues that rejection of the unity of geography theoretically lays the foundation for an *exclusively* branched line of development in which systematic laws would become absolute and "geographical" periodicals, Faculties, Societies, etc., would become anachronistic.³⁴

³⁰ *Teoreticheskie Problemy Geografii*, p. 147 et seq. Incidentally, he also classes Robert S. Platt as a proponent of "indeterminism" (p. 81).

³¹ See, for example, N. N. Baransky, *Ekonomicheskaya Geografiya—Ekonomicheskaya Kartografiya* (Moscow: 1960), p. 37.

³² I. M. Matley, *The Soviet Approach to Geography* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1961, unpublished, but available from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mich.) throws light on this and other early movements in Soviet geography.

³³ E.g., Anuchin, *Teoreticheskie Problemy Geografii*, p. 243.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 242.

²⁹ E.g., Saushkin, in *Geografiya v Shkole* (footnote 5, above), p. 92; and S. V. Kalesnik, in *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 10 (December, 1961), pp. 20-21.

RELEVANCE FOR AMERICAN GEOGRAPHY

We cannot comfort ourselves with the thought that we at least have long upheld the idea of the unity of our subject and that what we are witnessing in the Soviet Union is just one more belated attempt to "catch up" with the United States. Lip service to unity is still generally paid here, but its theoretical underpinnings are rarely analyzed. The unity of W. M. Davis' geography has been protested as strongly as that of H. H. Barrows or E. A. Ackerman and yet the functional bases for that unity, the approach and even the range of subject matter assumed, are in the several cases markedly divergent. Meanwhile there has recently been a tendency towards neglect or even depreciation of integrated, historically based regional studies in the U.S., alongside a great increase in the emphasis placed on techniques and quantification in specialized branches. In Ackerman's words "fundamental research in geography at this stage is disintegrative,"³⁵ and there may well be some grounds for Saushkin's observation that American geographers are "departing further and further from monism . . . and favor [it] only in forewords and introductions to summary presentations and not in actual practice."³⁶

Further, the Soviet problem of integrating a fast-growing "economic geography" with a powerfully developed and quite self-contained physical geography is more difficult than the American problem of maintaining a "unity" resulting to some extent from a virtual abandonment of much of physical geography to neighboring sciences. However a noticeable change in attitude on this question in the United States has recently become evident³⁷ and may herald the resurrection of the vigorous study of physical geography, in which case

³⁵ E. A. Ackerman, *Geography as a Fundamental Research Discipline*, University of Chicago, Department of Geography Research Paper No. 53 (1958), p. 35.

³⁶ Yu. G. Saushkin, in *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (February, 1961), p. 74.

³⁷ E.g., J. Leighly, "What Has Happened to Physical Geography?" *Annals*, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 45 (1955), pp. 309-318; also C. W. Thornthwaite, "The Task Ahead," *Annals*, Association of American Geographers, Vol. 51 (1961), pp. 345-356; and F. Ahnert, "Some Reflections on the Place and Nature of Physical Geography in America," *Professional Geographer*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1962), pp. 1-7.

the problem of the theoretical and practical bases for unified geography may approach the Soviet degree of difficulty. The problem seems to be that of reconciling the natural and legitimate desire of physical geography not to be blinkered too severely by restrictive clauses, with the need for a real functional as well as formal bond making the two "sides" vitally relevant to, if not inseparable from, each other. To define the central goal of geography as an understanding of the location of man on the earth, which according to the published record seems to have largely preoccupied American geographers for some decades, both logically involves and practically necessitates a thorough, dynamic study of the interacting processes which give character to the living natural environment.³⁸ The relativity to man would tend to be expressed, as it undoubtedly is in Soviet physical geography, in the selection of significant *subjects* for study, such as heat and water balance, stream behavior, permafrost, rather than in the nature of the analytical techniques in each case. There should therefore be no necessary contradiction between the scientific integrity and freedom of a strong physical geography and its position within a basically man-centered science, or between genetic (as distinct from evolutionary) and descriptive terms appropriate to the provision of the maximum understanding of the real character of the environment.

We may also find a convergence of views on other methodological matters between Soviet and American geography. It is often a question of distinguishing shadow from substance in much of the jargon still used in Soviet geography. For instance one finds repeated general references to "laws" in Soviet economic geography, but on looking further, one is hard put to it to find any specific law enunciated, and it turns out that what is meant is policies, trends, and tendencies similar to those which are recognized and acted upon from time to time in the Western world. However, although location theories have been notably absent from Soviet economic geography and "Western" theories have in the past been reviled, it is notable that,

³⁸ See D. J. M. Hooson, "The Distribution of Population as the Essential Geographical Expression," *Canadian Geographer*, No. 17 (November, 1960), pp. 10-20.

recently sympathetic references to the works of Isard, Warntz, etc., have been made by Saushkin,³⁹ representing a marked change from his earlier strictures on geographers who dealt in "geometric space rather than a definite concrete territory with unique characteristics."⁴⁰

Similarly, Soviet name-calling on the subject of "determinism" in Western geography has lost its former crudity and it is widely conceded that the doctrine now has very few avowed supporters in the West. Therefore it is particularly depressing to read Anuchin's statement that "by bourgeois geography we understand geography based on geographical determinism. My book discusses unified geography of a completely different kind."⁴¹ The image of Soviet regional studies as being necessarily different in kind from "bourgeois" counterparts is commonly propagated,⁴² but as in the case of the "laws" it is hard to find out what specific differences there are or should be, apart from the obvious distinction between planned and semi-planned economies. We would probably be wrong, however, to take such protestations as more than superficial gestures, but we should recognize the apparently persisting need in Soviet academic life to demonstrate fundamental differences in philosophy between things Soviet and things American. For example, Academician

Gerasimov at the Third Congress of the All-Union Geographical Society at Kiev, felt it necessary to accuse the present writer of "using his knowledge of the trends in Soviet geography chiefly to glorify bourgeois geographical science, masking its own methodological weaknesses and trying to minimize the progressive principles of Soviet geography," while a warning that we cannot take the outcome of the monism-dualism intellectual contest for granted is taken to be a "serious internal contradiction."⁴³ One may, perhaps, politely turn a blind eye to such baffling pronouncements, while taking comfort in the increasing intelligibility, intrinsic interest, and value of current substantive work and internal methodological disputations in Soviet geography. These, for the most part, use the common geographical tongue. We should keep in mind the natural preoccupation of Soviet geographers with the bounding development of their country and also the ferment which has set in in Soviet academic life in recent years. In turn one may hope that they will eventually recognize, and freely acknowledge integrity where it exists in Western work, and jettison the absurd notion that our integrated regional studies must needs bring into play a "loaded" deterministic viewpoint.

In actual fact geography seems to be one of the best vehicles through which effective contact can be established between Soviet and American academic groups. It is not so thoroughly "engaged" that polemics inevitably take over, as in economics or politics, but does possess enough social and philosophical content and international flavor to enable us to preserve many of the ingredients for the spice of fruitful argument.

DAVID J. M. HOOSON
University of British Columbia

³⁹ Yu. G. Saushkin, "K dvukhsoletii termina 'ekonomicheskaiia geografiia'" ["On the bicentenary of the term 'economic geography'"], *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta, seriia geografiia* (1961, No. 5), p. 26; see also *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 7 (September, 1961), p. 40.

⁴⁰ N. N. Baransky, N. P. Nikitin, and Yu. G. Saushkin, *Otechestvennye Ekonomiko-Geografii XVIII-XX Vek*. [Native (i.e., Russian) Economic Geographers of the 18th and 19th Centuries] (Moskow: 1957), pp. 53-54.

⁴¹ Anuchin, *O Kritike . . .*, p. 12.

⁴² E.g., Saushkin in *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (February, 1961), p. 74; and I. P. Gerasimov, in *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (January, 1962), p. 27.

⁴³ *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation*, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May, 1960), p. 82.

Note: While this article was in press the September, 1962, issue of *Soviet Geography, Review and Translation* appeared, containing a translation of Anuchin's pamphlet (footnote 13, above) and other articles pertaining to this controversy.