

Placing Geographia: “Philosophy of Place” and the Subject- matter of Geographia

Prof. Musa S. Dibadj, Ph.D

Summary:

Philosophy as the fundamental Knowledge of being, as well as the substantial knowledge of all natural and human sciences, conditionalizes all other branches of sciences through its basic and important questioning. The general philosophical ideas might convey certainty or uncertainty of propositions to other kind of geographical propositions. The vast broad of philosophical doubts and destabilized world- views can bring the geographical propositions to the level of uncertainty and hesitation.

Occasionally in different articles such as *Farideh Maknieh* and *Arschia Makanieh* (written in Persian) related to the concept of space as a pure one or the concept of place I have discussed the absolute and non- conditional certainty hidden in the concept of space. The self certainty of the concept of space deserves much attending above other supper philosophical concepts as being, truth, substance or else, this certainty seems as a unique solution for difficult questions in human knowledge and epistemology as well as for fundamental paradoxes or perplexities hidden in the subject matter of Geography.

Within different divisions of geographies, appeared from Ptolmaeus time until now, the idea of substantiality of space/ place can surely direct us to unveil the true meaning of determined and particular places. In geographical knowledge, including the various' divisions, natural as well as human geography, the place accepted as the same and one subject matter.

With all different intentions, beliefs and personal tendencies and views, so far, all geographers agreed the place as the most united subject that assisted geography became generally a unique knowledge compare to the other human sciences, in example, the rival knowledge of history, fulfilled by rather stable and reliable statements and propositions, far from, doubt and hesitancy. It is said that Strabo wished a geographer- become finally a philosopher, indeed this wish has been realized from the starting phase of geography even before appearing of Strabo.

Introduction to Our Question:

The original ideas in philosophy have power to form, reform or even change the basis for other scientific propositions included geographic. The certainty or uncertainty rooted in philosophical subjects can stretch over geographical domains, make the value of geographical proposition more and less relativistic. Thus, in order to escape from the chaos of anti-determinism and uncertainty one should resort to the philosophy again.

As I demonstrated carefully in my book *Fi- ALmakan* (On Space) the certitude of the concept of space/ place is of such strong, out of risk of hesitation and beyond doubt absolutely. Therefor this concept might provide geography a chance of refining its subject- matter which has been interrogated through the history of this knowledge, or let us say the history of the subject- matter in geography.

As we demonstrated carefully the occasional recognition of the place in spite of differences among super famous geographers and geoscientists as well, with different world views, different philosophical orientations and thinking styles, caused geography, to be a united knowledge compared to other human sciences, less contradicted. Geographia, a concrete knowledge which because of the concreteness of its statements and propositions became a more reliable science compare to other rivals as historical knowledges. The Strabo’s dream in his historical great work *Geographic* has been realized truly and geography united with pure philosophy of space.

I think we must mention primarily the human kind native consciousness of space/ place. This essential consciousness is not restricted at all to any kind of scientific data on space or spatial epistemology. Our being present at space or place seems exclusive and unique, not be found in any other else consciousness cases. We are beings in nature while our awareness of nature become increasingly variant and vast.

But, the natural environment exists without us and our awareness of being environmental or our negligence of the fact does not change its truthfulness at all, yet we cannot neglect that through our knowledge of natural world we become aware of its existence.

Hence the concept of environ is a conditional compared with the unconditional concept of space/ place. We already know what space is since our birth time arriving in this world, without being owed to our sensations, individual understanding or social affairs and political activities and other similar attitudes.

Of course, this does not mean that we have a perception of space not detachable from us. Rather it must be stated that space cannot be driven to any human conception or imagination. We have variety of spatial images, of spatial beings such as mountains, oceans, moon and stars and other spectacles, visible small or big things in our imagination or located in their own places around us, in an open environment, of which some can be seen, moved or changed by imaginal invention.

Obviously, we cannot grasp the place of things as such. Place itself cannot be seen by our eyes while each micro and macro of phenomena in places could potentially be seen. We cannot occupy the places belongs to things as long as occupied by themselves.

Other aspects of physical beings might be retained by our acquaintance except spatial aspect. Because human mind cannot intervene in the places of things in the objective world outside nor in the subjective world, human being cannot retouch the place quo place of beings. As subjective beings, if we cannot create in our imagination any true picture of the places in which things are, could it possible to obtain the places of things as they are. Of course, we are certain that things are located in their places, a wonderful necessary result of the concept of space. As final word, it must be concluded that although human mind is where all things are located subjectively in, never it would be where the place itself in.

Human being is a spatial being rests in a place but also, let being existed on the earth, the mother of his special natural place. Perhaps, because of the importance of the human terrestrial place, in his book called *Geographica Generalis*, Varenus considers the terrestrial as absolute place.

This means that being spatial, privileged human of other non- terrestrial beings. Earth is, a mother land for vital and non- vital terrestrial beings but it is only human being deserved to have terrestrial determination before become created materially. The Scripture has narration of the fall of human on earth reflects the mystery of terrestrial destine of human being.

People are living of earth, in different parts of the world, no matter they be aware or not be aware of the value of the dwelling land. In return the Earth, does not ask people living on its surface of what they will or not and do not beg for self terrestrial consciousness.

The general geographical hermeneutics

Geographia can be considered generally having relation to hermeneutic of both natural sciences and human sciences. The difference between these two refers mostly to experimental investigations, observations based on experiences and also mathematical and statistical analysis. Geographia become in cross with hermeneutics. From one side, since hermeneutic defined as the knowledge of interpreting being, inclined to discover ontological foundations of the worldly beings included the determined existence human being of on the surface of earth.

Understanding and interpreting being become possible throughout ontological foundations of individual as well as collective human living on earth. From the other side, the knowledge of Geography joins the hermeneutical interrogation of space/ place. This interrogation is not merely about discovering the nature of space rather, how “interpreting space” and “thinking about space” throughout different branches of natural and human sciences became qualified.

The German philosopher, Martin Heidegger describes understanding being through his fundamental ontology. Human being, Dasein- as he introduced, regarded as a mile stone to know other beings and entities. In his view, unfortunately, there is not any original linkage between Da- sein, and from other side, distance and being spatial. The Da in Dasein not regarded as “Spatial da”.

I assume that Heidegger’s thinking on Dasein and sein is negotiable through a language based on the conscious of space. If there were not spatial & geographical available terms it was not clear then how we could explain or define the basic concepts of Dasein and human being. In Heidegger’s master work titled as Sein und Zeit in most times although crucial words of “being” and “time” been used, he frequently takes advantages of many “space” related words and terminology in order to express what might be “being” or “time”. Al though Heidegger never got the chance to deliberate enough on the concept of space and place as such, i. e. he never found out that “projection” more likely is a geographical and spatial characteristic of Dasein rather that of its temporality.

In Heidegger view, facticity as a mode of Dasein, in which human finds himself, not referred to geographical realm and situation but rather defined as historical and cultural characteristic of Dasein.

One can conclude that based on Heidegger’s view on two categories time and space, the world is not located in space but vice versa it is the space seated in the world. All restricted to the human world rather than world per se. The foundations of Heideggerian world is not realized in space and never can be considered spatial.

Space and to be in space as well place and to be in place(*ad place*) all regarded finally as human characteristics, while human being is the only one that enjoys of having world, i. e. in- der- welt sein.

Even the spatial extensions that already in Kantian idealism taken as spatial essentials, interpreted by Heidegger merely as different dimensions of human world. Against his explicit interpretation of dimensionality of natural world, we are sure that other animals have sense of been physically in a dimensional world as like as we have. Spatial distances for Heidegger not viewed as depended on the characteristic of space per se, rather, they are secondary consequential and characteristics of human being.

This is human being, in his account, who brings things close to himself as though been spatially close or far depends on whether a thing is in possession of human being or not. Human being causes things be spatial, geographical and related to a place.

In other words, in Heidegger fundamental ontology, Dasein (Da- sein), or being- in- the- world, cannot bear any indication to space. He explicitly claims there is not any spatial correspondent meaning for *da* of place so by making it following the temporality of being we remind Hegel in his abstracting the real world when he puts all emphasis in spirit.

We observe that in spite of all scientific endeavors by those geographers translating Heidegger's thinking into geography, there is no place in Sein und Zeit for the concreteness of space and indeed most credibility remains rather for the historische Konkretheit.

In Heidegger's view, the spatial order of things is not independent of human activity. The order and arrangement of things is not related to geometrical divisions of space.

Place concerns to the special place of instrument (der Zeug) and instrumental context.

The relation between humans and environmental and internal spaces is due to the instrumental conditions. There appears variety of grounds in Zeug for human being based on which the spatial and place related distances been measured.

We have pointed out that many geographers who highly respect Heidegger like to interpret his view in a way corroborating modern theories emphasizing the privilege of space. For example, it has been asserted the ontological interpretation of space as a localized affair with quantity mixed with the analysis of our practical exchange with world/ space existentially seems twin with temporality. Pickles, explicitly agrees with the theory of world's invasion and fulfillment with caring things. Periphery, for him, is not an already existent spacenees, rather a collection of inhabitants constituted by a world full of human occupations and interactions.

The phenomenological task in the realm of geography defined by him as reconsideration of basal concepts of geography. He is of those scholars interested to expand Heidegger's hermeneutical vision into geography, tries to show how ontological analysis of spatiality can introduce a new geographical wisdom, humanist as well as beyond spatial determination represented by Descartes, Newton and Kant. Indeed, the fundamental structures of geographical subject lied in the manner of occurring our everyday experiences of the world.

The fundamental phenomenology of Heidegger considers mostly the basic links between human and his world, that means, human is a being occupied with world. But in confronting worldly things, we are sure that the case is not a mere relation based on self- excited consciousness. This view can be helpful in phenomenological explanation of geography once we consider human employment directed more than anything to space and spatial world.

The world no longer viewed as an abstractive world credited fully by human being and full of his consciousness and self- consciousness. Rather, it is a real world, created in space and place, a real world stretches over all beings, includes the earth, that is a geographical world. Geography refers essentially to man kind's experiences of the world, the world, and human interpretations of it. This experience of “world/ space” and the interpretation of it by human being guarantees both fundamental structures of natural geography as well as human geography.

Of those thinkers who spread Heidegger's thinking into geography one important figure is Edvard Relph. In his work Place and Placlessness he tries to distinguish between practical knowledge of space and the theoretical one, considering the first knowledge as essential and important for human being. He claims place as geographical phenomenon of living world which can be discovered thorough ordinary experiences. Does this mean he had decreased the scientific value of space subject to a practical class of category.

My reaction to Edward is if place merely defined as limited to deep and interwoven (complex) experiences of the world made by man there no place principally would be a place. Such claim reflects the ultimate arrogance of human being where as he thinks place, where he finds his reality and actualization, is purely due to his existence? There would be no place without human being!

Thus far there is not left any solution except to find out completing terminology in philosophical theorems of geography, that is to say we human beings were never practically isolated from space so far in any past state of our life and living and there would never be so in future too. It is obvious this spatial terminology finally leads on most to the interest of the substantiality of space as we have demonstrated than the theory of temporality of Dasein. The cause is so evident: To say that we are outside of a place or inside of the other is of less validity than to say this is a place we are in or that is a place we are not in. The space is where we are in or out.

It seems other that of Heidegger's hermeneutics needed to apply here in order to explain the world according to the philosophical and primordial concept of space.

Therefore, Da in Dasein must not be taken along the criteria confined in temporal and historical basis. Da is primarily a spatial definition. The fundamental ontology must describe spatial phenomena, as far as they lead to the purposes determined by variety of manners in which lives in space.

As Relph explains along with the geographical scientific doctrines, the placelessness arises because of spatial identities left into dangerous state. Placelessness is a description for the spatial conditions in which spatial identities sunk into weakness and illusion. Compare with the geographies of macro-world and even that of micro- world, i.e. the earth, the theory of placelessness limits the case study to some determined parts of the earth stresses the lack of meaning in human living via mystical and symbolic language.

The modern social life causes the placelessness of large masses of people in different cities and urban areas. But the fact of displacing masses reflects only the living identity of human being in some restricted areas and the concept of placelessness is not applicable to all spatial states and instances of human being.

Relph has a famous phrase expressing peoples are places for people. The place and space are the place and space for people, whether the immediate places like houses, alleys and streets or the mediate places for mankind as sights, mountains and rivers, i. e. the places that form world of environment partially in which human enjoys living.

Of course, the place accompanies human spatial in substance. Relph does not consider place as an accident within the table of categories in Aristotle's classification.

Rather, in his view the place has an origin in human substance meanwhile human substance takes room in place. Our roots are in places. Therefore, we now must face a question in front of us: If space is not a substance rather than an accident, how deserves such incredible privilege in human determination and life. Certainly, without the doctrine substantiality of space/ place it would not be possible at all. We observe here the important of space is one not like the spatial character of human.

The spatial Existence, the human home same as the spatial things in nature are equally in space. For example, that tree in our garden has a place at the same quality as you and me do. The same story with this pen in my hand and the book in this room. In comparison, temporal beings, one can say, do not enjoy of the same quality of time. There are spatial things, like as human, animal, planet been different in temporality.

Vis- a- vis one can understand that temporal affairs and historical phenomena are equally in space. To spend in the cold whether Siberia or in hotness of Sistan been in space appears the same. Of course, we can measure different of quality, distance, magnitude, size and else qualities in one space in order to classify the living and biological diversities, as one does usually in environmental kind of investigations, but to be or appear merely in space seems not differ for human being as well as for other vital beings.

The material thing would change, its situation undergo change, if may disappear because being temporal is nothing than appearing and disappearing frequently where as to be in place principally does not change and remains unmoved and firm.

The main paradox in spatial knowledge including geography is that we cannot imagine space/ place in its being general despite the firmness and steadfastness exist in each place. Rather as we expressed earlier. As much as we think a material thing in space or its parts, we cannot percept its place or the place of its parts. We are sure that spatial figures and things have pieces we can imagine a square, its geometrical sides can be imaginal as well.

The frequency in our perceptions and imagination of geometrical figures and spatial things does not occur in our thinking of place itself. Suppose that there would be possible to have a perception of place- though that is not possible at all- this perception never undergoes change, modification and transformation. In other words, in all different circumstances and conditions human and other conscioused beings would face undivided spatial identities.

The truth is that perceiving and imagination of space/ place never been possible for any created being included human. We cannot have in our mind a picture of a place never existed already. Against what has been suggested by Kant, there would not be any apriori general form of place to be applicable to individual cases. Rather as one can observe that any geographical region and point is different that of other each place has its own authenticity of placeness.

In the real place as such, one cannot see of the plurality of geometrical relation in kind be found in the imaginative figures and forma. Perhaps, for the same reason some of geographers correctly have stated that geometry cannot help describing geographical phenomenal, though it may helpful in explaining them.

A person while standing to any direction or moving toward in any direction, be in move or stable state, can look some things above his head and some in down. Even when moves his head toward under horizontal line, there seem some things above his head and some down his head. The world of a cultural things for the viewer divided to up and down portions. Things are ups & down's. the wonderful phenomenon is this: as much as the viewing horizon becomes open and, so to say much more full of space, the up things and down things, the world up and the world down get closer and closer to each other. So, at final our view touches the supposed horizontal line, if you pass the line, the horizon less world disappears in space, in a unity that has not the above and the beneath.

Based on this introduction, we can conclude that spatial direction would not be a pure spatial affair as Kant used to think in that way. Reciprocally, the spatial direction depends essentially on our manner of consciousness about space. Our grasp of the world is not characteristically isolated of spatial directionality. Therefore, direction in space must not be understood as of absolute objectivity, like as presupposed in Euclidean geometry, rather of its ties with a relative objectivity (cases of which can be show in human geography).

Now it become clear why Heidegger against philosophers and physicists rightly takes the opposite view thinking the directionality of the things as an abstractive understanding of space. He regards the true and real space equals directionality of sein and his tendency toward proposed regions.

But the pure space, unhuman and impersonal in its true meaning is out of our access, and in spite of the fact that everything is circumcised in and captured makes the closeness and touchiness containing with contained unfounded and empty. This mean, as much as we get close to the space and fastened in it, understanding becomes much more deficient and improper and we became disable to provide a fit explanation.

Hence, reducing directionality in accord with the condition of human existence should not be defined in a way removing it from the environmental space and pure space. Since the human existence also been arrested by space and space directionality. Through his understanding of his distance of the world in which he lives, human being insist to get close to it and make the world as his home. For this reason, our house, village, earth and world, determines the inner connection of our place makes them in order and meaningful.

Based on the argument expressed above, David Sack defines space place and location as dependent parts of human world. In his theory called the geography of spatial separatism he persists the independent role space impresses human behavior. In his note no. 18 in chapter III of his master work called *Homo Geographicus* he recognizes physical space is there having central role, “Humans do not make, produce or build everything”. According to him, places have influence on each other because they are related already in physical space. The spatial impressions and impressible caused by the relativistic situations in physical space.

He acknowledges the independent space, i.e. the space not conditioned by human being, meanwhile recognizes the more complexity hidden in place and locality than in space.

The places are places we are in. They function in such a manner contain things and forces or detach them. The places have causing forces, forces that motivate structures and make them exhilarating and full of cheer. How places act in combination with each other. Indeed, they do everything. This is quiet truth even in the very tiny places of modern world. The place that for everything is place and everything in place. This consciousness that places contain all things in the same manner, it can be concluded that everything which is behind appears in a supporting role.

The place assists us to develop our conceptions of the world and of ourselves. In the heart of these conceptions lies the difference between nature and culture.

The distinction and combination of the nature & culture require place so that place gains its fundamental structures, from city with art museums and administration buildings to the heart of Alaska forests and the desert of Sonora, from places that are considered primarily cultural to the places primary natural.

This geographical collection of differences give shape to these realms. Sack continues this collection leads to a third branch, for the cultural branch divides up to social and meaningful links. The place and space help this fundamental structure of nature, social and giving meaning relationship constituted and balanced, through delineation all in the special proportions.

In Sack’s view, places become united through moving ingredients toward each other in the space. One can experience space due to the feeling of such a movement, everything been felt in movement and continuation in time. Such a feeling happens when we are travelling by train and drive a car in states high ways or even more when we are on plane and the openness of undeferential regions can represent a horizon that merely looks like an empty space.

According to the existentialism, space becomes uncovered when we change our perspective. So, mere thinking about space seems not much useful neither fruitful. We imagine ourselves abstracted looking from top heaven to the world.

So that places in a spatial system or geometrical net would transform to situations. This idea has been rendered in modern topography and for this reason can be called spatial analysis. The known analysis creates models of spatial interactions.

As Sack notices this analysis based on space presupposes a combination of harmonic systems, geographical length or width provide structures for space, so in such a spatial system, we can put activities, occasions, groups of people and places of the world. From this view, the space is a starting point and places in company with other things are regarded situations in that space.

Based on Sock thinking place must not be taken as a fundamental category in the world, rather a mere toll to describe a collection of activities. With such of view, space is due a secondary place in the table of categories, or becomes a secondary term. The activities are of more validity than spaces containing activities.

Sack claims spatial understanding based on law of physics included Newton’s referring to the opposite relation of spatial distance and gravity attraction seems no sufficient and complete in order to explain space or spatial distance. Newton’s laws are not verisimilitude concern absolutes space, unless we define the domain relatively. Also, the doubt is there whether physical laws can be imposed on the understanding of pure absolute space. Sack expresses that we are living in a spatial world described by physics in which the behavior of atoms and planets are relativistic impressed by distance.

In the same way, our worldly engagement been effected by distance, so therefore by abstracting space of these laws of inside or outside of place we also make culture abstracted of space.

But there a question raises whether this abstraction of space becomes possible unless through understanding pure space with its supreme laws? In our imaginations the space can exist ever without spatial parts, included things or forces placed in it. Therefore, understanding pure or absolute space before than anything whether contained or container refers to the priority of space pure itself.

The general space & special space of Geography

In Kant’s view geography counted as a way toward an experimental science required by philosophical investigations. He was seeking for a philosophical foundation for geography in order to transcend the role of it. For Kant, geography is a science the task of which is to study phenomena belonging to a space. In spite of these searches general geography as pure philosophy has faced with the difficulty of determining and defining its subject matter. The kea secret of geographical subject lies in mystical philosophy of space.

The category of space or place if taken as substantial one in the science of philosophy not only the relation between geography and pure science or philosophy became more easy and fruitful for both sides, but also, based upon this foundation, the geographical judgments and propositions would enjoy immediatly of the sources of certainty lied in the fundamental judgments of space. Thus, the geographical judgments take advantage of borrowing necessity as well as certitude from ontological judgments of space. As a result of this the geographical hermeneutic would unite with the philosophical hermeneutic on space.

In geography, the space/ place is unveiled not for its apparent character of been extensional as one can observe in the pure philosophical knowledge of ‘space’. Geographical space as much as defined by its terms of terrestrial expansion, transformation and development, it also determined by the contractibility, continuity and being homonymous in different parts, regions and sectors.

Human being stretches out his social life and concentrates in the specific geographical region and centralization becomes part of being social. Metropolitans and urban areas are central places in which big multitude communities as well as limited ones’ marsh, are mediums for large or limited economical complexity. The human social reality and political community becomes appear simultaneously in one specific geographical piece and makes society become more geographically completed.

Spatial centralization can be classified due to prosper of authority and control, order, politics and economic, culture and other social pillars, accordingly to different ranks.

Each of geographical region based on its classification orders a kind of authority proper to its geopolitical space. Spatial assemble gives spatial determination to other assembles of power, investment, market and money and working forces. Spatial kind of concentration gives to collective identities like city or state nation a concrete and real meaning. The distance between the central part of a city and surrounding urban areas, represents minimum or maximum capacity, discloses the process of centralizations and also the unique identity of that city. This concept of geographical concentration, compared with the philosophical concept of spatial expansion, proposes human geography as an independent and serious knowledge in contrast to philosophy.

A knowledge which introduces an exclusive unprecedented understanding of space. Geographical spaces in general, whether in subject class of natural or of human are differentiated and detailed.

The cause for this difference is reality of space itself. Being concrete and allocated found in space not restricted to the natural or human geography, rather, space itself identifies with concreteness and allocation, from which else substances and accidents are excepted.

If we take the subject matter in geology and geoscience as the kind “surface of the earth”, the geographical subject comparatively restricted and limited. Therefore, the subject matter of geography becomes defined to experimental conditions behalf of which spatial activities and distributions on the experimental realm of the earth surface are examined.

The science of geography becomes as a transcendental kind of knowledge if the subject of which bounded to the surface space of earth mean while not determined thorough mere physical determination. It is regarded as a transcendental because of the fact in its subject matter spatial relations reflected beyond geometrical conditions. In such a science, space meant the unconditional spatial distributions without presumption human being. The spatial sciences included human geography does not resist with anthropocentrism, because with this supposition that earth moves on its axis for the sake of human, the human geographical disabled to reach the spatiality as such and cannot undertake the essence of space.

In summery, there pure science geography, as the theory of geo systems not conditional by human presence on the surface of earth meanwhile such a science not meant as in contradiction with the limited and determined human geography. Accordingly, pure & natural geography been distinguished from human geography while both become united and joined their borders are still distinct.

Now it becomes clear why R. John Johnstone in his book *A question of place, the practice of place: exploring the practice of Human Geography* takes his task to develop concept of space as the central axis in geographical investigation.

Despite the fact that geography felt into different divided parts, yet it has invented a substantial estimation, a safe realm for the theory as well as practice of space where as history of philosophy fallowing Aristotle shows a coming short to recognize the substantiality of space this represent a shining historical event in the history of sciences and the totality of consciousness of human.

Hetner and Heertschon known to be Kant followers, insist on the identical aspects of geography, but I think David Sack emphasizes much more to explain and define the geography as a science concerns space. He spells out space as a basic framework for all aspects of thought while geographical space in different manner possess the obvious validity in all times and variety of cultures. Sack express space been build up by humans into different mediators so that if human being as well as culture were not existed, and place too was not at all, then space or distance affected our interaction more easy and simple.

Space in our treatment disclosed relatively. The pure space does not have any power and energy by itself. It is not like a thing that immediately possess its own force. Both space as well as distance will get energy whenever medication intervenes and become relative.

If human being under steamed taken merely as a natural being, deemed with lack of social relations and spiritual modes there would be no place at all.

Of course, the space be there ever but no place is imaginable. As it is obvious the place so been reduced to the second level of meaning, that is the place for the interactivity of the natural things in space.

Till what time, things are for human and till when for nature? Sack states of laws concerning places, places be inside or outside become annulled loses credibility i.e. all different regional roles went out there remains nothing except secondary places and people and the things which are in counteraction with each other in space.

Natural Geography and Human Nature

Now we can reach the conclusion that the natural Geography in its truly defined term never been in the opposite place of human geography. The judgments of human geography in its different branches not deemed as that of social sciences propositions which not been necessitated by space. It can mostly be esteemed as a spatial social science which enjoys nourishment in the field of natural geography, as its mother originality, but also transcends it to the human living privileges, the ground of human geography is not like social sciences as abstractive or totalistic.

In spite of the fact that as other sciences it faces different of subject matters different and dispersed in the geography of human physical being, population, the geography of dwelling and habitation, economy geography, and political geography and etc.

For all scientific study and knowledge of earth, space & place, location, grant that science the concrete identity despite the independency of each section in geography and the concentration in the defined section there neither from the nature and the earth nor from the consciousness pure human, the holistic spirituality spread over guarantees the productive results for other natural and human sciences.

From the other side, we are witnessing the gradual approximation of geography of geography to the concept of space. In pass years of 50 & 60's in 20th century though we saw geography distancing from the quantitative space, yet it does not mean that special and place- related concepts and debates had been removed in this period.

The current process of geographical investigation seeks for a concept of place and space which would be capable to contain controversial aspects of the live of earth combined with human living on earth. Such an approach no longer would be based on abstractive perception of earth and living places of earth. So, the geography of abstractive space replaced by the geography of concrete place which can be prosecuted and observed in the live- world.

Geographers have become aware that as much as geography get near to the truly space or place, its scientific propositions get more justification and validity. As far as the environment as general concept and environmental geography comes into combination with the nature of human, a unification of natural geography and human geography deserved to gain educational privileges and as a result of this instead of the term “space” the “place” seems more attractive.

In human geography, the predict of space carries conceiving more acquainted and human, indicates the subject of place and demonstrates the manner of spatial possession of things by man.

From the perspective of classical philosophy, the natural substance of human body does not reflect all human essential characters. Thus, as we observe in Ritter’s definition of geography as an example, the human nature was not restricted to earthy and non-metaphysical modes. In his teaching, the geographical nature is not contradicting the nature of human.

But rather, this latter originated from the other. It is certain that the human being is part of general geography, material nature and environment. The process of socialization and civilization of human rooted mostly in the geography of periphery.

In retrieve, it plays as a cause of it too. Human consciousness brings changes in his environ and transforms the geological patterns, and changing environ provides new measures of development prosperity for human societies and individuals.

Richard Pitt has talked about the sincere relation between human space and environmental space, there a synthetical system dominates that combined of different generalizations.

Nicholas Entrikin once stated the place, is the center for human meaning and sympathy. Yet one must not conceive that human is the only creature living on earth. Nor that living conditions lonely be passible on earth, neither that the earth is alone in sky. Of course, geography deals with the ‘place for human’ more than other places, but this does not mean that such a science of place can disregard the absoluteness of place.

Geography must take a combination of both regards of general space and particular space, i. e. that in which human lives. What Kant was telling about the a priori synthetical privileges as the only criteria for scientific judgments, may be taken here usefully.

The claim of the so called humanist geography that the geography should not be absorbed into subjectivation seems absurd and vague. The truth is if geography become intended to face the world as where humans are living in, it is inevitable, therefore to draw distinction between general space and particular space and so therefore subjectivation is unavoidable. The emphasis must be added that the human geography is not representing general of natural geography in all aspects.

We do not deny that there are magnificent part of geographical researches dealing with the lives of various groups and races of different nations, the states of collective, disciplined and social lives, but although it is out of realistic assumption to think all existing geographical scientific data conditioned and restricted to our knowledge of human life or his social living environment. In other words, it would be mistake to think the natural environment have no reality but it being source for spatial reflection on human society.

It is truth that geography of natural environ though distinguished but not divided up from geography of human home. As far as the destiny of human being is concerned, it must also be added accordingly logical judgment of space, there is non-differentiated state among the geographical space, the geography of environ and the geography of home in spite of dividedness. Inwardness and outwardness counted by Relph as included in the existential experiences of human, are relative and not absolute.

Though there are some things for human regarded as external nonetheless there is not anything outside of general space. The deficiency hidden is that Relph view not explicitly explains the inwardness and outwardness both through referring to the structures of the concept of space.

He likes to explain it by referring and explaining the concept of human. In his view, the authentic human dependence to a place lead to existential inwardness, and the human dependence to space, if become inauthentic leads to outwardness, in which all places are not different.

In such a state, the geography takes places as equal subjects. Through categorical articulation and arrangement based on data he tries spaces become scientifically explained and clarified. Disregarding the fact that he already swept himself presupposing outside of space.

We repeat again human being can be outside of his home, but not outside of space, since the general absoluteness of space/ place discards all exceptions because each external thing gets a way to space before been realized. Thus, the absolute space, sinks both (spaces of) natural geography and human geography as well. Metaphorically, the home is inside the environ space perfects its space inside facing no damages at all.

Sack expresses that the house can make a balance among nature, meaning and social relations. These elements differ in different houses and for this reason, each one found on a specific balance, emphasizes to one or some elements more than other. In order to explain clearly, he makes an interesting example. از اینجا متن هوموژن و گرو فیکوس ص 63-66 چاپ شود.

The Geographical Conscious of Time and the Historical Space

The geography thinks about living nature as a general nature which includes human nature. The fundamental subject matter of the science of geography, the same that of natural sciences, deemed to be interesting research subject in other sciences of biology, hydrology, meteorology and other and other similar natural sciences: the primary interesting subjects of natural sciences are environ, botanic, wild and botanical and animal description of life and death.

The nature, the mother case be studied by geographies, i.e. what determined in the science of vital organism in relation with outside environment is not merely ecological. In first step, geographer like a friend of geologist looks after the process of realization of natural environ around the globe.

At the second, he enters into studies in which the relation of human and nature determined in spaces matters.

As conclusion, we state firmly that geographical study of nature more intended toward investigating the place of nature rather than history of nature. The space in which nature glorifies is the unique criterion in so called historical phenomenology in geography.

In the opposite if Hegel's historical thinking in which nature must be ascended to history, here, the geographer tries indeed to explain different samples in natural becoming and transformation, not in the historical and temporal columns rather in the spatial rested fields which have gotten atemporal unhistorical situations. The study of the history of human world, the *Leben welt* and evolution of species been circumstanced and become valid by spatial settlement.

It can be stated that natural environ create the concept of spatial geography, rather on the contrary, natural environ, is the created natural space, natural space surrounding human life. In Hettner view the difference between history and geography is not that geography indented to study one time, especially current time, rather the big difference is that in geography the temporal dimension of propositions and phenomena becomes a secondary cause, takes the back seat.

It might be stated that in regard of a historian, the temporal dimension of the events and phenomena is authentic, to which serves the spatial dimension and the spatial phenomena rolled by temporality of event.

On the opposite, a true geographer thinks of the sciences to do respects the spatial mode of phenomena reflected in its propositions followed meantime by the temporal and historical aspects. Becoming and transition in human as well nature and temporal, historical and periodical concepts described and explained by and through circulation around spatial axis of meanings.

The Kant's idea about space shows a very deep distance with what have suggested so far in the substantiality of space and the certainty of space. In his account of space, there would be no place there, neither the independent substance relied on itself.

The space merely serves as supposed pure general which makes the sensitive perceptions and experimental judgments possible. Therefore, in contrary to David Harvey inventory interpretation of Kant's concept of space and the form of pure space, Kant himself not suggested any essential and logical description for the state of singularity and exceptionality of space.

Thus, the theory of pure form of space looks not sufficient at all.

The historical consciousness in its generality and expansion has got chance in the geographical space. Space deemed here not like an empty thing, outside the corporal, social and historical reality.

Henry Lofevre in his book *The Production of Space* (1991), has noticed correctly the potential power in terminology and language of space in a doing deep interpretation of history. In his interpretation, for Hegel the space of the historical time looks as motionless, a station of intellect get organized by the act of historical reason. In the mentioned book, he is investigating haw a space is a social product based on which the relations between state, society and classes receive explanation.

Our aim in this essay seems now conspicuous.

What been appeared in the natural as well as social terminology and theory about the space, in natural as well as in human geography were not been able so far to represent a unique and solid theory on the nature of space.

In my view, the space, as like that contains us primarily, in which we came to this world and pass, is not to be explained through social affairs happens in space.

On the contrary, space is authentic itself can be interpreted on its own. Historical & social phenomena like as state, organization, power and etc. no matter we respect the triumph for historical revolution or not they are all have to be defined in their historically defined spaces.

References:

- Musa S. Dibadj; Sources: *Almakan*, University of Tehran Press, Tehran, 2014.
Musa S. Dibadj; *Farideh Makanieh*, The Center of Dialogue among Civilization, Tehran. 1383.
Musa S. Dibadj; *Arahih Makanieh*, The Center of Dialogue among Civilization, Tehran. 1383.

Professor Musa S. Dibadj is an established Iranian philosopher whose academic career includes teaching at the University of Tehran, advanced studies in the United States, and a body of research that bridges hermeneutics, philosophy of place, culture, and contemporary social thought. His contributions have appeared in international scholarly contexts, reflecting both philosophical depth and interdisciplinary reach.