

UDC 911.3

Alexander Gladkey¹, D.Sc. (Geography), Professor
e-mail: gladkey_alex@univ.kiev.ua
Iurii Golubchikov¹, PhD (Geography), Senior Lecturer
e-mail: golubchikov@list.ru
¹*Kyiv Taras Shevchenko National University*
¹*Lomonosov Moscow State University*

THE INTEGRATION PARADIGM OF GEOGRAPHY

The processes of natural and humanitarian integration in the geography are described. The humanistic geography (or human geography, anthropogeography), is seen as an integrating methodology for geography which combines the principles of natural sciences and humanities. The general scientific problems connected with the dehumanization of knowledge as well as with differentiation of sciences are rethinking. The history of geographical paradigms development is explored. Anthropogeographical paradigm (anthropogeography), which combines the principles of natural sciences and humanities, prevailed in Russian geography of the early XX century and then turned out to be uncalled by Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Positivist paradigm, connected with dehumanization of knowledge as well as with differentiation of sciences, held dominating position in Soviet geographical school. The role of post-modern worldview in the development of post-disciplinary knowledge is revealed. The introduction subject in the scientific knowledge is defined.

The role of geography in development of humanistic scientific values and post-disciplinary knowledge is based. The development of the humanism in geographic sciences is analyzed in the historical aspect. The current problems of "mechanistic approach" in geography are investigated. The necessity of perfection of current system paradigm with entering of humanistic elements is substantiated. It is offered four ways for paradigm transformation: 1) from anthropocentrism to humaneness; 2) from systematicity to humanistic synergy; 3) from quantitative methods to its further qualitative analysis and humanistic interpretation; 4) from territorial differentiation to philosophic fundamentals of global geo-space.

Key words: integration paradigm, humanization, post-disciplinary knowledge, quantitative and humanistic methods, humanistic values, imperative of humanistic thinking in geography.

Олександр Гладкий, Юрій Голубчиков. ІНТЕГРАЦІЙНА ПАРАДИГМА ГЕОГРАФІЧНОЇ НАУКИ

Досліджено процеси природно-гуманітарної інтеграції в географії. На роль загальногеографічної методології, що поєднує принципи природничих і гуманітарних наук, претендує гуманітарна географія (вона ж географія людини, антропогеографія). Осмислюються загальнонаукові проблеми, пов'язані з дегуманізацією знання і диференціацією наук. Розкривається світоглядна роль постмодерну у формуванні постдисциплінарного наукового знання. Обґрунтовується введення в науку суб'єкта. Визначено роль географії у формуванні гуманістичних наукових цінностей і постдисциплінарного знання. Розвиток гуманізму в географічних науках проаналізовано в історичному аспекті.

Ключові слова: інтеграційна парадигма, гуманізація, постдисциплінарне знання, кількісні і якісні методи, гуманістичні цінності, імператив гуманістичного мислення в географії.

Александр Гладкий, Юрий Голубчиков. ИНТЕГРАЦИОННАЯ ПАРАДИГМА ГЕОГРАФИЧЕСКОЙ НАУКИ

Исследованы процессы естественно-гуманитарной интеграции в географии. На роль общегеографической методологии, сочетающей принципы естественных и гуманитарных наук, возводится гуманитарная география (она же география человека, антропогеография). Осмысливаются общенаучные проблемы, связанные с дегуманизацией знания и дифференциацией наук. Раскрывается мировоззренческая роль постмодерна в формировании постдисциплинарного научного знания. Обосновывается введение в науку субъекта. Определена роль географии в формировании гуманистических научных ценностей и постдисциплинарного знания. Развитие гуманизма в географических науках проанализировано в историческом аспекте.

Ключевые слова: интеграционная парадигма, гуманитаризация, постдисциплинарное знание, количественные и качественные методы, гуманистические ценности, императив гуманистического мышления в географии.

Introduction. The investigations dealing with natural and humanitarian integration of geographic knowledge as well as with its general humanization have become more and more urgent nowadays. Dehumanization and increasing differentiation of positivist science affected the whole scientific knowledge of 20th century, but especially detrimental influence they caused on the Soviet geographic school.

We remember the destruction of genetics and cybernetics in the USSR. But the marginalization of other "nonprincipal" sciences that neither broadens our world of things nor enhances the power of man over nature was less developed. Soviet scientists did not have the slogan - more possess, more produce as well as more consume.

Their slogan was – to know more. Anthropogeography and the study of local lore were among these sciences.

Literature review. Before 1929 the Russian science did not experience any pressure of ideological attitudes, although the dictate of Marxism philosophy (historical materialism) until the middle 1920s was already quite noticeable in the field of humanities. But for natural sciences the 1920s were still something like a golden age. This period was marked by prominent scientific works: Biosphere by V. Vernadsky and Nomogenesis by L. Berg; V. Sukachev laid the foundations of biogeocenosis theory; V. P. Semenov-Tyan-Shansky exercises his scientific talent; L. Berg published his comprehensive anthropogeographical review named Landscape-

Geographical Zones of the USSR that had little in common with its subsequent reissues in the field of physical geography. Geography continued developing its unique way, combining features of both natural and humanitarian sciences.

The scientific goal of the article is to investigate the processes of natural and humanitarian integration in geography as well as to define the role of geography in the development of humanistic scientific values and post-disciplinary knowledge.

Main contents of research. Fractures of positivism. The development of positivism in geography had several stages. The Soviet geographic sciences suffered from the most devastating ideological storms during the 1920-1930th. These ideological campaigns, resulted in elimination of any philosophical and methodological foundations of science, except Darwinist-Marxist-Leninist ones. The way of the differentiation between natural and social sciences was consistent and principled. The disciplines that were between natural and social sciences became undesirable. Any scientists who were engaged in researching the relations between man and nature in the frames of narrow practical tasks became inconvenient. It is interesting that the teaching of Karl Marx just predicted the opposite – i.e. the junction of natural science with the science of society into a single one.

Physical geography was suggested to be the natural science discipline based on the principles of dialectical materialism and evolutionism. Economic geography was declared to be a social science based on the foundation of historical materialism and political economy. According to N. Dronin [9] and Yu. Simonov [29], any attempts to unite the so-called laws of historical and dialectical materialism in one conceptual scheme were firmly suppressed.

In accordance with the division of political economy into political economy of capitalism as well as the political economy of socialism, economic geography was suggested to be differentiated into the economic geography of capitalist countries and the economic geography of the USSR. Subsequently, this distinction caused changes in the structure of the faculties of geography in most soviet universities, for example in the Moscow State University, where there appeared the departments of economic geography of the USSR, the economic geography of socialist countries as well as the economic geography of capitalist and developing countries. So structure of science was based on the doctrine of changes in socio-economic formations with complete disregarded of any global or civilizational features. It was a formation-progressivist picture where only phase and time differences were important, for example, between feudalism and capitalism. The differences between countries or continents in formation doctrines had no significance.

The gap between economic geography and physical one in the USSR increased. The investigations in physical geography gave no place to economic one as well as the economic one and the investigations in economic geography did not proceed the physical geography researches. The economic geography division into districts

did not correspond to the physical geography one. They were studied separately. And both of them lost relation to the course of history.

Natural and humanitarian unity of geography was divided into many disciplines. Physical geographic characteristics of any country or any part of the world were shown as if there were no population, no people or their history on the territory. Physical geography refused human investigations and kept only the anthropogenic factor and economic geography declined the investigations of nature and was engaged in the research of natural resources only.

The philosophical and methodological foundations of geography, such as geographical determinism (doctrine of man's dependence on the geographical environment), horology (the study of space) as well as anthropogeography (human geography) were consistently and strictly suppressed. According to A. Grigoryiv [8], national geography investigations were practically forbidden (for example, geopolitics and regional studies) and others (such as geography of culture) were not well developed in contrast to foreign science.

This approach had apparently, a lot of followers. It was the time of prosperity, caused by the science delimitation in the mid of the 19th century. This resulted in organization of institutions, faculties and departments, training programs, scientific journals and international scientific institutions, supported by terminology and bibliography, definitions and identities, shown to B. Turner [33].

Dehumanization disrupted the unity of scientific perception and comprehension of nature, destroyed the integrity of science, which resulted in structural decomposition and dissipation of science that lost the character of human values [12]. The principles of reductionism combined with the investigations of the world meso-complex objects only as a physical world, where there was no place to Cosmos, living matter and man, were suitable and acceptable for many geographers. Such geographers tried to follow the canons of experimental and "exact sciences" and as a result they found themselves as geophysicists, geologists, geochemists or geoeconomists. Usually they do not give a self-descriptive name for their geographic science and changed it with pleasure to "geoecology".

The present-day geography almost completely refused the descriptive and speculative approaches in studies. It widely operates with formalized quantitative research methods based on mathematical and statistical analysis, modelling and logic. Their emergence and development are associated with the dominance of dehumanizing scientism and positivism. According to these ideologies, physics and chemistry become unconditional standards of all sciences that should be made such accurate and conclusive as they are. Therefore, special attention is paid to the methods and techniques for getting results and to the accuracy of research procedures as well as to a wide application of statistical methods. Prof. I. Pavlov [11] said that science moves by any stimuli and these stimuli are predetermined by methods.

Many geographers accepted the fundamentals of experimental and exact sciences and investigated com-

plex objects of mesoworld in a simplified version only as a physical world. According to A. Tishkov [31], the leading positions in geography were occupied mostly not by those who knew and understood the nature, but by those who became proficient in the formal methods of analysis such as mathematical, chemical and biochemical, physical, computer, etc.

According to D. Zamyatin [10] and Yu. Saushkin [28], geography began to lose its humanistic values using only the quantitative researches and moving away from humanitarian problems. This "quantitative revolution" included the creation of a new mathematical geography as a science that studies using the mathematical method complex dynamic (changing its condition with time) and spatially distributed in areas of dry land and water systems that combine nature, production and population with direct and feedback relations. The systematic approach (based on the system paradigm) as well as structural analysis and synthesis became the basis for geographic studies [22].

The concept of positivism overcame the exceptional complexity of geographical systems by reducing schematization and modelling of geographical objects. The tendency to measure everything that may be measured was observed in all the fields of geographic studies. This resulted using math in publishing books or defending PhD thesis. Therefore, mathematics was shown to be able to open or establish certain structures, patterns and interaction in geography.

Reductionism in many ways became an integral part of the culture of geographers. It determines the development in modern geography in our country. The geographer-analyst forced out still more the geographer-philosopher who tried not for the depth of analysis, but to for a wide overview and conceptual synthesis in the science. As show by prof. N. Mironenko [17], these processes are especially characterized by the differentiation of geographic science as well as by the difference between the current periods of its development with availability of many new objects of investigations activities at new scientific trends and new disciplines.

Yu. Tyutyunnik [32] said that geography is not mathematics; it is opposite to it in many ways. Mathematics is not even a science; it is a language of high degree generality. Its postulates do not contain any reality, but certainly, they are absolutely accurate.

The development of integrated geographical research is really connected with the introduction of computer technology. These sciences were expected to present all the elements of geographic reality as any kind of a matrix that will include all the elements to quantify geographic systems (complexes). However, it was not happen. On the contrary, with mathematization and formalization processes in geography caused the science to lose its philosophical and epistemological content as well as it turned down the total dehumanization of geographical knowledge. Any attempts to reduce geographical science to the laws of other fundamental sciences often resulted in a real threat to the existence of geographical science. Instead of hermeneutic "understanding" of the essence of geographical processes and phenomena, modern geography moved to a partial formalized "explanation" of their separate properties. The ex-

tension of quantitative methods led to a simplified mechanized representation of geographical reality that appears in the form of quantitative data separated from a concrete territory.

Criticism of quantitative methods in geography had begun in the days of their mass introduction into scientific investigations. Some scientists criticized the new prospects opened with the "quantitative revolution" and warned the apologists of mathematization in geography that their practice leads to a loss of integrity in understanding the geographical reality as well as to the appearance of small-section applied research that would not be able to adequately reflect all the processes and phenomena in geographical environment [4]. The application of systemic paradigm and diverse quantitative methods can give us the understanding of specific problems only. It is difficult to formalize a significant number of geographical facts.

Efficiency of quantitative geographical investigations is limited by the imperfection of mathematical technics. Mathematization of new material objects and systems in the history of mathematics involved the development of new mathematical theories. So, classical mechanics connected with the application of ordinary differential calculus. The vector analysis was suitable for classical electrodynamics. The investigations in aerodynamics led to the development of the complex variable theory. The theory of relativity caused the tensor analysis and the theory of curved Riemann spaces, quantum and nuclear physics caused the functional analysis and the theory of Hilbert spaces and the elementary particle theory caused the theory of groups and generalized functions. According to Yu. Golubchikov [7], mathematization of economic studies generated the optimal control theory, theory of games, statistical decisions theory as well as investigations of dynamic and linear programming.

In this case, the need for simulating any class of objects was supplied by the corresponding formal scientific techniques created earlier. In other words, the theory of differential calculus was created before mechanics needed it. The development of the game theory or optimal control theory was prior to the needs in economic science. An appropriate theory was seemed to exist already or some class of geographical objects. The information-cybernetic approach was proposed as a formal-logical method created for physical geography. But the energy-physical approach in modern science was the first both historically and logically. In this connection, V. Solntsev [30] stated that the analysis of information processes in geosystems would be possible in the nearest future only on the basis of intensive investigations of their thermodynamic entity.

So, using mathematical methods, geographers are not able for the time being to analyze and explain all the set of components of territorial systems. Scientists explain this problem by a very high complicacy of territorial systems and their dependence on a number of internal and external factors. S. Moroz [18] stated that scientists need to simplify and schematize territorial systems using quantitative analysis.

However, such simplification and schematization may result in dehumanization of geographical knowl-

edge and in disregard of humanistic elements in geographical systems. This problem was widely covered in works of the Noble prize winner Ivan Bunin [3]. In his opinion, geographers make use of quantitative methods as a cover for their work. Using such methods, they investigate only separate elements of geographical reality, essentially schematized and simplified. These methods are aimed at substantiation of the systematics of any territorial complex and devoted to support this system. So, such methods are correct only within a speculative quantitative system but they lost touch with reality.

Integration trends. Since the 1990th the ideas of humanism in the Post-Soviet sciences make every-increasing transition from a pure philosophical and humanities researches to the natural ones. At the same time such a transition becomes a basis for new post-disciplinary knowledge all over the world. The ideal of this knowledge is not only the research cognition of separate (dehumanized) individual coincidences, regularities, laws as well as the collection of solid information base for a better understanding of general laws of nature and society development. This knowledge forms the foundation for understanding the essence of nature, human, society or a state as well as for understanding "how their development was possible, or, in other words, - how did it happen that they become to origin as they are" [5;16].

As V. Preobrazhensky, T. Aleksandrova and L. Maksimova [23] showed the development of human geography in western countries resulted in the development of knowledge that is hard to be identified with any of the traditional science branches developed in the former USSR. These authors emphasized the general position of human geography in western science that is equal to the central position of physical geography in our science.

According to M. Pistun [22], under conditions of new humanistic post-disciplinary knowledge formation geography should combine both directions of scientific investigations - natural and social. Only geography can provide these two polar systems with the contiguity and close relationship. The unique role of geography consists not only in simple combination of different sciences, but also in deep and comprehensive analysis of space and all its elements (tangible and intangible) in their unity, integrity and relationships. However, the dehumanization of geographic research resulted in a simplified conception of the world, space and the man, his intelligence, culture, values.

The era of tourism, postmodern, epistemological and philosophical investigations intensified the emotional side of our perception in the mesoworld. The landscape paradigm gained unique humanistic regulations with tourism that was based on the natural sciences only. Tourism returned a landscape perception to the physical landscape according to O. Borsuk [1] and E. Kolobovskiy [15]. Prof. D. Zamyatin [11] made a detailed description of individual areas using socio-cultural, economic and landscape-aesthetic aspects, which provide an informal humanitarian-colored analysis of geographic images.

Tourism returned the individual experience and emotional content of a subject to scientific discourse.

This discipline becomes a revolution in all science, not only in geography. Before that scientific investigations demanded to release the objective reality from its personal understanding of the subject. Natural science investigated universe problems of existence, but the individual world disappeared. Humanities made to think using the state ideology, where the individual point of view was also lost. But suddenly there appeared tourism that uses relativistic models of world cognition, places subject knowledge between impersonal and personal substations, declares knowledge to be the subject-object substation relative to different times, spaces and civilizations. This concept has the world view radically.

Some sources of information from everyday life were needed to understand the landscape essence: articles from mass media, advertising, travel notes, belles-lettres, etc. There occurs the transformation from the sensory-measurement interpretation of the landscape to the perception of its natural and socio-cultural unity as stated by V. Kalutskov [13; 14], M. Ragulina [26; 27].

The picturesque and high aesthetic qualities of landscapes became one of main requirements to them by A. Bredihin [2]. The unique visual characteristics become important for creation of national parks. Natural landscape classification was supplemented with emotional and visual groupings, landscape diversity, aesthetic qualities of the territory as well as with the presence of water and type of the water basin, as O. Borsuk et al. [1], V. Nikolaev [19] and E. Petrova [21] described.

As V. Kalutskov [13; 14] says, the status of scientific and artistic landscape concept is created in modern geography. The aesthetic relations to the nature are started as a special form of its cognition connected with natural science according to A. Ozerov [20]. There occur a deep epistemological synthesis of worldview, science and art connected with current mainstream investigations in geography.

S. Moroz [18] and V. Maksakovskiy [16] defines humanistic elements in geography as a new Weltanschauung that is based on common-to-all-mankind values and gives the first place in scientific research to human persons and their social relations. The great humanistic value of geographic investigations and description of different territories and nations were stressed more than once by such well-known Russian literary men as N. Gogol, K. Paustovskiy, M. Voloshin, I. Bunin, etc.

Post-discipline geography. The wide process of humanization in geography at the level of transformation to conceptual fundamentals is still to come. For the further development of humanistic ideas in geographic science we can suggest a number of such transformations. Here are four main directions of humanization in geography:

1. From anthropocentrism to humanness. The traditional anthropocentric concept in geographic investigations requires practical orientation of our science for the most complete satisfaction of human needs. However, such a scientific approach is rather utilitarian. Anthropocentrism means that the human needs are the center of scientific problems and their satisfaction is the main goal of any scientific research. On the other hand, geography as any other science must be involved into problems of humanness and common-to-all-mankind values rather

than individual persons only. According to K. Voblyi [4], geographic investigations can be useful for man to realize his role in the world, for developing high aesthetic, cultural, moral and living principles as well as for making natural resources more balanced and the society more humanized.

2. From systematics to humanistic synergy. Most of geographic objects are considered as a complex and compound system of different components and relations. According to V. Preobrazhenskiy [25], the system consists of many heterogeneous elements, each of them playing its own role, having own internal relations, a number of chain reactions, internal mechanism of stability and self-regulation. However, most elements of geographic space do not fit into a traditional concept of the system, especially if it is formalized with quantitative methods. The classical system in itself has no humanistic tint, so it cannot illustrate geographic reality in an adequate manner. According to M. Pistun [22], geographic systems include not only material components of human activities, but also spiritual ones. These spiritual components cannot be involved into the formalization and mechanistic concept of systematics. The systemic paradigm that is based on concepts of natural and exact sciences only should be supplemented with new humanistic elements, which will provide an integral and non-formalized approach to investigation and comprehension of any object of inquiry. Every geographic landscape or complex has specific elements of humanistic synergy. Such elements are hardly studied due to imperfection of a systemic approach. So, according to V. Preobrazhenskiy [25], physical geographers should realize humanistic elements in natural-science investigations and social geographers should study human geography firstly. Yu. Golubchikov [7] shown that geography should combine all elements from every science into one symphony, one landscape. To feel the soul of landscape, to comprehend its music and harmony – these are the main topics of geography.

3. From quantitative methods to their further qualitative analysis and humanistic interpretation. The quantitative methods in geography have been criticized since the time of their introduction. Prof. V. Preobrazhenskiy [25] warned against a wide use of the above mentioned methods, because the latter results in simplification of geographic reality, development of small-scale applied investigations that cannot reflect all the processes and phenomena in geographic space in an adequate manner. Evaluating on the whole positively the development of exact formalized methods in geography, Prof. V. Preobrazhenskiy [25] claimed that these methods should be followed by synthesis, qualitative analysis and creative interpretation of the obtained results, which would complete quantitative investigations. According to representatives of the American school of geographers, the rigorous scientific method does not provide a com-

prehensive perception of the object of geographic study. Undoubtedly, the introduction of new humanitarian methods into modern geography is possible only together with a wide use of formalized methods of information processing and computer systems. Nevertheless, research tools of geographers should not be limited only by them. Geographers should use both formalized and non-formalized methods in their investigations, both quantitative and qualitative ones with their further humanistic interpretation and predominance of the universal, common-to-all-mankind values.

4. From territorial differentiation to philosophic fundamentals of global geospace. This transition is devoted to definition of main topics of geographic investigations as well as to characteristics of geographical objects. According to V. Preobrazhenskiy [25], the main problem in the definition of the essence of geography consists in the existence of different points of view on its object of study: “What is geography? Is it a science about complexes or about territorial differentiation of any processes and phenomena on the Earth? If so, is there any difference between geography and geology or geophysics? Is it a method of solving a variety of problems (geographic approaches to perception of biological diversity, economic division into districts)? I think that geography is ‘a complex + the many-dimensional terrestrial = biota, people, space’. But now many scientists think that we deal with bodies and phenomena in three-dimensional physical space”. So, geography should not be limited by narrow bounds of perception of spatial system and relations. The bounds of geography are much wider and essentially extend to generalized comprehension of philosophic fundamentals of global geospace in all the variety of its manifestations, sides and properties. It is this statement that the close relations between geography and philosophy and humanities consist in. It is here that the foundation of new post-disciplinary knowledge is laid according to A Hettner [6].

Conclusions. These four directions of humanization in geography would determine gradual transition from systemic to humanistic paradigm in geography that would be based on the common-to-all-mankind values. This would allow one to investigate the geographic reality in the context of post-non-classical hermeneutics.

So, according to S. Moroz, modern geography should be based on the imperative of humanistic thinking. Its great philosophic, cultural and world outlook potential is of great importance for humanitarian studies as well as systemic studies of space are of the same significance for natural sciences. The humanistic paradigm in geographic investigations will help to avoid a mechanistic systemic approach and allow one to develop new conceptual fundamentals of geography. It will keep together the elements of lost scientific unity and become the basis of new post-disciplinary knowledge.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Борсук О.А. Эстетика рельефа и ее изучение / О.А. Борсук, Э.А. Лихачева, Д.А. Тимофеев // Новые и традиционные идеи в геоморфологии. V Щукинские чтения. Труды. – М.: Географический факультет МГУ, 2005. – С. 582-584.
2. Бредихин А.В. Рекреационно-геоморфологические системы. / А.В. Бредихин. – М. – Смоленск, 2010. – 330 с.

3. Бунин И.А. Вести с родины. Собр. соч. в 6 т. / И.А. Бунин – М.: Издание т-ва А.Ф. Маркс, Петроград, 1915. – Т. 2. – С. 29-36.
4. Воблий К.Г. Організація праці наукового працівника (методика і техніка). / К.Г. Воблий. – К.: Видавництво АН УРСР, 1947. – 150 с.
5. Гадамер Ханс-Георг. Истина і метод: пер. з нім. / Ханс-Георг Гадамер. – К.: Юніверс, 2000. – Т. 1.: Герменевтика I: Основи філософ. герменевтики. – 464 с.
6. Геттнер А. География, ее история, сущность и методы. / А. Геттнер. – Л.: Госиздат «Красный пролетарий», 1930. – 416 с.
7. Голубчиков Ю.Н. Энергетико-физический подход к изучению природных комплексов / Ю.Н. Голубчиков // Вопросы географии. Геофизика ландшафта. – М.: Мысль, 1981. – Сб. 117. – С. 88-95.
8. Григорьев А.А. География всемирного наследия. / А.А. Григорьев. – СПб.: Астерион, 2012. – 344 с.
9. Дронин Н.М. Эволюция ландшафтной концепции в русской и советской физической географии. / Н.М. Дронин. – М.: ГЕОС, 1999. – 232 с.
10. Замятин Д.Н. Гуманитарная география. Пространство и язык географических образов / Д.Н. Замятин. – М.: Алетейя, 2003.
11. Замятин Д.Н. Метагеография. Пространство образов и образы пространства. / Д.Н. Замятин. – М.: Аграф, 2004. – 512 с.
12. Ішук С.І. Розколота географія / С.І. Ішук, Т.І. Шпарага, О.В. Гладкий // Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Географія. – 2003. – Вип. 6. – С. 5-8.
13. Калуцков В.Н. Ландшафт в культурной географии / В.Н. Калуцков. – М.: «Новый хронограф», 2008. – 320 с.
14. Калуцков В.Н. Основы этнокультурного ландшафтоведения: Уч. пос. / В.Н. Калуцков. – М.: Изд-во МГУ, 2000. – 96 с.
15. Колбовский Е.Ю. Эстетическая оценка ландшафтов: проблемы методологии. / Е.Ю. Колбовский. – Ярославский педагогический вестник. 2011. - № 4. – Т. III (Естественные науки). – С. 161-166.
16. Максаковский В.П. Географическая культура / В.П. Максаковский. – М.: Гуманит. изд. центр Владос, 1998. – 416 с.
17. Мироненко Н.С. Страноведение: Теория и методы. Уч. пос. для вузов / Н.С. Мироненко. – М.: «Аспект Пресс», 2001. – 268 с.
18. Мороз С.А. Методологія географічної науки: Навч. посібник / С.А. Мороз, В.І. Онопрієнко, С.Ю. Бортник. – К.: Заповіт, 1997. – 333 с.
19. Николаев В.А. Ландшафтоведение. Эстетика и дизайн / В.А. Николаев. – М.: Аспект пресс, 2003. – 176 с.
20. Озеров А.Г. Формирование экологической культуры личности в процессе исследовательской, туристско-краеведческой деятельности учащихся / А.Г. Озеров // Краеведческий альманах. – 2009. - № 1. – С. 3-12.
21. Петрова Е.Г. Эмоционально-зрительное восприятие природных ландшафтов в России и Японии: сравнительный анализ / Е.Г. Петрова, Ю.В. Миронов // Известия РАН. Серия географическая. – 2014. - № 1. – С. 130-140.
22. Пістун М.Д. Основи теорії суспільної географії: Навч. посібник / М.Д. Пістун. – К.: Вища школа, 1996. – 231 с.
23. Преображенский В.С. География в меняющемся мире. Век XX / В.С. Преображенский, Т.Д. Александрова, Л.В. Максимова. – М.: «ИГРАН», 1997. – 273 с.
24. Преображенский В.С. Острые проблемы ландшафтоведения на рубеже веков / В.С. Преображенский // Известия РАН. Сер. географ. – 1998. - № 3. – С. 14-19.
25. Преображенский В.С. Я – географ. Из творческого наследия / В.С. Преображенский. – М.: ГЕОС, 2001. – 292 с.
26. Рагулина М.В. Культурная география: теории, методы, региональный синтез / М.В. Рагулина. – Иркутск: ИГ СО РАН, 2004. – 173 с.
27. Рагулина М.В. Культурный ландшафт и сотворчество человека и природы / М.В. Рагулина // География и природные ресурсы. – 2007. - № 3. – С. 88-95.
28. Саушкин Ю.Г. Избранные труды / Ю.Г. Саушкин. – Смоленск: Универсум, 2001. – 416 с.
29. Симонов Ю.Г. История географии в Московском университете: события и люди / Ю.Г. Симонов. – М.: «Городец», 2008. – 504 с.
30. Солнцев В.Н. О трудностях внедрения системного подхода в физическую географию / В.Н. Солнцев // Вопросы географии. – М.: Мысль, 1977. – Сб. 104.
31. Тишков А.А. Люди нашего племени. Очерки / А.А. Тишков. – М.: Институт географии РАН, 2012. – 276 с.
32. Тютюник Ю.Г. Проблемные вопросы теории культурного ландшафта / Ю.Г. Тютюник // Известия РАН. Серия географическая. – 2013. - № 4. – С. 34-45.
33. Turner B.L. Contested identities: Human-environment geography and disciplinary implications in a restructuring academy / B.L. Turner // Annals of the Association of American Geographers. – 2002. – V. 92(1). – P. 52-74.

References:

1. Borsuk, O.A., Likhacheva, E.A., Timofeev, D.A. (2005). Estetika relyefa i ee izuchenie. *Novye i traditsionnye idei v geomorfologii. V Shchukinskie chteniya. Trudy*. M.: Geograficheskiy fakultet MGU, 582-584.
2. Bredikhin, A.V. (2010). *Rekreatsionno-geomorfologicheskie sistemy*. M. – Smolensk, 330.
3. Bunin, I.A. (1915). *Vesti s rodiny. Sobr. soch. v 6 t.* M.: Izdanie t-va A.F. Marks, Petrograd, 2, 29-36.
4. Voblyi, K.H. (1947). *Organizatsiya pratsi naukovo-ho pratsivnyka (metodyka i tekhnika)*. K.: Vydavnytstvo AN URSR, 150.
5. Gadamer, Gans-Georg. (2000). *Istina i metod: per. z nim.* K.: Iunivers. T. 1.: Germenevtika I: Osnovy filosof. germenevtiki, 464.
6. Gettner, A. (1930). *Geografiya, ee istoriya, sushchnost i metody*. L.: Gosizdat «Krasnyi proletariy», 416.
7. Golubchikov, Iu.N. (1981). *Energetiko-fizicheskiy podkhod k izucheniyu prirodnykh kompleksov. Voprosy geografii. Geofizika landshafta*. M.: Mysl, Sb. 117, 88-95.
8. Grigoriev, A.A. (2012). *Geografiya vsemirnogo naslediya*. Spb.: Asterion, 344.
9. Dronin, N.M. (1999). *Evolutsiya landshaftnoy kontseptsii v russkoy i sovetskoy fizicheskoy geografii*. M.: GEOS, 232.
10. Zamiatin, D.N. (2003). *Gumanitarnaya geografiya. Prostranstvo i yazyk geograficheskikh obrazov*. M.: Aleteia.
11. Zamiatin, D.N. (2004). *Metageografiya. Prostranstvo obrazov i obrazy prostranstva*. M.: Agraf, 512.
12. Ishchuk, S.I., Shparaga, T.I., Gladkey, O.V. (2003). *Rozkolota geografiya. Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedagogichnogo universitetu imeni Mykhayla Kotsyubynskoho. Seriya: Geografiya*, 6, 5-8.
13. Kalutskov, V.N. (2008). *Landshaft v kulturnoy geografii*. M.: «Novyi khronograf», 320.
14. Kalutskov, V.N. (2000). *Osnovy etnokulturnogo landshaftovedeniya: Uch. pos.* M.: Izd-vo MGU, 96.
15. Kolbovskiy, E.Iu. (2011). *Esteticheskaya otsenka landshaftov: problemy metodologii. Yaroslavskiy pedagogicheskiy vestnik*, 4, III (Estestvennye nauki), 161-166.
16. Maksakovskiy, V.P. (1998). *Geograficheskaya kultura*. M.: Gumanit. izd. tsentr Vlados, 416.
17. Mironenko, N.S. (2001). *Stranovedenie: Teoriya i metody. Uch. pos. dlya vuzov*. M.: «Aspekt Press», 268.
18. Moroz, S.A., Onoprienko, V.I., Bortnik, S.Iu. (1997). *Metodologiya geografichnoi nauky: Navch. posibnyk*. K.: Zapovit, 333.
19. Nikolaev, V.A. (2003). *Landshaftovedenie. Estetika i dizayn*. M.: Aspekt press, 176.
20. Ozerov, A.G. (2009). *Formirovanie ekologicheskoy kultury lichnosti v protsesse issledovatel'skoy, turistsko-kraevedcheskoy deyatel'nosti uchashchikhsya. Kraevedcheskiy almanakh*, 1, 3-12.
21. Petrova, E.G., Mironov, Yu.V. (2014). *Emotsionalno-zritel'noe vospriyatie prirodnykh landshaftov v Rossii i Yaponii: sravnitel'nyi analiz. Izvestiya RAN. Seriya geograficheskaya*, 1, 130-140.
22. Pistun, M.D. (1996). *Osnovy teorii suspilnoi geografii: Navch. posibnyk*. K.: Vyshcha shkola, 231.
23. Preobrazhenskiy, V.S., Aleksandrova, T.D., Maksimova, L.V. (1997). *Geografiya v menyayushchemsya mire. Vek XX*. M.: «IGRAN», 273.
24. Preobrazhenskiy, V.S. (1998). *Ostrye problemy landshaftovedeniya na rubezhe vekov. Izvestiia RAN. Ser. geograf.*, 3, 14-19.
25. Preobrazhenskiy, V.S. (2001). *Ya – geograf. Iz tvorcheskogo naslediya*. M.: GEOS, 292.
26. Ragulina, M.V. (2004). *Kulturnaya geografiya: teorii, metody, regionalnyi sintez*. Irkutsk: IG SO RAN, 173.
27. Ragulina, M.V. (2007). *Kulturnyi landshaft i sotvorchestvo cheloveka i prirody. Geografiya i prirodnye resursy*, 3, 88-95.
28. Saushkin, Yu.G. (2001). *Izbrannye trudy*. Smolensk: Universum, 416.
29. Simonov, Yu.G. (2008). *Istoriya geografii v Moskovskom universitete: sobytiya i lyudi*. M.: «Gorodets», 504.
30. Solntsev, V.N. (1977). *O trudnostyakh vnedreniya sistemnogo podkhoda v fizicheskuyu geografiyu. Voprosy geografii*. M.: Mysl, 104.
31. Tishkov, A.A. (2012). *Lyudi nashogo plemeni. Ocherki*. M.: Institut geografii RAN, 276.
32. Tiutiunik, Yu.G. (2013). *Problemye voprosy teorii kulturnogo landshafta. Izvestiya RAN. Seriya geograficheskaya*, 4, 34-45.
33. Turner, B.L. (2002). *Contested identities: Human-environment geography and disciplinary implications in a restructuring academy. Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 92(1), 52-74.

Надійшла до редколегії 07.03.2016 р.