

Janice M. Kentala
February 7, 2011

Moderation of "Wither Geography" by Jay R. Harman

Arguments are not supported and criticisms of Geography were largely opinion. Claims of Geographers not addressing important issues that are beneficial to society are unfounded and plainly untrue.

Literary style is effective but largely comes across as using scare tactics with key words and sneaks in this scathing criticism under the guise of editorial. This style is purposefully deceiving and attempts to mislead or even manipulate the reader through repetitive terminology and underlying deceptive formulation of critiques

Sources are old and his opinions are formed from old ideas.

Contradictions, contradictions, contradictions.

Harman approaches his article with both a volatile tone and matter of fact interpretations of his geographical experience.

Market scholarship/research is valid at some level, but Harman oversimplifies the complexities of market unpredictability and fails to consider political motivations and corrupted economic support tendencies towards particular disciplines. Also, markets are largely based on perceptions and he does not acknowledge this very important factor in basing a research focus on a market model.

Market driven research corrupts the research and does not serve to produce whole hearted and passionate studies, therefore diminishes the discipline's integrity no matter the field. We as Geographer's should be able to shape the discipline and impact society through showing the importance of issues.

Harman states that research should be dictated by social climate, however the scholars may be aware of surfacing issues before the public and introduce them to society through research.

Controversial opinions are strewn throughout the article that critique Geography's failure to gain social favor but the argument is not supported.

Failure to back-up his claims with hard data or even supporting opinions that lend themselves to his accusations make the article less effective.

Surprisingly, it took 2 ½ years for a commentary to be written.

He offers a few points that have some merit such as market driven research, communication problems between Geography and Society, social disconnect with geography's message, bunker mentality within the ranks of Geography and perceptions of society relative to support.

Though there are a few valid points, the approach of the editorial is more argumentative and brings out a defensive position, rather than a true evaluation of the shortcomings of the discipline that could potentially spur a meaningful dialog.

Personal interpretations of the article and its tone can be prone to one's circumstance and research focus. One may find it offensive and completely inaccurate while another may find it to have some merit and make sense, but all agree that it is unsupported.

Harman recognizes GIS as methodologically important and falls short of acknowledging the far reaching influence, rocketing popularity and the validation of the technology and e.g. Geography across the board of disciplines.

The purpose of the article is unclear and all over the place, but it is clear that it is meant to inject the controversial ideology of the author.

Throughout the article Harman fails to offer a direction or suggestions as to how to move forward, only criticisms.