

Chapter 1 : Social geography - Wikipedia

Conceptions of Space in Social Thought Space and Modes of Thought. Robert David Sack. The Societal Conception of Space.

Biographical Sketch Hannah Arendt, one of the leading political thinkers of the twentieth century, was born in Hanover and died in New York in 1962. In 1929, after having completed her high school studies, she went to Marburg University to study with Martin Heidegger. The encounter with Heidegger, with whom she had a brief but intense love-affair, had a lasting influence on her thought. After a year of study in Marburg, she moved to Freiburg University where she spent one semester attending the lectures of Edmund Husserl. In the spring of 1931 she went to Heidelberg University to study with Karl Jaspers, a philosopher with whom she established a long-lasting intellectual and personal friendship. During her stay in Paris she continued to work on her biography of Rahel Varnhagen, which was not published until hereafter RV. In 1941 she was forced to leave France and moved to New York with her husband and mother. In New York she soon became part of an influential circle of writers and intellectuals gathered around the journal *Partisan Review*. During the post-war period she lectured at a number of American universities, including Princeton, Berkeley and Chicago, but was most closely associated with the New School for Social Research, where she was a professor of political philosophy until her death in 1962. In 1949 she published *The Origins of Totalitarianism* hereafter OT, a major study of the Nazi and Stalinist regimes that soon became a classic, followed by *The Human Condition* in hereafter HC, her most important philosophical work. In 1961 she attended the trial of Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem as a reporter for *The New Yorker* magazine, and two years later published *Eichmann in Jerusalem* hereafter EJ, which caused a deep controversy in Jewish circles. The same year saw the publication of *On Revolution* hereafter OR, a comparative analysis of the American and French revolutions. A number of important essays were also published during the 1950s and early 1960s: At the time of her death in 1962, she had completed the first two volumes on *Thinking and Willing* of her last major philosophical work, *The Life of the Mind*, which was published posthumously in hereafter LM. Introduction Hannah Arendt was one of the seminal political thinkers of the twentieth century. In these works and in numerous essays she grappled with the most crucial political events of her time, trying to grasp their meaning and historical import, and showing how they affected our categories of moral and political judgment. What was required, in her view, was a new framework that could enable us to come to terms with the twin horrors of the twentieth century, Nazism and Stalinism. She provided such framework in her book on totalitarianism, and went on to develop a new set of philosophical categories that could illuminate the human condition and provide a fresh perspective on the nature of political life. Although some of her works now belong to the classics of the Western tradition of political thought, she has always remained difficult to classify. Her political philosophy cannot be characterized in terms of the traditional categories of conservatism, liberalism, and socialism. Nor can her thinking be assimilated to the recent revival of communitarian political thought, to be found, for example, in the writings of A. Her name has been invoked by a number of critics of the liberal tradition, on the grounds that she presented a vision of politics that stood in opposition some key liberal principles. However, it would be a mistake to view Arendt as an anti-liberal thinker. Arendt was in fact a stern defender of constitutionalism and the rule of law, an advocate of fundamental human rights among which she included not only the right to life, liberty, and freedom of expression, but also the right to action and to opinion, and a critic of all forms of political community based on traditional ties and customs, as well as those based on religious, ethnic, or racial identity. Arendt did not conceive of politics as a means for the satisfaction of individual preferences, nor as a way to integrate individuals around a shared conception of the good. Her conception of politics is based instead on the idea of active citizenship, that is, on the value and importance of civic engagement and collective deliberation about all matters affecting the political community. If there is a tradition of thought with which Arendt can be identified, it is the classical tradition of civic republicanism originating in Aristotle and embodied in the writings of Machiavelli, Montesquieu, Jefferson, and Tocqueville. According to this tradition politics finds its authentic expression whenever citizens gather together in a public space to deliberate and decide about matters

of collective concern. Political activity is valued not because it may lead to agreement or to a shared conception of the good, but because it enables each citizen to exercise his or her powers of agency, to develop the capacities for judgment and to attain by concerted action some measure of political efficacy. In these writings Arendt is primarily concerned with the losses incurred as a result of the eclipse of tradition, religion, and authority, but she offers a number of illuminating suggestions with respect to the resources that the modern age can still provide to address questions of meaning, identity, and value. For Arendt modernity is characterized by the loss of the world, by which she means the restriction or elimination of the public sphere of action and speech in favor of the private world of introspection and the private pursuit of economic interests. Modernity is the age of mass society, of the rise of the social out of a previous distinction between the public and the private, and of the victory of animal laborans over homo faber and the classical conception of man as zoon politikon. Modernity is the age of bureaucratic administration and anonymous labor, rather than politics and action, of elite domination and the manipulation of public opinion. It is the age when totalitarian forms of government, such as Nazism and Stalinism, have emerged as a result of the institutionalization of terror and violence. Modernity is the age where the past no longer carries any certainty of evaluation, where individuals, having lost their traditional standards and values, must search for new grounds of human community as such. In her political writings, and especially in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Arendt claimed that the phenomenon of totalitarianism has broken the continuity of Occidental history, and has rendered meaningless most of our moral and political categories. The break in our tradition has become irrevocable after the tragic events of the twentieth century and the triumph of totalitarian movements East and West. In the form of Stalinism and Nazism, totalitarianism has exploded the established categories of political thought and the accepted standards of moral judgment, and has thereby broken the continuity of our history. Faced with the tragic events of the Holocaust and the Gulag, we can no longer go back to traditional concepts and values, so as to explain the unprecedented by means of precedents, or to understand the monstrous by means of the familiar. Our inherited concepts and criteria for judgment have been dissolved under the impact of modern political events, and the task now is to re-establish the meaning of the past outside the framework of any tradition, since none have retained their original validity. It is the past, then, and not tradition, that Arendt attempts to preserve from the rupture in modern time-consciousness. The hermeneutic strategy that Arendt employed to re-establish a link with the past is indebted to both Walter Benjamin and Martin Heidegger. From Benjamin she took the idea of a fragmentary historiography, one that seeks to identify the moments of rupture, displacement and dislocation in history. Such fragmentary historiography enables one to recover the lost potentials of the past in the hope that they may find actualization in the present. From Heidegger she took the idea of a deconstructive reading of the Western philosophical tradition, one that seeks to uncover the original meaning of our categories and to liberate them from the distorting incrustations of tradition. Such deconstructive hermeneutics enables one to recover those primordial experiences *Urphaenomene* which have been occluded or forgotten by the philosophical tradition, and thereby to recover the lost origins of our philosophical concepts and categories. In her view it is no longer possible, after the collapse of tradition, to save the past as a whole; the task, rather, is to redeem from oblivion those elements of the past that are still able to illuminate our situation. To re-establish a linkage with the past is not an antiquarian exercise; on the contrary, without the critical reappropriation of the past our temporal horizon becomes disrupted, our experience precarious, and our identity more fragile. Only by means of this critical reappropriation can we discover the past anew, endow it with relevance and meaning for the present, and make it a source of inspiration for the future. Against tradition Arendt sets the criterion of genuineness, against the authoritative that which is forgotten, concealed, or displaced at the margins of history. Arendt articulates her conception of modernity around a number of key features: World alienation refers to the loss of an intersubjectively constituted world of experience and action by means of which we establish our self-identity and an adequate sense of reality. Earth alienation refers to the attempt to escape from the confines of the earth; spurred by modern science and technology, we have searched for ways to overcome our earth-bound condition by setting out on the exploration of space, by attempting to recreate life under laboratory conditions, and by trying to extend our given life-span. The rise of the social refers to the expansion of the market economy from

the early modern period and the ever increasing accumulation of capital and social wealth. With the rise of the social everything has become an object of production and consumption, of acquisition and exchange; moreover, its constant expansion has resulted in the blurring of the distinction between the private and the public. The victory of animal laborans refers to the triumph of the values of labor over those of homo faber and of man as zoon politikon. All the values characteristic of the world of fabrication – permanence, stability, durability – as well as those characteristic of the world of action and speech – freedom, plurality, solidarity – are sacrificed in favor of the values of life, productivity and abundance. Arendt identifies two main stages in the emergence of modernity: She also identifies a number of causes: I will focus my attention on two categories employed by Arendt, those of nature, and the social. With respect to the category of nature, Arendt oscillates between two contrasting accounts. According to the first account, the modern age, by elevating labor, the most natural of human activities, to the highest position within the *vita activa*, has brought us too close to nature. Instead of building and preserving the human artifice and creating public spaces for action and deliberation, we are reduced to engage in the activity of sheer survival and in the production of things that are by definition perishable. According to the second account, however, the modern age is characterized by a growing artificiality, by the rejection of anything that is not man-made. Arendt cites the fact that natural processes, including that of life itself, have been recreated artificially by means of scientific experiment, that our natural environment has been extensively transformed and in some instances entirely replaced by technology, and that we have searched for ways to overcome our natural condition as earth-bound creatures by setting out on the exploration of space and envisaging the possibility of inhabiting other planets. All this leads to a situation where nothing around us will be a naturally given event, object, or process, but will instead be the product of our instruments and the will to refashion the world in our image. These two accounts are difficult to reconcile, since in the former we have nature intruding upon and even destroying the human artifice, while in the latter we have art *techne* expanding upon and replacing everything natural or merely given. The result is to endow nature with an ambiguous status, since in the former case the victory of animal laborans indicates our subjection to natural processes, while in the latter case the expansion of scientific knowledge and of technological mastery indicates the overcoming of all natural limits. The modern world would thus appear to be too natural and too artificial, too much under the dominance of labor and the life-process of the species, as well as too much under the dominance of *techne*. With respect to the second category, that of the social, Arendt was unable to account for certain important features of the modern world. Arendt identifies the social with all those activities formerly restricted to the private sphere of the household and having to do with the necessities of life. Her claim is that, with the tremendous expansion of the economy from the end of the eighteenth century, all such activities have taken over the public realm and transformed it into a sphere for the satisfaction of our material needs. Society has thus invaded and conquered the public realm, turning it into a function of what previously were private needs and concerns, and has thereby destroyed the boundary separating the public and the private. Arendt also claims that with the expansion of the social realm the tripartite division of human activities has been undermined to the point of becoming meaningless. In her view, once the social realm has established its monopoly, the distinction between labor, work and action is lost, since every effort is now expended on reproducing our material conditions of existence. Obsessed with life, productivity, and consumption, we have turned into a society of laborers and jobholders who no longer appreciate the values associated with work, nor those associated with action. I would argue, however, that it blinds her to many important issues and leads her to a series of questionable judgments. She claims that the social is the realm of labor, of biological and material necessity, of the reproduction of our condition of existence. She also claims that the rise of the social coincides with the expansion of the economy from the end of the eighteenth century. However, having identified the social with the growth of the economy in the past two centuries, Arendt cannot characterize it in terms of a subsistence model of simple reproduction. She is, in fact, unable to acknowledge that a modern capitalist economy constitutes a structure of power with a highly asymmetric distribution of costs and rewards. By relying on the misleading analogy of the household, she maintains that all questions pertaining to the economy are pre-political, and thus ignores the crucial question of economic power and exploitation. Finally, by insisting

on a strict separation between the private and the public, and between the social and the political, she is unable to account for the essential connection between these spheres and the struggles to redraw their boundaries. Today many so-called private issues have become public concerns, and the struggle for justice and equal rights has extended into many spheres. By insulating the political sphere from the concerns of the social, and by maintaining a strict distinction between the public and the private, Arendt is unable to account for some of the most important achievements of modernity – the extension of justice and equal rights, and the redrawing of the boundaries between the public and the private. By distinguishing action praxis from fabrication poiesis, by linking it to freedom and plurality, and by showing its connection to speech and remembrance, Arendt is able to articulate a conception of politics in which questions of meaning and identity can be addressed in a fresh and original manner. Moreover, by viewing action as a mode of human togetherness, Arendt is able to develop a conception of participatory democracy which stands in direct contrast to the bureaucratized and elitist forms of politics so characteristic of the modern epoch. Lastly, I will look at the remedies for the unpredictability and irreversibility of action, namely, the power of promise and the power to forgive. HC, 7 For Arendt, action is one of the fundamental categories of the human condition and constitutes the highest realization of the *vita activa*. Arendt analyzes the *vita activa* via three categories which correspond to the three fundamental activities of our being-in-the-world: Labor is the activity which is tied to the human condition of life, work the activity which is tied to the condition of worldliness, and action the activity tied to the condition of plurality. For Arendt each activity is autonomous, in the sense of having its own distinctive principles and of being judged by different criteria. Labor is judged by its ability to sustain human life, to cater to our biological needs of consumption and reproduction, work is judged by its ability to build and maintain a world fit for human use, and action is judged by its ability to disclose the identity of the agent, to affirm the reality of the world, and to actualize our capacity for freedom. Although Arendt considers the three activities of labor, work and action equally necessary to a complete human life, in the sense that each contributes in its distinctive way to the realization of our human capacities, it is clear from her writings that she takes action to be the *differentia specifica* of human beings, that which distinguishes them from both the life of animals who are similar to us insofar as they need to labor to sustain and reproduce themselves and the life of the gods with whom we share, intermittently, the activity of contemplation. In this respect the categories of labor and work, while significant in themselves, must be seen as counterpoints to the category of action, helping to differentiate and highlight the place of action within the order of the *vita activa*. The two central features of action are freedom and plurality. By freedom Arendt does not mean the ability to choose among a set of possible alternatives the freedom of choice so dear to the liberal tradition or the faculty of *liberum arbitrium* which, according to Christian doctrine, was given to us by God. Rather, by freedom Arendt means the capacity to begin, to start something new, to do the unexpected, with which all human beings are endowed by virtue of being born. Action as the realization of freedom is therefore rooted in natality, in the fact that each birth represents a new beginning and the introduction of novelty in the world.

Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.

Social distances Town and country See also We like to keep our distance from others and there are very specific social rules about how close we can go to others in particular situations. This social distance is also known as body space and comfort zone and the use of this space is called proxemics. Regulating the distances between us and other people provides us with several benefits, including: When people are closer, it is easier to communicate with them. When they are closer still, we can be intimate. The reverse can be used - you may deliberately threaten a person by invading their body space. Social distances The social distances here are approximate, of course and will vary with people. But they are still a good general rule. Hall identified four zones that are common for Americans: That is, when we are walking around town, we will try to keep at least 12 feet between us and other people. For example, we will leave that space between us and the people walking in front. Of course there are many times when we cannot do this. What the theory of social distance tells us is that we will start to notice other people who are within this radius. The closer they get, the more we become aware and ready ourselves for appropriate action. When we are distant from another person, we feel a degree of safety from them. A person at a distance cannot attack us suddenly. If they do seem to threaten, we will have time to dodge, run or prepare for battle. When they are closer, then we can talk with them without having to shout, but still keep them at a safe distance. This is a comfortable distance for people who are standing in a group but maybe not talking directly with one another. People sitting in chairs or gathered in a room will tend to like this distance. We can also see more detail of their body language and look them in the eyes. When they are closer, they also blot out other people so all we can see is them and vice versa. Romance of all kinds happens in this space. Entering the intimate zone of somebody else can be very threatening. This is sometimes done as a deliberate ploy to give a non-verbal signal that they are powerful enough to invade your territory at will. Varying rules The rules about social distance vary with different groups of people. If you feel safe and they seem not to feel safe, back off. If they invade your space, decide whether to invade back or act otherwise. Turning sideways is an easy alternative for this, as a person to the side is less threatening than a person at the same distance in front of you. Town and country People who live in towns spend more time close to one another and so their social distances may compact somewhat. In a large and crowded city, the distances will be less than in a small town. People who normally live a long way from others will expand their social distances and may even have to lean over towards another person to shake hands and then back off to a safe distance. Different countries Different countries also have different rules about social distances. The overcrowded nature of some Asian countries means that they are accustomed to talking to others from a very close distance. Watch a Japanese person talking at a party with a person from the Western countryside. The Japanese will step in and the Westerner will step back. Speeded up it is like a dance around the room.

Chapter 3 : Concepts of Space in Greek Thought

Social Science and Objective Meanings of Space 57 point away from the first, the energy should be located somewhere in space between the two points between the time of transmission and.

The term "space" has been defined variously by scholars: In general terms, the Oxford English Dictionary defines space in two ways; 1. A continuous extension viewed with or without reference to the existence of objects within it. The interval between points or objects viewed as having one, two or three dimensions. Thus, the relationships between objects in space is the central of the study. Space is an outcome of the hard and continuous work of building up and maintaining collectives by bringing different things into alignments. All kinds of different spaces can and therefore do exist which may or may not relate to each other. Thus, through space, we can understand more about social action. History of the sociology of space[edit] Georg Simmel has been seen as the classical sociologist who was most important to this field. Investigations on the Forms of Sociation". His concerns included the process of metropolitanisation and the separation of leisure spaces in modern economic societies. Only in the late s did it come to be realised that certain changes in society cannot be adequately explained without taking greater account of the spatial components of life. This shift in perspective is referred to as the topological turn. The space concept directs attention to organisational forms of juxtaposition. The focus is on differences between places and their mutual influence. This applies equally for the micro-spaces of everyday life and the macro-spaces at the nation-state or global levels. The theoretical basis for the growing interest of the social sciences in space was set primarily by English and French-speaking sociologists, philosophers, and human geographers. Marxist theories of space, which are predicated on a structural, i. Also in contrast to neo Marxist concepts of space, British geographer Doreen Massey [8] [9] and German sociologist Helmuth Berking , [10] for instance, emphasise the heterogeneity of local contexts and the place-relatedness of our knowledge about the world. Spaces are hence the outcome of action. At the same time, spaces structure action, that is to say spaces can both constrain and enable action. This concept has been empirically tested in studies such as those by Lars Meier who examined the constitution of space in the everyday life of financial managers in London and Singapore , Cedric Janowicz who carried out an ethnographical-space sociological study of food supply in the Ghanaian city of Accra , and Silke Streets who looked at processes of space constitution in the creative industries in Leipzig. Marxist approaches[edit] The most important proponent of Marxist spatial theory was Henri Lefebvre. He proposed "social space" to be where the relations of production are reproduced and that dialectical contradictions were spatial rather than temporal. Lefebvre sees a line of flight from alienated spatiality in the spaces of representation "â€” in notions of non-alienated, mythical, pre-modern, or artistic visions of space. This causes a general acceleration of economic cycles. Postcolonial theories of space[edit] Theories of space that are inspired by the post-colonialism discourse focus on the heterogeneity of spaces. He claims that local contexts form a sort of framework or filter through which global processes and globally circulating images and symbols are appropriated, thus attaining meaning. Third Space[edit] Henri Lefebvre see also Edward Soja says that social space is a social product, or a complex social construction based on values, and the social production of meanings which affects spatial practices and perceptions. That means that we need to consider how the various modes of spatial production relate to each other. He argues that there are three aspects to our spatial existence, which exist in a kind of triad: First space is physical space, and spaces are measurable and mappable. The second space is a mental or conceived space which comes from our thinking and ideas. Soja argues that our old ways to thinking about space first and second space theories can no longer accommodate the way the world works because he believed that spaces may not be contained within one social category, they may include different aspects of many categories or developed within the boundaries of a number of category. For instance, two different cultures combine together and emerge as a third culture. This third hybrid space displaces the original values that constitute it and set up new values and perspectives that is different from the first two spaces. Thus, the third space theory can explain some of the complexity of poverty, social exclusion and social inclusion, gender and race issues. Rational view of space[edit] In the work of geographer and

critical theorist Nigel Thrift , [17] he wrote a rational view of space in which, rather than seeing space being viewed as a container within which the world proceeds, space should be seen as a co-product of these proceedings. He explained about four constructed space in modern human geography. There are four different kinds of space according to how modern geography thinks about space. Empirical Construction of Space, 2. Image space and 4. First Space is the empirical construction of space. Empirical space refers to the process whereby the mundane fabric of daily life is constructed. These simple things like, cars, houses, mobiles, computers and roads are very simple but they are great achievements of our daily life and they play very important role in making up who we are today. The first space is real and tangible, and it is also known as physical space. Second space is the unblocking space. This type of space refers to the process whereby routine pathways of interaction as set up around which boundaries are often drawn. The routine may include the movement of office workers, the interaction of drunk teenagers, and the flow of goods, money, people, and information. Unlike the old time in geography when people accepted a space as blocked boundary Example: A capitalist space, neoliberal space or city space , we began to realize that there is no such thing like boundaries in space. The space of the world is flowing and transforming continuously that it is very difficult to describe in a fixed way. For example, the second space will explain the behaviors of people from different social class and the social segregation among rich and poor people. Third space is the image space that refers to the process whereby the images has produced new kind of space. The images may be in different form and shape; ranging from painting to photograph, from portrait to post card, and from religious theme to entertainment. Nowadays, we are highly influenced by images in many ways and these certain images can tell us new social and cultures values, or something new about how we see the world. Images, symbols and sign do have some kind of spatial expression. Fourth space is the place that refers to the process whereby spaces are ordered in ways that open up affective and other embodied potentials. Place space has more meaning than a place, and it can represent as different type of space. As a result, we have seen the creation of supra-national political bodies such as the European Union , the devolution of political power from the nation-state to regional political bodies. The questions such as whether scale is simply a mental device categorizing and ordering the world or whether scales really exists as material social products, particularly, were debated among materialists and idealists. Discourses of the global and the local[edit] Gibson-Graham [21] has identified at least six ways in which the relationship between the local and the global is often viewed. The global and the local are seen as interpretive frames for analyzing situations 2. Meaning that, the global and the local each derive meaning from what they are not. The local is global. In this view, the local is an entry point to the world of global flows which encircle the planet. The global and the local are actually the processes rather than the locations. So, the global is a force and the local is its field of play. However, the local can serve as a powerful scale of political organization; the global is not a scale just controlled by capital “ those who challenge capital can also organize globally Herod, A. Metaphors of scale[edit] For representing how the world is scaled, there are five different and popular metaphors: First, in using such a metaphor of hierarchical ladder, the global as the highest rung on the ladder is seen to be above the local and all other scales. Second, the use of concentric metaphor leaves us with a particular way of conceptualizing the scalar relationship between places. In this second metaphor, the local is seen as a relatively small circle, with the regional as a larger circle encompassing it, while the national and the global scales are still larger circles encompassing the local and the regional. For the hierarchy of Russian Matryoshka nesting dolls, the global can contain other scales but this does not work the other way round; for instance, the local cannot contain the global. Such the metaphor leaves us with an image of scale in which the global and the local are connected together and not totally separated from each other. For the tree roots metaphor similar with the earthworm burrow metaphor, as the earthworm burrows or tree roots penetrating different strata of the soil, it is difficult to determine exactly where one scale ends and another begins. Such an appreciation of metaphors is important because it suggests that how we talk about scale impacts upon the ways in which we engage socially and politically with our scaled world and that may impact on how we conduct our social, economic and political praxis and so make landscapes Herod,A [22].

Chapter 4 : Conception | Definition of Conception by Merriam-Webster

Buy Conceptions of Space in Social Thought: A Geographic Perspective on calendrierdelascience.com FREE SHIPPING on qualified orders.

By Alla Zaykova In Essays Social Media further referred to as SM creates new norms and structures in the way we interact socially, particularly in relation to space and time. They enable the formation of communities regardless of their geographic proximity and the participation in conversations by large numbers of people simultaneously. SM blur the lines between the real and cyber worlds adding a new dimension to our interactions. They combine the immediacy and permanence of communication and contextualize seemingly disparate messages. SM liquefying our perception of time and create a sense of occupying multiple spaces at ones, changing the way we understand these concepts with regards to social interaction. McLuhan saw that all technology could create new meaning and new environments and referred it as media. He believed that any medium is an extension of ourselves in that it enhances some aspect of our agency. For example a light bulb allows us to see better in the dark and is an extension of sight. He also claimed that the content of any medium is another medium. In this way the content of a telegraph is writing and the content of writing is speech and the content of speech is thought. In that way, new technology is not only an extension of ourselves, but of other extensions. However, any new medium goes beyond its original intended function because it changes the way we understand our environment creating new appropriations and environments. This is exemplified through SM. SM is primarily an extension of the interactive capabilities of Web 2. Sites and applications now SM emerged as tools to make it easy for anyone to create and share content, which led to the formation of social networks. The actual content that users produce and share is a convergence of older media such as videos, photos and text. However, within the environment of SM these familiar media gain a new meaning. One-to-one model was enabled by the telephone and one-to-all model via the traditional media such as newspapers and television that allowed the broadcasting of information to a large number of people at the same time, yet allowed minimal feedback. In that sense it retrieves the participatory culture of the verbal tradition e. However, it allows the participation of a greater number of people, and removes the need for physical proximity to other participants. The networks we form on social media alter our perception of space and how we organise as communities “ not by our geographic location but our virtual connections. In addition to removing the distance barrier, SM creates a sense of space of its own “ the cyberspace Kweon, Hwang, and Jo, SM platforms such as Facebook extend on this perception. On Facebook you can simultaneously interact with any number of people privately via instant messenger and also publically through wall posts and comments. Therefore our perception of space becomes layered. There is frequently overlap between our SM and real-world communities “ we may even choose to only interact with people we know in real life. However, these interactions will not be the same but impact one another. You can then do a SM status update about what you have done together “ this is a completely new dimension that SM adds to social interactions. The real world is embedded into SM e. It is also more immediate than other mediated forms like email. On Facebook you can see once your instant message was read and whether the recipient is typing a response. The layered space of SM enables multitasking but also amputates some of our attention spans and concentration. SM combines the immediacy of face-to-face communication with the permanence of the written record “ making our perception of time fluid. This fluidity creates new norms around the structure of conversations. In the real world it would be socially awkward to leave part way through a conversation and just pick up where you left hours later without needing to explain or recap. On SM this is quite common as there is an unspoken understanding that you simultaneously occupy two spaces the real and cyber and probably multitasking. However, that is exactly what happens on SM “ public status updates are basically short decontextualized announcements. This is acceptable on social media because the website itself acts as the context because medium truly is the message McLuhan, and your updates are effectively an utterance within a conversation that you started with your entire network five years ago or whenever you signed up to the SM. SM changes our understanding of space and time. They help overcome the distance

barrier, making geographical location irrelevant while enabling two-way conversation between a large numbers of people simultaneously. It also gives us the perception that we can occupy multiple spaces at ones and converges the real and the cyber-space “ adding a new dimension to our concept of space. SM makes time seam fluid by combining immediacy the permanence of communication and itself serves as a context for our seemingly disconnected interactions, proving that the medium is the message. In these ways SM changes the way we organise as communities and how we structure our social interactions. Matrizes, 7 1 , pp. Time and Space Perception on Media Platforms. Proceedings of the Media Ecology Association, Volume 12, pp. The extensions of man.

Chapter 5 : Social Geography: Definition & Study

Get this from a library! Conceptions of space in social thought: a geographic perspective. [Robert David Sack].

Besides the patterns, the way the social phenomena express themselves in space may become a cause of concern as well. This has attracted scholarly attention, particularly since when all-embracing changes in the political and economic order of the world started casting their shadows on the global society. As compared to the other branches of geography social geography has a certain amount of recency. Eyles also visualized social geography as a continuation of the philosophy of Vidal de la Blache and Bobek: The process of urbanization had thrown up issues of social concern such as access to civic amenities and housing and the related socio-pathological issues, such as incidence of crime, juvenile delinquency and other expressions of mental ill-health. The underlying idea was to examine the social content of the urban space which resulted from coming together of diverse ethnic groups within a city. The city with its specific functional specialization cast these social groups in its mould, resulting in the assimilation of diverse elements into a universal Europeanized urban ethos. However, certain ethno-cultural identities e. The taxonomy of a discipline, while arising out of its logical system, subsumes within itself the specificities of its intellectual tradition, whereby words and terms acquire specific connotations and nuances of meaning through large-scale usage and social acceptance. But this process of crystallization of the classificatory scheme is greatly distorted if the same term tends to acquire different connotations or different shades of meaning tend to be expressed through the same term. Such is unfortunately the case with that segment of geographical studies which is termed as Human or Anthro or Social or Cultural Geography. La Mer as a synonym for Human Geography and has since then remained ill-defined—its boundaries fluctuating at an alarming rate. A look at some of the standard definitions of these terms would clearly bring out the prevailing lack of clarity on these questions. It is quite clear that definitions like the above are of no help in demarcating the areas covered by these sub-disciplines of Geography. If there is so much of connotative similarity there is a strong case for discarding two of these terms so that geographers can at least understand each other. Alternatively, two of these areas of academic work may be viewed as sub-sets of the third one. This resulted in their spatial segregation in ghettos with all the socio-pathological implications that follow from it. Social geographers differentiated between regions on the basis of the dominant patterns as social phenomena, mostly based on the population characteristics. During this phase of development, the major focus of research remained on the analysis of the social data for the cities. One inevitable consequence was that studies in this area, such as factorial ecology, made social geographic research dependent on the theories of human ecology. It may, however, be pointed out that any study of the social phenomena within the city in the context of factor analysis helped only in the identification of patterns. It is a noteworthy fact that the western social science was alive to the real issues in society. Thus, social geography in the western world developed much in response to political happenings of contemporary social relevance. A common concern was expressed on issues such as poverty and social inequality within the United States. Emrys Jones and John Eyles who described social geography as a group approach conceded that the attempts at definition represented the viewpoints of their authors to which others may not agree Box 1. Definitions With due apologies to those omitted by oversight, the last twenty-five years or so have produced eight definitions of social geography, seven of which are provided by geographers working in the Anglo-American tradition. Groom Helm, ; The progress of social geography in the decades since has taken three main paths, each cluster of research acquiring the status of a school of thought in its own way. This school of thought related the contemporary social problems to the development of capitalism particularly the internal contradictions of capitalism. For example, cities and the communities within the city were perceived as organized spatially in response to the class relations and the Marxian interpretation was that a welfare approach might not be helpful. It is thus obvious that contemporary social geography is in line with the theoretical development in human geography as a whole. This does not mean that the welfare or humanistic concerns or the quest for the causes of social inequality and class-based exploitation or phenomenological perceptions of space have replaced the tradition of areal differentiation or region formation. All these

approaches have continued to co-exist. Some themes have received greater attention at certain stages in the development of Anglo-American school of geography. They may be mentioned here in brief. References have been made to social physics, implying that for the analysis of human behaviour analogies can be drawn with the physical world. The idea was revived by J. Stewart in the forties of the twentieth century. A distance factor also operated such as cost as an exponent revealing an inverse relationship. The basic idea of the gravity model also found its place in other models such as entropy maximizing model and diffusion model. Other applications are found in rank-size rule and the population potential model. These approaches were contested by many geographers who found social physics as simply mechanistic. The human society was not exactly a physical organism which could correspond to precisely defined laws. American sociology adopted social area analysis as a technique for relating social structure with urban patterns. The two hypothesized that within a city the range and intensity of relations depends on the social rank; that the process of urbanization leads to differentiation in the functions of the households leading to changes in the family status; and that social organization within the city leads to concentration of groups along cultural and ethnic lines. Thus, the ethnic status of an individual also plays a role in social interaction. Geographers who adopted social area analysis as a method in their studies of urban social geography depended on statistics disaggregated for the micro units such as the census tracts within the city. The technique was criticized for being mechanistic as there was no link between the social scaling and differentiation of population within the urban space. As a method social area analysis was abandoned in favour of what came to be known as factorial ecology. However, the concept was defined within the framework of the social system of capitalism. The underlying assumption is that the poor were not in a position to satisfy their basic needs. The first generation of Indian geographers, viz. Deshpande followed by V. However, their debates mostly remained internal to geography, although echoes were heard in the corridors of power, e. Ensonced within the confines of its own academic shell, it was virtually reduced to a social isolate. In a way the JNU experiment laid down a new agenda for social geographical research building systematically on the tradition of V. Prakasa Rao and his associates who focused their efforts on the problems of perspective planning for national and regional development.

Chapter 6 : Social Distances

E. Gordon Ericksen, "Conceptions of Space in Social Thought: A Geographic Perspective. Robert David Sack," *American Journal of Sociology* 88, no. 4 (Jan.,):

His family was devoutly Jewish, and his father, grandfather, and great grandfather were all rabbis. He graduated in and began teaching the subject in France. In he was appointed to teach Social Sciences and Pedagogy at the University of Bordeaux, allowing him to teach the first ever official sociology courses in France. Also in , Durkheim married Louise Dreyfus, with whom he would eventually have two children. A Study in Sociology , Suicide. In , Durkheim was finally given a promotion in the form of the chair of the Science of Education at the Sorbonne. In he became a full professor and in , his position was changed to formally include sociology. Henceforth he was chair of the Science of Education and Sociology. Here he gave lectures on a number of subjects and published a number of important essays as well as his final, and most important, major work *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* , *Forms*. The outbreak of World War I would prove to have disastrous consequences for Durkheim. From this Durkheim would never recover and in November he died of a stroke, leaving his last great work, *La Morale* *Morality* , with only a preliminary introduction. During his lifetime, Durkheim was politically engaged, yet kept these engagements rather discrete. Nevertheless, he supported a number of socialist reforms, and had a number of important socialist friends, but never committed himself to the party and did not make political issues a primary concern. Despite his muted political engagement, Durkheim was an ardent patriot of France. He hoped to use his sociology as a way to help a French society suffering under the strains of modernity, and during World War I he took up a position writing anti-German propaganda pamphlets, which in part use his sociological theories to help explain the fervent nationalism found in Germany. Intellectual Development and Influences Durkheim was not the first thinker to attempt to make sociology a science. Auguste Comte, who wished to extend the scientific method to the social sciences, and Herbert Spencer, who developed an evolutionary utilitarian approach that he applied to different areas in the social sciences, made notable attempts and their work had a formative influence on Durkheim. However, Durkheim was critical of these attempts at sociology and felt that neither had sufficiently divorced their analyses from metaphysical assumptions. While Durkheim incorporated elements of evolutionary theory into his own, he did so in a critical way, and was not interested in developing a grand theory of society as much as developing a perspective and a method that could be applied in diverse ways. With Emile Boutroux, Durkheim read Comte and got the idea that sociology could have its own unique subject matter that was not reducible to any other field of study. Gabriel Monod and Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges, both historians, introduced Durkheim to systematic empirical and comparative methods that could be applied to history and the social sciences. Charles Renouvier, a neo-Kantian philosopher, also had a large impact on Durkheim. Between and , Durkheim spent an academic year visiting universities in Germany. What Durkheim found there impressed him deeply. Importantly these scholars were relating morality to other social institutions such as economics or the law, and in the process were emphasizing the social nature of morality. Arguably the most important of these thinkers for Durkheim was Wundt, who rejected methodological individualism and argued that morality was a sui generis social phenomenon that could not be reduced to individuals acting in isolation. Early in his career Durkheim wrote dissertations about Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Montesquieu, both of whom he cited as precursors to sociology. Before this time, as in *Division*, Durkheim focused on how the material and morphological elements of a society affected it. The most important of these, arguably, is Kant, whose moral and epistemological theories were of great influence. This can be partly explained by the fact that the Durkheimian school of thought was greatly reduced when many of his most promising students were killed in WWI, that Durkheim went to such great lengths to divorce sociology from philosophy, or by the fact that his thought has been, and continues to be, simplified and misunderstood. Nevertheless, his ideas had, and continue to have, a strong impact in the social sciences, especially in sociology and anthropology. However, these thinkers never discuss Durkheim at length, or acknowledge any intellectual debt to to him. *Society and the Study of Social Facts According to Durkheim*, all

elements of society, including morality and religion, are products of history. As they do not have a transcendent origin and are part of the natural world, they can be studied scientifically. In particular, Durkheim viewed his sociology as the science of the genesis and functioning of institutions, with institutions being all of the beliefs and modes of conduct instituted by the collectivity. A fundamental element of this science is the sociological method, which Durkheim created specifically for this purpose. An important corollary to the above definition is that social facts are also internal to individuals, and it is only through individuals that social facts are able to exist. In this sense, externality means interior to individuals other than the individual subject. In order to fully grasp how social facts are created and operate, it must be understood that for Durkheim, a society is not merely a group of individuals living in one particular geographical location. Rather, society is an ensemble of ideas, beliefs, and sentiments of all sorts that are realized through individuals; it indicates a reality that is produced when individuals interact with one another, resulting in the fusion of individual consciences. It is a *sui generis* reality, meaning that it is irreducible to its composing parts and unable to be explained by any means other than those proper to it. In other words, society is greater than the sum of its parts; it supercedes in complexity, depth, and richness, the existence of any one particular individual and is wholly new and different from the parts that make it up. This psychic reality is sometimes although especially in Division referred to by Durkheim with the term *conscience collective*, which can alternately be translated into English as *collective conscience* or *collective consciousness*. What is more, society and social phenomena can only be explained in sociological terms, as the fusion of individual consciences that, once created, follows its own laws. It cannot be explained, for example, in biological or psychological terms, or be reduced to the material forms of a society and its immediate vital necessities, as is the case in historical materialism. Social facts are key, since they are what constitute and express the psychic reality that is society. Through them individuals acquire particular traits, such as a language, a monetary system, values, religious beliefs, tendencies for suicide, or technologies, that they would never have had living in total isolation. In *Rules*, Durkheim delineates two different classes of social facts. The first class concerns social facts of a physiological, or operative, order. In these cases it is easy to see how society imposes itself onto the individual from the outside. The first class of social facts also contains currents of opinion, or social phenomena that express themselves through individual cases. Examples include rates of marriage, birth, suicide or migration patterns. In these cases, the operation of society on the individual is not so obvious. Nevertheless, these phenomena can be studied with the use of statistics, which accumulate individual cases into an aggregate and express a certain state of the collective mind. The second class of social facts is of a morphological, or structural, order. It is often concerned with the demographic and material conditions of life and includes the number, nature, and relation of the composing parts of a society, their geographical distribution, the extent and nature of their channels of communication, the shape and style of their buildings, and so forth. While at first glance it might not be evident how the second class of social facts is influenced by collective ways of thinking, acting, or feeling, they indeed have the same characteristics and the same elements of externality and constraint as the first class. Durkheim then provides a set of rules for studying social facts. The first and most important rule is to treat social facts as things. What Durkheim means by this is that social facts have an existence independent of the knowing subject and that they impose themselves on the observer. Social facts can be recognized by the sign that they resist the action of individual will upon them; as products of the collectivity, changing social facts require laborious effort. The next rule for studying social facts is that the sociologist must clearly delimit and define the group of phenomena being researched. This structures the research and provides the object of study a condition of verifiability. The sociologist must also strive to be as objective towards the facts they are working on as possible and remove any subjective bias or attachment to what they are investigating. Finally, the sociologist must systematically discard any and all preconceptions and closely examine the facts before saying anything about them. Durkheim applied these rules to empirical evidence he drew primarily from statistics, ethnography, and history. Durkheim treated this data in a rational way, which is to say that he applied the law of causality to it. At this, Durkheim introduced an important rationalist component to his sociological method, namely the idea that by using his rules, which work to eliminate subjective bias, human behavior can be explained through observable cause and effect relationships.

Accordingly, he often used a comparative-historical approach, which he saw as the core of the sociological method, to eliminate extraneous causes and find commonalities between different societies and their social facts. In so doing, he strove to find general laws that were universally applicable. Durkheim also argued that contemporary social facts could only be understood in relation to the social facts preceding and causing them. Accordingly, Durkheim followed the historical development of political, educational, religious, economic, and moral institutions, particularly those of Western society, and explicitly made a strict difference between historical analysis and sociology: In other words, sociology searches for the causes and functions of social facts as they change over time. In the early part of his career, Durkheim focused on the second class of social facts, or the structural organization of society. Later, social facts of the first class, such as suicide rates, religion, morality, or language became his primary topics of interest. In his later works, Durkheim focused more on questions of a normative nature, or how individuals come to think and act in similar ways, and less on actual physical or legal constraints. Here society still imposes itself onto the individual, but social facts are seen in a more positive light, as the enablers of human activity or as sources of strength for the individual. As time wore on Durkheim eventually ceased using the word constraint altogether. Within this realist position there are two important claims. First, Durkheim makes an ontological claim concerning the sui generis reality of social facts. Hence, Durkheim is arguing that social facts have particular properties of being and that they can be discovered and analyzed when the sociologist treats them in the proper, scientific way. Durkheim strongly refuted such accusations. In response to the first critique, it must be remembered that social facts are both exterior and interior to individuals, with externality in this case meaning interior to individuals other than the individual subject. To say that social facts exist independent of all individuals is an absurd position that Durkheim does not advocate. Only on a methodological level, in order to study social facts from the outside as they present themselves to individuals, does the sociologist abstract social facts from the individual consciences in which they are present. In response to the second critique, Durkheim maintains that social facts, as manifestations of a psychic, or ideational, reality, do not have a material substratum. They can only be observed through the more or less systematized phenomenal reality to be analyzed as empirical data that expresses them. *The Sociology of Knowledge*: His most definitive statement on the subject can be found in *Forms*, a book dedicated not only to studying religion, but also to understanding how logical thought arises out of society. Other works, such as *Pragmatism and Sociology*, a posthumous lecture series given late in his life, elaborate his views. Not only are our common beliefs, ideas, and language determined by our social milieu, but even the concepts and categories necessary for logical thought, such as time, space, causality, and number, have their source in society with the latter claim Durkheim challenges the entire philosophical tradition going back to Aristotle. This logical structure helps to order and interpret the world, ensuring that individuals have a more or less homogenous understanding of the world and how it operates, without which human society would not be possible. And since every society has had some form of logical system to guide its understanding of things, it follows that there has never been a society that is pre-logical or one that has lived in disorder or chaos. Furthermore, Durkheim rejects the idea of the *Ding an sich*, or the transcendent thing in itself. This means that the world exists only as far as it is represented, and that all knowledge of the world necessarily refers back to how it is represented. As Durkheim explains, words, or concepts, are unlike individual sensory representations, which are in a perpetual flux and unable to provide a stable and consistent form to thought. Concepts are impersonal, stand outside of time and becoming *le devenir*, and the thought they engender is fixed and resists change. Consequently, language is also the realm through which the idea of truth is able to come into being, since through language individuals are able to conceive of a world of stable ideas that are common to different intelligences. Thus, language conforms to the two criteria for truth that Durkheim lays out, impersonality and stability.

Chapter 7 : CiteSeerX " Citation Query Conceptions of space in social thought

In physical space, such verbs are used to specify the physical location of the speaker and addressee(s), whereas, in social space, such verbs function to identify the social relationships, such as power, solidarity, politeness, intimacy, etc., between the speaker and addressee(s) in terms of proximity and distance to a common ground.

CATMOG has been created to fill in a teaching need in the field of quantitative methods in undergraduate geography courses. These texts are admirable guides for teachers, yet cheap enough for student purchase as the basis of classwork. Each book is written by an author currently working with the technique or concept he describes. Introduction to Markov chain analysis- L. Distance decay in spatial interactions- P. Understanding canonical correlation analysis- D. Some theoretical and applied aspects of spatial interaction shopping models Show Context Citation Context Measured against Euclidean space human spatiality is seen to be a distortion - it is subjective, idiosyncratic, unreliable. Only by aggregating spatial responses can such unreliability be evened out Progress in Human Geography 22,4 pp. Though a few geographers have made communication the object of study, communication has been undertheorized by Anglo-American geographers. When considered, communication has often been conflated with transportation, or been subject to quantification at the expense of sustained analysis of When considered, communication has often been conflated with transportation, or been subject to quantification at the expense of sustained analysis of its implications for people and places. The increasingly central sociospatial concerns raised by new digital information technologies, however, suggest the urgency for the discipline to re-evaluate a reluctance to engage with communication processes that, until lately, because of their relative invisibility, may have seemed naturalized or beyond the disciplinary purview. Ironically, new communication technologies, because of the visual representations in which they trade, allow social and human geography to incorporate study of communication without abandoning an empirical focus on the visible. Communications seem to be the Cinderella of geographers. They are always accorded lip-service in theoretical discussion and their importance invariably acknowledged in regional descriptions. But few geographers have set themselves the task of examining communications for their own sake Appleton, I communications in geography by Ken Hillis, Ken Hillis " The range of acceptable positions about important political issues defines the political space of society. This paper presents a model of how political space is transformed over time based upon linear differential equations. Constructable transformations of political space are ones that can be modeled Constructable transformations of political space are ones that can be modeled by such equations and thus can result from gradual evolutionary change. Non-constructable transformations cannot be represented in this way because they embody political discontinuities of some kind. A simple typology of constructable transformations is discussed and illustrated. Methods of estimating the political space transformation model are outlined and applied to General Show Context Citation Context The Public and Private in C. The article thus looks at the public-private distinction as it manifested in the public writings The article thus looks at the public-private distinction as it manifested in the public writings and private life of one of the major theorists of this theme. This connects intellectual biography with the spatial turn in sociology. Show Context Citation Context In sociology, Urry championed the spatialization of contemporary capitalism and the spatialization Physical space and social space: In physical space, such verbs are used to specify the physical location of the speaker and addressee s , whereas, in social space, such verbs function to identify the social relationships, such as power, solidarity, politeness, intimacy, etc. We propose that, with regard to Behavioural and perceptual geography by John R. Gold, Brian Goodey, His Associates saarinen " Their reviews, taken together with those of other commentators e. Downs and Meyer, ; Bunting and Guelke, ; Cox and Golledge, ; Thrift, effectively chart the course and major Downs and Meyer, ; Bunting and Guelke, ; Cox and Golledge, ; Thrift, effectively chart the course and major foci of recent research, but differ markedly in their assessments. While a large and fast-growing literature is taken by some to indicate a thriving area of study, the accompanying conceptual wrangles and epistemological controversies can be interpreted by others

as showing a field of inquiry at a critical stage in its development.. In the course of three reviews, we aim to shed light on this matter and to evaluate the state of health of behavioural and perceptual geography. Working on the premise that behavioural and perceptual geography is not a rigidly constituted subdiscipline but rather a broad movement within geography, this review looks Show Context Citation Context Whatever richness has been gained from the new plurality of approaches and from the search-.

Chapter 8 : Hannah Arendt (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Chapter 9 : Sociology of space - Wikipedia

Robert David Sack (Auth.)-Conceptions of Space in Social Thought_ a Geographic Perspective-Macmillan Education UK () - Ebook download as PDF File .pdf), Text File .txt) or read book online.