




1) System vs Regional geo →

This dualism is related with the methodology of geo. ^{approach} Systematic analysis founder is known as Humboldt. while Regional approach is devd by Ritter. As it is cleared 2nd that both of them are scholars of same ^{period} geographers who told physical geo. as the main subject-matter of geo; but a lot of conflict occurs betw the 2 on subject methodology. Humboldt by his book KOSMOS develops system approach. On Humboldt thinking Kant had an influence. Analytical geo. & systematic geo. was emphasised by Kant. Humboldt was affected by it. Again due to the student of geo. he had more analytical features. Acc to him no any subject matter can be analysed isolated. For this it is necessary to specify the subject-matter related to it. On this basis he studied the climate of Germany as subject-matter & cleared that its explanation the analysis of factors related with the origin of climate is necessary. Then only a subject-matter can be rightly explained.

Sir Ritter in his book Erdkunde doesn't favour this methodology of Humboldt. In place of it he devd regional approach. Acc to Ritter the study of geo. should always be in context with regional unit. That region can may be of big or short size. The fundamental necessity is this that of those areas every elements had an analysis.

Not only one element is analyzed. Ritter examining Germany as a region put emphasis on the fact that it is necessary for geographers that they analyse all the physical elements of Germany like - landscapes, climate, drainage, popⁿ, agriculture etc to him any areas all these elements are related with each other thus by explaining any one of the elements we can't do justice with geo. subject matter.

	A	B	C	D
Landscapes				
Climate				
Drainage				
Pop ⁿ				

 systematic

This dualism in content with methodology reaches to classes of geo. Both of them teach same subject with diff. methods. Thus students a condition of confusion arises, which ultimately became the cause of conflict ^{among} between these 2 scholars. But Richthofen & Hettner etc to them the methodologies of both doesn't have so much qualitative diff. which was presented in latter years. Richthofen cleared this that methodologies of both are ~~same~~ ^{parallel} to each other but not same. He also cleared this that the Regional methodology of Ritter is systematic which told about Regional systematic. Like this in Humboldt systematic regional quality was also visible. Thus betw them apart of dualism a kind of complimentary is established. The main difference is that Humboldt taking any one subject matter want to study systematically while Ritter taking region as basis want to study systematically.