Chapter 3

Cultural Turns

Heidi Scott

Recent decades have witnessed the meteoric rise of 'culture' and its study to a position of prominence across the social sciences and humanities. While this 'cultural turn' has been hotly contested and struggled over – no less so in geography than in other disciplines – it has nevertheless emerged as a reflection of, and timely response to, deep-rooted transformations that have taken place since the Second World War in the world's social and political landscapes. These changes have placed culture in the spotlight and made it a central focus of struggles over identity, belonging, and justice in the contemporary world.

The cultural geography that is associated with the recent transdisciplinary turn towards culture received its initial impetus from British geographers, who drew much of their initial inspiration from the work of Raymond Williams and the Birmingham Centre for Cultural Studies. In stark contrast to the old *Kulturkritik*, those working within cultural studies sought to reclaim culture for the population at large by embracing the view "from below" (During 1999: 25), and insisting upon the recognition of cultural diversity and processes of cultural change.

In the early 1980s, calls for a 'new' cultural geography were made by Jackson, who urged his colleagues to attend to the "inner workings of culture" (Jackson 1980: 112), and by Cosgrove, who proposed a radical cultural geography that would seek to understand symbolic production and "its role in the ordering of space" (Cosgrove 1983). In contrast to the traditional American cultural geography which it sought to critique,[1] the emergent field was closely linked to British social geography and sociology and deeply concerned with issues of space, power relations, and the diverse cultural practices of everyday life. Like cultural studies, the new cultural geography embraced and was profoundly shaped by feminist scholarship, as well as by poststructuralist, postmodern, and postcolonial theory. Since its early beginnings, it has been taken up and developed in diverse ways by geographers outside the UK, though almost exclusively within the English-speaking world. During the last 10 years, cultural geography has flourished to such an extent that it has become futile to try to conceptualize it as a unitary field with a coherent agenda or well-defined boundaries.

In what follows, I do not intend to dwell further on a discussion of cultural geography's genealogies, as this has been well-rehearsed elsewhere (see Jackson 1989; Mitchell 2000). Instead, I provide a brief sketch of the directions that geography's cultural turn has taken over the past decade or so, and then engage in a lengthier discussion of current developments, although for reasons of space and the sheer volume of the literature, I cannot hope to provide a comprehensive survey. More modestly, I aim to highlight some of cultural geography's most dominant contemporary trends and draw attention to significant parallels and points of connection with related fields of research.

Following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the rapid emergence of struggles over a "new world order," Cosgrove declared that a "spectacular agenda" had presented itself for cultural geography (Cosgrove 1992: 272). Initially, that agenda was overwhelmingly located in urban metropolitan areas of the industrialized West, as these came to be identified as key sites for the manifestation of social and political struggles that were being founded upon and expressed in terms of cultural difference. While research on lifestyle issues and the social construction of 'race' and gender featured prominently in work on the city, the material landscape was often of limited concern (Cosgrove 1992; Duncan 1993, 1994). The early preoccupation with first-world urban contexts may partly be understood as an endeavor on the part of new cultural geography to distance itself, like cultural studies, from an imperial past in which the term 'culture' – where it did not stand for the rarefied intellectual products of a privileged élite – was applied to the ways of life of 'primitive' non-Western peoples. At the same time, it constituted an understandable reaction to the traditional cultural geography's insistent and uncritical focus on rural and non-Western landscapes.

Despite the constant and continued prominence of the urban, research in cultural geography has embraced subject-matter of remarkable and ever-growing diversity. While the exploration of the relationships between nature and culture has proven to be an area of particular concern since the early 1990s, (post)colonial geographies, gender, sexuality and the body, national identities, travel writing, tourism and leisure, rural geographies, cultures of consumption, and globalization are just a few of the areas that have come under scrutiny. More recently, increasing attention has also been paid to cyberspace and internet technologies, to religion and to previously neglected social groups such as children and the disabled. At the same time, the predominantly visual focus of much work has been challenged by a growing interest in corporeal and sensual geographies that take account of touch, taste and hearing as well as of sight.[2]

Although sidelined by some early studies more concerned with issues of space and social construction, the last decade or so has witnessed the production of much significant research on landscapes and, as Matless illustrates in a review of work done by cultural geographers in 1995, a diverse range of topics has been examined through the prism of landscape (Matless 1996). If particular emphasis was initially placed on exploring the symbolism and textuality of landscapes (see e.g. Cosgrove & Daniels 1988; Duncan 1990; Barnes & Duncan 1992), later work reveals a gradual shift to the concept of landscape as a socionatural *process* and to thinking about how it *works* (Mitchell 1996; Matless 1998) – an approach which is equally apparent in archaeological and anthropological research (Bender 1993; Hirsch & O'Hanlon 1995).[3]

While reflecting its dynamism, the very proliferation of work in the new cultural geography has elicited cries of concern, not only from other areas of geography, but also from those who consider themselves practitioners within the field. From the early 1990s onwards, fears were repeatedly voiced over what some regarded as the indiscriminate overshadowing and 'colonization' of economic, political, and social concerns by the cultural, and the consequent overstretching of the term 'culture,' almost to the point of meaninglessness (see e.g. Thrift 1991; Gregson 1993; Barnett 1998). Bound up with this were worries that the cultural turn had caused geographers to lose their way in labyrinths of textuality and self-referentiality in which, predominantly concerned with linguistic games and the decoding of meanings, they had distanced themselves both from the material world and the political struggles that shape and take place within it. Although reprimanded on the one hand for abandoning substantive research in favor of ungrounded theoretical discussions, on the other, Thrift suggests, cultural geographers have also been accused of "hard-hearted empiricism" that reduces the world to a "lucky dip, a source of innumerable case studies waiting to be plucked, suitably agonized over . . . and published" (Thrift 2000: 1). While such charges are worth heeding, they are nonetheless guilty, I would argue, of frequent exaggeration and simplification. Geography's cultural turn most certainly involved a decisive turn towards text and representation, yet a concern for the material was by no means ever abandoned.[4] On the contrary, as Jackson indicates, interest in material culture is currently undergoing a renaissance (Jackson 2000).[5]

Despite the prominence of doubts and criticisms, cultural geographers continue to turn their attention to new areas of study with undiminished enthusiasm. However, the value of current work lies less in the subject-matter of new additions to a potentially infinite 'shopping-list' of topics that may be acquired for the field's consumption, but rather, I would suggest, in the ways in which cultural geography is being carried out and in the nature of its relationship with other areas of scholarship.

Cultural Geographies in Practice

If, as some have argued in recent years, the 'culture' concept has been used in a somewhat indiscriminate and careless manner, there is current evidence of a growing concern for paying close attention to the ways in which it is employed. Mitchell has been especially outspoken in criticizing cultural geographers for their willingness to concede to culture an amorphous multiplicity of meanings and, moreover, for what he regards as their repetition of traditional cultural geography's central error: that is, the reification of 'culture' as a "superorganic thing" or "realm," a perspective which has encouraged the "proliferation of examples that presumably *constitute* culture . . ." Instead, he argues, it is necessary to conceptualize culture as an *idea* and to concentrate on showing how it *works* in society (Mitchell 2000: 73–5). Mitchell's criticisms seem somewhat unfair given that, for many years, cultural geographers have in fact recognized culture as a process rather than as a 'thing' which may be possessed (see e.g. Anderson & Gale 1992 and 1999), although it is true that many studies pay scant attention to explaining how those processes work.

Nevertheless, it appears that Mitchell's suggestions have struck a chord within cultural geography. Shurmer-Smith provides enthusiastic support for Mitchell's understandings of culture in a new undergraduate textbook (Shurmer-Smith 2002), while Barnett, drawing on recent work in cultural studies that engages with Foucauldian notions of governmentality, proposes that culture

> be understood as an historically variable range of practices that apply or deploy power to particular effects, and not as a realm that reflects, refracts or represents other modes of power. (Barnett 2001: 11)

In a range of disciplines beyond cultural geography, the turn of the century has been marked by comparable calls for revising the concept and usage of the term 'culture.' In cultural studies and literary criticism respectively, Mulhern and Eagleton warn against the collapsing of distinctions between culture and politics, a point which is also taken up by Barnett (Mulhern 2000; Eagleton 2000; Barnett 2001).[6] In anthropology, meanwhile, Ortner insists that "there is no longer anything we would call 'culture' or even 'cultures,' but that we want cultural interpretation to do different kinds of work" (Ortner 1999: 9).

If culture is done rather than possessed, growing emphasis is consequently being placed at present on the *doing* of cultural geography. This is perhaps most strikingly reflected in the title and style of Shurmer-Smith's *Doing Cultural Geography* (2002), which guides students through the application of theoretical perspectives and a range of methods in the practice of cultural geography. More widely, discussions about methods have gained prominence, and moves may be afoot for researchers to embrace broader, more engaged methods that go beyond textual analysis and traditional ethnographies. While Thrift would have cultural geographers learn from methods as diverse as street theatre, music and dance therapy and performative writing (Thrift 2000b: 3), Lilley suggests that mapping should not merely be treated as a practice to be deconstructed but recuperated as a creative strategy which offers "a way of connecting with landscape, and those who shape it" (Lilley 2000: 370).

Whether engaged research methods such as mapping will be widely adopted remains to be seen, but what their discussion does reflect is a more general, *theoretical* interest in issues of practice and performativity, and a related shift away from representation. Arguing that texts and representations can provide no more than a narrow and impoverished account of the world, Thrift proposes that we seek to valorize and apprehend the embodied, sensuous practices and noncontemplative knowledges that constitute the fabric of everyday life, a strategy which he terms "nonrepresentational theory."[7] While acknowledging the real and often tragic effects of power in the world, this approach seeks to escape from "the guilt-ridden, doom-laden and life-denying tone of much Western philosophical thought" (Thrift 1999: 302) and to celebrate the ways in which everyday creativity, imagination and play undermine and elude the workings of power (Thrift 2000a). The currency of these ideas is apparent, for example, in recent work on the embodied practices of caravanning and camping (Crouch 2001).

Notwithstanding current interest in nonrepresentational theory, it seems clear that the study of texts and other forms of representation will continue to play a

prominent, albeit less dominant, role in cultural geography. Recent work reveals a sustained interest in travel writing and literature (Phillips 2001; Sharp 2002), as well as in historical research, where medieval and early colonial geographies may prove to be a new area of growth (Jones 2000; Wiley 2000; Harvey 2002). While textual analysis will necessarily continue to be central to such historical work, it is also apparent that texts are being engaged with in ways that bring the performative and material to the fore. The unearthing of meanings embedded within texts is increasingly being sidelined by concerns for recuperating the spatial practices and bodily performances that may be detected within them and which, until recently, have largely been overlooked or dismissed. Such an approach is strongly evident, for example, in recent work on imperial cities. While the study of texts and other representations forms the basis of this work, it is argued that

> to understand the variety of ways in which cultures of imperialism were represented and negotiated in the European city, it is necessary to move beyond maps and texts to consider the relationship between different kinds of spaces – architectural, spectacular, performative and lived. (Driver & Gilbert 1999: 7–8)

Jacobs expresses related concerns with regard to the role of the city in the formation of colonial and postcolonial Australia. Seeking to move beyond mere spatial metaphors by attending to "the 'real' geographies of colonialism and postcolonialism," her work explores the complex "spatial struggles" through which imperial contests over identity and power have been articulated (Jacobs 1996: 1–5; see also Taylor 2000).

At the same time, cultural geographers are increasingly attentive to tracing the processes by which representations are *produced*, thereby reconnecting with the material contexts and practices that shape them. The exploration of *acts* of mapping thus provides the central theme of a recent collection of essays (Cosgrove 1999); in a similar vein, Driver turns his attention to geographical fieldwork practices in the high era of European exploration and imperialism (Driver 2001) and Brace examines the role of publishing and publishers in the formation of English rural identities in the mid-twentieth century (Brace 2001).

Returning to the theme of colonialism, a recent essay by Dubow moves away from commonplace discussions of a disengaged "power-charged colonial gaze" to exploring the ways in which colonial vision is created through dialogues between sight, embodied desire and the experience of space (Dubow 2000). In the light of Nash's recent warnings against the dismissal of representation and texts that some proponents of nonrepresentational strategies appear to advocate, this work responds to her call for the exploration of "the intersections between representations, discourses, material things, spaces and practices – the intertwined and interacting material and social world" (Nash 2000: 661).[8]

Just as much recent work in cultural geography seeks to reject 'either/or' approaches in favor of more complex and textured accounts, so it also displays a marked concern for overcoming – or at least challenging – some of the binary oppositions that have long been fundamental to Western thinking. Perhaps most prominent amongst these is the nature–culture dualism, which has attracted particular attention in recent years from a range of disciplines within the social sciences and

humanities. If moves have been made for over a decade to recognize 'nature' as a cultural construct, the emphasis is now shifting towards drawing out the many ways in which the nonhuman, both animate and inanimate, is inextricably connected with and partly constitutive of human societies.

Drawing on actor-network theory,[9] geographers are challenging anthropocentric conceptions of the world by re-cognizing the human subject as just one form of agent whose actions are relationally shaped within hybrid networks of diverse agents – "human and nonhuman, technological and textual, organic and (geo)physical, which hold each other in position" (Whatmore 1999: 28; see also Whatmore 2000). The recent and related development of animal geographies is concerned not only with the ways in which human societies use and define animals and 'place' them both materially and imaginatively, but equally with examining – despite recurring fears about anthropomorphism – questions of animal agency and resistance to human orders (Philo & Wilbert 2000; Wilbert 2000).

The workings of power relations are currently being rethought in diverse contexts, in ways which reject any clear-cut oppositions between domination and resistance. This move is reflected in a recent publication which, while focusing on the domination/resistance couplet, seeks to undermine the binary model and draw out "the messy and inherently spatialised entanglements of domination/resistance, as always energised and traversed by the machinations and effects of power" (Sharp et al. 2000: 2). Geographical work on colonialism and imperialism is producing particularly nuanced accounts of power relations and identity which display sensitivity towards their enmeshed nature and the spatial processes and practices that constitute and shape them.[10]

Focusing on Victorian women travelers in nineteenth-century West Africa, McEwan draws attention to the inadequacy of adopting a feminist approach that recuperates and celebrates their agency without attending to issues of class, ethnicity and sexuality which cross-cut their relations with the colonized as well as with fellow Europeans. Thus, the ability of these women to exercise power over colonial subjects is undermined (as in the case of their male counterparts) both by acts of native resistance and by a frequently profound dependence on indigenous knowledges. At the same time, the textual *visibility* of this dependence reveals that, as women, they were unable (and also unwilling) to make claims for themselves as producers of geographical knowledge, and were largely denied membership of the Royal Geographical Society (McEwan 2000).

Such attentiveness to the internal differences and fractures that inflected the identity and (self)perceptions of European colonizers, and to how these were partly shaped in and by the periphery, is equally evident, for example, in work on white identities in colonial Barbados (Lambert 2001), in nineteenth-century South Africa and Britain (Lester 2001) and on European constructions of the tropics, to which a special issue of the *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* was recently dedicated. Introducing the papers, Driver and Yeoh draw attention to the ways in which they question the assumed "homogeneity and coherence in European systems of knowledge" and show how these views "may have been shaped by interactions with indigenous people and places" (Driver & Yeoh 2000: 3).[11]

Meanwhile, recent work by Martins and Abreu on imperial Rio de Janeiro undermines "conventional narratives of modernisation," which portray the rise of

modernity on a global scale as the exclusive product of a dynamic and expanding Europe, by showing how early nineteenth-century processes of urban transformation "were shaped by a distinct local geography of globalisation" (Martins & Abreu 2001: 533).[12] While concerned with tracing global networks and flows of economic, cultural, and human capital as a consequence of European expansionism, much new work on imperialism and colonialism is therefore equally dedicated to the project of "provincializing Europe"[13] by emphatically drawing attention to the modulating effects of diverse local contexts, agencies and knowledge in the colonial 'peripheries.' Understandably, such approaches that seek to "blur the boundaries between centre and margin" (Anderson & Jacobs 1997: 21), have attained particular prominence in recent geographical (and anthropological) work that deals with issues of landscape, power and identity in (post)colonial Australia and New Zealand (see e.g. Morphy 1993; Jacobs 1996; Pawson 1999).

Transgressing Boundaries?

While cultural geographers and other scholars have become increasingly anxious to trace the ever-shifting networks that linked and mutually shaped local landscapes and global processes in the context of past centuries, this has become a goal of particular urgency where work of a contemporary nature is concerned. The dramatic effects of global capital, new technologies and the growing mobility of populations have made it imperative to rethink territorially bounded concepts of culture or culture groups in cultural geography, anthropology and cultural studies alike.[14]

Whereas initial reactions to globalization in the late twentieth century involved predictions of the future irrelevance of place and territoriality, these have given way to more measured accounts that acknowledge their continued significance. Focusing on local resistances to tourism in Goa, Routledge insists on the need to "remain attentive to place-specific discourses and practices of resistance" (Routledge 2001: 238), while Holloway and Valentine, who explore the use of the internet by British children, suggest that, rather than being placeless, "cyberspace is shaped through place-routed cultures" (Holloway & Valentine 2001: 153). At the same time, growing emphasis is placed on the difficulty of comprehending the production of local landscapes, identities, and practices without attending to the multiscalar networks of places and processes through which they are constituted. Such an approach is evident, for instance, in recent work on geographies of culinary authenticity in Britain, and on religion and suburban landscapes in south London. While the former study underlines the ubiquity of "mixed up, messed up, boundary defying culinary histories and practices" that defy countless national and cultural boundaries (Cook, Crang, & Thorpe 2000: 132), the latter illustrates how the London Mosque's suburban location is inextricably "tied to cultural, political and economic forces on a global scale" (Naylor & Ryan 2002: 50).[15]

Work on landscape in particular has long displayed a tendency to focus narrowly on the local. This, however, is clearly beginning to change, as reflected in a collection of essays on landscapes of defense edited by Gold and Revill. It is insufficient, they suggest, to study landscapes in isolation because of the interconnections that inevitably link them to other landscapes in relation to which they were formed (Gold & Revill 2000: 15). Their approach is applauded by Mitchell, who, making refer-

ence to his own work on California's contemporary landscapes, argues that those landscapes "do not just reflect but also incorporate and reify social processes working at a range of scales" and consequently "cannot be understood in isolation from other landscapes, other regions and other places" (Mitchell 2002: 383).

The transgression of traditional boundaries is evident not only in cultural geographers' current interests in tracing global processes that work across rather than within borders, but equally in terms of the growing connections that are being forged between cultural geography and other disciplines. Although fruitful exchanges and borrowings have long taken place, it now seems possible to detect the forging of stronger, more deliberate alliances that seek – actively and often with political intent – to weave connections across boundaries that have long maintained the existence of discrete disciplinary realms. While Featherstone and Lash suggest that the complex global processes of the contemporary world cannot be studied or comprehended through separate disciplines (1999: 2), Shurmer-Smith similarly questions the usefulness of maintaining the notion of 'cultural geography' as a distinct subdiscipline (2000: 524).

Although the imminent dismissal of labels such as 'cultural geography' seems highly unlikely, these concerns are nevertheless being actively engaged with in new publications that aspire to greater disciplinary hybridity by interweaving (rather than simply juxtaposing) methods and ideas from distinct areas of research. This approach is adopted in contributions to *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns*, which aims to "break the boundaries of geography" by forging connections with work in diverse disciplines (Cook et al. 2000: xi), and is equally apparent in a major new volume on the archaeology and anthropology of landscape (Ucko & Layton 1999).

Current work on landscape in archaeology and cultural geography is particularly striking in its complementarity and common interests: while landscape archaeologists have displayed growing interest in landscape perceptions and the multiple meanings and power relations that shape and are shaped by material form (see e.g. Ucko & Layton 1999; Bradley 2000), cultural geography appears to be meeting them halfway in its present emphasis on the materiality of landscapes. At the same time, the prominence of actor-network theory in cultural geography is mirrored by new archaeological concerns for rethinking traditional divisions between human bodies and material things, and for constructing "a framework that acknowledges objects as a creative part of social life" (Gosden 2001: 164).

Despite cultural geography's growing involvement in such disciplinary transgressions and intertwinings, it may still be pertinent to question the extent to which it has really succeeded in overcoming other, no less traditional boundaries. In the early to mid-1990s, both Cosgrove and Duncan remarked on the tendency of work in new cultural geography to concentrate narrowly on the Western (and predominantly Anglo-American) world (Cosgrove 1992; Duncan 1994). More recently, Smith has suggested that, despite much talk of globalization, the field continues to be plagued by what he terms a "faux cosmopolitanism" (Smith 2001: 27–8).[16]

It cannot be doubted that much recent work, such as Bonnett's wide-ranging study of whiteness (Bonnett 2000), does indeed endeavor to look beyond the boundaries of the West, or that efforts are increasingly being made to include and review the work of scholars from beyond the Anglo-American realm in cultural and other human geography journals.[17] The recently-launched journal *Social and Cultural*

Geography, meanwhile, is notable for its inclusion of abstracts in French and Spanish. Nevertheless, many cultural geographers continue to show a striking disregard for literature written in languages and traditions other than English (unless it has been translated). Grossberg's recent criticisms, aimed at cultural studies, are equally applicable to cultural geography:

> As a field, cultural studies remains too centered in Anglophone perspectives, traditions and disciplinary histories. These problems are exacerbated by the apparent reluctance of many English-speaking cultural studies scholars to grapple with empirical social and cultural contexts with which they are largely unfamiliar. (Grossberg 2002: 1)

Such lack of attention to non-English literatures and contexts is of no small consequence, given cultural geography's frequently proclaimed interest in decentering the West and its histories and geographies. Challenging the quietly accepted dominance of English should surely be central to the pursuit of this interest; otherwise, cultural geographers will continue to find themselves ironically bound by and reinforcing the very boundaries they wish to transgress. The persistence of linguistically determined barriers means that, even in a European context, geographers working within the Anglo-American tradition have largely maintained their distance from their non-Anglophone neighbors.[18]

While it is not my intention to suggest that all cultural geographers should necessarily become linguists, it is clear that cultivating greater attentiveness to other languages will further enrich an already diverse and dynamic field of research. The prominence that this issue has recently attained in human geography, as well as in related disciplines, suggests that such a move may soon be underway.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Jim Duncan for his helpful editorial comments on an earlier draft of this chapter.

NOTES

1. See chapter 2, this volume, for a discussion of traditional cultural geography.
2. For reasons of space, I am unable to provide comprehensive references to this work. However, annual reviews of work done in cultural geography may be found in the journal *Progress in Human Geography*.
3. Although a geographically inspired lexicon of spatial and cartographic metaphors has been widely adopted across the humanities and social sciences, some of cultural geography's most fruitful and substantive exchanges appear to have been made with archaeology and anthropology.
4. As Matless observed in 1995, "most cultural work proceeds by putting into question any easy distinctions of materiality and representation" (1995: 396). Anderson and Gale (1999: 15) make a similar point: intensified interest in the politics of difference throughout the 1990s, they argue, has in fact "helped underline the inherent materiality of cultural life."

5. A possible consequence of this may be the forging of positive and productive links with the work of traditional cultural geographers who, in turn, seem increasingly receptive to approaches derived from new cultural geography.
6. This approach contrasts with Mitchell's rather strident assertion that "culture is politics by another name" (2000: 294).
7. This approach also involves a revision of traditional understandings of 'theory.' For Thrift, theory "becomes *a practical means of going on rather than something concerned with enabling us to see, contemplatively, the supposedly true nature of what something is*" (1999: 304); original emphasis.
8. The adoption of such a multifaceted approach appears to be reflected, for example, in recent work on postcolonialism and ecology in New Zealand (Dominy 2002), where textual analysis is combined with, rather than sidelined by, ethnographic fieldwork methods.
9. Initially developed by social theorists such as Callon, Latour, Law, and Serres, actor-network theory seeks to overcome the binaries and Euclidean certainties of Western thought. See e.g. Murdoch 1998 for a detailed discussion, and Whatmore 1999.
10. For a wide-ranging review of recent work on colonialism and imperialism, see Nash 2002.
11. Current work on European notions of the 'tropics' again reflects the enormous interest in issues of nature/culture, and their intersection with the study of colonialism and imperialism. Little explored until very recently, this may prove to be a significant area of future research for cultural geographers, cultural historians and literary critics alike. An interdisciplinary conference on tropicality was held in Greenwich (London), July 2002.
12. Recent work in history is similarly concerned with showing that 'globalization' is by no means a homogeneous and homogenizing product of the contemporary West, but rather a phenomenon that has emerged in diverse forms, places, and times. See e.g. Hopkins 2002.
13. I borrow this expression from Chakrabarty, cited in Rafael 1993: ix.
14. Anthropologists, for example, have recognized the inadequacy of traditional, Geertzian notions of 'culture' as bound to specific geographical locations and particular groups, and called for the need to "reconfigure the anthropological project in relation to the study of very complex social formations – nations, transnational networks, discontinuous discourses, global 'flows,' increasingly hybridized identities, and so forth" (Ortner 1999: 7).
15. Having said this, Peach (2002) argues that a *narrowing of scale* is currently apparent in cultural geography. I would strongly question the general applicability of this observation, but suggest that it may be so in the case of some work based on nonrepresentational and performative approaches, which tend to focus on microgeographies.
16. Arguably, such 'faux cosmopolitanism' applies above all to those who are at the 'center' of the new cultural geography (if such a thing exists). Scholars who work in areas such as environmental geography are showing interest in the ideas and approaches of cultural geographers, but without surrendering their interest in non-Western contexts. See e.g. Batterbury 2001.
17. Issues of language, and the need for Anglo-American geography to forge stronger links with geographers beyond that sphere, are discussed in a series of papers in vols. 18 and 20 of *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. Volume 18 also includes a review of Spanish and Portuguese literature.
18. Recent work in *Geographische Zeitschrift*, for example, shows that ideas central to Anglo-American cultural geography are being explored by geographers in other traditions, yet so far there is little evidence of reciprocity. Volume 88, for example, contains a series of papers on Orientalism. See especially Meyer 2000.

REFERENCES

Anderson, K. and Gale, F., eds. 1992: *Inventing Places: Studies in Cultural Geography*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Anderson, K. and Gale, F., eds. 1999: *Cultural Geographies*. Australia: Longman.

Anderson, K. and Jacobs, J. 1997: From urban Aborigines to Aboriginality and the city: one path through the history of Australian cultural geography. *Australian Geographical Studies* 35, 12–22.

Barnes, T. J. and Duncan, J. S., eds. 1992: *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape*. London/New York: Routledge.

Barnett, C. 1998: Cultural twists and turns. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16, 631–4.

Barnett, C. 2001: Culture, geography, and the arts of government. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19, 7–24.

Batterbury, S. 2001: Landscapes of diversity: a local political ecology of livelihood diversification in south-western Niger. *Ecumene* 8, 437–57.

Bender, B., ed. 1993: *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Providence, RI/Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Bonnett, A. 2000: *White Identities: Historical and International Perspectives*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall.

Brace, C. 2001: Publishing and publishers: towards an historical geography of countryside writing, c.1930–1950. *Area* 33, 287–96.

Bradley, R. 2000: *An Archaeology of Natural Places*. London/New York: Routledge.

Cook, I., Crang, P., and Thorpe, M. 2000: Regions to be cheerful: culinary authenticities and its geographies. In I. Cook et al., eds., *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns: Perspectives on Cultural Geography*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall, 109–39.

Cook, I., Crouch, D., Naylor, S., and Ryan, J. R., eds. 2000: *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns: Perspectives on Cultural Geography*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall.

Cosgrove, D. 1983: Towards a radical cultural geography: problems of theory. *Antipode* 15, 1–11.

Cosgrove, D. 1992: Orders and a new world: cultural geography 1990–91. *Progress in Human Geography* 16, 272–80.

Cosgrove, D., ed. 1999: *Mappings*. London: Reaktion Books.

Cosgrove, D. and Daniels, S., eds. 1988: *The Iconography of Landscape*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crouch, D. 2001: Spatialities and the feeling of doing. *Social and Cultural Geography* 2, 61–75.

Dominy, M. D. 2002: Hearing grass, thinking grass: postcolonialism and ecology in Aotearoa – New Zealand. *Cultural Geographies* 9, 15–34.

Driver, F. 2001: *Geography Militant: Cultures of Exploration and Empire*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Driver, F. and Gilbert, D., eds. 2000: *Imperial Cities: Landscape, Display and Identity*. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.

Driver, F. and Gilbert, D. 1999: Imperial cities: overlapping territories, intertwined histories. In Driver and Gilbert, eds., *Imperial Cities: Landscape, Display and Identity*. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 1–17.

Driver, F. and Yeoh, B. S. A. 2000: Constructing the tropics: introduction. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 21, 1–5.

Dubow, J. 2000: 'From a view *on* the world to a point of view *in* it': rethinking sight, space and the colonial subject. *Interventions* 2, 87–102.

Duncan, J. S. 1990: *The City as Text: the Politics of Landscape Interpretation in the Kandyan Kingdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Duncan, J. S. 1993: Landscapes of the self/landscapes of the other(s): cultural geography 1991–92. *Progress in Human Geography* 17, 367–77.
Duncan, J. S. 1994: After the civil war: reconstructing cultural geography as heterotopia. In K. Foote et al., eds., *Re-reading Cultural Geography*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 401–8.
During, S., ed. 1999: *The Cultural Studies Reader*. London/New York: Routledge.
Eagleton, T. 2000: *The Idea of Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Featherstone, M. and Lash, S., eds. 1999: *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*. London: Sage Publications.
Foote, K., Hugill, P., Mathewson, K., and Smith, J., eds. 1994: *Re-reading Cultural Geography*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Gold, J. R. and Revill, G., eds. 2000: *Landscapes of Defence*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall.
Gosden, C. 2001: Making sense: archaeology and aesthetics. *World Archaeology* 33, 163–7.
Gregson, N. 1993: 'The initiative': delimiting or deconstructing social geography? *Progress in Human Geography* 17, 525–30.
Grossberg, L. 2002: 'A special editorial for 16(1).' *Cultural Studies* 16, 1–2.
Harvey, D. C. 2002: Constructed landscapes and social memory: tales of St. Samson in early medieval Cornwall. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20, 231–48.
Hirsch, E. and O'Hanlon, M., eds. 1995: *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Holloway, S. L. and Valentine, G. 2001: Placing cyberspace: processes of Americanization in British children's use of the Internet. *Area* 33, 153–60.
Hopkins, A. G., ed. 2002: *Globalization in World History*. London: Pimlico.
Jackson, P. 1989: *Maps of Meaning: An Introduction to Cultural Geography*. London: Unwin Hyman.
Jackson, P. 2000: Rematerializing social and cultural geography. *Social and Cultural Geography* 1, 9–14.
Jacobs, J. 1996: *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. London/New York: Routledge.
Jones, R. 2000: Changing ideologies of Medieval state formation: the growing exploitation of land in Gwynedd c.1100–c.1400. *Journal of Historical Geography* 26, 505–16.
Lambert, D. 2001: Liminal figures: poor whites, freedmen, and racial reinscription in colonial Barbados. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19, 335–50.
Lester, A. 2001: *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-century South Africa and Britain*. London/New York: Routledge.
Lilley, K. D. 2000: Landscape mapping and symbolic form: drawing as a creative medium in cultural geography. In I. Cook et al., eds., *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns: Perspectives on Cultural Geography*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall, 370–86.
Martins, L. L. and Abreu, M. A. 2001: Paradoxes of modernity: imperial Rio de Janeiro, 1808–1821. *Geoforum* 32, 533–50.
Massey, D., Allen, J., and Sarre, P., eds. 1999: *Human Geography Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Matless, D. 1995: Culture run riot? Work in social and cultural geography, 1994. *Progress in Human Geography* 19, 395–403.
Matless, D. 1996: New material? Work in cultural and social geography, 1995. *Progress in Human Geography* 20, 379–91.
Matless, D. 1998: *Landscape and Englishness*. London: Reaktion Books.
McEwan, C. 2000: *Gender, Geography and Empire: Victorian Women Travellers in West Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Meyer, F. 2000: Methodologische Überlegungen zu einer kulturvergleichenden Geographie oder: Auf der Suche nach dem Orient. *Geographische Zeitschrift* 88, 148–64.
Mitchell, D. 1996: *The Lie of the Land: Migrant Workers and the California Landscape*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Mitchell, D. 2000: *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Mitchell, D. 2002: Cultural landscapes: the dialectical landscape – recent landscape research in human geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 381–9.
Mitchell, W. J. T., ed. 1994: *Landscape and Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Morphy, H. 1993: Colonialism, history and the construction of place: the politics of landscape in northern Australia. In B. Bender, ed., *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Providence, RI/Oxford: Berg Publishers, 205–43.
Mulhern, F. 2000: *Culture/Metaculture*. London/New York: Routledge.
Murdoch, J. 1998: The spaces of actor-network theory. *Geoforum* 29, 357–74.
Nash, C. 2000: Performativity in practice: some recent work in cultural geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 24, 653–64.
Nash, C. 2002: Cultural geography: postcolonial cultural geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 219–30.
Naylor, S. and Ryan, J. R. 2002: The mosque in the suburbs: negotiating religion and ethnicity in South London. *Social and Cultural Geography* 3, 39–59.
Ortner, S. B., ed. 1999: *The Fate of "Culture": Geertz and Beyond*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Pawson, E. 1999: Postcolonial New Zealand? In K. Anderson and F. Gale, eds., *Cultural Geographies*. Australia: Addison-Wesley Longman, 25–50.
Peach, C. 2002: Social geography: new religions and ethnoburbs – contrasts with cultural geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 252–60.
Phillips, R. 2001: Decolonizing geographies of travel: reading James/Jan Morris. *Social and Cultural Geography* 2, 1–24.
Philo, C. and Wilbert, C., eds. 2000: *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: New Geographies of Animal–Human Relations*. London/New York: Routledge.
Routledge, P. 2001: 'Selling the rain,' resisting the scale: resistant identities and the conflict over tourism in Goa. *Social and Cultural Geography* 2, 223–40.
Sharp, J. P. 2002: Writing travel/travelling writing: Roland Barthes detours the Orient. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20, 155–66.
Sharp, J. P., Routledge, P., Philo, C., and Paddison, R., eds. 2000: *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*. London/New York: Routledge.
Shurmer-Smith, P. 2000: Cultural turns/geographical turns: perspectives on cultural geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 25, 524–6.
Shurmer-Smith, P., ed. 2002: *Doing Cultural Geography*. London: Sage Publications.
Smith, N. 2001: Socializing culture, radicalizing the social. *Social and Cultural Geography* 1, 25–8.
Taylor, A. 2000: 'The sun always shines in Perth': a post-colonial geography of identity, memory and place. *Australian Geographical Studies* 38, 27–35.
Thrift, N. 1991: Over-wordy worlds? Thoughts and worries. In C. Philo (comp.), *New Words, New Worlds: Reconceptualising Social and Cultural Geography*. St. David's University College, Lampeter: Social and Cultural Study Group, 144–8.
Thrift, N. 1999: Steps to an ecology of place. In D. Massey et al., eds., *Human Geography Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 295–322.
Thrift, N. 2000a: Entanglements of power: shadows? In J. P. Sharp et al., eds., *Entanglements of Power: Geographies Of Domination/Resistance*. London/New York: Routledge, 269–78.
Thrift, N. 2000b: Introduction: dead or alive? In I. Cook et al., eds., *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns: Perspectives on Cultural Geography*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall, 1–6.

Ucko, P. J. and Layton, R., eds. 1999: *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape*. London/New York: Routledge.

Whatmore, S. 1999: Hybrid geographies: rethinking the 'human' in human geography. In D. Massey et al., eds., *Human Geography Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 22–39.

Whatmore, S. 2000: Heterogeneous geographies: reimagining the spaces of N/nature. In I. Cook et al., eds., *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns: Perspectives on Cultural Geography*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall, 265–72.

Wilbert, C. 2000: Anti-this – against-that: resistance along a human–non-human axis. In J. P. Sharp et al., eds., *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*. London/New York: Routledge, 238–55.

Wiley, J. 2000: New and old worlds: *The Tempest* and early colonial discourse. *Social and Cultural Geography* 1, 45–63.