

## Chapter 1

# Introduction

*Nuala C. Johnson, Richard H. Schein, and Jamie Winders*

---

It is hard to find a key word or topic in cultural geography these days that does not enjoy an interdisciplinary constituency. That is a good thing. The contemporary fascination with the “cultural” has generated an enormous body of work on which cultural geographers draw and to which they contribute. Cultural geography as a subdiscipline brings to the conversation a long tradition, most notably attention to space and place, to the spatiality of everyday life at multiple and fluid scales, to landscapes as the re-suturing of human and physical worlds, and to the politics and epistemological implications of these engagements. In the past decade, these traditional foci have remained intact, even as some have garnered renewed enthusiasm (such as nature–society questions), others have undergone increased conceptual scrutiny (such as the “cultural landscape” concept), and many have engaged new conceptual or theoretical possibilities (such as increased interest in affect and emotion or consideration of the “posthuman”). All of these developments are present in this volume, and this introductory chapter signposts some of these traditional, new, and renewed areas of interest in cultural geography and the ways these topics have shifted in the last decade. This chapter is not, however, meant as a comprehensive introduction to the subdiscipline of cultural geography. Instead, it is an invitation to examine the field’s ever-changing contours through the ensuing essays.

Cultural geography has been a foundational building block of human geography since the discipline formally was established in the nineteenth century. Documenting spatial patterns in human interaction with, responses to, and transformations of the natural landscape, raising questions about how landscape itself was shaped by and shaped social dynamics, and problematizing the ideas of culture, landscape, and nature have been cultural geography’s contributions to the ways that human geographers have thought about the world around them, past and present. Today, the line between human geography as a discipline and cultural

geography as a subdiscipline is blurred to the point that cultural geography *is* human geography in some corners of our field. Recent intellectual and scholarly developments within geography have drawn cultural geographers closer to the fold and to deeper engagements with colleagues and ideas once thought beyond cultural geography's purview – political, economic, historical, or environmental geography, for example. These connections have been strengthened through cultural geography's embrace of and relevance to the so-called cultural and spatial turns across the human sciences as well as its engagement with social theory and concepts of interest to a broad range of scholars within and beyond the discipline. In short, cultural geographers today study nearly every aspect of human geography and do so in ways that simultaneously reinforce the subdiscipline's place in geography and question the logic and locations of its boundaries.

Cultural geography is itself deeply geographic in terms of what places and spaces cultural geographers study and how cultural-geographic scholarship is conducted across institutional and national contexts. Although cultural geography developed historically and intellectually in relation to other areas of human geography, such as cultural ecology and social geography, it also has developed in relation to its practical and institutional contexts. Cultural geography means different things in different places *and* is enacted in different ways, especially between its North American and British variants (see, for example, Audrey Kobayashi's discussion of this phenomenon in relation to geographic treatments of race in Chapter 9). *Where* cultural geography is performed, and where cultural-geographic research is produced, then, shapes what cultural-geographic scholarship looks like as much as does the widening array of spaces and places that cultural geographers now study. In all these ways, cultural geography, as a body of work, is as unruly as ever in its wanderings into other subdisciplines and disciplines, is as spatial as ever in the different strands of theories and writings that coexist as cultural geography in different places, and is as foundational as ever to the field of human geography in its interrogation of the relationship between the spatial and the social, landscape and cultural processes, past and present.

The chapters commissioned for this new companion to cultural geography take up the difficult task of sorting through the unruliness, spatiality, and continuing centrality of contemporary cultural geography. The chapters are written by scholars who self-identify as cultural geographers and by geographers who write about cultural themes from the perspective of other subdisciplines. Thus, this companion reflects on the field of cultural geography from within and from without. While this approach might problematize the notion of a coherent subdiscipline, it also makes a claim about the continuity and relevance of cultural geography as a way of looking at the world, from the past to the future. That claim is especially salient today. Scholarly and intellectual inquiry focused on the social, political, cultural, and economic worlds must respond to changes in the intellectual worlds of theory, the academic worlds of changing scholarly subjects, and, ultimately, the worlds of everyday social practice.

In the midst of these multiple, sometimes competing, foci, there is also a critical argument to be made for the normative qualities of any intellectual activity that might claim, even demand, that scholars go beyond "response" to the world around them to contribute to the shaping of that world in which they operate and upon which they gaze. This argument, of course, sat at the center of critical human geography as it emerged in the late 1990s. With a dual focus on critically interrogating the categories, lenses, and frameworks through which geographers examined the social world *and* on working to envision a more just and equitable version of that social world, critical human geography began from the

presumption that geographers can, and should, do more than report on the world and, instead, should be part of interventions that improve it. Cultural geography played a key role in the development of critical human geography. Its connection to questions of emancipatory visions, interventions, and social justice is evident here in chapters covering such issues as the Occupy movement, the global financial crisis, the politics of food, and the continuing centrality of race and racism within the neoliberal rhetoric of a post-racial world. In the process, and in multiple ways, these chapters call for a politics of *relevance* in contemporary cultural geography and for engaging not only academic theoretical debates but also the everyday world around us.

To maintain that relevance, scholarly inquiry must remain vigilant of itself: always looking backward and looking forward, always remaining cognizant of the aims, intents, and consequences of a defined field, past and present, no matter how difficult the task of locating “the center” of that field. So it is with cultural geography. In responding to the ever-changing nature of the field of cultural geography and the world in which it practices, we introduce this *new* companion to cultural geography as a contribution to the ongoing conversation around this particular subdiscipline of human geography. It is emphatically a new volume, even as it follows almost ten years on the heels of the first companion (Duncan, Johnson, and Schein 2004). Some of the authors in this volume are the same; many are different. All of the essays are original and were commissioned specifically for this volume, with the intent of continuing to look forward and of looking at cultural geography from more than its center. As any review of the field makes clear, cultural geography has meant many things in many contexts; and that vibrancy must continue if it is to survive in the contemporary world of interdisciplinary study and challenges to intellectual orthodoxy, even those that fostered the subdiscipline in the first place.

Defining cultural geography, indeed any discipline or subdiscipline, is tricky; and different, imbricated categorical criteria often are employed. For cultural geography, these criteria might include attention to tradition or genealogies (which themselves have a geography, see Tolia-Kelly 2010); to personalities or hagiographies of specific cultural geographers; to theoretical and conceptual paradigms and debates over their utility and appropriateness across time and space; to thematic focus on some aspect of the world; to disciplinary key words and ideas; to calls for particular research agendas. Each of these categories is represented in this volume’s essays; and together, they comprise a broad introduction to cultural geography, albeit an introduction located in the Anglophone world and largely stemming from British and US traditions.

Those more generally interested in the definitional breadth of cultural geography *per se* also might look at other sources. This volume’s predecessor, for instance, presented three chapters which, at the time, proclaimed the *fin-de-siècle* revival of cultural geography as a field and attempted to trace traditions and a set of genealogies reflecting the differential nature of cultural geography across (part of) the Anglophone world (Schein 2004; Scott 2004; Barnett 2004). The fact that there were *three* chapters dedicated to “Introducing Cultural Geographies” explicitly recognized that disciplinary genealogies can be notoriously teleological and tend to present neat historical progressions that elide difference – including geographical difference – conflict, tension, and those who “lost” in the process. Designed to be read in stereo, one of those chapters told the perhaps “standard” genealogy of cultural geography from a US-based perspective (Schein 2004). This cultural geography, particularly in the United States, is sometimes referred to as *traditional* cultural geography. It generally is traced to the fifty-plus-year corpus of work produced by Carl Sauer, most famously associated with the

geography department at the University of California, Berkeley, and ultimately known in shorthand as “the Berkeley School.”

Sauer himself was heavily influenced by German geography and American anthropological ideas of culture. His work drew on extensive fieldwork in the Americas; and as is the case with any active scholar, his approach to geography changed over the years, making any attempt to accurately characterize a fundamental or essential “Sauerian” position problematic. Nevertheless, there came to be something identified *as* a Sauerian, or Berkeley School, approach to cultural geography that seemed to take on a life of its own across the discipline. By the 1980s, that approach was under attack on primarily ontological and epistemological grounds that were part of human geography’s general critique of positivism at the time. In that critique, the two immediate targets of a so-called Sauerian cultural geography were, theoretically, the concept of culture and, substantively, the focus upon cultural landscapes. The challenge to both pillars of a “Sauerian” cultural geography came from British and US academics and, in its earliest manifestation, was perhaps most associated with the work of Denis Cosgrove, Jim Duncan, and Peter Jackson (e.g., Cosgrove 1984; Duncan 1980; Jackson 1989). These geographers were joined in short order, however, by other scholars, trained in cultural geography, who saw the opportunity to bring to the critique a continued interest in “cultural” geographies that took on board serious theoretical questions of social power, especially around questions of race, gender, class, nature, and the nature of fieldwork (e.g., Anderson 1995; Domosh 1991; Kobayashi 1989; Mitchell 1995; Nast 1994; Rose 1993). That challenge to *traditional* cultural geography by what became called the *New* cultural geography constituted a series of debates and battles over ownership of concepts, epistemologies, and subject matter. These struggles became known as a Civil War (although like most paradigm clashes, it was not always so civil) and helped to catalyze a round of disciplinary positioning in the 1990s that reinvigorated cultural geography as part of the larger discipline’s critical turn (see, for instance, Price and Lewis 1993; Duncan 1993; Cosgrove 1993; Jackson 1993; Foote *et al.* 1994).

Meanwhile, Heidi Scott could write in the *second* of those introductory chapters in 2004 that “recent decades have witnessed the meteoric rise of ‘culture’ and its study to a position of prominence across the social sciences and humanities.” Scott traced this “cultural turn” in British geography to Raymond Williams and the Birmingham Centre for Cultural Studies, thus marking a different genealogy of cultural geography from a different geographic starting point in Britain. While Scott acknowledged transatlantic links to American cultural geography through geographers like Jackson and Cosgrove, her genealogy took little note of traditional (American) cultural geography and demonstrated that (then) recent British cultural geography was more closely aligned with cultural studies, British sociology, and social geography (but see Peach 2002) – a subdiscipline that never had a strong counterpart in the US and, instead, was absorbed by urban and cultural geography (del Casino and Marston 2006). Britain’s new cultural geography, from Scott’s perspective, “embraced and was profoundly shaped by feminist scholarship, as well as by poststructuralist, postmodern, and postcolonial theory” (Scott 2004: 24). Its most recent, and perhaps most volatile and productive, set of debates focused around the non- or more-than-representational challenge to the genealogy established in that chapter.

Clive Barnett, in the *third* “introducing” chapter, took exception to (mostly British) geography’s (claim to a) cultural turn *per se* and worried about intellectual fashion and theoretical fetishizing, especially the “othering” of Marxism, positivism, and realism. He also raised

concerns about claims on the part of one (sub)discipline (“cultural geography”) to stand for the whole of human geography, as well as what he perceived as the short shrift given to actually defining the culture of cultural geography and the workings of power and politics in the process.

What was meant then (c. 2002) to be a simple introductory chapter on cultural geography’s genealogy metamorphosed into three chapters demonstrating differing claims to tradition, different kinds of intellectual impetuses, and different institutional geographies and debates over what cultural geography comprised. More positively, the need for three chapters demonstrated the (re)invigoration of cultural geography itself, whether old or new, Marxian, poststructuralist or positivist, or focused on landscape, individuals, societies, or natures. In the 2000s, conceptual and theoretical debate joined a pluralism of substantive foci as the breadth of cultural geography expanded.

This reinvigoration was captured in geographical journals as well. The founding of new international journals *Gender, Place and Culture* in 1994, *Ecumene* (now *Cultural Geographies*) in 1995, and *Social and Cultural Geography* in 2000 gave new outlets to cultural-geographic scholarship, where previously the only subdisciplinary journal had been the US-based *Journal of Cultural Geography*. The foment of cultural geography in the past ten years can also be traced in the periodic “progress reports” that are the staple of the journal *Progress in Human Geography*. The fact of cultural geography’s joining the mainstream of Anglo-American human geography led to both a commonality of substantive topics in the subfields and to inevitable clashes over relevant and critical theoretical perspectives that are the hallmark of any vibrant intellectual pursuit. In a series of reports, Catherine Nash noted, for example, that cultural geographers’ concern with meaning, belonging, place, and identity mandated an engagement with other realms of social inquiry; and she called forth the necessary ties between cultural geography and the study of the nation, especially the postcolonial condition and links with anti-racist geographies (Nash 2002, 2003). Subsequent reports broadened cultural geography’s thematic or substantive engagement with human geography to take up intersections with geographies of home, migration, transnationalism, mobility, and diaspora (Blunt 2005, 2007). Other reports urged a reexamination of cultural geographies of race and racism and the body and a renewed engagement with the politics of visual culture itself (Tolia-Kelly 2010, 2012).

Meanwhile, theoretical challenges also were published. For example, Hayden Lorimer charged cultural geographers to move beyond their ostensible reliance upon the representational epistemology of cultural studies to engage the non- or more-than-representational aspects of everyday life (2005, 2007). This debate over representation has, in many ways, structured contemporary cultural geography for the last decade, splitting the subdiscipline into “representational” and “non-representational” camps in a manner that has yet to be fully articulated, yet which runs as a *leitmotif* through many chapters in this volume. The dichotomies presented in such debates, however, are never so simple; and the charges on all sides generally are made through metonymic arguments that single out individual works to represent the entirety of the corpus under attack. The positive outcome of these dialogues, though, has been the animation of cultural geography itself. They have also driven us to continually (re)evaluate the terms of our academic and scholarly inquiry, to seriously engage in cultural geographies of practice, and to meet the rest of the discipline – and scholars in other disciplines – on the common grounds of substantive scholarly inquiry. For the moment, then, we are left with a set of new concerns for the next generation of cultural geographers, concerns which are unavoidably caught up in the traditions and disciplines of our scholarly

writing and journals but which also are captured in this volume as moments to look forward to.

### Volume Structure/Summary

The previous volume of this companion was a response to renewed intellectual vigor/rigor in the post-positivist and culturalist/critical turns that marked cultural geography at the *fin de siècle*. Through its chapters, it attempted to bring progress reports (and especially theory) to the subdiscipline and those at large. Since that volume, much has changed in cultural geography, especially around theory, which has been so incorporated into much of cultural geography, if not the discipline as a whole, that an explicit discussion of it no longer seems necessary. Instead, this volume more often represents important thinkers and writers in the field (and its subfields) who offer new directions, reflective essays, as well as overviews and entries into their respective literatures. The authors here were given a broad scope to address their topics with the aim of capturing the best of cultural-geographic thinking exemplifying a topic or an approach. Because cultural geography has been so thoroughly and explicitly “theorized,” we revised the volume’s format to include only a few “theoretical dispatches” to signpost (some) dominant theoretical or conceptual positions in the field.

We hope that these essays and dispatches, in addition to capturing or reflecting the state of cultural geography, also serve as interventions into its ongoing reinvention and reinvigoration. These essays prompt consideration on a number of themes that we offer as part of a new set of conversations about the direction that the discipline of geography, and the subdiscipline of cultural geography, might take in the next generation.

The volume opens with the theoretical dispatches. We do not proclaim these dispatches to be an exhaustive list. We offer them, instead, as some of the more important theoretical moments that underpin contemporary cultural geography and as reminders (following Eagleton 1983) that cultural geography, like any academic inquiry, is always and everywhere party to some theoretical framing, whether intentionally or consciously invoked. Given that premise, it follows that we should always be cognizant of the theoretical genealogies, assumptions, and implications of cultural-geographic scholarship. Chapters 2 through 7, thus, offer short introductions to the imbrications of cultural geography with: postcolonialism (Chapter 2 by Tariq Jazeel), poststructuralism (Chapter 3 by John Paul Jones III), feminism (Chapter 4 by Mary E. Thomas and Patricia Ehrkamp), materiality (Chapter 5 by Hayden Lorimer), affect (Chapter 6 by Deborah Dixon and Elizabeth R. Straughan), and historical materialism (Chapter 7 by Don Mitchell).

The rest of the book is divided into four thematic sections, somewhat heuristically determined and titled, in order: Foundations, Landscapes, Natures/Cultures, Circulations/Networks/Fixities. The first three of these sections capture cultural geography’s traditional foci in their contemporary moments. The last presents new directions, engagements, and developments not always considered heretofore as central to cultural geography but which have been engaged by cultural geography in name and in spirit.

The Foundations section begins with Catherine Nash’s essay (Chapter 8), which serves as an introduction to some of the creative ways in which cultural geographers are doing cultural geography that stretch and test the limits of established approaches to the practice and dissemination of research. It also works with an elastic sense of cultural geography that not only describes wider cultural geographies at large beyond the academy but also attends to the ways in which cultural themes and cultural approaches now span subdisciplinary areas

and weaken rigid definitions of their boundaries. Audrey Kobayashi treats “race” in Chapter 9 as both a fundamental product of Western cultures and an analytical concept of central importance to cultural geography. Cultural geography for a long time either ignored race altogether or took for granted seemingly pre-given racial categories that emerged from Enlightenment thinking. Her focus on the social construction of race, the importance of tackling racism, and processes of racialization charts the intellectual history of “race” in geography across several national contexts and several hundred years.

Geraldine Pratt and Berrak Çavlan Erengezgin’s chapter on gender (Chapter 10) traces three strands of thinking that have produced gender as a foundational/non-foundational category of analysis in cultural geography. As they show, gender is now seen as so infused, and destabilized, by other social and cultural relations as to be unthinkable on its own. Pratt and Erengezgin discuss three areas of contemporary interest and debate about gender: retheorizations of the relations between biology, the non-human, and social constructions of gender; the challenges of transgender studies for both re- and de-centering gender; and the unfinished business of provincializing Western theorizing about gender to make room for fuller, richer understandings of the world. Linda McDowell’s chapter (Chapter 11) on social class offers a rich discussion of cultural geographies of class and class identities. Moving across both theoretical perspectives on class and the multi-scalar geographies of class politics themselves, McDowell highlights the complexities of class as it intersects with other systems of difference, especially gender and race/ethnicity, and the ongoing importance of class as a shaper of life chances and outlooks. In doing so, her chapter pays particular attention to the links between class, place, and culture, as well as to the relationships among theory, methods, and geographical analysis in thinking about class. As she shows, class is both economic and cultural in geographically and temporally contingent ways; and studies of class must treat it as such.

Natalie Oswin (Chapter 12) examines the place of sexuality, and geographies of sexualities, in cultural geography and the discipline at large. As she shows, sexuality has been “on the map” for geographers since the 1990s, when the “cultural turn” enabled a focus on issues of sexual difference and facilitated engagement with queer theory. Over the last decade or so, the literature on geographies of sexualities has been healthy, with a fairly strong interdisciplinary presence. Sexuality is still, nonetheless, largely cast as a peripheral disciplinary concern, even in cultural geography. Oswin’s chapter surveys the recent geographies of sexualities literature, arguing that sexuality should be taken more seriously as a central critical geographical concern. In Chapter 13, Patricia L. Price takes on “Place” as one of cultural geography’s “key words.” Starting with the heuristic utility of seeing place as simultaneously concerned with location, material form, and meaning, she takes us beyond simple definitions to explore questions of identity and authenticity as bound to notions of place in ways that are often problematic. The humanistic approach to place taken in this chapter emphasizes the narrative qualities of place, bodies, and mobilities in experiencing as well as constructing place, and the emotional dimensions of place.

John Agnew (Chapter 14) addresses the enduring significance of nationalism to the exercise and expression of group identity in the modern world. By taking seriously the power of nationalism to influence both the ideas and practices of political life, he traces the territorial and cultural underpinnings of nationalist identity in the conduct of everyday life across a range of different contexts. Caitlin DeSilvey’s chapter (Chapter 15) on objects narrates a series of events in the geobiography of a pair of granite bookends. Positioning the bookends as “potent objects” that illuminate multiple paths of inquiry and the fluidity between matter, material, and objects, her chapter explores the complexities of the cultural geography of

material culture. The bookends' mobile history allows DeSilvey to explore geographical perspectives on the underlying dynamism of ostensibly inert matter, the labor required to maintain the durability of cultural artifacts, and the importance of material mediation in the performance of cultural memory and the construction of individual identity. In doing so, it offers both methodological and theoretical arguments for a critical approach to material culture.

The Landscapes section begins with Chapter 16, where Niall Majury argues that over the past decade scholarship within economic geography has drawn upon an increasingly pluralist, heterodox intellectual culture. The chapter explores the cultural politics of homeownership and mortgage finance in the United States, arguing that economic landscapes can fruitfully be thought of in terms of situated logics and imperatives that animate a variegated geography of "worth" permanently "under construction." Nuala C. Johnson (Chapter 17) explores how the politics of landscape overlaps and intersects with representational, material, and performative approaches to interpretation. Focusing on three arenas of everyday life – nation, map, nature – she investigates how the cultural geographies of landscape reflect and refract with deeply political questions that are anchored in debates about identities and power relations.

Derek H. Alderman and Joshua F.J. Inwood (Chapter 18) trace the significance of commemoration in the conjugation of historical and contemporary memory and its possibilities in developing social justice. Drawing largely from African American experiences in the southeastern United States, this chapter reviews the importance of landscape to remembering (and forgetting) the past and discusses the narrative and arena frameworks for interpreting memorials and heritage sites. Mona Domosh (Chapter 19) explores the differing meanings contained within the terms consumption and landscape and highlights some of the commonalities (both terms draw their contemporary meanings from the early modern period) and some of the overlaps (both terms touch on issues related to the economy and economic class) that may not be immediately apparent from their everyday usage. She draws on some of these similarities to focus on the ways in which landscape is consumed and the ways in which consumption produces landscape.

In Chapter 20, Tom Mels and Don Mitchell introduce us to two seemingly disparate landscape transformations – in Gotland, Sweden, and Ohio, United States – as a prelude to discussing the relationship between land, landscape, and social, economic, and environmental justice. They present cultural landscapes as the hard material of life, the very places where (and through which) injustice lives as they interrogate both liberal and radical notions of justice, the role of oppression and exploitation in considering justice, and, finally, the politics of landscape and the possibility of landscapes as sites of justice. In Chapter 21 Paul Cloke examines how rural landscapes have been differently understood in terms of history, cultural politics, performance, and assemblage. In using these categories as convenient pegs on which to hang different ways of stretching ideas about rural landscape, he suggests that these seemingly "distinct" approaches are not mutually exclusive but intersect and co-constitute in different ways.

David Delaney (Chapter 22) presents a "culturalist" conception of the legal landscape, particularly considered for its utility in cultural geography and with especial attention to interpreting cultural landscapes. He first discusses varying uses and conceptions of "culture" and "law" in cultural geography before exploring the idea of law and/as culture in combination, where the law is central to the socio-spatializations that concern cultural geographers. He concludes with examples drawn from the realm of aesthetic nuisance litigation and

landscape practices. Elizabeth A. Gagen's chapter (Chapter 23) on aging asks readers to think beyond age-related categories, such as childhood and adulthood, and to approach aging itself as a relational process. Drawing on work in children's geographies and geographical gerontology, she argues for increased attention to intergenerationality, life course, and age-related transitions as key aspects of understanding cultural geographies of aging itself. Gagen's chapter examines the ways that assumptions about age are incorporated into the built environment and highlights some recent efforts to work against age-related segregation. To conclude, she reflects on the complexities of multigenerational living in both the global North and South and the economic imperatives and social choices bound up with the act of cohousing.

In Chapter 24, Meghan Cope reviews themes in the growing literature on children's geographies, paying particular attention to where children's geographies and cultural geography intersect and can inform each other. Organizing her chapter around the workings of power, landscape, and material culture in children's geographies, she examines the role of agency, identity, context, place, and discourse in thinking through how youth and children experience, transform, and produce space across sites and scales. Through a discussion of public and private, intimate and institutional spaces of childhood and adolescence, Cope's chapter lays out ways that cultural geography can contribute to the area of children's/youth geographies and that children's/youth geographies can draw on the insights of cultural geography. Tim Bunnell (Chapter 25) challenges cultural geography's traditional rural-centrism to realize what he calls our increasingly urbanized (and decreasingly Atlantic-centered) world. Drawing upon over a decade of work in Kuala Lumpur, he demonstrates the complementary approaches to the urban landscape that are iconographic and interpretive with those that move beyond representation toward questions of embodiment, experience, and affect. His rapprochement joins contemporary debates regarding cultural geography's theoretical, epistemological, and methodological direction.

In Chapter 26, Robyn Dowling and Emma R. Power examine domesticities – the processes and sites through which people create senses of belonging, safety, security, and comfort. As they show, domesticities are produced in myriad ways, in diverse sites, and across scales and are always already imbricated with relations of power. Through a discussion of feminist, material-culture, and postcolonial perspectives on domesticities, Dowling and Power argue that for cultural geographers, domesticities can illuminate connections between identities, imaginaries, and geographies. Their chapter reviews trends in the study of domesticities, from examinations of everyday practices of homemaking to the more-than-human nature of domesticities, to argue for the importance of bringing cultural geography home.

The Natures/Cultures section begins with Chapter 27, where Paul Robbins assesses the importance of metaphors as necessary cultural artifacts that stand for and help us to make sense of the relationship between humans and non-humans, especially as considered within environmental geography, cultural ecology, and political ecology. He traces a critical genealogy of geographical approaches to the nature–society nexus through themes such as determinism, functionalism, adaptation, networking, and mutuality, as a prelude to establishing a new vocabulary for our present epoch, the “Anthropocene.” Bronwyn Parry (Chapter 28) traces the ethical, epistemological, and economic implications of historical and recent developments in biotechnology through case studies of agricultural biotechnology, posthuman enhancement, and synthetic biology. She delves into the question of why genetically modified organisms have been subject to such approbation before turning to investigate the implications of their

profound capacity to rewrite human–animal–technology relations in unprecedented ways in the twenty-first century.

In Chapter 29 Jamie Lorimer and Krithika Srinivasan review the work in animal geographies over the last decade. They differentiate work concerned with what animals tell us about people from that concerned with the agencies and lived experiences of animals in their interactions with people and reflect on the consequences of each for the development of a more-than-human geography. The chapter on food (Chapter 30) offers an innovative approach to not only the topic of food but also the act of writing itself. Initially written as a collective blog by Ian Cook and ten other food scholars, it examines emerging cultural geographies of food. Taking inspiration from recent reflections on cultural geography's past and future, the chapter develops a series of arguments about the texture, creativity, and activism embedded in geographies of food. In doing so, the authors highlight what cultural geography can bring to geographic research on food, as well as how geographers can join ongoing activism associated with the politics of food across space and scales.

Robert M. Wilson's chapter (Chapter 31) provides an insightful review of key themes in environmental history, especially from the perspective of North America, in the last two decades. His chapter addresses work on topics from the management of nature to environmental politics, from transnational and urban environmental histories to disease and animal geographies. Grounding his review in cultural geography's own engagement with nature–society relations, Wilson highlights both points of divergence between environmental history and cultural geography and areas of current and possible convergence, especially vis-à-vis recent trends in environmental history to write for a wider audience and to address themes like evolutionary history. David N. Livingstone's essay (Chapter 32) critically examines some contemporary scientific debates in relation to Darwinism in general and natural selection in particular. He focuses on how the cultural as much as the scientific informs the terms and boundaries around which these debates – or science wars – are prosecuted.

The final section on Circulations, Networks, and Fixities begins with Chapter 33, where Matthew Sparke develops an argument about the worldly cultural geography of activism in Occupy Wall Street. Drawing on a range of activists and scholars, Sparke shows how cultural geographers can learn from and contribute to the cultural work in which Occupy activists and their supporters are engaged as they reflect on the complex, multi-scalar geographies built into activist space. A local repossession of spaces in lower Manhattan and elsewhere draws attention to global dispossessions of various sorts, bringing into focus what Sparke describes as seven "problem spaces" associated with Occupy activism. In this way, Sparke suggests, the Occupy movement offers the opportunity not only to think critically about the geographies embedded in and produced through activism but also to bring the insight of cultural geography and efforts toward global justice together.

Rachel Silvey's chapter on migration (Chapter 34) examines the increasing centrality of migration studies to cultural geography as a field. Locating the migrant as a key figure in an era of globalization, Silvey offers three themes in which the insights from cultural geography, especially feminist cultural geography, illuminate the lived politics of migration and the changing link between place and culture associated with migration: concepts of control and dominance, especially the relationality of inequalities and workings of gender; migrant subjectivities, particularly vis-à-vis religion and the intimate labor of social reproduction; and geographies of im/migrant justices through sanctuary cities and remittance justice. To conclude, the chapter argues that acts of migration are bound up with cultural geographies from

the home to the transnational and that migration politics *are* cultural politics that merit more attention from cultural geographers.

Jeremy W. Crampton's chapter (Chapter 35) on "Mappings" takes us through several cartographic revolutions, material and epistemological. He treats the emergence of modern mapping as part of the political turn in critical cartography and geographic information systems (GIS) and specifically engages maps through three themes rather than by a strict chronology: mapping as material form, mapping as knowledge(s), and mapping as practice and performance. He concludes by juxtaposing the surveillant capacity of new (and exciting) mapping and location technologies, often serving the interests of the state, with the possibilities for counter-mapping in an open-source world. In Chapter 36, Andrew Boulton and Matthew Zook articulate at the place of "locative digital technologies" – software, code, smartphones, online maps, georeferenced data sets – as actants in everyday life. Their exploration of these technologies in mediating the production of space, landscapes, and subjectivities addresses the "inner workings" and duplicity of code itself, before using examples to look at the imbrication of code with questions of visibility, positionality, and memory in our mundane engagements with the world around us.

Ben Anderson's chapter (Chapter 37) reflects on what difference attention to affect and emotion makes to cultural geography as a field. Through a discussion of recent work on both topics, he argues that incorporating affect and emotion promises a cultural geography sensitive to the dynamics of how life is lived and how a life takes place. Highlighting shifts away from culture as a signifying system, the chapter lays out key elements of a politics of affect and emotion, of ways of being political, that can enrich scholarship in cultural geography. To end, Anderson raises the question of whether the "turn" to affect and emotion heralds a "new" cultural geography attuned to life and living. In Chapter 38 Chris Gibson navigates a course through two prominent threads in tourism geographies. The first starts with neo-Marxist research critiquing tourism capitalism (very much the antecedent for later critical tourism geographies) and then discusses post-capitalist and relational approaches to understand the situatedness of tourism work, livelihoods, and performativities. The second thread considers the theme of spaces of encounter, embodiment, and ethics.

Anssi Paasi's chapter (Chapter 39) on borders and border-crossings examines the meanings of borders, arguing for their importance not only in political but also in cultural geography. Drawing on geographers who call for a relational approach to the production of space and identity, Paasi lays out the historical context for the emergence of border studies in geography and discusses two modalities – landscapes of social power and landscapes of social control – that both destabilize traditional approaches to borders and illustrate their contemporary operations and politics as more than "mere lines." As Paasi shows, borders no longer are "fixed" at the territorial edges of states; and a cultural-geographic approach to borders contributes to stronger understandings of topics from citizenship to memory, from daily life to nation-states. John Morrissey, in Chapter 40, reflects on the key themes and theoretical concerns of geographers working on imperialism today. The chapter begins by sketching the development of "postcolonialism" and outlines the various functions and legacies of imperial discourse, the critical challenge of theorizing resistance, and the enduring imperial modalities of power operative in our contemporary moment.

Chapter 41, by Declan Cullen, James Ryan, and Jamie Winders, examines the relationship between cultural geography and postcolonial studies itself. Through a discussion of the idea of postcolonial geographies, it lays out the different meanings associated with the term

“postcolonial” and reflects on what a distinctly *postcolonial* cultural geography might entail. It identifies three broad themes within postcolonial geographies and shows how cultural geographers can both draw on and contribute to the wider field of postcolonial studies for each topic. The chapter concludes by calling for more attention to the geographic and historical specificities of how colonial power works, as well as to the very material and discursive manifestations of that power and resistances to it.

## References

- Anderson, K. (1995) *Vancouver's Chinatown*. Toronto: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Barnett, C. (2004) A critique of the cultural turn. In J.S. Duncan, N.J. Johnson and R.H. Schein (eds.), *A Companion to Cultural Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 38–48.
- Blunt, A. (2005) Cultural geography: Cultural geographies of home. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29 (4), 505–515.
- Blunt, A. (2007) Cultural geographies of migration: Mobility, transnationality and diaspora. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31 (5), 684–694.
- Cosgrove, D. (1984) *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. London: Croom Helm.
- Cosgrove, D. (1993) On “The reinvention of cultural geography” by Price and Lewis, commentary. *Annals, Association of American Geographers*, 83 (3), 515–517.
- Del Casino, V.A. and Marston, S.J. (2006) Social geography in the United States: Everywhere and nowhere. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 7 (6), 995–1009.
- Domosh, M. (1991) Toward a feminist historiography of geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 16 (1), 95–104.
- Duncan, J.S. (1980) The superorganic in American cultural geography. *Annals: Association of American Geographers*, 70 (2), 181–198.
- Duncan, J.S. (1993) On “The reinvention of cultural geography” by Price and Lewis, commentary. *Annals, Association of American Geographers*, 83 (3), 517–519.
- Duncan, J.S., Johnson, N.J. and Schein, R.H. (eds.) (2004) *A Companion to Cultural Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eagleton, T. (1983) *Literary Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Foote, K.E., Hugill, P.E., Mathewson, K. and Smith, J. (eds.) (1994) *Re-reading Cultural Geography*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Jackson, P. (1989) *Maps of Meaning*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Jackson, P. (1993) On “The reinvention of cultural geography” by Price and Lewis, commentary. *Annals, Association of American Geographers*, 83 (3), 519–520.
- Kobayashi, A. (1989) A critique of dialectical landscapes. In A. Kobayashi and S. McKenzie (eds.), *Remaking Human Geography*. London: Unwin Hyman, pp. 164–183.
- Lorimer, H. (2005) Cultural geography: The busyness of being “more-than-representational.” *Progress in Human Geography*, 29 (1), 83–94.
- Lorimer, H. (2007) Cultural geography: Worldly shapes, differently arranged. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31 (1), 89–100.
- Mitchell, D. (1995) There's no such thing as culture: Toward a reconceptualization of the idea of culture in cultural geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS, 20, 102–116.
- Nash, C. (2002) Cultural geography: Postcolonial cultural geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 26 (2), 219–230.
- Nash, C. (2003) Cultural geography: Anti-racist geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27 (5), 637–648.
- Nast, H.J. (1994) Opening remarks on “women in the field.” *Professional Geographer*, 46 (1), 54–66.

- 
- Peach, C. (2002) Social geography: New religions and ethnoburbs – contrasts with cultural geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 26 (2), 252–260.
- Price, M. and Lewis, M. (1993) The reinvention of cultural geography. *Annals, Association of American Geographers*, 83 (1), 1–17.
- Rose, G. (1993) *Feminism and Geography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schein, R.H. (2004) Cultural traditions. In J.S. Duncan, N.J. Johnson and R.H. Schein (eds.), *A Companion to Cultural Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 11–23.
- Scott, H. (2004) Cultural turns. In J.S. Duncan, N.J. Johnson and R.H. Schein (eds.), *A Companion to Cultural Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 24–37.
- Tolia-Kelly, D.P. (2010) The geographies of cultural geography I: Identities, bodies and race. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34 (3), 358–367.
- Tolia-Kelly, D.P. (2012) The geographies of cultural geography II: Visual culture. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36 (1), 135–142.

