

Interactive comment on “From political construct to tourist souvenir – building the “National” landscape through advertising in Galicia (Spain)” by F. López Silvestre and R. Lois González

F. López Silvestre and R. Lois González

Received and published: 31 January 2008

Firstly, we would like to thank the editors of this forum for having allowed us to take part. It is always a pleasure to receive intelligent comments about the work undertaken. In fact, it is the only way to give meaning to an academic effort.

We have been given the chance to close the debate which has been generated about the text on landscape and tourism in Galicia (Spain). Bearing in mind the stimulating comments we have received, We think there are three aspects which need a mention: issues of a historic nature, issues of a theoretical nature and bibliographical references.

1) Regarding the historic part, an anonymous reader reproaches us for not having touched upon the persistence of Galician nationalist landscape clichés during

S187

the Francoist period. The authors of the article know and have reviewed the tourist posters of the Francoist's period and they know that during this period the same landscape motifs were kept alive. However, given the limits of space which usually apply to these kind of articles for magazines, a more in-depth development of this period would have been practically impossible. Undoubtedly, as the reader says, it is a question of great interest. We agree. Nevertheless, personally we feel that this issue would be better dealt with in a separate article. What most interested us in this case was to refer to the landscape clichés in their origin (the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th) and their survival a hundred years later in tourist advertisements in audiovisual media. In other words, we were interested in highlighting the origin and the contemporaneity of the phenomenon, because its survival showed the strength of the stereotypes. This, and not any other, is the topic of the article.

2) With regards to the theoretical part, we have been criticised in this and in other forums, that although the landscape stereotypes are the same in the nationalist media and in the tourist advertisements, the objective is different: some aim at the difference; and others at the inclusion. Undoubtedly we can accept this difference in objectives. However it may be, what we wanted to do in our research was not to reach a political conclusion in line with traditional critical geography. What we wanted to do was to deal with an issue of a philosophical nature: Can our perception of landscape be impoverished? Reality is perceived through codes, but, can the over-coding of landscape; be it fostered by nationalism or by advertising; reduce our image of the world and even limit our mental effort on perceiving it? This ambitious question affects us all and its answer has repercussions of great interest, which go far beyond local geography. That of Galicia is only one example. But it may be extrapolated.

3) Further to the bibliography, firstly, we would like to thank all those who have sent works which broaden the reading list of interest to our work. However, we might add an observation. Many of the proposed books were known to us before writing our

S188

work. In some cases they were not cited so as to suggest evidently different methods to the ones used. When one is familiar with the theory of art, one knows that both Gombrich and Panofsky cannot be followed at the same time. They knew each other personally, but they disagreed about many theoretical aspects. One of the authors of this article has been a professor in aesthetics and theory of art for ten years and well knows what he is referring to when he makes this statement. In the same way we can refer to Umberto Eco: the authors of the article followed the methodology of Roland Barthes, as it adapts well to the field of advertising. Whoever has read Eco knows that he modifies some of the aspects of Barthes's theory. Therefore, if you follow one, you cannot follow the other. Perhaps, we may be criticised because Eco's ideas are more updated than those of Barthes. These questions apart, we are very grateful for the references to other books, which we will read with enthusiasm.

In general we continue to make progress on the formalisation of a theory of landscape and landscape stereotypes. At present, we are developing a theory of over-coding and under-coding of the landscape, which we expect to publish shortly in book format. In this, we will try to satisfy the expectations of those who call for more depth in our work.

To finish with, we would like to thank Stephanie Jennings, professional translator, for her effort and the patience she has shown us in the different stages in the translation and review of the work from Spanish to English, a language she knows well, as it is her mother tongue.

Interactive comment on Soc. Geogr. Discuss., 3, 237, 2007.