

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

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 19 November 2007

GENERAL COMMENTS

Interesting paper which deals with the construction of the prevailing cliché of Galician landscape in social imaginary since the end of the 19th century onwards, taking into account two main sources: the Galician nationalist imaginary previous to 1936 Spanish Civil War and the present-day tourist television advertising. The subject is relevant from the point of view of current social and cultural geography studies and it is correctly documented, organised and written; combines theoretical considerations (concerning the rhetoric of landscape advertising) with the case study; uses an appropriated, updated bibliography (particularly in English and Spanish); and provides a critical view of the

S177

questions examined. For all these reasons, the manuscript is worthy to be published, with some minor revisions and remarks.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1) Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of SG?

Yes, as it deals with subjects such as the social construction of landscape and national identities, the production of territorial social imaginary, etc.

2) Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?

The two main novel contributions of the paper lie in: 1) The theoretical and empirical approach to the rhetoric of landscape advertising, exploring the connections between art and the media; 2) The empirical connection between Galician nationalist landscape clichés previous to 1936-39 Spanish Civil War and the present-day Galician tourist iconography

3) Are substantial conclusions reached?

There is a main substantial conclusion: the persistence and progressive interiorisation of the discourse of the territory developed by the ideologists of Galician nationalism at the beginning of the 20th century, which has been reproduced since that time under very different political periods and in spite of the considerable social and landscape changes taking place in the last century.

4) Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined?

Yes, specially in sections 1 and 3.1.

5) Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?

In my opinion, there are two important gaps in the paper that could be clarified or examined in order to support better the conclusions.

- First, the persistence of Galician nationalist landscape clichés during the Francoist's period. The paper pays little attention to this crucial (and somehow paradoxal) ques-

S178

tion. In the beginning of section 3 (page 247) authors steer this topic on the catalogue coordinated by SANTOS (2005) but it would be interesting to say something more about it.

-Second: concerning the recent and present-day tourist image of Galician landscape it would be interesting to examine and compare other official sources and media (e.g: campaign posters, tourist guides, institutional tourist promotion documents, etc), apart from TV advertising, to see possible coincidences or differences.

6) *Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)?*

Some statements or paragraphs require a major scientific support: for instance, what is the source or scientific research which underlies the “indeph study” mentioned in page 245 in order to classify the “20 main themes” of the iconography of Galician landscape during the 19th and first third of the 20th centuries?

7) *Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?*

In general they do, but I would recommend some additional mentions or references (see comments below, in response to QUESTION 14).

8) *Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?*

Yes.

9) *Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?*

Yes.

10) *Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?*

Yes, except for the gaps or unclarified questions I have previously mentioned in QUESTIONS 5 and 6.

S179

11) *Is the language fluent and precise?*

Yes, except for some mistakes (see below, in the TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS section). In any case, in this respect I suggest the paper to be revised by an English-speaking scholar.

12) *Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used?*

Yes.

13) *Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?*

No.

14) *Are the number and quality of references appropriate?*

Yes, but I would recommend to add some references to enrich the list.

In what concerns the “geographical dimensions” of Galician Nationalist mentioned in some occasions (specially page 245, footnote 2), authors should make explicit reference to the book by J. Garcia-Alvarez specifically devoted to this question (*Territorio y nacionalismo: la construcción geográfica de la identidad gallega...*), which is included in the final reference list, but not within the main text, as well as the work by FERNÁNDEZ, C.: *A construcción nacional no discurso literario de Ramón Otero Pedrayo*, Vigo, A Nosa Terra, 2003.

Another interesting reference on the question of Galician Vs Castilian landscape clichés used by Galicianists that could be taken into account in the paper (particularly for questions mentioned in page 246) is Garcia-Alvarez, J.: “Substate nation-building and geographical representations of ‘the other’ in Galicia, Spain (1860-1936)”, *Finis-terra. Revista Portuguesa de Geografia*, vol. XXXIII, 65, pp. 117-128, 1998.

Finally, as regards to the symbolic “national landscapes” of the different state and sub-

S180

state historical nationalisms in Spain (including the case of Galicianism), it would be interesting to mention the collective book edited by Ortega Cantero, N. (ed.): *Paisaje, memoria histórica e identidad nacional*, Madrid, Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid / Fundación Duques de Soria, pp. 171-212, 2005.

Some references in the final list contain also mistakes (see below, in section TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS).

15) Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate?

Yes.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

Some language or reference mistakes detected in the paper are:

-Footnote 2 (page 245) refers to “Libre Institución de la Enseñanza”, whereas the correct name of this institution (in Spanish) was “Institución Libre de Enseñanza”.

-In the final reference list (page 269), the author cited as CHAQUIN is indeed (François) CACHIN.

-The book by GARCÍA-ÁLVAREZ, J., *Territorio y nacionalismo...* was not published in 2002, but in 2003.

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