Soc. Geogr. Discuss., 6, C100–C102, 2011
www.soc-geogr-discuss.net/6/C100/2011/

Social
Geography
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Families and food: beyond the "cultural turn"?" *by* P. Jackson

A. Pott (Referee)

andreas.pott@uni-osnabrueck.de

Received and published: 18 July 2011

Building on an insightful personal account on the "cultural turn" in human geography and subsequently focussing on the application of some of its central ideas to two recent research projects, this article assesses and illustrates its conceptual and methodological strengths and limitations. Assuming that the "cultural turn" has by no way exhausted its potential, in his conclusion Peter Jackson outlines possible (and necessary) future directions. These would include more conceptual reference to changing social structures (i.e. political economy), new approaches informed by actor-network theory and geographies of emotion, embodiment and affect in order to better understand the significance of the material world, as well as a stronger focus on social practices. The paper's main arguments are well developed, well explicated, and convincing. Thus, there is not much for me to comment on.

The other referee (J. Everts) raised two (minor) points for revision which he believes could help to polish the overall argument: (a) the fairly abrupt ending of the second example at the end of section 3 (suggesting to briefly sum up the implications of the presented research as to why a post-cultural geography has the ability to detect moral panics), and (b) the reader's interest to learn a little more about why approaches such as ANT and embodiment, emotion and affect (as well as other methods like, for example, ethnography) seem promising for future research.

In addition to these two points my comments can be confined to the following three suggestions:

(1) Reading the introductory paragraphs of chapter 3 (pp. 57-58) one wonders about the geographical identity of the two research projects. The average German geographer, for example, would surely appreciate their interdisciplinary character, but at the same time ask: Is this still (cultural) geography? And if so: In what way do places or space-related issues become relevant aspects in these research projects? Is, for example, the "manufacturing of meaning along the supply chain" interrelated with specific places? Discussing the two projects in the following two sub-chapters (3.1 and 3.2) the author gives at least four indirect answers to these questions:

a. p. 61: British consumers care about the geographical provenance of poultry, but not of sugar (lines 9-14 on p. 61);

b. p. 63, lines 16-17: "(. . .) where provenance was considered relevant for the former but not for the latter". To make this point even clearer the author might insert the adjective "geographical (provenance)", like above on p. 61, line 12;

c. p. 65, line 21: non-availability of "these foods (. . .) in all localities";

d. p. 66, lines 16-17: "eating practices (. . .) have always varied by social class and geographical region".

Thus, in order to answer potential questions about the geographical relevance or iden-

tity of the research, the author could briefly refer to the four answers given below or briefly indicate in the introductory paragraphs of chapter 3 (pp. 57-58) why he believes that the research projects can be read as examples of (human or cultural) geography's research, too.

(2) The additional remarks under "Contribution to the plenary discussion" (pp. 72-73) raise central issues. But since they take the form of an added postscriptum they appear a bit isolated, which is a pity. Would it be possible to integrate these thoughts into the main article? This is not a major point either, but I believe that such an integration is easily done and would further strengthen the article. My suggestion for dissolution of the postscriptum by integrating it into the article itself is:

a. Integrate the first two paragraphs of "Contribution to the plenary session" – page 72 (lines 2-24) – into the article's "Introduction": e.g. p. 52, line 21 (after "intellectual movement", before "This paper").

b. Integrate paragraphs 3 and 4 of the postscriptum (pp. 72, line 25, until p. 73, line 23) into the article's "Conclusion and future directions" (chapter 4, pp. 66-68).

(3) Two minor formal mistakes; please correct:

a. Missing full stop on p. 55, line 12, after end of sentence (before: "The concern (. . .)").

b. Spelling mistake on p. 64, line 29: "responsibility" (instead of "responsible").

Interactive comment on Soc. Geogr. Discuss., 6, 51, 2010.