Chapter 2

Social Geography in Three Acts and an Epilogue

On the Histories of Social Geographic Thought

There are an infinite number of ways to write the history of any subdiscipline. Believe me, I know, I have recently tried. Traditionally, one might trace the developments of social geography in relation to the various theoretical approaches taken in the

discipline, from environmental determinism through regionalism and quantitative theory to Marxism, feminism, and poststructuralism. To be honest, I also began this project that way, hoping to sketch the variegated theoretical frameworks in geography and how they have conceptualized the social and the spatial, society and space. I became unsatisfied, however, with the narrative that was developing; it parodied what we already knew about the development of the discipline. And, to be honest, I have been more interested in thinking across theoretical and conceptual categories instead of simply through them. Importantly, as well, when working through the various approaches there is a tendency to privilege what comes at the end instead of seeing that many of these approaches remain at work today. What I also discovered as I tried to trace the history of social geography, at least as it has appeared in twentieth-century Anglophone geography, is that analyses of "the social" in geography have almost always worked in and through other subdisciplinary identities even as a nascent social geography developed in the post-Second World War period. Put simply, social relations as they have been examined in geography are always already informed by environmental, economic, political, cultural, and feminist narratives, to name just a few.

So why trace the history of social geography at all? First, in understanding how geographers have conceptualized what is meant by "the social" and "society" we can begin to understand the larger relationship between the social and the spatial as well as the relationship between society and nature, society and economy, or society and culture. Second, in comparing social geography in relation to a number of other subdisciplinary frameworks, we can investigate the alternative narratives (sometimes called subaltern or counterhegemonic) that distinguish the importance of a social geographic analysis versus other ways of seeing the world. Third, despite the fact that social geography has "ebbed" and "flowed" as a subdisciplinary identity, social geographic theory and inquiry remains central to the broader discipline of geography. Fourth, geography is intimately engaged with sociology and sociological (or social) theory, which means that the relationships between various sociologies and geographies continue to hold import in our discipline's interdisciplinary dialogues. Finally, despite the fact that social geography has found itself somewhat "submerged" under other disciplinary narratives, there is an advantage to taking as our starting point social geography's conceptual focus on questions of difference and inequality, questions that are not always of central concern to other ways of framing geographic questions.

In building this narrative across a number of "acts," I want to suggest that past ways of thinking remain important to how we understand social geography today. As we will see, certain themes continue to appear again and again as geographers struggle with the construction of their social geographies. For the purpose of brevity, the story begins in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. At this time, geographers, many of whom were trained in physical geography, borrowed extensively from theoretical developments in the natural sciences, including Darwin's theories of evolution, to explain the spatial organization of society. Social geography emerged out of this moment with a variety of alternative ways of conceptualizing the spatial

organization of society, from anarchism to urban ecology to non-environmental based models. In the post-Second World War period, geography as a discipline struggled with its own identity as a social science. The influence of positivism and quantitative methodologies across the social sciences was brought to bear on geography in this period, which looked to economic theories of *Homo economicus* (economic man) to increase its so-called rigor. Social geography, borrowing from economic theories, privileged the economic in its study of society: social relations are economic relations. Although working from a different theoretical lens, Marxist geographies developing at this time also privileged the economy in the study of social relations of production. Questions raised regarding social justice and equality were based, largely, in assumptions that capitalism structures social and spatial relations. At this time, however, geographers began to blur the boundaries between the social and the spatial in ways that complicated theories of a "social space." Moreover, humanist and feminist geographers, along with queer and critical race scholars in the field, began working against and through (political) economic approaches, offering alternative theorizations of social space as well as social production and reproduction. Out of these struggles, social questions related to human experiences of place and the gendering of space rethought how social geographers conceptualized the sociality of space and spatial relations and the spatiality of the social and social relations.

The post-Second World War period through the 1980s was thus a robust time for the theorizations of sociospatial relations in geography, despite the contested nature of the terms society and space. In the late 1980s, the "cultural turn" in geography further challenged the privileging of social analysis in geography, as representations and representational politics took centerstage in the discipline. The 1990s through the nascent twenty-first century has been a period of intense theoretical debate about the "state of social geography" and its place in the discipline. New ways of imagining sociospatial relations are now informed by various strains of post-structuralism as well as psychoanalysis, cultural studies, queer theory, and critical race theory. Geographers have also struggled in the wake of the cultural turn to "rematerialize" geographic analyses by once again privileging social relations of inequality. The theoretical ferment continues, with new calls from both sociology and geography to engage "post-society" and "post-human" studies. Sociologists have questioned the efficacy of taking "the society" as their starting point. Instead, the focus is now on networked relations and the complication of society as a presumed unified whole. Geographers have complicated the relationships between society and nature or human and animal by suggesting that narratives of human control over nature are too simple to explain our current (and past) global conditions. In some ways we come full circle, once again entertaining the question of the relationship between "social space" and "natural space" or "society" and "environment."

This chapter is not a complete history of social geography, but it does trace a set of "moments" when "the social" and social relations have found themselves centered in the discipline. What this chapter suggests is that social geography can be imagined in a number of different ways, and that these imaginings are tied to

the historical and geographical contexts in which ideas are fermented. What we will also see as we trace these social geographic theorizations is that there are any number of ways to think about the social in geography and even more ways to consider how society and space inform each other. In this chapter, we will stay at the level of theory, examining the various epistemological and ontological assumptions that have been privileged in social geography at different points in time. In Chapter 3, we will trace the methodological approaches that parallel the various theoretical trajectories that social geography has taken. We begin our story by examining the relationship between social geography and environmental and ecological models for investigating social relations.

Act I: Social or Environmental/Ecological Geographies?

To set the scene for this first act, we have to imagine ourselves in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as many scholars were struggling with the theoretical relationships between society and physical environment. These struggles were situated within a broader intellectual framework contextualized by the emergence of Darwinian evolutionary thinking. Put simply, many scholars thought to apply Darwin's and other evolutionary theories (Livingstone 1992) about the biological world, including his notions of "natural selection," "survival of the fittest," and "mutation," to their explanations of the social world. Geographers, many of whom were working in a physical geography tradition during this time, were attracted, to varying degrees, to social models informed by theories emanating from the environmental and natural sciences. Many of these theories appear most explicitly in the work of the environmental determinist school of geography, whose proponents included Ellen Churchill Semple (1911) and Ellsworth Huntington (1915) in the United States. Put rather crudely, as environmental determinists these scholars believed that the physical environment (climate, landforms, vegetation patterns) determined development in the social world – including social characteristics, such as race and ethnicity.

These theories, in some of the worst instances, led geographers to propose deep-seated racist theorists of social development, suggesting tha certain climates bred societies (and peoples) that were less capable than others. Huntington argued that "the native races within the tropics are dull in thought and slow in action" (Huntington 1915: 56; cited in Cloke et al. 1991: 5). In another instance, Huntington theorized that the US South's economic development was retarded by the fact that so much of its working population was, in fact, of African origin – as the tropics bred sloth, laziness, and lower levels of intelligence. Not all geographers went to these extremes. Some actually sought to rethink, challenge, and/or abandon environmentally determinist theories for other theories to explain the development, distribution, and spatial organization of the social world. It is to these "somewhat" alternative theories of "the social" in geography that we now turn. This act's three scenes trace

the four moments of difference in which social geographers sought out alternative explanations for why (and how) the social world was spatially differentiated. In some cases, these nascent social geographers suggested how to "intervene" into the spatial organizations of societies to address inequalities, particularly class-, race-, and gender-based economic differences. In tracing these early social geographies, we will begin to consider what these scholars have to say to us in the "now" as we struggle to construct our own social geographies.

Scene 1: Anarchy

We begin our journey in France where a geographer named Elisée Reclus might have been the first to employ the term "social geography" over 120 years ago (Eyles 1986). Looking at his work today, we might not recognize it as social geography per se. Reclus was, after all, particularly interested in the relationships between humans and the natural world, an area of research often characterized as nature–society studies, not social geography. But at the time, Reclus, like others around him, had to contend with the profound impact that Darwin's evolutionary theory brought to the world and to the discipline of geography. Unlike other geographers at the time, Reclus was not simply an academic, he was also an activist. His political philosophy was informed by anarchism, a social theory that suggests a "state of being without rule or government. Although some people might dream of building a society that has no governmental structure whatsoever, as a practical matter most anarchists would settle for a highly decentralized society in which there are no repressive controls" (Dunbar 1979: 157). In general, however, Reclus was known as a political pluralist and quite "tolerant," such that "he could embrace nearly everyone on the far left side of the political spectrum" (ibid.).

His own views of the society–space relationship are interesting and deserve attention, particularly because Reclus believed that "knowledge of peoples and places is necessary for improving understanding" (Dunbar 1978: 91). He saw geography, and the study of society–environment relations, as a lens through which he could engage his anarchist political philosophy. "Geography and anarchism are closely related, the more his prejudices and antagonisms decline, until at last he becomes a true world citizen" (ibid.). Because he was an anarchist, Reclus's discussion of "the social" was directly concerned with "social ills and their solutions . . . [as well as with] the importance of the study of geography in making an inventory of the world's resources and suggesting a plan for their equitable spread" (Dunbar 1981: 161). In particular, "Reclus stressed the mystical bond between man and nature" (Dunbar 1978: 44), suggesting that "Man [*sic*] is nature becoming self-conscious." Reclus thus argued that humans are not separate from but part of the natural world, arguing that "The action of man gives the greatest diversity of aspect to the earth's surface. On one hand it destroys, on the other it improves; according to the social state and the progress of each society, it contributes something to degrade nature, sometimes to embellish it" (Reclus 1864: 763; cited in Dunbar 1978: 44). Reclus

equated "social progress" not with damage to the natural world but with the possibility of "giv[ing] the landscapes which surround him more charm, grace, and majesty" (ibid.). Reclus's geography was replete with examples of human modifications within the natural world that created positive change to the use of it. And, because of his own political philosophy, he argued that human change to the natural world was best when it benefited the larger whole and not the elite few. At the same time, he also sought to balance the anthropocentric (human-centered) narrative of much social theory, and instead theorized "humanity as emerging *within* nature rather than *out of* it" (Clark and Martin 2004: 24, their emphasis). His almost romantic view of human society as "natural" meant he was keenly aware of our use (and abuse) of the world's resources. Reclus's view was thus globally conscious; he was staunchly anti-racist and anti-imperialist. As Dunbar suggests, Reclus's witnessing of US slave culture repulsed him, as did the inequities inherent in the distributions of the world resources (also see Fleming 1988). Peter Kropotkin further suggested that Reclus's "work is free from absurd national conceit, or of national or racial prejudice; he has succeeded in indicating . . . what all men [*sic*] have in common – what unites them not divides them" (Kropotkin 1905: 341; cited in Stoddart 1975: 188). Reclus thus set out to both explain the spatial inequalities in and of societies and directly intervene in the social and spatial organization of the world.

Despite Reclus's prolific career and his advocacy for asking socially relevant questions, his work has only been selectively introduced into the history of geographic thought, and even more rarely into social geography (Clark and Martin 2004). Anne Buttimer (1971), who traces the extensive French school of geography and its contributions to geographic thought, does not engage with Reclus's work or theories. Dunbar believes that Reclus's contributions are there but that his own unique geography, as a French scholar working not in France but in Belgium and Switzerland, mitigated his impact. Despite his relative obscurity in the history of geographic thought, some geographers resurrected Reclus's research and political ideals in the 1970s and 1980s as part of a foundation for "radical" social and economic geographies (see Box 2.1).

Scene 2: Urban ecologies

In a different national context, at a slightly later historical moment, a group of scholars emerged with strong interests in social theoretical models of human society. Also influenced by environmental models, particularly models from plant ecology, a group of Chicago School sociologists had a significant impact on geography's development and its urban social school in particular. In fact, one could argue, at least in the context of the USA, that social geography became significantly urban in the post-Chicago School years. In particular, the work of Robert Park, Ernest Burgess, and Robert McKenzie and their pathbreaking text, *The City* (1967 [1925]), outlined a theory of urban social organization based in a reading of "ecology theory [that] was Darwin's concept of the web of life. . . . Since man is an organic creature,

Box 2.1 Anarchist Geographies and "the Radical Turn"

Although the work of French geographer Elisée Reclus has remained marginal to the history of social geography, his anarchist philosophy inspired a number of social geographers in the 1970s. The reason why can be seen in earlier descriptions of Reclus and his work. In his obituary, published in *The Geographical Journal* in 1905, Peter Kropotkin, another anarchist geographer, wrote of Reclus:

> It must also be said that the human inhabitants of the globe are what interested Reclus most, much more than the animals or plants, or the flora and fauna of past ages. The Earth was the abode of man, and what man has done and is doing to his abode, this is what absorbed his main attention. (Kropotkin 1905)

It was this commitment to human society along with his global outlook that appealed to radical geographers, who saw in Reclus a challenge to the individualism found in behavioral geography and the localism (place-centrism) of much humanist geography. Reclus, and other anarchist geographers, were thus employed in the debates about "social relevance" in geography in the 1970s by radical geographers who argued that social justice studies in geography were not new but part of a longer tradition of geographic practice and inquiry. Stoddart wrote that "The discussion on relevance in geography which has taken place in *Area* [a journal of geography] since 1971 gives the impression that this a movement of recent development, replacing the 'New Geography' of the 1960s as a focus of activity. Just as there were earlier New Geographies, however, so a tradition of social relevance can be traced back to the beginnings of academic geography in this country [the United Kingdom]" (Stoddart 1975: 188). Stoddart goes on to describe the influence that Reclus and others had on human geographic thought and practice throughout the twentieth century, suggesting that it is important to examine disciplinary history when considering questions of relevance and concerns related to social justice and equality.

Quick Exercise

Go to your favorite web- or library-based search engine and type in the words "anarchy" and "geography." What do you find? Is anarchy being discussed in geography today? If so, how so? If not, why do you think it may be marginal?

Park argued that he is subject to the general laws of the organic world" (Robson 1969: 9–10; cited in Hamnett 1996, p. 8). Following on this theoretical innovation, "Burgess asked, 'In what way are individuals incorporated into the life of a city?' " (Fyfe and Kenny 2005: 19). In sum:

> Park, Burgess and McKenzie's inductive model, produced in 1925 and based on the city of Chicago, explained urban form as the result of a complex social ecology, where members of different migrant and immigrant groups competed for residential space in the city through the process of invasion and succession, such that one group was able to displace another through superior command over resources. The result of this rippling process of change was an urban social geography that reflected a pattern of distinctive neighborhoods as ecological niches within the larger metropolis. (Del Casino and Marston 2006: 997)

As an inductively derived model and working from the ground up, observations were used to create a generic ecological model of the city. Armed with social Darwinian thinking, and theories of natural selection mediated by the struggle for a finite amount of resources, these sociologists tried to explain the spatial organization of the city's ethnic distinctions. First wave immigrants occupy inner city areas, known as "the loop," while second wave immigrant communities establish themselves over time in a second belt of housing settlements. Working further out of the city, successive waves of immigrants work their way out to the belt of the "residential" and "commuter" zones, moving from inner city apartments to single-family owner occupied housing. As each generation enters their newest zone, they bring their social and cultural practices with them, modifying those urban spaces based, in part, on economic upward mobility.

This model, Burgess argued, demonstrates that ethnic segregation is a key aspect of urban development:

> This differentiation into natural economic and cultural groupings gives form and character to the city. For segregation offers the group, and thereby the individuals who compose the group, a place and a role in the total organization of the city. Segregation limits development in certain directions, but it releases it in others. These areas tend to accentuate traits, to attract and develop their kind of individuals, and so to become further differentiated. (Burgess 2005: 25)

Focusing on issues of "disorganization" (Hamnett 1996), such as crime, deviance, and promiscuity (key areas of social geographic analysis, particularly in the post-Second World War period), for example, Burgess and other Chicago School sociologists tried to explain the violence of the inner city.

For his part, Burgess believed that this ecological model only partially represented the day-to-day experiences of the city. He thus chose to focus his own energies on microstudies of particular ethnic neighborhoods as a microcosm of the successionist model of urban transition and ecology. Such empirically grounded work subsequently inspired researchers to use qualitative approaches, including ethnography

and participant observation, in social geography (Ley 1977; S. Smith 1981, 1984; Jackson 1983).

Scene 3: Against the environmental grain

As some scholars sought to apply ecological and environmental approaches to the study of their social geographies, other scholars were trying to rethink the deep-seated tensions produced within these environment narratives. Some did this in very apolitical ways, while others directly addressed social inequities and inequalities. In 1907, G. W. Hoke published "The Study of Social Geography," trying to carve out a distinct subdisciplinary identity for examining social patterns. As Philo (1991) suggests, Hoke's piece is one of the first to explicitly discuss, at least in the English-speaking world, the nature and purpose of social geography. Hoke's (1907: 64–5) rendition of social geography is an interesting one:

> social geography deals with the distribution in space of social phenomena . . . its working programme may be stated as the "description of the sequence and relative significance" of those factors, the resultant of whose influences is the localization in space of a series of social phenomena chosen for investigation. Ultimately, by comparison with similar situations, and the elimination of the accidental, generalizations may be derived which will be of value in predicting the future distribution of similar phenomena. The subject deals, therefore, with the facts and products of human association as represented by group characteristics, industries, institutions, technology, customs, beliefs, and related phenomena; and estimates the significance of the various factors which have influenced their distributions.

In many ways, Hoke argued that the study of spatial patterns and relationships of social phenomena – be they ethnic group distributions or technological innovations – can be mapped, described, and compared across different spaces and through the "localization" of various social phenomena. On the surface, this is not much different from what someone might do in an introductory cartography or geographic information systems (GIS) course, where they might focus on the spatial organization and distribution of various social variables.

Guiding this reading of social geography was a belief that social phenomena are material, represented by objects such as technologies, industries, or institutions (Philo 1991: cited in Phillips 1998: 124). And, more simply, by studying these distributions it is possible to spatially articulate where one society begins and another ends (Gilbert and Steel 1945). Hoke's social geography is interesting because he was struggling against the strong influence of environmental determinism and evolutionary thinking in geography (Campbell and Livingstone 1983). Commenting on this theoretical moment, Hoke (1907: 65) suggested that "It is trite to note that the response, in terms of distribution, of a social group to any given environment is determined, not only by its 'physical circumstances,' but by the status, both technical and psychical, of that group as well." He further argued that "the same

prairie land furnished a home, first for wandering tribes of Indian hunters, later for the agricultural and commercial white. In this case, the potent differentiating elements must be sought, not in the land, but in the character and attainment of the people" (ibid.). Hoke thus acknowledged environmental factors, but set out a distinction between society and nature, the social and the environmental by privileging the power of societies to determine how they organize themselves into localities and how they can "write space" to mimic their own societal conventions and needs.

It is easy to locate Hoke's, Reclus's, Park's, or Burgess's research in the context of social geography because they participated in the academic spaces of the discipline. Other social geographies were being written that have been neglected in histories of the discipline. David Sibley's (1995) incredibly important volume, *Geographies of Exclusion*, points out that black scholars, such as W. E. B. DuBois, and early feminists, such as Jane Addams, were actively engaged in re-evaluating the dynamic social geographies of the city at the same time as the Chicago School sociologists. Their work, however, has been marginalized from a canonical reading of urban social geography. As Sibley notes, this is fairly ironic, at least in the case of DuBois, since Park was interested in the urban sociology of blacks in Chicago. Yet Park never mentions DuBois or his work. Sibley's fairly recent evaluation of the urban social geographic history is thus important because there remains a relative lack of discussion about DuBois and Addams in the urban social geographic literature (at least within the major texts on the subject: see, for example, Hamnett 1996; Fyfe and Kenny 2005).

Not unlike Park, though, DuBois believed that his work had real application. While Park's application influenced generations of urban planners and policy makers, DuBois "passionately believed that research could supply the basis for achieving a racially equalitarian [*sic*] society" (Rudwick 1974: 25; cited in Sibley 1995: 138). As Sibley explains, DuBois's research, empirically based in a door-to-door survey of the entire Seventh Ward of Philadelphia, employed then current sociological principles for studying economic and social difference not just across racial or ethnic groups but also within the black community itself, all in an attempt to explain spatial segregation driven by racism. Through his intensely detailed look at the daily geographies of blacks and whites in Philadelphia's Seventh Ward, DuBois traced the dynamic migratory patterns of blacks into the city, examined the ways in which housing markets were socially and spatially regulated through "discriminatory practices," and investigated the "connection between the job market and racial segregation" (Sibley 1995: 144–5). DuBois found that "the mass of the Negroes have been so often refused openings and discouraged in efforts to better their conditions that many of them say, as one said, 'I never apply – I know it is useless' " (DuBois 1967: 333; cited in Sibley 1995: 145).

DuBois's analysis had a very complicated understanding of the relationship between society and space. Space and spatial relations as well as the spatial organization of the city no longer acted as a benign backdrop to social relations but reproduced discrimination and segregation that impoverished urban Black-Americans. His "observations are based on the actual experience of black people; they give an idea

of what it is like to be black in a predominantly white society and indicate how social geography is shaped both by white prejudice and social bonds within black culture" (Sibley 1995: 147). Working through more subjective geographies and employing a variety of qualitative methodologies, DuBois articulated the lived experience of the city for blacks in Philadelphia at the turn of the twentieth century. Yet "DuBois probably failed to make an impact, first, because of his methods" (Sibley 1995: 153), which did not follow the path taken by Park, Burgess, and other Chicago School sociologists. Furthermore, "DuBois eschewed Social Darwinism, recognizing that it provided a justification for the oppression of black people, and what he termed 'the colored races' " (Sibley 1995: 154). This, combined with the fact that he was largely shut out of the academic job market, meant that his theories and approaches to studying the social geographies of the city remained marginal to the discipline.

Not dissimilarly, but as Sibley explains for a very different reason, Jane Addams's research on urban social geography was also marginalized by the Chicago School sociologists. As a contemporary of both Park and Burgess, Addams had to contend with a number of discriminatory practices tied to both her politics and her gender that has kept her work (and the work of her compatriots) out of the canon of social geographic theory. Addams helped found, in the late 1800s, the Hull House Settlement "to bring together the local working-class population and middle-class academics and social workers" (Sibley 1995: 163). Located in a working class ethnic neighborhood in Chicago, the Hull House Settlement was a conscious attempt to reorganize space to create a new and dynamic set of social relationships between academics and non-academics. Not only was the Hull House Settlement intentionally situated in a particular locale, it was networked to a broader global set of politics that linked Chicago to social movements throughout Europe and across the United States. Like DuBois, Addams and her Hull House colleagues, whose academic work was located in the University of Chicago School of Social Service and Administration, focused on the everyday lived experiences of working class individuals in Chicago.

Following on the traditions established by Addams and others, Edith Abbott helped write and publish a substantial long-term study titled *The Tenements of Chicago, 1908–1935*. Working from an ethnographic base, the authors of this particular volume were pained to describe the experiences and conditions of urban living in inner city Chicago. Through an examination of housing stock and rent prices, as well as the social composition of households, families, and neighborhoods, these scholars examined the lived experiences of urban economic development that ignored the needs of immigrant communities, the race and racial politics that marginalized certain populations from the profits of urban development, and offered suggestions of how to directly intervene to mediate the problems associated with urban poverty, including poor health, sanitation, and housing conditions.

The marginalization of Addams and Abbott by Park and other urban sociologists is partially explained by conflicting epistemological assumptions they held. Park operated under the assumptions that "human ecology was an abstract science, making use of facts of geography – a concrete science – to develop a theory through the application of the scientific method." This "scientific sociology" was intensely

"apolitical" (Sibley 1995: 169). Addams and Abbott worked, however, from "concrete" experience. They were, at least according to Park and Burgess, incapable of producing abstract knowledge.[1] As Sibley suggests, this distinction between "sociology" and "social service" was highly gendered, with sociology representing the dominant masculine, scientific approach and social service the feminine, subaltern one.

However, the work of the Hull House scholars as well as those working in the School of Social Service and Administration resonates with the work of geographers, including David Harvey, whose *Social Justice and the City* (1973) makes somewhat parallel arguments about rent structures and discrimination (Sibley 1995). The grounded "ethnographic" work of the Hull House thus serves as a model of current social geographic work that engages in the subjective experiences of difference and inequality. It is time that such work is regularly articulated as part of a longer trajectory of social geographic inquiry and influence. Social geographers have a lot to learn from the depth and power of these subjective studies of poverty, race, class, and housing in the city.

Act II: Social or (Political) Economic Geographies?

Intellectual and political shifts in the post-Second World War period of geography would change the relationship between social geography and the rest of the field, as geographers began to rethink their discipline, its purpose, and its main theoretical inspirations. In particular, a new "spatial scientific" geography was enlivened through a more active engagement with quantitative social theory, while other geographers developed affinities for Marxist, humanist, and feminist social theories. Importantly, these advances were not always mutually exclusive: some scholars developed a Marxist spatial science or a feminist political economy perspective for studying spatial difference and inequality. All in all, in the post-Second World War period, particularly the period of the 1960s through the 1980s, an explosion of social geographic research sought to become more "relevant" to the societies within which this work was embedded.

In a broader context, the emergence of a geography concerned explicitly with "the social" and the relationships between society and space was informed by the broader theoretical and intellectual ferment of the time. This included the major shifts in social life, which witnessed an expanding urban and suburban experience in the developing worlds of North America and Europe as well as a massive and rapid decolonization of much of Africa, Asia, and Australasia. Moreover, in the 1960s and 1970s, new social movements, such as the civil rights, feminist, and gay liberation movements, suggested that the categories of class, race, gender, and sexuality needed to be more critically examined and understood. In short, societies needed to be interrogated for how they created systems of economic and political authority and social and cultural power to privilege certain social groups over others. Moreover, this period witnessed the Cold War politics of US-Soviet relations

and the development of alternatives to the dominance of these two "superpowers," including the nonaligned movement of countries claiming autonomy from either side of this "war." It was also witness to the rethinking of sociocultural systems, such as religious practices, through the merging of economic concerns (socialism) with religious ones (Catholicism), e.g. the emergence of liberation theology in Latin America. In this period, questions of *social difference* – and the practices of discrimination and/or liberation – and *inequality* – at the microscales of cities and towns and at the global scales of developing and developed nation-states – informed the changing geographies of this time. Not all social geographers in the post-Second World War period took on all (or any) of these issues directly. Nonetheless, what we will see is that social geographers would, to varying degrees, start to investigate new nodes of difference and inequality and do so in ways that would largely evacuate the underlying environmental and ecological determinism of the previous period.

We begin by looking at what is often dubbed "the quantitative revolution," an era in geography ushered in by concerns with creating a more "rigorous" scientific geography. Next, we turn to the development of "radical geographies," which sought to reconcile geographic theories with sociological theories developing out of Marxist schools of thought. Taking a different tactic, we next examine the emergence of a "humanistic geography," a social theoretical geography strongly influenced by philosophies concerned with subjective experiences and interpretions about the world in which we live. In addition, we examine the growing importance of feminist geography and sexuality studies as critical correctives to masculinist-inspired Marxist and humanist geographies as well as valued new perspectives on our study of social geography. Throughout this act, we will interrogate how the study of difference and inequality has become a concern across a broader array of geographic concerns and subdisciplinary positions.

Scene 1: Toward a socially relevant spatial science of class, race, and ability

The post-Second World War period brought much intellectual ferment to the field of geography, which was struggling with its identity as a social science. As other disciplines, particularly economics and political science, advanced new, mathematically driven models of human society, many geographers became concerned about their position within the academy and society more broadly. This moment of intellectual malaise presented geographers with a unique opportunity to rethink their field. In 1953, Schaefer explicitly argued that geography had become mired in a deeply descriptive science of places. The discipline offered little explanation of spatial patterns and why they looked the way they did, or spatial behavior and why people did what they did. Turning his attention to other social sciences, which he saw as more "scientifically rigorous," such as economics, Schaefer (1953: 227) suggested that "science is not so much interested in individual facts as in the

patterns they exhibit." Schaefer's calls for a "scientific geography" suggested that geography should be reorganized as a "spatial science," although Schaefer himself gave no real tools for developing that science (Johnston and Sidaway 2004). It was in the hands of other scholars that a new quantitative scientific geography began to emerge. For geographers interested in social questions, the development of a spatial scientific geography provided a new opportunity to develop their social geographies. This is particularly true because the emergence of quantitative geographies further legitimated the development of distinct "systematic schools" of geographic inquiry, such as economic geography, political geography, and social geography. Moreover, the emergence of systematic subfields further differentiated physical from human geographies, studies of the environment from studies of society (Johnston and Sidaway 2004).

In this context, social geography began to gain momentum as a fairly autonomous field of inquiry. As a systematic subdiscipline of geography, Pahl (1970: 81) argued, social geography should be the study of "the processes and patterns involved in an understanding of socially defined populations in their spatial settings." As he went on to suggest, "Just as economic geography is now more concerned with the theories of the location of economic activity, so social geography has become concerned with the theoretical location of social groups and social characteristics" (ibid.: 82). Unlike Hoke, whose social geography was defined solely by its study of distribution, Pahl further averred that studies of "distributions, however well presented, are not enough. Description does not necessarily imply comprehension and understanding" (ibid.).

In this period, there was a break from the earlier traditions, which were concerned with human–environment relations. As Pahl once again argued, "the field of social geography is concerned less with the relationships of social groups to the physical environment than with the patterns and processes involved in the segregation of social groups and settlements in space" (ibid.: 95). As geographers turned their attention to the social, they simultaneously sought to identify how a geographer might study that social world. In this way, geographers sought out their own "primitives" (Nystuen 1968), such as distance, location, and connectivity, which could be the core variables in a newly emerging spatial science. Richard Morrill (1970: 15; cited in Johnston and Sidaway 2004: 114) further suggested that geography should be concerned with the study of "space, space relations, and change in space – how physical space is structured, how men [*sic*] relate through space, how man has organized his society in space, and how our conception and use of space change." Within this theoretical framework of space, Morrill identified "five qualities relevant to the understanding of human behavior – (1) distance, the spatial dimension of separation; (2) accessibility; (3) agglomeration; (4) size; and (5) relative location" (ibid.). While we will deal more extensively with the methodological implications of this "turn" in Chapter 3, it is important to note that geographers began to more consistently employ methods that were quantitative, mathematical, and statistical. In many ways, then, these geographers sought to examine, to varying degrees, geography as geometry (Bunge 1962), a set of spatial patterns operating in and across the landscape

that explained various spatial behaviors, such as where one group might locate relative to another or how mobility, and thus access to urban institutions such as hospitals or economic opportunities, was mediated by the spatial structure of the city.

For many social geographers working in this nascent spatial scientific tradition the study of spatial difference was not enough. They wanted to make a social difference and be "relevant," arguing that geography needed to contribute to both local and global society. "Geography does not belong to geographers alone," argued Bunge (1973a: 482), "any more than medicine to doctors . . . geography departments in the end must be accountable to the people among whom they lie." In this broad mindset, social geographers sought to apply their new found knowledge of spatial science to questions of social change, hoping to address the inequalities in access to social benefits, health care, and economic prosperity between the "haves" and the "have nots." Geographers, who witnessed social changes and challenges, began to question the spatialities of racism and poverty, for example. They also questioned the efficacy of an objective science that refused to engage with or intervene in societal problems. In fact, some of the early developments in a "race studies" in geography can be traced to the social analyses of geographers interested in problematizing the relationships between economic inequality, access to resources (including social services), the racial and ethnic makeup of certain neighborhood spaces, and the maintenance of ghetto spaces in the city (Morrill 1965; Bunge 1973b; Blaut 1983; *Economic Geography* 1972 (Vol. 48, No. 1) on "Black America").

This powerful pull toward applied social geographies was no more evidenced than in the area of welfare geography, an emergent field of inquiry that developed in the 1970s. Smith, in arguing for a renewed focus on inequality in the discipline, suggested:

> The question of who gets what *where* and how provides a framework for the restructuring of human geography in more "socially relevant" terms, without necessarily abandoning the rigour and sophistication of the quantitative era. It requires us to identify the desirable or undesirable aspects of human existence, to find out and measure how these are allocated between individuals or groups distinguished by place or area, and to examine and if possible model the processes which lead things to be as they are. In addition, the resurgence of applied geography requires that this knowledge be put to the service of society, in the design of predictably "better" spatial allocation of the benefits and penalties of modern life. (Smith 1974: 289–90, original emphasis)

Smith went on to argue that indices of "quality of life" are "incapable of value-free scientific analysis" (ibid.: 290). As such, social geographers cannot operate in a black box of valueless science whose sole purpose is to refine theory, technique, and instrumentation. In constructing welfare geographies, social geographers must begin with the assumption that societies construct a certain degree of spatial inequality that can be mapped, illustrating the correlations between "physical needs (nutrition, shelter and health); cultural needs (education, leisure and recreation, and security); and higher needs (to be purchased with surplus income)" (Johnston and Sidaway 2004: 336).

In applying spatial science to everyday social problems, geographers also turned to some of its primitives: location, distance, and connectivity (Nystuen 1968). In terms of location, geographers asked questions about how society was spatially organized to reinforce spatial inequalities. Pushing even further, they began to suggest ways to reorganize society spatially to benefit the "have nots." Wolpert et al. (1975) examined how mental health facilities were spatially isolated in poor, inner city neighborhoods. The spatial fix of mental health care facilities limits the mobility of people with mental illnesses through their ongoing spatially marginalization. The social stigma attached to mental illness thus functions to produce a particular geography that is mitigated by a number of social actors, including service providers and local community members that determine where facilities are located (Takahashi 1998a, b). With little regard for the individual geographies of people with mental illnesses, the system of health care and social services designed to help them instead constrains them. Worse yet, the resulting geographies continually create stigmatized people and places.

As these geographies of inequality moved to the fore in the field, social geographers began to emphasize questions related to poverty, racism, and health care, for example. Giggs's (1973: 72) study of schizophrenia sought to explain the relationship between mental health status and other sociogeographic variables as well as the development of "preventive policies" and the "planning of future hospitals" to serve those most in need (see also Shannon and Dever 1974). The location of facilities and services for those most in need thus became a critical site of social geographic analysis, as spatial scientists sought to explain social inequalities and how to best address those by changing the spatial organization of needed social service and health care organizations. They did so, mostly, by mapping these locations. Then, through the use of statistical analyses they assessed the relationships between individual/group location and social and economic status. Importantly, the arrival of a "socially relevant" spatial scientific approach to studying social difference and inequality remains pressing today, as geographers continue to struggle with how to best organize our social world spatially to meet the needs of various populations (Del Casino and Jones 2007).

Scene 2: On a political economy of the social

By the late 1960s, geographers were clearly engaging in broader social debates about inequality, justice, and politics. In the United States, this was marked by the emergence of *Antipode: A Journal of Radical Geography* in 1969, whose "goal is radical change" and the "replacement of institutions and institutional arrangements in our society that can no longer respond to changing societal needs" (Stea 1969: 1; cited in Hague 2002: 656). This idea of change was informed by the broader ongoing debate in the field about geography's "social relevance," which "was conceived not in a vague way, as 'feeling sorry for one's fellow human beings,' but as taking the side of the oppressed, advocating their causes, pressing for fundamental social change" (Peet 1998: 68).

For some geographers that change would take place through a much more thorough and consistent engagement with Marx and Marxist theory (Peet 1998). While *Antipode* provided one outlet for some of these discussions and debates about whether or not Marxism was the right approach for addressing social problems, the published work of some geographers, such as David Harvey, Doreen Massey, and Ed Soja, focused attention on the mutual constitution of the social and the spatial, society and space, through a deeper analysis of the processes of what Lefebvre called "the production of space." Put simply, spaces are organized to sustain inequalities and difference, while benefiting capitalist modes of production by generating certain uneven social geographies (N. Smith 1984). Within this emerging Marxist turn in geography, David Harvey's (1973) *Social Justice and the City* became a key text marking a watershed in how geographers theorized the relationship between social processes and the spatial organization of society. "Harvey's radical contribution to social geography through *Social Justice and the City* was to merge the social and the geographical and to lay out a framework for understanding how space is produced by social practice and how those spaces then shape the social groups who produced them" (Del Casino and Marston 2006: 997–8). In more consciously link of regional economic development to the distribution of "income," Harvey suggested that for there to be social and class-based justice there must be a system of distribution that addresses a broadly conceived "common good" across social groups and spaces. In the end, capitalists were not interested in that common good, for "capitalist means invariably serve their own capitalist ends" (Huberman and Sweezy 1969; cited in Harvey 1973: 113). So, it was necessary to construct new forms of justice that took as their primary concern the restructuring of the spatial distributions of resources so that all social groups benefited. Fundamentally, this meant transforming the means of production such that society itself could be transformed.

Resting at the heart of these theorizations were new conceptions of what geographers called social space or "spatiality." In this new conceptualization "human practice and space are integrated" (N. Smith 1984; cited in Peet 1998: 100). Space is given meaning and structure and those meanings and structures then act to constrain movements and mobilities. Social spaces help to maintain difference and inequality or similarity and equality, or some combination of these binary pairs. What this all means is that space is not a backdrop to social relations, a blank slate upon which social institutions or patterns can be mapped. "Rather, [space] is a structure created *by* society" (Soja 1980: 210, original emphasis). As Soja further argues:

> Whether it be form or content, and distributional pattern of the built environment, the relative location of centers of production and consumption, the political organization of space into territorial jurisdictions, the uneven geographical distribution of income and employment, or the ideological attachments to location symbols and spatial images, all organized space will be seen as rooted in a social origin and filled with social meaning.

Box 2.2 On Harvey's *Social Justice and the City*

David Harvey's research is central to the "radical" turn in social geography. *Social Justice and the City* is the first in a series of books that introduces Harvey's Marxist perspective and challenges the notion that geography can remain neutral when it comes to combating injustice, poverty, and inequality. It marked a turn from Harvey's first book, *Explanations in Geography* (1969), where he outlined an approach to a hypothetical-deductive spatial science, and signaled a broader trend toward the study of inequality in social geography. Harvey also nuanced his theory of space, arguing that space is absolute – a "thing in itself" – relative – "understood as a relationship between objects which exists only because objects exist and relate to each other" – and relational – "an object can be said to exist only insofar as it contains and represents within itself relationships to other objects." This move from an absolute to a relative and/or relational notion of space, inspired largely by the French social theorist Henri Lefebvre, demonstrated that urban stratification was produced through the social relations of capitalism. In Harvey's own words:

> space is neither absolute, relative or relational *in itself*, but it can become one or all simultaneously depending on the circumstances. The problem of proper conceptualization of space is resolved through human practice with respect to it. . . . The question "what is space?" is therefore replaced by the question "how is it that different human practices can create and make use of distinctive conceptualizations of space?" The property relationship, for example, creates absolute spaces within which monopoly control can operate. The movement of people, goods, services and information takes place in a relative space because it takes money, time, energy, and the like, to overcome the friction of distance. Parcels of land also capture benefits because they contain relationships with other parcels; the forces of demographic, market and retail potential are real enough within an urban system and in form of rent relational space comes into its own as an important aspect of human social practice. An understanding of urbanism and of the social-process-spatial-form theme requires that we understand how human activity creates the need for specific spatial concepts and how daily social practice solves with consummate ease seemingly deep philosophical mysteries concerning the nature of space and the relationship between social processes and spatial forms. (Harvey 1973: 13–14, original emphasis)

Not all social geographers agreed with Harvey's conceptualization of the society–space relationship or his take on justice. That said, Harvey's attention to theories of space, social justice, and equity in urban spaces remains pressing today, particularly because cities are still sites of social and economic contestation and conflict. Geographers continue to reflect back on *Social Justice* and other works by Harvey when studying the complex society–space relationship.

Quick Exercise

Using a citation index – Web of Science, Google Scholar, Social Science Citation Index – locate recent articles or books that cite *Social Justice and the City*. Pick one and evaluate how Harvey's work is discussed.

For Marxist geographers the societies they studied were based in capitalism, the spaces that were produced by capitalism were clearly beneficial to those who controlled the means of production. Spatial power is social power and economic control is equivalent to social control. As Peet (1998: 107) stresses, "Once it is recognized that space is socially organized there is no longer a question of it being a separate structure with rules of transformation independent of the wider social framework." In this social theoretical framework, there is not one social space but many overlapping social spaces (e.g. the home, the market, the city), all defined by social practices tied to capitalist modes of production. At the same time, within these evolving Marxist geographies was a consideration of the subjective experience of uneven capitalist relations of social production and reproduction at the scale of the local. In short, what we discern from Marxist inspired social geography is that "social inequalities . . . can be investigated for the ways in which social and spatial relations work together, by facilitating flows of capital across spaces and creating new social structures of difference in distinct locations and at particular scales" (Del Casino and Jones 2007: 241).[2]

Scene 3: Humanizing the social and the dynamic study of space and place

Marxist geographers were not the only ones to theorize the relationship between society and space in geography. A second emergent set of geographies was born out of an engagement with humanist philosophies, which eschewed purely economic explanations of social difference and privileged subjective experiences of place and a theoretical framework informed by phenomenology. As Relph (1970: 195) explains, "Phenomenology is a philosophy in which it is assumed that knowledge does not exist independently of man [*sic*], but has to be gained from man's experience of the world." These new "humanistic geographers" turned their attention away from either an abstract space found in spatial science or a social space as theorized by Marxist geographers. Place as lived experience became an important site for the study of embodied experience, and the conceptual focus thus shifted to the human subject as an agent for the construction of places: individuals understood themselves as social beings through their experiences of and interactions with place, they gave place meaning and gained their own social meanings through their

practices of place (referred to by some as social space as well: e.g. Buttimer 1969). In Tuan's (1975) terms, humanistic geography focused on how humans "made the earth into a home." While the human actor in spatial science was a rational one who responded to external stimuli in abstract space (i.e. moved according to the spatial patterns of economic production and consumption in the city set before him or her), the humanist actor internalized place and acted on and through it. So, as Buttimer (1969: 423) argues, "when spatially juxtaposed groups held widely contrasting ideas about [social] space [or place], tensions arose, which influenced spatial movements, thus affecting the geography of that sector [of the city]."

Humanistic geographers drew attention to subjective modes of knowing the world, while at the same time not losing sight of its order. Focusing on the intentionality of individuals and their "potential range of experiences" (Buttimer 1976: 290), humanistic geographers saw "man" as the "creative center of [his or her] world" (ibid.: 279). Starting at the point of rather idiosyncratic experience, humanistic geographers began to explore, in collective terms, "what it means to be human." Despite the focus on subjective experience of place, however, humanistic geographers also strove to understand core human "essence" – a broader social subconsciousness – something that "does not come . . . from location . . . [but comes from] the largely unselfconscious intentionality that defines places as profound centers of human existence" (Relph 1976: 43; cited in Cresswell 2004: 20). As Creswell (2004: 20) suggests, "place [in humanistic geography] was seen as a universal and transhistorical part of the human condition. It was not so much places (in the world) that interested the humanists but 'place' as an idea, concept and way of being-in-the-world." For Tuan (1974) there was an "affective [and emotional] bond between people and places" (cited in Cresswell 2004: 20).

There are, of course, implications for the study of social relations when one moves from a spatial scientific reading of space and spatial relations to a humanistic one (Buttimer 1976; Entrikin 1976; Tuan 1976). Concerned with subjective experience, humanistic geographers turned their attention to how places are permeated by various social meanings and informed by people's understandings of being in place and being placeless (Relph 1976; Cresswell 1996). The proliferation of social inequalities, to paraphrase Cresswell (1996), means that certain people are "in place" and some are "out of place," pushed to the margins of society by the oppressive structures of race, gender, and class relations. Humanistic geographers are thus concerned with how places, as they come into being, shape and are shaped by social relations and inequalities. At the same time, they remain less concerned with "structures" per se, and more focused on everyday experiences and the emotional connections people have with their place in the world.

Scene 4: Emerging alterities through feminism and sexuality studies in geography

While Marxist geographers turned their attention to the concerns of capitalist class relations and humanists suggested a more sustained focus on the subjective

experiences of place, feminist geographers called attention to the gendering of the society–space relationship. Monk and Hanson (1982: 12), even though not the first geographers to raise questions about the relationship between gender and geography, did suggest that "Geographers have . . . been more concerned with studying the spatial dimensions of social class than of social roles, such as gender roles. Yet for many individuals and groups, especially women, social roles are likely to have a greater impact than social class on spatial behavior." In shifting the discussion from one of class to one of role, Monk and Hanson, like other feminist geographers, moved the discussion from the realm of social *production* to the realm of social *reproduction* and the relationship between these two sets of geographic processes.[3] "Thus [while] geographers address the political economy of the international division of labor . . . [they] ignore the theoretical implications of the sexual division of labor" (ibid.: 15). Feminist geographers "translated [this new focus] first into a project to 'add women' to the field, both as producers of knowledge and as subjects of analysis . . . [by offering] ground-breaking research on the material realities of women's lives" (Nelson and Seager 2005: 3).

The development of feminist (social) geography was profound in that it marked a direct challenge to the basic assumptions that human experiences were centered on/in men's experiences of place and space. The new focus on the social category of gender and the ways in which gendered roles and experiences mediated our experience of place and space provided an opportunity to nuance older social geographies. Some sought to map gendered differences across space (Seager 2003a; Nelson and Seager 2005). Others began to turn their attention to new empirical foci, such as the home (Blunt and Dowling 2006), and to rethink urban social geographies from the lens of feminist inquiry (Gilbert 1997). And feminist geographers, such as Gillian Rose (1993), offered a systematic critique of how geographic theories privileged men's gaze. According to Rose (1993: 60), for example, "Humanistic geography assumes masculinity as its implicit norm, and does so with all the authority of masculine claims to really know."

Importantly, this critique did more than simply "add women" to the mix. It suggested that geographers investigate how their theoretical lens informs their understanding of the world around them. As Bondi and Davidson (2005: 15) suggest:

> One of the most important effects of feminist geography has been to unsettle taken-for-granted assumptions about women's and men's "places" in the societies, communities, organizations, and relationships within which we live and work. Thus, feminist geography has opened up questions about ways in which spaces and places – from bathrooms to call centres, from urban parks to teaching spaces – are experienced differently by different people, and come to be associated with the presence or absence of different groups of people. . . . It has also prompted much reflection on what the categories "women" and "men" mean, and on the concept of gender, in the context of social identities and social relations more generally. One expression of this has been growing interest in a diversity of "masculinities" and "femininities"; that is, in different ways of being men and women.

Feminist geographers have thus worked through and across any number of theoretical approaches in developing their analyses of how various gendered differences and inequalities constitute the spaces of social production and, importantly, reproduction. This has included critiques of how "feminism has been consistently marginalized by mainstream geography" (Rose 1993). Just as importantly, feminist geographers have remained skeptical of purely economic explanations of social difference and inequality and encouraged geographers to investigate the interrelationship between class and gender as well as gender and other social categories based in race, ethnicity, and, eventually, sexuality.

Box 2.3 "Beyond" Gillian Rose's *Feminism and Geography*

In 1993, Gillian Rose published *Feminism and Geography*, a critique of the discipline's inherent masculinist perspective. Rose's analysis evaluates the problematic assumptions of geography's core philosophies and approaches. In her criticism, she argues that the default object/perspective in human geographic research has been not only men but also masculinist ways of knowing and seeing. In her interrogation of humanistic geography, Rose argues that "sense of place as a universal human trait" (p. 51) serves to erase the complex gendered – as well as raced, sexed, and classed – differences between men and women. In examining cultural geography's critical turn in landscape studies, Rose notes that "landscape painting [a central object for many critical cultural geographers] then involves not only class relations, but also gender relations" (p. 93). Importantly, Rose also outlines how "Feminist explorations of the different spaces of the contemporary city often reject the search for totality from a position of complete knowledge" (p. 133). In conclusion, Rose argues that:

> The subject of feminism insists that spaces are extraordinarily complex. . . . Its multidimensionality refers to complicated and never self-evident matrix of historical, social, sexual, racial and class positions which women occupy, and its geometry is one strung out between paradoxical sites. These feminist maps are multiple and intersecting, provisional and shifting, and they require "ever more intricate skills in cartography." (Rose 1993: 155; citing Hirsch and Keller 1990: 370)

While this was certainly not the first feminist critique or analysis offered in geography, this controversial text suggests that feminist geographers do not need to work with humanistic, Marxist, or cultural geography perspectives. It also encourages geographers to be critical at the level of epistemology, i.e. how we know what we know.

At the same time, other feminist geographers pushed against the grain of other masculinist geographies. J. K. Gibson-Graham penned *The End of*

Capitalism (as We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy in 1996, and Doreen Massey authored *Space, Place, and Gender* in 1994. Both of these volumes, which draw from different epistemological approaches to "doing geography," highlight the longer trajectory and tradition of feminist scholarship within the discipline.

Quick Exercise

1 Find a work of feminist geography that predates Rose's *Feminism and Geography*. What are some of the questions important to feminist geographers in the 1980s and early 1990s?
2 Find a work that postdates *Feminism and Geography*. How has Rose's controversial analysis been discussed by other feminist geographers?

So, as feminist geographies began to develop so to did a nascent sexuality studies in geography make present the unequal conditions associated with a variety of non-heterosexual categories, including lesbian women and gay men. Geographers such as Lauria and Knopp (1985) worked through a political economic approach to "understand the role of gay communities in urban redevelopment" (Brown and Knopp 2003: 314). The pioneering work of McNee (1984, 1985; cited in Brown and Knopp 2003: 314), for example,

> focused on where, how and why gays and lesbians are not able to express our *embodied difference* from heterosexuals, particularly our same-sex desire and practice but also other forms of gender non-conformity (for example, drag) and affiliations (for example, prostitution) that tend to make middle-class professionals (like geographers) "squeamish."

The 1980s, then, brought about the recognition that experiences of space were different depending on one's understandings and practices of certain sexual identities. Moreover, geographers interested in sexuality studies promoted research on inequalities that oppressed certain peoples and constructed spaces through a hegemonic heterosexuality (Brown 2000). Importantly, though, early attempts to investigate sexual geographies incorporated political-economic theories of urban design and development (Knopp 1990a, b). Lauria and Knopp (1985), for example, investigated the sociospatial organization of the city through a "combination of Marxian-inspired theories of organizations and urban land use, feminist approaches to gender and sexuality, and some early lesbian/gay social theory to understand the role of gay communities in urban redevelopment" (Brown and Knopp 2003: 314). Extending Lauria's and Knopp's work on "gay men and the city," Rothenberg (1995: 180) suggests that lesbian women in Park Slope, New York have also

"created a recognizable social space – recognizable most importantly to each other, but increasingly to the 'straight' population as well. The concentration can be attributed in large part to lesbian social networking, the success of which has contributed to the neighborhood's continuing gentrification, and consequently, to lesbian displacement." The initial work in the geographies of sexuality thus relied heavily on socioeconomic models, particularly those developed by Marxist geographers.

It is hard to underestimate the importance of feminist geography and later sexuality and space studies to the discipline of geography and to social geography more specifically. They challenged the broader assumptions of the discipline, expanding how social geographers theorize both difference and inequality. This challenge informed a number of important changes in how geographers "do" social geography, and also presented new possibilities and concerns. Social geography thus entered a new phase as feminist geography became more important to human geography more generally. At the same time, the expansion of sexuality studies in geography, and the emergence of an explicitly queer geography (Browne et al. 2007), began to push the boundaries of what might be "appropriate" topics for our social geography, making space for the broadening of our studies of sexualities (Bell and Valentine 1995). As a more recognized "queer geography" developed, however, new social theories entered the field and queer geographers, like others in the field of social geography, began to think "beyond" the economy. In this new phase, however, just as new sites of inquiry and difference became more important, social geography would be challenged by the re-emergence of a "new" cultural geography. Fortunately, as we will see, the focus of social geography will continue to evolve as new approaches and concepts enter the field.

Act III: Social or Cultural Geographies?

Critiques of both spatial scientific and Marxist geographies prompted many geographers to question the explicit and implicit assumptions that economic relations of capitalist production exclusively underpinned social geographic processes. These challenges prompted new openings and possibilities for a social geography that was concerned not only with issues of class but also with differences and inequalities based in categories of race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and even nationality. In some cases, this meant modifying economic approaches, developing a radical feminist geography, for example, that investigated the twin processes of class and gender relations simultaneously. In other cases, social geographers had to contend with the growing importance of new theories of social identity and subjectivity, which were emerging out of a revitalized "new" cultural geography. Led, in part, by prominent social geographers, such as Peter Jackson (1989), cultural geography turned its attention away from a theory of culture that presumed culture "was . . . an entity above man, not reducible to actions by individuals who are associated with it,

mysteriously . . . [Culture responds] to laws of its own" (Duncan 1980: 182). Instead, culture was reconceptualized as a process, and a contested one at that, often constructed by those in positions of authority and power to maintain their positions over an oppressed majority. In this, cultural geographers called for greater attention to "the social construction of categories of social differentiation . . . [which] leads, of course . . . to challenging the supposed naturalness of the categories of social differentiation (gender, race, age, etc.) and to examinations and explorations of the ways in which (and means through which) such categories are (re)produced and interpreted/negotiated" (Gregson 1993: 527).

For Gregson, and others (e.g. Peach 1999), this "turn" toward the deconstruction of social processes and categories marginalized social geography's key concerns with the material experiences of inequality and difference. Nonetheless, the importance of interrogating the categories that underpinned understandings of inequality and difference suggested that social geographers needed to question some of their basic assumptions about how they viewed the theoretical relationship between key concepts, such as self and other, inside and outside, old and young, white and black, and north and south. Moreover, social geographers began to consider not only their historical objects of analysis, those in so-called marginal positions in society, but the normative assumptions about relatively uncontested hegemonic and privileged categories, such as whiteness, heterosexuality, and masculinity, that were underexamined in the field. The result of this robust period of theoretical ferment is a social geography that has both complicated its historical object of study – difference and inequality – and legitimated topics of inquiry that were once considered taboo in a discipline that has a historically conservative edge (Smith 2000b), such as sexuality studies and children's geographies.

This act traces the relationship between social geographic and cultural geographic thoughts and ideas. Importantly, both subfields have learned from each other and social geography has "emerged" from this engagement with a number of new and important lines of inquiry. We begin by examining the turn toward postmodern and poststructuralist theories of difference, developing a better understanding of how the "cultural turn" and its focus on representations and representational politics challenged the core of a self-identified "materialist" and "empirically grounded" social geography. Next, we trace the development of a number of alternative theoretical positions that call into question the ways in which social geographers investigate difference and inequality. This includes paying particular attention to the growing importance of theories of identity, subjectivity, and body politics. These new theoretical and methodological sites of inquiry suggest that it is important to work in the realm of both representation and experience simultaneously. Finally, we briefly examine the "backlash" to the "turn" and the implications for a social geography that would become, itself, differentiated across a number of modes of analysis and inquiry. Through a brief discussion of this challenge, it is suggested that social geographers can learn how to move toward a more open view of our own theoretical differences and disentangle certain methodological practices from particular theoretical positions.

Scene 1: The "cultural turn" and the "social category"

The "cultural turn" in geography enabled a new set of critiques of how social geographers think about the underlying assumptions of their theories about space and society. It was informed by the broader engagement of geographers with both postmodern and poststructural social theories. These theoretical positions challenged the basic assumptions of spatial science, Marxism, and humanism. In particular, they eschewed reductionist philosophies, which presumed that researchers could explain all experience by reducing its elements to the workings of capitalism, humanity, or patriarchy, for example. Also, they challenged essentialism, a philosophical position that suggests there is some innate and essential quality to all social categories. In challenging reductionist philosophy and essentialist thinking, the cultural turn in geography called into question a number of central assumptions that had, until fairly recently, structured our social geographies. First, social geography could no longer assume that the social categories of age, race, gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality, or nationality were natural. Instead, the social category became, itself, a social construction, a process whereby certain assumptions of what it meant to be a "woman" or "black" or "queer" or "working class" were constituted through various discourses and linguistic conventions. Second, by evacuating the category of its essential character, the cultural turn forced social geographers to historicize how and in what ways categories of analysis have been produced in and through time and space. This turned social geography's attention "inward," forcing a period of critical self-reflection. Social geographers could no longer simply assume that the categories of the census, and the social groups it distinguished and demarcated, were "true" representations of collective experience. They had to think about their own implicit, and perhaps explicit, role in the reproduction of essentialist thinking, which assumed that oppression or segregation was experienced equally by all those who somehow fit into certain marginalized categories.

Third, the cultural turn called into question the bounding of social categories, insisting that social geographers focus on concepts such as hybridity, identity, and subjectivity. This challenged the long-held assumptions of social geography, which suggested that spatial segregation could be neatly displayed across a grid of absolute space. This challenge called into question the concept of the boundary itself, as both a physical and social artifact, and forced social geography to reconsider how certain identities and subjective experiences of social categories of age, race, class, gender, age, sexuality, or nationality were constructed through various spatial representations. Fourth, over time, the cultural turn forced social geographers to consider how power and authority, as well as subversion and resistance, constituted our social categories. Following the work of social theorists such as Michel Foucault, social geographers investigated how social categories were naturalized, temporarily defined with certain meanings, through the effects of power: what it has meant to be white or black, gay or straight, masculine or feminine, is situated in a historical set of social relationships and practices. In very important ways this has meant that social geographers could no longer fix their "gaze" on so-called marginal populations.

They must also consider how categories of power – whiteness, heterosexuality, capitalism – were also partial and incomplete processes. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the cultural turn forced social geographers to think about the constitutive nature of their social categories. Put simply, there is no "heterosexuality" without an "other," such as "homosexuality." In this way, then, the spaces that are tied to particular social categories through various cultural representations can never completely erase the "other" upon which they are based: there is no ghetto without neighborhoods of affluence.

From a political perspective, this move appeared to dismantle the very core of social geography, shifting its focus from one that investigated "real world" differences and inequalities to the realm of representational politics and the processes through which social categories were defined by "essentialized" and "naturalized" characteristics. It is not surprising, then, that some social and cultural geographers, particularly feminists, were concerned by how this "turn" appeared to shift attention away from "the oppression of women" (Domosh 2005: 38) and toward representational practices, such as art, film, landscape painting, and architecture. At the same time, the "cultural turn" opened social geography up to a new array of critical voices, ones that had been largely submerged under the weight of essentialist thinking. This included, for example, postcolonial scholars, whose work challenged the Eurocentric and Anglo-centered nature of human geography (Blunt and McEwan 2002; Gregory 2004). Subaltern voices began to "seep into" social geography as social geographers called into question the complex relationships between a global north and global south (Pratt 1992). Instead of "speaking for others," social geographers also reflected on how best to represent social difference and inequality themselves. As we will see in Chapter 3, this has helped to promote more explicit connections between research and politics through the development of "action research" projects.

The next scene explores some of the variegated and contested theoretical possibilities that have resulted from the "turn." These possibilities have developed both in concert with and in juxtapostion as well as opposition to the "cultural turn." There is no doubt, though, that as social geographers began to question the basis of the social category, they were forced to develop much more complex theories of how difference and inequality emerge in the day-to-day practices of individuals and social groups in and across differing sociospatial contexts.

Scene 2: Complicating space, identity, body, and subjectivity

It has been suggested that social geography, beginning particularly in the 1990s, became a bit more "open," concerned with a variety of subjects that had been quite marginal to the discipline as a whole. Historically, studying racial segregation was perfectly appropriate but studying the social construction of race and racism was treated more skeptically in the discipline. The "cultural turn" and the investment in theories concerned with challenging hegemonic assumptions about what

constituted difference and inequality established a foothold, albeit a relatively small one at the beginning, for social geographers to take on topics that had long been marginal to the discipline as a whole. Various social processes and categories were now being called into question, and social geographers (along with many other geographers) took up the study of new axes of difference that were situated in discussions of sexuality, age, race, and nationalism. Social geography was becoming, among other things, more queer, a theoretical and political position that suggested social geographers challenge the underlying heteronormative assumptions of their research and practice as well as consider various identities and practices that were not typically investigated – such as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered subjectivities. As the theoretical breadth of social geographers was enhanced by their conscious engagement with new social theories, so too did the subjects of their research expand. Social geographers rethought a number of areas of social geographic research, including geographies of race (Pulido 2006), rural geographies (Cloke 2003a), urban social movements (Miller 2000), and geographies of ageing (Andrews and Phillips 2005), in new and innovative ways.

Of growing interest within this expanded social geography was the relationship between space and identity (Natter and Jones 1997). In particular, through a study of spatial representations, social geographers have suggested that social identities are constituted in and through the organization of spaces and representations. Put simply, space and identity are relationally constructed: identities are geographic in that they are constructed in and through particular spaces. As an example, our identities as students and teachers are constituted in relation to the spaces of universities and classrooms. Feminist geographers thus analyzed how spaces and identities are gendered, suggesting that there was nothing essential to the identities "women" and "men." More than this, though, social geographers have also suggested that space and identity are performances (Del Casino and Hanna 2000). As a performance, there is no inherent or essential characteristic to either space or identity. Instead, spatial identities are constructed through the varying ways of knowing the world (i.e. through one's epistemological lens). Individuals thus perform their identities in ways that reinforce certain spaces as "straight" or "gay," "colonial" or "postcolonial," for example. These performances of identity and space are translated through the social production of various spatial representations of the city and the country, the rural and the urban, the developed and the developing, for example. In fact, this line of argument suggests that performances of social identities can only be understood through our interpretations of the relationships between space and representation (Del Casino and Hanna 2005).

As social geographers became more concerned with questions of the relationships between space and identity, they also turned their focus toward the study of identity politics. In particular, social geographers, with a concern for challenging the presumptions of various social norms – heterosexuality (Valentine 1993; Hubbard 2000), whiteness (Bonnett 1997; Dwyer and Jones 2000; Gallaher 2003), cultural practices, and globalization (Herod et al. 1998; Blunt and McEwan 2002; Binnie 2004) – engaged the highly problematic ways in which certain forms of power sutured

certain spaces and identities together. Thus, while there is nothing essential to certain spaces that are deemed appropriate for white western tourists, in the non-western world certain spaces are structured as natural sites for the practices of tourism for particular peoples who occupy specific social identity positions. In the context of this new theorization of the hegemonic construction of spatialized identities, social geographers also conceptualized counterhegemonic and resistant geographies (Nelson 2006). At one level, this resistance exists in the constitution of "alternative" spaces, such as gay neighborhoods, collective and cooperative local economic organizations, or African-American or Native-American community organizations. At another level, spaces, and their apparently reified identities, are constantly being challenged through mundane acts and practices as individuals and groups transgress the so-called boundaries of, for example, capitalist space. As Gibson-Graham (2006) has suggested, social relations developed through gift economies and other forms of noncapitalist social production and reproduction subvert an apparently ubiquitous capitalist space economy.

Some geographers, however, have become concerned that a social geography based purely in the realm of identity fails to capture the complexity of human experiences: it focuses too much on the area of representation and difference, while relinquishing concerns for inequality (Gregson 2003). As a corrective, some feminist, health, queer, psychoanalytic, and postcolonial geographers have turned their attention toward the study of subjectivity and the "body" (Longhurst 2001; Moss and Dyck 2002). Subjectivities are defined by the intimate relationship among the social and material body, other subjects, and broader ideological processes (Probyn 2003). Subject positions or subjectivities are "formed" through these relationships, which are themselves deeply engrained in the spaces in which and through which people live. In the words of Pile and Thrift (1997: 4), "the body or the self becomes a location within various power-riddled discursive positions, but where the body or the self is not a passive medium on which cultural meanings are merely inscribed." Subjectivities thus form in relation to the spaces people inhabit, including their own bodies. Again, as Pile and Thrift suggest, "Institutional practices such as the madhouse, prisons, schools and universities, rather than containing particular subject positions create them: prisons create prisoners, universities create students. Prisoners and students are inconceivable outside the institutions that give them meaning" (ibid.). The move from identity to subjectivity suggests that social geographers investigate the materialities of individuals' everyday geographies. Perhaps oversimplistic in its interpretation, identity theory has been, to date, dominated by a concern for the field of representation and identity politics, whereas questions of subjectivity remain concerned with the realm of bodily, or corporeal, experience. It is not uncommon to find scholars who use identity and subjectivity in quite interchangeable ways. But as social geographers have recently argued, it is important to further investigate how the formation of "the subject" is a process made real through the embodied practices of day-to-day activities, such as cooking, cleaning, eating, working, etc. (see Probyn 2003). Turning their attention toward questions of subjectivity, social geographers want to investigate not a singular and coherent subject

but a subject that is constantly changing. After all, people draw from and work through so many different subject positions – class, race, gender, sexuality, ability – and spaces – schools, hospitals, neighborhoods, nations – in their everyday lives.

Scene 3: Rematerializing and reclaiming social geography

The turn toward more "embodied" social geographies has raised questions about the potentially problematic relationship between cultural geography, as the study of cultural representations and representational practices, and social geography, as the study of social inequalities and differences. As Gregson (2003: 54) has argued, it is necessary to have a "transparent debate within social and cultural geography." For Gregson, and others, the focus on individual bodily experiences has meant that social geographers have given less attention to broader social differences and inequalities. In light of these challenges, Gregson suggests we need to examine "three issues":

> (1) what we mean by "the social", and – perhaps even more importantly – how this connects with and to society and societal reproduction and, therefore with economy and polity as well as culture; (2) what vision/s of society we have – for example, whether this is (still) about commitments to ameliorate and/or eradicate inequalities through redistribution, or is based on equality of opportunity – and whether these (still) construe themselves as broadly left; and (3) the role we attach to "the academic" – simply commentator or critic.

Extending this further, Gregson has also suggested that social geographers have become intensely focused on individual experience while leaving behind the core tenets of the subdiscipline's concern for social injustice and inequality. "This bodily (social) is predominantly represented as located within the 'scales' inhabited by individual bodies, notably homes and neighborhoods. This is very different from definitions of 'the social' that privilege other geographical scales, for instance nation-states or (western) cities, or indeed from readings of the body that connect to governance, regulation and citizenship" (ibid.: 43). As she also suggests, "there is a clear case to be made for reclaiming a 'social' that relates directly to the materiality of social life, specifically to the conditions of its organization and reproduction" (ibid.: 43). In shifting the debate away from bodies and experiences toward other "scales" of analysis, such as the nation-state, Gregson is concerned that social geography's ongoing focus on inequalities continues to be marginalized from the larger agenda of an "engaged" social geography.

More than this, even, is the fact that social geography provides an important entry point into questions of how social exclusion, inclusion, and marginalization operate spatially (Sibley 1995) and how spaces can be both "enabling" and "disabling" (Jackson 2003). Social geography is thus a subdiscipline that has dedicated itself over time to examining "inequality and its regulation" (Gregson 2003: 48), while

also "revealing and challenging injustice" (Pain 2003: 650). That said, there is no doubt that cultural geographic theorizing has challenged the "integrity" of social geography. But the robust theorization that has developed over the past twenty years or so has enabled a more dynamic social geography, one that is capable of transgressing theoretical and methodological boundaries within subdisciplines and between geography and other social sciences and humanities-based scholarship.

Not to oversimplify a very complex story with a much longer historical trajectory, but social geography – despite warnings of its demise (Gregson 1993; Valentine 2001) – is now practiced across the discipline of geography (Del Casino and Marston 2006). In some cases, social geographers work in close theoretical connection to cultural geographers, investigating how the social is culturally constructed through languages, discourses, and representations, while others continue to consider how to examine difference and inequality as material constructs. Many do both simultaneously. Some scholars complicate traditional subdisciplinary boundaries further by focusing on empirical subjects, such as ability/disability, which work across any number of intellectual axes – feminist, political, social, and cultural, for example (Gleeson 1999). And social geographers have begun to challenge the efficacy of working with one particular theoretical or methodological approach, becoming much more serious about "mixing" approaches to answer complicated social geographic questions (Brown et al. 2005). A core of social geographers simply "remained behind," working through what social geography could and should be as it evolved in relation to this emergent cultural geographic dominance (see discussion by Peach 2000, 2002). While some social geographers continue to invest themselves, therefore, in spatial scientific approaches and practices, they continue to reconsider the use of new technological advances in geography as they work through their research interests related to the geographies of difference and inequality. Over the course of the past twenty years, many new social geographic analyses were developed, focusing on the body and embodied experience of social differences and inequalities, for example (Parr and Butler 1999; Moss and Dyck 2002). Others rearticulated social geography's commitment to questions of justice and equality, and invested their energies in the importance of social action research (Pain 2003, 2004, 2006). For these latter researchers, a growing concern emerged that cultural geography was becoming so focused on discourse and language that it had lost sight of the materialities of difference and inequality that constitute so many daily geographies (England, e-mail communication 2006; cited in Del Casino and Marston 2006).

The debates about the relationship between cultural and social geography are not likely to be completely resolved any time soon. It is thus in the best interest of social geographers to continue to move forward, creatively constructing their own social geographies. They must do this, however, with the strict caveat in mind that social geography and its story is never complete. This text and project is therefore about opening up possibilities and not about closing down difference by fixing the boundaries of what is considered social geography. In this way, this text follows the tradition that cultural geographers have established to complicate the very partial nature of any category, be it social geography or cultural geography.

Epilogue: Post-Human Social Geographies?

As we have witnessed, the central questions of social geography have evolved and changed, with some theories holding a more dominant position than others in different times and spaces. At this point, however, it is clear that there is no one social geographic perspective. In fact, social geographers continue to trace their social geographies in and through any number of questions that intersect with other critical objects of analysis in geography more generally, including "nature," "economy," "politics," and "culture." In some ways, the "core" of social geography has remained focused on "the social" and how that social is constructed in and through societies. In recent years, though, questions about the integrity and naturalness of the concept of society have also been called into question (Urry 2000). In place of a fixed notion of society comes a new conceptual toolkit and vocabulary, including concepts such as networks and networked relations as well as globalization and globalizing processes (e.g. following Castells 2000), as well as concepts such as mobility (Cresswell 1996), nomads (Deleuze and Guattari 1987), and hybridity (Whatmore 2002). These new theoretical languages enable geographers to conceptualize societies not as singular points in time and space but, instead, as intertwined through larger processes and practices that exceed their boundaries. In some cases, people have argued that a rather monotonous global society through the process of McDonaldization is emerging. In other cases, scholars argue that the rapidity of these global processes has created "dystopias" and exacerbated differences, increasing tension across and through human boundaries.

Despite all the contestation and complexity, for the most part social geographers have remained interested in the "human" and the organization and construction of inequality and difference within and across human societies. Recently, however, the integrity of "the human" and thus "the social" has come under increasing pressure within the confines of our broader social theories. As John Urry explains:

> it is *inhuman* objects that reconstitute social relations. Such relations are made and remade through machines, technologies, objects, texts, images, physical environments and so on. Human powers increasingly derive from the complex *interconnections* of human with material objects, including signs, machines, technologies, texts, physical environments, animals, plants, and waste products. People possess few powers which are uniquely human, while most can only be realized because of their connections with these inhuman components. The following inhuman developments are novel in their ontological depth and transformative powers: the miniaturization of electronic technologies into which humans are in various ways "plugged in" and which will inhabit most work and domestic environments; the transformation of biology into genetically coded information; the increasing scale and range of intensely mobile waste products and viruses; the hugely enhanced capacities to stimulate nature and culture; changing technologies which facilitate instantaneously rapid corporeal mobility; and informational and communicational flows which dramatically compress distances of time and space between people, corporations, and states. (Urry 2000: 14, original emphasis)

Social geographers have seized on this moment of uncertainty, pushing the boundaries of what have typically been seen as the dichotomies of, for example, "the social" and "the natural," "society" and "nature." In some cases, social geographers are drawing from a very broad field called actor-network theory (ANT), which suggests that the so-called immaterial or nonhuman "are [identical to human] actors who bundle multiple intentions and act in ways that complement and extend humans" (Harvey 2001: 30; cited in Del Casino and Hanna 2005: 41). In this way, the "social" is not bound up in the "human," for human societies have never been and can never be distinctively "set off from" the various nonhuman actors present in our worlds (Braun 2004a). This concern has prompted a number of ethical questions pertaining to the relationships humans have with the so-called nonhuman. With this in mind, social geographers have engaged in debate and discussion about the relationship between animals and humans as well as "animals' role in the social construction of culture and individual human subjects" (Wolch et al. 2003: 188). This work suggests that the distinctions between animals and humans are at best artificial and are at most partial (also see the extended discussion in Wolch and Emel 1998).

The turn toward studies that break down the "human" in human geography thus questions the integrity of social geography. Moreover, these concerns have opened up new possibilities and horizons, or "lines of flight" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987), through which to explore "the social" and "the spatial." Importantly, though, it suggests that social geographers must continue to think outside the boundaries of what has historically constituted their social geographies if they are to even begin to scratch the surface of what mediates the society–space relationship. As George Henderson (cited in Del Casino and Marston 2006: 1004) suggested when asked what he thought constituted social geography:

> A little while ago, I might have been tempted to say: everything. That is, if we take notions of social constructionism, situated knowledges, and so on, seriously. But I am intrigued by work in the posthuman vein of late. I think it's becoming harder to sustain the very idea of "social geography." The notion of human–non-human assemblages exerts a powerful pull and I'm keen to see what becomes of it. At any rate, it does pose a huge challenge to the notion of the social that ought be taken seriously.

While the question of human–nonhuman assemblages will not monopolize this entire text, these new theories can help to address some of the other questions asked throughout this volume. In particular, we have to be sensitive to the fact that social geography tends to be human-centric. There is much value, then, in thinking through the possibilities that new theories of so-called human–nonhuman relations may articulate new ways of doing social geography. At the same time, social geography's general commitment to questions of difference and inequality reflect a larger set of concerns that already suggest that we consider the nonhuman – the built environment, economic resources, health care products, and other consumptive goods – in our study of the everyday sociospatial organization of the world in and through which we all live, even if social geographers do not always theorize nonhuman subjectivities in the same way in our social geographic studies.

Notes

1 Entrikin (1980) also discusses the difference between ecology and geography prior to geography's own "scientific revolution."
2 Scholarly debate about "working class studies" remains important today (e.g. Stenning 2008).
3 This work also challenged the notion that biological sex was a natural category for the basis of gender. The turn toward a social constructionist approach to the geographies of roles suggests that gender is a contested and historical category, which has no basis in an essential male/female sexual distinction (i.e. biological sex does not equate to a specific set of roles).