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Tim Cresswell and Peter Merriman

What can geography offer to a ‘new mobilities paradigm’ (Sheller and Urry 2006)? The very question suggests that geography needs to embrace mobility. Sociology, anthropology and other disciplines across the social sciences and the humanities have gone mobile (Urry 2007; Urry 2000; Clifford 1997; Kaufmann 2002). Why not follow suit? In many ways, of course, we have. Geographers are leading contributors to and editors of the journal Mobilities. We have our own mobilities text book (Adey 2009) and monographs on mobility in general (Cresswell 2006) and specific forms of moving (Merriman 2007). Our conferences are jam packed with sessions on mobility or mobilities in the title.

Equally, it could reasonably be argued that we have no need to embrace a ‘new mobilities paradigm’ because we have always had mobility as a central focus of work in human geography. Indeed, a call for a new mobilities paradigm in our discipline has often been repeated. In 1938, for instance, the Scottish geographer Percy Crowe, in an argument for a ‘progressive geography’, suggested that we had become too focused on fixed things and needed to pay attention to process and circulation (Crowe 1938). Geographers, he argued, had ‘advanced a static geography ... incapable of seeing movement except as pattern’, but a future ‘dynamic’ geography must adjust its focus to study ‘men and things moving’ (Crowe 1938, 14):

The study of things moving will at least take us a step along the right road, for, as compared with static distribution, movement implies three essentials – origin, destination, and an effective will to move. Movement does not take place in a vacuum, it is effected upon the surface of the earth and it is very largely through movement that Mankind becomes conscious of its geography. (Crowe 1938, 14)

Crowe’s call was largely ignored, but it was repeated with the move to a ‘theoretical geography’ of space (rather than region) that we now know as the quantitative revolution. One proponent of such a mobile human geography was William Bunge.
He suggested that it was movement and pattern which lay at the heart of a new ‘theoretical geography’ that could cut across the human and physical domains.

Notice that any explanation of a location involves the notion of movement. Even such static features as mountains and sea coasts are explained by movements over long geologic periods. In many ways patterns and movements are interrelated as are the chicken and the egg with one causing the other. Does the location of the river valley cause the movement of the river or is it the other way? Obviously one operates on the other. Thus, theoretical geography, the geography of explanation, is interested in both movements and patterns. (Bunge 1966, xvi)

In his manifesto for a ‘Theoretical Geography’ Bunge argued that movement was the key geographical ‘fact’ to be explored, modelled, theorized and explained. It was in the study of movement, he argued, that theoretical geography had made its most significant advances. Chapter 5 of his book is called ‘Toward a General Theory of Movement’. It is rooted in the question posed by Edward Ullman – ‘What makes objects move over the earth’s surface?’

It can be argued that Ullman’s question encompasses all geographic theory, since in explaining how an object acquires its location it is difficult to avoid the notion of movement. Even such “static” features as mountains and sea coasts are explained in terms of movements taking place over long periods. (Bunge 1966, 112)

At a time when spatial scientists were looking to theoretical approaches to space and time in physics and mathematics (see, e.g. Harvey 1969), Bunge suggested that the movement of people could be equated to the movement of electricity or the flows of fluids, as understood by scientists. To a positivist such as Bunge (in Theoretical Geography anyway) it is important that generalizations are as general as possible. So laws that could be applied to people and to water were particularly valued. Movement, then, was incorporated into a general mathematical geography. It was positioned at the heart of the project of spatial science.

This was never clearer than in the development of transport geography. The study of transport became a central part of geography during the late 1960s and early 1970s when the urge to quantify and produce ‘laws’ was at its height. Gravity models and spatial interaction theory were both used to understand and predict transport-aided movement. A ‘rational-mobile-person’ was invented who was seen to make careful decisions about when and how to move. Here is how this is described at the end of an influential transport geography text.

Transport exists for the purpose of bridging spatial gaps, though these gaps can be expressed not only in terms of distance but also of time and cost. It is the means by which people and goods can be moved from the place where they are at the moment to another place where they will be at a greater advantage; goods can be sold at a higher price, people can get a better job, or live in the sort of house they prefer, or go for a holiday at the seaside. In short, people and goods are transported from one place where their utility is lower to another where it is higher. Transport as a fundamental human activity may thus be effectively studied in spatial terms: geographical methods are basic to such study and are of practical relevance to the solution of many of the problems associated with the transport industry and with its activities. (White and Senior 1983, 207)

Occasionally, however, other marginal figures would appear as quaint and unpredictable exceptions to law-like behaviour. Three such exceptions occur at the beginning of the same text book.

For the most part the demand for transport is derived. With exceptions such as motorists who simply drive into the country, passengers on cruise liners and ‘railfans’, transport is used as a means to an end: the movement of people and goods from where they are to another place where, for the time being at any rate, their satisfaction of value will be enhanced. Transport creates utilities of place. (White and Senior 1983, 1)

While movement is most often seen as the outcome of rational choices involving the comparison of one location or mode with another, there are people such as ‘the leisure motorist’, ‘cruise ship passenger’ of ‘trainspotters’ who conduct mobility for its own sake. These people are beyond the scope of spatial science. They are scientific anomalies, or perhaps simply irrational. Needless to say, they are irrelevant to the scientific approach.

This is not the only place that the differently-mobile appear as exceptions and deviations. Abler, Adams and Gould also note the always-awkward exceptions to general rules of movement. ‘Least net effort’ is one of the important organizing principles of many approaches to mobility in spatial science. It suggests that there is (or perhaps, should be) a general drive to reduce the amount of effort spent in moving from place to place.

We stress net effort to emphasize that the very movement process itself may carry benefits at the same time that costs are incurred. A commuter sitting in a traffic jam inhaling gasoline and carbon monoxide fumes pays a high cost for his trip, but he also has relative peace and quiet twice a day, a radio to listen to, and the feeling that for a while at least he is the boss. If his job were to move next door to his house he would probably move. (Abler et al. 1971, 253)

This is but one example of how movement is presented as a secondary geographical fact made necessary by the arrangement of primary considerations of space and location. So despite Crowe’s call for geographers to focus on ‘men and things moving’, rather than the nodes or networks that provide the material infrastructure for such movement, geographers who worked obsessively on movement continued
to relegate it as logically secondary to the arrangements of space and place. This is why the apparently throw-away references to patterns of mobility that do not fit the various models put forward by spatial scientists catch the attention. Qualitative exceptions, differences and experiences of movement leap off the page, but spatial scientists relegate such details to footnotes and asides. In contrast, we see the qualities of mass movements, as well as marginalized or purportedly ‘irrational’ movements, as important and worthy of study. We are interested in producing critical analyses of these practices, spaces and subjects, whether the ‘motorists who simply drive into the country, passengers on cruise liners and “railfans”’ (White and Senior 1983, 1), or the commuter enjoying ‘relatively peaceful and quiet twice a day, a radio to listen to, and the feeling that for a while at least he is the boss’ (Abler et al. 1971, 253). Turning these experiences into a footnote is a result of thinking of movement as a cost and as dead time.

Mobilities Again

In many ways, then, geographers are not coming to mobilities anew but are revisiting an old friend. In our discussion thus far, we have concentrated on spatial science and transport geography, but there are many other ways in which geographers have positioned things or people on the move as central to the discipline. These include the development of migration theory in population and development geography (Boyle and Halfacree 1998), the tradition of time-space geographies associated with the Lund School (Hägerstrand and Pred 1981; Pred 1977), accounts of journeys to work developed within feminist geography (Hanson and Pratt 1995; Law 1999), geographies of tourism (Crouch 1999), choreographies of place developed within the phenomenological tradition (Seamon 1979), historical geographies of transport and mobility (Freeman and Aldcroft 1985; Thrift 1990; Freeman 1999; Pirie 2000), geographies of commodities, globalization and capital (Allen and Pyke 1999; Cook 2004), research on the imaginative geographies of travel writing (Blunt 1994; Duncan and Gregory 1999), and accounts of the role of travel and exploration in the very foundation of our discipline (Driver 1999; Stoddart 1986; Domosh, 1991).

Despite all of this, however, it is still the case that geographical knowledge often assumes a stable point of view, a world of places and boundaries and territories rooted in time and bounded in space. A new focus on mobilities in geography allows us to re-centre it in the discipline. While drawing on the traditions of mobility research noted above, geographies of mobility often start with the fact of moving and retain that as a focus. The apparently marginal mobilities of spatial science (the spotters etc.) become central to our investigations. We do not want to leave the commuter listening to the radio as a marginal curiosity. Rather we want to make her central to our interests by asking exactly what happens on the move. How is mobile time and space filled with liveliness? The mobile worlds that are labelled dead, irrational and dysfunctional by transport geographers and others come alive when they become the focus of our attention.

This book is divided into three sections that reflect the subtitle—practices, spaces and subjects. We recognize at the outset that every chapter includes aspects of all three. How could it be possible to write about the practice of driving without considering the space of the road or the subject position “driver”? We have simply asked authors to start from a departure point and journey from there.

Practices

Mobility is practiced, and practice is often conflated with mobility. To move is to do something. Moving involves making a choice within, or despite, the constraints of society and geography. It is no surprise, therefore, that in Michel de Certeau’s oft-cited classic The Practice of Everyday Life (de Certeau 1984), he focuses on the act of walking in the city in order to elucidate the tactical practices of the weak. Staying still (insofar as such a thing is possible) is also a notable practical positioning in the face of surrounding mobilities and the compulsion to move. An attention to the practice and performance of mobilities forms an important component of recent work on the geographies of mobilities, and the philosophical agenda driving much of the ‘new mobilities paradigm’ are inspired by a poststructuralist sensitivity to movement and practice. Indeed, in outlining and defining what he terms ‘non-representational theory’, Nigel Thrift has referred to it (though, elsewhere, he stresses the plurality of such theories) as a ‘theory of mobile practices’ (Thrift 2000, 556), and he has shown how there is an ‘almost/not quite ontology which is gathering momentum around the key trope of mobility’ (Thrift 1996, 258). Mobile, embodied practices are central to how we experience the world, from practices of writing and sensing, to walking and driving. Our mobilities create spaces and stories—spatial stories.

In this section the authors examine five modes of mobile practice: walking; running; dancing; driving; and flying. These practices are associated with different spaces and scales of movement. They involve a range of embodied engagements and an array of technologies and infrastructures. As the chapters by Hayden Lorimer and John Bale show, even running and walking—practices associated with the physical capacities of animate bodies—have become embedded with a range of more-or-less complex technologies, from the shoe, running trainer and walking boot, to the asphalt running track, digital stopwatch, personal stereo, rucksack and map (see also Mattress 1998; Michael 2000; Bull 2000). Driving and flying are practices which have clearly become dependent upon an extensive network of technologies and space, from different types and makes of airplane and motor vehicle, to the spaces of the road, motorway, car park, airport and the sky. These practices and associated spaces are entwined with a complex array of political, cultural, economic and environmental debates. All of these embodied mobile practices have complex histories and geographies, as has
been exemplified by recent work on dance in geography (Nash 2000; Cresswell 2006). These practices have also come to be associated with different ways of being and thinking, and different ethics, aesthetics and ecologies. Walking has been variously constructed as romantic, reflective, escapist, natural; running as efficient, powerful, or exhausting/dancing as elegant, poetic, fun or embarrassing; driving as modern, essential, stressful, dangerous or environmentally destructive; flying as wondrous, modern, and (again) polluting. While there is a focus, in this section, on embodied practices which appear to be active and controlled (rather than passive), we should not forget that such actions as standing still, sitting or being a ‘passenger’ in a car, train or plane are equally, if differently, active in their embodied practices, affects, mobilities and fixities (cf. Laurier and Brown 2008; Laurier et al. 2008; Bissell 2010).

In Chapter 2 Hayden Lorimer provides a critical overview of the geographies of walking studies. He discusses how walks have been presented as a product of places, as features of everyday life, adopted as an artistic practice, and used as a way to interrogate the relationship between self and landscape, or self and world. He shows how walking has been adopted as an embodied methodological practice as well as a practice to observe or study, and how walks have been the subject of historical geographic study as well as integral to contemporary phenomenologies of landscape. Walking as a historic practice, artistic method and contemporary philosophical tool appears to connect important themes which lie at the heart of geography: embodiment, landscape, place, experience, practice, mobility, representation, materiality, subjectivity, objectivity.

In Chapter 3 John Bale addresses the practice of running. Running is frequently presented as a leisure pursuit, but in this chapter Bale shows how competitive, ‘sportised’ running is perhaps best considered as a form of work. Over the past century and more, speeds have increased, average times have decreased and the sport has been encompassed by a vast array of technologies, from the standardization and improvement of track surfaces, to the global commodification of the running shoe, and changing technologies for timing races. The practice of running is very much an achievement of the hybrid, trained and equipped runner.

In Chapter 4 J.D. Dewsbury discusses the ephemeral, embodied mobile practices of dancing, and he provides a critical intervention into recent geographical debates about non-representational theory, representation and dance. Dewsbury draws upon the writings of philosophers Alain Badiou and Gilles Deleuze to show how an interrogation of the showing of dance can enable geographers to explore ontological-dimensions of moving bodies, and he does this by tracing seven elements or stages in the performance of dance. At the heart of Dewsbury’s chapter, is the focus on the ‘philosophical show of dance’. He argues for an analysis of the movement of dance that is beyond the issue of historical (or any other) context. In this chapter mobility (as dance) is a spectacle and an event.

In Chapter 5 Eric Laurier discusses the practices of driving and, like Dewsbury, his aim is to make a critical intervention into geographic debates about non-representational theory. Drawing upon extensive ethnographic research and the writings of post-cognitive psychologists, Laurier questions Nigel Thrift’s distinction between ‘preambulation’ and ‘cognition’, and particularly his assertion that driving is frequently practised in unconscious, automatic or non-cognitive ways. In contrast, Laurier’s studies of the ordinary practices of driving and passengering accounts for the everyday actions of driving without resorting to cognitive psychology or a Cartesian split between cognition and pre-cognition.

In Chapter 6 Dydia DeLyser examines ‘flying’, focusing on the practices of pioneering American aviators in the 1920s and 1930s. DeLyser draws on the experiences of three crusading women pilots — Amelia Earhart, Ruth Nichols and Louise Thaden. She utilizes feminist understandings of embodiment and theories of practice to show how their embodied flying practices were used intentionally to challenge dominant gendered narratives about the place of women in American society and the lived spatialities that accompanied them.

Spaces

Advocates of the ‘new mobilities paradigm’ have consistently noted the need to consider mobilities alongside ‘moorings’ (Hannam et al. 2006; Crang 2002). Aircraft need airports, cars need places to park (they spend most of their time parked) and refuel, ships need ports, and we all need moments and spaces of rest. There is a long tradition, in geography, of considering the infrastructure of transport (and other forms of mobility) in both quantitative and qualitative modes (Appleton 1962; Horvath 1974; Jackson 1997; Graham and Marvin 2001; White and Senior 1983). As well as spaces of rest, or mooring, mobilities also need spaces in which to enact mobility — roads, the air, the sea, railway lines, bridges. These spaces have their own grammar which can direct or limit mobility. They produce structural or infrastructural contexts for the practising of mobility. They are agents in the production of mobilities. But spaces are not simply contexts, they are also actively produced by the act of moving. Streets, places, urban areas are created through variations of what David Seamon referred to as ‘place-ballets’ (Seamon 1980). Practices of mobility animate and co-produce places, spaces and landscapes. While there is a long tradition of associating practices and spaces of mobility with notions of ‘abstract space’, ‘placelessness’ and ‘non-places’ (Jacobs 1961; Relph 1976; Lefebvre 1991; Augé 1995), we would argue that places and landscapes are continually practised and performed through the movement and enfolding of a myriad of people and things. Rather than think of places or landscapes as settings, surfaces or contained spaces through and across which things move, it is perhaps more useful to think about the ongoing processes of ‘spacing’, ‘placing’ and ‘landscaping’ through which the world is shaped and formed (Merriman 2004; Merriman et al. 2008). Space, place and landscape are best approached as ‘verbs’ rather than as ‘nouns’ (cf. Mitchell 1994; Cresswell 2003; Merriman 2009).

The authors writing in this section examine five spaces which occupy very different positions within networks of mobilities: roads; bridges; airports;
immigration stations; and cities. Airports, bridges, roads, and immigration stations appear to have a fairly singular function, while cities are large-scale multi-functional agglomerations of materialities and mobilities (Amin and Thrift 2002; Latham and McCormack 2004). And yet, airports vary in size and function, ranging from rural aerodromes to international airports and military airbases; facilitating business travel, holiday flights, amateur aviation, military bombing campaigns, and extraordinary rendition. As Ulf Strohmayer shows in Chapter 8, bridges have served as spaces for living and trading, as well as strategic and symbolic crossing points. Streets and roads have served as spaces of carnival, protest, surveillance and play, as well as spaces for vehicular and animal movement (Fyfe 1998). Modern day immigration stations continue to process refugees and asylum seekers, while former immigration stations serve a very different function after their renovation as museums that celebrate and commemorate the heritage of immigrant mobilities. The chapters in this section examine spaces which are associated with different temporalities and durations of dwelling, and they trace the geographies of spaces designed for different constituent publics. Immigration stations are designed to arrest and control movement, processing people according to their past and potential future mobilities, and often confining them for lengthy periods of time. Cities are frequently associated with speed, movement, energy, and a 24/7 economy and culture, but they are also spaces of continuous dwelling and of innumerable fixities. What’s more, we could just as easily have included a chapter on ‘villages’ or ‘the countryside’, which are far from being places of fixity. Streets and roads are upheld as democratic public spaces of social interaction, but anti-air protestors argue that the increasing dominance of the motor car has resulted in the corrosive privatization of public space (Merriman 2007). Airports have been likened to large towns or small cities, which employ thousands of people as well serve their flying publics.

In Chapter 7, Peter Merriman examines the spaces of the road, focusing on the work of American landscape architect Lawrence Halprin in envisioning and scoring US streets and freeways in the 1960s. Merriman discusses Halprin’s collaborations with his wife, the pioneering dancer Anna Halprin, and he examines how he drew upon ideas of movement, choreography, notation, and embodiment from dance in an attempt to understand and shape people’s more-than-representational practices of inhabiting landscapes (including roads). He discusses Halprin’s involvement in drafting US highway design principles and examines his scores for streets, before highlighting how Halprin’s explorations of landscape architecture and dance choreography represent an attempt to engineer the affective potential of driving spaces.

In Chapter 8 Ulf Strohmayer discusses the spaces of bridges, examining how these vital structures can be positioned at the intersection of geographical writings on mobility and architecture. Drawing upon historical research on European bridges from the medieval era to the present day, he shows how bridges are not singular or homogenous structures, but they vary immensely in their design and function. Bridges are a very particular type of space, where one is between places and forced to make decisions, and by way of example Strohmayer discusses the historical geographies of the Pont Neuf and Pont-au-Change in Paris.

Another kind of space in which mobility is conditioned, and where mobility merges with architecture, is the airport. In Chapter 9, Peter Adey discusses this iconic space of modern mobility. Adey approaches the airport by way of a discussion of vectors, which he take to be ‘embodied and experiential’, and he traces the ways in which people, things and airports may be considered as vectors — as ‘path-like’. Adey’s aversion to pointillist thinking results in an approach to airports that is underpinned by a post-structuralist sensitivity to the incessant mobilities of the world.

In Chapter 10, Gareth Hoskins and Jo Maddern transport us to the spaces of two US immigration stations: Angel Island in San Francisco and Ellis Island in New York. They examine how, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Angel Island and Ellis Island were important sites for the processing and regulation of 1 million Asian and 12 million European immigrants, respectively, where they were assessed, categorized and either admitted or excluded. Hoskins and Maddern then proceed to examine the revisioning of these immigration stations as sites of commemoration; as museums presenting stories today about the significance of mobility and immigration to US identity, history and heritage.

In Chapter 11, David Pinder discusses the space of the city – perhaps the exemplary kind of modern mobile space. His focus is on a series of conceptual architectural projects by European avant-garde architects from the 1950s and 1960s, in which cities were envisioned as moving, machinic agglomerations of floating, modular parts. Cities, here, are not just cross-cut by movements, rather they are envisioned as shifting, moving, roaming entities, and Pinder discusses at length a number of projects that were associated with the Archigram group of English architects. In addition to the creativity of these projects, Pinder also delineates an implicit politics of mobility.

Subjects

There is an important history and geography of how particular means and styles of moving have come to be associated with distinctive subject positions. The subject ‘citizen’, for instance, has been defined as much by the right to move as by the particular cities or nations to which he or she belongs (Cresswell 2009). Familiar figures such as the tourist and the refugee are also defined through their mobilities and are subjects of relatively recent origin (Bauman 1993). They are mobile and modern despite their different practices and experiences. These subjects are defined by representational schemes that lie beyond the scale of the individual. They have been constructed and represented in law, newspaper accounts, novels and films, but these subject positions are also inhabited, resisted and manipulated through practice. Representations of particular subject positions frequently caricature such figures, stereotyping the manner in which people of different gender, class,
While the tourist and the academic are relatively privileged mobile subjects, migrant workers often inhabit the opposite end of the spectrum. In Chapter 14, Elizabeth Lee and Geraldine Pratt discuss the lives of two migrant women – Mexican janitor Feriana, who lives in the USA, and Filipina care worker Liberty, who lives in Canada – revealing how they have quite different (yet in some ways similar) experiences of migration policies in two affluent North American countries. Lee and Pratt show how the act of migration both women have been forced to work in low-skilled 'feminised' jobs, separated from their children, and caught up in an ongoing situation of vulnerability and uncertainty. This is a long way from the world of tourists in Kefalonia.

In Chapter 15, Tim Cresswell focuses on the mobile figure of the vagabond or vagrant. In an account which traces the ‘curious career’ of the vagabond figure from the medieval era through to the present day, Cresswell traces the role of the vagabond in law, literature, art, popular music and theory. In doing so he shows how this figure has been variously constructed as ‘hero and villain’, as ‘threat and salvation’, with his mobility being legislated against, romanticized, and upheld as a postmodern figure par excellence. He also alerts us to the necessity of seeing the mobilities of the past in the mobilities of the present and future.

The refugee may be the modern incarnation of the vagabond. In Chapter 16, Alison Mountz examines the mobilities of the refugee. Drawing upon Giorgio Agamben’s writings on the paradoxical spaces of sovereign power, she shows how as sovereign territory has become dispersed, so the categories of refugee and migrant have become increasingly blurred, resulting in caricatures and confections of the two subject positions by sensationalist newspapers and an increasing policing of borders and mobile subjects by state authorities.

Moving On

This book is willfully wide-ranging in terms of the theoretical approaches taken and the types of mobility considered. Some chapters are historical, while others are contemporary. All, however, remain focused on the ways in which bodies and things move, the political, cultural and aesthetic implications and resonances of these movements, the meanings ascribed to these movements, and the embodied experiences of mobility. We have deliberately encouraged the authors to cover a diversity of scales of movement (from the steps of the walker to the inter-continental migrations of the refugee) and to address the histories as well as the geographies of mobility (from the medieval tramp and bridge, to contemporary migrant workers and museums). It is through this willful diversity that the central theme of mobility emerges most strongly. It is also through this eclecticism that we believe it is possible to show how ‘a mobility turn’ in human geography is different from other kinds of mobile explorations (outlined above) that have peppered the discipline’s history. This approach, we believe, allows links to be made between transport and dance, or migration theory and tourism. Occasionally the juxtapositions can be
jarring and possibly even disturbing (such as that between a touristic/ethnographic exploration of Kefalonia and the migrant experiences of domestic workers in the US and Canada). But in addition to highlighting the variety of mobile experiences that characterize a world in motion (a world too often generalized and homogenized as simply ‘mobile’) they also point to some of the connections and logics that link the seemingly disparate worlds of the metaphorical ‘tourists’ and ‘vagabonds’ (Bauman 1998).
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