

Preface

Kyle Shelton

Kinder Institute for Urban Research, Rice University

What good are mobility scholars? And what does our scholarship—be it rooted in history, geography, sociology, anthropology, or any other discipline—provide the world outside academia?

Those are questions I have been pondering for the last year, ever since Gijs Mom and Peter Merriman engaged in a stimulating polemic in the pages of Yearbook Six. Must we move beyond our academic silos, as Mom suggested, and peek (if not step boldly) into interdisciplinary work and even policy? Can the scholar be a planner or policy maker? Can the historian offer insights on the future of mobility? And what of our subjects? Should our gaze be turned to the international? The comparative? Or, as Merriman argued, should we polish well-trod national mobilities in ways that allow new subjects, local particularities, and actors to shine through?

As an organization the International Association for the History of Transport, Traffic and Mobility (T²M) has sought to answer these questions in recent years. First, the group has expanded well beyond historians to include a cross section of academia. Sociologists, anthropologists, geographers, and professionals from other disciplines can be counted among our membership now. Our relationship with the Cosmobilities Network—an interdisciplinary group of mobility scholars—cemented at the 2015 annual conference in Caserta, Italy, will push us all to think more broadly, and more fruitfully, about how mobility functions in both the past and present. Second, our publications have become more diverse, reflecting our changing field. Between the *Journal of Transport History*, *Transfers*, and *Mobility in History*, we have three offerings that present the gamut of approaches scholars are taking today. All three publications continue to search for articles and scholars whose work covers topics outside of North America and Europe. The strength of recent issues of this publication in Asian and Latin American mobilities reflects this commitment. Most important, the pages of these publications offer room for intellectual conversation and growth. Historians and geographers exchange ideas. Anthropologists and media studies scholars debate theories of



practice, representation, and emotion. In the future, these publications will continue to work off of and orbit each other. All three will become stronger through the collective energy they produce. Third, with more and more frequency we find scholars bringing their knowledge and skills to the realm of policy and advocating for others to do so as well. This has taken the form of innovative humanities and social science efforts focused on contemporary issues—represented by initiatives such as the Mobile Lives Forum (Forum Vies Mobiles)—and has emerged in the work of individual scholars participating in local, national, and even international debates.

The recent moves of T²M and the Merriman and Mom debate from Yearbook Six pick up a thread of conversation that has carried through each issue of *Mobility in History*. While this journal continues to produce reviews of recent historiography and mobility scholarship, as editor I have come to recognize just how vital these volumes are to the wider field. Here scholars work through the macro trends and turns in the literature. They forward bold new directions for study and invert, subvert, and adjust the lenses through which we see, study, and understand mobility. All this takes place in an academic venue suitable for such intellectual exploration. But, beyond the academic world, these volumes offer a space through which outside readers, be they new to T²M or new to mobility studies, can find a wide range of scholarship that provides an irreplaceable overview of the field.

Over the past six issues, dozens of diligent and talented scholars have attempted to parse out just what it is that makes mobility scholarship a vibrant and growing field. The pieces included in this year's edition continue that effort. *Mobility in History*, Yearbook Seven, offers seventeen essays from an esteemed collection of scholars.

Per Lundin and Mathieu Flonneau join the dialogue begun by Mom and Merriman, each offering their own angles on what direction mobility scholarship might take. Lundin provides a balanced look at how scholars have or have not engaged with policy makers in the past, and explores what it might mean if we begin to do so more in the future. Along those same lines, Flonneau asks specifically how mobility historians can cast their knowledge of past transit decisions—and transit inequality—forward to help inform the roiling, ongoing debates about moving contemporary Paris.

We have also returned to a tried-and-tested format with Yearbook Seven, the interview. In a captivating conversation with scholar Guillermo Giucci, associate editor Dhan Zunino Singh and colleagues Tomás Errázuriz, Rodrigo Booth, and Melina Piglia explore Giucci's influential cultural approach to mobility and discuss how mobility scholars might grapple with subjects as broad as technology and modernity.

Carlos López Galviz, Jessica Lockrem, and Florian Wöltering present review pieces that analyze mobility beyond a single location or object. Galviz uses historic visions of the future of London, Paris, and Shanghai to ask how historians might inform current discussions of the future of cities and our future mobilities. Lockrem's review considers how recent scholarship accounts for the intersecting

sensations of a body in motion. From the emotions one feels while moving to the subjectivity one possesses, Lockrem highlights how we have and might continue to study the act of passing through the world. Wöltering takes on the topic of war tourism, showing how scholars have dissected the use of conflict sites as tourist attractions. At a moment when insecurity and violence grip many parts of the globe, this piece sheds light on the ways such conflicts might be remembered.

In Yearbook Six, we (re)introduced the continental review (after a hiatus since Yearbook One). Dhan Zunino Singh's look at mobility literature from and about Latin America began a cycle that we hope will continue into the next several yearbooks. This year we feature a wide-ranging review by M. William Steele on how the legacies of World War II have affected the practice and conception of mobility in Asian countries. Steele's review leads a strong subsection of pieces centered on the latest scholarship on mobility in Asia.

Ivan Small looks at developments in Vietnamese mobility studies—focusing on how scholars have discussed the sometimes interconnected, sometimes at odds social, migratory, and transportation mobility practices that have shaped modern Vietnam. Michael Pante's piece highlights the ongoing efforts of scholars in the Philippines to move the study of mobility beyond the topics of traffic congestion and infrastructure. Pante documents works of academics attempting to bring a more critical understanding of the social and cultural role of movement. Finally, Marielle Stigum Gleiss and Weiqiang Lin push the study of Asian aeromobilities to the fore. They argue that aviation must no longer be viewed strictly through a Western lens. Indeed, they show that Eastern aeromobilities offer important insights to Western conceptions of the mode and call for an acknowledgment of these overlapping mobilities.

Melina Piglia picks up the theme of broadening our conceptions of aeromobility, reviewing work on the development of the aviation industry in Latin America. Like Gleiss and Lin, Piglia challenges the U.S./Europe-centric gaze of much of our understanding of aviation.

Luminita Gatejel and Lale Duruiz forward discussions of automobility in understudied geographic areas. Gatejel offers a review on the place of cars in the cultural life of the Eastern Bloc under Communist rule. Duruiz demonstrates how scholars' understanding of automobility in Turkey is linked to notions of nationalism and tensions with the West. Each of these works represent important summaries of ongoing work in areas that mobility scholarship is only beginning to grapple with.

Arnaud Passalacqua and Ana Prata bring our focus to mainland Europe. Passalacqua's review zooms in on Parisian mobility scholarship, offering a microview case study of shifts in the study of the city. As the region has become more important, questions of transportation equity—similar to those raised by Flonneau in our opening polemics—have risen to the top of many scholarly productions. Prata discusses Portuguese port history. Like Passalacqua, she urges scholars to move beyond the focus on major cities, calling for more interdisciplinary and comparative histories.

Finally, Torsten Feys and Paul Stephenson come at the issue of borders in mobility scholarship from two angles. Feys presents a wide-ranging review of works that discuss the role of transoceanic shipping in the creation of modern states and border controls. Stephenson, focused solely on the Canada-U.S. border, delves into how the securitization of that space has altered the connection between border crossings and waiting.

I want to thank my hardworking editorial team for soliciting and shepherding this impressive collection of reviews. The publication team at Berghahn Books, especially Martha Hoffman, has once again made this an easy process. We also want to extend our thanks to our peer reviewers, whose careful comments improved each piece. And finally, thanks to T²M for continuing to support this publication. Enjoy!

Kyle Shelton

On behalf of the editorial team

Christiane Katz

Kate McDonald

Dhan Zunino Singh

Kyle Shelton is the editor in chief of *Mobility in History*, Yearbook Seven, and a postdoctoral fellow at the Kinder Institute for Urban Research at Rice University in Houston, Texas. He is an urban and environmental historian and researcher. He received his Ph.D. in history from the University of Texas at Austin in May 2014. He is currently working on his first monograph about the mobility history of Houston, Texas.

Christiane Katz is a research associate in the Economic and Social History and History of Technology Unit, RWTH Aachen. She is working on her Ph.D. dissertation, which focuses on the decision-making process of urban mobility infrastructures. She is also interested in the history of electromobility, the automobile industry, and business history.

Kate McDonald is an assistant professor of history at the University of California at Santa Barbara. Her research focuses on the history of empire and mobility in modern Japan. She is currently at work on a history of travel and the spatial politics of the Japanese Empire. Her most recent article, on the history of global transportation networks in twentieth-century East Asia, appears in *Technology and Culture*.

Dhan Zunino Singh is a sociologist and historian. He works as a research assistant at CONICET, University of Quilmes, Argentina, on cultural history of urban mobilities. He lectures for the doctoral seminar "Mobility and City" at the University of Buenos Aires and collaborates as a coeditor on *Mobility in History*.