Austria’s society from an agrarian one to a fossil fuel-dependent industrial society. This part ends with the presentation of mapping as a tool in the sustainability research while Murphy and King draw upon the issue of urban noise in Dublin.

Part IV explores the connection between time and sustainability as an important aspect in sustainability research. In the first chapter Melanie Jaeger-Erben focuses on the impact of life events such as, moving out of parents’ home or the birth of a first baby, on consumption. Erben demonstrates the methodology of biographical research to explore this subject among forty persons in Berlin. In the second chapter of this part Rau and Edmondson deal with the question of how the way people spend their time influences sustainability.

As the editors point out, the purpose of the book is to deal with sustainability issues in the perspective of social science. Indeed, the book has a good collection of different researches and methodologies that present a wide variety of the sustainability field as well as various open questions presenting issues for further research. Since the book brings together studies from different disciplines it enables presenting the complexity of society-nature interaction and demonstrates the needs and the benefits of interdisciplinary approach in sustainability research. These qualities make this book useful for both social science researchers as well as students.

Zeev Stossel
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev


“The ‘claiming’ and ‘occupation’ of space is significant here, for territory in many ways is about claiming ownership, taking over and occupying a certain terrain” (page 53), writes Yvonne Whelan in her article on ‘Territory and Place.’ She argues that “the bounded social spaces that go hand-in-hand with territory are invariably a result of the adoption of strategies of territoriality, whereby people, groups or organizations exercise power and control over a particular place and its component parts” (page 53). This is a good example of the kind of analysis brought to us in the recent volume edited by Morrissey, Nally, Strohmayer and Whelan.

The editors bring together strengths from the study of geography and history in Europe, Canada and the US and respectively are experts in colonialism, human geography, social theory and aspects of heritage and memory. This situates them excellently to write an edited volume on concepts of historical geography. The discipline itself is not neatly defined. Although its origins go back to the 1950s, where it was criticized for impinging onto the hallowed discipline of history, it gained recogni-
tion in the 1970s along with the multiplication of disciplines in the academy. The authors argue in the introduction “an overarching methodological concern of this book is to ask geographical questions of the historical evidence that seeks to situate meaning in context” (page 2). They argue the main strength of historical geography is that it examines “localized research in broader, comparative contexts” and is therefore interesting for being multi-disciplinary”. The authors set out by claiming “our central aim has been to illuminate the relevance of critical historical geography and of thinking in and across multiple temporal and spatial contexts” (page 4).

This zeal for “critical” scholarship leads into a discussion of Edward Said, “relations of power, race, gender and sexuality (page 5).” They go on to argue that this volume will seek to examine themes such as “otherness”, “anti-colonialism”, “imaginative geographies” and examine how “race, class and gender are best seen as concepts that take their meaning from their conjunction with other topics and motifs and from the specific historical conditions under which they are deployed” (page 7). These concepts all seem relevant to other disciplines and this notion of being “critical” almost seems like the authors are dropping concepts in order to make this research appear to break new ground and relate to the fad in some studies to put “othering” and “gender” into a study without explaining why. Is the concept of “other” one that lends itself to historical-geography and if so in what context? In discussing the need for “critical” historical geography, the introduction should have at least explained what normative historical-geography is, or are they arguing that historical-geography lends itself to a post-modern critique in general? Either concept might be interesting, if they had explained what they meant.

The problem with this assumption of “critique” is obvious from the first chapter. John Morrissey’s two chapters on colonialism have nothing to do with historical-geography; nor does he explain how they might connect to the sub-discipline. He sets out with a mundane and well known definition of imperialism; explaining that it involved “the notion of mission civilisatrice…[which] invoked the idea of bringing French civilization, culture and language together with Christianity to the uncivilized and unenlightened” (page 18). He references Said, as the introduction did, discussing “colonial discourse” and noting that “colonialism is best understood as the practice of domination of alien peoples” (page 21). His second chapter returns to the same theme; noting Said’s “invigorating and irrevocable impact on studies of colonial geographies” (page 27). This is well and good; but just giving plaudits to Said, a research does not make. Arguing that “a key role that geography can play in studies of colonialism is to demonstrate the import of locating analyses in necessarily grounded and differentiated ways” (page 29), is a meaningless sentence and adds to an otherwise impenetrable chapter.

All of the ideas Morrissey mentions, such as the “agency of the colonized” and “the nuances of colonialism’s in-between spaces”, may be of interest and lend themselves to historical-geographical analysis, if only he had provided examples and explained how (page 29). Arguing that “in many colonial accounts…sufficient space
is not given to the agency and practices of anti-colonialism” has nothing to do with
geography or historical geography and is a complaint against historical narratives.
It leaves the reader at the end of two chapters perplexed as to how any of this is rel-
relevant. Historical geography has added a great deal to the understanding of colonial-
ism; but Morrissey doesn’t explain how or critically examine how it could do better.

Morrissey frees himself from dwelling on social constructs and well known anti-
colonial studies in his chapter on ‘identity and the nation.’ Arguing that “territory,
spatiality and geographical imagination have historically been essential elements in
any nation or state’s self-identification” (page 65), he provides examples of various
national monuments and identities. He references Benedict Anderson and argues
that national histories tend to be mythologized, a well-known fact. Concluding
that it is important to contest “simplified models of national identity” (page 76)
fails once again to address any geographical aspect of what is basically a critique of
history or nationalism.

David Nally’s chapter on the subject of “development” is interesting. He de-
scribes the colonial contexts of the nature of “progress” and argues that colonial
voyages, such as that taken by Hernan Cortes, were seen not only in terms of space
but also time. “To sojorn in ‘darkest Africa’ was to bear witness to pre-history” (page
41). Yet Nally lets the reader down in concluding largely about the nature of “devel-
opment discourse” (page 46); like Morrissey concentrating more on historiography,
social critique and post-colonial studies, than on historical geography.

Whelan’s article on ‘Territory and space’ explores the nature of space and power
as it relates to territorial conflict. She provides examples from Northern Ireland and
Derry, examining how “territory in parts of the province came to be defined by a
whole range of human rituals and symbols” (page 58). She argues that “wall murals”
developed in the 1980s and 90s as a way for activists to literally “claim space” (page
59).

Whelan’s other strong chapter, ‘Making sense of urban settlement’, examines how
historical geography can be applied to topics such as urbanization. She notes that “A
whole host of questions have spurred on research in this field, as geographers have
attempted to account for how and why urban settlements are spatially organized in
the ways that they are” (page 143).

The main problem with this volume is that while the editors brought various
strengths to the work, many chapters are disconnected from each other and while
several clearly examine historical geographical topics, many do not. Some seem to
think that just dropping names and terms like “otherness” and Edward Said suffice
to justify the existence of the chapter. Others, such as Ulf Strohmayer’s examina-
tion of “capitalism and industrialization” provide sub-chapter headings that seem to
indicate a geographical context, such as “spatializing capitalism” but then provide
banal descriptions such as “capitalism is thus originally ‘global’ in orientation…
and has historically intimate links with processes of colonialism” (page 195). This
might be accurate; but by not relating to the existing body of historical geographical
studies or explaining how researchers might advance this analysis it results in just another chapter defining what capitalism is; which readers already knew.

Unfortunately this volume on “key concepts” does not live up to its title. It does not provide a clear explanation of how the “key concepts” relate to historical geography and is a badly organized series of chapters that substitute catch-phrases and fashionable terms for a rigorous or systematic examination of the state of the sub-discipline.

Seth Franzman
The Hebrew University


This book contributes to a burgeoning body of literature which seeks to highlight the importance of studying small cities. Dissatisfaction with urban theory dominated by study of ‘the city’ defined in terms of a small number of ‘global’ cities has led theorists to consider what is lost as a consequence of this bias. More specifically, the kinds of creative work highlighted as emblematic of the ‘new’ urban creative economy – fashion, music, new media and so on – are considered in this research to reflect the spectacular, exciting and global cities in which they are imagined and created (Florida, 2003). In other words, small cities are ignored because they are not expected to provide the necessary preconditions and environment attractive to ‘creatives’. But in the last decade there is a growing body of literature that argues the importance of studying small cities (Bell and Jayne, 2006, 2009; Garrett-Petts, 2005; Jane et al., 2010; Ofori-Amoah, 2007).

Small-Town America fills a significant gap in the sociological literature. It paints in a slow pace, the slow pace of life in a small town, a rich panorama of the lives and livelihoods of people who reside in small communities, finding that, for many people, living in a small town is an important part of self-identity. He offers a more balanced view of small-town life and culture. Drawing on more than seven hundred in-depth interviews in hundreds of towns across America and three decades of census data, Robert Wuthnow shows the fragility of community in small towns. He covers a host of topics, including the symbols and rituals of small-town life, the roles of formal and informal leaders, the social role of religious congregations, the perception of moral and economic decline, and the myriad ways residents in small towns make sense of their own lives.

More than thirty million Americans live in small, out-of-the-way places, and they remain cultural touchstones in the United States in the 21st century. Robert Wuthnow shows that there are two contradictory images of them persist. In the