

Im/mobility: Connecting Disciplines — An Editorial Introduction

Elissa Rosenberg*
Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design

Kelly Shannon**
University of Leuven

Over a decade after the formulation of the “new mobilities paradigm” by Sheller and Urry (2006), which explained the increasing im/mobility within social institutions and practices, this issue of *Geography Research Forum* seeks to reconsider the concept of mobility as an interpretive framework. The contemporary global context underscores the basic contradictions at the heart of the concept of mobility alongside immobility, characterized by both massive migration and political protectionism. The world is becoming increasingly divided and defined by uneven terrains—politically, economically, socially and ecologically.

The idea of mobility—as distinct from mere physical movement—stresses the *social production* of movement. Mobility addresses not only physical human movement associated with the daily processes of walking, transport or travel, or large-scale movements of migration, but also other kinds of circulation, such as the flow of money, images, information, technologies or ideas. The concept of mobility addresses a range of scales, from the micro-scale of the human body to that of global networks, and, by its very nature, suggests new spatial and scalar logics. Indeed, mobility as a framework challenges the idea of space as a fixed container for social processes by placing new emphasis on its relations, networks, flows and circulation (Appadurai 1995; Castells 2004; Cresswell 2010; Sheller and Urry 2016). Yet, at the same time, mobilities are enabled by fixed “spatial, infrastructural and institutional moorings” (Hannam, Sheller and Urry, 2006), and form a complex, interdependent system in which mobilities and immobilities are intertwined. Sheller has pointed out the “in-between and liminal places at which movement is paused, slowed or stopped: borders, airports, toll roads, hotels, motels, detention centers, refugee camps, etc.” (Sheller 2013, 51). Immobility also references the unevenness of mo-

* Graduate Program in Urban Design, Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, Jerusalem, Israel. elissabrosenberg@gmail.com

** Faculty of Engineering Sciences, Department of Architecture, University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium. kelly.shannon@kuleuven.be

bility systems and practices and the unequal access to them. Since “mobility and control over mobility both reflect and reinforce power” (Sheller and Urry 2006), the study of discourses and practices of mobility must relate to both movement and non-movement (Sheller 2006), with an emphasis on how access to mobility is promoted, enabled or blocked.

Mobility opens up new sets of questions, subjects and methods that cut across disciplines, linking the social sciences and humanities. It also directly links the professions of the built environment (urbanism and planning, landscape architecture and architecture) to social, economic, biologic and political ecologies. It forces the redefinition of notions such as global and local, boundaries and borders, place, territory and landscape (Cresswell 2010). The themes of power, identity and everyday life offer a framework to study a wide range of daily practices, from walking, dancing, driving, air travel and playing sports, to new phenomena as diverse as parkour and elite helicopter travel (Adey 2009). Mobility is also a key framework for investigations into spatial transformations that occur at all scales as a result of globalization, migration, diasporic networks, capital flows and innovations in transportation. These themes and others have been theorized through a set of figures that have come to represent the mobility of modern life (Salazar 2017): from the *nomad* (Deleuze and Guattari 1986), to the *tourist* (MacCannell 1976), the *pilgrim* (Bauman 1996), and the *flâneur* (Benjamin 1996). Above all, mobility has become a kind of shorthand for the culture of modernity: fluid, free, detached and ‘deteritorialized’ (Bauman 2000, Sheller and Urry 2006).

It is this rich and nuanced transdisciplinary potential that has drawn us, as guest editors, to mobility as a key organizing concept that bridges the design disciplines and the social sciences. Our interest as scholars of landscape architecture and urbanism is to focus on the relationship between mobility and space. The evolution of mobilities research is outlined and then traced in respect to the manner in which the “new mobilities paradigm” has challenged ideas of space, place and territory. Two main issues are explored across various scales to provide context for the essays included in this issue. The first explores the complex impact of global migration on urban space; the second focuses on the agency of driving and walking in the production of space.

MOBILITY, LANDSCAPE AND THE CITY

While the concept of mobility has become established in geographic research (Sheller 2013) as well as in anthropological studies (Salazar 2017), it has not yet assumed a central role in design discourse. However, movement—through buildings, cities and landscapes—has been a recurrent theme in architecture and landscape architecture theory and urban history. Movement has always structured settlement, both urban and rural. The domestication of territories by mobility infrastructure is

driven by the fact that accessibility lies at the root of development. Urban structures and settlements are repositioned on the basis of new economies, proximities and hierarchies that are disclosed by mobility. Throughout history—via carriage paths, railways, trams and roads—mobility infrastructure merged with landscape to create vessels of collective life and drove modes of consumption and production. At the same time, landscapes and ecologies continue to be radically altered (Shannon and Smets 2010).

The idea that the experience of movement is central to urban life and to the perception of both city and landscape gained currency in the 1960s. In his captivating 1958 essay “The Abstract World of the Hot-Rodder” ([1958]1997), American cultural geographer J.B. Jackson considered how our relationship to the landscape was being rapidly reshaped from behind the wheel. Jackson reflected on the American romance with the road and the poetry of speed, using the image of a drag-racer’s “world of flowing movement, blurred light, rushing wind or water...” (206-7) to suggest the ways in which American road culture had altered the experience of the landscape itself: “The new landscape, seen at a rapid, sometimes terrifying pace, is composed of rushing air, shifting lights, clouds, waves, a constantly moving, changing horizon, a constantly changing surface beneath the ski, the wheel, the rudder, the wing” (204).

Some years later, Appleyard, Lynch and Myer summed up the critical role of movement in shaping the image of the city in their classic work *The View from the Road* (1964): “the experience of a city is basically a moving view, and this is the view we must understand if we wish to reform the look of our cities” (cited in Kamvasinou 2010, 6). The American landscape architect Lawrence Halprin embraced this idea by developing a landscape aesthetic for the urban freeway (1966). In the post-war period, British landscape architects such as Brenda Colvin, Sylvia Crowe and Geoffrey Jellicoe also claimed a central role for landscape architects in the design of Britain’s highway network. They drew on English landscape traditions as well as a new landscape aesthetic based on the emerging field of environmental perception, and its themes of speed, time sequences and mobile viewpoints (Merriman 2006; Kamvasinou 2010). Other examples of movement-based design approaches include Lawrence Halprin’s writing and design methodology using notational “scoring” systems based on choreographing kinesthetic experience (Halprin 1966, 1970), as well as Gordon Cullen’s “serial vision,” a central idea of his “townscape” aesthetic based on designing a sequence of changing views along a path of movement. Movement was also a central concept and tool for the emergence of cognitive studies in environmental design, such as Kevin Lynch’s pioneering work *The Image of the City* (1960) in which movement was the basis for the development of the “cognitive map” of the city, based on concepts such as orientation and legibility.

Recent research on mobility is indebted to these seminal studies of the perceptual and cognitive dimensions of movement which analyze the visual dimensions of movement and its role in shaping individual urban experience. If these spatial

theories understand the city from the starting point of individual experience and perception through movement, contemporary mobility research has stressed its social production, based on the fundamental assumption that mobile practices both produce and are produced by social relations. Thus, its focus has been on “the constitutive role of movement within the workings of most social institutions and social practices” (Sheller and Urry 2016, 11). This approach has been applied to the understanding of the city as a whole: “People not only observe the city whilst moving through it, rather they constitute the city by practicing mobility. The meaning of places in the city is constituted by movement as much as by their morphological properties” (Jensen 2009, 140). It is from this perspective that walking is often a focus of mobility research. Historically, urban walking has taken different forms, from the ceremonial urban procession in ancient Rome, to the seventeenth-century development of the promenade as a new leisure space, to the urban *flâneur* identified with nineteenth-century Paris. Walking is an everyday practice that shapes urban space and is shaped by the space in which it occurs. It can create new subjects, new forms of public space and provide alternate readings of the city (Conan 2003, Rosenberg 2016).

But how does movement actually constitute the meaning of places? Mobility offers new ways of conceptualizing city and territory, and the notions of place that have been used define them. As Massey has argued, rather than a static, bounded entity, with a single, essential identity, the idea of place has become more fluid. If, as she has asserted, “space is the product of social relations,” place is best imagined as a particular intersection in a network of social relations that occur at various scales (Massey 1994). Place is thus open, dynamic and a site of ongoing processes. Massey presents a dialectical view of the relationship of the local to the global, where place and local identity are porous, multiple and open to constant transformation. In this view mobility participates in the continuing production of space through everyday mobile practices which create meaning and shape identity (Jensen 2009, Adey 2010). It replaces the metaphor of space as a container for social processes with the concept of networks and the “space of flows,” Manuel Castells’ (1996, 2004) term for the translocal, technologically driven networks of the city in the information age.

Perhaps one of the key impacts of this approach on the discipline of landscape architecture and urbanism is the concept of “landscape as infrastructure”—an integrative concept that proposes to address functional issues together with ecological, aesthetic and social concerns (Rosenberg 1996; Allen 1998, Shannon 2004, Belanger 2009; Hung 2011). Landscape architects and urbanists have addressed conditions of mobility, dispersal, decentralization and flexibility by reconsidering the relationship of urbanism and landscape to infrastructure and restoring its connection to the biophysical landscape. According to this approach, landscapes function as *systems* at nested, interconnected scales, and cannot be designed as discrete ‘scenes’. Instead, they are characterized by their performance, rather than by their appearance, meaning that landscapes that can be empirically evaluated for achiev-

ing specific goals. Designers have re-engaged with infrastructural systems in order to transform them from socially neutral, technocratic systems to cultural artifacts — from totalized, invisible systems to contextualized spaces that express cultural values which are part-and-parcel of the public realm. Approximately seventy years ago, Lewis Mumford would have labelled these as polytechnic infrastructures, when one-sided civil engineering was transcended to a civic dimension (Mumford 1934).

In contemporary society, the social production of movement is also being radically transformed by diverse mobilities of people, objects, images, information and technologies. The world is on the cusp of a paradigmatic shift in physical mobility. This, in turn, will fundamentally transform the built environment and generate novel spaces and temporalities. As the post-petrol age beckons, a number of forces are coming together, namely technological developments on vehicle autonomy, vehicle sharing, vehicle electrification, alternative personal transport (e-scooters, self-driving pods, etc.) integration of renewable energy resources, which are complemented by concepts of shared economies/mobilities and increased investment in public transportation. The convergence of new shared mobility services with automated and electric vehicles will offer more transportation choices, greater affordability and accessibility, and eventually contribute to healthier, more livable cities, along with reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

Mobility is often conceived of as a form of freedom, but in fact it results from the dichotomies of autonomy and heteronomy, production and adaptation (Kesselring 2006, 270). Worldwide and local networks (spatial, economic and socio-ecological) continue to evolve and as Castells argued more than two decades ago, networks “constitute the new social morphology of our societies, and the diffusion of networking logic substantially modifies the operation and outcomes in processes of production, experience, power and culture” (1996, 246). At the same time, heeding the warning by Urry, attention must be given to democratic accessibility, since “movement makes connections and connections make inequalities” (Urry 2012, 24). Inequalities result from dramatically uneven forms of access to or effects on various kinds of mobility (Urry 2000, 195).

MIGRATORY MOBILITIES

Inequality is an unavoidable term in relation to migratory mobilities. Humankind is presently witnessing immense refugee and migration waves, with numbers reaching heights not seen since the partition of India in 1947. On the one hand, migration flows have been driven by uneven economic development, accelerated ecological (even climate) change, warfare, ethnic conflict and political instability. On the other hand, the reach of new communication media and transport facilities have generated supply-driven migration flows. Large segments of populations have been

completely uprooted and thereafter face reception contexts that range from welcoming and absorbing to overtly hostile.

Although there are liberating and emancipatory aspects to mobility (Urry 2000) there are also numerous hurdles that often culminate in various forms of immobility. For some, refugees and immigrants represent human security threats, competing for ever more scarce resources (land, food and water, welfare, jobs, etc.) and threaten the status quo. As evidenced by unforgiving contemporary immigration policies in the United States (responding to groups primarily from Central America), Italy (responding to groups primarily from North Africa and the Middle East), Hungary (responding to groups primarily from Eastern Europe), and Brazil (responding to groups primarily from within Latin America) the populist wave sweeping the globe brings with it a high degree of inhumanity and intolerance associated with migration. The stringent immigration policies under President Trump, including the separation of children from their asylum seeking parents at border crossings exemplify growing racism and xenophobia.

Transnational mobility and migration are not frictionless, as Castells' "spaces of flows" (1996) or Bauman's "liquid modernities" point out. Migration is linked to the notion of "transnationalism" which interrogates the social organization and consequences of the complex interconnectivity of cross-border networks that are embedded in everyday social practices (Appadurai 1995; Smith 2005). Research through the prism of transnationalism includes topics as diverse as social construction of transmigrant networks, to the politics of transnational social movements, the proselytizing activities of organized religions, the economic connections of commodity chains and criminal syndicates, and now, sadly, the machinations of transnational terrorist networks (Smith 2005).

The thorny issue of migration has been tackled here in three contributions from different, yet overlapping spatial perspectives, that each probe the complex impacts of migration on urban and rural space. Monica Rivera-Muñoz and Bruno De Meulder unravel the embeddedness and social solidarities of migration and how chain migration transforms the local landscape by affecting destination locales and villages in Cuenca, Ecuador. Jeroen Stevens indirectly addresses rural to urban migration and the prospects and perils of *'the right to the city'* without the support of the Brazilian state, showing how these processes have led to new prototypes of urbanism in São Paulo. In the French context, Jeremy Foster critically interrogates the changing power of the state in relation to migrant/French identity, through a discussion of the relationship of citizenship and urban park design.

The contribution of Monica Rivera-Muñoz and Bruno De Meulder, "Effects of migration and mobility: mapping spatial transformation in the peri-urban settlements of Cuenca," compellingly delves into themes tied to the mobility of people, resources and ideas through an interpretative reading of centuries old migration processes in Ecuador's rural Andes. Beginning with Spanish colonization and their stricter control in the north, southwards migration of colonial outcasts, impover-

ished whites and indigenous people formed secondary *parroquia* (parish) settlements. They developed ‘*in-between*’ the formal colonial city and native territory of fertile lands that the *haciendas* had appropriated on the plains and the Andes’ steep slopes. In recent decades, migration has become transnational, following close on the heels of successive economic crises. In turn, the agency of mobility and remittances has resulted in the dramatic social and spatial transformation of the rural hinterlands. Entrepreneurial investments are complemented by traditional systems of reciprocity, solidarity and care, including *minga* activities (community cooperation). Repeated iterations of such processes incrementally develop household and community patrimony alike and expand and renew support networks.

Countering mainstream prejudices of the detrimental effects of migration, Rivera-Muñoz and De Meulder focus on the close intertwinement of ‘*ever-more global flows and ironically ever-more anchored reproductions of locality.*’ They argue that migration transcends individual acts and is conceptually and literally collective, juxtaposing private, collective and reciprocal practices. Mobility includes a host of micro-scale strategies of becoming, ‘*becoming a migrant, becoming successful, becoming a returnee, becoming an entrepreneur.*’ Migration and the impact of transnational remittances in rural and peri-urban territories transcends material enrichment and help locals resist expulsion through the endogenous urbanization processes they catalyze. The mobility of some is instrumental to sustain a socio-economic mix and preserve social networks for others. Migration empowers vulnerable peasant groups, allows them to break social structures imposed by centuries-old traditions and regulations, and initiates social mobility. The essay reveals the manner in which *parroquia* and extended family units are continually torn between self-reliance and dependency upon outside forces, while arguing that the process of migration provides resistance to over-arching generic suburbanization of the territory.

The “right to the city” is deeply entrenched in a number of Latin American cities. As Rivera-Muñoz and De Meulder reveal in the case of Ecuador, incremental, self-built informal settlements prevail in both urban and rural areas. However, the incremental rural development afforded by migrant remittances is a far cry from the makeshift encampments and home-made homes explored in the contribution of Stevens, ‘*Prototypes of Urbanism: Urban Movements Occupying Central São Paulo.*’ As a centuries-old arrival city for migrants, successive waves of vacancy and occupation define São Paulo. Stevens concentrates on occupation movements that claim the right to the city for the homeless (many rural-urban migrants) through popular demonstration. Following both the outward expansion of the city’s conurbation and the inner city proliferation of squatter settlements, new migrants soon began to occupy vacant buildings in the city’s urban core. They resourcefully, yet illegally, house themselves, and justify this activity by pointing to the failure of the State. In Brazil, as elsewhere, social and economic mobility is tied to geographic specificity and as riches grow, so too does abandonment of lower-lying landscapes and underserved areas, opening up vacancies to accommodate newcomers.

Stevens' prolonged embeddedness in the city's organized movement of movements, particularly with the *Frente de Luta por Moradia (FLM)* (Frontline of the Housing Struggle), allowed him to actively participate in the creation of an alternative city, of 'urbanisms in the making.' As in Cuenca's rural hinterland, principles of mutual aid and communal reciprocity prevailed, however in São Paulo collective life was imposed by occupation movements and included more strangers than family members. Unlike Cuenca's gradual build-up of patrimony, in São Paulo the incremental and innovative parasitizing on the structural frame of iconic vacant buildings is always temporary. Thus, the investment in the makeshift encampments and improvised homes would be wasted, if the materials were not continuously recuperated and moved from one occupation to the other, creating a sort of makeshift mobility. In the case of the occupations of São Paulo, meanings of buildings are radically exchanged: the moving out of high-end functions from the center is exchanged for the most elementary base, namely housing for an uncertain, floating population. In 'Towards a post-historical landscape governmentality? Refractory im/mobilities and multi-temporality at Paris' *Jardins d'Eole*, Jeremy Foster develops the notion of a 'right to the city' through the prism of French identity and redefinition of the urban commons. Following a comprehensive framing of France's notions of citizenship using Michel Foucault's concept of *governmentality* (a regulatory web of behavior where the state maintains socio-economic order), Foster critically interprets the *Jardins d'Eole*, a ten-year old park in the *Cour du Maroc* quarter of Paris in the 19th arrondissement which hosts a predominately migrant population. He advances political scientist Arun Agrawal's idea of bio-political governmentality which orchestrates the mineral and the vegetal in constructed landscapes not only to provide a 'setting' for daily life, but also to act as a vehicle for ideology, sociality and identity. Landscape is conceived of not merely as a place, but as an event, a 'space of becoming,' wherein the temporality of socio-ecological processes is central.

Foster argues that the *Jardins d'Eole* represents a new kind of landscape governmentality, which struggles to maintain a 'balance of republican universalism and local plurality.' His interpretation of the park highlights its seemingly contradictory goals: simultaneously to promote France's commitment to assimilationist-republican core values of social and environmental equity while supporting multi-ethnic cultural appropriation and political solidarity. Through a number of episodes, including the occupation of park of the park by drug dealers and urban encampments by immigrant groups, the park is testimony to the contemporary challenges of 'translocal fluxes.' Foster concludes that the notion of landscape governmentality is no longer possible in the contemporary context, where mobility continues to reshape the city and 'where heterogenous publics undermine the possibility of the urban commons.'

AUTOMOBILITY, WALKING AND TERRITORY

The second section is focused on the everyday practices of driving and walking. Underlying this interest is the belief that people's understanding of the world comes out of everyday practices, and that space comes into being through such social practices. The concept of the everyday was articulated by Henri Lefebvre and Michel de Certeau as the basis of all social experience and a crucial arena of modern culture. The everyday, according to Henri Lefebvre, can be defined as "a set of functions which connect and join together systems that might appear to be distinct . . . (it) is therefore the most universal and the most unique condition, the most social and the most individuated, the most obvious and the best hidden" (cited in Harris and Berke, 1997, 34). The everyday opens up new areas of urban experience, the overlooked ordinary in-between spaces of habit and routine and stresses the temporal as much as the spatial.

The routine, often non-reflective practice of driving has been approached from a range of theoretical and methodological perspectives in mobility research. A core concept is that of *automobility*, which places the driver (and the car) into a broader socio-cultural context: a complex matrix that encompasses, according to Edensor "humans, machines, roads and other spaces, representations, regulatory institutions and a host of related businesses and infrastructural features" (2004, 102). His research analyzes the complex ways in which automobility is linked to identity and the production of cultural meaning, based on the understanding that national identity is partly constituted out of the habitual performance of everyday life (Edensor 2004). Baudrillard recognized the centrality of the automobile to understanding the organization of society: "driving creates a new experience of space and, at the same time, a new experience of the whole social system" (cited in Packer 2008, 12). His insight into the car's unique, hybrid spatial qualities underscores the experiential aspects of driving: the car "rivals the house as an alternative zone of everyday life: the car too is an abode, but an exceptional one; it is a closed realm of intimacy but one released from the constraints that usually apply to the intimacy of the home..." (cited in Featherstone 2005, 9).

The complex portrait of the car as an intimate domestic space is one of the issues alluded to in Nir Cohen and Orit Rotem's essay '*Driven by fear? Commuting and Fear of Terrorism in the West Bank.*' The control of movement is a central feature of the occupation, enforced through a system of checkpoints, physical roadblocks, and patrols (B'Tselem 2004; Handel 2014). Road systems strengthen Jewish networks of settlement while fragmenting Palestinian communities. Cohen and Rotem's research examines driving behavior in the contested space of the Occupied West Bank, focusing specifically on Israeli Jewish settlers' perceived fear of terrorism. The authors apply principles derived from the scholarship on the fear of terrorism to the mobile context of the commuter, arguing for the need to "re-problematize (cars) as hybrid spaces in which automated materiality and human subjects create new forms of emotional agency." Citing Sheller (2004), they refer to the "automotive

emotions” that are a product of “historically situated car cultures and geographies of automobility.” They examine the effects of personal, environmental and situational factors on the fear of terrorism among various groups of Israeli West Bank settlers, and identify the specific factors that are correlated with fear. Overall, Cohen and Rotem’s findings show that their research respondents generally indicated a high level of perceived safety. The authors suggest that two concepts may account for these counterintuitive findings: first, the routinization of mobility as a strategy for dealing with fear, and second, driving as a form of refuge. These two ideas shed light on the overall role of mobility practices in managing and shaping geo-political realities. Defensive transportation planning has become one of the most visible hallmarks of the geography of occupation. The segregated road system of bypass roads and tunnels has transformed the settlement complex in the West Bank to a “gated/gating community” designed to separate Palestinian and Jewish populations (Handel 2014). Cohen and Rotem’s research makes a contribution to the understanding of the perception of fear associated with Jewish Israelis’ commuter practices in a volatile setting through a study of individual drivers. It points to the critical role of fear and safety in shaping Jewish Israeli driving behavior in a politically fraught mobility system in which the control of movement is key to the process of territorialization (Handel 2014).

Walking is also addressed in this volume as an everyday practice through which one may negotiate urban space and perform identity. Walking, according to de Certeau, similarly can be part of a process of appropriation and territorialization. It is an expression of choice; it is like an individual act of speech that gives new meanings to urban space: “space is practiced place. Thus the street geometrically defined by urban planning is transformed into a space by walkers” (1984, 117). Other recent mobility research has focused on the emotional, sensorial dimensions of everyday mobility as an embodied practice, drawing on phenomenology in order to study the performative aspect of movement that begins with the human body. Two essays explore how identity is negotiated and performed through walking and reconsider how the city is remade—or re-imagined—by its walkers.

Arnon Ben-Israel and Avinoam Meir’s essay *‘Mobility along socio-cultural borders: Brisk-walking in Bedouin towns in Israel’* addresses the ways in which the practice of walking inscribes a new spatial organization in the city through a study of brisk-walking among the highly marginalized population of Israeli Bedouins. Based on in-depth interviews with brisk-walkers from the towns of Hura and Tel Sheva, the authors have drawn a vivid portrait of a leisure sports practice that has been growing among Bedouin men and, more surprisingly, among Bedouin women, despite its lack of formal legitimacy in Bedouin culture. The spatial structure of the Bedouin town is based on tribal segregation in which women’s access to public space is restricted by a patriarchal social structure and codes of honor and modesty. Thus, in a traditional society characterized by highly restrictive social norms, especially for

women, brisk-walking has become a transgressive practice that has had subtle, but far reaching, effects on the construction of space, gender and identity.

Ben-Israel and Meir document the social dynamics of group walking as well as the practices of individual walkers, the itineraries they follow, and the personal experiences that the walkers narrate. The authors interpret the social, cultural and spatial dimensions of this data and reveal the ways in which walkers have succeeded in re-drawing boundaries of legitimate social space and social identities. These questions follow from a Lefebvrian approach to the defining role of space in the production of social relations, by defining boundaries of exclusion and inclusion. There is no public sphere in the Bedouin town as defined by modern Western societies, given that land is largely private and based on familial and tribal ownership. Moreover, as the authors note, because of its lack of legitimacy, there are no acceptable, '*conventional*' spaces for this exercise to take place. Brisk-walking instantiates the clash of cultural codes between Jewish and Bedouin spaces and leisure practices, and points to the improvisational solutions to the problems of access, some of which include choosing to brisk-walk in socially neutral spaces outside the town. These 'borrowed spaces', as the authors refer to them, which may include nearby Jewish towns, allow the Bedouin to "bypass restrictive social norms and cross-cultural boundaries."

In *The Mobile Imagination: walking-mapping-constructing the urban landscape*, Hirsch and Gabrielian also theoretically ground their contribution in French post-structuralism, as do Foster and Ben-Israel and Meir. However, their object of interrogation is Manhattan's canonical "rogue street," Broadway, a single diagonal that slices through Manhattan's pervasive grid, and their objective is to move from thick description to designed projection. They interrogate the history of this street and its everyday practices, particularly in relation to the 1811 Commissioners' Plan. Hirsch and Gabrielian 'fieldwalk,' map and ultimately reimagine Broadway through design strategies which reconfigure various mobility infrastructures and disclose new relations to ecology, topography and the horizon, and open up new programmatic use.

For Hirsch and Gabrielian, walking is much more than "promenading;" it is an activist design methodology. Their "mobile fieldwork" allowed them an imaginative reading which sought to "uncover previously unforeseen connections between the two grounds of Manhattan: the inherited (Broadway) and the imposed (grid)." They employed walking "as spatializing" and a form of "critical ethnography." They stress the importance of drawing (specifically section and perspectival drawings) as an alternative means of seeing—of uncovering and engaging hidden logics. Their design research unfolds new forms of appropriating and exploring the city. Through the focus on a series of specific mobility infrastructures, they inscribe new urban narratives for a possible future of Manhattan, using the practice of walking as a design tool.

CODA

The issue closes with a reproduction of Vadodara-based Nilima Sheikh's painting series "Kashmir in Your Dreams." Her sixteen large, ceiling-hung scrolls reinterpret the mural and scroll painting traditions of India and the Himalayas, Tibet, China and Japan. The series, widely acclaimed at *Documenta 14* (exhibited in Athens in 2017), is to be read as pairs with the otherworldly painting on one side and text on the other, creating an alluring interplay of image and text. The work encapsulates a number of the large themes addressed in this im/mobility issue and metaphorically complements the text-based contributions. The tumultuous history of Kashmir—including early plundering armies, the epic works of Hamzanama for Emperor Akbar in 1577, the 1948 partition of India and Pakistan, the 2002 Gujarat riots (which Sheikh simply terms genocide) and age-old violence against young Indian brides—is evocatively captured by Sheikh with layered references to inter-tribal and sectarian anarchy across time and imagined landscapes.

In Sheikh's work, both mobility and immobility are implicitly addressed through reinterpreted myths of the trouble-in-paradise region. The migration and displacement of besieged peoples are overriding themes, and as Sheikh herself explains, "My concerns are primarily about losing home. When you move on, you take some material belongings and leave behind others. You take some memories along too. In that sense, who is not a refugee?" (Kalra 2018). The work itself reveals the mobility of ideas: her source material comes from Turkish, Persian and Indian manuscript painting, to literary excerpts extracted from historical accounts, folktales, fiction, poetry and journalism. Sheikh credits her long-standing fascination with Kashmir to childhood walks where she not only heard repeated tales of the landscape and humankind embodying alternating roles of protagonists, but also learned to see the territory from a naturalist point of view through her mother's interest in botany. The literal traversing of the ground as a palimpsest reveals the *longue durée* of landscape despite the contestation of territories and divisive politics.

It is our hope as editors that the essays selected for this issue of *Geography Research Forum* add conceptual richness to the "new mobilities paradigm" by stressing its spatial complexity. The diverse set of new subjects and physical or geographical settings presented in this collection raise new questions regarding the relationships of mobility, city and territory and offer promising avenues for future research across disciplines.

REFERENCES

- Allen, S. (1998). Infrastructural urbanism. *Cambridge University Journal of Architecture Scroope*, 9: 71-79.
- Appadurai, A. (1995). The production of locality. In: Fardon, R. (ed.) *Counterworks: Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*, London: Routledge, 204-225.

- Bauman, Z. (1996). From pilgrim to tourist – or a short history of identity. In Hall, S. and P. Du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, London: Sage, 18–36.
- Bauman Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Belanger, P. (2009). Landscape as infrastructure. *Landscape Journal*, 28: 79–95.
- Benjamin, W. (1996). *Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- B'Tselem, (2004). *Forbidden Roads* (https://www.btselem.org/download/200408_forbidden_roads_eng.pdf), accessed November 10, 2018.
- Castells M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- (2004). Space of flows, space of places: Materials for a theory of urbanism in the information age. In Graham, S.(ed.) *The Cybercities Reader*. London: Routledge, 82-93.
- De Certeau, M. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Conan, M. (ed.) (2003). *Landscape Design and the Experience of Motion*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.
- Cresswell, T. (2010). Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28 (1), 17–31.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1986). *Nomadology: The War Machine*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Edensor, T. (2004). Automobility and national identity: Representation, geography and driving practice. *Theory Culture & Society*, 21(4-5), 101-120.
- Featherstone, M., Thrift, N. and Urry, J. (eds.) (2005) *Automobilities*. London: Sage.
- Halprin, L. (1966). *Freeways*. NY: Reinhold Publishing Corporation.
- (1970). *The RSVP Cycles: Creative Processes in the Human Environment*. NY: G. Braziller.
- Handel, A. (2014). Gated/gating community: the settlement complex in the West Bank. *Transaction of the Institute of British Geographers*, 39: 504–517.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobilities, immobilities and moorings. *Mobilities*, 1 (1): 1–22.
- Harris, S. and Berke, D.(eds.) 1997. *Architecture of the Everyday*. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Hung, Y. (2011). *Landscape Infrastructure, Case Studies by SWA*. Basel: Birkhauser Verlag für Architektur
- Jackson, J.B. [1958] (1997). The abstract world of the hot-rodder.” In Horowitz, H. L. (ed.), *Landscape in Sight: Looking at America: John Brinckerhoff Jackson*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 199-209.

- Jensen, O. B. (2009). Flows of meaning, cultures of movements – Urban mobility as meaningful everyday life practice.” *Mobilities* 4 (1): 139–158.
- Kalra, V. (2018). My concerns are primarily about losing home Nilima Sheikh. *The Indian Express*, July 29, 2018 (<https://indianexpress.com/article/express-sunday-eye/my-concerns-are-primarily-about-losing-home-nilima-sheikh-5279542/>, accessed October 2018)
- Kamvasinou, K. (2010). Notation timeliness and the aesthetics of disappearance. *The Journal of Architecture*, 15(4): 397-423.
- Kesselring, S. (2006). Pioneering mobilities: New patterns of movement and motility in a mobile world. *Environment and Planning, A* 38: 269-279.
- Lynch, K. (1960). *The Image of the City*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Massey, D. (1994). *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Merriman, P. (2006). 'A new look at the English landscape': Landscape architecture, movement and the aesthetics of motorways in early postwar Britain. *Cultural Geographies*, 13: 78-105.
- Mumford, L. (1934). *Technics and Civilization*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc.
- Packer, J. (2008). *Mobility without Mayhem: Safety, Cars, and Citizenship*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rosenberg, E. (1996). Public works and public space: Rethinking the urban park. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 50(2): 89–103.
- . (2016). Gilpin in the city: The Baltimore stream Valley parks. *Journal of Landscape Architecture*, 11(3): 6-19.
- Salazar, N. (2017). Key figures of mobility: An introduction. *Social Anthropology*, 25(1): 5-12.
- Shannon, K. (2004). *Rhetorics and Realities. Addressing Landscape Urbanism. Three Cities in Vietnam*. Leuven (unpublished doctorate).
- Shannon, K. and Smets, M. (2010). *The Contemporary Landscape of Infrastructure*. Rotterdam: NaI.
- Sheller, M. (2013). Sociology after the mobilities turn. In P. Adey et al. (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, . London: Routledge, 45-54.
- Sheller, M., and Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A*, 38: 207–226.

- (2016). Mobilizing the New Mobilities Paradigm. *Applied Mobilities*, 1:1, 10-25.
- Smith, M.P. (2005). Transnational urbanism revisited. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(2): 235-244.
- Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*. London: Routledge.
- (2012). Social networks, mobile lives and social inequalities. *Journal of Transport Geography* 21: 24-30.

ELISSA ROSENBERG teaches in the Urban Design Graduate Program at the Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, Jerusalem. She is Associate Professor Emerita at the University of Virginia, where she served as Chair of the Landscape Architecture Department. Her research has focused on contemporary landscape architecture and urban design including post-industrial landscapes, urban infrastructure, and landscapes of commemoration. Since relocating to Israel, she has published on topics related to Israeli landscapes and urbanism, including studies of the Israeli kibbutz landscape as an exemplar of landscape modernism.

KELLY SHANNON teaches urbanism at the University of Leuven. Her design research is at the intersection of analysis, mapping and new cartographies and design. It primarily focuses on the evolving relation of landscape, infrastructure and urbanization in Asian public sector. A particular interest focuses development of robust landscape structures as a form of resilience to deal with contemporary design challenges at the territorial and urban design scales.