

Notes

- 1 D. Bell, *The Coming of Post-industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*, New York 1973; J.-F. Lyotard, *La condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir*, Paris 1979.
- 2 T. Benn, F. Morrell and F. Cripps, *A Ten-Year Industrial Strategy for Britain*, London [1975]; S. Hall, *The Great Moving Right Show*, in: *Marxism Today* (January 1979), pp. 14–20.
- 3 E. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*, London 1994; H. Kaelble, *The 1970s in Europe: A Period of Disillusionment or Promise?* (German Historical Institute, *The 2009 Annual Lecture*), London 2010; J. Tomlinson, *De-industrialization Not Decline: A New Meta-narrative for Post-war British History*, in: *20th Century British History* 27 (2016) 1, pp. 76–99; A. Doering-Manteuffel, L. Raphael, *Nach dem Boom: Perspektiven auf die Zeitgeschichte seit 1970*, Göttingen 2008.
- 4 D. Edgerton, *The Rise and Fall of the British Nation: A Twentieth-Century History*, London 2018, p. 497.

**Konrad Lawson / Riccardo Bavaj /
Bernhard Struck (eds.): A Guide to
Spatial History: Areas, Aspects, and
Avenues of Research, Abingdon /
New York: Routledge, 2022, 308 pp.**

Reviewed by
Matthias Middell, Leipzig

“Space matters!” not only has become the rallying cry of critical geographers who are finding a new centrality of their discipline within the humanities, but also has turned many disciplines upside down. Spatial history has established itself as a new sub-discipline within the historical sciences, encompassing a wide range of approaches that have been given a further boost

through encounters with the data-driven digital humanities. This volume provides an introduction to this recently so successful sub-discipline and is, at the same time, an original contribution to its continued development.

As the title suggests, the authors are concerned with the practice of spatial history. In the first part, they discuss the value of source genres. In the second part, they ask about the suitability of certain spatial configurations (from oceans to border zones) for doing spatial history, and in the third part, they discuss theoretical concepts and their applicability. The volume emerged from the close collaboration among a group of historians at the Institute for Transnational and Spatial History at the University St Andrews, whose networks were mobilized from Greece to Texas, from New Zealand to Canada and Ireland, guaranteeing the diversity of examples used in the volume to illustrate and ground the theoretical claims. In this way, we actually learn how spatial history is done in various contexts.

The introduction starts by painting a picture of a broad field in which many experiments are undertaken that relate to both the materiality of space and its discursive production. The core of a spatial history focused on modern history, however, is an engagement “with practices of territorialization, the drawing of borders and creation of infrastructures” (p. 1). This fixation on territory and territorialization is reinforced by the fascination with the new possibilities opened up by GIS technology. This characterizes spatial history, especially in the USA, for which the Stanford-based Spatial History Project, founded in 2007, was particularly influential. Regarding this

interesting project, Richard White postulated that it was about the “creation of visual representations of the interrelation of time and space through digital tools” [1] – an approach that is also followed by the *Routledge Companion to Spatial History*, published in 2018. However, it should not be forgotten that GIS by no means produces innocent data but is in itself a product and instrument of territorialization processes. The fact that these processes are so central can be seen when considering the obvious influence of historical geographers in the field of spatial history, who are primarily interested in the history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and therefore focus primarily on the heyday of territorialization (primarily in the West). Looking back at earlier historical epochs is therefore often viewed through the paradigm of a not-yet-complete territorialization, just as non-European history is contrasted with a seemingly complete territorialization in France as a history of deficits. From a global historical perspective, this perspective is stimulating and plausible insofar as the connection between globalization projects and territorialization is addressed, but it is also unsatisfactory in parts because alternative processes of re-spatialization remain unexposed.

In a multi-perspective global history, it is imperative not to ignore the importance of approaches that focus on space- and place-making. Such approaches reveal, as the authors of the introduction quite rightly emphasize, “an acute sensitivity to the historical contingency and cultural constructedness of space” (p. 2). In the view of this reviewer, it is worth going one step further here and asking how the historical actors dealt with this contingency, thereby

not simply taking their spatial literacy for granted but making it an object of empirical investigation. For it is evident that spatial configurations are highly diverse and by no means “objectively” arranged in a clear hierarchy. This hierarchy is created by historical actors who have a certain ability to “read space” and impose their own ideas of how this space should be organized. It is only by paying attention to the power relations inscribed in this process that a critical spatial history as well as a critical cartography of “established” maps and atlases can emerge. Space loses its apparent neutrality and is transformed into a spatial order. This happens in the immediate local space as well as in the political space of rule and statehood.

As globalization progresses, ambitions to bring the entire world into a spatial order emerge (approximately since the eighteenth century, sometimes even somewhat earlier). However, this ambition remains unfulfilled. Globalization projects emerge that not only compete with each other but also cooperate, because, although they claim to order the world, they are ultimately only able to order one part that is particularly relevant for the respective actors. Spatial history is therefore global history from a certain perspective and vice versa, because a central dynamic of modern globalization processes is directed towards the ordering of the world – not only through military and political action but also through economic interdependencies via value chains and the construction of corresponding infrastructures. This is accompanied by imagined world orders that are culturally shaped in various ways and also have a spatial dimension.

However, the editors of the volume rightly argue at various points that the importance of the spatial dimension for understanding history corresponds to the place that this dimension occupies in education. If one looks for a place at universities where space-making, mapping, or spatial literacy is discussed, then it is more likely to be historical geography (a sub-discipline that is now marginalized in many countries, even within geography) than history. And, of course, there are the many facets of geopolitical thinking that play a role in the social sciences – often normatively charged and presented with revisionist intent.

This volume is an excellent introduction to changing this. It is clearly written by academics who have experience of teaching space-making and present their arguments in a didactically concise manner. The introduction shows that there is no universalist version of spatial history, highlighting that the North American version (mainly concentrated on the West Coast), for example, differs from a French version in which the impulses of Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, and the Annales school continue to be felt. In Germany, by contrast, the prominence of geopolitics and cartography in the expansion of the Third Reich led to a notable absence of maps in the arguments of most disciplines after 1945. Added to this are the influences of the respective historical contexts: the Cold War, the globalization euphoria of the 1990s, the conflicts over the fate of the Palestinian state or the collapsing Soviet Union or Yugoslavia, migration and porous borders of nation-states, worldwide chains of goods and value creation, the new role of urban centres as possible global cities, etc. etc. The term spatial turn

holds together a bundle of different developments rather than describing a homogeneous phenomenon.

The first chapter, written by Bernhard Struck and Riccardo Bavaj, focuses on maps and takes the example of nineteenth-century Poland as a space colonized by Russia, in which a cartography developed posing the question of power through counter-mapping. This example makes it clear that maps are not graphic representations of facts but rather instruments in a dispute for which there are, however, rules that are administered by an increasingly professionalizing community of cartographers. The controversial nature of these rules was recently demonstrated by a very prominent example, the ethno-nationalist *carte rouge* produced by Hungarian cartographers at the end of the First World War, in Daniel Segyevy's Leipzig dissertation. Other examples in this section of possible sources of spatial history are travel guides; trajectories of individuals described in various forms of literature, including autobiographies and memoirs; newspapers; and architectural drawings. In all cases, the authors use many examples to illustrate how a new perspective on these traditional source genres can emerge when the spatial lens is held up in front of the eye.

The second part of the book is entitled "Exploring Spaces" and follows the actors of space-making first into maritime history, which is explored with ships, and next into the history of everyday life, with a special look at the places of collective leisure. By taking a closer look at rivers that connect regions and infrastructures that give order to space, the section finally arrives at border zones, which have experienced a multi-faceted rise in recent

years – as contact zones, as transitions where the qualitative difference between empire and nation-state can be clearly demonstrated, or as places where hybrid identities are constantly recharged due to ongoing migration. All five chapters are highly interesting in their own right and demonstrate the fruitfulness of spatial history. However, what is a little bit lacking is a systematic approach that makes it clear why these particular examples were chosen and not others, for which it could equally be claimed that they add new facets to spatial history.

This leads the reader to the third section, in which concepts, tools, and approaches are reflected upon. It begins with a discussion of “Lefebvorean landscapes” as a tension between physical space and social space, manifested in various forms as “representations of space” and “representational space” in the language of Lefebvre. The experience of a landscape (played out here using the example of mountains) and the cultural processing of this experience in literary texts offers Dawn Hollis the opportunity to demonstrate very convincingly the relationships between very different types of space-making. With the heading “Maritoriality”, Michael Talbot first points out that territory naturally also means water surfaces, moving on to concentrate on the transformation of space into territory and thus on the making of territory, which means (following Charles Maier’s interventions into the field) sovereign control over people and infrastructures and should by no means be reified as given space. Using an example from the Ottoman Empire in the late eighteenth century, Talbot shows how incomplete territorialization processes often were and still are today. This is fol-

lowed by chapters on regional imaginaries (in which the fluidity of the term *region* is not problematized in detail, but is nevertheless chosen as a starting point for the contested character of regional imaginaries), on economic geographies (in the field of tension between cultural interpretations of the economic and its analysis of the basis of “hard facts”, which can easily be cartographically included into large data collections), and on digital mapping. They all follow the central message of this guide to spatial history: spaces are made, and this making happens in competition between different actors and results in different visualisations and other cultural artefacts.

The volume concludes with a concise (although unfortunately, as is common on the Anglo-Saxon market, largely limited to English-language publications) but nonetheless very useful bibliography that will encourage further reading.

One can only hope that this volume will be widely used in academic teaching so that the innovation of spatial history is firmly anchored in the history curriculum as soon as possible and no longer has to be distilled from the offerings of neighbouring disciplines.

Note

- 1 R. White, What is Spatial History (Stanford University: Spatial History Project), Stanford 2007.