CHAIR’S REMARKS | Kirsten Greer

Welcome to the 2018 issue of Past Place

In 1946, author Thomas Raddall reflected on his childhood coastal town in his book *Pride’s Fancy*: “I live in a small Nova Scotia seaport [Liverpool, Nova Scotia] which in colonial times had a great deal to do with the West Indies. More than one garden blooms actually in West Indian soil, brought north as ballast in the days of the Caribbean trade. Street corners are marked by half-sunken cannon, muzzle down, which once upon a time spoke sharply for their owners in the Caribbean waters.” Used as a seasonal camp by the Indigenous Mi’kmaq peoples, the Liverpool harbour or ‘Ogomkigeak’ (dry sandy place) and ‘Ogukegeok’ (place of departure) took on global economic significance as part of the triangle trade of timber, fish, sugar, rum, and enslaved peoples in the late eighteenth-century British Atlantic.

Raddall’s attention to the connected landscapes of Nova Scotia and the Caribbean draws attention to the historical materialities of place, and to the legacies of colonialism that shaped both regions. As a historical geographer, I have become increasingly interested in the historical, cultural, and biophysical connections between Canada and the Caribbean not only through the textual archive, but through natural history specimens, historic timbers, stories, and biophysical processes. This research direction has led me to engage in interdisciplinary and collaborative work with my physical geography colleagues to “boundary cross” and to reflect on the role of historical geography as an anchor to integrative research on global environmental change, especially when involving past environments.
This year’s *Past Place* 2018 is reflective of the continued place of historical geography as a field of study that sheds light on current environmental and societal challenges such as climate change, species conservation, and uneven development between a Global North and Global South. For example, the 2019 Historical Geography Specialty Group (HGSG) Distinguished Historical Geographer is Professor Georgina Enfield, Professor of Environmental History and Associate Pro Vice Chancellor for Research (Humanities and Social Sciences) at the University of Liverpool. Enfield has contributed significantly to climatic history and historical climatology; human responses to unusual or extreme weather events; conceptualizations of climate variability in historical perspective; and the links between climate and the healthiness of place. Her expertise is in the use of historical records and sources for the reconstruction of climate variability over time. She has drawn on a variety of sources and oral history approaches to investigate the histories of climate variability in a variety of spatial and temporal contexts in Mexico, to explore the timing, impacts of and responses to extreme weather events across the UK, and to investigate the role of place in weather memory. Endfield’s lecture, “Weather Heritage and Elemental Place Making,” is scheduled at the AAG on April 5th, 1:10 PM / 2:50 PM, Room: Balcony 1, Marriott, Mezzanine Level, Washington D.C.

Endfield’s lecture follows in the footsteps of Professor Craig Colten’s 2018 Distinguished Historical Geographer lecture, which focused on “Values of Practicing Historical Geography”. Colten is the Carl O. Sauer Professor of Geography and Anthropology at Louisiana State University, has devoted over 30 years to studying the geography of hazards, including topics such as resilience, adaptation to changing environments in Coastal Louisiana, water and hazards in the American South, and toxic waste sites in the United States. One of his former students, Dr. Alexandra Giancarlo (Geography, Brandon University), reflects on his influence on her research trajectory during her graduate studies at LSU. Giancarlo focuses on critical race theory, cultural politics, the politics of commemoration, social memory, and critical disability studies.

This past year also featured a special “Critical Historical Geography Lecture” at the International Geographical Union meeting in Quebec City last August, featuring Professor Mona Domosh (Geography, Dartmouth College). Domosh presented her *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* paper, “Race, biopolitics and liberal development from the Jim Crow South to postwar Africa,” which examined links between the racialized biopolitics that characterized the US government interventions in the US South in the early 20th century, and the USA’s and the UK’s late colonial and early development strategies in Africa. In this issue, Domosh reflects on her forthcoming book, *Practicing Development in the Jim Crow South*, (Geography, Dartmouth College), followed by
commentaries from the session by Dr. John Paul Catungal (The Social Justice Institute, University of British Columbia) and Dr. Matt Farish (Geography & Planning, University of Toronto). The session was co-sponsored by the CAG Historical Geography Specialty Group, the AAG Historical Geography Specialty Group, and the Canada Research Chair in Global Environmental Histories and Geographies.

In this year’s Past Place, “From the field” showcases the fieldwork of Dr. Matthew Fockler (Geography, Augustana College) and his project, “Two-Mississippi: An Analysis of Social-Ecological Change on the Upper Mississippi River Since the 9-Foot Project.” Fockler applies micro level repeat photography and HGIS methodologies to explore environmental transformation nearly 80 years after the original photographs taken of the river. Over the last two winters, Fockler rephotographed over 500 photo points along the river between Muscatine, Iowa and Oquawka, Illinois, and established five main themes: inundation, shoreline accretion, shoreline recession, transformed human landscape, and transformed ecological landscape. These themes are showcased as a visual essay in this issue, and again highlight the role of historical geographer in examining environmental change from an interdisciplinary perspective.

The 2018 winner of the Andrew Hill Clark Award, Nick Lombarto (Geography & Planning, University of Toronto), also writes about his recent fieldwork, “Transforming Law and Space on the Waterfront: The Port of New York, 1870 – 1920.” His doctoral research interests fall broadly under the heading of urban and economic geography. In particular Lombarto is interested in the interplay between capital, technology, and the state, specifically in relation to large-scale infrastructure planning and land-use law. Empirically, his research focuses on New York City after the American Civil War, from 1865 until the Great Depression began, in 1929.

A new theme to Past Place is “Historical Geography and Interdisciplinarity,” which features the influence of historical geography to other fields of study such as climatology. This year Professor Cary Mock (Geography, University of South Carolina) reflects on the role of historical geographer Jeanne Kay-Guelke and historian Richard White on his work in historical climatology. His historical climatology interests, focused mostly within the last few hundred years, includes reconstructing extreme weather events such hurricanes and typhoons, snowstorms, and assessing historical impacts of climate on society. Geographically, his research covers most of North America but has also expanded internationally and includes East Asia, the Western Arctic, Bermuda, and Belize.

This year’s “Conference Reports” covers a selection of conferences of interest to historical geographers. Professor Graeme Wynn (Geography, University of British Columbia) contemplates on his role as President of the American Society for Environmental History (ASEH) and as a historical geographer within that field in his report “‘Environment, Power, & Justice” in California and Beyond.” Wynn highlights how “landscape” and “environment” are well-worn geographical watchwords, but how environmental historians are equally interested, if not more, in pushing historical research on the environment than geographers. “On the larger canvas of scholarship,” Wynn states, “the erosion of disciplinary boundaries has been marked so often in recent decades that one might legitimately doubt their legitimacy.”

Historical geographer, Dr. Maria Lane (Geography, University of New Mexico), writes about her experience at the 17th International Conference of Historical Geographers in Warsaw, which included an exciting program of historical geography topics ranging from historical geographies of science, border studies, cartography, urban and rural geography, and digital studies. Lane also highlights the lack of Indigenous scholars and research at the international conference, hoping this will change at the 18th ICHG 2021 in Rio de Janeiro in the conference’s first location in the Global South.

Dr. Katie Hemsworth (Geography, Nipissing University) reports on the “Challenging Canada 150 International Symposium hosted at Nipissing University, North Bay, Ontario, in “Challenging Canada 150: Settler
Colonialism and Critical Environmental Sciences,” which centered on how the humanities, environmental sciences, and Indigenous studies can come together and revisit how we examine past environments within the context of settler colonialism. The event brought together First Nations elders, community partners, and international scholars to enhance research and analytical skills by attending workshops about ethical research practices, building meaningful partnerships between universities, and First Nation communities, and how to safely share indigenous environmental knowledge with outside communities. Perhaps organizers of future historical geography and environmental history conferences can learn from the initiatives undertaken at a northern university in Canada.

Past Place ends with an announcement of Historical Geography and its new home with the University of Nebraska Press, the journal’s next issue (2018) on “Historical Critical Physical Geographies” and Craig Colten’s Distinguished Historical Geography Lecture, as well a number of exciting HGIS projects, and the HGSG student awards awarded in 2018. We look forward to seeing you in 2019!

LECTURE SERIES: HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY SPECIALTY GROUP (HGSG) DISTINGUISHED HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHER 2019

DISTINGUISHED HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHER 2019 | Georgina Endfield

Weather Heritage and Elemental Place Making

Weather knowledge, experience, and memory are necessarily situated. In as much as memory is spatially constituted and is attached to key ‘sites’, both physical and non-material, weather memory is also a function of and shapes place. Place plays a central role in influencing weather histories and memories while weather provides a frame of reference and contributes to the making and meaning of place. Recent work has focused on the importance of place-specific experiences of weather in shaping popular understanding of people’s perception of their local climate. There is also a growing body of scholarship linking relational context and weather memory, and on popular experiences of ‘ordinary’ weather, and how this shapes individual and collective sense of place. In this paper, however, I wish to explore the relationship between weather, heritage and place-making. I will investigate how weather has helped to shape – and continues to shape – understandings and representations of local heritage, and
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I will consider how weather histories, issues of inheritance, and legacies of weather knowledge, may have contributed to comprehension of place-specific cultural heritage, local identities, and changing articulations of place over time. Finally, I will make the case for how an understanding of this ‘weather heritage’ may serve society and communities at a time of uncertain weather futures.

My talk was based on a chapter of my forthcoming book, Practicing Development in the Jim Crow South, a version of which was published recently in the Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers (https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12231). The book documents how the US government’s interventions into the lives and livelihoods of African-American tenant farmers and sharecroppers living in the cotton belt of the US South in the first decades of the 20th century served as a key site in the genealogy of liberal forms of international development.

I began the talk querying why Thomas M. Campbell, the United States’ Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) field agent in charge of African-American extension work in the seven lower southern states, was chosen to co-direct (along with Jackson Davis, associate director of the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation and Margaret Wrong who worked with the International Missionary Council) a 1944 survey of educational and agricultural activities in West Africa. Thomas Campbell was certainly an unusual choice to co-direct this survey since he had no prior experience or expertise in regard to African education, missions, or resources – the intended goals of the trip – nor was he a prominent African-American educator, although he was an African American. Instead, what I showed is that Campbell was chosen for the survey because of his experiences and expertise in overseeing a different form of education, one that was developed by and dispensed through the USDA’s African-American extension service. Through archival documentation of the trip, including a series of related surveys that preceded it, and an interrogation of the book Africa Advancing that was written afterward, I documented the ways in which Campbell’s experiences directing biopolitical interventions within the racialized formation of the Jim Crow south positioned him as a potential postwar and colonial advisor.
US Bureau of Reclamations dam-building projects throughout the tricontinental world, and the Rockefeller Foundation’s green revolution in Mexico and later India. These scientific and economic modernization strategies that served as tools of the Cold War are certainly important sites for understanding the US’s later technological aid efforts through the 1960s and 1970s, but in my book I show how these forms of development are distinct from a counter-movement among the US political elites, an attitude to development that envisioned small-scale community-based improvements as key to development. And it is this approach that forms the basis of today’s liberal forms of development such as humanitarian aid and other self-help schemes.

My book also explores the ways in which improvement schemes are constituted within a racialized state. By this I mean that the negotiations and concessions that were practiced on a daily basis by Campbell and his co-workers bring to the fore the ways in which a state's biopower – a form of power garnered by safeguarding the health of a set population – is shaped by race. In Foucault’s formulation, biopolitics is inherently about race, a form of governance that gains its power through securing a population’s purity and safety within the context of an imagined, alien, raced, internal or external threat. Without doubt the Jim Crow South provides an illustrative case study of how state power was strengthened through creating improvement projects meant to lessen the threat of a potentially unruly Black population. The practices discussed in this book, however, take that analysis of biopower and race one step further by illustrating the multiple forms of biopower operating in a racialized state, and its limitations when it confronts the legal and disciplinary power of white supremacy. Even though the USDA’s extension service mandate was the same for its white and Black agents, I document in the book how USDA agents like Campbell devised various mechanisms and practices that differentiated the African-American extension service from its white counterpart because they understood the limitations of state biopower within the context of white supremacy. Campbell and his co-workers knew that Black rural improvement projects would only be allowed to succeed up to a point. The legal and disciplinary power of white supremacy contained efforts by the federal government to improve Black lives. I show how agents like Campbell, negotiating between these various powers, forged a path for themselves that they believed combined the USDA's extension service goals with their own goals of racial uplift. I then document how these practices became the model for the US government's liberal development schemes overseas, although the historical geographies of those practices and their rootedness in Black extension work has been largely forgotten.
DISCUSSANT COMMENTS | John Paul Catungal

It was an honour and pleasure to comment on Mona Domosh’s keynote presentation at the CAG/IGU 2018 conference in Quebec City. I have always admired Mona Domosh’s work – her 2001 *Putting Women in Place* (co-authored with Joni Seager) was a formative piece of scholarship for me during my undergraduate degree, as was her 2006 *American Commodities in an Age of Empire* during my early graduate years. In her CAG/IGU keynote presentation, drawn from a section of her forthcoming book, Domosh expands on key themes that have been important throughout her history of scholarship, among them the geographies of domesticity, and to consider linkages and mobilities between USDA interventions in the US South to joint US-UK agricultural and educational interventions in West Africa (see Domosh, 2018). Domosh makes clear that both are tied to biopolitical projects of normalization, which seek to emplace the liberal virtue of self-improvement among liberal subjects-in-training, which in her study includes both US Southern African-Americans and West Africans. Domosh traces the ways that the gospel of self-improvement spread through the pedagogical work of agents such as Thomas Campbell, which nicely illustrates the role of education as a racial and colonial technology of liberal subject formation.

With painstaking attention to detail and a keen eye to archival methodology, Domosh traces beautifully the ways that the USDA’s African-American self-improvements projects in the US South became starting points for US forays into the Global South in the form of international development. I especially admire Domosh’s incisive intersectional feminist analysis, which makes clear that the racial projects of these schemes work through the normalization of gender and sexuality. That is, Domosh argues convincingly that the training of racialized liberal subjects-to-be involved an education in ‘proper’ gender norms, calibrated as they were (and continue to be) to Western norms of domesticity as private property ownership, the nuclear family form and gendered divisions of labour in the home.

As I engaged Domosh’s work at the keynote presentation and in its print form, I could not help but think about the genealogies of the historical processes and phenomena that she traces. Sitting in so-called Quebec City on the traditional territories of the Huron-Wendat peoples, I was struck by parallels and linkages to settler colonial projects of improvement across Turtle Island. I was reminded of the work of Sarah de Leeuw (2007) and Evelen Nakano Glenn (2015), who argue that North American Indian residential schools were civilizational projects of self-improvement that sought to erase Indigeneity in part through imposing white Western markers of civilized subjectivity, among them ‘proper’ domesticity, onto Indigenous children. Bonita Lawrence (2003) and Deborah Miranda (2010) have also documented the imposition of Western gender and sexual norms as central to settler colonialism. Considered alongside these scholars and broader settler colonial studies scholarship, Domosh’s work forces us to reckon with the political and historical nexus between settler colonialism and international development and the multiple and shifting workings of power – sovereign, governmental, biopolitical – that they require.

In addition, I was also struck by how the gospel of self-improvement that Domosh centers in her analysis links to the humanitarian present, a clear ‘afterlife’ of the early development schemes that she analyzes. Tania Murray Li’s (2007) work on governmentalities of improvement and development in Indonesia comes to mind, given her similar concern with desires for biopolitical improvement at the scale of the population. In addition, Michelle Murphy’s (2013) analysis of the Girl...
Effect phenomenon in international development and humanitarianism captures similar investments in improving the lives of Global South subjects in training through pedagogical projects that inculcate in these subjects a desire for self-empowerment. It seems to me, then, that Domosh’s work could be read as part of a collective scholarly effort to trace both the longue durée and the expansive geography of development and improvement as racial, gender and sexual projects of liberal subject formation.

There is much more to be said about Mona Domosh’s work, but I want to end this short reflection with an appreciation for Mona Domosh and her achievements. Her keynote presentation at the CAG/IGU was a masterclass in engaging public speaking. I have deep admiration for the clarity of her prose: she presents her complex and astute argument in a way that invites her readers in. Above all, I appreciate that her work exemplifies her clear commitment to a feminist and critical race geography attuned to the intersectional politics of gender, race, sexuality and class. I look forward to see her develop her arguments even further once her book comes out!

Works cited:


As with all of her work, Dr. Domosh’s CAG-IGU presentation and the accompanying publication provided many provocative and valuable threads to follow. In my comments at the conference, I chose three, focusing on the material toward the end of her talk, and leaning on my own interest in the mid-century United States and its global presence.

First, this project helpfully draws connections between the early 20th-century context of the US South and the planetary horizons of mid-century US power. More could be made of these horizons, amid the concerns over ‘security’ that swirled around decolonization, global war, and planning for the postwar period. As David Nally and Steven Taylor wrote in a 2015 paper on the Rockefeller Foundation, by the time of Harry Truman’s 1949 Point 4 address, if not earlier, “philanthropic strategies” had begun to “dovetail with wider security imperatives.” In essence, biopolitics and geopolitics were entangled. As Domosh notes, the authors of *Africa Advancing* were aware of these matters of “stability”, vis-à-vis the uncertain future of (in their words) the “so-called backward and dependent peoples of the world.” We might tie this more directly with Rockefeller’s particular role in what Inderjeet Parmar has called the US’s “rise to globalism.” What if we treat the work underpinning *Africa Advancing* as, among other things, an effort to collect geographical knowledge – as a nascent form of mid-century area studies, that program funded so enthusiastically by Rockefeller and other philanthropies, which leaned so heavily on the extension, or analogization, of ideas developed in the US to cover other parts of the planet? All of this would shift and expand our approaches to the historical geographies of World War II and the Cold War – to move beyond or at least supplement the emphasis on strategic thinking and representations – mostly produced by a small set of white men (albeit some of them emigres and exiles) based in the United States.

Second, I hesitated over the distinction drawn by Dr. Domosh (more so in the published article) between the “large state-run projects of technoscience” and the “small is beautiful” approach more characteristic of “liberal development” discourses and projects. Without blurring the distinctions, it seems sensible, given that Domosh ends her paper with the crucial hinge of Truman’s Point 4 program, to also see various initiatives (and their intellectual and personal foundations) as part of the broad project of “modernization” tied to David Ekbladh’s “the Great American Mission”. Is the distinction just a matter of scale, or perhaps of intimacy? Or should we more forcefully distinguish different kinds of development interventions? Can we compare the educators of moveable schools to the engineers who worked “on the ground” to build high modernist dams?

Finally, I was intrigued by Thomas Campbell – not just as a choice for an “agent of the biopolitical”, but also as a biographical subject: one who talked back. For a start, Campbell, and the larger narrative of which he was a crucial part, sent Dr. Domosh to some archives that have not been used sufficiently by historical geographers. Campbell was a fascinating figure, with an extraordinarily difficult upbringing, whose life spanned the arc of Jim Crow. Two of his children were serving in World War II (one with the famed Tuskegee Airmen) while he was dispatched to Africa. Campbell is at the
centre of Domosh’s paper, and yet she wants to tell a broader story, to make a broader argument with him: what do we make of this relationship in the telling of historical geographies? Is there more to say about Thomas Campbell? Did he ever reflect on his role, or write anything more personal? As someone still moving more toward (and struggling with) the presence of biography in our histories – on the fullness and complexity and contradictions of lives – I am grateful for Domosh’s efforts in this direction, not least for the questions it prompted.7

2 Quoted in Mona Domosh, “Race, biopolitics and liberal development from the Jim Crow South to postwar Africa,” Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 43.2 (2018), 319.
4 Domosh, “Race, biopolitics, and liberal development,” 314.

FIELDWORK

FROM THE “FIELD” | Matthew Fockler

Two-Mississippi: An Analysis of Social-Ecological Change on the Upper Mississippi River Since the 9-Foot Project

The United States Army Corps of Engineers began its earnest attempts to maintain a navigable channel on the Upper Mississippi River in 1866. They accomplished this by dredging, snagging, and clearing overhanging trees and sunken vessels. It was immediately clear that if the Upper Mississippi was to become a predictable and reliable transportation route, dredging wasn’t enough. In 1878, Congress appropriated $350,000 to contract the channel by narrowing the river’s main stem with wing dams – rock piers that force water to a main channel – guaranteeing at least 4 1/2 feet of draught.

But there was a real problem. Below St. Louis, where the Missouri and Ohio rivers added their waters, the Army Corps could easily maintain a 9-foot channel. The discrepancy in channel depths meant that barge fleet operators ascending the river either had to use smaller boats for the entire length of the Mississippi, or they had to transfer to smaller boats at St. Louis. Either action cost time and money. Rather than reloading onto smaller crafts, many fleet operators chose to ship their cargo by rail. Riverfront towns and farmers felt the pinch and began lobbying Congress for waterway improvement. Proponents argued that a viable 9-foot-deep water route from the upper Midwest to the Gulf of Mexico would reduce rail rates and provide additional cargo capacity. It could link the upper Midwest with New Orleans and from there, the world.

By the late 1920s, the time was ripe for a federal reordering of the river. Engineer and presidential candidate Herbert Hoover called upon the Army Corps to flex its high-modernist muscle and create a systematic navigation system on
the Upper Mississippi. Boosters capitalized on the devastating 1927 Mississippi River flood and a near-decade-long farm crisis to bring the 9-foot project to pass. Great Depression New Deal funding provided the federal largesse.

And so, between 1930 and 1940, on the upper Mississippi River, from St. Paul, MN to just below St. Louis, the Army Corps constructed 23 lock and dam facilities. The 9-foot project converted 552 miles of mostly free flowing river to the “staircase of water” – a series of navigation pools that function as slack-water lakes. It fixed the main channel in its present location – no longer does the Mississippi wander through its flood plain.

In the months leading up to dam imposition, the Army Corps painstakingly photographed, mapped, and documented thousands of landscapes to be impacted by the 9-foot project. This archive consists of thousands of photos taken on the eve (sometimes literally) of the Upper Mississippi River’s largest manmade alteration. These maps and photos establish a visual benchmark of the social and ecological landscapes that existed in the Upper Mississippi watershed – a view into the Upper Mississippi’s past before its single greatest manmade transformation.

In Two-Mississippi: An Analysis of Social-Ecological Change on the Upper Mississippi River Since the 9-Foot Project, the author uses repeat photography and HGIS methodologies to explore this transformation. Traditional repeat photography often uses grand landscapes, a single shot, to tell a story. This research utilizes a process I’ve named “micro level repeat photography.” I use data from thousands of photos condensed within a relatively short distance to tell this story. I “mine” each photo for a dozen social and ecological conditions – including soil and ground cover, tree size and structure, inundation, and human land use. This data is entered into a GIS and allows me to visualize that benchmark. I then “reoccupy” the site and photograph the same scene – nearly 80 years after the original. These photos are similarly “mined” for data. When compared, patterns of landscape change emerge that we can use to assess ecological trajectories and support management.

Over the past two winters, I have rephotographed over 500 photo points in pools 17 and 18 – between Muscatine, IA and Oquawka, IL. In total, pools 17 and 18 constitute over 50 river miles. Five broad themes have emerged and are displayed in the following sample photo sets:

1. Inundation
2. Shoreline Accretion
3. Shoreline Recession
4. Transformed Human Landscape
5. Transformed Ecological Landscape

Fig. 1 Study area map of 9-foot project.
Inundation
A majority of landscapes on pools 17 and 18 show evidence of inundation. The roller dams that help maintain a 9-foot channel flood miles of Mississippi River shoreline. The Army Corps accepts inundation as a necessary side-effect of channel maintenance. In some portions of Pool 17, agencies control inundation throughplumbed landscapes that move and regulate water. Where possible, as shown in this photo set, the Army Corps has partnered with other management agencies to incorporate inundated landscapes into waterfowl habitat.

Shoreline Accretion
Shoreline accretion is a normal fluvial process. Suspended sediment settles in calmer water and adds to shoreline growth. However, accretion is magnified on the Upper Mississippi as the dams and other training structures slow the river. Beginning near the middle portion of each pool, this research has identified significant shoreline and island growth – creating new public land. The original photo shows a recreation cabin perched on the shoreline. A repeat photo taken 80 years later reveals that past shoreline is now a small slough pathway. The current shoreline is more than 500 meters distant.

Shoreline Recession
Erosion and shoreline recession are a major management concern for the Army Corps. As with accretion, shoreline recession is a part of the normal riverine process. Again, this process is accelerated by the 9-foot project. Inundation has created artificially high water levels and has weakened shorelines. High water levels exacerbate erosional processes thanks largely to nearly continual wave swash left in the wake of thousands of barges that move goods up and down the Mississippi. As evidence in this photo set, wave swash has eroded most of the shoreline away from this recreation cabin’s foundation. The original photo was taken fifteen feet from the shoreline. The repeat photograph had to be taken from our research boat.
Transformed Human Landscape
Inundation led to a loss of property, use, and industry. These photos become powerful descriptors of that change. The Army Corps, following eminent domain proceedings, burned most of the built and agricultural landscape in place. Occasionally, the original photos show people on the landscape. When I’m out taking the repeat photos, it is rare to see people at all. In fact, if you close your eyes to the plastics and other trash that accumulates on the shoreline, it is easy to imagine that this is the forest of Huckleberry Finn and that few people have ever walked across its landscape. This project, therefore, has the ability to resurrect what I call “ghosts on the landscape.” It offers an opportunity to know more about the people who lived on and used these landscapes.

Transformed Ecological Landscape
Clear ecological transitions are occurring as a result of the 9-foot project – especially in landscapes where human settlement disturbed the soil and the new flood regime opened up opportunities for ecological transformation. GIS analysis shows that there are two common outcomes for anthropogenically disturbed land within the 9-foot project boundaries. The first outcome is described by a very dense undergrowth and invasive species colonization. The most prevalent species are honeysuckle, multiflora rose, and kudzu.
The second outcome is described as a loss of forest diversity. I often find, especially in formerly agricultural landscapes, single species (predominantly silver maple) forests of similar size and age. They are beautiful to walk through in the fall – it’s like hiking through a golden tunnel. But they’re starkly quiet in the winter. There are no nut-bearing trees in these maple monocultures. It is rare to see any sign of bird or animal life here and the lack of undergrowth does not support cover for small mammals.

Conclusion
Micro level repeat photography, when mined and analyzed utilizing GIS, can provide a framework for understanding public land agency managed landscape change over time. Pairing photos does the work that all good historical geography does to “expose the process,” as Craig Colton suggested in his recent 2018 Distinguished Historical Geographer’s lecture. It gives us an opportunity to examine the social and ecological trajectory of managed land. I invite readers to see more of this project at www.two-mississippi.com. In the following weeks and months, this site will display photos, the accompanying GIS maps, and invite comment and participation from locals and Upper Mississippi public land users, both past and present. My hope is that in some way this returns public interest and knowledge to these public lands.

IN THE FIELD | Nick Lombardo

Transforming Law and Space on the Waterfront: The Port of New York, 1870 – 1920

I started my PhD by going through the online catalogues of archives, libraries, and special collections dealing with New York City’s history. The Port of New York, I thought, has been one of the most important sites of American economic, political, and social change for well over two centuries, so there should be a huge amount of material dealing with its history. Just one quick look was enough to let me know that my hunch was right, and that there was, if anything, too much material for me to go through if I had any hope of finishing my project!

The enormous amount of newspapers, manuscripts, and archival materials dealing with virtually every aspect of Manhattan’s waterfront forced me to narrow down my research topic. I settled on the years from roughly 1870 to 1920. These years were important for several reasons: economically, they included numerous business cycles and a significant recession, as well as the expansion of industrial capital around the world. Historically, this period is bracketed by the American Civil War and the First World War. Technologically, this was the age of rapid expansion of steamships and railway lines. Importantly for my research, 1870 was the year the Department of Docks was created, the first municipal body with the sole task of governing the waterfront. Fifty years later, the foundation of the Port
Authority of New York and New Jersey in 1920 would change the administration of the waterfront forever.

My research scope successfully narrowed down in time, I turned to its spatial boundaries. Examining the extensive waterfronts of New York’s five boroughs (Manhattan, the Bronx, Queens, Brooklyn, and Staten Island) would be far too much. Instead, I decided to focus on a small area of one borough: the West Side of Manhattan between the Battery and West 50th Street. This area, which I walked over a few hours one hot, humid afternoon after finishing up at the New York Historical Society, was, I thought, a manageable focus. Six weeks spent in archives in Manhattan, Brooklyn, Albany, Buffalo, and Philadelphia, where I took more than 7,000 images of over 1,000 individual documents, made me question that belief.

I examined official reports, documents, letters, legal briefings, and other materials. These documents were produced by clerks, lawyers, elected officials, engineers, property owners, and concerned citizens working for state agencies, private firms, and for themselves. While they dealt with issues ranging from the ideal location to take tidal borings to the best design of piers to disputes over pay, these documents reveal a common story: New York’s waterfront was an intense site of contestation, negotiation, and conflict over the shape of infrastructure and property.

What emerged from the historical record was a waterfront that was a deep site of conflict. In the colonial and early Republican Era, New York granted away much of its land to small holders who would later become big names in property speculation and rentier capitalism. Astors and Roosevelts abound in these early records, filling in their lands and leasing waterfront property to shippers, but also to fisher people, oyster farmers, rendering plants, and to a host of other non-transportation uses. By the 1870s, the result was a waterfront where railway lines and steamships could not find enough room to dock. While these land owners pulled in high rents, officials worried that a lack of berths would cause New York to lose its place as chief American port to places like Boston, or even Hoboken.

I began this research with (what I thought was) a fairly straightforward question: How did the Port of New York transform from a rather ramshackle collection of privately held wooden piers before the American Civil War to the world’s largest Port by the end of the First World War? I wanted to know how this had happened, who had made the necessary changes, and how it was related to wider
changes occurring in New York City, the United States, and around the world.
The archival documents, newspapers, and manuscripts that I encountered moved me to expand my dissertation focus beyond simply the how and why of waterfront change. What struck me during my first round of research was how important the issue of property law was to the waterfront, and to the creation of infrastructure for steamships and railway lines in Manhattan. Who owned the land, and what could owners do with waterfront land, was a question that reared its head in virtually every conversation between state and private actors alike. Land use too, and the ability of the state to control how lessees and owners of piers, wharves, and bulkheads on the waterfront, could use their riparian property, was a constant theme. In the end, this research has encompassed a host of questions about urban historical geography that will shed light on how planning, infrastructure, and property are related in cities.

The research and analysis I undertook for this project has been an immensely rewarding process. Though still in the process of writing up my dissertation, it is clear that I’ve only scratched the surface of New York’s waterfront. I began this project with a question about infrastructure and urban development. Even by expanding my question and going to unexpected theoretical and empirical concerns, I have left a great deal of material out of my story. My deep dives into the archives have convinced me that this is but the beginning of a much larger project.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HISTORY (ASEH), RIVERSIDE, CA
REPORT | By Graeme Wynn

“Environment, Power, & Justice” in California and Beyond

Historical geographers and environmental historians are often described as kindred spirits. Members of both groups point to common ancestors. Carl Sauer and George Perkins Marsh probably figure most frequently in such genealogies. Comparisons of the two subfields have suggested various forms of kinship between them. In the judgment of Australian historical geographer Joe Powell, environmental historians generally placed greater emphasis on storytelling than most members of his own guild but, he concluded in 1996, there was “little or nothing” beyond this to set the two endeavours apart. Seven years later, American environmental historian John McNeill suggested that the two disciplines shared “essentially the same” subject matter and that differences between them were “matters of style, nuance and technique.” A decade on, historian Marty Melosi acknowledged that historical geography and environmental history are related, but wondered whether this was by blood or marriage.

Deeper reflection tells us that degrees of consanguinity vary, and that even blood relatives are not always close. Some indeed may choose to emphasize differences from, rather than similarities with, those who share aspects of their heritage. “Those who ask geographic questions,” write Craig Colten and Lary Dilsaver in their recent preface to Yolanda Youngs and Geoffrey Buckley’s *The American Environment Revisited*, “provide insights that may not be obvious merely by taking a strictly historical perspective.” But this of course is also an argument for cross-fertilization or hybridity, and Youngs and Buckley were explicit in asking contributors to their volume to “read and include in their chapters literature from
both historical geography and environmental history.”

It was, perhaps, in this spirit, that the editors of Past Place asked me, an historical geographer, to offer some perspectives on the most recent conference of the American Society for Environmental History, of which I am currently President. Held in Riverside, California in mid-March 2018, this gathering attracted just over 600 registrants; its tightly-packed proceedings included 100 sessions, field excursions (surely once the sine qua non of a geographical sensibility), a sizeable poster display and a massive book exhibit. But using this gathering as a window through which to assess the ways in which history and geography contribute to understanding past environments is no simple task.

We might take the conference program as a source of reasonably-transparent empirical data about this question. But such evidence points to conflicting (or at least ambiguous) conclusions. On a triumphal note, we might read the program and echo Joseph Conrad and Felix Driver in discerning “geography militant.” Diana Davis, an historical political ecologist and card-carrying geographer currently employed in a department of History, chaired the program committee for the conference and helped define its theme: “Environment, Power, and Justice.” Juanita Sundberg, a contemporary political ecologist from UBC Geography, anchored a well-received plenary panel on “Imperial Technologies of Power, Border Walls and Desert Landscapes in the Western US Borderlands.” Yolanda Youngs was there, and Colten and Dilsaver appeared with Terence Young in a session on “The Power of Geographic Depictions in Environmental Management.”

From another perspective, though, geography seems almost imperceptible. Only two panels other than the one featuring Colten, Dilsaver, and Young used the word Geography in their titles (“Climate and the Geography of Slavery 1550-1860” and “Grounding Knowledge in Place: Earth Scientists and Surveyors, Fieldwork, and the Geography of Power”). Only three papers expressly referred to Geography in their titles, invoking embodied geographies, moral geography, and geographic perspectives. By my own subjective count (ASEH does not identify the disciplinary affiliation of conference participants), barely a dozen presenters (2.0 percent) beyond those mentioned above, were trained, or are employed, as geographers. Slightly smaller numbers with training in engineering, industrial ecology, and landscape architecture, also participated in the conference, making connections between their areas of expertise and environmental history.

But the purpose of Felix Driver’s book is to understand how geography functions as an idea as well as a practice. There were references aplenty in the conference program to topics commonly considered geographical. Titles focussed on landscapes; on mapping, digitizing, and surveying; and on “the environment.” Several presenters discussed transformations of, impacts on, and assessments of environments, and others engaged with various forms of environmentalism and their consequences. Indeed, as Robert Wilson noted in 2014, “much environmentally-oriented writing in … history …[focuses] on space, place, and landscape.” Reflecting this shift, ASEH’s 2018 conference in Riverside might be described as “inherently geographical.” Yet to characterize it in this way is to beg a large set of questions about the nature of contemporary geography.

Although “landscape” and “environment” are well-worn geographical watchwords, neither holds the place it once did in the geographical imagination. As “the environment” became a global phenomenon and the subject of rising public concern after World War II, the mainstream of human geographical inquiry turned away from the materiality of landscapes in favour of quantitative, behavioral, humanistic (idealistic) or cultural analyses that, variously, conceived of environments as isotropic planes and emphasized mind over matter. In this context, historical geography garnered somewhat grudging acceptance, and even enjoyed a few decades of spectacular florescence, but it was concerned, in the main, with patterns on the land, and paid curiously little attention to ecological questions. Although Carl Sauer and others who organized the “Man’s Role in Changing the Face of the Earth” symposium at
Princeton in the 1950s stoked the embers of G.P. Marsh’s *Man and Nature* (1864), North American geographers stirred little more than a pale glow of interest in human modifications of the physical environment through the last decades of the century. Late in the piece, self-styled political ecologists within geography began to address this imbalance, although most of their work was contemporary, located in the global south, and more explicitly theoretical than almost all historical geography. In broad, and all too stark terms, the final years of the second millennium were a dark time for historical studies of the environment in geography.

Two decades later, prospects are perhaps more propitious. Some critical resource geographers have brought time into their interrogations of resource “production.” Although the balance of work in political ecology has engaged questions of power and justice more forcefully than it has the biogeophysical environment, it mirrors the concerns of many environmental historians in recognizing the reciprocal nature of society-environment interactions. At the same time, environmental historians have much to say about questions of representation, which is of increasing concern to geographers as they relate to questions of cultural and natural identity and environmental politics. On the larger canvas of scholarship, the erosion of disciplinary boundaries has been marked so often in recent decades that one might legitimately doubt their legitimacy.

The great challenge of our times (as William Wyckoff frames it in the “Afterword” of *The American Environment Revisited*), is to figure out how we can “live in a crowded, resource-constrained world and do so in a more sustainable and equitable way.” This is a fundamentally geographical and environmental question, and historical studies that address it can provide useful “parables of both inspiration and folly” to help us move forward. Geographers whose inclinations point this way need to tell such stories, not to re-claim long-neglected disciplinary turf but because they are important. In taking this path they surely stand to gain from intellectual engagement, exchange, and even collaboration with like-minded scholars. ASEH conferences are terrific venues for such meetings of minds. Relatively manageable in size, relatively coherent in emphasis, and far less marked by a sense of hierarchy than many disciplinary conferences, they offer a welcoming forum for the sharing of ideas among people with a broad range of disciplinary backgrounds and intellectual commitments. As one young scholar, who took an MA in History before enrolling in a Geography PhD program, wrote me after the Riverside meeting: “[This] was a great conference – though I’ve come to expect as much….in my opinion it is definitely one of the better – scratch that – the best conference for us environmental/historical folk.”

Those interested in historical studies of the environment will find much of interest at ASEH’s 2019 conference in Columbus, Ohio (10-14 April) which will explore, among other things, the potential rewards and risks of historical scholarship that addresses critical issues rather than aiming to write history for history’s sake. There is even a field trip to the local brewery district.

Works cited:
Thomas, William L. Jr., *Man’s Role in Changing the Face of the Earth* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956)
Wynn, Graeme, Craig Colten, Robert M. Wilson, Martin V. Melosi, Mark Fiege, and Diana K. Davis, “Reflections on the American environment,” *Journal of Historical Geography* 43 (2014), 152-168
HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY AND INTERDISCIPLINARITY

REFLECTIONS ON JEANNE KAY-GUELKE AND RICHARD WHITE FROM A HISTORICAL CLIMATOLOGIST | By Cary Mock

I started my Masters program in Geography at the University of Utah in the Fall of 1987. At the time, my intent was to be a “traditional” physical geographer/climatologist with research interests in high resolution Quaternary paleoclimatology. I immediately got interested in historical climatology of the Intermountain Region because of the “high resolution” temporal resolution from historical documents, and being trained by Paul Kay (main advisor), Jeanne Kay-Guelke, and historian Richard White. The latter two gave me the initial important historical training by which I was able to develop my historical climatology research for many years to come, and to broaden out to the social science and humanities aspects.

Jeanne possessed one of the broadest and most informative interdisciplinary minds in geography that I have ever known. In addition to her knowing the common themes from several historical geography schools such as the Carl Sauer, Andrew Clark, and Donald Meinig traditions, and typical historical methods/archival approaches, she was very thoughtful on how to cover themes in which both human and physical geography intersected with one another. Jeanne was always very encouraging in training students, she often challenged them to learn individually as well, and always had invaluable advice ranging from how to write papers for publication, for popular reading, to various aspects of professional development. She could converse on many topics, ranging from tree-rings and climate, to Mormon archives, ideas on environmentalism, biogeography, geographic writing, and to recent geographic developments.

I was extremely fortunate and lucky to have Richard White on my masters committee, which came initially through Jeanne’s suggestion. Richard’s historical training and influences on my career became more prominent years later, particularly after my PhD at the University of Oregon when I ventured into newer directions in historical climatology. Richard trained a then mostly “quantitatively minded physical geographer” on what serious environmental history and historical methods were all about. He was extremely challenging on 1-on-1 conversations, as he would give you a lot of things to think deeply about and caused me to do my “homework” to get ready for the next conversation. Richard introduced to me numerous ways on how different environmental historians approach their work, and particularly influenced me on focusing with themes of a historian versus a historical geographer. Since the late 1990s, I have mostly conducted research in historical climatology, and I routinely consult with historians on advice and invaluable information, always using the training and ideas that Richard taught me. This includes continued academic connections with former Richard White students and postdocs (e.g., Tom Lekan, Jon Christensen, and Emily Brock), but I have also ventured to outside academic connections with other historians (e.g., Eleonora Rohland, Jim Tuten, and Ann Johnson) thanks to what I learned from Richard.

Academically, historians take different paths to achieve career success as compared to most geographers, thus I have seen very few serious broad historical climatology collaborations between historians, historical geographers, and climatologists. It
A REPORT ON THE 17TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHERS, WARSAW | By Maria Lane, Department of Geography & Environmental Studies, University of New Mexico

Just two hours after France sealed victory in the 21st FIFA World Cup by dispatching Croatia in Moscow, another exciting international event kicked off 1200 kilometers to the west. As clouds of swifts darkened the sky over the old market square, the 17th International Conference of Historical Geographers opened just as sunset fell in Warsaw. Delegates from 39 countries squeezed into the Polish Academy of Sciences’ Institute of History to hear an inaugural plenary by Felix Driver (Royal Holloway) that set the tone for a productive and enjoyable week. Like the World Cup, ICHG 2018 was filled with talent, drama, and goodwill. Unlike the World Cup, no one was sent home after the group stages, and hooliganism was kept to a minimum.

Over the course of one packed week – 15-20 July 2018 – ICHG delegates attended 106 sessions and 4 plenary lectures that spanned an impressive spectrum of historical geography topics. The plenary lectures alone, for example, ranged far and wide across methodological, theoretical, and topical ground. Following Driver’s Sunday plenary on “Biography and Geography,” Karen Morin (Bucknell) presented Monday on the historical carceral geography of “Prisoners and Animals,” Humphrey Southall (Portsmouth) presented Tuesday on strategies for “Web-Enabling Historical Geography,” and Diogo de Carvalho Cabral (Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics) provided Thursday’s plenary on “Alphabetic Literacy and Socio-Environmental Change in Early Brazil.”

The overall program was similarly varied, with delegates able to choose from up to 10 concurrent sessions in each time slot. Many of historical geography’s disciplinary strengths featured prominently – e.g. studies of knowledge, science, narrative, cartography, religion, landscape, borders, and urban or rural settlements – but the conference was also rich in sessions that explored newer topics. A number of sessions focused on climate, for instance, and compelling sessions and papers throughout the week delved into digital methods, crowdsourced historical geography, migration, mobility, conflict, academic networks, protest and dissent, architecture, and even socionatures.
welcome and exceptional nourishment throughout the week. The morning and afternoon coffee breaks were almost meals in themselves, while the lunches provided a showcase of Polish culinary delights.

Around town, delegates could frequently be seen after hours exploring the local restaurants and taking in the sights of downtown Warsaw. Wednesday was reserved for field trips, as per usual, and many delegates took advantage of the opportunity to more deeply explore Warsaw’s urban history or Jewish history, or the broader industrial and religious histories of Poland beyond the capital city. Those who did not participate in the conference field trips found no shortage of museums and attractions to explore, including lengthy bike trails along the Vistula River and its famously unimproved right bank.

Overall, ICHG 2018 was a wonderful follow-on from the 2015 meeting in London. Whereas the London meeting was focused on placing historical geography – as a discipline, conference, and journal – in relation to its past, the Warsaw installment was a distinctly forward-looking meeting. London had featured a record-breaking number of delegates jointly ruminating on the 40th anniversary of JHG’s launch and the inaugural 1975 Kingston meeting, and no one expected the Warsaw meeting to draw the same crowds. The 2018 meeting was nonetheless very well attended, and it has the added distinction of making a ground-breaking decision: to hold the 18th ICHG in Latin America for the first time, where it will be supported by a coalition of Brazilian academic and research institutions.

And so to conclude with what I consider the most important legacies of the 17th ICHG. First, when delegates endorsed the proposal to hold ICHG 2021 in Rio de Janeiro, they conveyed strong enthusiasm for going beyond historical geography’s traditional spheres to engage with scholars and institutions that have long been marginalized. I expect that this first-ever designation of an ICHG venue in the Global South will enable meaningful change in the composition of future delegations, to include more scholars of color and indigenous scholars. Such change will of course influence not only the conference itself but also the norms of journal authorship and editorship, supporting broader change across the subdiscipline.

Second, other issues raised at the same business meeting pointed toward additional steps for improving the diversity and vitality of our scholarly community. At a logistical level, delegates considered the possibility of conducting future conferences in multiple languages to better accommodate and encourage participation from non-English-speaking scholars. Although this idea was not developed in detail, delegates acknowledged that other conferences have used successful models, including the Conference of Latin Americanist Geographers, which boasts a small “crossover” contingent that attends both CLAG and ICHG. At a moral level, delegates considered the need for a formal statement setting guidelines and expectations for preventing sexual harassment and handling any cases that may arise in the context of ICHG meetings. Again, delegates noted that other conferences have successfully developed such statements, and the group encouraged ICHG to study such models and develop a formal statement protecting conference attendees’ rights. Steps like these are crucial to making ICHG a welcoming place for talented scholars from new regions and new generations. Without these additions, our subdiscipline would be looking at a bleak intellectual future, and I applaud the delegates who acknowledged this reality.

After this important business meeting on Thursday night, delegates decamped to the gala dinner at “Villa Foksal” restaurant, where conversations continued late into the night as delegates enjoyed both the fare and the company. Friday featured a few last sessions and a small closing ceremony before delegates traveled on to Kraków for the post-conference field trip or to other destinations in Europe or back home.

In the end, the conference ended with zero red cards, no charges of match-fixing, and no fighting in the pubs outside the venue (as far as we know). It was simply a lovely opportunity to meet new people, hear new ideas, and face new challenges with a fresh approach.
Reflection – Challenging Canada 150: Settler Colonialism and Critical Environmental Sciences

In October 2017, Nipissing University’s Dr. Kirsten Greer and Dr. April James co-hosted Challenging Canada 150: Settler Colonialism and Critical Environmental Sciences, a critical response to national celebrations of the 150th anniversary of Canada as a nation (“Canada 150”). The five-day event took place at various locations on the traditional lands of the Nibiising Anishinaabeg and the area currently known as North Bay, Ontario, on Robinson-Huron Treaty territory of 1850. The symposium – an outcome of a SSHRC Connection Grant (with co-applicant Alan Lester, University of Sussex) – brought together a host of Indigenous knowledge holders and scholars from across Turtle Island (North America) and the UK.

The symposium sought ways to bring together the humanities and geophysical sciences with Indigenous knowledges to revisit how we examine past, present, and future environments within the context of settler colonialism. Guided in large part by Indigenous research and teaching principles, meeting places were rearranged to accommodate the organizers’ goals of co-constituted knowledge, relationship building, and place-based education. Presentation and keynote topics ranged from human-plant-animal relationships to toxic legacies of the state to sonic geographies of environmental change.

Teachings, blessings, and songs connected guests with each other and the surrounding land, including frequent references to nearby Lake Nipissing. Indeed, water featured prominently throughout the week, starting with elder Lorraine Whiteduck Liberty’s water teaching in the Thomson Room at Nipissing University’s Library and extending into Nipissing Nation Chief Scott McLeod’s evening keynote about treaty agreements made and broken in relation to the Lake Nipissing fishery. The lake also provided a reflective backdrop for the second day at North Bay Museum, with elder John Sawyer sharing stories about the lake after an outdoor smudging ceremony. The theme of water flowed through our conversations right up to the final day, with international accounts of Onondaga Lake pollution (Bob Wilson), watershed histories in the Truckee-Tahoe Basin (Adam Csank), and water management in territorial-era New Mexico (Maria Lane).
Historical geographer Alan Lester delivered the symposium’s first keynote talk, offering a strong theoretical foundation for thinking through the relationship between settler colonialism, scientific knowledges, and archives. Other thought-provoking keynotes given throughout the week focused on traditional ecological knowledge and storytelling (Deborah McGregor, CRC in Indigenous Environmental Justice at York University), navigating Hudson Bay Company records (Frank Tough, University of Alberta), territorial jurisdiction and human-animal relationships (Paul Nadasdy, Cornell University), and preserving and revitalizing Aboriginal environmental knowledge (Wendy Makoons Geniusz, Bear Clan; University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire).

Historical engagement with place necessitated guidance on treaty relationships, including the Robinson Huron Treaty of 1850 and the 1764 Treaty of Niagara. Maurice Switzer (Bnesi, of the Mississaugas of Alderville), alongside treaty historian Catherine Murton Stoehr, took up this task of grounding discussions in the treaties’ historical content, rights and responsibilities, many of which have been silenced and broken over time. Switzer shared teachings through wampum belts and other cultural artifacts, adding a material element that further animated the learning space and left openings for thinking about modern wampum-based agreements. Each day also featured workshops spanning oral histories, archival methods, Indigenous research agreements, knowledge constellations, and revitalization of ancestral knowledges.

At the halfway point of the symposium, participants had the opportunity to showcase their athletic prowess at The Big Soccer Game. Both teams – featuring international ringers including Maria Lane, Simon Naylor, Alan Lester, Bob Wilson, and Paul Nadasdy – played with a competitive yet respectful spirit (even Kirsten “Elbows” Greer kept those elbows tucked!). The game ended with graduate students Keithen Sutherland and Trycia Bazinet receiving MVP accolades.

My favourite day began with an early morning drive around Lake Nipissing and along the French River to Dokis First Nation. Randy Restoule (Aboriginal Consultation Coordinator) took on the enormous task of hosting, organizing, and presenting at the day-long event. Along with an elders’ welcome and a visit from Chief Gerry Duquette, participants appreciated welcome songs performed in Anishinaabemowin by school children who visited from down the hall. The multi-layered use of the community space was also a reminder of the intergenerational effects of the issues addressed throughout the symposium. Norm and Clayton Dokis led participants on a medicine walk through the nearby woods, sharing stories and medicinal uses for plants in the area and sparking discussions about human-plant relations. Cindy Peltier, Anishinaabe-kwe and Chair in Indigenous Education at Nipissing University, closed the day with a circle reflection.
As a sonic geographer, I was drawn to the symposium’s attentiveness to multi-sensory approaches. Wendy Makoons Geniusz encouraged opening lines of communication between people and other beings through the revitalization of oral/aural tradition. The song she shared about Nookimis Giizhik (Grandmother Cedar, *Thuja occidentalis*) still flutters through my mind over a year later. Laura Cameron also reflected that the careful pace and tone set throughout the symposium was important for finding common ground, establishing trust, and building relationships. Decolonization takes time — to unlearn and reimagine. Yet the symposium had other rhythmic elements beyond its careful pace; many of the topics discussed, including anthropocentric climate change and water crises in Indigenous communities, invoked an underlying sense of urgency and require immediate action. There is much work to do — in the past, present, and future.

The next opportunity for “Symposium 2.0” will be in March 2020 in Ottawa, in conjunction with the American Society of Environmental History conference. ASEH 2020 will be co-hosted by Nipissing University’s Kirsten Greer and Ingenium’s William Knight, under the fitting theme, “Reparative Environmental Histories.”

I’m grateful to Kirsten Greer and April James of Nipissing University, Alan Lester of University of Sussex, and Randy Restoule of Dokis First Nation, for putting together a funding proposal that enabled this impactful gathering, and to Catherine Murton Stoehr, Sabrina Morrison, and Emily Fachnie for their many contributions. Thanks also to the Nipissing MES/MSc students who helped behind the scenes and to the Nipissing and Dokis First Nation community members and leaders who so generously shared knowledges, resources, and land. Chi-miigwetch!
**HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY**

**HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY EDITOR’S PERSPECTIVE | By Arn Keeling**

*Historical Geography is on the move!*

*Historical Geography* 46 (2018) will be published, with some slight delay, in the coming months. This volume is particularly notable as it is our first published as a University of Nebraska Press journal. It has been a challenging but exciting year as we work out our new relationship and explore the new platform with Nebraska. We look forward to growing the journal alongside the press over the coming years. As usual, AAG Historical Geography Specialty Group members will continue to enjoy full subscription access to both the current issue and the archives of the journal on the new platform.

Volume 46 features material from both old and new friends in historical geography. We present first the text of Craig Colten’s 2018 Distinguished Historical Geographer lecture, as delivered at the American Association of Geographers annual conference in New Orleans, the city he has so passionately studied for many years. Craig is a former editor and long-time supporter of this journal, so it is a particular pleasure to feature his reflections on decades of “practicing historical geography.” This lecture text is followed by an engaging special issue exploring “Historical Critical Physical Geographies,” edited by Kirsten Greer, Adam Csank, and Katie Hemsworth. This suite of papers and commentaries explores efforts to combine methods and analysis from “traditional” archive-based historical geography and those employed by physical geographers to reconstruct past environmental changes. The result is a thoughtful and diverse set of studies, ranging from the 20th century Caribbean to late-medieval Italy, that further advance the discussion of how to best integrate human and physical methods in geography.

In addition to regular research articles and book reviews, this issue also includes an insightful conference report on the International Conference of Historical Geographers, held in Warsaw, Poland, in 2018. We are also pleased to present a new feature, courtesy of co-editor Michael Wise: an interview forum with leading thinkers working at the intersection of historical geography and the emerging interdisciplinary field of Critical Indigenous Studies. In the forum interviews, readers will find rich reflections by authors of prominent new work in Indigenous Studies (and probably add to their own reading lists in the process!). This volume is rounded off with our extensive book review section, ably compiled and edited by John T. Bauer.

---

**HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHIES ON THE WEB**

The Historical Geography Specialty Group (HGSG) of the American Association of Geographers (AAG) offered a session at the New Orleans conference to provide a forum for historical geographers who present their research on the World Wide Web (WWW). Technological changes over the past decade have increasingly facilitated the publication and integration of interactive Web maps, text, photographs, audio, and video files on the WWW. Additionally, university presses are experimenting with these types of digital alternatives to the traditional academic monograph. The *Journal of Historical Geography*, for example, now publishes Web maps in its articles. As well, a growing number of historical geographers are experimenting with interactive projects through Web browsers. The following are a selection of abstracts the HGSG received from the session’s presenters.
THE ODYSSEY, FROM MYTH TO PHOTOGRAPHY  |  Estelle Sohier, with Raphael Pieroni

“The Odyssey, from Myth to Photography” is an interdisciplinary research project carried on at the Department of Geography of the University of Geneva. The recent discovery of an unpublished body of archives has allowed a reconsideration of the history and significance of a photographic mission undertaken by the French translator of Homer and Professor of geography, Victor Bérard, and the Geneva photographer Fred Boissonnas “on the trail of Ulysses”. Both set out on a months-long journey across the Mediterranean in 1912 to prove that the Homeric poems were not merely fiction, but could be read as a faithful description of the Mediterranean at time of the Phoenicians. The Odyssey was thus considered a veritable “geographic document.” This hypothesis, since refuted, provoked admiration, debate, and controversy up until recent times. The research project has several objectives: it seeks to reconsider the artistic, scientific and political scope and nature of the photographic project. More broadly, their endeavor offers a novel and remarkable case study for examining the notions of a geographic imaginary (Mediterranean imaginaries, colonial imaginaries), the scientific application of photography, the history of geography and its methods for interpreting landscapes, and finally the possible forms of interconnection between geography and fiction. By availing of recent technologies in digital imaging and GIS, and drawing on their spectacular possibilities, we have created a website to convey the photographic archive to a wide public, while experimenting in scientific communication.  


PROTOTYPE WEBSITE OF COLONIAL GRANTS FOR SPANISH LOUISIANA  |  Andrew Sluyter

This prototype website geographically locates eleven documents held by the LSU Libraries Special Collections that relate to the surveying of colonial land grants dating to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century in what is now the state of Louisiana. The ultimate goal is to locate all of the thousands of such land grants that survive in order to use their unique data for analyses that range from personal genealogical research to helping historical social scientists and humanists understand environmental and social patterns and processes. Each document consists of a map showing the land granted and text describing it, comprising not only boundary information but artistic renditions of landscape elements such as vegetation, water bodies, and land uses as well as the ethnic and genealogical information inherent in documents about named individuals. No other set of documents

https://sites.google.com/site/louisianacoloniallandgrants/home

provides such a comprehensive overview of the patterns of land and life of this part of North America on the eve of its integration into the territory of the United States of America.
RECONFIGURING THE “REGION” USING QUALITATIVE GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (QGIS) | Kirsten Greer & Megan Prescott

This prototype examines the value of small-scale, qualitative field data in contribution to the overall understanding of “region” through the use of web-based geographic information systems (GIS). A case study of Nipissing University’s Centre for Understanding Semi-Peripheries’ (CUSB) project “Reconfiguring the Region” is presented, which examines Robert Swanton Platt’s research trajectory in Northern Ontario based on his 1934 field excursion from Moosonee to Toronto. Platt shaped the subfield of regional geography as an advocate for the intensive field study of small-scale geographical areas to support large-scale regional generalizations. Field notes, as well as photographs of the 1934 excursion housed at the American Geographical Society Library (AGSL), are geotagged and overlain with contemporary satellite imagery to visualize a transect of the case study using the platforms of ESRI’s Web App Builder and Story Maps. The advantage of web-based GIS is to incorporate qualitative data (photographs, field notes, postcards) in visualization that supports broader theoretical generalizations on the interrelation of landforms and human occupancy, through a medium that fosters easy dissemination, data exploration, and user-software interaction. Platt’s past research trajectories and personal history are additionally integrated into the prototype, which allows users to explore the development of his field approach to regions alongside the detailed example of his 1934 case study in Northern Ontario. The ability of interactive, qualitative GIS to incorporate spatial data and narratives is used to achieve greater depth than quantitative GIS or written medium alone, supporting large-scale generalizations with detailed components much like Platt’s own “Field Approach to Regions”.

https://cusp.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=6475de8ff85a4c7b9a2b4be500d99605
HGSG AWARDS

Historical Geography Specialty Group Student Awards

Carville Earle Student Research Award (For PhD Students)
The Carville Earle Award ($400) recognizes research at the PhD-level. To apply, students must submit a two-page research proposal that gives their research question and explains how archival work and/or fieldwork is necessary to complete their project. The research proposal must also specify the archives and/or the field research site that will be utilized. A budget of estimated expenses and a letter of support from the student’s major advisor must accompany the research proposal. The award may be used for travel or other related research expenses. This award is only open to student members of the Historical Geography Specialty Group.

The Invisible Ecologies of Brazilian Forest Legislation (1850-2018)
| Chris Lesser

Chris Lesser’s research project, “The Invisible Ecologies of Brazilian Forest Legislation (1850-2018),” reconsiders the ecological geography of Brazil’s Paraiba Valley, where large plantations co-existed with small subsistence farms in the 19th century. This is where Brazil’s first environmental legislation was established, and where recent studies of land cover change have revealed new forest growth. Chris’s research addresses two related questions: Why did forest conservation practices emerge in this region in the 19th century?; and How has subsequent forest regrowth taken place? Chris will interview farmers, conduct searches in several archives, collect soil samples, and undertake dendrochronological analysis of trees to reveal the discursive production of conservation science through institutions established by planters; and the correlations between historic land uses and present-day ecological patterns of forest regrowth which environmental legislation has rendered invisible.

Andrew Hill Clark Student Paper Award (For PhD students)
The Andrew Hill Clark Award is given for papers written at the PhD-level. Each award carries with it a $150 first prize. Second prizes of lesser amounts are given at the discretion of the competition judges. Preference is given to papers based on primary sources of information rather than literature reviews. For the 2018 award, papers must have been presented at any professional conference in the period of time beginning the day after the 2017 AAG Annual Meeting and ending the last day of the 2018 AAG Annual Meeting. Students must be members of the Historical Geography Specialty Group to be eligible for this competition.

Reading High Modernism and Embodied Experience in Hugo Eck’s Bozeman Deaconess Hospital
| Robert Briwa

Architecture is a referent for human experiences that reveals wider ideological contexts; the power of individual human agency; and insights into embodied practices, performances, and experiences. Designed by Montana State College architects Fred Willson and Hugo Eck, former Bozeman Deaconess Hospital’s architecture materializes Bozeman’s ideological pulse and the hospital architects’ lived, embodied experiences. I scrutinize the latter by examining Hugo Eck’s life experiences via archival research. I then draw from nonrepresentational theory and its foci on embodiment and performance to argue that these formative, embodied moments in Eck’s life informed his design and renovations of Bozeman Deaconess Hospital. I support this argument by analyzing Eck’s architectural drawings in conjunction with site visits to suggest that Eck’s experiences persist, phantom-like, in the spatial and material form of the hospital’s architecture.
Eck’s experiences—those of an innovative architect who was embedded in a modernist ideological paradigm and who experienced firsthand the trauma of mid-century healthcare—are manifest in Eck’s hospital renovations and design. Eck incorporated new medical technologies, materials, and modernist ideologies, reflecting his position as an architect trained during the zenith of modernist thought. His experiences as a hospital patient, meanwhile, informed his streamlining of hospital healthcare achieved through designing unobstructed pathways from admittance, to care, to after care. Eck’s efforts made the illegible dramas of healthcare practices formulaic in their resolution. In Bozeman Deaconess Hospital’s material structure and spatial design, Eck’s experiences linger and persist, testament to the roles individuals play in shaping cultural landscapes in enduring ways.

The research proposal must also specify the archives and/or the field research site that will be utilized. A budget of estimated expenses and a letter of support from the student’s major advisor must accompany the research proposal. The award may be used for travel or other related research expenses. This award is only open to student members of the Historical Geography Specialty Group.

**Family or Bureaucratic Traplines?: The Registered Trapline System as a Tool of Colonialism in James Bay**

| Keithen Sutherland |

Keithen Sutherland’s research project, “Family or Bureaucratic Traplines?: The Registered Trapline System as a Tool of Colonialism in James Bay,” will examine traditional and colonial governmental traplines in the Muskegowuk, Cree territory, Northern Ontario. The nomadic illiluwok people of James Bay have existed with this land for trapping, hunting, and spiritual purposes since time immemorial. The illiluwok have their own way of establishing traplines that follows the seasonal migration of animals. Ontario’s Ministry of Natural Resources imposed a colonial trapline system in the 1970s. It is a grid system that has proved to work in much the same way as the reservation system did to keep Indigenous people on reservations. Keithan asks, How did these imposed traplines impact the illilu way of life?; and Were there conflicts between families about the imposed traplines? Keithen’s project is interdisciplinary and draws on methodologies in Indigenous studies, history, and geography. An Indigenous language speaker of the region, and a trapper and hunter, Keithen will collaborate with Elders of the Kashechewan community to develop this research project. He will collect oral histories and will also access archival materials (maps, photographs, and correspondence) from the Ontario Archives.

**Ralph Brown Student Paper Award (For Masters Students)**

The Ralph Brown Award is given for papers written at the Masters-level. Each award carries with it a $150 first prize, but second prizes of lesser amounts may be given at the discretion of the competition judges. As with the Arthur Hill Clark Award for PhD-level papers, preference is given to papers based on primary sources of information rather than literature reviews. For the 2018 award, papers must have been presented at any professional conference in the period of time beginning the day after the 2017 AAG Annual Meeting and ending the last day of the 2018 AAG Annual Meeting. Students must be members of the Historical Geography Specialty Group to be eligible for this competition.
Who Gets to Draw the Neighborhood? Google, Airbnb, and Reproducing "The 73" | Ian Spangler

When it comes to digital spatial media like Google and Airbnb, software developers must make decisions about how to represent neighborhood boundaries. Those choices, however, have myriad implications for the actual places to which they refer. In this paper, I argue that neighborhood names and boundaries have cultural and economic value; as such, the task of representing (in digital spatial media) and re-presenting (to locals and tourists) those names and boundaries is problematic when limited to organizations deemed “authoritative.” I first use strategies of critical historical GIS to analyze how neighborhoods in New Orleans were produced and their boundaries ossified through various mechanisms of urban planning (Campanella 2014a). Then, I reprise critiques of GIS through the 1990’s and beyond (Schuurman 2000, Kwan 2002) to challenge the authority of the official neighborhood boundaries that circulate in digital media like Google Maps and Airbnb. Finally, drawing on the Treme neighborhood as an example, I describe how the production of a dominant neighborhood shapefile operates as a technique of “securitization,” defined by Crampton as “the efforts made to anchor, control, and discipline” our ways of knowing geographically (Crampton 2010, 5). In contrast to Haraway’s call for a “politics of engaged, accountable positioning” in knowledge production, such securitization works to re-inscribe a top-down spatial epistemology of New Orleans via Airbnb’s web application (Haraway 1988, 590).

Works cited:
Crampton, Jeremy. 2010. Mapping: A Critical Introduction to Cartography and GIS.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

2019 American Association of Geographers (AAG) Historical Geography Specialty Group (HGSG) Research Proposal Award and Student Paper Award Competitions

HGSG Student Research Award
Student members of the American Association of Geographers (AAG) are invited to submit research proposals for the Historical Geography Specialty Group (HGSG) Student Research Awards. The specialty group will award two prizes in 2019. The Carville Earle Award ($400) recognizes research at the PhD-level, and the Terry G. Jordan-Bychkov Award ($200) recognizes research at the Masters-level. To apply for either award, students must submit a two page research proposal that gives their research question and also explains how archival work and/or fieldwork is necessary to complete their project. The proposal must also specify the archives and/or field research site that will be utilized. A budget of estimated expenses and a letter of support from their major advisor must accompany the proposal. The award may be used for travel or other related research expenses. Students must be members of the AAG to be eligible for this competition. Students must submit their two...
page research proposal, with budget and letter of support, by March 25, 2019, to the following two competition judges: Dr. Dean Bond, Geography, Loughborough University (D.W.Bond@lboro.ac.uk) and Dr. Margôt Maddison-MacFadyen, Geography and History, Nipissing University (margotm@nipissingu.ca).

HGSG Paper Award

The Historical Geography Specialty Group (HGSG) will sponsor two student paper award competitions in 2019. The **Andrew Hill Clark Award** ($150) is given for a paper written at the PhD-level, and the **Ralph Brown Award** ($150) is given for a paper written at the Masters- or undergraduate-levels. Second prizes may be awarded at the discretion of the competition judges. Preference is given to papers based on primary sources of information rather than on literature reviews. For the 2019 awards, the papers must have been presented at any professional conference in the period of time beginning the day after the 2018 American Association of Geographers (AAG) Annual Meeting and ending the last day of the 2019 AAG Annual Meeting. Students must be members of the AAG to be eligible for this competition, but they do not need to be members of the HGSG. Students must send their paper of no more than eleven double-spaced pages (plus notes, figures, etc.) by email in MS Word or PDF format to each of the following two competition judges: Dr. Samuel Otterstrom, Geography, Brigham Young University (Sam_otterstrom@byu.edu) and Dr. Matthew Fockler, Augustana College (matthewfockler@augustana.edu). The submission deadline is March 25, 2019.