The Klaus Tschira Foundation has supported the series of symposia entitled “Knowledge and Space” for more than a decade now, resulting in 17 events and 11 published volumes so far, with the last two, “Ethnic and Cultural Dimensions of Knowledge” and “Knowledge and Action”, already reviewed in this journal previously (ILLÉS, T. 2016; SÁGI, M. 2017). The tenth such symposium was held at the Studio Villa Bosch in Heidelberg under the title “Spatial Mobility of Knowledge” between 15–18 September 2010 (MEUSBURGER, P. 2010), with the participants’ submitted essays published in the volume “Mobilities of Knowledge” 6 years later. Despite the fact that half a decade has passed since then, the topics covered at the symposium are still relevant today, also for readers in Central and Eastern Europe, especially in the light of increasing interdisciplinary cooperation between researchers from Western, Central and Eastern Europe. Still, the majority of the contributors in this volume are from the British academia, without anybody from universities in countries once belonging to the Eastern Bloc.

The introduction written by the editors Heike JÖNS, Michael HEFFERNAN and Peter MEUSBURGER sets out a conceptual framework to the following essays and provides a readily intelligible introduction to the main ideas around the entanglement of the geographies of knowledge and mobility studies (which in itself is a notable achievement). The authors wish to examine “the role of geographical mobilities in the production and circulation of knowledge in different historical and geographical contexts” (p. 2).

After BÄHR, J. (2010), the authors define mobility much more condensed than it is usual in mobility studies, merely as “an entity’s change of position in a specific system” (p. 2). Yet, reading the essays reveals that the reason behind such a simplistic interpretation was to escape unnecessary conceptual boundaries instead of circumventing the problem. The editors refer to an expanded version of John Urry’s (2007) “five interdependent mobilities” (p. 47), including corporeal travel of people, physical movement of objects, imaginative travel, communicative travel, virtual travel, and knowledge transfer as a newly added category correcting Urry’s neglect of the topic. These are each represented in the case studies of the volume. The introduction of knowledge transfer as a new category also symbolises the authors’ critical reading of the “novelty claims and hyperbole of the ‘new paradigm’ language” (p. 4), and also that they emphasise and acknowledge the long-existing lines of enquiry (like Manuel CASTELLS’, 1996, concept of the space of places), the importance of which is often underestimated in the literature in favour of the more dramatic narrative of the ‘turn’.

Knowledge, the second concept mentioned in the title of the volume, receives a more familiar treatment, as it is the core idea behind the book series. Following the work of STEHN, N. (1994), the authors adopt the interpretation of knowledge “as a capacity for social action” (p. 95), which in turn can relate to both codified (explicit) and tacit (implicit) forms of knowledge. This binary is critically dissected by MEUSBURGER later in his chapter, but even in the introduction the editors point out that four different types of knowledge (secret, tacit, codified and widely available) should be differentiated based on their spatial ontology (MEUSBURGER, P. 2000). As a conclusion of these theoretical considerations, the editors argue that the diverse mobilities of knowledge are characterised by a dialectic relationship between fixed centres and multidirectional flows. At this point they cite the more recent findings of CRESSWELL, T. (2006), MERRIMAN, P. (2012) and JÖNS, H. (2015), and connect them to the notions mentioned above.
The volume consists of 13 chapters and the introduction, divided into two parts (a bit arbitrarily in my opinion) following different trends in mobilities research. This division does not follow that of the original 6 sessions of the symposium, mainly since five of the original abstracts had not been developed into a full paper for this volume, whereas five new essays were included (namely the first four chapters and Chapter 13). In the first part (Chapters 2–7) entitled “Circulation, Transfer, and Adaptation” the authors assess the movement of knowledge and related (im)materialities, while in the second part (Chapters 8–14) “Mediators, Networks, and Learning” the essays focus on the interactions between these elements by analysing personal careers and collaborations between different disciplines.

The first peer reviewed essay is Peter Meusburger’s study on the different forms of knowledge transfer mentioned before, with strong emphasis on the role of successful (or unsuccessful) communication and how it is shaped by different environments. In stark contrast with the more theoretical first essay, in the second one Jonathan Bloom traces the material and technological history of paper and, even more importantly, papermaking, shedding light on the construction of the Eurocentric myth that ancient Egyptian techniques were reintroduced to Europe through China.

The fourth chapter, written by Innes Keighren, presents the case study of the complex geographies of production, circulation and transformative reproduction of William Macintosh’s book “Travels in Europe, Asia and Africa...” (1782). The author presents how the collection of Macintosh’s letters was carefully edited and stylistically upgraded by the publisher John Murray. While not affecting the popularity of the book itself, this radical, provocative content filled with criticism geared towards Britain’s imperial rule in India provoked an outcry among colonial officials, but locally met with sympathy after it was republished in Dublin and in German and French translation as well. These republications “were precisely what permitted the circulation of Macintosh’s text, they are also what changed its meaning – placing emphasis on certain parts at the expense of others, offering new juxtapositions and contextualization” (p. 80), thus allowing the publishers to present the text in a politically comfortable interpretation.

Felix Driver’s chapter deals with two different forms of the mobilities of knowledge: exploration and exhibition. The former, which is a geographical knowledge-making process that unevenly represents the subject matter, can be the basis for the latter, which serves as the primary means to disseminate the constructed knowledge to the public. His case study of the “Hidden Histories of Exploration” exhibition organised at the Royal Geographical Society with the Institute of British Geographers (RGS-IBG) in 2009 serves to exemplify how a critical representation of historical accounts can help question conventional narratives and reveal the hidden histories of European exploration.

In the following chapter the authors Trevor Barnes and Carl Christian Abrahamsson scrutinise the way the mathematical approach permeated spatial studies and geography. The essay is centred on a new legendary diagram (or map?) entitled “Quant Geog airlines flight plan”, which first appeared in Peter J. Taylor’s “Quantitative Methods in Geography” (1977), and follows the sites represented there. What that diagram lacks, according to Barnes and Abrahamsson, the mobility perspective that presents these relations as fluid and multifaceted, as “the disciplinary articulation of geographical ideas became caught up in events played out geographically on the ground” (p. 118). In order to understand these mobilities, “geographical ideas need to be developed to understand the geography of ideas” (p. 118). In Chapter 7 Peter J. Taylor argues that the social sciences and archaeology are focusing on the state as the frame of knowledge production, neglecting the role of cities in the process.

In the second part the volume essays shift our perspective toward people as mediators in the process of knowledge production and articulation, with Chapters 8 to 10 examining different aspects of the academic sphere in the British Empire. The chapter of Heather Ellis explores the different opinions of British and European scholars to the British imperial project, the facilities of which they actually used. The subjects range from supporters of the Empire to those propagating scientific internationalism to some who were openly critical of colonial practices. Ellis argues that the mobility of knowledge is often more closely linked to the infrastructural conditions of research than to the political position of researchers.

Tamson Pietsch addresses the changing nature of academic appointment practices in the British Empire in Chapter 9. With the expansion of progressive professionalisation and specialisation, the academia and universities gradually moved from a patronage system based on personal trust between highly regarded gentlemen toward a centralised committee-controlled approach. Although these practices meant that the academic system in the colonies and dominions became more independent from Britain over time, they essentially fostered the reproduction of an exclusionary, racialised, gendered and classed British academic world at settler universities.

Heike Jöns investigates the changing geographies of academic travel at the University of Cambridge. Her study shows that newly emerging research institutions in the United States as well as at imperial and other destinations were visited for different academic
reasons. Jöns uses the example of Sir Frank Leonard Engledow, Drapers’ Professor of Agriculture, who greatly contributed to colonial reform movements in Britain and the African postwar empowerment, yet his research focus on the tropics prevented him from participating in the Americanised trends of academic travel at Cambridge.

Madeleine Herren scrutinises the underlying and hitherto uncovered happenings of knowledge transfer in Geneva between 1919 and 1945. She argues that because Geneva was not a capital city and therefore did not have a strong presence of official diplomats, the city was able to develop a high level of spatial connectivity. In Chapter 12, Jonathan V. Beaverstock focuses on expatriation, more commonly known as international assignments, which according to his analysis seem to remain a valued strategy for firms to exchange knowledge between subsidiaries and clients, irrespective of the rapid development of transport and ICTs. Since face-to-face communication is still highly regarded in business, world cities, where the TNCs are located and where business meetings are held, are going to reproduce themselves as the main global nodes where knowledge is created.

In her essay, Melanie Mbah examines “the triple nexus of education, migration, and integration” (p. 247) by studying migration patterns from Nigeria towards Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States. She suggests looking at education not only as a goal for migrants, but also as an important instrument to ease migration and integration. Although the migration of Nigerian university graduates is often seen as harmful for local education, Mbah points out that it can be productive as well with the resulting transnational links and the possibility to utilise the highly skilled migrants living abroad through diaspora organisations.

In contrast with the case where students need to mobilise themselves to gain knowledge, in the last chapter Johanna L. Waters and Maggi Leung investigate how knowledge is mobilised within TNE (Transnational Education) programmes, which can be seen as time-space compressors lifting the spatial barriers for immobile knowledge consumers (students). The authors challenge the view of these programmes as unproblematic, and argue that by the use of the flying faculty model knowledge transfer is hampered by that the internationalised presentations of lecturers are not always understandable for local students due to language barriers or locally irrelevant case studies. This drives the programmes to adapt to the franchise model, where more and more control is handed over to the local partner and knowledge transfer becomes thus more successful, but the transnational nature of knowledge is constrained.

The mere existence of this collection of essays demonstrates the potential of placing knowledge at the centre of mobility studies, which is supported by the elegant flow of topics throughout the volume. As one of its main goals, the Klaus Tschira Foundation “champions new methods of scientific knowledge transfer, and supports both development and intelligible presentation of research findings” (p. 287), and this volume fulfils all these expectations in the intersection of two very complex topics.
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REFERENCES


1 Department of Social and Economic Geography, Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE), Budapest, Hungary. E-mail: palaczki.botond@gmail.com