

DRAFT PAPER for T2M 12th Annual Conference: Spinoffs of Mobility
Drexel University, Philadelphia, 18-21 September 2014

Imagined, Built, and Experienced Railscapes on AMTRAK's Northeast Corridor

Mimi Sheller, Drexel University

Introduction

A number of historians have written about the importance of railways in nation-building, including in the U.S. (Minn 2013; Stilgoe 2007; Verstraete 2002), the United Kingdom (Freeman 1999), Australia (Bishop 2002), and India (Aguar 2011). Railways, we know, were vital contributors to industrialization and urbanization, colonization and empire-building, colonial and postcolonial governance, controlling large territories and moving populations. Beyond their practical political and economic purposes, however, cultural historians also note the railways' significant relationship to the imagination of time, space and national modernity (Schivelbusch 1986), to central national narratives (Nye 1997), and to literature, cinema and popular cultures (Kirby 1997; Aguair 2011), forming a wider cultural landscape that Julie Cidell (2011) calls "trainspace". Railways, we could say, are built of iron and steel, but also of dreams and stories, and of the practices and subjectivities that these together generate – or what together we refer to as "imaginaires". An *imaginaire* is the combination a) discourses, representations, and meanings of trainspace, but also b) the objective built environments of railspace which includes not only material elements such as tracks and stations, but also laws, regulations, and institutions that govern trainspace; and c) the practices that take place through these spaces and discourses of the train.

In this talk I would like to describe three different registers in which such imaginaires work, drawing on Henri Lefebvre's three-part model of the production of space, in which he refers to the Material shaping of urban space by engineers and builders, the Conceived plans or representations of urban space by experts or urban planners, and the Perceived experience of such space by urban dwellers. We can extend this model more generally to think about what urban historian Jessica Sewell calls Imagined Landscapes, Built

Landscapes, and Experienced Landscapes. In relation to rail projects, this specifically means that we can think of three different (but interacting) registers:

1. Imagined railsapes: conceived spaces consisting of the visions, drawings, narratives and plans of decision makers, designers, urbanists, transport planners, rail advocates and urban boosters with particular visions of the future
2. Built railsapes: the physical infrastructure that actually exists and is built by engineers and operated by rail workers, investments of capital and labor, but also determined by the institutions such as the Federal Railway Administration, by standards in engineering practice, or by regulations of the National Travel Safety Board.
3. Experienced railsapes: the bodily engagements and perceptions of those rail environments, which consist of a combination of the imagined and the built; they are both materialized experiences and narratives and stories we tell about them. And such experiences also get wrapped into particular kinds of rail subjectivities.

In the following I will give examples of each of these registers in relation to some existing international studies of rail, but in particular relation to plans for rail development along the Northeast Corridor in the United States, in order to explore how these three registers of the imagined, the built and the experienced railscape are at play in shaping the possible future trajectories of trainspace in the United States.

Today, the 457-mile NEC—anchored by Boston's South Station in the north, New York's Pennsylvania Station in the center, and Washington's Union Station in the south—is one of the most heavily traveled rail corridors in the world. It connects major urban centers yet traverses some extremely impoverished city neighborhoods in a sprawling megaregion of almost continuous development. The future of this corridor is subject to a number of contested planning processes. In particular, “NEC FUTURE is a comprehensive planning effort to define, evaluate and prioritize future investments in the Northeast Corridor (NEC), launched by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) in February 2012.” As the announcement of this program states:

NEC FUTURE will create a framework for the future investments needed to improve passenger rail capacity and service through 2040. Technical work includes an analysis of market conditions in the corridor, development of

reasonable program alternatives and an evaluation of the environmental impacts of those alternatives, and a recommended approach that balances the needs of various users of the corridor - whether commuters, intercity rail passengers, or rail freight - in a manner that ensures safe, efficient travel throughout the Northeast. Yet NEC FUTURE is not only a technical process. Equally important is the opportunity for a broad public dialogue to establish a future vision for the corridor. (<http://www.necfuture.com>)

By attaching imagined railscapes to the case for investing in built railscapes, rail advocates hope to advance the next phase of American high speed rail. We are especially interested in this idea of a “future vision”, how that gets translated into a built railscape, and what alternative imagined railscapes are posed against it. Certainly the planning of high speed rail in the USA is an important case of the envisioning and promise of imminent mobility, which may or may not come to pass, but still has important political effects in and of itself.

In Europe and Asia high speed rail is imagined and narrated as “an economic driver, a paragon of sustainability and an arena of competition with economic rivals”; however, as Michael Minn (2013) points out, such discourses have not taken hold in the United States, where high speed rail is deeply contested, in what remains essentially a “republic of drivers”, as Cotton Seiler (2008) described it. If national rail projects do still resonate in the US, then in what ways, for whom, and towards what future ends? What kinds of practices, memories and representation are attached to such future visioning projects of improving train space and rail mobility? How are shared representations embodied in plans that bring together social actors to build new railways or improve on existing ones? And, finally, in a comparative mode, how does the achievement of the material making of shared representations differ between one country and another?

Imagined Railscapes

American *imaginaires* of electric high speed rail go back at least to 1922 with Victor Appleton’s novel *Tom Swift and His Electric Locomotive; Or, Two Miles a Minute on the Rails* (1922). In the book the Swift Manufacturing Company builds a 4,400 hp, 120-mph electric locomotive, which saves an unprofitable railroad from bankruptcy. “An electric locomotive that can make two miles a minute over a properly ballasted roadbed might not be an impossibility, said Mr. Barton Swift ruminatively. “It is one of those

things that are coming,” and he flashed his son, Tom Swift, a knowing smile (Appleton 1922:7). On May 26, 1934, the Chicago, Burlington, & Quincy’s *Zephyr* ran at an average speed of 77.6 mph and a top speed of 112.5 mph for 1,015 miles in 13 hours and 5 minutes, Denver to Chicago (Steffe1953:25). This lightweight, kerosene fueled and electrically powered train introduced the age of American streamliner passenger trains. In 1965, following Japan’s creation of its high-speed Shinkansen, President Lyndon Johnson requested a Congressional plan for similar HSR. This led to the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-220, 79 Stat. 893), which received strong bipartisan support in the U.S. House of Representatives. The act established in the U.S. Department of Commerce an Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation, but lacking subsequent political support it was discontinued in 1972.

Interest in high speed rail recently picked up again with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, which included \$8 billion of federal investment in a national network of high-speed rail corridors as part of the stimulus package. This was meant to at least seed the beginnings of a strategic plan with eleven proposed one-hundred to five-hundred mile corridors across the country (FRA 2009). As Minn notes, “Amtrak’s Acela service on the Northeast Corridor is still the only American passenger train that operates regularly at speeds over 110 mph, and most of the line is under 100 mph due to limitations of the old rail alignments” (Minn 2013: 186), thus most current discussions of HSR in the US are not so much a technological leap forward as simply restoring passenger service to what it was in the mid-20th century.

We might contrast another very fanciful vision of the future of rail on the Northeast Corridor of the United States. This comes from the winner of the Audi Urban Future Award in 2012, the architects Howeler + Yoon for their design of a new BOSWASH corridor [Fig. 1]:

“There will be space for everyone in constant dialogue with each other and every means will be used in a more intelligent and zero impact: the movement of high-speed trains will fit perfectly with pedestrian lanes and bike paths. Public transport will be more powerful and "green" and the only electric car on the road. The machine strictly car-sharing and the underground super environmentally friendly. A dream? Absolutely not. It is the reality developed by the architects of the study Bostonian Howeler + Yoon, who have imagined a new urban model from existing infrastructure and logistics.”

[<http://www.dailyenmoveme.com/en/smart-city/boswash-megalopolis-becomes-smart-city>]

This image reminds us of the role of visions and plans in our understandings of rail. The *imaginaire* of trainspace is more than its physical infrastructure, more than its technological achievements, more than its successes or failures, and more than the banal forms it sometimes might take in everyday life. It also encompasses the hopes, dreams, failures, and emotions invested in plans, visions, and narratives – whether of urban commuter trains that might catapult a city forward, of national rail networks that might build a nation, or of high speed rail projects that might re-scale entire regions. In this regard we need to consider the stories people tell about trains, the ways in which they imagine their possibilities, and the many way in which they pervade literature, film, song lyrics, and personal narratives.

Peter Thomas reminds us that “Railways have been at the heart of change since their inception in the 1830s, both driving and reflecting broader changes in the social, cultural and economic landscape within which they are situated.” But beyond that, “Railways created new socialities and transformed people’s senses of self. They gave rise to new modes of spectatorship (Kirby 1997) and in doing so rewired how bodies sensed and perceived the landscape they moved through (Nye 1997), now witnessed as a swiftly moving panorama” (Thomas 2014: 215). Following the work of Wolfgang Schivelbusch, we could say that railways change our very modes of sensory perception, selfhood and sociality. They also produced new anxieties and fears, new mobile publics, and new urban spaces. So all of these elements also feed into the culture of national railways, its material forms and its symbolic representations. The imagined railscape involves a far wider material and immaterial context than one might at first assume. The White House plans for HSR, for example, have been justified through several legitimation frames – which go far beyond transportation itself – including that they will provide safe and efficient transportation options, will enhance economic competitiveness, enable energy efficiency and better quality urban environments, and support connected livable communities (FRA 2009). It is linked, in other words, to particular visions of an clean-energy “green” urbanism, a rebooted version of modernity.

Marian Aguiar argues that in the case of India, “versions of modernity came to be constituted in India through the culture of mobility”, which was materialized in part via railway building projects, but also via visual and literary representations of the railway as a microcosm of Indian culture. Equally important “that same culture exposed the

contradictions inside the modern” (Aguiar 2011: xxiv). As much as projects of modernity are invested in utopian fantasies, such fantasies may also fail. Thus when we talk about the *imaginaire* of rail, we are registering both the hopes and dreams built into it, as well as the failure of some of its ideological fantasies and never-built projects. Significantly, we see that *imaginaires* revolving around past mobility systems or historic objects (such as the transcontinental railway) can still be wielded in the present in efforts to shape future-oriented practices and re-make material cultures by reminding listeners of past experiences and achievements. These past visions of an American national railscape, for example, are symbolically welded onto the future visions of HSR.

Most recently, in February 2014, Amtrak brought new locomotives into service, the innovative *American Cities Sprinter* (ACS) 64, of which 70 are on order by Amtrak. These ACS-64s will enter long-distance and regional service and eventually have deployment to the Keystone Corridor. They are equipped with computer diagnostics of technical issues and self-corrective actions, and regenerative electrical braking system that will send over 300 kilowatt hours back to the electrical grid for \$300 million in energy savings across two decades (Vantuono 2014a; Amtrak’s New Locomotives 2014:3). A ribbon-cutting rally celebrating the investment in these new locomotives opened with a speech by the President and CEO of Siemen’s USA, heralding the building of new electric locomotives for Amtrak: “The story of America’s expansion is the story of railways. Rail is important to America’s history, but rail has never been more important to the future of America” (Eric Speigel, 02/06/2014, Philadelphia).

It comes as no surprise to find historical narratives being leveraged for future-oriented projects of rail investment, linking together technology and national development. A crucial sub-theme was that the building of railways not only connected the country together, but also created a national workforce. Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx chimed in: “More than 150 years ago when Abraham Lincoln launched the transcontinental railway he created not only a connection across the country, but also a workforce.” (Anthony Foxx, 02/06/2014, Philadelphia). The workforce is invoked as discourse of railsapes that are not only about passengers, but about those who make the rail equipment and run the railways every day. And Vice President Joe Biden then enjoined the audience to link America’s past greatness to its infrastructure, and to extend that legacy into the future:

“Why did we lead the world economically for so long? We had the most modern infrastructure in the world! [...] This locomotive represents a lot more than just getting from point A to point B. American ingenuity is making a comeback. We are better positioned than any nation in the world to lead the world economically. It is time to seize the opportunity. It’s time to move. Transport is critical. Rail is critical. Passenger rail is critical to this country.” (Joe Biden, 02/06/2014, Philadelphia).

This *cri de couer* for passenger rail is closely connected to the battle to gain support for implementing the latest plans for higher speed rail. As Michael Minn notes, the campaign finance for sponsors of recent high speed rail legislation include those most likely to directly benefit: engineering firms, rolling-stock manufacturers, and unions.

But for opponents the dream of high speed rail is an ideological fantasy that will never, and should never, come to pass. As Alfredo González-Ruibal puts it: “Unlike daydreaming, ideological fantasies are not individual, but shared by a collective” (2013: 307). Modernist utopias, he argues, both of the totalitarian and the liberal variety, have often been built upon dramatic re-organizations of material cultures: “technical wonders, such as airplanes or automated factories, grandiose buildings and mathematical urban layouts” (ibid: 309), and we might add, transcontinental railways or more recently high speed rail projects. Failed modernities, those never built or those that fall into ruin, are as important as those that are built. *Imagined* railscapes revolve around both future utopias, and around past mobility systems or historic objects (such as the transcontinental railway) that can still be wielded in the present in efforts to shape future-oriented practices and re-make material cultures. And this brings us to our second register, built railscapes.

Built Railscapes

The second register of the *imaginaire* of trainspace is the built railscape, consisting of tracks and rolling stock, engines and bridges, platforms and stations, electric power and diesel infrastructure, and all the material engineering that goes into making train travel possible. Such investments in built environments, as David Harvey has long pointed out, entail “the creation of a whole physical landscape for the purposes of production, circulation, exchange, and consumption” (Harvey 1981: 96), and at times the growth of capitalism leads to contradictions which require a “spatal fix”. Beyond the

trains, tracks and stations, Thomas argues, railways are moreover “a complex assemblage of tightly meshed socio-technical systems, involving different forms of knowledge and practical know-how (Law and Mol 2002), where signals, signalling equipment, staff rosters, ticketing systems, rules and regulations, and maintenance regimes, amongst many other components, must all work together for the mobility system to operate smoothly” (Thomas 2014: 216). The imperative to run trains on time and above all safely drove national standardization not only of track gauge, but also of time zones, of safety regulation, and of work practices. These are all elements of the built railscape.

Yet, as Katherina Manderscheid reminds us, “the link between knowledge and materialisation entails more than one-dimensional realisations of concepts and plans, but rather consists itself of constant power struggles between different stakeholders and existing landscapes (cf. Flyvbjerg 1998; Richardson and Jensen 2003). *Mobility landscapes* as sedimented knowledge and power thus constitute a powerful force within current discursive struggles.” (Manderscheid, forthcoming). Thus while the already discussed aspects of the imagined railscape play a strong part in the planning and design of new rail infrastructure, there is also a power struggle with opposed stakeholders such as the entrenched interested of the automobile-driving suburbs (Seiler 2007; Minn 2013), as well as with the built landscape itself which “talks back”, so to speak, and also shapes what actually gets built, when and where.

There is also competition amongst different railsapes, influencing decisions taken whether to invest in metro systems, commuter light rail to the suburbs, intercity regional rail, or long distance high speed rail, not to mention other mobility scapes involving highways and public transit. These decisions in turn have a huge impact on the production of urban space, and even regional and national space. In a study of the contested plans over the Grand Paris transit project in France, for example, J.P. Addie argues that “Changes in transit infrastructure not only affect who moves, where, how, and why, but developments associated with any new transit system will change the meaning and function of the urban environment and define the uneven contours of regional growth, quality of life and governance” (Addie, forthcoming). Here the built railscape comes to the fore, as transportation infrastructure produces urban and suburban space and along with it inequalities in accessibility, motility, and the right to the city. “Conflicts over transit projects,” Addie argues, “are thus also conflicts over the essence of the metropolis. Moments when transit systems are in question, as they are

with Grand Paris, are key points of opening that reveal diverse interpretations of the city and a range of transformative possibilities” (ibid).

Likewise Michael Minn (2013: 191) argues that US HSR may represent a conflict over New Urbanist visions and who they will benefit, waged through different interpretations of the city, urban space, and regional development. A political economy perspective on high speed rail suggests that it may serve as

an expensive public amenity that will operate to the benefit of a select, privileged minority – much like the manifestations of neoliberalism in Chicago’s public transit investment choices observed by Farmer (2011). Given the concentration of corridors in densely-populated regions that also represent concentrations of wealth and wealthy travelers (Florida 2009), HSR may represent a conscious or subconscious attempt to replicate the Acela model on a national scale.

With these kinds of conflicts in mind, our project focuses on the contestation of plans for future built infrastructure for rail in the United States, and in comparison with other countries, in order to find these moments when “systems are in question” and what this reveals about transformative possibilities.

Even rail systems that are not built raise interesting questions. In his study of urban transit plans in Australia, Thomas suggests that future plans for railways are manifest in “symbolically and affectively powerful ways”:

Infrastructure plans and the promises they make to deliver mobility systems enact power. Here I use the term ‘imminent mobilities’ to refer to how infrastructure plans generate their own flows and attachments. Their virtual existence is felt in the urban landscapes through the places they are to pass. Revealing a similar affectual landscape to those documented in periods of early railway construction, these plans enact similar torsions of excitement and anxiety, celebration and repulsion (Thomas 2014: 219).

Railway plans and dreams encapsulate these affectual landscapes; “imminent mobilities” not only shape urban growth, but are invested with “important political capital that can be wielded by politicians with their electorates” (ibid). Thus *even if they are not built*, railway

plans are important contributors to the *imaginaires* of mobility, modernity, development, and can enhance a city's or a nation's image on the world stage.

Closely connected to such plans for build railscapes may be not just the trains and tracks, but also crucially the stations. In fact, one of the main ways in which rail investment moves forward is through the leveraging of urban rents. Addie argues that this is a fundamental aspect of "late capitalist accumulation": "The most audible voices in the Grand Paris transit debates assume that mobile infrastructures must be pursued in order to attract increasingly mobile capital into the built environment, to catalyze urban rent production, and to increase territorial competition and economic growth." The creation of new stations and their placement are crucial to this process. "The Grand Paris Express... is poised to capitalize on space by improving land values around new stations... The main beneficiaries of this speculative process are thus not inhabitants themselves, but financial and real estate actors who profit from closing rent gaps and trading attractive debt on securities markets" (Addie, forthcoming).

We can see exactly this type of capital accumulation taking place in the planning and design of new rail terminals in the United States. Currently under construction in San Francisco, the new Transbay Transit Center is a \$4.5 billion project to replace the former transit center, the Transbay Terminal [Fig. 2]. In addition to bringing together access and connections to the Bay Area's several transit authorities, including BART, Muni, and Caltrain, the station will be able to accommodate Amtrak trains as well as the possibility of high-speed rail. The station is designed by Cesar Pelli and will be capped with a 5.4 acre public park on the roof. It's planned to open in 2017. The Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (you can just call it ARTIC) [Fig. 3], will be completed later this year in Orange County to improve local rail and bus connections. But more importantly than the connections they enable, these stations seem to be banking on real estate investment in their vicinity. Just completed last month, Denver's spectacular new transit hub [Fig. 4] plays off the historic 1914 Union Station, which will transition into shopping, restaurants and a boutique hotel. By turning a rail yard into the main station, Denver can consolidate all methods of transit in one place, including Amtrak, light rail, buses and a new commuter line that goes directly to DIA. The hub's master plan (by SOM) includes offices and public space.

[<http://gizmodo.com/5-new-rail-stations-preparing-the-u-s-for-a-golden-age-1585675486>]

As plans emerge for development of higher speed rail on the Northeast Corridor, cities along that corridor are also reconsidering the value of land around their stations,

such as 30th Street Station here in Philadelphia. A master planning process is currently underway to bring together AMTRAK and a range of other stakeholders including real estate developers, engineering firms, universities, and business development districts to envision future uses of the area around the station. Drexel University is itself deeply involved in planning a Transportation-Hub Innovation Neighborhood on fourteen acres it owns around the station, as well as working on plans for development using air rights over the track yard adjacent to the station.

All of these plans rely on the model of urban development that is now emerging around the concept of “innovation districts”. As described in a recent Brookings Institution report:

“These districts, by our definition, are geographic areas where leading-edge anchor institutions and companies cluster and connect with start-ups, business incubators, and accelerators. They are also physically compact, transit-accessible, and technically-wired and offer mixed-use housing, office, and retail. Innovation districts are the manifestation of mega-trends altering the location preferences of people and firms and, in the process, re-conceiving the very link between economy shaping, place making and social networking. In recent years, a rising number of innovative firms and talented workers are choosing to congregate and co-locate in compact, amenity-rich enclaves in the cores of central cities. Rather than building on green-field sites, marquee companies in knowledge-intensive sectors are locating key facilities close to other firms, research labs, and universities so that they can share ideas and practice “open innovation.” (Brookings Innovation Districts Report: Bruce Katz and Julie Wagner (May 2014)

Crucially, such built environments lead to different kinds of experiences of railspace. Addie, for example, argues that in the Grand Paris Express vision, “the prioritization of regional connectivity and concentration on transportation infrastructures that most benefit the productive capacity of city-regions forges distinct kinetic elitism by elevating the importance of one particular set of spatiotemporal rhythms.” (Addie, forthcoming). In the final section I turn to the third register, experienced railscapes, in order to explore how different “rail subjects” experience the lived rail space in different ways.

Experienced Railscape

If high speed rail is developed on the NEC, it will connect not only city centers of major cities like D.C., Philadelphia and NY, but also will have stops at Philadelphia International Airport or Newark Airport. This will re-shape the access of “kinetic elites” to airspace, in effect bringing Philadelphia’s airport very close to Manhattan air travelers. As Minn suggests, this development is likely to “further geographic class stratification in the same way that late nineteenth century railroads fostered the development of railroad suburbs and allowed the wealthy to glide away from the fetid working-class urban environments of industrialized America” (Minn 2013: 192). To understand the differential effects of such imagined and built railsapes – and the scales, speeds, and rhythms that they impose on differentiated groups – we can turn to the third register, the experienced railscape.

While there are elements of nostalgia informing much of American train culture, as Minn (2013: 195) describes it, there is also a utopian modernist streak in the HSR space, that may be at odds with the actual physical experience of rail travel today:

The marketing of HSR is relentlessly futuristic. The websites of advocacy organizations are adorned with the imagery of sleek, streamlined trains and dramatically lit modernist stations. Trips between these stations are on sleek contextually- and ecologically sensitive structures snaking through verdant valleys dotted with windmills. The imagery gives little hint of railroad phobia, or the tyranny of the timetable, or the unpleasantness of having to sit for hours behind a child who has succumbed to motion sickness. Everyone is young, vibrant, healthy, wealthy and on-time – and if you support HSR, you can be too.

Such experiences of the kinetic elite tie in with their experience of HSR while traveling in Europe or Asia, and set them apart from the daily commuters who use buses, outdated trolleys, or underground subways built in the mid-twentieth century to get to work. Perhaps in an effort to attract the New Urbanist creative classes, an art installation has recently opened on the Northeast Corridor which involves large painted areas and a downloadable sound track: aestheticizing urban blight for those who have to ride through it on their inter-city commute.

Experiences of railscape, then, are not simply about individual perceptions, but are about our structural emplacement into the experiential affordances of particular built environments. In his study of the culture of classic car appreciation, anthropologist Pierre Lemonnier examines how memories, practices, toy models, magazines, books, collecting, tinkering, shows and meet-ups all go into “the material making of shared representations” (Lemonnier 2013: 752). It is a whole set of social practices, embodied experiences, and collective gatherings around specific places and objects that for him constitute a shared representation. His insights into material culture and social experience could be extended to understanding the shared culture of railways, which also convergences around three types of relations that he identifies:

- (1) between a material object [such as a train]... and its complex and changing historical and contemporary context;
- (2) between an individual and his [or her] own memories and ongoing interactions with [the railway] year after year; and
- (3) between those people... who build and maintain social relations connected with [trains, railways, stations. Etc.] (ibid: 753).

This “amalgam of memories, representations, and practices” inform a collective “sharing of information, grouping people and making them do things together as social actors” (ibid: 755). The question, then, is whether railways still have the force to play the role of such social and cultural “resonators”, or have they lost their sacred place? And do people having different class-based experiences of rail travel form quite distinct social relations with trains, with others connected to the railway, and with their own memories and interactions with railscapes? What kinds of interventions in railspace might change different social actor’s experience of it?

Alongside the NEC rail tracks running into Philadelphia a current art installation by the Berlin-based artist Katharina Grosse is described as follows in the New York Times:

The five-mile stretch of railroad track that slices through some of Philadelphia’s most impoverished areas along the Northeast Corridor is dispiriting. It encompasses a wasteland of abandoned warehouses and buildings missing walls and roofs, neglected neighborhoods and graffiti-strewn passageways. Since mid-May, though, the area has been home to (and a scene on view for train commuters) a Christo-esque installation of seven enormous works of art by the Berlin-based visual artist Katharina Grosse, titled “psychylustro.” [http://www.nytimes.com/2014/07/27/travel/bright-passages-along-the-northeast-corridor.html?emc=edit_tl_20140725&nl=travel&nid=50682986&r=0]

How does this work interact with embodied experience, and perhaps change it?

To investigate this register we need to know more about individual rail users, and their relation to the materiality of the railscape (its seats, carriages, trains, platforms, stations, views from the window, etc.); their personal memories and ongoing interactions with the materiality of the railway over many years; and finally their relation with other groups of people who are also engaged with maintaining a relation to the railscape. These are topics that we will address in future research associated with the ImagineTRAINS project.

References

Addie, J.P. (forthcoming). in D. Prytherch and J. Cidell (eds) *Intersecting places: Transportation and mobility in the production of urban space*. New York: Routledge.

Aguiar, Marian (2011) *Tracking Modernity: India's Railway and the Culture of Mobility*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bishop, P (2002) "Gathering the land: the Alice Springs to Darwin rail corridor", *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20: 295-317.

Cidell, Julie (2011) "Fear of a foreign railroad: transnationalism, trainspace, and (im)mobility in the Chicago suburbs", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*.

Gonzalez-Ruibal, Alfredo (2013) "Modernism" in Graves–Brown P, Harrison R, Piccini, A (eds) *Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 306-320.

Kirby, L. (1997) *Parallel Tracks: The Railroad and Silent Cinema*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). 1997. High speed ground transportation for America. <http://www.fra.dot.gov/rpd/passenger/515.shtml>.

Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). 2009a. FRA and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. <http://www.fra.dot.gov/us/content/2153>

Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). 2009b. A vision for high speed rail in America: highlights of strategic plan (April 16).
<http://www.fra.dot.gov/Downloads/RRdev/hsrspfacts.pdf>

Freeman, M (1999) *Railways and the Victorian Imagination*. London and New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lemonnier, Pierre (2013) "Autoanthropology, Modernity, and Automobiles." In Graves–Brown P, Harrison R, Piccini, A (eds) *Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 743-757.

Manderscheid, Katharina (forthcoming). "The Movement Problem, the Car, and Future Mobility Regimes: Automobility as Dispositif and Mode of Regulation", *Mobilities*, SI on Mobilities & Foucault.

Minn, Michael. (2013) "The Political Economy of High Speed Rail in the United States", *Mobilities* 8 (2): 185-200.

Nye, David (1997) *Narratives and Spaces: Technology and the Construction of American Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang (1986) *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Seiler, Cotten, 2008. *Republic of drivers: a cultural history of automobility in America*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.

Stilgoe, J.R., 2007. *Train time: railroads and the imminent reshaping of the United States landscape*. Charlottesville, London, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Thomas, Peter (2014) "Railways" in Adey, P., Bissell, D., Hannam, K., Merriman, P. and Sheller, M. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*. London: Routledge, pp. 214-24.

Verstraete, Ginette (2002) "Railroading America: towards a material study of the nation", *Theory, Culture and Society* 19: 145-59.