INTRODUCTION

The second volume of the *International Review of Environmental History* examines the diverse environmental legacies of colonialism around the world, from Qing (1644–1911) efforts at settling Xinjiang (‘New Territory’), north-west China, to US attempts to curb bovine diseases in the Philippines; from the use of transnational US Dust Bowl images in an Australian film, to a methodology calling for closer intellectual collaboration among garden historians, environmental historians, and historians of health; and, lastly, to a study of how the mining lobby was responsible for conserving forests in Victoria, Australia.

Around the world, the mining lobby has rightly been held responsible for a host of environmental problems, from air and water pollution, to the destruction of soils and vegetation. In ‘Political agitation for forest conservation: Victoria, 1860–1960’, historical geographer Stephen Legg presents a fascinating counterpoint to the prevailing orthodoxy by showcasing the role of Victoria’s mining lobby in agitating for the protection of forests and for developing forest plantations. Legg demonstrates that from the 1860s the mining lobby, motivated by fears of losing timber supplies for its industry, engaged in a sustained campaign for forest conservation and afforestation. To achieve its ends, it relied on lobbying ministers and newspaper-writing campaigns, and pressuring parliament to undertake commissions of inquiry into forestry. What Legg’s pioneering articles does is to outline the length, depth, and sophistication of lobbyists involved in forest conservation from the nineteenth century. In illuminating the connections between nineteenth- and twentieth-century conservation campaigns, Legg’s article is a must-read for anyone interested in the history of conservation and resource use, right up to the present day.

The next article examines soil and water management through a transnational framework. In ‘Wartime political ambition behind one image of a dam in *Australia is Developing a Dust Bowl* (1943): US/Australian film imagery, environment, and nationalist storytelling’, Janette-Susan Bailey analyses in depth the impact of a 1943 film that invoked imagery from the US Dust Bowl to press for Australian state development of water schemes in postwar New South Wales. By placing it in its cultural, social, and political history, she demonstrates how ‘Hall’s film fuses
aspects of US and Australian national myth, traces of US Depression-era and wartime hopes and fears, irrigation mythology, and technological optimism’ to drive for the development of the Snowy River and associated irrigation projects. Bailey’s article pushes the methodological boundaries of environmental history in Australia and the US through its innovative use of film, and opens up novel points of transnational comparisons between the US and Australia.

The next contribution in the volume turns to gardens. In ‘New perspectives on methodology in garden history: Approaches towards writing about imported medicinal plants in colonial New Zealand’, Joanna Bishop uses the case study of the use and introduction of imported medicinal plants to speak to wider historiographical and methodological concerns relating to the disciplines of garden history, environmental history, and health history. Through a sustained discussion of the methodological uses of a variety of sources on imported medicinal plants, Bishop both argues for the need for the three disciplines to speak to one another and presents an elegant case study of the benefits of such an approach in providing new perspectives on colonial environmental history, plant introductions, and plant uses.

Ts’ui-jung Liu and I-chun Fan move discussion of the impacts of colonisation and environmental change from Australasia to north-west China. Their article, ‘The Tuntian system in Xinjiang under the Qing Dynasty: A perspective from environmental history’, presents a novel examination of the nature, extent, and impact of the Qing Dynasty’s (1644–1911) varied land settlement schemes in Xinjiang, using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to map these changes. They highlight the several different systems of land settlement introduced into the region by Qing authorities: Bingtun (兵屯, land tilled by soldiers), Qitun (旗屯, land tilled by soldiers of the Banners), Qiantun (遣屯, land tilled by exiled criminals), Mintun (民屯, land tilled by civilians), and Huitun (回屯, land tilled by the Uyghur 維吾爾人). They argue that most early schemes relied on the development of public lands, but that over time they morphed into private schemes. The authors show that later schemes were the most successful at land development. Their article is particularly useful for the comparative dimensions it opens up with similar schemes of settlement and pacification in other parts of the world at the same time, where settled states tried to introduce agricultural schemes as a means of sedenterising and, as they saw it, civilizing nomadic peoples.

The final article of this volume is Arleigh Ross D. Dela Cruz’s ‘Epizootics and the colonial legacies of the United States in Philippine veterinary science’. This offers a new interpretation of the efforts of US colonial officials to eradicate rinderpest from its new colony. As Dela Cruz shows, in the first few decades of colonial rule, all US anti-rinderpest schemes failed, including inoculation and quarantine. They failed, as Dela Cruz argues, because of a combination of infrastructural
problems, scientific limitations, and local resistance to the measures that officials tried to enact. Ultimately, however, the development of an effective serum and inoculation programme in the 1920s succeeded in eradicating the disease from the island’s cattle by 1939. Despite such success, the author demonstrates that the programme caused great resentment from among cattle owners, because it flew in the face of local customs regarding the treatment of animals.

I am delighted that the contributions to this volume uphold the journal’s goal to provide a truly world coverage of environmental issues. Our contributors, from Taiwan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, each embrace interdisciplinary, comparative, and transnational methods, while still recognising the importance of locality in understanding global processes.

Editor’s note: Janette-Susan Bailey

The editing of this volume is tinged with sadness at the passing of one of the contributing authors, Janette-Susan Bailey. With a PhD from the University of New South Wales, Australia, and a combined Honours degree in Film, Theatre and Performance Studies and Environmental Studies, Janette’s work exemplifies the very best of environmental history in her cross-disciplinary approaches to historical research. Those wanting to read more of Janette’s work can do so in Dust Bowl: Depression America to World War Two Australia (Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming).

Journal aims

Before closing, I would like to summarise the journal’s aims, look ahead to some of the papers in the next volume, and request contributions from particular regions. The journal publishes on all thematic and geographic topics of environmental history. It developed in part to enhance the strength of environmental history in places like Australia, New Zealand, India, Africa, and South and Central America—as well as East and Southeast Asia—to which no journals actively catered. In response to this urgent need, it especially encourages articles with perspectives focused on or developed from the southern hemisphere and the ‘Global South’. This includes, but is not limited to, Australasia, East and Southeast Asia, Africa, and South America. The expertise of the editorial board reflects the desire for inclusivity and the focus of the journal on these areas.
A second key aim of the journal is to break down the barriers to scholarship and publication by providing a freely available, open-access journal. (For traditionalists, there is also a print-on-demand option.) Research has revealed that the high costs of access to academic journals unfairly disadvantages scholars working in places such as South America, Southeast Asia, and Africa, many of whose universities often do not have the funds to subscribe to expensive journals, even for online accounts.¹

A third motivation is to provide a forum for highly original—even contentious—scholarship that promises to reshape the field or to provide bold overviews of fields of use to teachers or students approaching the topic for the first time. A particular advantage of an online journal such as this is that it enables publication of scholarly articles that may be longer than most journals accept, or which may contain a large number of high-quality images.

The next volumes

The next volume of the International Review of Environmental History is already well underway and we have received several submissions. A second issue of the journal is also planned for 2017, drawn from papers presented at ‘Foreign Bodies, Intimate Ecologies—Transformations in Environmental History’, held at Macquarie University from 11–13 February 2016. The volume will be edited by Ruth Morgan and Alessandro Antonello.

I especially encourage submissions on topics in South Asian, Russian, South American, or African environmental history.

Submission details
See inside cover.
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