The Imperial Map: Cartography and the Mastery of Empire. Edited by James R. Akerman. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009. ISBN: 9780226010762

Cartography has a long as well as ongoing history. As James Akerman, the editor of the anthology and director of the Hermon Dunlap Smith Center of the History of Cartography at the Newbery Library in Chicago, points out in the introduction, mapping is today done by a far larger number of actors than ever before: state as well as local bureaucracies, intelligence organisations, and weather bureaus, to mention some. I might add that private companies such as Google and those companies mapping consumer movements and patterns through the dispersal of 'cookies' on our computers use mapping. Kids as well use mapping, although in a different fashion and for different purposes than the other do. We all probably do. Most maps by 'nature' are therefore used by even more people and organisations than by those who make them and this number seems only to be increasing in the foreseeable future with distributional technologies and channels increasing and broadening access. In my own time in both light and heavy reconnaissance units in the Danish army now a decade ago, I was offered to rely on this rather large device that was not only incredibly complicated to operate but would also offer me a ten digit coordinate that I would then need to locate on the map. I (would like to) believe that it was some of the first broadly circulated military GPS gadgets in NATO armies, but somehow doubt that. The explanation was most probably that the Danish army was operating with a limited GPS budget. Needless to say, I would mostly rely on my own skills to read the map and how it corresponded to the landscape unfolding before me. A growing number of people, who for the past 50 years relied on paper maps and atlases, now have GPS gadgets in their cars with rather precise electronic maps, as do most people with smart phones at their disposal. Although technologies of surveying and especially mapping are spreading and the appropriation and use of knowledge, geographical, social, political, economic or military, in visual form, has indeed

become common practice, these technologies are also still very much contested. NGO's protests against Google and the American opposition to the development of the European GPS system of Galileo and Chinese satellite imagery capabilities are illustrative cases in point. Akerman initially also emphasizes the importance of whom the maps are made for and with what purpose and how we do not need to look far to see imperial mapping in our own world and worldviews. Again, an American example serves well to illustrate a point. Just as the US was making maps plotting former Iraqi army units and militias in Iraq as Akerman notes, I find it useful and worrisome to note that voting patterns according to party lines have been mapped and now increasingly form the basis for redrawing voting districts in the US itself. Maps are, perhaps unsurprisingly, all about power and in many cases also of Foucaldian bio-power.

The anthology is a collection of lectures transformed into articles by specialists of imperial cartography ranging from assistant professors to professors and based on the fifteenth series of Kenneth Nebenzahl lectures at the Newberry Library in Chicago in 2004. The common theme in all the contributions is how imperial cartography has been used, not only as means of control and communication, but also as creations and outlines of the future territories to be. The anthology is comprised of six chapters of varying length, beginning with a general introductory chapter, with the subsequent, chronologically ordered chapters each focussing on a particular part of the world.

Some basic assumptions are shared, and to some extent, also demonstrated by the contributors throughout the chapters. First is the rejection of the assumption that cartography is strictly a European, and, by extension, American imperial technology. Indeed, the chapters on Russia in the seventeenth century and the Qing Empire in the subsequent century clearly make that point. Although the editor, Akerman, nonetheless makes the argument that while maps were used by the Roman Empire, it was not until the emergence of the modern state in Europe over the fifteenth and

sixteenth centuries and their development of technologies related to public works, military information and exploratory chart making that it became a regular practice. A second assumption, although not made explicit by all contributors, is the perhaps impossible to make distinction between imperial maps of empire and other maps. Perhaps the cases of Russia and the US best illustrate this point. Thirdly, the contributors, relying on concepts such as discourse, technology, power and surveillance, also operate on Foucaldian platforms, although some more explicit than others, and thereby emphasize that imperial mapping has always been contested by those 'being mapped'.

In the first chapter of 35 pages, including 10 maps, Matthew Edney makes some general points regarding the 'imperial map' and 'non-imperial' maps. Taking his point of departure from the little degree of conceptual consensus of what is empire and imperialism and on the basis of an explicit Foucaldian platform, he sees mapping as several processes of appropriating local institutions suffused with power and knowledge. This, in turn is harnessed for external use by the mapmakers and surveyors, initially with the aim of aiding the powers that invested in the map and later extending its use to society and individuals. Therefore, he argues that maps are not only highly partial, but also persistently hold ideological meanings and that is little to differentiate cartographic practices in imperial and non-imperial contexts. All maps empower their users and readers to discipline the world and to construct territory. 'Empire' is hence, in his eyes, a cartographic construction and modern cartography a construction of modern imperialism.

In the second chapter (45 pages, 12 maps) Valerie Kivelson looks into how Russian geo-religious practices of mapping in Siberia in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were expressed and how they formed visions that in turn influenced the allocation of space and distribution of people under Muscovy imperial power. The mapping and geo-religious practices of the expanding Muscovy Empire into Siberia, Kivelson differed from the Spanish in South America and the

English in North America. Where the Spanish would see advantages in bringing new converts from the conquered territories into the towns that formed the spatial organisation of military and religious Spanish dominance and map all conquered territories and peoples as coherently catholic, the English often mapped indigenous lands as empty, while only rarely displaying either odd characters of animals or oversized indigenous characters. In this manner they also laid out a spiritual landscape which displayed little interest in missionary activities and an alien native population. The Russians did want to promote Orthodox Christianity in the Siberian lands and amongst its peoples clearly seeing themselves as spiritual superior. While the Russians did do so via a network of outposts rather than a network of towns as the Spanish in South America, it was done on a much smaller scale than the Spanish since they realised the risk of alienating the indigenous with whom they were trading. They were therefore not pushing missionary activities and when doing so keeping them under strict control. The Russian presence was also not strong enough to adopt only a forceful approach, perhaps also the main reason why only Christian natives were allowed into the Russian imperial towns and recognition of the tsar was for the most part deemed sufficient. This strategy of ambivalence also reflected in the maps as some mapmakers attributed effective power to Christian architecture even before it existed off the maps and others displayed Siberia a vast empty space or an imperial space with a network of Russian towns. The indigenous peoples were, in contrast to the English maps, included albeit in different styles, by the hands of the mapmakers. It was not uncommon that nomadic peoples were presented as fixed peoples living within fixed entities. As pointed out by Kivelson, imperial maps did (and do) not make empires, but they were (and are) powerful expressions as to the ideological agenda of their makers. Despite the brutalities and disturbances of settlements and farming of Russian imperialism in Siberia and that Stalin resorted to relocation and mass killings they were unable to homogenise the various groups. The

fact that Orthodox Christianity to this day is not common all over Russia is testimony to the size and diversity of what is seen as Russia.

In the next chapter, comprised of over 39 pages and with 10 maps, Laura Hostetler focuses on the mapping practices of the Qing Empire as one of the most successful empires in the early modern period from 1636 to 1911 when it was continuously expanding its territories from Manchuria, initially through alliances and later conquest, or only by conquest. The previous Ming dynasty succumbed just as Mongolia, Tibet, Xinjang and areas southwest of the Ming territory were also either conquered or annexed. Connecting these parts of Asia, as Hostetler points out, the Qing Empire was not only successful but also one of the main actors in the early modern world. The Qing surveyors and mapmakers adapted both indigenous and Western techniques and practices, not as a sign of inferior technology, but rather when such techniques were useful. In this way cartography (along with ethnography) was turned into a tool of managing and also furthering the expansion internally by outlining the future state of affairs to the subjected peoples and the imperial administrators, as well as externally to Western powers claiming recognition, as much as informing them of its territory. In retrospect the maps made during the reign of the imperial Qing Dynasty have, by promoting a strong linear sense of continuity, therefore furthered the naturalisation processes of the coming-together of the Chinese nation state to its subjects becoming citizens as well as to the rest of the world (although 'China' very much remains a disputed territorial and political unit).

In the following chapter of 52 pages and with 19 maps Neil Safier shifts the focus to South America and Iberian imperial cartography there set within the context of the territorial conflict between Spain and Portugal on basis of their division of the South American territory as outlined in the Treaties of Madrid (1750) and of Tordesillas (1755) and the according 'black holes' of cartographic knowledge in certain parts of the Amazon region. Specifically, he looks at a contested Amazonian

area near the Jupurá River and into Portuguese cartography there. While resources in the known areas were mapped by the Portuguese, the more remote territories on the peripheries of the larger maps have seen a strong continuity in sense of unknown space marked initially by monsters, Amazon warriors and flesh eating Amerindians, in other words, savage versus civilised, and, with time, becoming the contemporary 'empty' space of the Brazilian Amazon. The contested area gradually became a perhaps not well known, but known area (to the Portuguese) and over time various peoples were charted and followed, later to be transferred to other mediums such as dynamic population charts with next and dynamic charts (rather than static geographic maps) holding information on financial, military and commercial matters. This transformation of the location of peoples in the imperial production of knowledge was connected to the (radical) agreement where (some) locals became vassals and were free to move where they pleased, provided they stay within the confines of the territory, offered protection against enemies of colonial projects, and took part in promoting secure navigation. and the following Portuguese need to be able to demonstrate their rights to the given territories given the presence of their new subjects. These population charts were interestingly, in part based on knowledge provided by locals organised in river maps made from rope with knots representing settlements, just as some geographic maps relied on local knowledge of the river systems, their directional flow etc. In this way Safier shows that Portuguese empire building in the Amazon, while most certainly not aimed at improving relations with the locals or their livelihoods, were in some ways two way processes in which the local groups also made their presence felt. Much like the relations themselves they were not only hostile, but mutually acknowledging in some instances.

In the fifth chapter, (72 pages and 25 maps), D. Graham Burnett addresses the, in his view overlooked, hydro graphic practices in the relations between cartography and empire via the concrete case of the strategic US Exploring Expedition in the first half of 19$^{th}$ century. At this time

American economic, strategic and popular interest in the Pacific and American general oceanic horizons and desire for power and knowledge were expanding. The ‘empty’ space of the Pacific became interesting due to increases in trading and whaling as well as the loss of the Spanish hegemony in the Pacific. Only a few years before naval squadrons had been assigned to both the West Indies and the Pacific. And, at this point, several people from congressmen to ship owners and citizens had begun calling for something, most for an exploration expedition, to take command of the position among the dominant nations and literally put the American pacific on the map. The French and British followed the developments close as can be read in concerned diplomatic correspondence. In 1836 6 ships, 80 officers and 350 men set out on a 4 year journey. Along the way they undertook what Burnett calls an essentially military undertaking and according imperial transformation of the region through mapping a large number of islands. they took note of where and what resources were available for whaling ships but especially, they followed the growing American navy, constructing outposts, appointing American consuls, mapping the directions and periods of the currents as well as winds and last but not least to impart ‘justice’ on the savages with whom American whalers had been in conflict with when approaching their settlements of fishing and whaling areas. One might add, that this oceanic or more precisely Pacific turn in US strategic considerations later led to the consolidation of the US territory as we know it today with the annexation of Hawaii and purchase of Alaska.

In the sixth and final chapter (40 pages and 14 maps) Michael Heffernan shifts the focus to public consumption of imperial maps by looking into the role of imperial maps in the English and French press in the era of the establishment of ‘new’ colonies from the 1870’s to the 1920’s and their place at the centre stage of public debate. He draws upon four literatures that run intertwined in the background: the new focus on journalistic cartography and its geopolitical and ideological content, the relationships between cartography and the construction of collective identity, the visual

representation of imperial spaces, and the cultural history of the popular press. Heffernan goes through the use of imperial maps in the nationally circulated newspapers of Times and Le Figaro, both conservative newspapers, and the weekly publications of Illustrated London News and L'Illustration, both of which synthesized the week's news, and to a lesser extent the urban Daily Telegraph, the Daily Mail, Le Petit Journal and Le Petit Parisien. In this material he finds two types of imperial maps. The first type was not in frequent use in the press prior to 1900 and was mostly related to military campaigns of not only the French and British empires, but also the Russian, Spanish, Austro-Hungarian and Japanese empires rather than the coming about of new technology. The use of this type of map increased throughout World War I, but also decreased in the years after. The other type of imperial map was less used and came to dominate in the years after the War although their use can be traced to the early 1890's. These maps no longer possessed or promoted the naïve war mongering and swagger seen prior to the War due to death of the naivety prior to the war. On this backdrop (and the ruined economies and severed trade between European states as well as their colonies) the maps (therefore) focused on the commercial potential and resource bases of the colonies with a higher degree of complexity. They carried more details and in some cases were also used in the growing industries of tourism, aviation, and commercial shipping materials (If one thinks less of France and Great Britain and instead of Belgium following World War I, it is probably not a coincidence that the massive investments into Belgian Congo came a few years after the end of the war). Heffernan offers a careful conclusion as he notes that the reception of the ideological and geopolitical contents is difficult to assess, but the relatively large presence of the maps and the use of newspaper for multiple domestic purposes, as well as the assumption that the press both shapes and reflects public opinion, indicate that the maps were not entirely without significance.

The anthology as a whole is without a doubt a gathering of works by cartography specialists. Generally, this type of anthology tends to be either a blessing or a curse. In this case the book is clearly for the specialist. Some remarks need to be voiced. Among them is a small criticism of how all contributions to some extent utilise a Foucauldian platform without theorizing this further, although Edney's chapter, in some ways, serves as the broader introduction, and does so well. Nevertheless, how Edneysees 'empire' (not imperialism) as a cartographic construction and modern cartography a construction of modern imperialism seems problematic. While I follow his thinking a long part of the way, and especially cartography as a construction of modern imperialism, I will respectfully disagree with him on 'empire' being a cartographic construction. I cannot separate 'empire' and imperialism, seeing 'empire' and imperialism as two sides of the same coin. The representation of the Other, whether in visual form of a map or through arrogant stories, lead to very real unequal relations between people, often ending in exploitation, torture and killings -the Leopoldian Congo Free State being a case in point. Another criticism has to do with the length of Burnett's chapter that is almost double the size of some of the others. His points on hydrographical practices, as important as they are, could have been served in a shorter text with no loss of meaning (or instead also have included an initial comparison to Russia as another late coming, as well as initially land based, imperialism). A homogenous chapter size throughout the anthology would have been helpful, not only for the reading and broadening access to the importance of the research presented, but also could also have made space for other contributions. Although time is a factor in all work, and most probably also here, contributions on other imperial mapping regimes would have been instructive. A chapter on the German cartographic practise in the Pacific or Africa on the backdrop of the development of the Prussian military high staff apparatus, or the Belgian practise in Congo in relation to the 'development' of the mining regions in the 1920's, or population relocations to promote border stability in the east would have been welcome. How the mapping and

visualisation of the territory, as in the case of China, to some extent came to naturalise the outline of these colonies would have been instructive. In the case of India the mapping clearly didn't match reality as a significant part, now Pakistan, ceded shortly after independence. Perhaps I am also biased since my work is interdisciplinary, but a presence of geographers or people from critical geopolitics could also have been interesting. The aim of the anthology, as stated by the editor Akerman, was to foster critical reflections on the common nature of mapping and imperialism as twin manifestations of unequal power relationships from the late seventeenth century through to the age of high imperialism that concluded in the early twentieth century. The contributors each most certainly achieved this in my case, but a conclusion on the contributions or a broader perspective would have been useful in my view. This broader perspective could, for instance, have focused either connecting imperial cartography with other forms of acquiring imperial knowledge, such as intelligence work and the use of locals in the imperial justice systems, or tax administrations. Or, it could have concentrated on opening up and taking further the introduced, and highly relevant and contemporary, debate on the differences between mapping of nation states and empire and, by extension, the ruptures and continuities in the paradigm of global governance in its current form.

It has to be noted that, although I find my points of criticism valid, they are also of the kind that, if theoretically followed up on, would only make a good specialist book better. As it is, the length of chapters do allow for detail and in-depth analysis by experts in their field. Moreover, the various chapters to some extent also read as histories of the processes of the day to day workings of the making of empire, and not only the western European empires, but with the inclusion of Russia and China, the comparative scope moves towards the global, something I appreciate immensely. Finally, and also rather important, the maps are more or less all well integrated in the different analyses, as well as allowing for a piece of specialist literature, such as this, to be used in relation to teaching.

With regard to teaching I have only taught briefly on European history after 1945 and globalisation, but in a form where the discussion of imperial maps and their use would have been relevant to say the least, but difficult to merge without creating some strange sense of being forced. That is not to say, however, that the anthology as a whole or an individual chapter could not be used. Was I to be given the opportunity (as well as time and resources) to develop for instance a BA level course with 8 to 10 lectures on global history, the history of modernity, imperial history, the history of intelligence work and organisations from the early modern period (from surveyors and mapmakers to Bond, Bourne, satellites and cookies), the history of global governance or European history (which to me cannot be separated with either listed previously) I would include all chapters, and most certainly as many of the maps as possible, and present and discuss cartography as being one of several means of acquiring knowledge and power or wielding the latter in the different imperial, later nation state and global governance regimes. 'My' university operates with a model where the students each semester work out their own research questions and do their own research in groups of 2-5 students rather than only take semester exams written up by their teachers. This promotes not only learning but also understanding by using concepts, bigger contextual history, and by finding relevant literature, etc. In this way the lectures would serve as an introductory framework for collective student project work on, for instance, British imperial technologies in Australia, or Belgian development policies in Belgian Congo, etc. At MA levels, where there is more room for seminars and debate along with individual essay exams, as well as individual or collective project work, rather than traditional lectures and the 'standard issue' written exams, I would have no hesitation giving chapters to students as readings and material for the students to present, problematize and discuss.

All in all, if digested and used with proper pedagogics, I would deem this a very useful book at both the BA and MA levels and a relevant and informative read for those interested in imperial or cartographic history.

Martin Jorgensen, PhD Fellow, History Department of Cultural and Global Studies, Aalborg University, Denmark