

## Chapter 21

### The Look of Surveillance Returns

#### Reflection essay: *Between demythologizing and deconstructing the map: Shawnadithit's New-Found-Land and the alienation of Canada.*

Matthew Sparke,  
Department of Geography University of Washington

##### *Influences*

Since the time when my article was first published critical cartographic studies have advanced considerably 'beyond the binaries' that it originally sought to challenge (see Del Casino and Hanna, 2006). Here, in this reflection paper, my goal is to build on these advances in inquiry into cartographic representation by exploring how they relate to more recent idealistic and voluntaristic suggestions about moving beyond geographic representation and traditional maps altogether. The rather different possibilities of both 'non-representational theory' and 'voluntary geographic information' are thereby re-framed with some re-presentations of my own original argument. To set the scene, though, these reflections begin by revisiting an unsettled binary between roots and routes that was an important inspiration of my article, and which now affords a biographical introduction into its critical geography. In short, I begin by reflecting on how three biographical roots of the article can now be retraced as geo-graphical routes too (hyphens intended, however unsettlingly).

The first route was my own movement into and through Canada, studying at the time as a British graduate student at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver and conducting my Ph.D. research at, amongst other places, the national archives in Ottawa (where I first came across Shawnadithit's maps in Howley's book). Second, was my interest in the adaptation of French post-structuralist theory by post-colonial critics, especially Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak whose reflections on the representation of the geo-graphic agency of subaltern women in India offered anti-colonial insight when re-routed again into the Canadian context (Spivak 1976, 1985 and 1988). And third, was the particular inspiration of arguments by Brian Harley, Dennis Wood and John Fels on the need to consider the power relations implicated in and moving through maps. It is an honor to have my article reprinted here alongside their important interventions, not least of all because my title and the notion of shuttling between demythologization and deconstruction was derived from their terminology. I want now therefore to explain why they became such significant signposts for my own post-structuralist-turned-post-colonial journey into Canadian history, before proceeding to reflect on how my article relates to more recent debates over non-representation, representation and political participation with maps, GIS and web-enabled VGI (Volunteered Geographic Information or 'Neo-Geo' as it's sometimes called) cartography.

Harley's work was enormously important at the time because of the way it demonstrated how one could examine maps in terms of Michel Foucault's arguments about the concatenation of 'power-knowledge'. His "Deconstructing the Map" article (this volume) sought thus to make sense of maps as representations of knowledge *about* the world that were deeply tied to relations of power *in* the world. To demonstrate these

worldly ties, Harley drew on his encyclopedic understanding of diverse cartographic archives: showing, amongst other things, their huge importance in the geographical development of European colonialism. I am still impressed by the ways in which he and other historians of cartography such as Matthew Edney (this volume) and James Akerman (2009) deliver such detailed and lively accounts of the ways maps are thereby implicated in imperial power, and, to some extent, my article reflected a desire to detail some similar dynamics *vis-à-vis* the Canadian cartographic archive.

At the same time, Dennis Wood and John Fels showed that it was possible to make these sorts of arguments about the worldliness of cartographic power-knowledge in ways that appealed to a wider audience outside of academia. Their article (this volume), and their book *The Power of Maps* clearly spoke to a huge public interest in the role maps play in everyday life. Moreover, their pithy, often poetic sound bites seemed to me to speak truth to power without ever sacrificing the possibility of contributing to intellectual innovation too. One of their most obvious contributions in this respect was to wider debates over the myth-making movements of concealment and revelation that Roland Barthes and others had connected to travel writing and landscape representations more generally. And, because of my own intellectual travels, I found this especially inspiring.

As an undergraduate I had learned a great deal from David Harvey's Marxian analyses of urban representations (including Haussmann's remapping of Paris) and their class-interested political-economy (*e.g.* Harvey, 1985). I had also read cultural critiques by other geographers who developed demythologization arguments in ways that showed that the discipline might have something to contribute to what was then the fast-expanding field of cultural studies (Anderson, 1988; Duncan and Duncan, 1988; Gregory

and Ley, 1988; and Jackson, 1989). Coming to UBC (partly as a result of an interest in this line of work) I was also introduced by Gerry Pratt and Aruna Srivastava to a wide range of feminist scholarship that took the critique of vision, ‘see-it-all-from-above’ god tricks and omniscient representation forward in ways that clearly showed how maps were bound up with masculinist, as well as, imperial power-knowledge (Haraway, 1989; Kolodny, 1975; Rose, 1993). And, meanwhile, I was also influenced by historical geographers in Vancouver (a city itself named after a colonial explorer) who sought to study colonial archives as spatial history – *i.e.* as ‘routes’ versus ‘roots’ (*à la* Carter, 1987) – and who thereby traced active native geographies obscured by wilderness myths of so-called British Columbia (*e.g.* Clayton, 2000; Galois, 1994; and Harris, 2002). Thus, while Harley did not draw on exactly the same theoretical repertoire, and while neither did Woods and Fels address all of these Marxist, feminist and post-colonial concerns, the critical cartographers’ ‘deconstruction’ and ‘demythologization’ of maps still seemed to me to be intellectually resonant with wider contemporary efforts to expand critical theorizing in geography.

The resonance noted, there was also intellectual dissonance too. In this respect it is ironic to describe the interventions of Harley, Wood and Fels as ‘signposts’ because their key terms actually pointed in opposite directions to the ways I used them for orientation in my article. While Harley spoke of ‘deconstructing’ the map, my own point was that his work really represented a form of demythologization: an attempt, in short, to debunk cartography’s claim to uninterested objectivity by showing the powerful interests in which it operated. Conversely, it seemed to me, that while Woods and Fels drew on Barthesian arguments about semiotic demythologization, the pragmatic spirit of their

project had more in common with Derrida's affirmative approach to deconstruction (which Harley by contrast rejected as overly textualist and relativizing). They were thus more interested in how maps produce particular consolidations of truth rather than in suggesting that we can identify once and for all what the real truth is behind the biases and cover-ups of a particular map. In other words, while Harley performed a version of cartographic ideology critique by pulling away the mask of objectivity and revealing the social and political structures behind maps, Woods and Fels pointed to the need to address the epistemological structures of maps themselves, the way they go on framing, consolidating and thereby remaking real world truths that they are assumed merely to record and represent.

I do not want to overstate these differences here. Clearly the two sorts of critical moves share much in common. But for me, following Barbara Belyea's critique of Harley (Belyea, 1992), and, learning from Spivak's explanation of Derrida's '*writing*' for literary and social theorists more generally (Spivak, 1976), it was important not to throw out the nuance of deconstruction with the wishy-washy bathwater of relativistic postmodernism. Deconstruction, it seemed to me, had a more robust role to play in keeping critique honest about its own limits, of always asking – as Spivak (1985) had herself done in her deconstruction of subaltern studies – critical questions about how the reinsertion of a neglected agent or account into the historical-geographical record risked essentializing the identity of the agent or reifying the representation of the account. Moreover, reading Spivak's own arguments alongside José Rabasa's post-structuralist-turned-post-colonial reading of colonial mapping, it became very clear that a rigorous deconstructive approach offered something that you could not find in ideology critique

alone: namely, a heightened sensitivity to the epistemological possibilities of counter-hegemonic cartographic production. If the map could be, in Rabasa's terms, "a signaling tool for scrambling previous territorializations," (Rabasa, 1985: 17) it might not only be a coactive co-product of colonial power-knowledge, but also an anti-colonial assemblage of power-knowledge too. Rabasa's suggestion that maps were in this sense geographical palimpsests was particularly provocative, and, for the same reason, it is worth re-quoting again here. "The transposition of the image of the palimpsest," he argued, "becomes an illuminative metaphor for understanding geography as a series of erasures and overwritings that have transformed the world. The imperfect erasures are, in turn, a source of hope for the reconstitution or reinvention of the world from native points of view" (Rabasa, 1985: 37).

It was just such a native point of view that I sought to highlight in the counter-hegemonic cartography of Shawnadithit. Demythologizers could debunk the limits of Cook's cartography and other colonial maps of Newfoundland all they liked, I thought, but without the deconstructive idea of the map as a palimpsest we might not register the reterritorializing remapping of the same space as New-Found-Land from a native point of view. Shawnadithit's maps – which are all now available online (Shawnadithit, 2009) – had generally been represented in the Canadian canon as anthropological relics of a pre-historical people. My argument was that they could be read instead as native mapping that returned the look of colonial surveillance and, as it were, anthropologized colonial history while redrawing the island's geography from an ab-original perspective (*i.e.* both native and moving away from 'original' European assertions of new-ness).

Although I cited Homi Bhabha in arguing that the look of surveillance returns resistantly, my points about Shawnadithit's story maps were also re-routed through a more embodied account of ab-original agency. I remain wary of Bhabha's tendency to read off post-colonial possibilities from just the poetics of performative word-play (see Bhabha, 2004). Anti-colonial agency is a historical reality, and one does not necessarily need supplementary suppositions about mimicry and hybridity to notice it (cf Mitchell, 1997). Indeed, much of the First Nations struggle going on in Canada (both now and when I wrote the article) has demonstrated this repeatedly, often in ways that also offer a sobering geographic displacement of Bhabha's locutions about location too (see Sparke, 2005; and for an important ongoing struggle that foregrounds a native map – as part of the Kétuskéno Declaration against Albertan oil sands destruction of native homelands – see Beaver Lake Nation, 2009). Returning to the debates in cartography via Spivak's and Rabasa's post-colonial re-routings of post-structuralism, I wanted to focus on the politics of context rather than just the poetics of text. The demythologization moment was therefore vital. The basic facts of native geographic agency obscured by colonial myths of Newfoundland had to be recognized. Yet at the same time, my aim was to show that deconstruction could usefully supplement demythologization by providing a way of remaining alert to how anti-colonial knowledge production reterritorialized the cartographic overlays of the colonialists while remaining subject to further reterritorialization and recolonization itself.

I had already written about the 'white mythology' of colonial overwriting in a review essay examining the relationship between deconstruction and post-colonial critique more generally (Sparke, 1994). So it was building on this earlier work that I

attempted to show empirically how the white man's colonial map could become re-readable as a palimpsest of power-knowledge in which counter-hegemonic cartographies were – in Derrida's terms – “active and stirring” too. This was an argument which, I further suggested *contra* Harley, was also compatible with Foucault's own insistence on studying power in terms of its capillary circulation through social relations, including those of resistance as much as of dominance and governance. Today, moves like this away from sovereign or juridical conceptualizations of power continue to enable non-romanticizing accounts of resistance in (and through) critical geography (see Sparke, 2008). As such, they also intersect with new concerns about non-representation, performativity and participation that have further shaped debates in critical cartography in the period since the mid 1990's. It is to these new intersections on the routes between demythologization and deconstruction that these reflections now turn.

### *Intersections*

In retrospect my article's theorization of a post-structuralist-turned-post-colonial argument “between deconstruction and demythologization” seems to have disappeared up its own subtleness. Notwithstanding my attempts to cite the relevant literatures and demonstrate the requisite theoretical *pouvoir-savoir*, the intervention has had little impact or recognition in post-structuralist/post-colonial theory, nor for that matter in Canadian historiography. It may have been too Canadian for the former audience, and not Canadian enough for the latter, but, whatever the case, the article has not travelled far outside of critical cartographic studies within geography (n.b. Wikipedia, 2009). Even within this narrower subfield it has hardly become a chart topper (only 23 cites in total as listed on *Google Scholar* in 2009). It was noticed enough to be republished in an edited

book entitled *Places Through the Body* (Sparke, 1998). But, despite this reprinting, it has still been left out of an authoritative online bibliography of work on the history of cartography (Edney, 2007), and, to add mis-representation to non-representation, has been treated in one its few moments in the citational sun as an example of ‘non-representational theory’ in critical cartographic studies (Perkins, 2004).

Given the relative non-representation of the article in citational circles, it might seem unfortunately ironic as well as ungrateful to complain about the association with non-representational theory. Chris Perkins in fact provides a great summary of the article’s main argument, and usefully links it to ongoing work by others on the cultural-political contexts of cartographic texts. I can also understand why he connects the article’s attention to Shawnadithit’s action-oriented and affect-laden mapping to the arguments by Nigel Thrift and his followers about the need to track the active and affective aspects of social and cultural life – movements, tastes, feelings, and so on – that are excessive to or otherwise elude disciplinary writes-turned-rites of representation. However, as Vincent Del Casino and Stephen Hanna argue in their creative critique of binary oppositions dividing representational maps from spatial practices : “it is not necessary to conflate all theories of practice and performance with non-representational theory” (Del Casino and Hanna, 2006: 37). Moreover, the additional attention given in my article to colonial violence, dispossession and resistance seems to me to be exactly the sort of attention to worldly oppression and the struggles it engenders that nonrepresentational theorists prefer to leave non-represented. This may well be done in the idealistic hope that non-representation will make the violence and political problems simply go away. But I would submit that it undermines resistance. It is hard to map-back and produce ‘rival’ cartographies if one runs away from the challenges of representation

altogether. No doubt this is why some of the most innovative work in critical cartographic and cultural studies would therefore seem to replace nonrepresentational idealism with a much more critical attention to the representational relays in which and through which cartographies of resistance develop (*e.g.* Basu, 2009; Brown & Knopp 2008; Camp, 2002; Crampton and Krygier, 2006; De Leeuw, 2009; Harris and Hazen, 2006 & 2009; Kitchen and Dodge, 2007; McKittrick, 2006; Nah, 2006; Radcliffe, 2009; St Martin, 2009). However, given the increasing influence of nonrepresentational theory it also seems idealistic to just ignore it in the hopes that it will disappear in puff of neo-Hegelian self-contradiction. What then are its implications for critical cartographic studies such as those represented by my article?

Non-representational geographers might protest that they are not apolitical, that, unlike the German idealists critiqued by Marx and Engels (1970), they are interested instead in noticing aspects of politics that others ignore, and that they do this by tracing the ways in which action and affect are manipulated in the lived geographies of everyday life. However, as Clive Barnett (2008) has argued, there is a philosophical sleight of hand performed in such non-representational representations about manipulated affect, a sort of idealization of politics that makes normative claims about what is wrong with the world (and what could be right) under the cover of ontological arguments about affect. While I find Barnett's own argument too ontologically axiomatic itself, his basic point translates well into other less stipulative styles of criticism. To put the argument in a more deconstructive way, for example, the non-representationalists want to have their non-representational cake while still eating and regurgitating all sorts of political commitments that remain unexamined and unexplained as politics precisely because they

become (non-)represented as ontology as affect.<sup>1</sup> The cake's ingredients are never fully disclosed, but seem to consist of a remix of anti-writing metaphysics baked with Deleuzian and Freudian ingredients rather than any apparent awareness of Derrida's deconstruction of the scene of writing in Freud, nor yet of Irigaray's unfolding of affect in and against Lacanian lack (on the latter, see Thien, 2005). And, philosophical affect aside, from the explicitly political points of view of Marxist, feminist and post-colonial geography, the apolitical mixing is also a problem. Indeed, it might further be interpreted as 'problematic' – in Althusser's adaptation of the term – because it is symptomatic of an 'advanced liberal' subject formation – in the self-descriptive sense of Nikolas Rose (2007). That is to say, it redefines critical politics around the individualistic and largely libertarian anxieties of privileged elites (or at least aspirant elites) whose main worries in life are not body counts and the annihilation of friends and family, but rather the sorts of calculations about bodies that turn risk surveillance into something risky even for straight white men of property (Sparke, 2006; see also Braun, 2007). Looking at the look of surveillance as the manipulation of affect amidst neoliberalism is in this sense quite different to examining how the look of surveillance returns as an affective mode of ab-original agency amidst imperialism.

These political differences between my article's argument and the crypto-normative contradictions of non-representational theory are important to emphasize because my own work has also been criticized by Barnett for what he sees as a similar philosophical sleight – a "slippage," he calls it, between deconstruction and normative

---

<sup>1</sup> To put this still more playfully, paraphrasing the American comic singer Tom Lehrer: if people feel they cannot represent, the very least they can do is stop representing the feeling in endless articles!  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/That\\_Was\\_the\\_Year\\_That\\_Was](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/That_Was_the_Year_That_Was)

critique (Barnett, 2007: 503). Moreover, with his definition of “foundationalism” in the latest *Dictionary of Human Geography* Barnett goes so far as to condemn Spivak too for attempting to “finesse” thinking like a skeptic and acting like a foundationalist (Barnett, 2009: 262). Disturbingly, he even accuses her, along with Judith Butler and a host of others, of being “deceitful” because of a “tendency to misconstrue what is at stake in issues of foundationalism” (2009: 262). I do not want to dwell here on the strange mix of metaphysics and moralism in this accusation, nor on the way Barnett himself finesses extraordinarily complex debates amongst globally-respected theorists to make a skeptical judgement with what reads like a foundationalist faith in a very local, almost private, philosophical correctness. Instead I want to suggest that in thereby misconstruing Spivak, Barnett ignores arguments she makes about representation that actually offer a compelling alternative to the problems he identifies in non-representational theory. These arguments are worth highlighting here because I think they also offer support for the sorts of collective or at least collaborative work being advocated by Casino, Hanna, Kitchen, Dodge and others in their invitations to critical cartographers to examine maps as representational practices.

Some of Spivak’s most well-known arguments about representation are made in her “Can The Subaltern Speak?” essay. This essay was an important inspiration for developing my critique of Shawnadithit’s silencing as a quaint artifact in Canadian colonial history (Spivak, 1988), and attuned as it is to the limits of ethnocentric theory – notably, Foucault’s focus on European spaces of discipline that actually took form amidst spaces of empire – the essay also offers an antidote to the parochial pattern in ‘nonrep’ repatriations of affect as that which affects ‘us’ (us, in this case, being the same advanced

liberals noted above). Answering her essay title's question in the negative, Spivak famously critiques Deleuze and Foucault for suggesting that critical scholars should let the oppressed and marginalized speak for themselves. She well understands the dangers of misrepresentation within dominant structures of power-knowledge, but she argues that to advocate non-representation is an abdication of critical representational responsibility, and, moreover, a denial of the ways in which we go on representing whether we say so or not. We cannot not represent, Spivak argues, and yet as we do so, we must also always subject our representations to persistent critique for what they ignore or misrepresent. As a way of explaining this approach, she points to the two German words for representation – *Darstellung* (to represent as in a portrait) and *Vetretung* (to represent as in a political debate). She argues that we need to recognize how these two senses of representation – the pictorial sense and the political proxy sense – each brings the other into a productive form of crisis. Every political representation has to be aware of the limits of representation in the picturing sense (and what it might therefore ignore or misrepresent), and every picturing form of representation has to be made accountable to its political repercussions (and how it might have a political outcome whether intended or not). There is no denying the limits and problems of pictorial representation here, but there is equally no attempt to say political representation is completely reducible to these limits and problems.

It seems to me that these arguments about the double relay of representation are especially useful for critical cartographers as we continue to confront the challenges of studying maps as politically-consequential representational practices. On the one hand, they help us avoid ontologizing anti-essentialism. This is the sort of move to which

Barnett objects and that tends to ascribe worldly outcomes or political judgements to purely epistemic structures and positions (such as the nonrepresentationality of affect, for example). On the other hand, Spivak's arguments about representation do not close-off (as Barnett's decree about "deceit" would seem to do), the ongoing production of explanations, arguments and, yes, maps that simultaneously make themselves vulnerable to critique for moments of misrepresentation, over-writing and exclusionary enframing. This is precisely what so much of the work in critical cartography now appears to be doing (see Kitchen and Dodge, 2007). It does not write-off maps as always already doomed to misrepresentation, nor yet suggest that the ways in which maps operate as practices and performances can be deduced purely on the basis of an anti-essentialist axiomatics. Instead it leads to a way of understanding the production and use of maps as political that simultaneously suggests we can leverage the lessons of deconstruction to open moments of cartographic representation to an iterative and collaborative process of critique, re-presentation and, thus, ultimately, re-mapping too. For the faithful few who have found metaphysical meaning in some select seminal works of western Philosophy this may sound like a populist finesse or even a deceit. But readers should judge for themselves, and instead of seeking sanctuary amidst the fortifications of a new foundationalism, the protection against deception and misrepresentation would here come in the form of a commitment to working collaboratively, creatively *and* critically on an ongoing basis, always making the moments of cartographic truth production and performance open to the world wide web, so to speak, of critical engagement.

Contemporary examples of critical cartographic production and engagement are now many, and they include amongst their most exciting innovations increasing work

with the actual web of ‘Web 2.0’ mapping: the so-called Neo-Geo map-making revolution that has been enabled in part by the internet, the explosion in geo-tagged online data, and the parallel development of map ‘mash-up’ technologies such as Google’s My Maps. In certain respects, these contemporary cartographic developments can be seen as a new chapter in PPGIS or ‘participatory GIS’ (see Elwood and Ghose, this volume; and Elwood, 2006), especially insofar as they index another historical shift away from the state holding a monopoly on the production of cartographic truth (Elwood, 2008). Yet while all sorts of subaltern social subjects can and do use web-enabled technologies to produce new maps that can speak a new cartographic truth to power (Elwood, 2010), and while this can surely be seen as an enabling expansion of cartographic citizenship beyond the ranks of ESRI-enabled Apollonian elites (Kingsbury and Jones, 2009), there are also obviously dangers of technological utopianism and biopolitical abuse attending the new possibilities for demystifying map-making (making Elwood and Ghose’s cautions about PPGIS all the more relevant). Here again deconstruction can critically supplement demythologization. Likewise, comparisons with the scene of Shawnadithit volunteering her story maps to Cormack can prompt critical reflection on the recapture and cooptation of geo-graphic agency through the neoliberal and neocolonial reterritorialization of the Neo-Geo revolution.

For one thing, the grim colonial circumstances of Shawnadithit’s not-really-voluntary map-making point to the ways in which broader patterns of violence and dispossession might overshadow the production of Volunteered Geographic Information (VGI being a term used to name the sorts of spatial data generated by web-users). Reflecting on this parallel we can note that while it may function as an enabling

technology for map-making by ‘citizen scientists’ (Goodchild, 2007), much VGI is generated and circulated on online commercial networks that are simultaneously colonizing and reducing the meaning of citizenship to the neoliberal common denominators of market choice, entrepreneurial calculation and consumer training (and this is to say nothing of the ways in which military data collection also surveys these new e-spaces much as the British marines once surveyed Newfoundland; see also Basu, 2009).

Given that Shawnadithit finally died due to an infectious disease, one telling contemporary example of this neoliberalization of VGI technology today is the iPhone application *Outbreaks Near Me* (HealthMap, 2009; and Harmon, 2009). Launched in the midst of the H1N1 pandemic in September 2009, this geoweb-enabled application is an illustration at one level of the democratization of public health disease surveillance (see Figure 21.1). But at another level, it just as clearly exemplifies the way in which such cartographic ‘democratization’ is only beneficial for a privileged few who can buy into the new market-mediated surveillance system as a way of managing their personal risk exposure and protecting their own individual bodies. Here we see not an imperial liberal like Cormack making an anthropological survey of a dying culture, nor mobile marines marching with bodies across native land, but rather ‘advanced liberal’ kinetic elites who move across borders and through new found lands of flatness with embodied privilege (Sparke, 2006 & 2009).

The inequalities of today’s ‘accumulation by dispossession’ (Harvey, 2005) become still more disconcerting when we turn to consider the contemporary sorts of alienation that might mirror Shawnadithit’s brutal alienation and the genocide of the Beothuk in Newfoundland. What happens, for instance, when online user-generated

spatial data reported or otherwise relayed by citizen scientists on the web subsequently becomes used in campaigns against those deemed to be ‘non-citizen’ threats to national security? Is there not a danger of crowd-sourcing turning thus into mob-sourcing, or, at the very least, of elites using the tools to further entrench their privilege (see Burrows, 2008)? To be sure, there are many cases of the new map-making tools working to contest such contemporary forms of alienation (for a useful survey see Crampton, 2010). The online *Atlas of Torture*, is one such example (<http://www.univie.ac.at/bimtor/countrymap>), as too is the work of Trevor Paglen that uses online data to track the sorts of conjoint neocolonial-neoliberal violence represented by the CIAs outsourcing of torture (Paglen, 2009, 2007; and Paglen and Thompson, 2006). In this sense Neo-Geo technologies can enable critical work for human rights just like, and sometimes alongside, formal GIScience (Madden and Ross, 2009). However, at the same time as they might enable the representation of political violence and genocide, it would be naïve to ignore the ways in which pre-existing asymmetries in access to the internet and computer technologies will go on skewing the distribution of benefits and costs of Web 2.0 mapmaking. This is not to suggest at all that Neo-Geo technologies are always and everywhere neoliberal and neocolonial. Nor does it mean that we can simply read-off the ways that they do serve such interests and imperatives simply on the basis of their epistemological organization. Instead, it suggests an ongoing need to keep moving between demythologization and deconstruction as map-making becomes more accessible and democratized and as the look of surveillance – as in the *Atlas of Torture* – returns once more to survey the surveyors of a new world disorder.

#### Further Readings:

Del Casino, V. J. and Hanna, S. P (2006) Beyond The 'Binaries': A Methodological Intervention for Interrogating Maps as Representational Practices. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 4 (1), 34-56. This is a great read for quickly catching up on where the debates in critical cartography have gone from the mid 1990's onwards.

Crampton, J. (2010) Cartography: performative, participatory, political, *Progress in Human Geography*, 1-9. Another useful overview of recent work on the power-knowledge nexus in mapping.

Elwood, S. (2010) Geographic information science: emerging research on the societal implications of the geospatial web, *Progress in Human Geography*. This progress report provides a terrific entry-point into the fast developing debates on the Neo-Geo revolution and geoweb.

Paglen, T. (2009) *Blank spots on the map: the dark geography of the Pentagon's secret world*, Dutton, New York. As reported on the *Colbert Report* (see <http://www.colbertnation.com>), the look of surveillance returns here to survey the US military and its geographies of disappearance.

Pickles, J. (2004) *A history of spaces: cartographic reason, mapping, and the geo-coded world*, Routledge, New York. An erudite introduction into the modern emergence of cartographic reason.

References:

- Akerman, J.R. (2009) *The imperial map*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Anderson, K. (1988) Cultural hegemony and the race-definition process in Chinatown, Vancouver: 1880 – 1980. *Environment and Planning D*, 6 127 – 149.
- Barnett, C. (2009) Foundationalism, in *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, (eds. D. Gregory, R. Johnston, G. Pratt, M. Watts, S. Whatmore), Wiley, New York, 261 - 262.
- Barnett, C. (2007) Review of *In the space of theory: postfoundational geographies of the nation-state* by M Sparke. *Environment and Planning A*, **39**, 502-504.
- Barnett, C. (2008) Political affects in public space: normative blind-spots in non-representational ontologies. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, NS **33**: 186–200.
- Basu, R. (2009) Phronesis Through GIS: Exploring Political Spaces of Education, *Professional Geographer*, **61**, 4, 481 – 492
- Beaver Lake Nation (2009) *Beaver Lake Cree Nation versus Canada and Alberta*, <http://www.raventrust.com/media/BLCNPressKit.pdf>
- Belyea, B. (1992) Images of Power: Derrida/Foucault/Harley. *Cartographica*, **29/2**, 1 - 9.
- Bhabha, H. (2004) *The location of culture*, New York: Routledge.
- Braun, B. (2007) Biopolitics and the molecularization of life. *Cultural Geographies*, **14**, 1, 6-28.
- Brown, M. & Knopp, L. (2008) Queering the map: the productive tensions of colliding epistemologies. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, **98**, 40-58.
- Burrows, R. (2008) 'Geodemographics and the Construction of Differentiated Neighbourhoods' in J. Flint and D. Robinson (eds) *Cohesion in Crisis? New Dimensions of Diversity and Difference* Bristol: Policy Press, 219-237.
- Camp, S. (2002) The pleasures of resistance: enslaved women and body politics in the plantation South, 1830-1861. *Journal of Southern History* **68**, 533-40.
- Carter, P. (1987) *The road to Botany Bay: an essay in spatial history*, Faber, London.
- Clayton, D. (2000) *Islands of truth: the imperial fashioning of Vancouver Island*, UBC Press, Vancouver.

- Crampton, J. (2010) Cartography: performative, participatory, political, *Progress in Human Geography*, 1–9.
- Crampton, J. and Krygier, J. (2006) An Introduction to Critical Cartography. *ACME Journal* 4,1, 11-33.
- De Leeuw, S. (2009) “‘I am Outraged’: Media, Racism, and Colonial Narratives of ‘Equality’ in Response to the Nisga’a Treaty of Northwestern British Columbia, Canada.” *Wicazo Sa Review: A Journal of Native American Studies, Special Issue: Empire’s War on Extremism*, 23 (2): xxx-xxx.
- Del Casino, V. J. and Hanna, S. P. (2000) Representations and identities in tourism map spaces. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24, 1, 23-46.
- Del Casino, V. J. and Hanna, S. P. (2006) Beyond The ‘Binaries’: A Methodological Intervention for Interrogating Maps as Representational Practices. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 4 (1), 34-56 accessed at <http://www.acme-journal.org/vol4/VDCSPH.pdf>
- Dodge, M. and Kitchin, R. (2007) Rethinking Maps. *Progress in Human Geography*, 3, 3, 331-44.
- Dodge, M. and Perkins, C. (2008) Reclaiming the map: British geography and ambivalent cartographic practice. *Environment and Planning A* 40, 1271–76.
- Duncan, J. Duncan, N. (1988) (Re)reading the landscape. *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space*, 6, 117 – 126.
- Edney, M. (2007) *Recent Trends in the History of Cartography: A Selective, Annotated Bibliography to the English-Language Literature*. Accessed at <http://purl.oclc.org/coordinates/b6.htm>
- Elwood, S. (2006) Beyond cooptation or resistance: Urban spatial politics, community organizations, and GIS-based spatial narratives. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 96(2): 323-341.
- Elwood, S. (2008) Volunteered geographic information: Future research directions motivated by critical, participatory, and feminist GIS. *GeoJournal*, 72, 173–83.
- Elwood, S. (2010) Geographic information science: emerging research on the societal implications of the geospatial web, *Progress in Human Geography*.
- Galois, R. (1994) *Kwakwa\_ka\_ 'wakw settlements, 1775-1920: a geographical analysis and gazetteer*, with contributions by Jay Powell and Gloria Cranmer Webster (on behalf of the U'mista Cultural Centre, Alert Bay, BC), UBC Press, Vancouver.

- Goodchild, M.F. (2007) Citizens as sensors: The world of volunteered geography. *GeoJournal* **69**(4): 211 - 221.
- Gregory D. and Ley D. (1988) Culture's geographies. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, **1**, 115 – 116.
- Haraway, D. (1989) *Primate visions: gender, race, and nature in the world of modern science*, Routledge, New York.
- Harmon, K. (2009) Slick mobile app tracks H1N1, other outbreaks near you. *Scientific American*, online article dated Sept 1, 2009, accessed at <http://www.scientificamerican.com/blog/60-second-science/post.cfm?id=sick-mobile-app-tracks-h1n1-other-o-2009-09-01>
- Harris, R. C. (2002) *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, And Reserves In British Columbia*, UBC Press, Vancouver.
- Harris, L. and Hazen, H. (2009) Rethinking Maps from a More-than-Human Perspective: Nature-Society, Mapping, and Conservation Territories, in *Rethinking Maps* (eds. C. Perkins, M. Dodge, and R. Kitchin), Routledge, New York, pp. 50 – 67.
- Harris, L.M. and Hazen, H.D. (2006) *Power of Maps: (Counter) Mapping for Conservation*, *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, **4** (1), 99-130, accessed at <http://www.acme-journal.org/vol4/LMHHDH.pdf>
- Harvey, D. (2005) *A brief history of neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Harvey, D. (1985) *Consciousness and the urban experience: studies in the history and theory of capitalist urbanization*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Md.
- HealthMap, (2009) *Outbreaks Near Me*, accessed at <http://www.healthmap.org/iphone/>
- Jackson, P. (1989) *Maps of meaning: an introduction to cultural geography*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Kingsbury, P. Jones III, J.P. (2009) Walter Benjamin's Dionysian Adventures on Google Earth, *Geoforum* **40**, 502–513.
- Kolodny A. (1975) *The lay of the land: metaphor as experience and history in American life and letters*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Madden, M. and Ross, A. (2009) Genocide and GIScience: Integrating Personal Narratives and Geographic Information Science to Study Human Rights. *The Professional Geographer*, **61**, 4, 508 – 526.

- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1970) *The German ideology*, International Publishers, New York.
- McKittrick, K. (2006) *Demonic Grounds: Black Women and the Cartographies of Struggle*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Mitchell, K. (1997) Different diasporas and the hype of hybridity. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, **15** (5) 533 – 553.
- Nah, A. (2006) (Re)mapping indigenous 'race'/place in postcolonial peninsular Malaysia, *Geografiska Annaler Series B-Human Geography* **88B**, 285-297.
- Paglen, T. (2009) *Blank spots on the map: the dark geography of the Pentagon's secret world*, Dutton, New York.
- Paglen, T. (2007) Groom Lake and the Imperial Production of Nowhere. In *Violent Geographies. Fear, Terror, and Political Violence* (eds. Gregory, D. and Pred, A.) Routledge, New York, pp. 237–54.
- Paglen, T. and Thompson, A.C. (2006) *Torture taxi. On the trail of the CIA's rendition flights*, Melville House Publishing, Hoboken, NJ.
- Perkins, C. (2004) Cartography - cultures of mapping: power in practice. *Progress in Human Geography*, **28**, 381-391.
- Rabasa, J. (1985) Allegories of the Atlas. In F. Barker, ed., *Europe and its Other*, 2 vols, Colchester, II, pp. 1-16.
- Radcliffe S. (2009) National maps, digitalisation and neoliberal cartographies: transforming nation-state practices and symbols in postcolonial Ecuador. *Transactions of the institute of British Geographers*, 34 (4), 426-444.
- Rose, G. (1993) *Feminism and geography: the limits of geographical knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rose, G. (2007) *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Shawnadithit, (2009) *The Drawings of Shanawdithit*, as recorded in Howley, J. P. (1915) *The Beothucks or Red Indians: The Aboriginal Inhabitants of Newfoundland*, accessed online at <http://www.mun.ca/rels/native/beothuk/beo2gifs/texts/shana2.html>
- Sparke, M. (2009) “On denationalization as neoliberalization: Biopolitics, class interest and the incompleteness of citizenship,” *Political Power and Social Theory*, 20: 287-300.

- Sparke, M. (2008) Political Geographies of Globalization (3): Resistance. *Progress in Human Geography*, **32** (1), 1 – 18.
- Sparke, M. (2006) A Neoliberal Nexus: Citizenship, Security and the Future of the Border. *Political Geography*, **25** (2), 151 – 180.
- Sparke, M. (2005) *In the Space of Theory: Postfoundational Geographies of the Nation-State*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Sparke, M. (1998) Mapped Bodies and Disembodied Maps: (Dis)placing Cartographic Struggle in Colonial Canada, in *Places Through the Body* (eds. Nast, H. and Piles, S.) Routledge, New York, pp. 305 - 336.
- Sparke, M. (1994) White Mythologies and Anemic Geographies. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, **12** (1), 105 - 123.
- Spivak, G.C. (1976) Translator's Preface, in *Of Grammatology*, J. Derrida, translated by G.C. Spivak. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Spivak, G.C. (1985) Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography, in *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society. Vol. 4*. Guha, Ranajit, Ed. Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- Spivak, G.C. (1988) Can the Subaltern Speak?, in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (eds by C. Nelson and L. Grossberg) University of Illinois Press, Urbana, pp. 271-313.
- St. Martin, K. (2009) Toward a Cartography of the Commons: Constituting the Political and Economic Possibilities of Place. *Professional Geographer*, **61**, 4: 493 – 507.
- Thien, D. (2005) After or beyond feeling?: a consideration of affect and emotion in geography. *Area* **37**(4): 450-456.
- Wikipedia, 2009, Shanawdithit, at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shanawdithit>