

development studies as he treats scalar complexity, globalization and heterogenous development strategies extensively. These themes are all presently under consideration by scholars in geographic studies and his reflections are both insightful and sophisticated.

J. Bury

*Department of Geography and Human Sciences, San Francisco State University,
1600 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132, USA
E-mail address: bury@sfsu.edu*

doi:10.1016/S0962-6298(02)00081-1

Bushmanders and bullwinkles. How politicians manipulate electronic maps and census data to win elections

Mark Monmonier; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, USA, 2001. pp. 208, hard-back ISBN 0-226-53424-3

Although the first national census in the USA took place in 1790, it was not until 1874 that the Census Bureau brought out an atlas of its findings. This was the groundbreaking and monumental Statistical Atlas of the United States, based on the 1870 returns, and the first statistical atlas of the United States. Its author was Francis Amasa Walker, the Bureau's superintendent for the 1870 and 1880 counts. As Hannah has documented in great detail, Walker was pre-eminently suited to oversee the census by virtue of his background and inclination, and he used the atlas to help construct a discourse of 'governmentality' about the American social body (Hannah, 2000). This geographic discourse has material effects on the American population and helped construct specific policies (to do with immigration for example).

Monmonier's new book focuses on the way that census data is implicated in political elections today. As such the story he tells bears comparison with Walker's efforts in the late nineteenth century. Although there are many similarities, especially in the way that politics is constituted as a question of managing populations, and the acute emphasis on statistics, Monmonier's account also recalls the extent to which the census and mapping have become entwined with the law. As was evident during the 2000 Presidential elections (about which Monmonier is silent) electoral politics is increasingly a juridical matter. Monmonier's interest in this question is cartographic and it follows his longstanding investigation of the role of maps in everyday life. While this interest often includes 'carto-political' questions as here, it also encompasses hazard and weather mapping, maps in the media, and what he called expository cartography (making your case with maps).

The book consists of ten short chapters that trace the relationships between 'geography, demography, and power' (p.x) during the American redistricting process. In Chapter 1 he explains his title as a pun on 'gerrymander' since he attributes the resurgence of gerrymandering to the Department of Justice under the elder Bush.

The Twelfth District in New York was dubbed a 'bullwinkle' by journalists which apparently refers to an American cartoon character (a moose). Monmonier adopts a useful graphic trick of illustrating districts as equal-sized silhouettes which can be easily compared. In one figure for example he shows a dozen districts divided between the 'unconstitutional' and the 'apparently acceptable' along with measures of their compactness. Many of the unconstitutional districts have boundaries that are just as complex as the apparently acceptable districts. This graphic serves to drive home one of Monmonier's major points: that 'bizarre' shapes can be quite legal as long as they are not based primarily on race.

The next two chapters offer a historical account of redistricting and show the increasing involvement of the Supreme Court during the 1990s. The central four chapters of the book examine how compactness and contiguity of districts have political impacts. Chapter 8, ironically titled 'What a friend we have in GIS' shows that faster, more interactive software allows ever increasing tinkering with district boundaries. This tinkering confirms that there has been a general increase in district complexity in the last twenty years or so. Yet there is still plenty of resistance to using 'algorithmic redistricting' because the criteria can be configured in different ways (to favour compactness or equality of the population's racial composition, for example).

Monmonier does not consider himself a political cartographer, which for him means a cartographer who produces political maps (and he suggest the word 'remap' to capture this process). Instead, he offers some suggestions in a concluding chapter on how to avoid the controversy and propaganda of redistricting. Using the nomination (later withdrawn by President Clinton) of Lani Guinier to assistant attorney general for civil rights in 1993, Monmonier points out that alternative methods of electing representatives – multimember districts and proportional representation – to the American (and UK and French) system of 'first past the post' have plenty of historical and international precedence. According to Monmonier '[p]roportional voting is used extensively throughout the world, by developed countries in northern Europe and the western Pacific as well as by less prosperous nations in Latin America and parts of Africa' (p. 144). Thus, despite the negative press Guinier received (as a 'quota queen,' and a promoter of racial preferences) Monmonier interprets her as problematizing the political agenda as far as space and representational politics are concerned: 'American-style elections are not a prerequisite for democracy' (p. 146). This probably won't be much of a shock to most readers, although there seems little appetite among the general population for electoral reform. Monmonier does not venture a position on what prerequisites are necessary for democracy (if any). Nor do we get much of the analysis promised in his Preface (and subtitle) of the effects of redistricting: how 'elected officials used the decennial remap to promote personal or ideological agendas' (p.x). Instead much of the book focuses on the cartographic silhouettes, compactness scores and maps as propaganda. The question of the meaning of politics as such is limited to the last chapter and a 6-page Epilogue.

This gap illustrates the difference between acknowledging that maps are used for political purposes (redistricting and power grabs) and a critical analysis of how spatial knowledge, mapping, and GIS help constitute the contemporary political agenda.

It's a question of whether your final target is the map or politics. Monmonier's focus is the map, which may be why he doesn't vest the idea of a 'political cartographer' with any substantial content. But as Elden argued in this journal in 2000, we need to take on board the fact that 'there is a politics of space because *politics is spatial*' (2000, p. 419, original emphasis). It's long been understood by cartographers that politics can intrude or infect the map (Denis Wood and Brian Harley worked in this vein) but then the project becomes one of recovering the underlying non-political truth of the map (unmasking the 'subliminal geometries' of power in Harley's evocative phrase). On this view power is repressive. If instead we take Elden's sense, which he reads in Lefebvre, Heidegger and Foucault, of a *spatialized politics* – of how space necessarily constitutes the political as a positivity – then it becomes an urgent task to understand how the production of geographic knowledge by maps is in fact making politics for us, today. In other words it's the kind of difference between this book and Hannah's analysis of the governmental rationality of Walker's Census Bureau.

References

- Elden, S. (2000). Rethinking the Polis, Implications of Heidegger's questioning of the political. *Political Geography*, 19, 407–422.
- Hannah, M. G. (2000). *Governmentality and the mastery of territory in nineteenth-century America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jeremy W. Crampton
Georgia State University, Department of Anthropology and Geography,
33 Gilmer Street, Atlanta, GA 30303, USA
E-mail address: jrcrampton@gsu.edu

doi:10.1016/S0962-6298(02)00093-8

Eight eurocentric historians

J.M. Blaut; The Guilford Press, 2000, 228 pages, ISBN-1-57230-591-6

As from the 1950s, diverse proposals put forward by scholars from different locations worldwide have been seeking to provide interpretations aimed at breaking visions that would naturalize and justify the configuration of the world political order. Understanding the role of societies in America, Asia and Africa in defining the central countries' political projects, has been a goal of the works by Gunder Frank, Samir Amin, Franz Fanon, by Gunder Frank, Samir Amin or Franz Fanon, among others. Their proposals were put forth as intellectual strategies and emancipation policies having as their main purpose the unveiling of the unequal and dependent relationships established by the United States and some European countries with the so called Third World through different economic, political and social activities.