

Territoriality, map-mindedness, and the politics of place


Camilo Arturo Leslie

Cite this paper

Downloaded from [Academia.edu](#) 

[Get the citation in MLA, APA, or Chicago styles](#)

Related papers

[Download a PDF Pack](#) of the best related papers 



[Off the Map: On Violence and Cartography](#)

Mark Neocleous

[Book Symposium: Mapping Europe's Borderlands: Russian Cartography in the Age of Empire \(Universit...](#)

Steven Seegel

[Trapped in mirror-images: The rhetoric of maps in Israel/Palestine](#)

Yair Wallach

Territoriality, map-mindedness, and the politics of place

Camilo Arturo Leslie¹

Published online: 1 April 2016

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2016

Abstract Political sociologists have paid closer attention of late to the territoriality of political communities, and have even begun theorizing the theme of territoriality's legitimation. To date, however, the field has mostly overlooked the topic of maps, the quintessential territorial tool. Thus, we know little regarding maps' crucial role in shaping modern subjects' relationship to territory. This article argues that "map-mindedness"—i.e., the effects of map imagery on how subjects experience territory—can be productively theorized by working through the social-scientific concept of "place." Using a range of modern and contemporary examples, I illustrate how maps can draw on and manipulate political subjects' experience of place. Maps, I submit, allow political communities to render themselves more place-like, thus bridging the phenomenological distance between these abstract, territorially vast units and their "emplaced" subjects. More specifically, maps solve this "problem of distance" through three idealtypical processes: 1) they render the political community as a proximate "object in the world"; 2) they present the political community as a body-like target for cathexis and identification; and 3) they mediate the traffic of meaning between the local and the national to produce a multi-scalar sense of place that can be harnessed in the service of the political community. Maps are a potent means of "re-personalizing" politics; their study suggests that territoriality is not only a form of "impersonal rule," as recent works have observed, but always also implicated in the production of political subjects.

Keywords Territory · Cartography · Cognitive mapping · Place-affect · Legitimacy · Political sociology

In January 2013, a French intervention in Mali caught the world's attention, if only for an instant. The previous year had seen a stunning sequence of events. From January to April 2012, Tuareg nationalists, calling themselves the *Mouvement National pour la*

✉ Camilo Arturo Leslie
caleslie@buffalo.edu

¹ Baldy Center for Law & Social Policy, State University of New York Buffalo, 511 O'Brian Hall, Buffalo, NY 14260, USA

Libération de l'Azawad (MNLA), had overrun Mali's arid north and declared it the independent state of Azawad. The failure of Mali's president, Amadou Touré, to head off the crisis triggered a military coup in the south. By June, the MNLA was battling its erstwhile Islamist allies, Ansar Dine, and losing badly. And by year's end, Western powers were in agreement that northern Mali had become a haven for Al-Qaeda affiliates—hence, the invasion. The secessionist conflict that drove these events was primarily over territory. The combatants, however, also sought a related prize: the recognition of, identification with, and affective investment in their claimed territory, by both constituents and foreign actors. To that end, the conflict was waged not only with bullets and mortars, but through the medium of map imagery.

Three images pithily sum up the quarrel (see Fig. 1). In the first, Tuareg youth flaunt a homemade map of their proposed homeland, during a protest in northern Mali, 2 months before fighting would commence. The banner, identifying them as MNLA supporters, portrays Azawad as under attack by Malian and Algerian aggressors (poignantly, it flubs the geographic position of those two countries). The second shows the map-adorned seal of the MNLA. This would be its polished face to the world, but also a means of galvanizing local “Azawadi” support, with its likeness passed around by cellphone (Kirkley 2012). The third, most striking image shows one of forty identical billboards raised by a secretive citizens' group in Mali's capital, Bamako, depicting Mali as undivided, but reduced to tears under threat of partition (Rice 2012).

The images dramatize the intersection of two vital sociological concerns. First, they are artifacts of *territoriality*. They depict two political communities—one, an aspirant state, the other, a badly weakened one—staking claims to defined portions of the earth's surface. Second, they represent attempts at *legitimation*. They communicate messages, both to their in-groups and outsiders, about their warrant and ability to control that territory. As such, they are attempts to instill, mostly in their members, particular dispositions toward and experiences of the political community's territory. That they do so in the idiom of map imagery is the impetus for this article.

Why maps matter

I point to the Malian example not for its quirks but for its utter typicality. Its defining feature—the use of map imagery to educe in a people a specific orientation toward



Fig. 1 Mali. Left: Tuareg youth display their hoped-for country's map at a pro-Azawad protest in Kidal, Mali, November 1, 2012; clawed hands, symbolizing Azawad's neighbors, threaten the would-be republic (Source: <http://www.mnlamov.net/>). Middle: The map of Azawad features boldly in the official seal of the MNLA (ibid.). Right: One of 40 identical billboards installed in April 2012 by the mysterious “Action and Truth Collective” in Mali's capital, Bamako, to protest Mali's military coup and *de facto* partitioning (Source: Peter Chilson)

land—is common to countless other cases. Uniquely powerful tools, maps allow political communities to lodge themselves, so to speak, in their residents' heads and hearts. They help to narrow the gap between the vastness and abstraction of the political community's territory and the everyday, emplaced lives of its subjects. In shaping not just the experiences but the identities of such subjects, maps are thus a key means by which collective claims to material resources are asserted and naturalized. Put simply, map imagery is central to the territoriality of modern political communities.¹

This category of practice poses a timely challenge to social theory, especially to political sociology. Although that discipline has sometimes overlooked the territoriality of political communities, the topic has crept of late toward its analytical center. Prominent works reveal territoriality to be a crucial form of “impersonal rule.” In addition, an emerging line of scholarship has broached the question of how territoriality is legitimated for and experienced by the political community's subjects. It is here that we most stand to profit from assessing the map's social effects. Maps are the quintessential territorial technology. However, as this article argues, maps are not only tools of impersonal rule but also a potent means of “re-personalizing” politics. Indeed, to study their effects is to grasp that territoriality is never only directed at material things and processes, but, rather, always also implicated in the production of political subjects. And yet, to date, the topic of what maps do and how they do it remains underdeveloped in the discipline.

For their part, map scholars have seldom studied the map's subjective effects in late-modern contexts. We thus know little about the role of maps in shaping contemporary subjects' relationship to territory. The absence of such accounts is likely due to the methodological hurdles to tracing the development of the cartographic disposition, or “map-mindedness.” Nevertheless, the effects of map imagery on the subjective experience of territory can be productively theorized, and I suggest we begin by working through the social-scientific concept of “place.”

Toward that end, this article makes the following argument. Drawing on a range of modern and contemporary examples, I argue that the map's value as a tool of territoriality rests in how it draws on and manipulates the subject's experience of place. Maps allow the political community to render itself more place-like, thus bridging the phenomenological distance between the community's claimed territory and its subjects. More specifically, I argue that maps solve this “problem of distance” through three ideal-typical processes: 1. they present the political community's territory as an experientially proximate “object in the world”; 2. they present that territory as a body-like target for cathexis and identification; and 3. they mediate the traffic of meaning between the local and the national to produce a multi-scalar sense of place that can be harnessed in the service of the political community.

¹ For simplicity's sake, I adopt geographer Robert Sack's well-worn definition, which holds that “territoriality” is “the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control phenomena, or relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area. This area will be called territory” (1986, p.19; see also: Elden 2010; Gottman 1973; Lyman and Scott 1967). Also, rather than refer to “states” or “nation-states,” I use the more inclusive term “political community.” In Weber's scheme a “political community” features a more-or-less stable territory; a more-or-less constant group of inhabitants; dominion over that territorialized population guaranteed by the threat of violence; and the presence of extra-economic “values,” a capaciously vague category that encompasses legal as well as cultural phenomena that confer legitimacy on ruling institutions (Weber 1978, pp.54, 901–904). I use “political community” in a more open sense than Weber, to signify groups that meet these conditions but also ones that either aspire toward them or seek to challenge or disrupt another political community's territorial dominion. Political community in this usage can thus refer just as well to empires as to small, landless ethno-nationalist groups with territorial designs.

These processes, whose realization I've termed "map-mindedness," are central to the legitimization of political communities as specifically territorial entities.

A note first, though, to establish the territorial claims of my own argument. The analyses here are directed especially at twentieth- and twenty-first-century uses of map imagery, a period often overlooked in sociological and historical works, which tend to focus on pre-twentieth-century contexts (cf. Anderson 1991; Goswami 2004). My arguments apply most straightforwardly to so-called "political maps"—classroom- and newsprint-style maps, globes, and atlases, for instance—but I contend that they apply with comparable force to most types of popularly ingested map imagery in this time period. These include not only the broad range of twentieth-century map imagery but also the images linked to products like Google Maps, personal navigation devices, and GIS software. Rather than differentiate among map genres, then, this article takes as its implicit object what I call the "system of maps," the full panoply of mutually-reinforcing, mutually-referential map images that subjects are exposed to (Jacob 2006; Liben and Myers 2007), a system ultimately grounded in a generalized awareness of cartography's scientism. Some authors have privileged "real" maps over so-called "logo-maps" (i.e., plain outline maps, such as those of Mali, above). For instance, Anderson and Winichakul each claim that logo-maps are not maps at all but rather "meta-signs" or symbols for "real" maps (Anderson 1991, p. 175; Winichakul 1994, pp. 137–138). Such distinctions, however, fit awkwardly with contemporary realities, in which both mapping and the scientism on which it leans have arguably achieved cultural saturation, imparting to most subjects an at least basic understanding of the map's representational logic.² Moreover, as I note below, such discrimination among map types is not supported by psychological studies that emphasize the range and diversity of map forms that instill map-minded ways of experiencing and being in the world. For the purposes of this article, however, I am less interested in cataloging the heterogeneity of maps than in capturing the commonality of their effects.

Scientism and indexicality: the epistemic power of maps

Ubiquitous in twentieth- and twenty-first-century political expression, maps are a vital means by which political communities *qua territorial entities* represent themselves and dramatize their claims to land. Moreover, I submit, maps boast two qualities—scientism and indexicality—that set them apart from other representational strategies. Cartography has long enjoyed an aura of scientism and the epistemic cachet it brings, from centuries of discourse linking mapping, in the popular imagination, to the goals of empirical truth and representational accuracy.³ Such associations matter because practices seen as "scientific" in late modernity not only benefit from considerable public trust but also evince an ability to create objects that later give off the appearance of "natural" things (see, e.g., Goswami

² Such distinctions also privilege the relationship that formally schooled subjects have with map imagery over what obtains between "commoners" and their "logo-maps," with the former depicted as rooted in logical understanding and the latter seeming to function by a kind of mystified totemism. They thus overstate the importance of formal education for understanding the map's representational logic and the roots of its authority.

³ Map historians and theorists trace its scientism at least back to the Enlightenment (Edney 1994a; Pickles 2004; Turnbull 1996; Wood 1992). In Edney's account, it originates in late eighteenth-century Britons' valorization of the measurement, quantification, conversion, and synthesis of data: activities the "mathematical cosmographer" (i.e., cartographer) was thought to partake in (1994a). Others date such scientism much further back (see, e.g., Lukermann 1999; Dalché 2007).

2004; Hacking 2002; Latour 1999; Mol 2002; Shapin 2004; Somers and Block 2005). Although this view is well-established within map scholarship, it is more often asserted in theoretical works than demonstrated in historical or contemporary case studies (e.g., Pickles 2004; Wood 1992; cf. Herb 1997; Sparke 1998). And yet, the specifically legitimating and socializing functions of maps cannot be fully appreciated without considering this scientism, which, in turn, is crucial to maps' indexical power.

Indexicality is the trait that distinguishes maps from other artifacts of political community. An utterly constructed object (Harley 2001), the map is nonetheless often experienced as a "non-interfering medium between spatial reality and human perception," a virtual "god's-eye view" (Winichakul 1994, p. 53; de Certeau 1984; Jacob 2006; Tuan 1977). And, unlike those objects (e.g., flags, anthems, monuments) that invoke the political community metonymically, maps purport to offer up the actual political community in its bounded entirety to one's gaze. Much like photographs, at first glance maps appear simply to "show" their referent. To borrow Peirce's terms, whereas other objects stand in "symbolic" relation to the community, a map of a nation-state stands in an "indexical" relationship to it (Peirce 1992, p. 226; 1998, pp. 5–8). That indexicality, the map's claim to truth-correspondence, is underwritten by the scientism of cartography and related disciplines. Additionally, indexicality makes possible the peculiar interpellative effect that a map has on its user. When viewing a map of the very territory in which she finds herself, the viewer and her immediate environs are implicated in the map. This is the "you are here" effect of small-scale, way-finding maps common to tourist sites and commercial plazas. As I discuss later, these entwined traits—the authority to dress the political community in scientific garb, and to "place" individuals and their environs within particular political bodies—are the source of mapping's legitimating and socializing power, and thus the traits that make maps so sociologically consequential.

Territoriality, legitimacy, and maps: charting the scholarly terrain

Political sociology

It is a truism of political economy that the mingling of the subject's labor with her material surroundings is the basis for producing "value," and that it is this activity, in the aggregate, that makes possible complex forms of political organization. However, people must be taught to relate to land in ways that makes such activity practicable. Wherever political bodies have drawn sustenance (e.g., tribute or taxes) from the marriage of a people and a territory, pains have been taken to legitimate or to naturalize that relationship. Nomadic bands and modern states, for example, are political communities that must legitimate their territoriality in starkly different terms. Numerous scholars have detailed how modern states instill in their subjects specific territorial orientations, such as *proprietary* feelings toward land, a commitment to "sedentarism," or a geographically-coded sense of ethnicity (e.g., Foucault 1995; Ludden 2003; Malkki 1992; Smith 1986; Torpey 1999). Property law, anti-vagabondage statutes, census taking, physical addresses, border control, electoral districting, and tax policy are just some of the ways our particular brand of territoriality is legitimated and performed. The territoriality of states and other communities, it would seem, could hardly be nearer to political sociology's core concerns.

Until recent years, however, that scholarship treated territoriality as an unremarkable given of social life.⁴ The topic's theorization is thinnest where it intersects with another of the discipline's founding concerns, legitimacy. Indeed, the notion that political communities' territorial claims and schemes need legitimating is seldom addressed. For instance, a venerable strand of Weberian sociology underscores the importance of war-making to the material and institutional integration of the state (Hintze 1975; Mann 1993; Tilly 1985; cf. Finer 1975). But, while such works address territoriality squarely, the military phenomena they describe largely imply the absence or suspension of a politics of legitimation (cf. Centeno 1997). Even where neo-Weberians have "brought the state back in" and attended to both concerns, territoriality and legitimacy appear as different, discontinuous moments in their analyses (e.g., Evans, Rueschemeyer, and Skocpol 1985). Other state theorists have revealed how the legitimacy of states is cemented conceptually but give territoriality short shrift (e.g., Abrams 1977; Nettl 1968; Mitchell 1999; cf. Torpey 1999).⁵ Nationalism scholars provide the odd exception to the rule (Brubaker 1996; Gellner 1983; Hechter 1975). Smith shows the keenest appreciation for the expressly territorial slant of nationalist narratives, singling out territory as vital to how national groups imagine themselves (1986, p. 28; 1992). Still, much nationalism theory views its object through an idealist, de-territorializing lens (Anderson 1991 [cf. pp. 47–66]; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983).

More recent writings in political sociology, including at the genre's boundary with science and technology studies (STS), signal a heartening shift toward considering not only territoriality but also, albeit inchoately, its subjective dimensions. More specifically, such works have begun to consider the need of the political community to legitimate itself as a material, political, and phenomenological presence in its members' daily lives. Among political sociologists, these efforts are often informed by Mann's writings on infrastructural power and his concept of "caging," the rare neo-Weberian notion that successfully joins questions of territoriality and legitimacy (2008, p. 355; 1993). Moreover, such scholars have suggested that the "infrastructural reach" of the state itself hinges on legitimation. That is, in order for state processes (whether administrative, fiscal, or didactic in aim) to unfold in territorial space, subject populations must acquiesce to them.⁶ Outside this Mannian orbit, others have argued for the emotional and political significance of territory and its subjective corollary, distance, to

⁴ This may stem from ambivalence toward the topic in early sociological texts. For instance, Durkheim's well-known musings on the spatial segregation of the sacred and profane might seem to presage, at a micro-political scale, a disciplinary focus on territoriality, and yet his *L'Année sociologique* routinely disparaged others' efforts to systematize geographical and territorial thinking (see, e.g., Andrews 1984; Berdoulay 1978; Besnard 1983; Durkheim 1972). For his part, Marx conceptualizes the state as an effect of capital and an object of political struggle, but rarely as an institutional actor whose administration of territory merits reflection. Even Weber, for whom territoriality and legitimacy are twin pillars of the political community (e.g., 1978, pp. 901–904), treats the former more as a definitional criterion than an empirical phenomenon. He thus neglects to specify whether and how political communities might be tasked with legitimating themselves qua territorial organizations.

⁵ In contrast, Foucault took seriously the territoriality of rule, but in his zeal to de-privilege the state as a locus of power, he characterized it as consisting in free-floating techniques of observation, measurement, categorization, and coercion (1995; cf. 2007).

⁶ Of note are Loveman's work on peasant resistance to Brazil's civil registration laws (2005), Vom Hau's demonstration of the dynamic, path-dependent relationship of territoriality and legitimacy in Argentina and Mexico (2008), and Soifer's study of the consolidation of the state educational system across Chile's territory (2009).

a range of both micro- and macro-political behaviors (e.g., Berezin 2003; Berezin and Díez Medrano 2008; Sewell 2001; Tilly 2000). Finally, within mainstream political sociology, Sassen has made the most visible recent contributions to the study of territoriality. She conceives of territory not as the state's geographical corpus but rather as a set of “capabilities,” staking out a refreshingly processual approach to the topic (2006, 2013). More to the point, she argues that the international legal norm of territorial sovereignty is but one part of an embracing ideology that naturalizes and limits our conceptual grasp of territoriality, most perniciously among social scientists (2006, 2013; see also Agnew 1994).

For their part, scholars at the border of political sociology and STS have attacked the question of territoriality with alacrity, even thematizing its subjective dimensions. Their studies reveal the latticework of material and epistemic practices through which modern states constituted themselves.⁷ Mukerji provides the literature's fullest treatment of territoriality and rich fodder for discussing the confluence of territoriality and legitimacy. Her monographs on seventeenth-century France, first on the royal gardens (1997), then on the Canal du Midi (2009), chronicle how Louis XIV and Jean-Baptiste Colbert transmuted the political ideology of “divine right” into an earth-bound legitimacy that announced itself through the brute presence of the pair's highly visible engineering marvels. They not only demonstrate the rise of a distinctly territorial mode of French statecraft but also historicize territoriality itself, puncturing the notion that “humans [are] by nature territorial creatures or that they always had feelings of political ownership about places” (Mukerji 1997, p. 3; cf. 2011). In recent articles, Mukerji expounds her theory of territory's political import (2010, 2011). She notes sociology's tendency to subsume the territorial and material dimensions of politics to a social logic premised on the interpersonal exercise of will. Against such conflation, she argues that politics in modernity in fact displays two distinct logics. “Strategies,” the more familiar, consists in the exercise of power against other subjects, “using favors or intimidation to control social outcomes in order to gain or maintain rank in a social hierarchy” (2010, p. 404). In contrast, “logistics” names the pursuit of political ends through manipulations of the natural and built environment. (pp. 404–406). A form of “impersonal rule,” logistics thus achieves its desired aims indirectly, where such interventions yield downstream practical and ideological effects on a subject population.

To be sure, territoriality is never purely “logistical” but rather always social in its aims. Likewise, the exercise of “strategic” power is always embedded in a territorial context. Human beings are never mere agents or objects of ideation, but rather material beings in material circumstances. Mukerji's typology, however, provides a needed corrective, elevating territorial politics, in sociological analysis, to a stature normally reserved to the study of “social” power. It challenges sociologists to ponder whether phenomena long thought to be purely social in nature might also have territorial and material explanations. What is more, it signals that despite its long-held ambivalence toward the topic, sociology finds itself in a propitious state to examine territoriality *and*

⁷ Carroll, for instance, reveals state territoriality in colonial Ireland to be a variously technical achievement blurring the boundary between governance and laboratory science (2006). Appuhn's magisterial study of Venetian forestry management notably suggests that legitimating narratives (here, popular consensus that surrounding forests were a “public good”) can themselves promote the refinement of territoriality as a set of technical practices (2009).

its legitimation, together. In light of this opening, the paucity of theorizing in political sociology on the topic of maps is puzzling. The instilling of “map-mindedness” in subjects is a key way in which the political community legitimates itself as a specifically territorial organization, inserting itself as a cognitive and affective presence in its inhabitants’ lives. Let us turn next, then, to the literature that addresses maps, their history, mechanisms, and effects directly.

Map scholarship

For its part, a rich and diverse body of map scholarship—some within sociology, but mostly without—has demonstrated mapping’s historical role in the consolidation of the modern state system (Biggs 1999); in rendering populations, the socio-physical environment, and various social and natural processes legible and pliable to rulers (e.g., Carroll 2006; Edney 1997; Mitchell 2002); and, in illustrating, and performatively bringing into being, unitary sovereignty within “bounded” political spaces (e.g., Anderson 1991; Biggs 1999; Goswami 2004; Winichakul 1994). In recent decades, historically-inclined map scholars have produced several broad, at times encyclopedic, surveys (e.g., Akerman 2009; Jacob 2006; Harley and Woodward 1987, 1992; Kain and Baigent 1992; Woodward 2007). Better known to non-specialists are a number of social histories of cartography, most of them monographs on individual countries (e.g., Craib 2004; Edney 1997; Kivelson 2006; Konvitz 1987; Mundy 2000). Such works, from across the disciplines, typically detail the political context and *dramatis personae* surrounding specific cartographic projects, such as the British Ordnance Survey, the French “Map of Cassini,” or the introduction of “Western” mapping techniques to Siam. These have placed beyond doubt the relevance of cadastral, military, and political mapping to the consolidation of modern states.

Overlapping with these substantively, if not always theoretically, are prominent works by STS scholars.⁸ Partly Foucauldian in approach, these portray cartography as a scopic tool for rendering space, nature, people, identities, relationships, economic processes, vulnerabilities, and disease, real, visible, and tractable (e.g., Carroll 2006; Crampton 2007; Goswami 2004; Joyce 2003; Mitchell 2002; Mukerji 1997, 2009). Their works also reveal cartography to be a powerfully social and aggregative mode of knowledge production, a model instance of “distributed cognition” (Latour 1987; Mukerji 2006b, 2009; Revel 1991; cf. Hutchins 1995). Finally, such scholars have devised frameworks for the formal and cultural analysis of map “texts” (Leuenberger and Schnell 2010). Comparatively small, but influential, are broadly sociological works about the map’s unique historical role in making peoplehood and sovereignty cognizable (e.g., Anderson 1991; Biggs 1999; Paasi 1996; Radcliffe 2010; Winichakul 1994). Finally, critical geographers and cartographers have produced a large, deeply Foucauldian literature debunking the ascribed scientificity, transparency, and political neutrality of maps, and detailing their inherently situated origins and effects (e.g., Harley 2001; Pickles 2004; cf. Harvey 2001; Lefebvre 1991).⁹

⁸ Given the interdisciplinary nature of science and technology studies, the scholarship under this rubric overlaps with both political sociology and map scholarship and is, therefore, discussed in both of these sections.

⁹ The question of so-called propaganda maps, and their role in propping up “real” maps (by an exception-proves-the-rule logic) is taken up by Monmonier (1991) and Pickles (1992); cf. Tyner (1982).

Clearly, map scholarship does not want for theoretical viewpoints. It does, however, display certain tendencies that narrow its vision. Most important for our purposes, map scholars are, as a matter of habit, state-centric. To be sure, the state is a logical focus for their efforts. Cartography begins its universalizing arc in early modernity due in large part to state patronage and in order to serve state needs (Biggs 1999; Harley 2001; Konvitz 1987; Wood 1992; cf. Mukerji 2006a). And it is precisely the state that cartography has shaped to such consequential effect (e.g., Carroll 2006; Craib 2004; Winichakul 1994). Nevertheless, map scholarship typically makes the state not only the anchor, but also the implicit agent and subject of its accounts. This gives rise to several problems.

First, the scholarship has tended, as a result, to sideline how mapping practices produce particular experiences or dispositions for state subjects.¹⁰ Those that take up the issue do so at a high level of abstraction that tends to re-privilege the state's vantage point. Anderson's map-themed musings, for example, note the power of "logo-maps" to penetrate "deep into the popular imagination," strengthening the imagined community (1991, pp. 175–176). But which features, one wonders, allow the map—and not, say, the national flag or anthem (Cerulo 1993)—to "penetrate the imagination"?¹¹ Here, as in other important works (Goswami 2004; Sparke 1998; cf. Winichakul 1994), images shape cognition as if by fiat, and references to relevant mechanisms are allusive at best. What is more, in neglecting the map's subjective effects, scholars fail too to consider fully what sorts of experiences political communities actually mean to create for their members.

Such state-centrism yields a second, compound problem. Recent monographs, almost as a rule, study cases between the seventeenth and early twentieth centuries: the heyday of state formation in world-historical time. Not coincidentally, a narrow conceptualization of "state formation" serves as the default focus and periodization of their analyses. Scholars tend to concentrate on mapping's role in the initial production of states, while discounting its role in their ongoing reproduction (note the relative scarcity of monographs on mapping's contemporary political effects). States and other political communities, however, are not once-and-for-all productions, but rather must be made anew, moment to moment, generation to generation, particularly in their subjects' minds. Related to this problem is the fact that when scholars do take interest in mapping's didactic and subjective effects, they largely limit their inquiry to formal educational phenomena, such as the use of geography textbooks and classroom

¹⁰ This is sometimes true even of studies that attend both to the subjective dimensions of territoriality and to mapping's role in territorial projects. For instance, Mukerji's aforementioned works on French territoriality are deeply sensitive to the meaningful quality of land. Yet, although maps play a crucial epistemic and practical role in the realization of state infrastructural projects, they are portrayed as not quite meaningful in themselves. Rather, Mukerji writes, French territoriality was directly "demonstrated" by such projects "more than represented" (1997, p. 298; 2009, p. 5; 2011). Elsewhere, however, Mukerji grants the map's power to shape subjective experience when she writes that "[c]artography was understood in the period to provide a means of 'eye travel,'" (2009, pp. 193, 195; see also, Biggs 1999; Jacob 2006).

¹¹ Anderson is not a map scholar per se, yet his chapter "Census, Map, Museum," added to later editions of *Imagined Communities*, is among the few map-specific pieces that many sociologists have likely encountered. His thoughts on mapping are valuable, but Anderson fails to integrate them with his suggestive but fleeting observations on territory (e.g., his chapter on "Creole Pioneers"). Moreover, his analysis is fundamentally *time-based*, not *spatial*. Thanks to the output of "print capitalism," he claims, subjects can imagine themselves living in a simultaneity-of-experience with their co-nationals. As the nation's population is too large for its members to be actually present in one another's lives, the nation-state relies on print to mimic the sense of synchronicity and mutual regard that obtains in face-to-face encounters. Anderson's theory, thus, is about the mitigation of absence through a ruse of temporality.

instruction in fledgling states (e.g., Edney 1997; Goswami 2004; Paasi 1996; Winichakul 1994). These, however, are not universal or necessary means of geographic inculcation—merely historically specific ones. And, as I elaborate below, there is reason to believe that map learning may be a much less structured affair.

Map scholars have clearly demonstrated mapping's role in the administrative and morphological consolidation of the state. Nevertheless, we lack compelling accounts of the map's power to render states and other political communities real and proximate to their subjects. Put simply, we lack an account of map-mindedness. It is toward such an explanation that I now turn.

Maps and their subjective effects

New research priorities

How might exposure to map imagery adapt a subject to the territorial character of her political community? How might it legitimate that community and its practices to her? Might such exposure help shape her dispositions and experiences? If so, how? Despite being pertinent to both, political sociologists and map scholars have rarely posed these questions.

Rather than simply pointing out these deficits, however, let us consider how we can productively reorient our research. As the preceding questions suggest, I argue that social scientists would benefit from bringing subjectivity “back in,” so to speak. To be sure, the relationship between state formation and mapping merits continuing study, but we need also to remember that the forms of political community constituted through such relations require subjects for whom the effects are meaningful. Maps, in other words, don't ultimately act on states, but rather, on people. And yet, we lack satisfying accounts of precisely how maps do this.

The works of cognitive and developmental psychologists provide a helpful reference point for such a discussion. They suggest that the mechanisms through which maps shape subjectivity, particularly early in life, are complex and opaque. Moreover, by engaging these insights, political sociologists and map scholars can better grasp the challenges involved in theorizing the map's subjective effects and gain a better sense of where their own theoretical insights might offer the surest purchase on the topic.

Map-mindedness as tacit knowledge

“Map-mindedness” is a concept familiar to map scholars and geographers (e.g., Edney 1994b; Hartshorne 1939; Ramaswamy 2001) but recently given firmer footing by cognitive and developmental psychologists. Uttal, for instance, describes it as a disposition resulting from “the internalization of a map-like view of the world,” such that subjects “think about space in map-like ways, even if they are not looking at a map at the time” (2000, p. 249; 2005, p. 10).¹² To psychologists, then, map-mindedness entails

¹² It is important to note that map-mindedness is not dependent on substantive geographical knowledge. One can be (as the typical US citizen is reputed) a complete geographic illiterate and yet be thoroughly map-minded.

not only the absorption of knowledge or skills, but the formation of a general mode of experiencing and inhabiting one's socio-spatial surroundings. Most importantly, as psychological experiments suggest, people may attain map-mindedness at a startlingly young age (but also later in the lifecourse), in a limitless variety of settings, from a dizzying array of influences, and in direct or diffuse ways (e.g., Blades et al. 1998; Plester et al. 2002; Liben and Meyers 2007; Meneghetti et al. 2011; Newcombe and Chiang 2007).¹³

In fact, psychological research makes plain that this process of absorption is too capacious—temporally, circumstantially, and in its ability to synthesize disparate influences—to confine to a narrow definition of “map learning.” Studies reveal that people can acquire map-mindedness from any number of sources, ranging from exposure to what Uttal calls “prototypical maps,” i.e., “maps shown in common atlases, road maps, and the kinds of maps that regularly appear on the walls of school classrooms” (2000, p. 248), to so-called “you are here” maps (Montello 2010), photo-maps (Blades et al. 1998), scale models (DeLoache et al. 1997), and even linguistic maps (Uttal et al. 2006; cf. Smail 2000) and “hypothetical maps” (Newcombe and Chiang 2007; cf. Ramaswamy 2004). What is more, exposure to a mix of map types and perspectives may yield a synergistic benefit (Liben and Myers 2007, pp. 211–212).¹⁴ Indeed, researchers suspect such learning is a process of varied and drawn-out accretion, wherein map awareness is “gained partly from text read and thought about over many years, as well as from film, TV shows, conversation, and actual travel” (Newcombe and Chiang 2007, p. 908). Their findings lend support to geographers and map theorists who have speculated that exposure to wide-ranging map imagery can constitute a cumulative, self-reinforcing system of signification (Harvey 2001, pp. 219–222; Jacob 2006; Wood 1992; cf. Zubrzycki 2011). What is more, they call into question map scholars' habitual focus on formal contexts of map learning (e.g., Paasi 1996; Winichakul 1994). Yet, if the radius of map learning is not the classroom but rather the subject's full social and semantic ambit, what are the disciplinary and methodological implications?

First, although developmental psychologists have shed much light on the early acquisition of map-mindedness, the broader contexts and means of its inculcation clearly spill into the analytical territory of other disciplinary fields. Sociologists' insights are thus of vital importance, for valuable as it is, psychological research is not a viable substitute or even starting point for a theory of maps' subjective political effects. Psychological experiments are built around instrumental task completion, and

¹³ Plester et al., for example, demonstrate that children as young as four can use maps to navigate and accomplish tasks within neighborhood-sized environments (2002, p. 30). Moreover, without instruction, the children were able to identify correctly aerially-shot “photo-maps” of familiar places. In a cross-national comparison, Blades et al. too found that four-year-olds in disparate cultural settings possessed a capacity for map use, readily grasping “perspective rotation and scale reduction” (1998, p. 269). Roughly by the age of nine, children may exhibit a well-developed “survey” or map-like mental model of space, such that they are able to assimilate new information (both spatial and verbal) into this map-minded view of reality (Taylor and Tversky 1996, Uttal et al. 2006). Human beings, such studies suggest, are born with a measure of spatial ability, which can express itself as a remarkable receptivity to map influence.

¹⁴ As Liben writes, summarizing her previous work, “children are advantaged by seeing the same referent space mapped in different orientations or azimuths, [...] in different projections, [...] at different scales, [...] using different graphic media (e.g., satellite imagery vs. perspective drawings vs. aerial photographs), and different symbol systems” (Liben and Myers 2007, pp. 211–212).

they focus almost entirely on map use for which the referent space is no larger than a neighborhood, and often much smaller (Davies and Uttal 2007; Uttal 2005). Moreover, map psychologists have nothing to say about, or evident interest in, political ideation.

Second, we must acknowledge the methodological challenge of map-mindedness in order to devise a workable theoretical approach. Although pervasive in its effects, the development of map-mindedness is not easily observed. Indeed, it typifies what Polanyi, Collins, and others have termed “tacit knowledge” (Collins 2010; Mukerji 2006b; Polanyi 1962; Turner 1994). In his classic formulation, Polanyi describes tacit knowledge as that which we know but cannot tell, using the examples of motor skills, such as bike riding, to illustrate its often embodied, sub-cognitive character (1962). More recently, Collins (2010) offers a typology of “relational,” “somatic,” and “collective” tacit knowledge. In line with psychologists’ findings, let us stipulate that map-mindedness is nearest to “collective tacit knowledge,” that is, it is a disposition absorbed in a cumulative manner from the surrounding social milieu. Indeed, scholars of tacit knowledge suggest that much of human learning occurs through an opaque sort of situated absorption.

Designating map-mindedness as a kind of tacit knowledge helps us to get a better grasp not only on why the process of its acquisition is elusive but also on why its effects are so deep-seated, even constitutive. Moreover, it underscores the need for a specifically theoretical approach to the phenomenon. The instilling of map-mindedness, I submit, is a crucial way in which political communities work to bridge the distance between the vastness and abstraction of their territory and the everyday lived experiences of their members. To capture this process, we thus need a theoretical framework adequate to the themes of distance and proximity, abstraction and embodied affectively-charged experience. The material for such a framework is readily available in the social-scientific scholarship on place.

Map-mindedness and the politics of place

Scores of sociological works, classical to contemporary, recognize “place” as an organizing principle of human activity and experience. Attempts to define it, however, are of somewhat recent vintage. Gieryn’s rendering is typical, combining “geographical location” (i.e., position in Euclidean space); “material form” (the physical “stuff” that constitutes places); and “investment with meaning and value” (i.e., its “interpreted, narrated, perceived, felt, understood, and imagined” aspects) (2000, pp. 464–465). The last of these, that is, place as a constitutive aspect of experience, offers the most traction for theorizing the subjective political effects of maps.

A tangle of elements—cognition, affect, and bodily experience—makes up the subjective dimension of place. As philosophers and sociologists of a phenomenological bent have argued, human subjectivity and experience is *embodied*, both influenced and made possible by our kinesthetic and sensory faculties (Bourdieu 1977; Casey 2001; Merleau-Ponty 2002). Objectively, our physical movements along regular “time-space paths” (Giddens 1984) help “secrete,” sustain, and remake place (Lefebvre 1991). Subjectively, however, the body’s configuration and perceptual apparatus (weaving all five senses) shape our experience of it, such that we construct place in the very act of perceiving it (Casey 2001; Merleau-Ponty 2002; Tuan 1977). In addition to this

outgoing process, there is an inward impression of place on the self, by which one's surroundings become inscribed in the body as a kind of place-specific habitus (Bachelard 1994; Casey 2001, p. 688; cf. Bourdieu 1977; Wacquant 2004).

In continuously traversing the same circuits, we endow them with meaning. Certain locations become way-finding tools or mnemonic prompts for both personal and cultural narratives (Basso 1996; Smail 2000). Relationships and memories—our lives, in short—are gradually “emplotted” in familiar places (Entrikin 1991; Glaeser 1998). The habitual place, moreover, is intelligible and predictable, a material and psychological “sheathing, which in its familiarity protects the human being from the bewilderingments of the outside world” (Tuan 1974, p. 99; Bachelard 1994). In addition, face-to-face interaction, the primary building-block of intersubjectively constituted reality, primarily takes place *in place*. “It is essential to the face-to-face situation,” writes Schütz “that you and I have the same environment”; our co-presence in place allows me to “assure the adequacy of my interpretive scheme to your interpretive scheme” (1997, pp. 163–172; Jansen 2008). Place, that is, affords basic understanding and connection between subjects. Our attachments thus tend to cluster in the near and familiar. Crucially, these may beget a sense of “topophilia”: a deep, richly textured affection for key places in our lives (Bachelard 1994; Tuan 1974).¹⁵ Conversely, distant places and peoples may elicit indifference or even mistrust (Schütz 1997; Tuan 1977; cf. Appiah 2006). Regarding this relationship of place to distance, Schütz is illuminating. He depicts the lifeworld as consisting in zones of varying immediacy and intensity of experience. The limitations of embodiment make proximate zones readily traversable and manipulable by us, and remote ones less so (see, e.g., Schütz [with Luckmann] 1989, pp. 102–130; 1970, p. 112). Thus, writes Schütz, the subject's world spreads out from her in concentric zones of diminishing contact, vividness, and efficacy. The reach of one's affect and the range of one's habitual experience tend, therefore, to be largely coextensive (Bachelard 1994; Tuan 1977).

If all this seems highly “personal,” place is in fact inexorably social. Moreover, numerous interests work to shape how it is experienced. This is because the affective bonds linking subjects, and in particular large social groups, to place are a precious resource. Naturally, the political too is implicated in questions of proximity and distance (e.g., Berezin and Diez Medrano 2008). The modern political community, however, faces those questions in inverted form. Whereas the subject readily develops topophilic feelings for what is near and familiar, an entity such as the nation-state is geographically and conceptually remote. It must, therefore, work to become more phenomenologically proximate to its subjects—that is, it must make itself *place-like*. Given that goal, its subjects' affect for their quotidian places can prove either valuable or vexing. Successfully co-opted, such place-affect can be a boon to the political community. Left unchecked, however, it can be an entropic force, a basis for separatism. These twin tenets—that political communities must get experientially near to their subjects; and, that their subjects' place-affect is, toward that end, a useful but volatile force—provide fertile ground from which to theorize the map's subjective effects. For it

¹⁵ Topophilia is evident in such diverse cases as a homemaker's pride for their dwellings, in proclamations of loyalty to neighborhood or city, and in emigrants' and exiles' yearning for “home soil.” *The Poetics of Space* (1994), Bachelard's gauzy meditation on topophilia, describes how habitual interaction can transform the house from a brute geometric fact into a home (p. xxxvi).

is in those instances when these are actuated—sometimes in concert, sometimes in conflict—that the meaningful effects of map-mindedness are rendered more visible and amenable to study.

In the sections that follow, I review contemporary empirical examples that illustrate the processes by which maps achieve their subjective effects. The first two, respectively, concern how the map creates a cognitive object and a “somatized” target for affect. Here, I rethink settled insights on these phenomena in relation to place and distance. The third offers a novel account of how maps negate the phenomenological distance between place and the political community.

Objectifying place: Google maps and Tamil Eelam

Scholars have long touted the map’s ability to make a “cognitive object” of the political community (Harley 2001; Jacob 2006; Winichakul 1994). Without maps, the vast territory of the political community would be available to the senses only piecemeal, as a “concatenation of places” (Biggs 1999, p. 386; Tuan 1974). The map’s synoptic vision, however, transforms the political community from a diffuse abstraction to a proper “thing”: visible, bounded, cognizable. So too have scholars recognized the map’s historical association with “science” (e.g., Edney 1994a; Wood 1992), the latter lending the political community much of its ontological heft. Finally, varied scholars have marveled at the map’s seeming power to temporally precede its referent, that is, to bring it into being performatively (or “proleptically”) (e.g., Baudrillard 1994; Brückner 2006; Lefebvre 1991; Sparke 1998). In what follows, I show that such insights, while invaluable, are improved when articulated more tightly to the themes of place and distance.

Consider the following two scenarios. First, in recent years, internet giant Google has been the object of bitter complaints by numerous governments over its Google Maps feature. Such rows have occurred at various scales,¹⁶ but the best-known cases center on territorial disputes between states. In 2010, for example, Cambodia disparaged as “radically misleading” and “professionally irresponsible” Google’s rendering of the contested Cambodian–Thai border, at stake in which is possession of the Preah Vihear Temple, a UNESCO World Heritage site (Reuters 2010). That same year, a Nicaraguan army general cited Google Maps as a post-hoc justification for an invasion of Costa Rican territory, to wide ridicule (Halliday 2010). Minor territorial disputes among China and its neighbors (India, Japan, and Vietnam), between Morocco and Spain, and elsewhere have likewise drawn Google into awkward map-based spats, with the firm’s images prompting charges of *partiality*.¹⁷

Second, in early 2012, a decidedly lower-tech, map-themed quarrel saw the French ambassador in Sri Lanka summoned before the latter’s foreign affairs minister for a dressing-down. Late the previous year, letters and packages began trickling into Colombo bearing French postage stamps featuring prohibited imagery. One design

¹⁶ For example, the German town of Emden and the government of Rio de Janeiro voiced grievances in 2010 and 2011, respectively (Barnes 2011).

¹⁷ On these disputes, see, e.g., Agence France-Presse 2013; BBC-Monitoring Asia-Pacific 2010; Govan 2010; Gravois 2010.

depicted Velupillai Prabhakaran, deceased leader of the vanquished Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE, or “Tamil Tigers”). Another featured the secessionist map of Tamil Eelam, proposed Tamil homeland, instantly recognizable to Tamil and Sinhalese Sri Lankans alike. As they had in Canada, Germany, Norway, and the United Kingdom, Tamil nationalists in France used the “design your own stamp” feature of their host country’s postal service to produce and circulate stamps marked with the separatist map, incensing Sri Lankan officials (Cross 2012; Fernando 2012; Sunday Times 2012).

Both the Google Maps and Sri Lanka disputes present puzzling behaviors. Why should multiple countries’ officials get so exercised over inaccuracies in a commercial online map service? With narrow exceptions, international law assigns maps little to no evidentiary weight,¹⁸ so Google’s renderings were hardly legally binding. Why too should Sri Lankan authorities have carped about the map stamps? The government had recently annihilated the LTTE on the battlefield, decisively ending their twenty-five-year war. Against that background, a postage hoax by Tamil émigrés would seem the geopolitical equivalent of bathroom stall graffiti—certainly not worth a diplomatic row. What is more, why should the expatriates even have bothered with such a gesture? These instances, I submit, render visible the powerful effects of maps precisely because the meanings and attachments at stake are being contested.

Moreover, they are symptomatic of the map’s power to construct and reify its referent. I have discussed cartography’s scientific legacy. The Google Maps cases, however, suggest that maps’ epistemic cachet is being remade and enhanced in the present. Google’s data-analytical supremacy and its incursions into the hard sciences have established it as a formidable distributor of “fact.” Its own scientific aura is expansive. Arguably, Google Maps surpasses ink-and-paper political maps and atlases in its claim of disinterestedly proffering “scientific” depictions of current world-political arrangements. With that in mind, we can see that the above complaints about its “inaccuracies” do not so much betray a fear of legal repercussions as of epistemic ones. The various officials’ objections reflect a wariness of the map’s authority and its performative power to constitute the political community as an object in the world for subjects. It is not merely a matter of conjuring concepts into subjects’ minds; such is where idealist accounts of the map’s cognitive power falter. Rather, the scientific map underwrites the political community’s ontological reality, rendering the community experientially proximate and certain in ways it could not otherwise be. So rendered, the political community can function as a powerful motivator of behavior—hence the allure *and* alarm that maps hold for political authorities.

Consider again the Sri Lankan stamp debacle. Parcels marked with the separatist map started arriving in Sri Lanka in late 2011, less than three years after the end of the war. The stamps bore the image of Tamil Eelam, its shape a jagged arc cut from the sides and top of the island (majority Sinhalese provinces are effaced, as if swallowed by the ocean) (see Fig. 2). Various versions of this map once blanketed LTTE territory, appearing on every conceivable surface, and had thus attained (as two Sri Lankan scholars bemoaned) “a level of sanctity” (Hennayake and Rathnayake 2005, p. 24). For Tiger supporters, it prefigured their wished-for state—a textbook case of the map’s performativity (e.g., Sparke 1998; Winichakul 1994)—and lent ontological weight to their aspirations. To their critics, it was an insolent “manipulation” of cartographic realism (Hennayake and

¹⁸ For a useful discussion, see Shaw 2008, pp. 519–520. For a complicating view, see Leuenberger 2013.



Fig. 2 Tamil Eelam and Sri Lankan images. Left: a Tamil nationalist stamp, issued unwittingly by Norway's postal service (Source: Tamil News Network). Middle: a young war-amputee passes a mural of Tamil Eelam's map in Tiger-controlled Manipuram, northern Sri Lanka, late 2008 (Source: Benjamin Dix). Right: Sinhalese Sri Lankan children make a crayon drawing of Sri Lanka's integrated form, after the war (Source: British High Commission in Colombo, Sri Lanka)

Rathnayake 2005, p. 24). Again, however, the map did not merely plant arid concepts in subjects' minds; rather, it made an object of Eelam and delivered it to friend and foe alike as an experience. When things went well for LTTE partisans, their incremental land gains and physical security were palpable proofs of Eelam's reality. For government forces, it made itself felt in their losses and insecurity. The "object" that the map made cognizable thus confirmed itself in embodied, affectively-charged experience,¹⁹ thereby becoming more than just "cognitive." It is against such experiences that we must judge officials' reactions to the stamps. Having once suffered the map's power—both to shape territory and to drive behavior—they were in no mood to revisit it. By banning the map at war's end, they hoped to extirpate the object of Tamil Eelam from their adversaries' reality, neutralizing its power to inspire. And so, the stamps were a disquieting reminder that, even to diasporic Tamils, the object remained present to lived experience, and, thus, that the threat of Tamil Eelam still hung over the victors.

"Embodying" place: naturalization, somatization, and the case of Hungary

I have argued that maps have the power to make an "object" of the political community. Such an object, moreover, can then confirm itself in experience, becoming phenomenologically present to the subject. Central to this "objectivation" is the map's scientism. Here however, I wish to deepen our discussion of one aspect of that scientism, namely the naturalism it imparts to the political community. In particular, I draw attention to the map's ability to "somatize" the political community, that is, to render it body-like, and I point to the place-related implications of such somatization for the subject's affective and political investments.

The naturalization of the political community is a well-trod topic in map scholarship. Winichakul, notably, demonstrates how early Thai geography texts moved seamlessly

¹⁹ This point is made with particular flair in a statement attributed to Sathasivam Krishnakumar, one of the LTTE's founders, at a speech in Zurich, November 1990: "I was once asked by an Englishman connected with the British Refugee Council: 'You say Tamil Eelam, but where are the boundaries of this Tamil Eelam that you talk about? Show me.' I was taken aback by the directness of the question. I thought for a while, searching for an appropriate response. Then I replied: 'Take a map of the island. Take a paint brush and paint all the areas where Sri Lanka has bombed and launched artillery attacks during these past several years. When you have finished, the painted area that you see—that is Tamil Eelam'" (quoted in Satyendra 1993).

between discussions of natural bodies (e.g., mountains and rivers) and political boundaries, with the clear intent to conflate their ontologies (1994). Moreover, maps depict natural and political features concurrently, effectively merging political units to their geological substrates. Indeed, the blurring of the natural and social aims to give the political community an air of inevitability and time-transcendent presence.²⁰

Winichakul enlivens the discussion of the map's naturalism by tracing a discursive shift, from portrayals of the community's territory as the king's "realm" to descriptions of it as a royally-inflected "body," susceptible to injury (1994, p. 134; cf. Kantorowicz 1957). This reaches its apotheosis in what he calls Thailand's "geo-body," the mapped outline of the nation-state: a novel, semantically generative means for communicating (and sometimes effecting) the unitary sovereignty, historical personality, and social homogeneity of the space it depicts. Extending the metaphor, Winichakul argues that the geo-body is a ready-made object of desire, as Thai territory proved to be for the French and British governments.²¹

And yet, though plainly profitable, the "geo-body" functions more as an expository device for Winichakul than as a fully realized analytical concept. It proves useful for cataloguing the poetic affinities between map boundaries and other semiological features of nationhood (e.g., the opposition of "us" and "them"). And he convincingly presents it is a cognitive anchor point for the nation's origin myths, historical grievances, and aspirations. However, Winichakul never specifies the extent or mechanism of its subjective effects. What, if any, are its repercussions for how ordinary subjects experience their political community qua territorial object? How are these brought about? How does the political community's somatization enhance its ability to "reach" its subjects? Or, is the somatic metaphor simply a conceit of nationalist elites, with no appeal for regular people?

Developments in Europe, contemporaneous with those Winichakul describes, cast light on these questions. In Germany, for instance, Friedrich Ratzel, father of "Geopolitik," was elaborating a set of concepts that would one day justify Third Reich territorial policy. In France, meanwhile, Paul Vidal de la Blache established his own school of Geopolitics, developing theories that melded republican and romanticist tendencies. Both traditions relied on holist, naturalist, and organicist tropes, each committed in its own way to theorizing states and regions as living bodies. Today, the Vidalian program persists in largely benign form, but the works of Ratzel and his heirs (e.g., Rudolf Kjellén and Karl Haushofer)—particularly, the concepts of *Lebensraum* (living space), *Kulturboden* (cultural soil), and the organic state—are indissociable from Nazi expansionism and irredentism.²²

More to the point, the concepts are remembered for having been powerfully dramatized in map form. However, as Herb demonstrates, it was not the state but rather activists and scholars who were initially responsible for promulgating map imagery of

²⁰ On the map's ability to "retroject" a contemporary understanding of the political community's shape into history, see Sparke 1998, Winichakul 1994, Wood 1992, Zerubavel 2003.

²¹ The analysis complements other scholars' historical reflections on the map's seductive power, such as its having inspired in *ancien régime* rulers feelings of possession, mastery, and motion over territory (Jacob 2006; Kain and Baigent 1992; Revel 1991). It also rings true to pivotal historical events like the Berlin Conference, in which European rulers displayed an almost libidinal craving for pieces of mapped African space.

²² On the French side, Vidalian sensibilities persist in the classroom invocation of the "hexagon" and in the fostering of an appreciation for the country's regional differentiation. On German organicism, see Dorpalen 1942, Herb 1997, Ó Tuathail 1996.

the somatized state (1997). It is to this point that I wish to speak. First, it suggests that the somatic state was not exclusively an elite preoccupation, even in the early twentieth century. Second and therefore, it forces us to ponder the source of its wide appeal and its possible effects. With respect to both points, the Hungarian case is instructive.

In June 1920, the Treaty of Trianon transferred over two-thirds of Hungary's territory to neighbor and successor states. The "tragedy" of Trianon and the "theft" of Hungarian land, it is claimed, is the one issue on which contemporary Hungarians all agree (Jordan 2010). Following the war, Hungarian artists began producing popular images depicting the country's post-Trianon map nested within a fractured *Nagy-Magyarország* or Greater Hungary (see Fig. 3). In some, greedy hands or tentacles intrude on the frame, as if to carve up and wrest away pieces of territory. One shows the map as a hunk of meat, awaiting the butcher's cleaver. In others, the map is set upon by scavenging beasts. Elsewhere the somatization is explicit. Several images depict Greater Hungary's map nailed to a crucifix, capping it with a crown of thorns. Another genre plays on masculine "honor": a nude male figure cowers over the map, broken sword in hand, territorial loss likened to emasculation and violation. A similar image shows a man held back by the barrier of Hungary's post-1920 western border, watching helplessly as a woman is dragged away by foreign brutes: territory lost, it admonishes, is territory raped.

More striking are the countless map-themed monuments and memorials to Trianon dotted across the country. These too feature the now-versus-then, nested map design, in a range of materials. One such work, in the city of Békéscsaba, has Greater Hungary cut out of a thick granite block and laid horizontally, so that the polished face of the map looks skyward. The granite block's side is rough-hewn, giving a sense of corporeality and depth. Constructed above and around the map is a marble guillotine, its bronze blade plunging toward Hungary. On the blade are engraved the words "Trianon. 1920, Junius 4." One might reasonably assume such works are solely state-produced. And, in fact, the Horthy regime of the 1920s and 1930s erected a great many (Kinchin 2012). In those same years, however, ordinary Hungarians displayed the irredentist map in shop windows and bought an endless array of consumer goods adorned with its image (Bihari 2006, p. 168). Moreover, with communism's fall, and especially since 2000, irredentist feeling has dramatically resurfaced, but, this time, the national government has distanced itself from old territorial claims (Kinchin 2012, p. 36). Instead, it has fallen on a motley mix of civil societal groups, local government, businesses, political parties, and individuals to re-erect old monuments and to build countless new ones (Foote, Toth, and Arvay 2000). As of late, the neo-fascist Jobbik party has taken the lead (Fig. 3). And, as before, patriots have at their grasp a dizzying range of products bearing Greater Hungary's map.

Like other cases, from the Balkans to the Falklands,²³ the Hungarian case suggests that the somatized state is a trope that resonates with a broad swath of people. The trope is activated, and the body is invoked, in various ways. In the above examples, the viewer is plainly meant to identify with the wounds and humiliations of the community's "corpus"—and is called on to rectify them. Additionally, some monuments, both in Hungary and elsewhere, feature large stone maps built to be walked on, thus joining the map's synoptic

²³ In the Balkans, consider Romania's neo-fascist *Nouă Dreaptă*, partisans of a Greater Albania, and agitators for a United Macedonia, all of which lean on somatic map metaphors. In Argentina, the Falklands—or rather, Las Malvinas—receive treatment nearly identical to what Hungarians accord their lost territory. The twin islands' shape is ubiquitous, appearing in murals, both public and private monuments, graffiti, protest placards, and, frequently, tattoos.



Fig. 3 Top left: a poster graphic for Jobbik, Hungary’s neo-fascist party. Jobbik has made the recovery of pre-Trianon territories an official plank of its political platform (Source: <http://derecske.jobbik.hu>) Top right: a typical post-Trianon rendering of Greater Hungary’s emasculation, circa 1920 (Source: public domain). Bottom left: a marble and metal sculpture of Greater Hungary condemned to the guillotine (Source: public domain). Békéscsaba, Hungary. Bottom right: a tattoo (based on the cover design of a 1928 book called *Justice for Hungary*) displays the ubiquitous nested map design, with the smaller post-Trianon Hungary enveloped in its previous “corpus” (Source: <http://ladybirdtattoostudio.blogspot.com>)

contraction of territory with an experience that enlists the viewer’s own corporal self. Another common practice in spectacles around the world consists in grouping performers together to form the shape of a given country’s map,²⁴ recalling the famous frontispiece of Hobbes’ *Leviathan*. Finally, young irredentists have often traced the body of the state, whether “wounded” or “redeemed,” onto their own flesh in tattoo form (Fig. 3).

In the aggregate, these show that the somatic state is a powerful, widely embraced trope. Subjects seem both to “cathect” with (i.e., affectively invest themselves in) and identify with it. But, we should ask why and how? The notion that a discrete shape can offer up order or

²⁴ Such performances range from the frivolous (US college marching bands forming the shape of their home state), to the aspirational (protestors in India’s Telangana region forming the outline of that proposed state), to the dystopian (performers in North Korea’s “mass games” forming the shape of a united Korean Peninsula).

comfort is redolent of some early twentieth-century insights regarding perception and feeling. As Gestalt theorists and phenomenologists first proposed, we tend to see and, moreover, like to see our world organized as “‘things’ and ‘spaces between things’” (Merleau-Ponty 2002, p. 18; Köhler 1947). Thus, apart from rendering remote and abstract phenomena visible, the political community’s bounded shape comports with a hardwired perceptual preference for “thingness.” This, of course, does not account for the bodily part of our inquiry. For that, we might gain clarity from an unlikely (and famously obfuscatory) source. Although best read allegorically, Jacques Lacan’s “Mirror Stage” lecture (2006) is useful for understanding the subject’s identification with the somatized map. The lecture describes a key developmental phase in which the infant, faced with her reflection in a mirror, first identifies with an image external to herself. Prior to this, the subject experiences herself as fragmentary and helpless. The sight of herself *whole*, however, offers her a feeling of plenitude and mastery. The subject is thus seduced by the image—so at variance with her usual self-perception—and, fatefully, comes to identify with it. Moreover, the original anxious sense of fragmentation does not dissipate, but rather persists, giving the subject’s identification with her mirror image an aggressive, protective character that will last throughout her life. Elsewhere, Lacan adds “[f]or the subject, the image of his body is the principle of every unity he perceives in objects. [...] They will all have a fundamentally anthropomorphic character, even egomorphic...” (1991, p. 166).

Understood this way, the map’s somatization of the political community does not just elicit “scopophilia” (e.g., Freud 2000; Mulvey 1991) or the sense of dominion over a miniaturized object (Bachelard 1994; Scott 1998; Tuan 1984). Rather, like the infant’s reflection, it offers the subject a fantastical image of her own—and her larger community’s—completion and integrity. Moreover, its power derives not from logic but from an elemental affective appeal, whereby the subject’s self-regard becomes both the model and impetus for her psychic identification with this external object (Lacan 2006, p. 76). Through this lens, references to the mapped body’s “mutilation” or “infection” are not just piquant metaphors. They are attempts to instill in the subject a faith that her and her political community’s survival are somehow bound up. In the last section, I wrote that the map’s scientism grants the political community its ontological standing as an “object in the world.” Subsequent experience may then seem to confirm that object, to make it *proximate*. Here, however, I have pointed to a complementary mechanism: by offering the political community’s “body” as an object of cathexis and identification, the problem of distance is psychically short-circuited. I turn now to the third and final way the map addresses that problem.

Harnessing the power of place: the local and the national

The political community must lessen the phenomenological distance between itself and its subjects’ daily, emplaced lives. I have proposed two ways that maps may bridge that distance: first, by presenting the community as a scientifically-validated “object in the world,” capable of confirming itself in experience, and thus becoming proximate; and second, by offering up the community as a bodily target for affect and identification, bridging that distance psychically. Here, I more directly address the question of place and distance. As Berezin and Díez Medrano (2008) demonstrate, rulers perceived to be geographically remote are

more likely to be deemed illegitimate by their subjects. In what follows, I first suggest that political communities are, metaphorically speaking, “aware” of this problem, and that there is a practical ideology of place at work in their responses. Second, I argue that they attempt, through map imagery, to effect a dynamic interplay of place and political community. However, I contend, such attempts to exploit the power of place using map imagery are fundamentally unstable.

With few exceptions, modern political communities are geographically too large for subjects to gain meaningful direct experience of them (Jacob 2006; Tuan 1974). Accordingly, many nation-states betray anxieties regarding this problem of distance. Such anxiety is most legible in the varied techniques they use to instill in their members feelings of closeness to the political community. These techniques, moreover, are varied, and their authors straddle the state/civil-society divide. Notably, many involve immersive physical experiences. In the decades prior to World War II, for example, various nationalist groups in Germany promoted activities premised on communing with one’s local environment. The *Wandervogel*, a romanticist youth group, was the first to extol “transformative” encounters with the German outdoors. In the 1930s, the *Hitlerjugend* repurposed such activities as tools of fascist affect and pedagogy. Organizers determined that experientially remote phenomena, such as the German territorial state and concepts like *Lebensraum*, could only be apprehended through embodied, local experiences (Cupers 2008, pp. 179–185). Such experiences, they reasoned, would serve as a window onto national “truths,” a way to make the abstract state sensuously present and affectively charged.²⁵

Brückner describes similar techniques in the early American republic (1999, 2006). Before the revolution, the colonies could be thought of as a unified whole by virtue of their shared subjection to England. In the early republic, however, that unity had to be made anew. Early nationalists considered “a tour of the United States [...] a necessary part of a liberal education,” believing such firsthand encounters could furnish the experiential basis for cathecting with the nation rather than its constituent (potentially seditious) parts (Brückner 1999, pp. 318–319). A Vermont, Connecticut, or Virginia, they believed, should be intelligible only by reference to the whole of which it was a part (1999, p. 317). Similar attempts to mitigate distance through embodied experience appear in a dizzying range of contexts (e.g., Garrido 2010; Lainer-Vos 2014; Leuenberger and Schnell 2010, p. 808; Powers 2011).

The anxiety of distance is also legible in the lexical self-presentation of political communities. Hobsbawm, for instance, spots an attempt to reroute affection from “one’s ‘little’ homeland on to the big one, [...] in the philological expansion of the scope of such words as ‘pays’, ‘paese’, ‘pueblo’, or indeed ‘patrie’, a word which as late as 1776 had been defined in local terms [...]” (1990, p. 90). The German term *Heimat* is similarly telling. Usually translated as “home” or “homeland,” *Heimat* was born of the desire to “conceive [...] of] and subordinate [...] the nation-state] to a local metaphor” (Herb 2004, p. 143), and to posit a “a basic affinity between [...] abstract political units and one’s home, thus endowing an entity like Germany with the emotional accessibility of a world known to one’s own five senses” (Applegate 1990,

²⁵ Without such immersive activities, warned a Hitler Youth manual, the “‘most important problems for the future of the German border area will always remain theoretical’” (quoted in Cupers 2008, p.184).

pp. 10–11). Naturally, *Heimat* and the embodied practices discussed above made for a powerful pairing.²⁶ Closer to home, the invocation of “small-town life” pays handsome political dividends in the United States, not least by flattering self-avowed “small town folks” that their lives are a distillation of the national character. Lastly, and closer still, the tendency of scholars to refer to disparately scaled forms of social action with terms like “community” (Calhoun 1999, p. 219) indicates how deeply naturalized such lexical tricks have become.

Taken together, these examples indicate, first, that diverse political communities have treated distance as a problem, and second, that there is a practical ideology of place at work in their responses—a purposeful effort to render the political community more place-like, available to the senses. As I have shown, one such response entails the framing of local experience as metonymic of the larger political community. Another involves using deictic metaphors that elide the difference between near and far. It is within such techniques that we must situate the dissemination of political map imagery. However, to appreciate what makes the map a unique bridge between place and political community, we must address what precisely its scientism and indexicality make possible.

Many scholars have written of the pleasure early modern rulers must have felt, launched skyward by the map into a god-like view (Biggs 1999; Jacob 2006; Revel 1991). Such examples, however, are mere variants of a broader, more important phenomenon. Faith in the map’s scientism, I wrote earlier, gives the map its indexical power, that is, its appearance of pointing in an unmediated way toward “reality.” This is vitally important as it makes possible a *cartographic interpellation* of the viewing subject.²⁷ By this, I mean the map’s ability to place the viewer “inside” of itself. When the map “indexes” the territory in which the viewing subject finds herself, she is herself interpellated as a physical presence in that space. Again, this is the “you are here” effect typical of commercial and tourist maps, only at an augmented scale. She is at once outside the map, as a bodily subject looming over the ink-and-paper (or electronic) representation, and yet inside the space represented. What is more, the map contains the viewer not as an abstraction, but rather as a bodily, emplaced subject. She can point with confidence to the place on the map in which she herself sits pointing at the map. This latter notion is critical. The mapped space of the political community thus envelops not only the subject’s bodily self but also the places—the city,

²⁶ In effect, *Heimat* presents nation-ness as an immanent property of place, “obscur[ing] any chasms between small local worlds and the larger ones to which locality belonged” (Applegate 1990, p. 10). As Herb observes “[w]hen children learn about [a familiar place and] celebrate its splendor through activities ... they are taught to recognize (and love) its ‘German’ essence. In other words, they are made aware that what they feel is not personal or local, but thoroughly German” (2004, p. 153). Conversely, Herb writes, “regions cannot be ‘imagined’ without connecting them to place-based experiences. Yet, these experiences are already thoroughly interpreted as national German; they are *Heimat*...” (2004, p. 154). In an odd twist, the *Heimat* idea helped shape the early Israeli state, imported to that country by German Jewish geographers well-versed in the concept (Leuenberger and Schnell 2010, p. 808). A *Heimat*-like logic also underlies the use of Israeli toponyms to inspire in Jewish-American summer-camp attendees place-attachment to Israel (Lainer-Vos 2014).

²⁷ We may liken this to the pictorial interpellation of the spectator, i.e., the notion that visual artworks have the power to implicate a viewer in given scenes or situations, placing her in specific “subject positions” (e.g., as witness or voyeur) (see, e.g., Benjamin 1968; Mitchell 2005; cf. Tuan 1977), the key difference being that maps bring to bear on this phenomenon the historically-accrued epistemic power of their scientism and indexicality.

neighborhoods, haunts, and home—in which she dwells. Moreover, cartography’s vision is totalizing: the viewer can be outside a particular map’s frame, but she is never outside mapped space.

What, though, does it mean for the subject and her familiar places to be inside the map? Several consequences follow. First, in reducing the political community’s vast territory to a visually compact form, the map seems to put its territory within reach. Accordingly, the subject’s zone of efficacy (Schütz and Luckmann 1989), ordinarily coextensive with place, may seem to expand. Moreover, through the map, the subject gets her bearings. The map becomes for her a kind of spatio-cognitive scaffolding, into which her experiences and her lifeworld, both immediate and remote, can be slotted.²⁸ And, to the degree that she and others see the map similarly, it offers them a virtual shared environment, a frame of reference for intersubjective understanding that mimics, but extends, Schütz’s place-bound “face-to-face encounter” (1997).

Most importantly, however, the map facilitates the traffic of meaning between the political community and place that lessens the phenomenological distance between them. This takes two forms. First, the map strives to *code the local as national*. We know from secessionist movements that the local is commonly a rival basis for political identification and affect. The map, however, depicts the local as ancillary to the national, ontologically derivative, thereby muting its independent affective and moral force. In doing so, it attempts to sap place of its seditious potential. What is more, the map creates within its lines an illusion of territorial homogeneity, an impression that, inside its borders, the political community’s dominant culture, authority, and capacity for violence are uniformly present. Thus, the map strives both to neuter the local and consecrate it with the larger political community’s “essence.” Put differently, the map experientially collapses the distance between the political community and place by infusing the former into the latter. If it is successful in taming the local, it is, ironically, because the map points to (and envelops) a reality verifiable to the subject’s own senses: the places in which her life is emplotted.

Second, the traffic of meaning between the two poles also flows the opposite way: that is, maps *code the national as local*. As I wrote above, its residents’ deep, textured attachments to places are invaluable to the political community. Indeed, by appearing to absorb its constituent places, the political community claims their affective power. What is more, by incorporating the subject’s places within this larger body, the map enables the subject’s affective ties to radiate out toward the political community’s boundaries. That is, it visually prompts the subject to draw from her proximate, affect-laden situation and project those place-bound feelings out to the larger community. In doing so, the political community’s variegated interior and the subject’s far-

²⁸ To extend this thought, cities, provinces, regions, even cardinal points, may become linked to particular facts, memories, discourses, sensory impressions, or future plans. Both zones and specific points on the map may become inscribed and enlivened by cognitive and affective content. Such associations may then be reinforced by habit. It becomes second nature to imagine one’s position relationally (e.g., “north of where I grew up,” “100 miles east of the coast,” and so forth). Regional designations—referring to someone as a “Southerner” or “West Coast-type,” for example—further naturalize this epistemology in which social meaning is geographically coded. Mundane acts, like calculating whether it is too late (or early) to call a friend on the opposite coast, rehearse this map-mindedness. As the map accrues content and associations, its distances seem to contract.

flung co-nationals are constructively made familiar and proximate. Through the artifice of the map, the subject's emplaced life is commandeered, made into an emotionally resonant metonym for the political community.²⁹

In closing, it remains to point out that the mechanisms I have described—the coding of the local as national and the coding of the national as local—hide an inherent instability. What makes place-affect valuable to the larger political community is also what makes its cartographic manipulation a risky prospect. As I wrote above, the local always lurks as a potential basis for separatist sentiment. As such, the place-affect that the map stretches to fit itself can nearly always snap back, as it were, devolving to a smaller scale than what a given political community demands. The case of Telangana provides an apt illustration. For six decades, the people of Telangana (a hardscrabble region that includes Hyderabad) sought secession from the state of Andhra Pradesh, to become India's twenty-ninth state. In recent years, both regional and national political parties took up the cause, saturating physical and internet space with Telangana's map. In July 2013, following hundreds of suicides by pro-secession university students (Polgreen 2010), and a sharp uptick in Telangana's national profile and legitimacy, both India's ruling party and its Union Cabinet approved a secession measure (Naqshbandi 2013). Local feelings of pride and aggrievement had never found a credible object in either the map of India (Ramaswamy 2010) or Andhra Pradesh. The map of Telangana, however, so prominent in that struggle, appears to have fit such sentiments snugly. Put differently, aided by the map of their wished-for state, Telanganans' claims to "peoplehood" had devolved to a scale that better approximated their lived sense of place. Therein lies the instability. In this specific instance, the "people" got what they wanted; their group identity and their aggregate sense of place fit well with their proposed state's map. And yet, critics countered, what is to keep scores of other regions from pressing their own map-equipped claims? Indeed, what is to keep Telangana's own ten districts from splintering into new, smaller states, should local sentiment become more local still?³⁰ Following the announcement of Telangana's imminent statehood, such critics were instantly vindicated: the leaders of Gorkhaland, another restive region given to cartographic self-presentation, voiced their own demands for statehood—with several other regions waiting in the wings (Benedict 2013; Naqshbandi 2013).

²⁹ The Hungarian case presents a complex variant of this. In that country's ubiquitous irredentist map, the shape of post-Trianon Hungary is nested within its pre-Trianon form (Fig. 3, bottom right). When their country was "mutilated" in 1920, and the image of its reduced territory was first circulated, Hungarians were given a shape onto which they could project both their wounded national pride and their daily personal privations. During this affectively charged post-war period, the distance between place and political community was thus easily bridged. In the coming years, however, the irredentist map would goad Hungarians to project their affect not only from their everyday places out toward Hungary's current "incomplete" body but also farther out, toward unredeemed territories that, belonging to neighboring states, were not practically accessible to most Hungarians. The case thus combines both the interplay of local and national with the power of the somatized state, to illustrate Hungary's attempted re-scaling of its citizens' sense of place.

³⁰ It is not for nothing that one of international law's fundamental norms—trumping even that of national self-determination—is the norm of territorial integrity, which itself contains a norm against secession (e.g., Atzili 2012). Where nations can, in principle, always "differentiate down" to a smaller scale, nationalist sentiment and cartographic expression make for a factious combination.

Conclusion and implications

I have argued that map imagery is vital to how modern political communities foster in their members particular orientations toward territory. Despite growing sociological interest in territoriality and, more recently, in its subjective dimensions, political sociologists have paid only fleeting attention to cartographic phenomena. My account of maps' effects, however, suggests that territoriality is not just a mode of "impersonal rule," but rather also involves the formation of political subjects and the shaping of their experiences. For their part, map scholars have theorized the map's subjective effects but have seldom measured their intuitions against twentieth- and twenty-first-century political realities. As a result of these tendencies, we know less than we might about how mapping, the quintessential territorial tool, figures at the confluence of two core sociological concerns, territoriality and legitimation.

People must be made to relate to land in particular ways. And, as an organizational form defined in part by its control over land, the political community depends for its viability on subjects who accept that control as legitimate. Such legitimation, in turn, requires the transformation of the territorial political community from an experientially unassimilable abstraction into a concrete and proximate object in the world. The map's scientism and indexicality, I have argued, make it uniquely well-suited to this task, lending the political community not only the ontological weight but also the affective warmth of everyday, place-bound life. The cultivation of "map-mindedness" exploits these strengths, rendering the political community, real, near, and dear to its subjects.

However, most of what we currently know regarding the map's subjective effects comes from the experiments of cognitive and developmental psychologists. These reveal that people may attain map-mindedness very early in life, via a kind of socially situated absorption, a process I have likened to what Collins (2010) calls "collective tacit knowledge." Moreover, psychologists' observations lend support to map theorists who have long claimed that the aggregate of map images in a subject's social milieu operates as a unified system of signification (e.g., Harvey 2001; Jacob 2006)—a claim especially germane to contemporary contexts in which subjects are assailed with a broad range of map imagery. Despite their considerable insights, however, the experiments of map psychologists are too limited in scope to serve as a basis for theorizing maps' political effects.

I submit that the best way to gain purchase on those effects is to begin with a problem that map imagery is implicitly intended to solve: namely, the distance between the quotidian lives of ordinary subjects and the geographically and thus perceptually remote political community. That is, the political community must make itself meaningful, inserting itself into that sensually vivid, affectively fraught zone in which the subject's life is largely emplotted. In short, it must make itself more *place-like*.

It is in light of this imperative that I have elaborated a three-part, ideal-typical scheme for understanding the map's subjective political effects. Map imagery, I contend, lessens the phenomenological distance between the political community and its emplaced subjects in three related ways. First, it delivers the political community to the subject as a scientifically-validated object in the world. Moreover, it does so in such a way that the subject's everyday experiences are enlisted as embodied evidence of the mapped political community's existence. Second, the map psychically short-circuits the distance between political community and place by presenting the former as

a body-like object of cathexis and identification. Third, drawing on its indexical power, the map effects a bi-directional traffic of affect and meaning between the political community and place. In doing so, the map both codes the local as national *and* the national as local. In the first instance, the map constructively “absorbs” the subject and her quotidian places, imbuing them with its national essence, thus sapping the local of its seditious potential. In the second, the subject’s place-affect is constructively “stretched” to cover the larger territory, thus rendering the latter familiar and emotionally charged.

The foregoing analyses are not meant to be exhaustive or conclusive. Rather, it is hoped they may encourage further discussion regarding the relationship between the territoriality and legitimation of political communities. I have highlighted the role of map imagery because maps and their effects bear on that theoretical intersection like few other social phenomena. To be sure, some sociological works (e.g., Leuenberger and Schnell 2010; Mukerji 2006a; Pickles 2004) already acknowledge, explicitly or implicitly, that the map is a uniquely powerful form of sensory politics. What remains is specifying more clearly how, and under what conditions, maps bring about their political effects. There could not be a more opportune time to do so.

The saturation of social life with products like Google Maps, personal navigation devices, and GIS software complicate our analytical terrain. Future research will decide whether such mechanisms as those I have proposed are equally applicable to synoptic map imagery as to more route-based visual experiences. In addition, the internet has become a vibrant and vital space for the dissemination of conventional map imagery, both in the context of online journalism and in openly partisan fora (Leuenberger 2012). Finally, territoriality and its tools of legitimation demand our sociological attention perhaps to a greater degree than ever before.

Despite countless *fin de siècle* eulogies, both right and left strains of nationalism are alive and well. Moreover, the bonds linking political communities, their subjects, and their claimed territories could soon grow more fraught and consequential than in past decades. As populations and environmental degradation increase, and resources grow scarcer, the mobilization of conflict around territorialized notions of identity is likely to intensify. It is thus critical to identify those mechanisms that render territorial identities and conflicts real, both to participants and third parties. Recent social upheavals (e.g., the Arab Spring, the Occupy protests, ongoing landless movements, and the creeping militarization of “public order”) remind us not only of the dynamism of “spatial claim-making” (Tilly 2000), but of the relationship between state-level currents and the micro-processes through which people create, inhabit, and dispose of place. Finally, mapping remains the pre-eminent visual language of civic planning, real property regimes, electoral processes, international territorial disputes, and the dissolution and coming-into-being of states. This article is offered as a contribution toward bettering our analytical traction on the role of mapping in these and similar territorial phenomena.

Acknowledgments For their suggestions on previous drafts of this work, I thank Mariana Crăciun, Raymond Craib, Mathieu Desan, Fiona Greenland, Kim Greenwell, Robert Jansen, Matthew H. McLeskey, Sumathi Ramaswamy, Hiro Saito, Peggy Somers, George Steinmetz, Geneviève Zubrzycki, and participants in Michigan Sociology’s Power, History, and Social Change workshop. For their insightful comments on my submission, I also thank the *Theory and Society* reviewers and Editors. Finally, I wish to thank the American Bar Foundation, where I wrote much of this piece while in residence as a Law and Social Science Fellow

References

- Abrams, P. (1977). Notes on the difficulty of studying the state. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 1, 58–89.
- Agence-France-Presse. (2013). Japan ‘takes issue with Google maps’ over disputed islands, September 29. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2013/09/29/japan-takes-issue-with-google-maps-over-islands/>.
- Agnew, J. (1994). The territorial trap: the geographical assumptions of international relations theory. *Review of International Political Economy*, 1, 53–80.
- Akerman, J. (2009). *The imperial map: cartography and the mastery of empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso. **Revised Edition**.
- Andrews, H. (1984). The Durkheimians and human geography: some contextual problems in the sociology of knowledge. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 9, 315–336.
- Appiah, A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Applegate, C. (1990). *A nation of provincials: the German idea of Heimat*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Appuhn, K. (2009). *A forest on the sea: environmental expertise in renaissance Venice*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Atzili, B. (2012). *Good fences, bad neighbors: border fixity and international conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bachelard, G. (1994). *The poetics of space*. Boston: Beacon.
- Barnes, T. (2011). Rio’s shantytowns shrink—on Google Maps, at least. *Christian Science Monitor*, April 27. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/2011/0427/Rio-s-shantytowns-shrink-on-Google-Maps-at-least>
- Basso, K. (1996). *Wisdom sits in places: landscape and language among the western apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- BBC-Monitoring-Asia-Pacific. (2010). Google corrects Vietnam-China border map after Vietnam’s protest. August 7. Retrieved October 1, 2015 at alternative link: https://wikileaks.org/gifiles/docs/84/847967_bbc-monitoring-alert-vietnam-.html
- Benedict, K. (2013). Andhra split sparks chorus of demands for smaller states. *Daily Mail Online* (India edition), July 30. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/indiahome/indianews/article-2381548/Andhra-split-sparks-chorus-demands-smaller-states.html>.
- Benjamin, W. (1968). The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. In H. Arendt (Ed.), *Illuminations* (pp. 217–252). New York: Schocken.
- Berdoulay, V. (1978). The Vidal-Durkheim debate. In D. Ley & M. S. Samuels (Eds.), *Humanistic geography: prospects and problems* (pp. 77–90). Chicago: Maaroufa Press.
- Berezin, M. (2003). Territory, emotion and identity: Spatial re-calibration in a new Europe. In M. Berezin & M. Schain (Eds.), *Europe without borders: Re-mapping territory, citizenship and identity in a transnational age* (pp. 1–30). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Berezin, M., & Diez Medrano, J. (2008). Distance matters: place, political legitimacy and popular support for European integration. *Comparative European Politics*, 6, 1–32.
- Besnard, P. (1983). *The sociological domain: the Durkheimians and the founding of french sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biggs, M. (1999). Putting the state on the map: cartography, territory, and European state formation. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 41, 374–405.
- Bihari, P. (2006). Images of defeat: Hungary after the lost war, the revolutions and the Peace Treaty of Trianon. In R. Stradling (Ed.), *Crossroads of European histories: multiple outlooks on five key moments in the history of Europe* (pp. 165–171). Council of Europe.
- Blades, M., Blaut, J., Darvizeh, Z., Elguea, S., Sowden, S., Soni, S., Spencer, C., Stea, D., Surajpaul, R., & Uttal, D. (1998). A cross-cultural study of young children’s mapping abilities. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 23, 269–277.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brubaker, R. (1996). *Nationalism refrained: nationhood and the national question in the new Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brückner, M. (1999). Lessons in geography: maps, spellers, and other grammars of nationalism in the early republic. *American Quarterly*, 51, 311–343.

- Brückner, M. (2006). *The geographic revolution in early America: maps, literacy, and national identity*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Calhoun, C. (1999). Nationalism, political community and the representation of society: or, why feeling at home is not a substitute for public space. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2, 217–231.
- Carroll, P. (2006). *Science, culture, and modern state formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Casey, E. S. (2001). Between geography and philosophy: what does it mean to be in the place-world? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 91, 683–693.
- Centeno, M. (1997). Blood and debt: war and taxation in nineteenth-century latin america. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102, 1565–1605.
- Cerulo, K. (1993). Symbols and the world system: national anthems and flags. *Sociological Forum*, 8, 243–271.
- Collins, H. (2010). *Tacit and explicit knowledge*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Craib, R. (2004). *Cartographic Mexico: a history of state fixations and fugitive landscapes*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Crampton, J. (2007). Maps, race, and Foucault: Eugenics and territorialization following World War I. In J. W. Elden & S. Crampton (Eds.), *Space, knowledge, and power: Foucault and geography* (pp. 223–244). London: Ashgate.
- Cross, T. (2012). France apologises to Sri Lanka over Tamil Tiger stamps. *Radio France International*, January 4. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.english.rfi.fr/asia-pacific/20120104-france-apologises-sri-lanka-over-tamil-tiger-stamps>.
- Cupers, K. (2008). Governing through nature: camps and youth movements in interwar Germany and the United States. *Cultural Geographies*, 15, 173–205.
- Dalché, P. (2007). The reception of Ptolemy's *geography* (end of the fourteenth to beginning of the sixteenth century). In D. Woodward (Ed.), *The history of cartography, volume three, part one* (pp. 285–358). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Davies, C., & Uttal, D. (2007). Map use and the development of spatial cognition. In J.M.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- DeLoache, J., Miller, K., & Rosengren, K. (1997). The credible shrinking room: very young children's performance with symbolic and nonsymbolic relations. *Psychological Science*, 8, 308–313.
- Dorpalen, A. (1942). *The world of general Haushofer; geopolitics in action*. New York, Toronto: Farrar & Rinehart.
- Durkheim, E. (1972). *Selected writings*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Edney, M. (1994a). Mathematical cosmography and the social ideology of British cartography, 1780–1820. *Imago Mundi*, 46, 101–116.
- Edney, M. (1994b). British military education, mapmaking, and military “map-mindedness” in the later Enlightenment. *The Cartographic Journal*, 31, 14–20.
- Edney, M. (1997). *Mapping an empire: the geographical construction of British India, 1765–1843*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Elden, S. (2010). Land, terrain, territory. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34, 799–817.
- Entrikin, N. (1991). *The betweenness of place: towards a geography of modernity*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Education.
- Evans, P., Rueschemeyer, D., & Skocpol, T. (Eds.). (1985). *Bringing the state back in*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fernando, M. (2012). Canada, France LTTE stamps a ruse to raise funds. *Sunday Observer* (of Sri Lanka), January 8. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.sundayobserver.lk/2012/01/08/fea08.asp>
- Finer, S. (1975). State and nation building in Europe: the role of the military. In C. Tilly (Ed.), *The formation of national states in western Europe* (pp. 79–126). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Foote, K., Toth, A., & Arvay, A. (2000). Hungary after 1989: inscribing a new past on place. *Geographical Review*, 90, 301–334.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (2007). Questions on geography. In J. W. Elden & S. Crampton (Eds.), *Space, knowledge, and power: Foucault and geography* (pp. 173–184). London: Ashgate.
- Freud, S. (2000). *Three essays on the theory of sexuality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Garrido, M. (2010). Home is another country: ethnic identification in Philippine homeland tours. *Qualitative Sociology*, 34, 177–199.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gieryn, T. (2000). A space for place in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 463–496.

- Glaeser, A. (1998). Placed selves: the spatial hermeneutics of self and other in the postunification Berlin police. *Social Identities*, 4, 7–38.
- Goswami, M. (2004). *Producing India: from colonial economy to national space*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gottmann, J. (1973). *The significance of territory*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Govan, F. (2010). Google error hands disputed territory to Morocco. *The Telegraph* (UK), November 10. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/google/8123467/Google-error-hands-disputed-territory-to-Morocco.html>
- Gravois, J. (2010). How Google's open-ended maps are embroiling the company in some of the world's touchiest geopolitical disputes. (The agnostic cartographer) *Washington Monthly*. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2010/1007.gravois.html#Byline>
- Hacking, I. (2002). *Historical ontology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, J. (2010). Google Nicaraguan map error threatens to escalate into regional dispute. *The Guardian (Online)*, November 15. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2010/nov/15/google-map-dispute-nicaragua>.
- Harley, J. B. (2001). *The new nature of maps: essays in the history of cartography*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Harley, J. B., & Woodward, D. (Eds.). (1987). *The history of cartography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harley, J. B., & Woodward, D. (Eds.). (1992). *The history of cartography. Volume 2, Book 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hartshorne, R. (1939). The character of systematic geography. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 29, 413–436.
- Harvey, D. (2001). *Spaces of capital: towards a critical geography*. New York: Routledge.
- Hechter, M. (1975). *Internal colonialism: the Celtic fringe in British national development, 1536–1966*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hennayake, S., & Rathnayake, C. (2005). Inventing the Tamil nationhood: The use of maps. *Proceedings of the Peradeniya University Research Sessions, Sri Lanka*, 10, 24.
- Herb, G. (1997). *Under the map of Germany: Nationalism and propaganda, 1918–1945*. New York: Routledge.
- Herb, G. (2004). Double vision: Territorial strategies in the construction of national identities in Germany, 1949–1979. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 94, 140–164.
- Hintze, O. (1975). *The historical essays of Otto Hintze*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1990). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (Eds.) (1983). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Jacob, C. (2006). *The sovereign map: Theoretical approaches in cartography throughout history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jansen, R. (2008). Jurassic technology? Sustaining presumptions of intersubjectivity in a disruptive environment. *Theory and Society*, 37, 127–159.
- Jordan, M. (2010). The roots of hate. *World Policy Journal*, 27, 99–111.
- Joyce, P. (2003). *The rule of freedom: Liberalism and the modern city*. New York: Verso.
- Kain, R., & Baigent, E. (1992). *The cadastral map in the service of the state*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kantorowicz, E. (1957). *The king's two bodies; A study in mediaeval political theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kinchin, J. (2012). 'Caught in the ferris-wheel of history': Trianon memorials in Hungary. In M. Rampley (Ed.), *Heritage, ideology, and identity in Central and Eastern Europe: Contested pasts, contested presents*. Rochester: Boydell Press.
- Kirkley, C. (2012). Azawad Libre! New media and imagined geographies in the Sahel: an exhibition at the Portland Museum of Art, November 18 – December 15, 2012. Description available at: <http://portlandmuseumofmodernart.com/Saharan-Cellphones-past>. Retrieved October 1, 2015.
- Kivelson, V. (2006). *Cartographies of tsardom: The land and its meanings in seventeenth-century Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Köhler, W. (1947). *Gestalt psychology: An introduction to new concepts in modern psychology*. New York: Liveright.
- Konvitz, J. (1987). *Cartography in France, 1660–1848: Science, engineering, and statecraft*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lacan, J. (1991). *The seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book II*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Lacan, J. (2006). The Mirror Stage as Formative of the I Function as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience. In *Ecrits: The first complete edition in English* (pp. 75–81). New York: Norton.
- Lainer-Vos, D. (2014). Israel in the Poconos: simulating the nation in a Zionist summer camp. *Theory and Society*, 43, 91–116.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's hope: Essays on the reality of science studies*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Leuenberger, C. (2012). Mapping Israel/Palestine: Constructing national territories across different online international newspapers. *Bulletin du Centre de recherche français a Jerusalem*, 23, 1–22.
- Leuenberger, C. (2013). The rhetoric of maps: International law as a discursive tool in visual arguments. *Law and Ethics of Human Rights*, 7, 73–107.
- Leuenberger, C., & Schnell, I. (2010). The politics of maps: Constructing national territories in Israel. *Social Studies of Science*, 40, 803–842.
- Liben, L., & Myers, L. (2007). Developmental changes in children's understanding of maps: what, when, and how. In J. M. Plumert & J. P. Spencer (Eds.), *The emerging spatial mind* (pp. 193–218). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Loveman, M. (2005). The modern state and the primitive accumulation of symbolic power. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110, 1651–1683.
- Ludden, D. (2003). Presidential address: maps in the mind and the mobility of Asia. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 62, 1057–1078.
- Lukermann, T. (1999). *The praecognita* of varenius: Seven ways of knowing. In A. Buttner, S. Brunn, & U. Wardenga (Eds.), *Text and Image: Social Construction of Regional Knowledges* (pp. 7–27). Leipzig: Institut für Länderkunde.
- Lyman, S., & Scott, M. (1967). Territoriality: A neglected sociological dimension. *Social Problems*, 15, 236–249.
- Malkki, L. (1992). National geographic: the rooting of peoples and the territorialization of national identity among scholars and refugees. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7, 24–44.
- Mann, M. (1993). *The sources of social power: Volume 2, The rise of classes and nation-states, 1760–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mann, M. (2008). Infrastructural power revisited. *Studies in Comparative International Development (SCID)*, 43, 355–365.
- Meneghetti, C., Fiore, F., Borella, E., & De Beni, R. (2011). Learning a map of environment: The role of visuo-spatial abilities in young and older adults. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 25, 952–959.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). *Phenomenology of perception*. London: Routledge Classics.
- Mitchell, T. (1999). Society, economy and the state effect. In G. Steinmetz (Ed.), *State/Culture: State formation after the cultural turn* (pp. 76–97). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Mitchell, T. (2002). *Rule of experts: Egypt, techno-politics, modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. (2005). *What do pictures want?: the lives and loves of images*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mol, A. (2002). *The body multiple: Ontology in medical practice*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Monmonier, M. (1991). *How to lie with maps*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Montello, D. (2010). You are where? The function and frustration of you-are-here (YAH) maps. *Spatial Cognition and Computation*, 10, 94–104.
- Mukerji, C. (1997). *Territorial ambitions and the gardens of Versailles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mukerji, C. (2006a). Printing, cartography and conceptions of place in Renaissance Europe. *Media, Culture and Society*, 28, 651–669.
- Mukerji, C. (2006b). Tacit knowledge and classical technique in seventeenth-century France: Hydraulic cement as a living practice among masons and military engineers. *Technology and Culture*, 47, 713–733.
- Mukerji, C. (2009). *Impossible engineering: technology and territoriality on the Canal du Midi*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mukerji, C. (2010). The territorial state as a figured world of power: strategies, logistics, and impersonal rule. *Sociological Theory*, 28, 402–424.
- Mukerji, C. (2011). Jurisdiction, inscription, and state formation: administrative modernism and knowledge regimes. *Theory and Society*, 40, 223–245.

- Mulvey, L. (1991). Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. In R. Warhol-Down & D. Price-Herndl (Eds.), *Feminisms: An anthology of literary theory and criticism* (pp. 438–448). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Mundy, B. (2000). *The mapping of New Spain: Indigenous cartography and the maps of the Relaciones Geograficas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Naqshbandi, A. (2013). Telangana at last: India gets a new state, clamour for other states grow [sic]. *Hindustan Times* (India), July 31. Original link obsolete. Available at: <https://www.questia.com/article/1P3-3032246991/telangana-at-last-india-gets-a-new-state-clamour>. Retrieved October 1, 2015.
- Nettl, J. (1968). The state as a conceptual variable. *World Politics: A Quarterly Journal of International Relations*, 20, 559–592.
- Newcombe, N., & Chiang, N. (2007). Learning geographical information from hypothetical maps. *Memory & Cognition*, 35, 895–909.
- ÓTuathail, G. (1996). *Critical geopolitics: The politics of writing global space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Paasi, A. (1996). *Territories, boundaries, and consciousness: The changing geographies of the Finnish-Russian boundary*. New York: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Peirce, C. (1992). *The essential Peirce: Selected philosophical writings*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Peirce, C. (1998). *Charles S. Peirce: The essential writings*. Amherst: Prometheus Books.
- Pickles, J. (1992). Texts, hermeneutics and propaganda maps. In T. Barnes & J. Duncan (Eds.), *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape* (pp. 193–230). New York: Routledge.
- Pickles, J. (2004). *A history of spaces: Cartographic reason, mapping, and the geo-coded world*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Plester, B., Richards, J., Blades, M., & Spencer, C. (2002). Young children's ability to use aerial photographs as maps. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 22, 29–47.
- Polanyi, M. (1962). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Polgreen, L. (2010). Suicides, some for separatist cause, Jolt India. *New York Times*, March 30. Retrieved October 1, 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/31/world/asia/31india.html?_r=0.
- Powers, J. (2011). Reimagining the imagined community homeland tourism and the role of place. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55, 1362–1378.
- Radcliffe, S. (2010). Re-mapping the nation: Cartography, geographical knowledge, and Ecuadorean multiculturalism. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 42, 293–323.
- Ramaswamy, S. (2001). Maps and mother goddesses in modern India. *Imago Mundi*, 53, 97–114.
- Ramaswamy, S. (2004). *The lost land of Lemuria: Fabulous geographies, catastrophic histories*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ramaswamy, S. (2010). *The goddess and the nation: Mapping Mother India*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Reuters. (2010). Cambodia blasts Google map of disputed Thai border. *Reuters*, February 5. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/02/05/cambodia-google-idUSSGE61406G20100205>
- Revel, J. (1991). Knowledge of the territory. *Science in Context*, 4, 133–161.
- Rice, X. (2012). Subversive adverts decry upheaval in Mali. *Financial Times*, June 8. Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/49f75a32-b157-11e1-9800-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3pnnH6XO8>.
- Sack, R. (1986). *Human territoriality: Its theory and history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen, S. (2013). When territory deborders territoriality. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 1, 21–45.
- Satyendra, N. (1993). Tamil Eelam struggle for freedom: boundaries of Tamil Eelam (quoting November 1990 speech of Sathasivam Krishnakumar). Retrieved October 1, 2015. <http://tamilnation.co/tamileelam/boundaries/index.htm>.
- Schütz, A. (1970). *On phenomenology and social relations: Selected writings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schütz, A. (1997). *The phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Schütz, A., & Luckmann, T. (1989). *The structures of the life-world* (Vol. 2). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Scott, J. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Sewell, W. (2001). Spaces in contentious politics. In J. Goldstone, R. Aminzade, D. McAdam, E. Perry, W. Sewell, S. Tarrow, & C. Tilly (Eds.), *Silence and voice in the study of contentious politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shapin, S. (2004). The way we trust now: The authority of science and the character of the scientist. In D. Glaser, P. Hoodbhoy, & S. Shapin (Eds.), *Trust Me, I'm a Scientist* (pp. 42–63). London: The British Council.
- Shaw, M. (2008). *International law* (6th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smail, D. (2000). *Imaginary cartographies: Possession and identity in late medieval Marseille*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Smith, A. (1986). *The ethnic origins of nations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, A. (1992). Ethnic identity and territorial nationalism in comparative perspective. In A. Motyl (Ed.), *Thinking theoretically about Soviet nationalities: History and comparison in the study of the USSR* (pp. 45–66). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Soifer, H. (2009). The sources of infrastructural power: evidence from nineteenth-century Chilean education. *Latin American Research Review*, 44, 158–180.
- Somers, M., & Block, F. (2005). From poverty to perversity: ideas, markets, and institutions over 200 years of welfare debate. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 260–287.
- Sparke, M. (1998). A map that roared and an original atlas: Canada, cartography, and the narration of nation. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 88, 463–495.
- Sunday Times of Sri Lanka. (2012). Norway says sorry for issuing LTTE stamps. *Sunday Times* (Sri Lanka) February 15. Retrieved October 1, 2015, at alternative link: <http://www.beta.sundaytimes.lk/news-online/latest-news/norway-says-sorry-for-issuing-ltte-stamps.html>
- Taylor, H., & Tversky, B. (1996). Perspective in spatial descriptions. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 35, 371–391.
- Tilly, C. (1985). War making and state making as organized crime. In P. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer, & T. Skocpol (Eds.), *Bringing the State Back In* (pp. 169–191). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (2000). Spaces of contention. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, 5, 135–159.
- Torpey, J. (1999). *The invention of the passport: Surveillance, citizenship, and the state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuan, Y. (1974). *Topophilia: A study of environmental perception, attitudes, and values*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Tuan, Y. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tuan, Y. (1984). *Dominance & affection: The making of pets*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tumbull, D. (1996). Cartography and science in early modern Europe: Mapping the construction of knowledge spaces. *Imago Mundi*, 48, 5–24.
- Turner, S. (1994). *The social theory of practices: Tradition, tacit knowledge, and presuppositions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyner, J. (1982). Persuasive cartography. *Journal of Geography*, 81, 140–144.
- Uttal, D. (2000). Seeing the big picture: Map use and the development of spatial cognition. *Developmental Science*, 3, 247–264.
- Uttal, D. (2005). Spatial symbols and spatial thought: Cross-cultural, developmental, and historical perspectives on the relation between map use and spatial cognition. In L. Namy (Ed.), *Symbol use and symbolic representation: Developmental and comparative perspectives* (pp. 3–23). Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Uttal, D., Fisher, A., & Taylor, H. (2006). Words and maps: developmental changes in mental models of spatial information acquired from descriptions and depictions. *Developmental Science*, 9, 221–235.
- Vom Hau, M. (2008). State infrastructural power and nationalism: Comparative lessons from Mexico and Argentina. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 43, 334–354.
- Wacquant, L. (2004). *Body & soul: Notebooks of an apprentice boxer*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology* (1978th ed., Vol. 1 and 2). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Winichakul, T. (1994). *Siam mapped: A history of the geo-body of a nation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Wood, D. (1992). *The power of maps*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Woodward, D. (Ed.). (2007). *The history of cartography. Volume 3*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zerubavel, E. (2003). *Terra Cognita: The mental discovery of America*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Zubrzycki, G. (2011). History and the national sensorium: making sense of Polish mythology. *Qualitative Sociology*, 34(1), 21–57.

Camilo Arturo Leslie is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Baldy Center for Law and Social Policy at the State University of New York at Buffalo. He recently earned his PhD in sociology at the University of Michigan, where he also completed a Juris Doctor degree. Currently, he is developing a book manuscript about the collaborative production of “trustworthiness” in a recent case of international financial fraud.