Map Art[1]

Denis Wood
Independent Scholar
Raleigh, NC

Artists make maps. Inspired by maps made by the Surrealists, by the Situationists, by Pop Artists, and especially by Conceptualists of every stripe, artists in increasing numbers have taken up the map as an expressive medium. In an age less and less enamored of traditional forms of representation – and increasingly critical – maps have numerous attractions for artists. Beyond their formal continuities, maps and paintings are both communicative, that is, constructs intended to affect behavior. As the energy of painting has been dispersed over the past half century into earth art, conceptual art, installation art, performance art, video art, cyber art, and so on, it has dispersed the map as a subject along with it. The irresistible tug maps exert on artists arises from the map's mask of neutral objectivity, from its mask of unauthored dispassion. Artists either strip this mask off the map, or fail to put one on. In either case artists simultaneously point to the mask worn by the map, while they enter unmasked into the very discourse of the map. In so doing map artists are erasing the line cartographers have tried to draw between their form of graphic communication (maps) and others (drawings, paintings, and so on). In this way map artists are reclaiming the map as a discourse function for people in general. The flourishing of map art signals the imminent demise of the map as a privileged form of communication. The map is dead! Long live the map!

Keywords: Map art, maps, earth art, performance art, graphic communication

Introduction

When I open the daily paper, in Raleigh, North Carolina, and find map art splashed across the front page of its Life section – as I recently did – I know that map art's arrived. There was a color detail from one of Joyce Kosloff's recent collage maps, a headline, "Charting worlds of ideas," a subhead, "Joyce Kosloff aims to map the contours of perception," and a story about an exhibition of her *Boys' Art* drawings and a talk she was giving about them. The story continued inside where there was a color reproduction of the full drawing and a photograph of the artist.[2]

I was familiar with the drawings. I'd seen an advertisement in the November, 2003, issue of *Art in America* for their inaugural exhibition at DC Moore, Kosloff's New York gallery, and had called to see if there was a catalogue. There was, and they'd be glad to send it along. It arrived in a large box together with a bill for $125.[3] After I got over the shock I was delighted, for the drawings were beautiful and lavishly reproduced. Across lovely, pencil renderings of military maps – from the Han dynasty through the second half of the twentieth century – Kosloff had collaged figures drawn by her young son Nik, by Hergé, by Posada, and by many others, all of them of men (or superheroes) attacking or being attacked with knives, swords, spears, guns, and other weapons, *boys' art*, as Kosloff saw it, like that her brother Bruce had drawn when he and she were growing up, or that she had watched her son draw while he was growing up.

Kosloff has been working this vein for a while. In a map art show at the Tang Teaching Museum at Skidmore College in 2001, Kosloff showed *Targets* (2000), a walk-in globe which surrounded the viewer with sections from U.S. military maps of the countries the U.S. had bombed since World War II and which Kosloff had repainted.[4] She also showed three smaller globes from her *Knowledge* series (1998-1999). The *Knowledge* works, mostly smaller, flat frescoes, had toured the country in 1999. These were redrawings of maps, mostly from the Age of Discovery, in which Kosloff explored issues of power and knowledge.[5] Since the early-1990s, Kosloff's work has increasingly revolved around maps.[6]

Overtly political (and currently active with Artists Against the War), Kosloff stumbled – her word – into map art in the days when she was largely involved with public art projects. The first thing clients would

Initial submission, September 9, 2005; revised submission, January 5, 2006; final acceptance, February 16, 2006

send her were site maps. "The maps I was sent," she's said, "were a kind of structure to put my content into, and in the early 1990s I realized I could do that in my private art."[7]

A Little History

Every artist tells a different story, but since the early 1990s more and more of them have been explaining to interviewers how it was that they began making art with maps. This wasn't something artists used to have to explain. There *was* earlier map art, and in the sense that we're using the term today, but there wasn't much of it. In 1924 the Czech proto-Surrealist, Jindřich Štzrský, had made a "picture-poem" that incorporated a map of the Gulf of Genoa.[8] In 1925 Salvador Dalí had made a collage that incorporated map fragments of the Sea of Japan and Greece.[9] In 1929 the Surrealists had published their Surrealist map of the world.[10] In 1933, in response to Hitler's seizure of power in Germany, Max Ernst made "an end-of-the-world allegory," *Europe After the Rain I*, in the form of a relief map of Europe.[11] In 1936 Joseph Cornell had begun making boxes that incorporated maps of the moon (*Soap Bubble Set*, 1936), the South Seas (*Solomon Islands*, 1940-42, *Object (Roses des vents)*, 1942-53) and European cities (*Medici Slot Machine (Object)*, 1942, *Medici Slot Machine*, 1943); and later he'd work with world maps (*Trade Winds No. 2*, c. 1956-58), diagrams of the solar system (*Untitled (Solar Set)*, c. 1956-58), and star charts (*Observatory Colomba Carrousel*, c. 1953).[12] In 1943 Marcel Duchamp had made his *Allégorie de genre*, punning a map of the United States with the head of George Washington;[13] and Joaquín Torres-García had made his south-up map for La Escuela del Sur.[14] In 1950 the Letterist, Maurice Lemaître, had published *Riff-raff*, a ten-page "metagraphy," which included a sequence that zoomed from the solar system through a drawing of the earth to maps of Europe, France, and Paris, and finally one of Saint Germain de Près.[15] More famously, in the later 1950s, the Letterist dissident and founder, first of the Letterist International, and later of the Situationist International, Guy Debord, made "psychogéographique" maps (*Discours sur les passions de l'amour*, 1956, and, with Asger Jorn, *The Naked City*, 1957).[16] In 1962 Max Ernst painted his *Le Jardin de la France*, and collaged elements of maps into later work (*Configuration No. 16*, 1974).[17] But by this time map art was beginning to pop up all over the place.[18]

Robert Rauschenberg was making making art with maps as early as 1956,[19] but more notoriously, in the early 1960s Jasper Johns had begun making paintings of maps (*Map*, 1961, *Map*, 1962, *Map*, 1963). Johns was at the height of his notoriety and his *Map* paintings were widely reproduced. His largest map painting, a mural for Montreal's Expo '67 based on one of Buckminster Fuller's Dymaxion projections, attracted widespread international attention.[20] In a related but highly individual vein, Claes Oldenberg began producing stuffed maps of Manhattan (*Soft Manhattan No. 1 (Postal Zones)*, 1966), while Öyvind Fahlström worked on board-game maps of the world (*World Map*, 1972; *Garden (A World Model)*, 1973).[21] Fluxus artists – including Yoko Ono, Robert Watts, George Brecht, Robert Morris – were making map pieces too, notably Yoko Ono's early *Map Piece* (1962) and Watt's *Fluxatlas* (of the 1970s).[22] At the same time, earthworks artists such as Robert Smithson, Walter De Maria, Dennis Oppenheim, Adrian Piper, Christo and Jeanne-Claude, Nancy Holt, James Turrell, and others began working with maps to plan, execute, and document their work.[23] Smithson's *Map of Clear Broken Glass Stripes (Atlantis)*, 1969, with its collaged and pencil-drawn maps, was a "sketch" for the outline of Atlantis that Smithson was to lay out on in sheets of glass in the Jersey Meadowlands. Piper's *Parallel Grid Proposal for Dugway Proving Ground Headquarters*, 1968, used maps to lay out an enormous, two-mile-square steel-grid proposed to float on I-beams a half-mile off the ground. As the sun moved across the steel beams it would cast a moving coordinate grid over the Dugway headquarters. Christo and Jeane-Claude could never have constructed their landscape pieces, from *Valley Curtain* (1970-1972) through last year's *The Gates* (1979-2005), without maps, first, as an essential aspect of the drawings Christo sells to raise money to support their projects; then as planning, approval, and construction documents; and finally as aides to the appreciation of the work. The Environmental Impact Statement for *Running Fence* (1972-1976), for example, ran to over 450 pages, many of them maps; while last month, thousands and thousands of *The Gates Map* were sold to help visitors negotiate their piece in Central Park.[24] With Nancy Graves churning out maps of the moon (as in her suite, *Lithographs Based on Geologic Maps of Lunar Orbiter and Apollo Landing Sites*, 1972), Susan Hiller performing and drawing dream maps (as in her *Composite Group Dream Map, Night of 23/24 August*, 1974), and Sol LeWitt cutting holes in air photos of New York (*Photograph of Part of Manhattan with Area Between the John Weber Gallery, the former Dwan Gallery, and Sol LeWitt's Residence Cut Out*, 1977), maps were all over the post-Minimalist landscape.[25]

This is glaringly apparent in hindsight, but the editors of *artscanada* picked it up as early as 1974 when they devoted an entire issue of their magazine to maps and mapping, prefacing with a history of the mapping of Canada, articles about the map art of Vera Frenkel (including *Map with Gates*, 1973-74), Nancy Graves, Michael Snow, William Wiley, Claude Breeze (with special emphasis on his *Canadian Atlas* series), and a survey of the art of others.[26] By the time David

Woodward came to publish a lecture series on art and cartography in 1987, he was able to refer to the independent appearance that very year of four major exhibitions on the theme.[27] When Robert Storr organized the exhibition, *Mapping*, for New York's Museum of Modern Art in 1994, he had to note that unbeknownst to him Frances Colpitt had been organizing another exhibition, under the very same title, that was to tour Texas.[28] Since then Kathryn Charles has curated *Mapping Lessons* for the William King Regional Arts Center in Abingdon, Virginia (1996); Robert Silberman has curated *world views: Maps and Art* for the Frederick R. Weisman Art Museum at the University of Minnesota (1999); Ian Berry has curated *the World according to the Newest and Most exact Observations: Mapping Art + Science* for the Tang Teaching Museum at Skidmore College (2001); Lize Mogel and Chris Kahle have curated *Genius Loci* at SCI-Arc in Los Angeles (2002);[29] Jane England has curated the massive *The Map is Not the Territory* exhibition for England & Co. in London (2002);[30] and Elli Crocker has curated *Mapping* for the Schiltkamp Gallery at Clark University (2005). Kitty Harmon's *You Are Here: Personal Geographies and Other Maps of the Imagination* (Princeton Architectural Press, 2004) included over four dozen contemporary map artists. Since its publication, so many artists have sent Harmon work she's already contemplating a second volume.[31] More than two hundred contemporary artists appear in the catalogue that is part of this special issue of *Cartographic Perspectives*, and it's far from complete.

What's This All About?

One thing it's certainly about is the growing ubiquity of maps. The growth of map art is almost like a fever chart of the growth of the map industry itself. I'm fond of provoking historians of cartography by insisting that 99.99% of all paper maps ever made have been made in the past hundred years, the preponderance of them in the past fifty. There's really no way of proving this, but consider the following: these days, not counting Sundays, Raleigh's *News and Observer* prints close to thirty *million* maps a week,.[32] Fifty years ago the paper might have printed about thirty *thousand* maps a week. Fifty years before that the paper might not have printed any maps at all. The numbers of maps have always risen with wars, but what's really driven them up have been changes in technology and the ever-increasing competition from more graphic media. The institution of map features, such as the weather page, has been a factor too. As a result, newspapers have become map factories: a middling paper like the *News and Observer* is printing over one and half *billion* maps a year.[33] Similar increases in map production can be seen in other graphic media, especially in news magazines, but also in textbooks, and this is to say nothing of television which adores maps, or the Web.[34]

During the twentieth century entirely new map genres have come into existence, some proliferating until they're as taken for granted as indoor plumbing. Take the automotive highway map. It was born with the twentieth century, grew up with the car, and was pushed by oil, rubber, automotive, and other interests until it flooded glove compartments and overflowed kitchen drawers. State governments alone print millions and millions of copies a year.[35] Another twentieth century innovation, field guides to trees, birds, wildflowers, reptiles, and so on, feel it incumbent upon them to include range maps for every species. Popular field guides can have hundreds of maps in them. Millions of copies are printed. I could go on.

The point, by no means trivial, is that in so far as artists deal with the world around them, during the past half century maps have become an increasingly prominent part of it. Because our society is more map-immersed than any that has previously existed, contemporary map artists have grown up bathed in maps to an unprecedented degree. It's true that they've grown up bathed in many things, not all of which have become compulsive subjects of artmaking, but the unique properties of the map make it an exceptionally apt subject for an art which, while it has grown less and less enamored of traditional forms of representation, has become increasingly critical. Maps have numerous attractions. In the first place, like paintings, maps are graphic artifacts. There is substantial formal continuity, especially with the painting of the second half of the twentieth century and its grab-bag of commitments to abstraction, surface, flatness, pattern, and formal systems of sign-making. Then too, like paintings, maps are communicative, that is, are constructs by which one human (or group of humans) affects the state or behavior of another (or others) in a communication situation.[36] That is, both maps and paintings are more or less permanent, more or less graphic artifacts intended to shape the behavior of others. As the energy of painting has been dispersed in the past half century through the forms of earth art, conceptual art, installation art, performance art, video art, cyber art, and so on, it has dispersed the map as a subject along with it.

What Maps Do

The special role of maps – normative maps, the everyday maps of our everyday lives – is to serve the descriptive function in human discourse that links behaviors through the territorial plane.[37] For example, the map links my living here with my son's going to school there, or my registering this deed here with my being able to extract ores there. Maps achieve these

linkages the more effectively as the maps are taken to be descriptions *of the territory* – as descriptions of a school district, of a tract of property – rather than descriptions *of the behaviors linked through the territory* – my son having to attend a certain school because of where we live, my right to dig up the earth because of having registered a deed in a particular courthouse. That is, it is one thing, and comparatively inoffensive, to say that we live in such-and-such a school district. It is another thing, and often contentious, to point out that my child is being forced to attend school there because we have a house here. It is comparatively innocent to remark that we have a deed to this property, another to observe that it gives us the right to dynamite a hole in it. Maps pass as descriptions of the territory most readily when they appear to be describing an objective state of affairs, to be reporting on an existing reality; and they appear to be doing this when they wear masks of impersonal authority. That is, maps pass as descriptions of the territory when they project the sense of being unauthored or, if authored, then by a machine-like medium through which the territory passes … merely to effect a convenience, a change, say, in scale or focus.[38] This mask, for so long worn by painting, makes maps an irresistible target for contemporary artists who either take the map's mask off, or refuse to put it on.

How does all this work?

Maps create links by fusing signs, under the control of at least ten codes, onto the plane of the map. Five of these codes, the intrasignificant codes, operate within the map, at the level of what Roland Barthes used to call language; the other five, the extrasignificant codes, operate outside the map, at the level of what Barthes called myth. Within the map, signs are subject to an *iconic* code concerned with their *whatness* (say, streets and schools); a *linguistic* code concerned with their names; a *tectonic* code concerned with their spatial relations (within which *scalar* and *topological* codes can be differentiated); a *temporal* code concerned with their temporal relations (within which codes of *duration* and *tense* can be distinguished); and a *presentational* code concerned with the structure of their ensemble. At the level of myth, the *thematic* code organizes the signs of the iconic code into a theme (it's a map of school districts); the *topic* code organizes their spatial relationships into a place (they turn into a county, say, Wake); the historical code organizes their temporal relationships into an epoch, into an era (for example, the coming school year); the *rhetorical* code organizes their presentation into a style (that most advantageous to the myth that these *are* the school districts); while the *utilitarian* code organizes the whole for the uses to which the map is intended (to achieve the complicated goals of the school board).[39]

To create a map of school districts like this, we draw streets and school districts on a single sheet of paper. This sheet of paper is the common plane, the plane of the map. Drawing the signs in the same plane fuses their signifieds, in this case, legal residences, and the schools to be attended by children of specified ages or grades. The fairy tale of the neighborhood school – which has always been a fairy tale – is dramatically belied in our age of compulsory attendance, busing, satellite attendance zones, magnet schools, and the rest of apparatus associated with the apportioning of educational resources, most of which are negotiated through the map. Among other signs on the map are those connoting trustworthiness – which is to say objectivity – and these "seal" the map as an independent object, in effect masking the interests motivating the behaviors. Since other coded graphics can also link things through the territorial plane – for example a painting can – it is this air of detachment, finally, which makes a map a map.

What are these signs of detachment?

Certainly the least of them are such formal attestations of authority as scales in multiple forms, arcane grid ticks, and the names of projections. Though these are necessary, they are radically insufficient. Instead of concentrating its authority in a single mark – like an artist's chop on a print – the "objectivity" of a map is dispersed evenly across its surface to infect every mark. Essential to such an appearance is a measured and mechanical uniformity, an evenhanded approach to every sign, one that exudes detachment and impartiality, and so neutrality, and so finally objectivity. This uniformity reduces the number of potential expressive elements to a handful, and is responsible for the characteristic formality of most maps (and their family-like resemblances). Long before the hand had altogether been severed by the digital revolution, it had pretty much disappeared from mapmaking. Emblematic were the lettering devices common through the 1960s. In the Normograph – isn't that a great name? – and the Wrico systems, the mapmaker had to push his pen (actually a small tube designed to insure an even flow of ink) through perforated templates. In the Leroy system the hand was constrained to trace debossed letters with a scribe while an attached pen – again a tube – reproduced them on the page. There were endless ruling pens, pantographs, imprinters, preprinted symbol sheets, splines, curves, and other devices for controlling the wayward hand. The acknowledged purpose of this constraint? "The tools and media," Arthur Robinson wrote in the first edition of his widely influential textbook, "… are designed primarily for the purpose of making it easy to obtain precision."[40] Ah, *precision*.

Here we find a "scientific" rationale – that is, mask – for the impersonal appearances designed to mask the social construction of the map. How did R. D. Laing put it? First we forget. Then we forget we forgot.

Not content with imposing themselves on the signs of the map proper, that is, on the signs comprising, at the level of language, the map *content*, the phatic codes – presentational, rhetorical, and utilitarian – churn out an elaborate array of signage of their own, this designed to make clear to the least perspicacious the map's objectivity.[41] These include, but are by no means limited to, formal frames, rules, borders, attestations to the depth of consultation with experts, descriptions of projections, scales in multiple forms, arcane grid ticks, notes about magnetic declination, inset maps, inset diagrams, and graphs and photographs, these themselves often encrusted with their own armamentarium of titles, borders, and credits. Among these would fall the formal attestations of authority: "Prepared by the Wake County Board of Education."

The combination of uniformity, *of a restraint*, at the level of the map content, with this gush of authoritarian impedimenta, is irresistible. It comes to a paper incarnation of Robert Boyle's seventeenth century program for the *construction of assent* necessary to establish the existence of *matters of fact* (all of which is about building feelings of confidence). At the beating heart of Boyle's program was the laboratory, conceived as a disciplined space where experiments could be collectively controlled by competent participants. Is it merely coincidental that mapmaking spaces in universities have traditionally been called labs? That they're crammed – and always have been – with "scientific" equipment (finely machined, exactly calibrated)?[42] To this disciplined space Boyle coupled a modest and "naked way of writing;" and he advocated "a philosophical rather than rhetorical" form of prose.[43] Is it also coincidental that following the seventeenth century, maps became progressively less and less *decorative* and more and more "just the facts, m'am"? Or that Boyle's eagerness to encumber his reports with the names of respectable and well-known witnesses found its parallel on maps in the increasingly frequent imprimatur of important scientific organizations ("based on the Work of the Geological Survey") or government agencies (the United States Army Map Service), often reduced to impressive acronyms (NOAA), all solidifying the weight of the authority standing behind the frail sheet of paper?

Once the map's social construction has been masked by every conceivable sign of dispassion; once its authority has been rendered unquestionable; once its ability to transmit the world *as it is* has been secured beyond doubt; the map is free to commit any violence it chooses. It can display, for example, in lurid pinks and greens and purples, a world smashed into nation-states and pass it off as … *only natural*.

How Have Artists Responded to This?

Let's consider the Surrealist map of the world of 1929, here in Patrick Waldberg's description:

The only cities shown are Paris and Constantinople, but without France or Turkey. Europe consists only of Germany, Austria-Hungary and an immense Russia, which also takes up half of Asia (the other half of which is composed of China, Tibet and an outsized Afghanistan next to a rather small India). By contrast, the islands of the Pacific occupy two-thirds of the world and carry as banners the marvelous names of Hawaii, the Solomons, New Hebrides, New Zealand, the Marquesas and the Bismarck Archipelago. The North American continent, from which the United States is missing, presents a gigantic Alaska, the Charlotte Islands, Labrador and Mexico. Further down, Easter Island is as large as all of South America, which is reduced to a single country: Peru.[44]

Of course all this corresponds perfectly to the permanent orientation of the Surrealist ideal, but how have the artists wrenched the map free from the Mercator on which it is so patently based? In the first place there is a complete absence of phatic signage, no border, frame, neatline, no scale, grid ticks – no grid! – inset maps, et cetera. While there is a notable uniformity of line weight in the portions of the map traced directly from the model, there is none in the lettering, which – no Normograph used here! – has obviously been drawn freehand. The letter-spacing is particularly idiosyncratic. Because the equator tries to pass through the points on the map through which it would pass on the globe, it wanders all over the place, here nearly rolling into a semicircle, there running straight as a ruler. Size distortions come with the Mercator, but the exaggerations of the size of New Guinea, the Bismarcks, and especially Easter Island and Tierra del Fuego arise solely from the heat of Surrealist desire. As for nation-states, while one *can* imagine that those of Europe, Asia, and South America have in general simply not been displayed, where the Mexican and Canadian borders run together there is simply no room for the forty-eight United States at all: they, with their detested plumbing, have been silently expunged.

Or not so silently. In fact their absence is a roar challenging not simply the Western Christian civilization which so revolted the Surrealists, but the authority of Western Christian cartography to map the world. This is a map which strips the mask off and, in so doing, points to the presence of the mask on the normative maps of Western Christian culture.

Leap forward to the summer of 2003. Mona Hatoum has poured 3,300 pounds of clear glass marbles on the floor of a gallery at the Museum of Contemporary Art

in Los Angeles. From a distance the floor seems simply to shiver like the air above a radiator, but as you approach you realize that you are looking at a map of the world, shimmering-marble land against matte-floor oceans. Not only are no nation-states in view, but everything shifts with the light, and you are never far from imagining your legs flying out from under you on the slippery surface. Hatoum has rendered the opaque transparent, the rigid unstable, and all that is solid threatens … to roll away. In Hatoum's earlier *Marble Carpet*, 1995 – in which she laid down a carpet of marbles – she unsettled viewers' physical and perceptual footing. In *Map*, 1999, Hatoum unsettles our cognitive footing, asking us to question the stability of our image of the world, and so its necessity.[45]

So striped down is Hatoum's *Map* it seems superfluous to point out that it too has stripped off the mask. Again there is an absence of phatic signage, or rather it is *there* – it's that little didactic on the wall – but the confidence the didactic calls for is in the *curatorial acumen* that these marbles constitute *a work of art*, not in their layout as a map of the world. The map has been displaced *within* the work of art. Nevertheless, *Map* depends on our accepting it as a map of the world, as indeed it is. Only this acceptance mobilizes the marbles, with their potential freedom of motion, to query the necessity of the lines fixed in ink on other world maps. Similarly, it is only our familiarity with other world maps that permits the absence of the U.S. on the Surrealist map of the world to signify Surrealism's rejection of American materialist values. Both maps contest the *authority* of normative mapping institutions – science, government, the news media – to reliably map the world, at the same time that both maps reject the *world* that such institutions bring into being.

Art maps are always pointing toward worlds other than those mapped by normative mapping institutions. In so doing art maps unavoidably draw attention to the world-making power of normative maps. What is at stake is the nature of the world we want to live in. In pointing towards the existence of other worlds – real or imagined – map artists are claiming the power of the map to achieve ends other than the social reproduction of the status quo. Map artists do not reject *maps*. They reject the *authority* claimed by *normative maps* uniquely to portray reality as it is, that is, with dispassion and objectivity, the traits embodied in the mask. The history of Situationist mapmaking is explicit in this regard. Debord's *psychogéographique* maps "first originated in reaction against city-planning schemes for the modernization of Paris which threatened the old Bohemian areas on the Left bank;"[46] Abdelhafid Khatib's *psychogéographique* maps of Les Halles were "meant in part as a riposte to redevelopment plans that had been hanging over the area for a number of years;"[47] and the *psychogéographique* mapping of Copenhagen and Amsterdam carried out by Asger Jorn, Constant, and others had similar motivations. In fact, Debord explicitly called for a "renovated cartography" as a way to *intervene* in redevelopment activities which, in the case of Paris, were far more extensive and devastating than those carried out under Haussmann during the Second Empire.[48] More was involved here than the abandonment of the usual phatic signage. Indeed caught up in this *renovated cartography* were the iconic, tectonic, and temporal codes (for Situationist psychogeography implied altered notions of scale, distance, and direction), and as a result the thematic, topic, and historical codes as well. Yet Debord insisted – and I agree with him – that his maps charted social and cultural forces that were every bit as "real" as those charted by the planners whose efforts the Situationists were attempting to combat. It was indeed a war of maps such as I advocate in the closing pages of my *Power of Maps*; and if Debord was out-gunned at the time, his psychogeographic heirs continue to gain ground today.[49]

Yet there is an alternative to taking off the mask and that is to never put it on. This is the option pursued by map artists like Newton and Helen Mayer Harrison, who for more than thirty years have been creating an environmentally beneficial art in which maps have loomed large:

Often beginning with preexisting maps, the artists extensively rework them, redrawing, digitally altering, painting over, and reorienting the original images so that familiar landmarks such as cities, borders, and roads tend to disappear while little noticed topographical and land-use patterns come to the fore. Pioneers of "Eco" art, the Harrisons use maps to emphasize one of their ongoing themes – namely the arbitrary nature of national boundaries and the way they often hinder ecologically responsible thinking.[50]

This concern with boundaries is a theme common to much map art, but the Harrisons' approach is not to draw attention to these boundaries by playing with the map codes but by altering the map *content*. Indeed, except for the handwriting that often appears on them, the Harrisons' maps can resemble the maps produced by normative institutions. One of their most recent projects, *A Vision for the Green Heart of Holland* (1995-96), includes three maps. One of these, entitled "Bad Government," shows what the Harrisons think Holland will look like if developed without deference to ecological considerations. The Harrisons' proposal, entitled "Good Government," leaves the existing "green heart" of Holland undeveloped, and projects green rays into the areas that would have to be more intensively developed. The third map was a laminated, walk-on, aerial photograph with the Harrisons' proposal in transparent green. Residents could walk – or crawl – on this to find their own homes and

see other details. There's an accompanying video and listening pads. The artists were hired by the Cultural Council of South Holland, and the piece has won the Groeneveld Prize of the Dutch Department of Agricultural. Embraced by Holland's Green Party, and at one point accepted by the Dutch Ministry of the Environment, the plan was once abandoned with a change of government, but is now again part of the official future.

Why isn't this simply planning? In the first place because the Harrisons are artists, not planners. In the second, because their intervention is usually at the request of arts groups. The Harrisons also "maintain that their position as artists allows them to cut through red tape, ignore professional territorialism, and present ideas in a form that general audiences can understand," but something needs to be said about their visions as artists too. As such they bring a wholly different set of values to environmental planning. The Harrisons' many, often large, and very beautiful maps, make no pretense about being objective, neutral, or dispassionate. Quite the contrary. Strong points of view, passionately advocated for, lie at the heart of the Harrisons' nonetheless remarkably subtle art. Committed to a positive art of unmasked advocacy, the Harrisons do not have to strip off a mask they never put on; and so their maps give us a glimpse of what mapmaking might have been had it never been yoked to the social reproduction of the status quo. The very different work of the exciting New York map artist, Jake Barton, has a similarly positive cast, and like the Harrisons' work, simply refuses to put the mask on.[51]

The examples I've just given – the Surrealist map of the world, Mona Hatoum's *Map*, the maps of the Situationists, and those of the Harrisons – were all constructed within an explicitly contestatory framework. Not all map art has been this straight-forward about its social posture, but no map art has failed to contest one or more aspects of the normative mapping program. Johns' maps, to take a uniquely painterly example, with their gestural expressionism, toss "precision" right out the door. So do Oldenburg's stuffed maps. The map made by the Conceptual Art collaborative, Art and Language, *Map to not indicate …* (1967), where my ellipsis indicates a list of fifty-seven places *not shown* on the lithograph where you *do* find Iowa and Kentucky, tramples on map claims to be inclusive.[52] One variation on this theme is Kathy Prendergast's *Lost* (1999), a map of the United States that only includes places with the word "lost" in their name.[53] Another is the maps in Marina Roy's *sign after the X* _____ that only include places beginning with X or have the X names circled.[54] John Hurrell's map-paintings carry this idea to an extreme: he blacks out everything on maps except those segments of streets that intersect a drawing, say of a face, that he's projected onto the map, works he refers to as "a kind of geographical sandwich."[55] Even these, as remote as they may seem from the interventionist activism of the Situationists and the Harrisons, relentlessly poke at the pretensions of maps to portray the world as it *really* is.

The power of maps lies in their ability to support discourse through the territorial plane. Map artists are all about reclaiming that power from the institutions that have held a near monopoly over it for the past several hundred years. In this they find themselves allied with an even larger and more energetic counter-mapping movement composed of indigenous mappers, Greens, and social activists, who are contesting the maps made by science, government, and the news media, not with letters to the editors and supplications at formal hearings, but with maps every bit as powerful – sometimes more so – than those produced by the agencies in power. Counter-mapping and art maps have come of age at the same time: both have exploded since the 1960s, and really gained authority during the 1990s. Their growth has paralleled the democratization of mapmaking capabilities that the computer, and especially the net, have promoted. I find it impossible to imagine that the three trends are not related. I see heralded in their vigorous health what I called in a recent editorial in *Cartographic Perspectives* … the death of cartography. By this I meant not the end of mapmaking, but the end of mapmaking as an elite preserve of university-educated cartographers. As the map art in this issue of *Cartographic Perspectives* makes perfectly clear, the map is not going anywhere when cartography kicks the bucket.

The map is dead! Long live the map!

Endnotes

[1] An earlier version of this paper was given at the Higgins School for the Humanities, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts, 2005, in conjunction with the opening of the exhibition *Mapping* in the university's Schiltkamp Gallery.
[2] Ellen Sung, "Charting worlds of ideas," *News and Observer*, February 6, 2005, 1G and 6G. Sung was interested in Kosloff's early role in the Pattern and Decoration movement of the 1970s. Sung also provided a guide to a number of Kosloff's public-art sites.
[3] Joyce Kosloff, *Boys' Art*, Distributed Art Publishers, New York, 2003. There was a limited edition of 55 copies with a hand-tinted, collaged etching. Robert Kushner wrote the neat introduction.
[4] In the catalogue by Susan Bender and Ian Berry, *The World According to the Newest and Most Exact Observations: Mapping Art and Science*, The Tang Teaching Museum, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs (New York), 2001, Kosloff's work is on pp. 42-43. Some of my own work was included in this exhibition as well.
[5] Janet Koplos reviewed this work in "Revisiting the Age of Discovery," *Art in America*, July 1999, pp. 86-87.
[6] Some of this earlier work is reproduced in Katherine Harmon, *You Are Here: Personal Geographies and Other Maps of the Imagination*, Princeton Architectural Press, New York, 2004, on pp. 60, and 160-161.
[7] Sung, op. cit., p. 6G.
[8] *Souvenir* is dated to 1924 in Brandon Taylor's *Collage: The Making of Modern Art* (Thames and Hudson, New York, 2004) where it appears

on p. 63. At the time he made *Souvenir*, Štzrský was a Poetist but had been aware of Surrealism for at least two years. In 1925 he and Toyen (Marie Cermínová) moved from Prague to Paris where they created Artificialism, "the Czech contribution to Surrealism." In "picture-poems" montage was used to make "film-like poems," and Taylor describes *Souvenir* as "laid out horizontally around the motif of a cartographic panorama" (p. 63).

[9] *La Casamiento de Buster Keaton* (*The Wedding of Buster Keaton*) is dated November 1925 in Ian Gibson et al, *Salvador Dalí: the Early Years* (South Bank Center, London, 1994) where it appears on p. 124. The piece consists of two sheets of paper, with elements of the solar system on the first, and map fragments – the Sea of Japan, Greece – on the second, together with a diagram of sea breezes. The indications are that, except for newspaper clippings related to Keaton, all the elements came from a geography text. Apparently the collage accompanied a letter to Federico García Lorca, and it seems that Dalí wanted to include it in the *Book of Putrefaction* he and Lorca had planned to publish (see page 137). Dalí opposed putrefaction and astronomy.

[10] *Le monde au temps des Surréalists* was published in a special issue, "Le Surréalisme en 1929," of the Brussels journal, *Variétés*, June 1929, pp. 26-27. The artist of this widely reproduced map is unknown.

[11] The description is Robert Storr's in "Past Imperfect, Present Conditional," in Werner Spies and Sabine Rewald, eds., *Max Ernst: A Retrospective*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 2005, pp. 51-65, the quotation on p. 62. This amazing painting, rarely reproduced, appears in color on p. 69. In his contribution to the retrospective, ""Max Ernst in America," pp. 66-79, Spies says that the painting, "suggests how the coming disaster will change the face of the European continent" (p. 69). In Edward Quinn's *Max Ernst* (New York Graphic Society, New York, 1977) – where the painting is misdated to 1934 – U. M. Schneede is quoted as saying, "In the year of Hitler's takeover of power came the first version of *Europe After the Rain*. The continent is deformed, laid waste, all traces of civilization are wiped out. What remains after the destruction is scarcely identifiable. When Joyce saw the picture, he found a play on words which acts as a verbal equivalent: 'Europe – Purée – Pyorrhée,'" p. 201.

[12] With two exceptions these are all reproduced in the lovely *Joseph Cornell: Shadowplay Eterniday*, with essays by Lynda Roscoe Hartigan and others (Thames and Hudson, London, 2003). *Soap Bubble Set*, 1936 (actually *Untitled (Soap Bubble Set)*, c. 1936), is reproduced in Ecke Bonk et al., *Joseph Cornell/Marcel Duchamp … in resonance*, The Menil Collection/Philadelphia Museum of Art, Houston/Philadelphia, 1998, p. 171. Whenever it was made, it was exhibited at The Museum of Modern Art in the important *Fantastic Art, Dada, Surrealism* show of 1936. *Object (Roses des Vents)*, 1942-53, is reproduced in Kynaston McShine, ed., *Joseph Cornell*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1980, plate XVII.

[13] See Bonk et al., op. cit., pp. 145-146, where the *Allégorie de genre* proper – if I can call it that – is accompanied by variants in Joseph Cornell's *Duchamp Dossier*, as well as by a preliminary piece in the version of the *Boite-en-valise* (Series A, XI/XX) that was initially owned by Orin Raphael (see the note under 1944 [Spring] on page 287 of the chronology). Cornell himself probably assembled this copy of the *Boite*.

[14] This is also often reproduced. See Robert Storr, *Mapping*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1994, p. 9. The date of 1934 given in Harmon, op. cit., on p. 133 is incorrect. Torres-García has dated it himself, 43, just to the right of his initials in the lower left of the drawing.

[15] Several pages from this metagraphy are illustrated in Jean-Paul Curtay's *Letterism and Hypergraphics: The Unknown Avant-Garde, 1945-1985*, Franklin Furnace, New York, 1985, unpaginated, but like halfway through.

[16] The literature on Debord is immense and growing. Simon Sadler's *The Situationist City*, MIT, Cambridge, 1998, makes a good introduction to Debord's maps, reproducing and discussing both of them at length, though to see *Discours sur les passions de l'amour* in color, check Out Storr, op. cit., p. 33. Essential for appreciating the maps are David Pinder, "Subverting Cartography: the Situationists and Maps of the City," *Environment and Planning A 28*, 1996, pp. 405-427; and Peter Wollen, "Mappings: Situationists and/or Conceptualists," in Michael Newman and Jon Bird, eds., *Rewriting Conceptual Art*, Reaktion, London, 1999, pp. 27-46. Wollen discusses a third map image, *Life continues to be free and easy*, c. 1959 – a collage Debord made by pasting hand-colored figures of soldiers over *The Naked City* – better reproduced, however, in Sadler, as cover and frontispiece. (Debord's collage anticipates Kosloff's *Boys' Art*.) Sadler also reproduces a page with a map from Debord and Jorn's *Mémoires*, Permild and Rosengreen, Copenhagen, 1959, which is reproduced nearly life-size and in color in Taylor, *Collage*, op. cit., p. 190. At one time Debord promised three other *psychogéographique* maps: *Paris sous la niege*, *The most dangerous game*, and *Axe d'exploration et échec dans la recherche d'un Grand Passage situationiste*, but if he made them no one's ever seen them (see Sadler, footnote 48, p. 182, and Pinder, personal communication). Let me note that Wollen reads Debord's maps in the light of the map codes I developed with John Fels in "Designs on Signs: Myth and Meaning in Maps," *Cartographica, 23*(3), Autumn, 1986, pp. 54-103.

[17] *Le Jardin de la France* is also widely reproduced, but both it and *Configuration No. 16* can be found in Edward Quinn's *Max Ernst*, New York Graphic Society, New York, 1977, pp. 332-333 and 421.

[18] Note that I've made no reference to the maps of John Held, Jr., Saul Steinberg, Seymour Chwast, and others working in the tradition of magazine and advertising illustration, despite ardent admiration and inner doubts. *The New Yorker* published a gorgeous portfolio of Steinberg's maps in its February 21 & 28, 2000, issue, pp. 216-223. I'm also an admirer of the maps of Maaira Kalman and Rick Meyerowitz whose post-9/11 map of the "Stans" is already a shower-curtain icon. Their more recent *The New York City Sub Culinary Map* is another laugh riot (*The New Yorker*, September 6, 2004, pp. 142-143). I'll try to justify this exclusion more meaningfully in what follows.

[19] A map composed of collaged fragments of a map of the United States and another of Europe lies at the heart of Rauschenberg's *Small Rebus* (1956). See the treatment on pp. 52-53 – which includes a reproduction of the piece and a detail of the map – in Thomas Crow's "Southern Boys Go to Europe: Rauschenberg, Twombly, and Johns in the 1950s," in Stephanie Barron and Lynn Zelevansky, eds., *Jasper Johns to Jeff Koons: Four Decades of Art from the Broad Collections*, Los Angeles County Musuem of Art, Los Angeles, 2001. It also seems likely that Rauschenberg gave Johns the map that led to Johns' map paintings. For example, see the recent article by Calvin Tomkins, "Everything in Sight: Robert Rauschenberg's New Life," *The New Yorker*, May 23, 2005, pp. 68-77, especially the quotation from Johns on p. 75.

[20] The Johns literature is also enormous. When the image is famous (and the *Map* paintings are very famous), and it is in one or another of the map show catalogues, I'm just going to note its location in the catalogue, in this case, for *Map*, 1963, Storr, op. cit., p. 25. Storr also reproduces a preliminary drawing for the Expo mural on p. 8. Storr's *Map* is a later map painting, grayer than the bright *Map*, 1961, though not as gray as *Map*, 1962. All three, plus the map based on the Fuller (*Map (Based on Buckminster Fuller's Dymaxion Air Ocean World)*, 1967-1971), are reproduced in Kirk Varnedoe, *Jasper Johns: A Retrospective,* Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1996, which also includes shots of Johns working on the Fuller, and as it was installed in Montreal.

[21] For the Oldenberg, see Storr, op. cit., p. 46; for Fahlstrom's *World Map* see Harmon, op. cit., pp. 112-113, for *Garden*, Storr, p. 29. There's a substantial monographic literature on both these guys.

[22] For a discussion of Ono's *Map Piece* in the context of Conceptualist and Situationist mapmaking, see Wollen, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

[23] Stephen Bann has written about this practice, as an art practice, in a piece about "Land Art"; and while mostly about the distinctive practices of Richard Long and Hamish Fulton, Bann also writes about those of De Maria and Oppenheim, and so the rest by implication. See Bann's "The Map as Index of the Real: Land Art and the Authentication of Travel," *Imago Mundi 46*, 1994, pp. 9-18; and as substantially excerpted in Jeffrey Kastner and Brian Wallis, *Land and*

Environmental Art (Phaidon, London, 1998), pp. 243-244.
[24] All the earthworks artists made *rafts* of maps. In Storr, there are examples by Holt (on p. 39), Smithson (on p. 49), and Piper (on p. 51). See, among others, Lucy Lippard, *Overlay: Contemporary Art and the Art of Prehistory* (Pantheon, New York, 1983), especially the chapter "Time and Again: Maps and Places and Journeys," pp. 121-158 (maps by Richard Long, Smithson, Patricia Johanson, and Hera). For cool color pictures of the work itself, see John Beardsley's *Earthworks and Beyond* (Abbeville, New York, 1984) (plus on p. 38 there's a reproduction of one of James Turrell's meticulous maps). *The Gates Map*, which carries a mini-history of Christo and Jeanne-Claude's work, as well as reproductions of numerous Christo drawings related to *The Gates*, bears the Central Park Conservancy logo, but was copyright 2004 by United Arts Group.
[25] For Graves' lithographs, see Harmon, p. 71; Storr reproduces one of Graves' drawings, p. 40. This work was heavily covered in the periodical press. Also see the article on Graves cited in the next footnote, which treats the paintings and sculpture in a maps and mapping context. For the Hiller drawings, see Harmon, pp. 40-41, but for a photograph of the dreamers in their sleeping bags among the fairy circles, see Lippard, p. 161. For LeWitt, Storr, p. 43. Again, all these artists are subjects of monographic review.
[26] *On Maps and Mapping, artscanada, 188-189*, Spring, 1974. In retrospect the issue is even more extraordinary than it seemed at the time. The history of the mapping of Canada, by John Warkentin, gives the art maps that follow a cartographic context too often missing from discussions of art maps. Much of the work deserves to be much better known, especially that treated in Joe Bodolai's survey.
[27] David Woodward, ed., *Art and Cartography*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1987. The papers collected here had originated as lectures in the 1980 Kenneth Nebenzahl Lectures in the History of Cartography. My "lengthy, spirited commentary" on this collection – editor Ed Dahl's words – appeared in "Commentary on David Woodward, ed., *Art and Cartography: Six Historical Essays*," *Cartographica 24*(3), Autumn, 1987, pp. 76-82, followed by David's "equally spirited reply," which he opened by agreeing with the substance of many of my criticisms, if not my manner (though privately, over dinner, he even supported my manner (note the seven years it took to get the book to press!)). (How I miss David!) The sad fact was that the book didn't deal with art and cartography but the tired – no, *exhausted* – theme of art *in* cartography, and that mostly of the Renaissance and its baroque exfoliations. The sole reference to what we're calling map art here is a paragraph in David's introduction, a valuable paragraph, worth quoting in full: "In the twentieth century, and particularly in the past decade [that of the 1970s], the mapping instinct has manifested itself in modern painting to an astonishing degree, as evidenced by the four exhibitions referred to earlier in this Introduction. More recent artists such as M. C. Escher, Jasper Johns, William Wiley, Christo, Claes Oldenberg, Thomas O'Donohue Ros, Misch Kohn, Beth Shadur, Newton and Barbara Harrison, Hundertwasser, Stacey Farley, Martha Glowacki, Michele Turre, Richard Lutzke, Nancy Graves, Masako Miyata, Richard Long, Roger Welch, and many others have used maps as their subjects or as artifacts in their paintings. An example is shown in color plate 1" (p. 5), where we find a reproduction – not even indexed – of Jane Lewin's lovely *Rheidol Collage* – not even dated. As far as I can tell only three of the exhibitions were actually devoted to map art (as opposed to art in maps): Four Artists and the Map: Image, Process, Data, Place, at the University of Kansas' Spencer Art Museum, in Lawrence, 1981; cARTography, part 2: Cartographic Images in Contemporary American Art, at the John Michael Kohler Arts Center in Sheboygan, Wisconsin, 1980-1981; and Mapped Art: Charts, Routes, Regions, a traveling exhibition organized by New York's Independent Curators, 1981-1983.
[28] Storr, op. cit., p. 23. Unbeknownst to me, while I was writing this text, Denis Cosgrove was publishing "Maps, Mapping, Modernity: Art and Cartography in the Twentieth Century," with its subheads, "Avant-garde Art and Cartography," "Duchamp and Johns," "Surrealism and Situationism," and so on, in *Imago Mundi*. I've only read the text, which Denis was kind enough to mail me, but inevitably we plow a lot of the same ground.
[29] This was a collaborative presentation of The City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, The Los Angeles Municipal Art Gallery, and the Southern California Institute of Architecture. They published a brochure – folded like a map – which had brief essays by the curators and Denis Cosgrove, together with artist biographies. There was also a related symposium at which, among others, Denis Cosgrove, Matt Coolidge, Norman Klein, and I spoke.
[30] This was accompanied by an extremely valuable catalogue.
[31] Personal communication.
[32] In a typical week the daily *News and Observer* will print a couple of world maps, a dozen U.S. maps, another dozen or so maps of North Carolina, another dozen of the local region, a half dozen of Raleigh, and twelve dozen maps of local roadwork, crime, and event sites, together with advertising locator maps. The mix varies, and some weeks are especially map heavy, others map light. That is, each subscriber gets about 175 maps a week. Through the period the paper's circulation has been about 170,000. It's printing a lot of maps.
[33] For a less anecdotal treatment see Mark Monmonier, "Maps in *The New York Times*, 1860-1980: A Study of Journalistic Cartography," *Proceedings of the Pennsylvania Academy of Science 58*, 1984, pp. 79-84, and "Maps in *The Times* (of London) and *The New York Times*, 1870-1980: A Cross-National Study in Journalistic Cartography," *Proceedings of the Pennsylvania Academy of Science 59*, 1985, pp. 61-66. More generally, see Monmonier's *Maps with the News*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984.
[34] See Susan Schulten, *The Geographical Imagination in America, 1880-1950*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2001. Schulten considers newspapers, news and other magazines (including *National Geographic*), and textbooks. If we consider maps made on or through the Web it may well be that 99.99 of all maps ever made have been made in the past decade!
[35] See Douglas Yorke, John Margolies, and Eric Baker, *Hitting the Road: The Art of the American Road Map* (Chronicle, San Francisco, 1996) for a colorful introduction.
[36] Colin Cherry, *On Human Communication*, MIT, Cambridge, 1957, p. 306. Cherry was Reader in Telecommunications at Imperial College, University of London, and he wrote *On Human Communication* to introduce the MIT Press's series "Studies in Communication." The idea is fundamental to all social theories of communication.
[37] See my paper" What Makes a Map a Map?", originally presented to the 1993 Yale-Smithsonian Material Culture Seminar, but published in *Cartographica 30*(2&3), Summer/Autumn, 1993, pp. 81-86.
[38] The mask *is* what makes a map a map. Again, see my paper, "What Makes a Map a Map," op. cit., where I use the presence or absence of the mask to discriminate among sketch maps, experiemental sketch maps, and maps.
[39] For a more detailed treatment of these codes, see Wood and Fels, op. cit., or my *The Power of Maps* (Guilford, New York, 1992), pp. 95-142, where Wood and Fels is reprinted. In addition to Wollen's use of these codes to compare Situationist and Conceptualist maps (Wollen, op. cit.), Irit Rogoff uses them in her work on what she calls "geography's visual culture" – which includes our map art – in her *Terra Infirma: Geography's Visual Culture*, Routledge, London, 2000, especially pp. 74-76.
[40] Arthur Robinson, *Elements of Cartography*, Wiley, New York, 1953, p. 80.
[41] Linguists would include this "air of detachment" among the *phatic functions* of communication, that is, among those exploiting speech or gestures to reveal or share feelings instead of ideas. The ideas in a map would include the existence and locations of things. The feelings would be about confidence.
[42] This is not the place to rehearse academic cartography's battle for its place in the university against those who would dismiss it as mere *craft* – a category usually missing from the hassle over whether cartography is an art or science – but the mere fact of the engagement is instructive.
[43] For the laboratory as a disciplined space, see Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer in their *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle and the Experimental Life* (Princeton, Princeton, 1985), p. 39; for the

"naked way of writing," see p. 66. I cannot say how much my thinking owes to *Leviathan and the Air-Pump*. For a (much) broader but concurring perspective on the rise of utilitarian prose in English, see Robert Adolph's *The Rise of Modern Prose Style* (MIT, Cambridge, 1968).

[44] Patrick Waldberg, *Surrealism*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1965, pp. 23-24.

[45] LAMOCA bought *Map*, 1999, in 2001. An earlier *Map* was made for Hatoum's one-person exhibition at the Kunsthalle Basel in 1998. For an extended treatment of Hatoum's map piece, *Present Tense*, 1996, about the territorial divisions of Palestine reached under the Oslo Accords, and made with glass beads and soap, see Rogoff, op. cit., pp. 86-91.

[46] Wollen, op. cit., pp. 30-31, but for an extended treatment – and Wollen's source – see Simon Sadler, *The Situationist City*, op. cit.

[47] David Pinder, "'Old Paris Is No More,': Geographies of Spectacle and Anti-spectacle," *Antipode 32*(4), 2000, pp. 357-386 (the quotation is from p. 372), where Pinder reproduces two of Khatib's maps.

[48] Guy Debord, "Introduction to a critique of urban geography," in K. Knabb, ed., *Situationist International Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secretes, Berkeley, 1981 [1955], pp. 17-25 (the quotation is from p. 7), which I learned about in Pinder, "Subverting Cartography," op. cit.

[49] See for example, David Pinder's "Ghostly Footsteps: Voices, Memories and Walks in the City," *Ecumeme 8*(1), 2001, pp. 1-19. Debord is not even mentioned in this treatment of three walking-artists – Janet Cardiff, Rachel Lichtenstein, and Iain Sinclair – but his spirit in everywhere implied, especially since Pinder opens and closes his paper with quotations from André Breton's *Nadja*, the 1928 Surrealist masterpiece that stands behind so much of Debord. (Richard Howard translated *Nadja* for Grove Press, New York, in 1960.) Or go to www.psygeocon.org to learn about the psy.geo.conflux which annually "brings together visual and sound artists, writers, urban adventurers, and the public to explore the physical and psychological landscape" of New York City, involving, among other things, "experimental walks with altered maps." One of last year's panels was entitled, "Can Psychogeography Change the World?"

[50] Eleanor Heartney, "Mapping a Better World," *Art in America*, October 2003, pp. 114-119, the quotation from p. 114. The Harrisons too have attracted a sizeable literature, but they also produce plenty of their own. See their remarkably moving catalogue for *The Lagoon Cycle*, Herbert F. Johnson Museum of Art, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1985, which is not only stuffed with maps and equipped with an appreciation by Michel de Certeau, but written in the Harrisons' characteristic diaristic-dialogue. (Thanks, Dante!) Agnes Dene, another map artist, is sometimes associated with Eco art, which emerged in the late 1960s out of the land art or earthworks movement. When Lippard wrote about the Harrisons in 1983 in *Overlay*, op. cit., she called them "'artist farmers' concerned with with imaginative, large-scale recycling of wastes, community, and labor" (p. 231-233).

[51] Much of Jake Barton's work is on-line and most of it can be visited there. Go to www.localprojects.net.

[52] The map is discussed and illustrated in Deborah Carter Park, "'Metaphysical Continental Drift': Fictions of Place and Space," *The Operational Geographer 10*(1), April 1992, pp. 3-6; Wollen, op. cit., also discusses it pp. 43-44; and it's illustrated and discussed in Kastner and Wallis, op. cit., pp. 176 and 273-74, who reproduce Art and Language's notes which also describe two other related maps: *Map of a thirty-six square mile surface area of the Pacific Ocena west of Oahu*, and *Map of itself*. Art and Language produced the influential journal, *Art-Language*, from May 1969 on. There's an extensive literature.

[53] This is reproduced in Harmon, pp. 92-93. At this size, it's pretty hard to read.

[54] Marina Roy, *sign after the X* _____, Advance/Artspeak, Vancouver, 2001. The map of Mexico with only Xochicalco, Xcosmil, and so on on it (called "Central American Tribal Groups" in the list of "illustrations, tables, graphs, & maps") is on p. 99. A map of "South American Language Groups," with those beginning with X circled, is on p. 101.

[55] John Hurrell, "Painting with Maps," *The New Zealand Map Society Journal 7*, 1993, pp. 137-139. One of the paintings illustrated is called "Self Portrait iii," where the self-portrait is one drawn by Joseph Albers. When the street segments are of any density, the lines are hairy and delineated "as if it were a cluster of capillaries or electrical wires."