

the stages of election mapping and cartographic techniques. Later, in the section *Construction of the Presidential Election Maps*, they provide a very nice and detailed discussion of sources consulted, data manipulations conducted, and techniques used so that each stage of the process can be critiqued.

In discussing the history and lines of historical demarcation in the eras of political parties, they present interesting analysis of third party eras and the difference between traditional thinking on dating the eras. "Most literature suggests that the Third Party System begins in 1960. Because the presidential election of 1856 displays a geographical pattern unlike previous elections, one could argue that the Second Party System had sufficiently broken down and that a new party system had begun in the mid-1850's" (p.9). Because of the nature of the data collected, and the painstaking way that it was analyzed using current spatial theory, Archer *et al.* can discuss geographic patterns in a more meaningful way than with historical literature alone, or without the benefit of the entire data set. While the maps themselves are the centerpiece of this atlas, the text could serve the geography student well as an explanation of applied mapping and the use of GIS. The research for this volume, and the level of detail used to distinguish and define variables from sources as varied as Census figures, local newspaper reports, and private data collections provides the most comprehensive comparable data set for presidential election results.

The maps themselves are very colorful and easily distinguished using clear keys and distinctive shading. Often other atlases use color coding that can be so difficult to distinguish that it renders any analysis moot. This is definitely not the case here. My only criticism is that some of the maps could have been reproduced larger so that finding and determining counties might be easier, although this would take away from the ability to see the all of the maps for a single election spread out before you at once (if they appeared on separate pages). Additionally, a chart at the beginning of the map section showing how each state selects electors may answer some of the questions raised by the display of popular vs. Electoral College results.

The fortunes of third party national candidates are represented as well, with number of electoral votes and party affiliation. Care is taken to be as inclusive and detailed as possible while leaving the display of the maps uncluttered and easy to read. Shading the percentages of popular vote, they invite the reader to casually flip through the map section between election years and scan for patterns in popular votes as well as checking for electoral vote patterns using the color scheme.

In comparison to the *Routledge Historical Atlas of Presidential Elections* (Mieczkowski, 2001), I again go

back to the geographical analysis of this atlas. It is the point of the authors of this book, a task I assert that they accomplish quite effectively, to study the geography of the data and to come to conclusions based on it. The *Routeledge* is a much more historical reading, using the maps to illustrate a point, rather than to bring you towards it. Another contrast between the two are the maps themselves. Mieczkowski maps only the electoral vote, leaving off the support of the states based on political party affiliation, as well as the all important popular vote.

In conclusion, as an atlas this volume may seem a hefty price for historical voting patterns. However, using the text as a reference for further electoral analysis and as a source for interpreting spatial patterns, it would be well worth the cost. Additionally, its inclusion of each presidential election that was contested does tend it toward a definitive reference for an academic or large public library for historical research. It is unique in its approach to the subject matter and in its treatment of data. All in all, a great product.

Works Cited

Mieczkowski, Yanek. 2001. *Routledge Historical Atlas of Presidential Elections*. New York: Routledge, 160pp.

disORIENTATION

Counter-Cartographies Collective
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, 2006

Reviewed by Denis Wood, Independent Scholar

I love this map!

I love almost everything about it. The cover fold – the map is available rolled but most will encounter it folded – carries the title "dis" (and this is lower case running vertically) "ORIENTATION" (all caps and horizontal). Below, the phrase, "your guide to UNC-Chapel Hill," with a credit to "Counter-Cartographies Collective, 2006." The map on the cover? An azimuthal equidistant projection centered on Chapel Hill's antipode in the Indian Ocean.

I mean, right off the bat: this is not your ordinary map. In fact, it's an anti-ordinary map. Instead of orienting you, it wants to disorient you. Instead of decorating its cover fold with cute images of Chapel Hill, it displays the world that *isn't* Chapel Hill. Its author is ... "Counter-Cartographies."

So no surprise that when you make the first unfolding you're confronted with a Mercator projection of "The World Through Course Titles" based on UNC's 2005 Undergraduate Bulletin. The next unfolding adds Mollweide projections of "International students

enrolled at UNC-CH in 2005" and "UNC-CH students studying abroad in 2005." The third unfolding adds "Graduate research at UNC-CH, 1990-2005," based on places included in the titles of UNC dissertations. It also reveals two blue boxes of text, the first headlined, "... a factory" and the second "... producing your world." This explains the maps of the world on this map of Chapel Hill: *Chapel Hill produces your world*. Talk about actor-network theory! The final unfolding unveils two more headlines, "UNC is ..." and "... a functioning body," this last over another blue box of text. Run together, as your eye now does, these headlines say, "UNC is a factory, a functioning body, producing your world." *Holy gamoly!*

This last unfolding reveals a lot more too. It now becomes plain that there's a map of the Triangle underlying everything else, schematically rendered with major roads in red and railroad tracks in grey. The Triangle is what locals call the region comprised of Raleigh, Durham, and Chapel Hill; that is to say, of NCSU, Duke, and UNC-CH, as well as twenty-five other educational knowledge factories (denoted by silver boxes crammed with vital statistics); the "educational" to distinguish them from the *corporate* knowledge factories broken out in a separate map of Research Triangle Park, where purple circles are graduated according to number of researchers employed, the largest of which is GlaxoSmithKline with its 4,000 researchers. The emphasis here on labor and profits gives meaning to the idea that the region's a knowledge *factory*, while the red roads and grey railroad tracks suggestive of arteries and veins, and the silver boxes of clusters of neurons, underline the idea of its being a body.

The body that UNC is "has bodily functions," reads the text in one of blue boxes, that include "sleeping, walking, driving, and consuming." Correspondingly there are maps of "Where UNC Sleeps" and maps of "Pedestrian Spaces," "Automotive Spaces," and "Dangerous Places for Pedestrians," as well as an air photo of "The Most Dangerous Intersection in North Carolina for Pedestrians." Erupting like an igneous dike into this cool map of pale blues, greens, and grays is a full-color geologic map of the area.

From this description you could imagine that this amounts to noise amid chaos, but everything's all so beautifully organized that the map reads like an elegant essay. Laid out by five graduate students in geography with minimal design training, Tim Stallmann (actually at the time an undergraduate), Craig Dalton, Sebastian Cobbarubias, Maribel Casas-Cortes, and Liz Mason-Deese, with only minor input from a graduate student in UNC's Studio Art program, Lauren Rosenthal, the map's brilliantly effective design makes the point better than pages of argument that design is essentially driven by the motivation to *make meaning*, not to look good. It also makes the point that maps packed

with meaning *can* look great, even sexy.

The flip side, in black and grey on white, gives us a number of text blocks floating this time on a hydrologic diagram of the Haw River watershed. Charts of gender, labor, and diversity at UNC; a map of local economies; a timeline "People's History of UNC-Chapel Hill"; texts about precarity, health, and alternative media; a directory of local progressive organizations; and a list of "A Few of Your Constitutional Rights" ("If Stopped by Police ..."), round out the Counter-Cartographies Collective's disorientation for incoming students. Compared to the usual orientation materials *disORIENTATION* is a "sleeper's awake" call to acknowledge the university as a site of production, one in league with other sites of production, and one that exploits labor of all kinds ("ask about your student debt as an Undergrad, your health coverage as an adjunct professor, your overtime as a cafeteria worker," the map encourages); and to acknowledge the local as reciprocally constituent of the global.

It also begs the question why so many orientation materials are not only so uninformative, but dull. *disORIENTATION* not only bristles with intelligence, it's exciting to look at. Its large size (it's two by three feet) and cutting-edge layout make it a great poster, but one that reveals more and more of itself the closer you get to it. It literally takes hours to read, and repays that time handily. Yet it was produced by a handful of geography students, a working group of the Culture of Economies Project supported by UNC's University Program of Cultural Studies. We should be seeing maps like this on every side, but instead this one is becoming iconic. As I write this, *disORIENTATION* is on exhibition in Just space(s) in Los Angeles (at Los Angeles Contemporary Exhibitions, September 26-November 18, 2007); and in Pedagogical Factory: Exploring Strategies for an Educated City in Chicago (Hyde Park Art Center, July 22-Sept. 23, 2007), where Counter-Cartographies members will also be presenting their map in a workshop on "How We Make a Disorientation Guide to Our University."

Although these days terrific new maps are erupting from the least likely sources, apparently we still need models to lead the way. I can't think of a better group to do this than UNC's 3-Cs. You can visit their map, both sides, navigable and zoomable, at www.countercartographies.org.