mission, embracing the “secular” meta-religion of progress. Second, in the long run, the democratization of political authority has brought in its train a slower but real democratization of Christian belief and practice, in such movements as liberation theology, the civil rights movement (which Laine does mention), and the struggle against apartheid in South Africa. These gaps, however, do not seriously diminish the overall value of the work.

DAVID LINDENFELD
Louisiana State University, Emeritus


Maps and mapping have very much been a topic in global history over the last four decades as ideas and understandings of spatiality have been assessed, along with the use of mapping to reflect, impose, and shape both power and authority. The work in this field has come largely from cartographic specialists, rather than world historians, but the work of the former has been of significance for the study of global history. At the same time, the source of this specialization itself poses problems—of both commission and omission—for the particular concerns of these specialists do not always contribute as much as they might to global history.

The key work has been the long-running History of Cartography project, published by the University of Chicago Press since 1987. This series has brought toward fruition a project that was planned in 1977 as a “general history” of mapmaking and was to have taken one million words and been published in four volumes, finishing by 1992. As with many similar schemes, this project was not realized. So far, there have been about four and a half million words in six volumes, comprised of eight books in total. The volumes on the eighteenth and nineteenth century remain unpublished. The first has gone into production, but the second is still in the early writing stage. Both these developments are matters not so much for congratulation as of relief as the delays had led to a sense of concern on the part of authors who delivered copy for volume four and had to face the prospect of their work going into a form of limbo for several years, which, in my case, led me to decide to publish it elsewhere.

It is pertinent to look at how far world history has been covered in this series. Initially, the signs were highly encouraging. Volume 1,
Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient, and Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean (1987), an impressive book that was especially valuable for providing much information on Greek and Roman mapping and on the intellectual and practical background, was followed by what was intended to be a volume on Asian cartography. This became, instead, two volumes: 2.1, Cartography in the Traditional Islamic and South Asian Societies (1992) and the longer 2.2, Cartography in the Traditional East and Southeast Asian Societies (1994). In addition, another volume, (2.3), covered indigenous cartography: Cartography in the Traditional African, American, Arctic, Australian, and Pacific Societies (1998).

In many respects, these three volumes, and notably the last, were the most innovative and important of the entire sequence. These volumes were conceptually acute and genuinely extended the subject, notably in 2.3 and in the lengthy and ground-breaking coverage of India in 2.1. In contrast, volume three, Cartography in the European Renaissance (2007), was more traditional in its scope and method, not least in its resembling, at times, aspects of a cartobibliography. At 1.5 million words and two books, this volume was also not easy to use. At the same time, it was very impressive and a major scholarly achievement, notably in directing attention to parts of Europe not commonly well covered.

The new volume, volume 6, is strikingly different in that it adopts the approach of an encyclopedia, rather than the lengthy, often extremely lengthy, essays of earlier volumes. This new approach, which involves an alphabetical organization, works extremely well, not least due to very good cross-referencing. As a separate issue of manageability, volume 6 is “restricted” to a million words. This change represents a response to the economics of publishing, but also opens the way to a renewed scrutiny of the choices made for inclusion and omission.

From the perspective of this journal, the question is not so much about individual entries, most of which are excellent, but, rather, the more general failure to engage adequately with the continuation of volume 2 and, thereby, of the experience of non-Western societies. In volume 6, there is, alongside most valuable material, a relative lack of coverage of Africa, Asia, and Oceania. For example, there is a discussion of national mapping institutes, cartographic firms, and cartographers in the book, but the coverage is overwhelmingly Western. This is unfortunate, as there is a great need to consider these categories for all of the world. Indeed, one of the biggest challenges in cartography over the twentieth century is that posed by the impact of independence of much of the world. It is valuable to consider how independence repeatedly led to new institutional and public identities, concerns, and perspectives. That perspective is largely overlooked in this volume. For
example, the section on “Geographical Societies” has subsections only on Canada and the United States and on Europe, while for “Cartographic Societies,” the longest subsections are on the United States and Canada and on Western Europe. There are also subsections on Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Australia and New Zealand, while that on Africa (there is not one on Asia) focuses on European imperial activity in Africa (as does that on boundary surveying in Africa). So also with the emphasis for illustrative material. The three maps illustrating the entry on “Race, Maps and the Social Construction of” are all devoted to Europe, which is unfortunate.

This geographical limitation is linked to a social counterpart. The cartographic knowledge, concerns, and imaginations of the bulk of the world population is underplayed. That possibly takes us to the heart of the problem of what the history of cartography ought to cover. This volume focuses on an account of cutting-edge developments in technique and institutionalization in what is seen as the key geographical area. Though the account is valuable, the approach underplays not only the remainder of the world, but also the more general issue of the use of maps and its consequences for the nature of cartography. This issue is not ignored. There are, for example, useful entries on school atlases, on maps and literature, and on maps and cinema, but these are too brief and do not give sufficient agency to the public and their mental mapping and cartographic awareness.

These are not the sole problems. There is, for example, an assumption that the century is the natural unit of analysis. This approach is problematic. For much of the world, it might be suggested that the post-imperial transition is the fundamental one, and, therefore, that the crucial continuities are those of imperialism and, then, of independence. As a result, the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century appears an obvious unit, followed by another on the mid-twentieth to the present. In the case of Japan, India, China, and most of Africa, the key years of change were between 1945 and 1960.

Furthermore, it is unclear why the end of the century should be a close. There was no break in cartography then, and a volume appearing in 2015, and appearing as the last in the series, should, arguably, continue to the present or, at least, to present trends. This is highly pertinent in, for example, technological entries, where there is indeed some move beyond 2000, as in the useful entry on “Remote Sensing.”

This review is not intended to strike a negative note, for the volume contains much of excellence and is important in its own right as the latest in a key series. At the same time, it is precisely because of the major expectations of this series and its sense of its own importance (a sense
that, as reflected in the entries in this volume, is both justified and, alas, at times risible), that it is necessary to draw attention to its limitations. Moreover, some of the individual entries contain problematic accounts. To describe, in the entry on “Thematic Atlas,” the “Jewish People” as “one of the Arabs’ key rivals” is troubling, but all too typical of a more general lack of grasp of the complexity of political issues. In this context, the absence of an entry on the cartographic aspect of the Holocaust is notable and a matter of concern and comment.

Leaving this aside, the volume is a pleasure to handle. The illustrations are well-chosen and handsomely reproduced, and the captioning is pertinent. Many of the individual items are excellent, notably those on military mapping. There is also a welcome inclusion of Soviet material. The material on cartographic techniques and production methods is first-rate and of consistent high value. There is an exhilarating range, much of it fascinating and innovative, as, for example, in the entry on “Forensic Mapping,” which focuses on the mapping of traffic accidents. The editorial contribution is both valuable in itself and offers much for those interested in historiography. This volume deserves to be in every research library. There are now high expectations for the two remaining volumes. Hopefully, there will also be a final reflective volume looking at current trends.

JEREMY BLACK
University of Exeter


Cross-cultural trade has been one of the original—one might say, defining—themes in the study of world history. From Braudel to McNeill, from Curtin to Bentley, the question of how goods, people, and ideas traveled between societies has been at the core of rethinking the human past in its global contexts. As a result, much of the focus has been on the individuals and groups who facilitated these exchanges: cross-cultural brokers and trade diasporas. The present volume is an attempt at building a comparative picture of how, against the odds, merchants across the globe “concocted ways of bartering, securing credit, and establishing durable commercial relations with people who did not speak their language, wore different garb, and worshipped other gods” (pp. 1–2).