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A graffitied “Wall” demarcates the boundary between the US and Mexico (figure 23.1). It is a political landscape defined by inclusions and exclusions. As a site of geopolitics and state power, this landscape expresses the sovereign right of one state to demilitarize political space through territorial spatial strategies, such as a material border, armed agents and soldiers, and a bureaucratic division, “Operation Gatekeeper,” established in 1994 (Nevins 2001). This wall, established to keep undocumented immigrants from entering the US, works politically because it gives the appearance of a border under control. But the physical presence of this barrier conceals the unequal effects, economies, and consequences of its making. With the increase in Border Patrol officers, for example, there has been an increase in more sophisticated and expensive smugglers to evade those officers, a number of changes in worker-migrant mobilities (people stay longer once in the US and are less likely to migrate back to Mexico in off-season), and an increase in deaths of immigrants in the less policed mountain and desert areas of the border (Nevins 2000). This militarized border, in other words, is at once policing and peopled, and as such it is an embodied setting of cultural practices that may have political consequences despite of, or even because of, the strict controls of this place. People cross this border daily, they negotiate their and other people’s movements, and they protest its presence, as evidenced by the graffiti stating “Stop Operation Gatekeeper!”

That this landscape expresses and creates so many meanings about political space should not be surprising. The various discursive and material meanings and functions of landscapes – as social environments, scenes, ways of viewing, representations of identity, nodes of capitalism, places of work, metaphors, and settings of everyday practice – are often used strategically by various actors to structure power relations and create understandings of “the political.” Until recently, however, cultural geographers did not consider landscapes as a political concept nor did they view landscapes as outcomes and constitutive of political processes. Rather, scholars analyzed how cultures and human actions impacted the physical environment, resulting in “cultural landscapes” that could be read as an autobiography of a folk or as sedimented layers of social and cultural accretion (see Lewis 1979, 1983).
Although some geographers paid attention to the role of processes and human activities in producing landscapes, those processes were often labeled ‘cultural’ and not considered political. Studies that treated landscape as everyday social space (work often associated with J. B. Jackson’s approach to studying ‘ordinary’ landscapes) also did not specify why certain landscapes should be privileged for study, such as why someone might want to research tenement districts as opposed to building types (Henderson 2002). These traditional approaches to cultural landscape tended to confl ate knowledge with knowledge and legitimated a masculinist way of knowing about the world (Rose 1993). Geographers could seemingly take in a portion of the land ‘at a glance’ (as all-knowing and seeing observers of natural and human world) and write up “objective” descriptive inventories of those landscapes.

In recent years, geographers have called for studies that examine the processes, places, and people that went into the making of landscapes at multiple scales (Mitchell 2001; Schein 1997). Landscapes are theoretically understood as “arenas of political discourse and action in which cultures are continuously reproduced and contested” (after Duncan 1990), in Graham 1998: 21). Scholars analyze the ways that deliberate human action, discursive practices, economic relations, and everyday practices result in the establishment (and contestation) of particular material and symbolic landscapes that, in turn, structure social and political space. Moreover, by exploring the ways that landscapes are made, used, and circulated, geographers also analyze how landscapes reinforce and create meanings about the political realm and about social identities.

In this chapter I discuss three distinct approaches to the ways that landscapes constitute power relations and sociopolitical space: landscapes of state power, landscapes as work, and landscapes as everyday practice. In the next section I describe how states, official institutions, and elites have constructed landscapes materially and discursively as political symbols. Geographers have drawn from various theories and methods to study the ways that officials and elites have imagined ‘the nation’ through paintings, representations, planning, and public monuments to gain or maintain access to political power and influence. In recent years, Marxist geographers have argued that scholars need to pay more attention to landscape as an expression of unequal social relations under capitalism, an approach to political landscapes I describe in section two. This perspective suggests that the production of landscape frames certain social relations and hides other relations, such as between labor and the making of landscape, and between labor and capital. Other recent research drawing from feminist and poststructuralist theories conceptualizes power in more diffuse ways than the first two approaches. In section three, I propose another approach, landscape as everyday practice, that draws from the strengths of the first two approaches yet is sensitive to the ways that social categories (gender, sexuality, race/ethnicity, class, and so on) interact and are constructed contextually. This approach would also examine the ways that multiple identity positions are performed in and through landscape. To explore the possibility of such an approach, I describe studies that may not explicitly theorize landscape but in some way examine how individuals and social groups self-consciously construct symbolic and material landscapes, or use the landscape in informal ways, to alter or question existing social and political relationships.

Landscapes of State Power: Imagining and Representing the Nation

As a form of geographical knowledge about how the world works, landscape is a central way of understanding social life and relations, including the relationships between a political community (an empire, regime, state, or even neighborhood) and its peoples. “Landscapes, whether focusing on single monuments or framing sketches of scenery, provide visible shape; they picture the nation,” even though “there is seldom a secure or enduring consensus as to which, or rather whose, legends and landscapes epitomize the nation” (Daniels 1993: 5). As symbols of national space (political territory and time (social memory and heritage), national landscapes contribute to the everyday reproduction of a society (Graff 1995; Johnson 1995). Cultural geographers have used different approaches to analyze how specific landscapes become dominant representations about how the world works that legitimate state and elite hegemony. Denis Cosgrove (1984) and Stephen Daniels (1993) describe the historical development of “landscape as a way of seeing” that accompanied the rise of linear perspective and was informed by the rational science of geometry. Further, this way of seeing material and social settings legitimated the emerging ideology of capitalism and the ruling, male-dominated, bourgeois class (see also Cosgrove & Daniels 1988; Rose 1993). When understood as an epistemology, the all-seeing, knowing, and consuming masculine gaze, according to Gillian Rose (1993), constituted the landscape as a feminized object of desire to be conquered and possessed. Another approach, the poststructuralist “landscape as text” model developed by James and Nancy Duncan (1988), theorizes how landscapes function as one of many cultural texts through which political values are communicated and discourses enacted within particular societies. In addition, landscapes of state power have been analyzed as theaters, a dramaturgical approach that captures the visual and routine nature of civic and state rituals (Cosgrove 1992);
Daniels & Cosgrove 1993). Common to all of these approaches is the view that the ‘national’ landscape is one of many competing articulations of powerful feelings and ideas that encapsulates a dominant image of how elites view ‘a nation,’ and perhaps even how ‘a people’ see themselves (see Duncan 1990; Olwig 2002).

Geographers have used these different approaches to landscape to examine how understandings of empire, state, and nation have been imagined, represented, and materially created through landscapes. For example, in early eighteenth-century landscape painting traditions, such scenes depicted the virtues of progressive state management (Daniels 1993). Such scenes were thought to reflect ‘good taste,’ being ‘civilized,’ and having a good social standing; being able to ‘see’ these landscapes properly also legitimated political authority (Nash 1999). Western, upper-class elite males claimed that only those who could objectively view the landscape had the rational detachment needed to properly see, rule, and govern. Those who worked the land lacked such visual objectivity because they were considered part of the landscape. Such ideas about visual ways of seeing the landscape were connected to a historically specific model of freedom and individualism (differentiated by region, class, race, and gender) upon which commercial capitalism depended (Nash 1999). With the emergence of the nation-state, elites and others became nostalgic for bucolic landscapes that were supposedly lost with the early commercialization of agriculture, the rise of industrialization, and the imperial state internationalizing British territories and realizing wealth. In this sense, they were ‘imagined’ as part of a planetary state (Agnew 1998a). Images of thatched cottages and pastoral countries were imagined to evoke a more pristine and imagined pre-contact ‘nature.’ Through these projects, city planners and tourists continued to locate ‘natives’ in their landscapes, a way of viewing the social and natural environment that devalues contemporary urban and suburban identities and cultures.

Elites have also created material landscapes as stages to display a distinctive national past and present. An example is the Queen’s Birthday Jubilee (celebrated annually in June). For example, Italy — a country unified by a heterogeneous population — had a more difficult time in creating a representative national landscape (Agnew 1998a). Although the image of ancient Rome as the Eternal City came to represent Italian national identity after unification in 1865 (see below), other images were promoted, such as the Tuscan landscape created by the famous nineteenth-century Macchioni painters in Florence. As John Agnew (1998a: 230) points out, a long-lasting association between a particular landscape ideal and Italian national identity (as was the case for England) remained difficult because “the glories of ancient Rome and the Renaissance, were phenomena that the whole of Europe (or, even more expansively, the whole of Western civilization) claims as parts of its heritage.”

While landscape images are historically specific forms of representing the nation in a given society, they have real political and material consequences, such as through land planning and in the projects of empire. Not only did wealthy British estate owners pay landscape architects to design properties to look like paintings and then have their properties painted (Duncan 1995), those same images were used to legitimate and support colonial rule, and, in turn, to make and remake material landscapes abroad (see Pratt 1992). To make a place more familiar and more ‘natural,’ landscapes in overseas British colonies were changed to reflect Western homesteads and their related gendered and racialized roles (Nash 1992). Categories of people (men/women, settlers/natives, white/black) were assigned different locations within the material landscape as well as in landscape representations: white men worked, played, and conquered lands and mountain peaks, white women stayed at home, ‘natives’ were located elsewhere (Blunt & Rose 1994; Kears 1997). After the phase of exploration was over, however, landscape stories and images indicated the contradictions between these landscape mappings and performed social identities. This may have been because such strict social divisions according to race, class, and gender, and between colonizer and colonized, were difficult to maintain in practice: colonial settler occupation depended upon hundreds of thousands of African workers who were legally classified as squatters or invaders, but without whom those farms would not have survived (Myers 2002). In addition, the very social categories themselves were inherently contradictory. Through a close reading of Eric Dutton’s (1929) Keryu Mountain, Garth Myers (2002) examines a story of a failed climb and conquest to demonstrate how the dominant discourse of robust white Christian masculinity — defined by militaristic and athletic performances in the colonial landscape, and by refinement and temperance moral authority in (white) public and private spheres — was at odds with men’s varied physical capacities and their lived experiences as clerks and shop assistants in colonial society. Nonetheless, dominant colonial images of social relations continued to influence the ways that colonial and even postcolonial landscapes were planned. Jane Jacobs (1966) examined how the state-sponsored heritage projects in contemporary Australia represent ‘authentic’ Aboriginal cultures as belonging to the time—spaces of a more pristine (and imagined pre-contact) ‘nature.’ Through these projects, city planners and tourists continue to locate ‘natives’ in ‘natural’ landscapes, a way of viewing the social and natural environment that devalues contemporary urban and suburban identities and cultures.

Elites have also created material landscapes as stages to display a distinctive national past and present, an exclusive understanding of a cultural-political community. During the period of nation building in Europe, places of memory, like monuments, memorials, and museums, were established to maintain social stability, legitimize existing power relations, and provide institutional continuity (Johnson this volume; Till 2002b). Such places represented ‘the nation’ in exclusive ways, according to gender, race, ethnicity, heteronormativity, class, religion, and/or region. According to Lorraine Dowler (1998), for example, war memorials and landscapes in contemporary Ireland exclude women (as well as other social groups) from being visible socially as leaders and active figures in the political realm. National landscapes also depict temporal continuity with past glories and the present state, evoking a sense of timelessness through material and symbolic means. The Vittorio-Emmanuele II Monument in Rome, built in 1878–82 as a sacred altar honoring a dead king, was transformed in 1921 under Mussolini to celebrate the Cult of the Unknown Soldier (Arkinson & Cosgrove 1998). Symbolically located adjacent to the Imperial and Roman fora, the stark, white Etruscan marble monument provided a new visual anchor for the city with its otherwise brown-tone buildings, an ordered vision of the world that materialized a mystical understanding of Italy as a transcendent classical empire, and linked a new political state to the mythical ancient acropolis of the ‘eternal city’ (Agnew 1998a; Arkinson & Cosgrove 1998).
Dramatic landscape inscriptions as these are typically built and rebuilt during times of political transition to maintain symbolic continuity and social stability (Foote, Töth, & Arraya 2000; Till 1999). State officials and elites often invest much money and time through the establishment and remaking of symbolic national landscapes to accumulate `symbolic capital' in the political realm and to project a particular worldview (Forest & Johnson 2002). Duncan (1990) describes how statues of British political figures - symbols of colonialism - were removed and replaced after independence by statuary commemorating Sri Lankan nationalist leaders. This process, while reflecting a unified movement in the toppling of the party (the United National Party) rather than a working alliance of parties opposed to colonial rule. In Taipei, Taiwan, after 1949, Chinese Nationalists renamed streets, schools, theaters, and other public buildings, squares, and spaces using names of Chinese national heroes, nationalistic slogans, and place names from the asserted living space of the Chinese nation-state (Leitner & Kang 1999). In contemporary Moscow, political elites co-opted, contested, ignored, or removed central Soviet-era public monuments after 1991 to engage in a symbolic dialogue with other politicians and the public and thereby gain prestige, legitimacy, and influence in cultural and political realms (Forest & Johnson 2002).

Recent research has indicated that material and symbolic landscapes of elite and state power - as ideology, way of seeing, stage, and text - cannot be necessarily used as "evidence" that those in power share similar ideas about the 'nation,' the 'state,' or the imposition of power. Nor does it imply that there is a one-directional flow of domination from ruler to ruled. Monumental landscapes may reflect the ideological incoherence, rather than popularity, of nationalistic agendas, as was the case in Mussolini's Rome (Agnew 1990); see also Atkinson & Cosgrove 1998.

In post-Soviet Moscow, Benjamin Forest and Juliette Johnson (2002) argue that the continuity between Soviet and Russian political elites constrained their ability to create Russian national symbols from Soviet ones, and so they chose to reinterpret, rather than erase, monumental landscapes (compare Bell 1999). Even then, these political elites, who controlled the resources to create national landscapes, must compete for symbolic capital, a process that means that these landscapes are not simply imposed on a passive 'public.' Their surveys of visitors indicated the limited appeal of these "new" (i.e. post-Soviet) monuments, suggesting that the past cultural functions of Soviet monuments may make it difficult to imagine a 'civic-democratic' Russian nation through such landscapes.

These approaches to political landscapes, while increasingly sensitive to the contradictions within state and national institutions and by elites with access to resources, still pay little attention to the histories and experiences of the individuals who actually make those landscapes. Further, as Don Mitchell (1996: 6) argues, "for all the importance of ideological, representational aspects of the idea of landscape, we need also to remember the geographical sense of landscape: the morphology of a place is in its own right a space that makes social relations. It is the ways that landscape works, such as in the further economic development of a place, and is a work that is labored over. As I describe in the next section, this approach emphasizes how landscapes reproduce unequal power relations under global capitalism, and conceptualizes landscape as a scale or node that can function as a site of social struggle. In particular Marxist geographers theorize landscape struggle in terms of conflict over property (who owns what) and conflict over social divisions of labor (who does what).

The Political Landscape as a Work that Does Work

According to Don Mitchell (1996), the labor and economic relations that go into the material and symbolic production of landscape are hidden from the dominant 'ways of seeing' the landscape. He argues that the work of landscape in capitalist societies is to hide their function as symbolic systems that reproduce unequal social relations through their materiality. Marxist approaches like Mitchell's assume a conflict model of social theory in which power is defined by the oppression and domination of groups according to axes of difference (by class, race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and so on) (Henderson 2001). It further assumes that the world is in crisis due to the uneven structures of global capitalism. From this perspective, landscapes contribute to, even create, that crisis. They are products of labor and systems of meaning that naturalize uneven relations of capital.

As Mitchell (2000) describes, landscape is a place of recreation "where one basks in the leisure of a well-ordered scene" (Mitchell 2000: 136). It is a materially produced object and property within capitalist economic markets, as well as a system of signs that "advertise" meanings to its consumers and spectators. For example, the creation of a city or a part of the city as landscape in capitalist societies, according to Mitchell (2000: 137), restores to the viewer (the tourist, the suburban visitor, or even the city resident) an essential sense of control within a built environment which is instead controlled through the creative, seemingly anarchic destruction of an economy over which they may in fact have very little control. Or more precisely, it provides an illusion of control in a space so highly designed, so carefully composed, so exquisitely 'set' by the owners and developers of that space that a visitor's control can only ever be an illusion.

Because landscapes conceal the inequalities and exploitation of their producers under capitalism and the ways that people are controlled, Mitchell argues that landscapes can never be truly public spaces.

Mitchell calls for studies that investigate the reasons why landscapes look the way they do (both in material form and through representation) by treating landscape as a social relation of labor. Other geographers have also recently emphasized the relationships between landscape and property, such as Nick Blomley (1998) who understands both as forms of representation, sets of lived relationships, produced material forms, and sites of struggle (see also Blomley 1994). And according to Herod's (1999) edited volume, the question of landscape and the manipulation of the social order is a central theme throughout, exploring the role of landscape in territorializing the body, the landscape and the state, and the relationship between landscape and state.
an identity, and in what particular contexts these actions take place. When power is understood as not purely repressive and not simply about domination and repression between coherent social groups, then the very meanings, categories, and settings of social relations need to be rethought. Power, as Michel Foucault (1977) reminds us, is never about a simple binary between those who dominate and those who are dominated; rather, power is internalized and transmuted through material and discursive acts that construct normative categories of belonging (like race and gender).

Power is also transmitted through embodied actors whose presence in particular settings may define social relations. From this perspective, people are not passive consumers, nor are they merely ‘disciplined’ transmitters of power. Moreover, landscapes are constitutive settings made up by individuals performing a ‘recognizable’ identity or even attempting to subvert that identity. As Dyda Dekster (1995), Jon Gros (1999), and Stephen Hochsheier (1998) forcefully demonstrate, landscapes, including the dreaded shopping mall and tourist site, are more than objects to be consumed or defined only by relations of property (although they are that too).

Thinking about landscape and politics in these ways, as embodied everyday practices, suggests a different possible approach to political landscapes, one that combines the strengths of the first two approaches I have outlined above but allows for more sophisticated understandings of power relations, politics, and agency. In the next section I indicate a future direction for studies about political landscapes to move towards, what I call landscape as everyday practice. While not all of the research below explicitly treats landscape as a conceptual category of analysis, they directly or indirectly examine how landscape use, change, and performance are significant cultural practices that stabilize and destabilize categories of social relations at multiple scales.

Political Landscapes as Everyday Practice

Individuals and social groups create meanings about who should and should not belong to a particular social group, place, or political community through everyday practices, including landscape use and change. Through habits, cultural practices, and discourses, an individual’s ‘identity’ is created, often in opposition to other social categories. Although social identities are constituted through repetitive, day-to-day performances in particular settings (Blister 1990), the act of ‘governing’ the world is not simply confined to the realm of the state and political economy. Marxist studies tend to focus on resistance, struggle, and action within the traditionally defined ‘public realm,’ ignoring other forms of politics, such as the politics of care (Danish 1998; Michel 1998). Everyday practices, however, including using water, walking down a street, eating (or not), working (or not working fast enough), putting on clothes, or going shopping, may have a range of meanings that may be political depending upon who is carrying out these actions, how that person is performing
suburban landscape should be. These dominant norms of home, neighborhood, and belonging, of course, can be challenged by non-political presence, such as the case of a homeless person who tries to find a place to sleep in the ‘safe’ landscape of Ashland Park or through racialized bodies in predominantly white cities, such as in Düsseldorf-Marcloh, Germany. Patricia Ehrkamp and Helga Leitner (2002) explain how conflicting ideas about what a ‘typical’ German city should look like, or who should be using a streetscape or particular building and in what ways, have shaped understandings of what it means to be a resident, and even citizen, of a place. Turkish immigrants feel tied to their (new) local spaces of residence through making and remaking the landscape, including the creation of neighborhood institutions and political demonstrations. These material and embodied expressions of belonging through more localized landscape practices, moreover, communicate a continued connection to transnational ties and identities. Some longer term residents of Marcloh, however, feel threatened and alienated by what they see as exclusive Turkish landscape practices, including veiling, predominantly male social spaces (teahouses), places of worship, or Turkish language signs (Ehrkamp 2002). Some ethnic German residents may even project their fears of potential economic loss, abandonment by the state, and even physical threat onto the bodies inhabiting ‘Turkish’ landscapes.

Individuals who are socially understood as being “out of place” may self-consciously assert their presence to challenge dominant discourses of “who belongs in the landscape.” Tim Cresswell (1996) describes such acts and protest as grassroots resistance through graffiti, sit-ins, or political protest. Other recent research has documented landscape-based citizen activism that challenges taken-for-granted understandings of national belonging by making voices, scenes, and perspectives of marginalized social groups materially accessible and ‘visible’ in the landscape, including “The Power of Place” project in Los Angeles (Hayden 1995), the District Six Museum in central Cape Town, South Africa (http://www.districtsix.co.za/htm), or the Topography of Terror in Berlin, Germany (http://topography-of-terror/index.htm). The District Six Museum, for example, was established by ex-resident activists, in a Methodist Church shortly after the neighborhood was declared an area for whites only in 1966; at that time the area was bulldozed and its 60,000 residents displaced. Ex-residents decided to build a museum in this barren landscape to remember the individuals who fought against the forced removals; they also established a forum for the Land Restitution process that was successful after the fall of apartheid in 1998. Today museum visitors challenge the official national violence written in the surrounding landscape by creating a socially vibrant memory of their homeland through mosaics, stories, a memory cloth, and neighborhood tours (Till 2002a). Another example of citizen activism that included protests, rallies, and landscape excavations is the Topography of Terror (Till forthcoming). In the late 1970s, this abandoned field next to the West Berlin Wall was ‘rediscovered’ by local historians who made public the National Socialist uses of the area as the former headquarters of the Gestapo, SS, and Security Service. Citizen groups understood this overgrown field as a metaphor for the German psyche and represented it as a symbol of national forgetfulness. Their demands to come to terms with the terrain resulted in the creation of a “documentation center” with an historical exhibition, outdoor mapping of the National Socialist terrain, educational programs, and a memorial. As these local activists have taught us, through the re-making of landscape, critical understandings of national pasts and new political spaces may be imagined and made concrete.

While such studies demonstrate the ways that transgressive actions confront existing social relations, recent research in sexuality studies and feminist geography explores the micropolitics of everyday action in streets, parks, or plazas that create or challenge new social relations even as they conform to socially dominant mores (Chauncey 1996; Domosh 1998; Kirsey & Forsyth 2001; Thomas 2002). Mona Domosh (1998) explores these processes through the mid-nineteenth-century streets of New York City, landscapes that she treats as sites of complex social engagement as well as economic activity. She argues that because these streets were neither completely controlled public spaces nor totally open, they could be used as sites of micropolitical action and tactical transgression. While promenades along Fifth Avenue were highly scripted rituals through which upper-class values were embodied on a daily basis, when African Americans engaged in those practices, they simultaneously disrupted and supported (white) bourgeois standards. Such tactical gestures, argues Domosh, “are enacted and resisted through everyday spatial practices, but practices that are fragmentary, fleeting, and not in place” (1998: 212).

Everyday spatial practices such as wearing clothing, according to Anna Secor (2002), may not only produce particular urban landscapes but also enable and constrain a social group’s experience of mobility through those landscapes. Secor describes women’s choice to veil (or not) in the context of contemporary Istanbul, detailing the ways that women negotiate dominant social regimes of veiling through their individual subjective interpretations of femininity, religiosity, and urbanism. The presence of women’s bodies may create exclusive gendered and sexed social landscapes through their veiling choices, but these choices also represent women’s particular responses to their lived environments. As Secor’s ethnographic research demonstrates, women in Istanbul do enact traditional narratives of nation, Islam, and modernity through veiling choices. Yet these daily practices may also traverse and reframe gendered and classed urban environments: “The veil, whether read as a sign of religious belief, political protest or village heritage, comes to demarcate spatial and social arenas of inclusion and exclusion in the city” (Secor 2002: 19).

Concluding Notes: Landscape Projects in Geography

As I have suggested here, how we think about landscape and power as theoretical concepts and forms of geographical knowledge results in distinct ways to approach both political landscapes, and how those landscapes structure and create political spaces at various scales, from states, to global systems, to microgeographies of everyday space, to transnational ties. Cultural geographers examine the ways that landscapes are made and used to change social and power relations through studies of elite power, labor relations, daily practices, and acts of transgression. Their research demonstrates how landscapes “are part of complex processes through which individuals and groups define themselves, and declare and challenge political authority” (Nash 1999: 223). Furthermore, these studies indicate how political landscapes are
open to interpretation and how their meanings change through time. Landscape practices, from monumental stagings of elite power to capitalist productions to veiling choices, are ways that individuals create meanings about who should be and should not be a member of what political community (and at what scales).

I have suggested that geographers should treat political landscapes as everyday practices, an approach that would pay attention to the particular contexts in which social relations are contextually situated and multiple potentialities of identity are performed, enacted, challenged, and negotiated. Such an approach would look critically at the ways that landscapes reinforce and have the potential to disrupt dominant categories of belonging, including categories of political community. It would also force us to interrogate such daily practices as "looking." Returning again to the image in figure 23.1, for example, think about the ways that looking locates a viewer in political and social space. Specifically, how are you connected to the other peoples and places assumed to be present (and absent) in this landscape? As a viewer, how are you related to the other viewers of this image (academics, students, a general reading public), undocumented migrants, different discourses and ways of seeing the landscape (and in this instance to the interpretive spaces of this book), to those who made the image, and to those who made the material landscape depicted? What do you "see" and what don't you see?

A reader of this edited volume may look at this image as defining a global North and South, each world characterized by unequal access to rights, resources, and citizenship-despite claims of increasing integration and democratization under NAFTA. When placed in another context, for example, a regional or national newspaper, a US citizen may view this picture in indignant, nationalistic ways, arguing that the border is necessary to 'protect' an 'American way of life.' Another person may feel anger and personal feelings of loss. Still another might look at this image in fear, remembering that crossing may mean death, violent injury, or not being able to go back home. Such viewing positions and situated interpretations (and there are many other possible responses) remind us that political landscapes are intensely humanized, embodied, and contextualized—both in terms of their construction, their situation, their symbolic use, and representation. Political landscapes render and express emotions, ideas, and cultural values at particular moments in time.

There are other obvious, ways that dominant discourses and material settings about "the border" are created through cultural practices. The day-to-day practice of traversing this border, for example, classify (and 'discipline') individuals according to the social categories of tourist, 'illegal immigrant,' worker, native, military agent, and so on. Yet as Schein (1997: 664) suggests, landscapes not only reconstitute a set of dominant discourses about social life, they also can be a "liberating medium for social change." The actions of immigration officers, coyotes (smugglers), personal relatives, human rights advocates, employers, government officials, and others, for example, result in "legal" and "illegal" openings and closings of this border as evidenced by the protest graffiti. As political graffiti, these skulls call attention to the very real human costs of the presence of US regulatory practices: tiny skulls form the letters Alto Guardian, each one representing a life lost at the border as a result of border enforcement practices.19 But the graffiti does more "work" than that. Because this message is quite literally painted onto the militarized border, it demarcates the ghostly realities of this landscape as territorial border at the same time it points to the fluidity of that border.

The act of transgression depicted in the image also shows the potential of art to create landscapes as sites of contestation and as metaphors for progressive politics. This graffiti, like other proposed artwork along the border (figure 23.2), refocuses our attention away from the border as "the Wall" and toward the political potential of seeing this landscape as a "borderlands." As Joe Nevins (2000) writes, many of our dominant political imaginations do not allow us to see that "the US-Mexico boundary, as a line of control and division, is an illusion. Mexico and California are increasingly one." The image in figure 23.2 suggests a different political imagination, a "Border Dynamics" installation planned for both sides of the wall by the "Beyond Borders" binational, nonprofit artistic collaborative (http://muralscientifica.org). Four, 12-foot-tall metallic human figures lean into and press at and through the wall at the Nogales, Arizona, US/Nogales, Sonora, Mexico border. This "public" art is intended to provoke questions about the state's authority to imagine political space, including the official (US) notion that this border separates two "peoples" (Kofler 2002). Indeed, these figures, "reflecting different levels of tenacity and spirit," create new political landscapes, border regions defined by "change, clash, and continuity" (Portillo Jr. 2002) rather than by boundaries, policing, and exclusions and inclusions.
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NOTES

1. For a discussion about the politics of producing "natural" landscapes see Braun (this volume); on national and postcolonial landscapes see Agnew, Johnson, and Ryan (this volume).

2. The etymology of the word 'landscape' dates back to medieval England when it referred to land controlled by a lord; in medieval German, it was a legal term defining the collective ownership of an area. By the early seventeenth century, landscape meant the representation of scenery in painting as well as the design of space (Cosgrove 1983; Obuig 2002; Rose 1993).

3. The information in this paragraph comes from Agnew (1998a).

4. Using Italian Renaissance traditions, and borrowing from English Romanticism and the French Barbizon School, the Macchiaioli painted landscape images that tied a noble past to the modern developing present. There was a deep relationship between their landscape impressions of native Tuscany and the development of the Risorgimento (revival through unification) concerned with establishing Italy as a center of European civilization. The Macchiaioli were, however, to lose their cohesion after unification in 1865, and it was only under fascism (1922-43) that their work would be used again as part of a fascist ultranationalist ideology. See Agnew 1998a.

5. Mitchell adopts a Habermasian definition of 'public' defined by open access and participation. Feminist political theorists have criticized such a definition for various reasons, a topic that is beyond the scope of this essay. The most comprehensive work in this direction is Mitchell's (1994). See, for example, Dromm 1998, Deutsch 1990; Fraser 1990; Riddick 1996.

6. Mitchell (2001) cites works in this paragraph as good examples of the direction landscape studies should move toward.

7. For a discussion of 'practice' as used in geography, see Crang 2000 and Painter 2000. For an overview of 'performativity' see Nash 2000.

8. The examples used in the next section are largely urban and from the 'first world,' a bias that reflects my own area of research and expertise. There is a large literature about everyday resistance in rural and developing countries, see, for example, Scott 1986 and Westwood and Radcliffe 1993.

9. At the same time, both the District Six Museum and the Topography of Terror have become institutionalized and are now dealing with the difficulties and advantages of being more established tourist sites.

10. According to Joe Nieuve (2000), the number of Border Patrol agents in the San Diego sector increased from 980 in 1994 to more than 2,200 as a result of Operation Gatekeeper. He argues that although Gatekeeper has made undocumented immigrants "less visible" at the US border, it has largely been unsuccessful even by its own terms: the numbers of people crossing have not gone down, more people have died (as of November 2000, 603 people have died), and people are not returning to Mexico once they cross successfully.
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Chapter 24

Religious Landscapes

Lily Kong

Inserting Religion in Geographical Analyses

Race, class, and gender generally are accepted as the primary axes of analyses across those disciplines concerned with understanding society. So, too, within geography, they have constituted subjects, as both a priori and problematized categories of analysis. Religion has not received this same attention. This is not to say that it has been reduced to a residual category, or even that there is a paucity of research on geographies of religion. In fact, over the last two decades there has been a noticeable increase. Conceptual and theoretical attention to geographies of religion, however, has lagged behind, and only resurfaced in recent years (see Levine 1986; Kong 1990, 2001a).

Early Intersections of Geography and Religion

Several earlier reviews of geographical research on religion (Isaac 1959–60, 1961–2; Fickeler 1962; Sopher 1967, 1983; Levine 1986) illustrate a primary focus on religious landscapes, although research was not restricted to this focus only. For example, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, ecclesiastical geography and biblical geography dominated. The former involved primarily mapping the spatial advance of Christianity and other religions in the world, often with an underlying aim of documenting which religions Christian missionaries found in what part of the world and how missions progressed among them (Isaac 1965: 10). The latter involved attempts to identify places and names in the Bible and to determine their locations, which illustrated the powerful influence of the Christian church during this period of geographic scholarship.

The focus on religious landscapes was to follow in the late seventeenth century and became particularly strong in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the physico-theological stance, scholars saw landscapes, and in particular, nature, to be divinely-created order for the well-being of all life (Glacken 1959, 1967; Burner 1986: 94–5). Whether it was in the distribution of climates, the production of plants and animals in different zones, or the distribution of landforms, lakes and streams,