forms of power or prestige in a specific field, and *habitus* is the 'set of embodied dispositions learned through education/participation in a field' (p. 11). A field, for Bourdieu, is an agonistic concept, structured by struggles over the boundaries of the field and the valuation of different types of capital. The field is hierarchically divided between two poles: the *autonomous* pole, where actors are most thoroughly determined by the power relations of the field, and the *heteronomous* pole, where actors are shaped by outside forces (p. 10). Lave, through Bourdieu, also distinguishes between the *objective* structure of the field, 'the hierarchical and structured relations among positions' (p. 11), and the *subjective* structure of the field, 'The habitus that agents within the field acquire through participation in it and the dispositions they bring to it' (p. 11).

Rosgen's success, argues Lave, cannot be explained by his 'charismatic authority' (p. 119), by NCD's 'correspondence with bureaucratic timelines' (p. 53), or by simple random chance (p. 3). The debate, moreover, cannot be resolved on substantive grounds, as the scientific data cannot parse each claim and counterclaim, as both sides advance some claims that are plausible while 'others are unsupported by definitive evidence or just plain wrong' (p. 77). Rather, armed with her Bourdieusian conceptual framework, Lave explains Rosgen's success by arguing that the subjective structure created by his approach corresponds with the 'neoliberalisation of the objective structure within which the stream restoration field is contained' (p. 12), characterized by three key shifts: the increasing privatization of knowledge claims, the emphasis on applied research to meet market demands, and the creation of metrics to commodify and marketize nature (p. 103).

Lave's argument is conceptually rich, and her synthesis of political ecology and STS through Bourdieu is novel, allowing for a granular analysis of the construction and performance of scientific authority. Nevertheless, I have three main criticisms. First, her insistence on tracing political economic 'influences on' science risk missing how political economy and science are co-constituted. Second, the book is almost devoid of normative argumentation; Lave outlines the positions of Rosgen supporters and detractors in the 'Rosgen Wars', but her political position is never fully articulated. Third, the book is written in accessible and lively language, an impressive feat; however, while I think this is accomplished successfully for the most part, some of the more jocular images occasionally seem out of place.

Fields and Streams demonstrates the potential benefits, and difficulties, in doing political ecology with a dual focus on the 'political' and the 'ecological'. Lave's book is a novel contribution to the field, and can serve as both an accessible introduction for the novice and a thought-provoking intervention for the expert.

Robert D. Kaplan, *The Revenge of Geography: What the Map Tells Us About Coming Conflicts and the Battle Against Fate*. New York: Random House, 2012; 432 pp.: 9781400069835, US$28 (hbk).

Reviewed by: Shannon O'Lear, Nathaniel Ray Pickett, John Biersack and David J. Trimbach, *University of Kansas, USA*
DOI: 10.1177/0309132513498549

Robert Kaplan is a geopolitical analyst at Stratfor, a corporate intelligence firm, after working for 25 years as a foreign correspondent for *The Atlantic*. He argues that the 'natural facts' of climate, mountain ranges, landmasses, etc., as unproblematically depicted on 'the map', have determined patterns of human conflict throughout history and will continue to trump 'artificial' borders of states.

Kaplan's geopolitical essay (Morrissey et al., 2009), turned best-selling collection of anecdotes, distorts our popular geographic imaginations and narrows the depiction of geopolitical events. Kaplan's sporadic forays into geography

are nothing new and neither is his discombobulation of geographic knowledge and understanding, as many renowned political geographers have already pointed out. They noted that Kaplan's views merely rewarmed imperialist agendas of strategists such as Mahan, Spykman, and Mackinder while neglecting the last 80 years of scholarship. His inconsistent geographic approach is a potpourri of Cartesian perspectivalism (Ó Tuathail, 1996), superorganicism, and environmental determinism. Kaplan's arguments naturalize military intervention in the interest of the global political economy without a balanced consideration of the value of cooperation in an increasingly interconnected world.

Revenge is rife with geographic misunderstanding. His interpretation of borders, a central theme in the book, is a prime example. For geographers, borders are complex geographic constructs indelibly bound to power, territory, and myriad processes (Johnson et al., 2011; Newman, 2008; Popescu, 2012). For Kaplan, borders are conceived within a simplistic 'natural' versus 'artificial' binary. 'Natural' borders include mountain ranges, deserts, and bodies of water, repetitiously touted as geographic and historical absolutes, while 'artificial' or 'man-made' borders include built structures like the Berlin Wall and state borders. This early 20th-century understanding of borders naively ignores 'the fact that landscape features are not necessarily barriers to human activity' (Popescu, 2012: 17), and infers that nation states without 'natural' borders must acquire them through force or military conflict. Humans have for centuries moved beyond the limits of landscape features and so-called 'natural' borders, yet Kaplan refuses to move beyond the limits of antiquated geographical understandings, and sloppy geography means sloppy geopolitics.

Geography and geopolitics are about power; thus the misuse of geographic concepts hinders our collective understanding of power processes, which in turn obstructs thorough geopolitical inquiry and comprehension. As the geopolitically literate, we must intervene in the misuse of geography and geographical concepts for the interests of the few: we must remain critically aware of the misappropriation of geography in popular discourse.

Though *Revenge* addresses the contemporary, post-9/11 world, it is constrained by maintaining traditional geopolitics as the territorial chessboard of state actors while paying little attention to geographies of postcolonialism and feminism, eschewing critical theory altogether. Postcolonialism and feminism offer important tools in helping to explain complex processes of reality in ways, and at scales, that an appeal to physical geography cannot. Many current, central concerns of recent feminist work on embodied, unequal spatial relations of power, such as human trafficking, political violence, and food security, are not addressed in *Revenge*, nor could they be.

Kaplan's overall perspective is gendered: geopolitics between territorial states and governments are the realm of great men, just as they were for classic thinkers of geography's past. Besides devoting few words to the geographic contexts of some populations of females, a general silence on postcoloniality and gender pervades the book, not to mention the general, total lack of critical theory, with a few minor exceptions. An illustrative case (or rather, just about the only case) of women's roles in affecting geopolitics is the higher birthrate of Chechen women than Russian women (pp. 177–178). This fact helps the author explain why Russia will not be successful in dominating a 'Eurasian' space. For Kaplan, Russia is held together only by 'geography', yet at the same time the declining demographic of ethnic Russians and the increasing population of Chechens means Chechen women are literally preventing a resurgent Russian empire. Such an argument is stated without elaboration and is predicated on a Huntingtonian civilizational clash *telos* and is reminiscent of Malthusianism, where women are blamed and relegated to the production of children and domesticity. This can be unkindly

interpreted as reflective of a stereotypical, traditional view of geopolitics as a sphere dominated by white males in positions of authority. Silences can speak volumes and it is a shame that Kaplan did not fill these silences with the valuable perspectives offered by postcolonialism and feminism.

Kaplan is no stranger to criticism from professional geographers. For every article of Kaplan's published in *The Atlantic* or book that makes it into *The New York Times* Best Sellers list, there comes a flurry of biting reviews, reactions, and commentaries pointing out how Kaplan misrepresents geographic scholarship to government and public readers. But then again, simply taking Kaplan to task again for inflammatory prose and poor scholarship yet expecting that he will read any works of post-Mackinder geography or gain an appreciation for critical theory and nuance accomplishes little more than making ourselves feel better.

Instead, geographers should focus on what we can change about the situation: our response. If we truly want to root out, or at least propose an alternative idea of, geography and geographical analysis to the public and government that more accurately reflects how we within the discipline think of it, then we must play the same game as Kaplan. When was the last time a work by a professional geographer was on the *Times* Best Sellers list? When was the last time an article from the State Department's Office of the Geographer, from the editors-in-chief of our most prestigious journals, or from you landed in a popular (non-academic) magazine, like *The Atlantic*, *The New Yorker*, or even *National Geographic*? When was the last time a president of a geographical association in America (or elsewhere, for that matter) unleashed a work so electrifying upon the public that she was invited to a talk show on NPR, Charlie Rose, C-SPAN, or any other program? Who then is in control of the definition and perception of geography itself?

Such a call to action is by no means a new one. In fact, the call for geographers to write for the public and for policy has been made by many over the years (Abler, 1987; Dobson, 2007; Hart, 1982; Harvey, 1984; Kropotkin, 1885; Murphy et al., 2005), yet the response from the geography community largely continues to be a deafening silence. It is time to take up our pens (or our keyboards) and show the world, not just ourselves, what geography is, how geography is important, and why geography matters.

On a concluding note, a problem with Kaplan's particular brand of deterministic thinking is that it is so widely read in policy circles – precisely where decision-makers are positioned to apply thoughtful inquiry into complex dynamics of human agency, environmental feedback mechanisms, and context-specific, spatial relationships of power. Practitioners of critical geopolitics understand geopolitical narratives as selective views of the world which simplify complex power dynamics to explain a particular agenda and/or view of spatial relationships. All geopolitics is discourse, and the aim of critical geopolitics is to understand how a particular spatial narrative benefits a certain group or agenda. The question must be asked: whom does Kaplan's view benefit? Certainly not those of us who wish to understand why violence and inequity happen when, why, and where they do.

References

Abler RF (1987) What shall we say? To whom shall we speak? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 77(4): 511–524.

Dobson J (2007) Bring geography back! *ArcNews Online* Spring. Available at: http://www.esri.com/news/arcnews/spring07articles/bring-back-geography-1of2.html.

Hart JF (1982) The highest form of the geographer's art. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 72: 1–29.

Harvey D (1984) On the history and present condition of geography: An historical materialist manifesto. *The Professional Geographer* 36(1): 1–11.

Johnson C, Jones R, Paasi A, et al. (2011) Interventions on rethinking 'the border' in border studies. *Political Geography* 30: 61–69.

Kropotkin P (1885) What geography ought to be. *The Nineteenth Century* 18: 940–956.

Morrissey J, Dalby S, Kearns G, et al. (2009) Geography writes back: Response to Kaplan's 'The Revenge of Geography'. *Human Geography* 2(2): 33–51.

Murphy AB, De Blij HJ, Turner BL II, et al. (2005) The role of geography in public debate. *Progress in Human Geography* 29(2): 165–193.

Newman D (2008) Boundaries. In: Agnew J, Mitchell K, and Toal G (eds) *A Companion to Political Geography*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 123–127.

ÓTuathail G (1996) *Critical Geopolitics*. London: Routledge.

Popescu G (2012) *Bordering and Ordering the Twenty-first Century: Understanding Borders*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.