so grant further reason to chart the city's form but, as Foxell also points out, migrants such as Rocque were able to translate London society's obsession with its image as a 'new Rome' into maps of a style like those undertaken by contemporaries in Italy. They composed drawings that offered a depiction of streets in the manner of an idealized picturesque landscape (p. 31) rather than the reality of grime, menaces, and poverty evident in literature at that time. Moreover the psychosomatic nature of London's map makers is not neglected. To provide two brief examples, Foxell refers to Charles Booth, an individual of deep benevolent intentions, whose interest in documenting working-class life led to the creation of colour-coded maps in the 1880s. This is revealed to have granted the first detailed glimpse into London's socio-spatial structure (p. 76). Unfortunately it also offered a map type that, when used in the 1890s to plot the dispersal of London's ethnic communities, became a source of propaganda for xenophobes (p. 75). Similarly attention is drawn to the obsessive nature of Phyllis Pearsall, a lady who in the mid-1930s walked and charted thousands of streets so as to create the present-day staple of every tourist's travel bag, the *A-Z atlas and guide* (p. 52).

Despite presenting a splendid narrative of time and place, and thereby falling within the scholarly tradition of urban biography, the underlying tenor of *Mapping London: making sense of the city* is not merely that of a chronicle of spatial continuity and change, but rather the articulate scrutinizing of the value of maps in comprehending an urban place. Accordingly whilst it may at cover glance appear to be similar to works such as Peter Whitfield's *London: a life in maps* (2006), in many respects Foxell's work differs. For example, in the short introductory section Foxell candidly outlines the value of maps as historical sources, and their role in appreciating and illuminating the underlying patterns of a city. In this regard Foxell not only makes reference to the layers of information contained within cartographic illustrations, and so the details of a place they can confer, but in effect he alludes to their significance in urban historiography (p. 16). For cultured morphologists instructing students in appraising the urban fabric, the statements put forth by Foxell will have much didactic weight.

Notwithstanding its drawing together of diverse and colourful cartographic images, this book is attention grabbing. Emphasizing map makers as active story tellers who offer more than snapshots of the urban tissue at fixed points in time, Foxell effectively explains how through the development of cartographic technology the makers of London's maps have in effect empowered themselves to do things that they never originally anticipated, in this manner exposing patterns, connections, and ideas that were as interesting as they were unexpected (p. 9). Significantly, as *Mapping London: making sense of the city* makes evident, how the city is shown and 'read' is an ongoing challenge to fathom, and one of great relevance given the contemporary academic world with its computation technology and its revolutionizing of the way data can be graphically portrayed. How this is harnessed will, as the book reveals, affect how we make sense of cities.

**Note**

1. Hall, S. S. (2004) 'Mercator', in Harmon, K. (ed.) *You are here: personal geographies and other maps of the imagination* (Princeton Architectural Press, New York).

*Ian Morley, Department of History, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin NT, Hong Kong. Email: ianmorley@arts.cuhk.edu.hk*

**Invented Edens: techno-cities of the twentieth century,** by *Robert Kargon* and *Arthur Molella*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., USA, 2008, 208 pp. ISBN 0-262-1130-1.

This short book traces the history of a specific application of utopian planning ideas, as implemented in building entirely new cities from scratch. It does not address itself to urbanists, and thus does not contain suggestions of how to plan new cities today. Instead, it takes the reader to both the garden cities of the West and dreary industrial towns of Soviet Russia, showing how their basic model was one and the same. The authors are historians, and have done a thorough job of digging up background material and making it available in digestible form. Let me go through some of what I found fascinating in this book. First, I was interested to learn that Ebenezer Howard, the British originator of the Garden Cities movement, was an amateur, and had to self-publish his classic book *Garden cities of tomorrow*. His direct influence, and support by the American Lewis Mumford had profound consequences for the future suburbanization of the world.

Leading up to the Second World War, the idea of building instant industrial cities appealed to

American, German, and Soviet leaders. In Germany, the industrial city Salzgitter was built under the direction of Hermann Göring. Interestingly, the architectural style was intentionally divided: industrial Bauhaus (implying a machine efficiency) for the production buildings, and a stripped traditional style (implying authority and reassurance) for the central direction. This was only the first of several unfortunate examples that acquired evil memory. Once the war started and manpower was scarce, the German industrial cities had to be run by utilizing slave labour, and eventually became concentration camps with the dual purpose of industrial-production/ extermination.

Back in the USSR, the government saw the solution to industrial production by means of such instant cities, the best-known example of which is probably Magnitogorsk in the Urals. This model served them well during the War, but its inhuman efficiency was continued as State building policy for years afterwards. The USA tried its hand at new cities, from a purely utilitarian and humane intention. Later, the two great protagonists in the Cold War, the USA and the Soviet Union, implemented similar ideas for instant cities. In the USA, wartime laboratories were built as isolated cities. These include Los Alamos and Oak Ridge National Laboratories. Contrary to the other examples mentioned above, the US Government really tried to make the residents and workers in these industrial cities feel as comfortable as possible in their isolation. The way this was done was to make the living quarters into a proto-suburb, which had momentous consequences when the same model was universally applied after the War.

The second fact I found fascinating is that the great American scientist Norbert Wiener wrote a paper that established the city as a connective network, back in 1950, but it was never published in full. This idea was to be developed much later by a group of urbanists, including the reviewer. Wiener's concerns came about after the first atomic bomb was developed, when it was realized that centralized urbanization was vulnerable to the new weapon. The obvious solution was decentralization, and this is where the dispersive ideas for new towns came in handy at exactly the right historical moment. Sprawling suburbia and the Federal Highway system were conceived initially as America's antidote to the Soviet nuclear bomb. It was soon realized, however, after the development of the hydrogen bomb, that no urban structure was really safe, and that decentralization was an illusory protective strategy. Tragically, the mechanism of sprawl had been set in motion, and could not be stopped.

The heroes of this book turn out surprisingly to be the new towns built under the Italian Fascist regime. These industrial towns were so well planned that they survive today as examples of good urbanism on the human scale. An example is the city of Torviscosa. Unlike in the USA and in the Soviet Union, where new cities absolutely 'had' to be designed as a total break with past urban typologies, Italian urbanists were more responsive to traditional urban models, and were thus far more successful. Those post-war industrial cities in Italy that have managed to copy the urban patterns of the earlier towns have also fared better than the ones that turned to the inhuman utopian model as defined by the Swiss architect Le Corbusier.

The instant city was exported to Latin America, without great success. The book discusses Ciudad Guayana in Venezuela and Le Vaudreuil in France as mixed or failed examples of new industrial cities (but does not mention Brasilia). The problem here is that the industrial city model was adopted throughout the world without revision, based purely on the original utopian ideals that led to trenchant problems since its initial implementations. The last example discussed is Celebration in Florida, a New Urbanist development sponsored by the Disney Corporation. This is not an industrial city, however. In an even-handed analysis, the authors conclude that by adopting people's ideas of individual comfort and traditional urbanism, a new town can indeed be built to include at least part of those human qualities missing from most industrial cities. Of course, there are detractors of New Urbanist towns such as Celebration, but despite some correct points, the hostility tends to centre on ideological grounds – that we should not *allow* a return to traditional planning principles. Being part of the New Urbanism movement, the reviewer is not sympathetic to those arguments.

Altogether, this book is a valuable addition to the literature on the history of urban planning. By including Celebration alongside the strictly industrial city examples, the authors are pointing to a broad critique and comparison of industrial and garden city typologies. One can draw many conclusions from the discussion given here, and it is good that the authors allow this without imposing their own agenda upon the reader.

*Nikos A. Salingaros, Department of Mathematics, University of Texas at San Antonio, One UTSA Circle, San Antonio, Texas 78249, USA. E-mail: salingar@gmail.com*