National Socialist period as well as during the post-war years and a good example of those scientists who had the ability to strengthen the status of the sciences within both political systems. Despite his activities on behalf of the Nazi regime, Meynen was able to continue his career after 1945.

The book is based on published and archival sources, the latter mainly from archives and libraries in the United States. The geographical archive of the Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography in Leipzig and the German Federal Archives in Koblenz are the only ones in Germany Mingus visited for his research. But this reviewer regrets that some other archives, namely the German Federal Archives in Berlin-Lichterfelde and Freiburg im Breisgau, the Berlin State Library and the Archive of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, were not consulted.

Remapping Modern Germany after National Socialism offers an excellent introduction to the subject and is a sound basis for further studies on the topic. By using more material from German archives, and additional German books, the author would undoubtedly have increased the amount of information he could deploy on his topic, taking it also beyond the period investigated here. As it is, a comprehensive analyses of cartographic networks, methods of data collection and evaluation, the sources used by cartographers, the multidisciplinarity of their approaches, and the political and economic links in the period by involving all universities, research societies and German federal institutes remains desirable. In that way readers would have gained a still better understanding of the differences between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic in the period considered, as well as from 1961 to 1989. That said, it has to be admitted that the inclusion of all such topics would have been too much for an introductory study. Mingus himself points out that he hopes 'this project [will] serve as a foundation for further research. Much more needs to be done on this particular time and place so that we might better understand the relationship between governance and maps'.

© Petra Svatek
University of Vienna
https://doi.org/10.1080/03085694.2018.1450811

The Red Atlas: How the Soviet Union Secretly Mapped the World. By John Davies and Alexander J. Kent. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2017. ISBN 978-0-226-38957-8. Pp. xiii, 234, illus. US $35.00; STG £26.50 (cloth).

Maps, as John Davies and Alexander J. Kent remind us in this fascinating study of Cold War cartography, are 'instruments of power'. From the end of the Second World War to the beginning of the 1990s, the Soviet Union was engaged in an all-encompassing struggle with its Western rivals. The Soviets, desperately trying to recover from the devastation of wartime Nazi attacks, wanted to maximize any advantage available to them against their wealthier and more technologically advanced ideological foes. Geographical intelligence was an important part of their strategy, and *The Red Atlas: How the Soviet Union Secretly Mapped the World* demonstrates the strenuous, thorough and successful nature of their efforts. For the Soviets, cartographic knowledge was indeed power.

The book, lavishly illustrated with informative examples, contains four chapters. The first briefly examines the history of Russian cartography. The second gives the basic information (series, scales and specifications) about the astonishingly detailed military maps that began to flood into the West as the Soviet Union collapsed. Much attention has been devoted in a third chapter, entitled 'Plots and Plans', to answering the naturally occurring question, 'How on earth did they do this?' A final chapter—'Resurrection'—tells the tale of what happened to the maps after the collapse of the USSR, and of the remarkable uses to which they have been put ever since. After these main textual courses have been consumed, readers are advised to save room for dessert in the form of eight delicious appendixes. Included are a generous sample (57 pages) of the full-colour maps themselves, with references, samples of *spravkas* ('information', *i.e.*, written descriptions), glossaries, codes, symbols and security forms.

If this book merely offered a selection of recently acquired cartographical items, it would still be worth buying and reading. Davies and Kent, self-described 'British map enthusiasts' (actually the editor of the map journal *Sheetlines* and the president of the British Cartographic Society, respectively), are mindful of a diverse potential audience. The maps themselves are attractive, and the supporting technical and scholarly apparatus will be helpful to general readers as well as specialists.

The true value, however, lies in the careful examination and side-by-side comparisons of the Soviet maps with their Western (mostly American and British) counterparts. Readers will see that the Soviet maps are almost invariably more detailed and therefore more useful, than those made on the free side of the Iron Curtain. Davies and Kent also go beyond these qualitative comparisons in their attempt to work out—without the benefit of access to still-classified Soviet archival documents—the sources and methods behind the data. They conclude that espionage had to have been involved, at first using traditional methods after the war, and later overhead reconnaissance (including spy satellites) to supplement the reports of agents on the ground.

The authors reason that the Russians, who regarded cartographical material as vital national-security information to be protected from unauthorized disclosure, would have been suspicious of any Western map freely available to them, thus making verification necessary. If the Soviet maps contained more information than the most recent United States Geological Survey or (British) Ordnance Survey publications available to them, they reason, then aerial images had to have been used. Similarly, if the Soviet maps lacked helpful information that was not recognizable through overhead reconnaissance (such as secret underground command-and-control bunkers), then one might reasonably infer that spy planes or satellites had been a major Communist source.

Davies and Kent also speculate on the reason for the unprecedented amount of detail offered by the Soviet maps, which, they point out, were 'not primarily concerned with the depiction of enemy military installations'. They conclude that these were not necessarily intended to be invasion or occupation plans; the motivation was probably a professional determination to collect and display as much information as possible, for whatever potential use might be made of it.

Strangely, the greatest benefit might well accrue to non-Russians desperate for elusive geographical information. The authors recount the testimony of a cartographer trying to map Afghanistan prior to American military operations there. He found that the Soviet maps gave details such as the dates during which mountain passes were clear of snow for travel and the locations of wells and fresh-water springs. Another convert was trying to determine Armenian water resources for the United States Agency for International Development. He discovered that the maps not only labelled artesian wells but also gave flow rates, which would allow planners to determine historic rates of depletion.

This, then, is a work that educates the intellect and pleases the eye. While some may regret the lack of any comparative discussion of American and British mapping during the Cold War, as a way to determine historical context, most will greet this work with enthusiasm, gratitude and even amazement.

© Daun van Ee
Columbia, Maryland
https://doi.org/10.1080/03085694.2018.1450812

The New Map of Empire: How Britain Imagined America before Independence. By S. Max Edelson. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 2017. ISBN 978-0-674-97211-7. Pp. xiv, 464, illus., with companion online atlas. US $35.00 (cloth).

Try this experiment: pretend you know nothing of the shape of the United States as it exists today. Imagine a time when it was a tangle of shifting borders with a speculative and often bloody interior. Max Edelson attempts to get our heads in that space as *The New Map of Empire* opens to a point in history when Britain was struggling to establish control of its newly won spoils of the Seven Year's War from far off London, a seven-week-sail away.

The book is divided into seven chapters sandwiched between an Introduction and Conclusion. Another 100-plus pages are devoted to Abbreviations, Notes, Map Bibliography, Acknowledgements and Index. This book about maps does not have maps within the pages. Instead, it is meant to be read with the companion online atlas provided by the author. Instructions at the beginning admit that 'The best way to read this book is with a computer screen close at hand so that you can view the maps'.

Once Edelson has set the stage and introduced Britain's small but powerful and renewed Board of Trade (first established in 1660 as a central collection point for information about the Americas, but with sharpened focus and mission after the negotiated peace of the Treaty of Paris in 1763), he argues that historians have downplayed the significance that Britain's (and especially the Board of Trade's) positions and policies had on undermining that nation's control of colonial territory. He pieces together a case through careful research (so thorough that he conducted a plane-table and lead-line survey from a boat off Key West just to see what it was like to map from the deck of a moving ship) using maps collected together for viewing for the first time, most created between 1763 and the American revolution. He describes the goals of the Board of Trade as the execution of new experiments in colonization for maximum profit and military security. From vision to atlas, Edelson walks us through the efforts—some successful and others not—to master space, growth and government of Empire.

After the Treaty of Paris, which established who got what after the Seven Year's War, the Board of Trade imagined their gains as a clean slate and knew that the first step in maintaining authority was to define it through visual boundaries, that is, surveys and maps. But as time went on and the surveying did not always yield what they hoped, their views became tainted by what they desired to be the result. From dividing St John Island, Newfoundland, in a way that made some parcels worthless, to ignoring eyewitness information about the uselessness of growing crops in Florida, the Board of Trade tried to manipulate outcomes. Without drama, Edelson manages to relate the horror of economically 'justified' abuses in the name of colonization. He takes Britain to task for the treatment of colonists and demonstrates that the Board of Trade actually functioned as a decisive, greedy, cruel and intentional pillager of land, people and resources.

At first I was put off by having to get in front of a computer to read the book. But as I continued reading, I got over my initial irritation (a friend reminded me that Peter Guralnick's book on Sam Cooke does not come with a soundtrack) and warmed to the stories. For such a thoroughly researched and meticulous work Edelson is a terrific storyteller, especially in the later chapters, and manages to get his points across in an engaging way. For example, in a rare (and early) moment of British enlightenment the Board of Trade acknowledged that Indian hunting territory, while not occupied in the sense of being settled with structures and crops, was an essential part of Indian land and must be included in any discussions about borders.

As a lawyer, what I found most interesting were the many creative attempts by the Board of Trade to limit colonists' relationships and rights to land with a variety of formulas and schemes to determine how much could be purchased, to whom it could be sold, where the boundaries were, how it would be taxed, what could be done on it, and more. This was contrary to the Locke-like approach most colonists embraced, which was ownership based on whether settlers' had improved the land.

Edelson has written this book for an audience of scholars with an expectation that research will continue, as evidenced by his instructions for finding a map he could not include in the online atlases: 'This map can be retrieved at shelf-mark MR 1/26 from its sturdy metal cabinet at the National Archives of the United Kingdom at Kew'. I look forward to the next study of this rich material now that Edelson has collected it into one 'atlas', and to seeing more digital archives around specific topics.

© Kris Butler
Cambridge, Massachusetts
https://doi.org/10.1080/03085694.2018.1451146

Evolution of the Texas–Louisiana Boundary: In Search of the Elusive Corner. By Jim Tiller and John P. Evans, Jr. Dallas: Southern Methodist University, William P. Clements Center for Southwest Studies, 2017. ISBN 978-1-929531-17-6. Pp. xvii, 544, illus. US $60.00 (cloth).

Thomas Jefferson created quite a stir in 1803 in the United States when he purchased Louisiana from Napoleon. Little did he know the full extent of the territory that he had acquired, and for some time he believed that the western boundary of Louisiana was the Rio Grande. Over time, and following ensuing treaties and other agreements, the