Discussions about sustainability in buildings have been widespread in recent decades, and increasing attention is now being paid to sustainability in urbanism and the larger built environment. We know that vernacular architecture was both culturally and technologically sustainable, an aspect lost in recent decades yet once again touted as important to contemporary societies. All good traditional architecture was sustainable; this was a given — rather like having to build with gravity. Considering this, within the Islamic World, notions of sustainability have until now been applied only to historic urban environments and to particular modern buildings. But this collection of essays, edited by Bashir Kazimee, makes the case for examining sustainability more broadly.

One of the most welcome aspects of this volume is that it pays attention to both cultural and technological sustainability. It is comprised of eleven chapters whose subject matter ranges, but which all focus on the Middle East and Western Asia (from Turkey to Afghanistan) — except for one which deals with Malaysia. The essays are, in the main, written by well-regarded scholars who have worked on issues related to Muslim cultures and architectures. They all emerge from recent research in the field and discussion in the classroom dealing with real situations and speculations about place. In his preface, Kazimee tries to frame this effort within a globalizing context. He presents the essays as a “critical discourse” that poses an alternative vision to modernism and urban development. And he makes a case for the vernacular and tradition as vital influences in the layout and architecture of contemporary cities in the Islamic World. Beyond this, however, there appears to be little structuring logic behind the sequence of the chapters in the volume, or indeed their subject matter.

In general, the notion of place related to culture and meaning and transformation over time underlies several of the essays — as does attention to shared elements of urban form and landscape as form-giving elements. There is a certain commonality in the way the architecture of Islamic cities is typically analyzed — from the characterization of spatial patterns and spaces (for example, the bazaar and the maidan) to individual building types such as the courtyard house, mosque, and caravanserais. Indeed, much writing tends to categorize the city into a “kit of parts” (my phrase and not one used in the book), which helps us understand and express it within different paradigms. On the other hand, this approach constrains how we may examine place, making narratives more normative, and in some ways, limiting. That said, a number of these narratives are informative, and some posit useful notions for examining the heritage of Islamic cities.

The first essay in the collection is by Kazimee, dealing with “Place and Meaning in Urban Isfahan.” Here, the author looks at a range of typical urban spaces and building forms in that city — from its great Maidan-i-Imam or Maidan-i-Shah (for which it is justly famous) to its covered bazaar, from its mosques to its courtyard houses. The traditional architecture of Isfahan has previously been widely analyzed and presented; however, Kazimee’s emphasizes the relationship between place-making and architecture as an ongoing cultural and spatial practice. In particular, he contends that traditional meanings are still apparent in the city’s older urban forms and architecture, and that they remain relevant to its contemporary life.
Perhaps less well-known than Isfahan is the city of Yazd, a marvelous historic settlement with famous badgirs (wind-catchers) and gardens at the edge of the desert in Iran. Rafi Samizay, who writes about it here, laments the insensitive modern interventions that have occurred in it, examines some of the main factors that traditionally shaped its urbanism, and proposes a number of methods to restore a balance between socio-cultural and physical concerns and promote a more sustainable future. Unfortunately, the recommendations, while sound, are general in nature, and little indication is given as to how they might be achieved — which may have been beyond the scope of the piece.

The last essay in the volume, by Kazimee, suffers from the same problem. It focuses on preservation strategies in arid regions, looking for a balance between ecological design and community and house form. Nature plays an important role in the author’s deliberations; yet only general recommendations are presented for action, and all-important mechanisms for implementation are hardly mentioned. In spite of this, the essay does provide a general framework for considering this type of built environment, making it apt companion to Samizay’s exploration of Yazd.

The above two essays make several parallel recommendations. Both argue that belief in Westernization and the implementation of imported methods of development have undermined local traditions and cultures. Both advocate for ideas of harmony using “time-honored indigenous solutions.” They agree that the issue of in-migration needs to be handled sensitively, and that the social and economic gap between the countryside and the city needs to be addressed. New urban settlements should also afford greater access to open and green space, which in traditional configurations was mainly found in private areas such as house courtyards. Both also recognize that people’s aspirations have changed, and that cities must provide for modern infrastructure and services. Finally, both consider attention to the historic urban fabric to be a cornerstone for the revitalization of contemporary living environments.

In addition to such contributions by established scholars, the book presents more speculative work derived from design-student studio projects. In one such chapter, Kazimee looks at a possible new model for housing in Kandahar, Afghanistan, where the research and design work aimed at addressing particularities of place. Ideas about continuity and change in a traditional settlement were explored, and a case is made for using traditional models such as the courtyard house to satisfy contemporary needs. The individual designs themselves, however, are only briefly presented.

Another speculative project, described by William Bechhoeffer, concerns the relationship between sustainable development, ecotourism, and historic place in Bamyan, Afghanistan, site of the destroyed monumental Buddhas. The surrounding valley provided the backdrop for a student studio project attempting to discover critical-regionalist narratives (in the Tzonis, LaFavre, Frampton construct) for the design of different buildings. The resulting designs “engaged students in . . . suggesting principles and approaches” for an interdisciplinary process to “revive and restore Afghanistan’s economy and culture.” However, one wonders whether this is a forward-looking enterprise.

The volume also includes an essay on cities in Iran by Faranoosh Daneshpanah and S.M. Mousavisade, which looks at the characteristics of the Islamic city there. Here again an effort is made to look at a kit of parts that may give a sense of place identity. As the authors write, “The concepts of ‘unity despite plurality’ and ‘plurality despite unity’ [is] an important ideological principle . . . profoundly influencing the works of art and architecture in these cities.” Tile patterns supposedly illustrate this. However, they are presented largely in shorthand, and a deeper, less cursory investigation would have been useful.

In “Urban Recovery: The Case of Historic Kabul,” Abdul Wasay Najimi and Jolyon Leslie draw upon their experiences with the Aga Khan Trust for Culture’s Historic Cities Program (HCP). They emphasize advocacy as a mechanism for urban development action through community participation and management in an attempt to balance short-term interventions with long-term goals. Although this chapter focuses on the urban heritage of cities in Afghanistan, its approaches have been applied more widely by the HCP. It typifies a holistic approach to development in a historic environment and serves as a good case study for those who wish to undertake this kind of work.

Henry Matthews’s essay on the Ottoman mosque and külliye (a built complex of different structures) changes scale to examine a particular building type. His examples of how külliye are still being used raises issues of sustainability and reuse of historic buildings. For example, the imaret (soup kitchen) of the Suleymaniye Mosque in Istanbul is now a restaurant. Matthews’s position is that these buildings can successfully withstand such changes over time.

Salim Elwazini engages in a very different form of speculation in his cross-cultural examination of a “historic context strategy” for developing a sense of geographical place. He looks both at Middle Eastern examples (in Palestine, Jordan and elsewhere) and at examples in the United States (the Greater Powder River Basin in Wyoming and the Route 66 corridor). Although he presents a methodology and tools for examining such divergent environments, it is hard to ascertain how they might work in practice. Nevertheless, the framework is intriguing.

Finally, Ayad Rahmani uses Khaled Hosseini’s novel The Kite Runner as a point of departure for a discussion of authenticity in an age of globalization. The book uses two characters from the book, Hasan and Amir, to embody the “authentic” and “inauthentic,” respectively. The former relates to tradition, history and culture; the latter to modern, imported values. Rahmani then uses these characteristics to talk about architecture and place. The device is a good one, and the place discussed is Dubai (inauthentic) and Sawa...
This chapter begins to consider what people’s aspirations are and how they may be considered in the design of contemporary urban environments. It is an avenue worth exploring further.

I end with an anomaly that occurs in the middle of the volume. Azizi Bahauddin’s chapter on the Malay Melaka house is the only one to deal directly with an Islamic setting outside the Middle East and Western Asia. Besides looking at the architectural elements, interiors, and climatic responses of this house type, the author usefully relates it to cultural and religious factors. However, there has been extensive literature on the topic in the past, and the chapter adds little to this discourse, even if it is well presented and useful for readers who are unfamiliar with indigenous architecture in Southeast Asia.

To summarize the above descriptions, one cannot help pointing out how a sense of romanticism pervades the writings and concerns of many of these authors. Yet this “looking back” at traditional models for new design directions remains useful for students and practitioners alike. And the understandings that these chapters propose provide a solid framework of analysis, even though there is a scatter-shot aspect to it. It is good that Kazimée has continued to explore the vernacular and historic environments of Islamic cultures with a number of like-minded scholars. They have given us a useful body of work.

Hasan-Uddin Khan
Roger Williams University


Often described as home to “tiger” or “miracle” economies, South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore have long been considered models for Third World development. Jini Kim Watson’s The New Asian City offers an impressive analysis of spaces and urban forms that challenges such official representations and discourses, and that reaches down to examine the everyday lives of people left out of such success stories.

Two different forms of representation, literature and architecture, are seamlessly integrated in Watson’s questioning of “unequal access to, and uneven development of, forms of modernity across the globe” (p.253). While architectural forms give representation to what is conventionally understood as modernity (department stores, railway stations, cafes, etc.) and development (bridges, highrise apartments, hotels, etc.), fiction provides a means for people to imagine and construct their own realities beyond the oppressive present, and so “disrupt [it] by fluid imaginaries and interpretations” (p.95). By exploring such representations of people marginalized by the expansion of global imperialism and capitalism, The New Asian City captures otherwise ungraspable spaces of modernity and development in countries that share a history of colonial contradiction and postcolonial desire.

The New Asian City should be understood as a project of cross-scale analysis, one which attempts to connect everyday spaces to world systems. Toward this end, it revolves around situating the colonial and postcolonial self in broader social structures. From the Heideggerian notion of “worlding” to bildungsroman novels, Watson’s analysis focuses on the problematic locations of colonies in the map of global imperialism, and of individuals in the state-led industrializing landscapes of new Asian cities after independence. This not only requires recognizing “how the colonial city is the crucial, interstitial location that gives the global/colony system its being” (by clearing it to “world” the metropole and global imperialism) (p.44); it also requires exploring the contradictory urban spaces of “triumphant” and “celebratory” development, where the promise of growth hardly reaches down to the people whose labor provided the foundation for underlying new national economies.
The New Asian City is divided into three thematic parts: “Colonial Cities,” “Postwar Urbanism,” and “Industrializing Landscapes.” Two transitional chapters between these sections complete the presentation by setting the theoretical framework for the succeeding parts. In “Colonial Cities,” Watson examines colonial literature on Asian cities, to show how Edward Said’s notion of “discrepant modernity” was manifest in the contrasting built environments of colony and metropole. Watson brings three literary works into her discussion here: Yŏm Sang-sŏp’s Mansejon, Wu Zhuoliu’s Orphans of Asia, and Yi Sang’s The Wings. The three novels represent the discrepant modernities experienced and felt most acutely in colonial urban spaces. Watson contends that such works, which fundamentally differed from their Western counterparts, expressed frustration with the reality of life in colonial cities, where the colonized were given unequal access to their own spaces, and even to “the promising surface of colonial modernity” (p.60). That said, Watson’s main argument remains that “all the discrepancies, longings, confusions, and hopes found to circulate through and around the colonial city would actually be the most authentic expression of so-called modern life” (p.85).

The second part of the book, “Postwar Urbanism,” investigates the contradictory and exploitative nature of the supposedly successful experiences and experiments of new Asian cities in the postwar years: export-oriented industrialization and ceaseless urban renewal. While colonies were seen as sites of raw-material extraction and cheap labor, with little opportunity to develop a true urban culture, the postcolonial spaces of Asian cities were imbued with the promise of (and obsession with) “vertical” development at the cost of migrant and female labor. This metaphor of “growth” or “development” is critical to Watson’s analysis of bildungsroman novels (“novels of formation”) set in new Asian cities — the content and form of which differs from their Western counterparts, in which individuals are expected to reach reconciliation with society. If bildungsroman literature is concerned with personal “growth,” Watson argues this takes on far more complex meanings in postcolonial contexts. The irreconcilability of individuals with society in the new Asian city is best expressed in Cho Se-hui’s novella A Little Ball Launched by a Dwarf. Here, the dwarf protagonist, whose unregistered shack is about to be demolished, is gradually led to his dispossess (and death) in striking contrast to the growth of chaebols (state-backed conglomerates) exemplified by gleaming highrise buildings.

The final section of Watson’s book, “Industrializing Landscapes,” provides the most interesting and illuminating discussion of new Asian cities. Evoking images of bridges, railways and roads as an infrastructure of movement and mobility, she examines Singaporean poetry, Taiwanese New Cinema, and Korea’s Minjung literature. These genres not only reveal the violent nature of infrastructure-obsessed urbanism, but they also capture new communal landscapes, in a truly Benjaminian sense, created in the midst of ruins and devastation. As in Hou Hsiao-Hsien’s films, Arthur Yap’s poetry, and Hwang Sŏk-ỳông’s novels, the industrialization of new Asian cities has caused nature to be “subjective to the tidy imperatives of the productive state” (p.190). And in these cities people have been displaced to make way for the circulation of capital in the service of developmentalist economies. Though ephemeral, Watson nevertheless writes that “the road itself is the place to find community and meaning” (p.248). People are offered “the paradoxical, shared experience of being motionless while on the road, the concrete experience of participating in, and being sidelined by,” the “galloping development” of new Asian cities (p.223). The most striking feature of this book is Watson’s keen observations about such new spaces of solidarity and commonality that have emerged out of the very spaces of fragmentation. This is why this book should be seen as “new” in comparison to other accounts of Asian cities.

Despite the author’s commitment to comparative analysis and emphasis on the interrelatedness of Asian cities, the book does fail to fully explore interreferencing practices between them. As many others have noted, Singapore has become a point of reference and emulation for other aspiring Asian cities. Also, the complex relationship between South Korea and Taiwan during and after the Cold War should be given due attention. In this regard, one needs to ask how individual new Asian cities have perceived and interreferenced each other, both in spatial and literary forms — though this may require further research. Still, this book is surely a meaningful contribution to both postcolonial studies and the study of Asian cities, one which challenges the univalent discussion of modernity, expanding the scope and content of both fields and recasting the notion of “region” as a unit of analysis. Furthermore, The New Asian City certainly provides a way to reflect on developments in other urban regions of Asia, such as Shanghai and Bangalore, where the colonial past is also conjured up in a postcolonial present shaped by the allure of the future.

Sujin Eom
University of California, Berkeley

Planning Asian Cities: Risks and Resilience is a timely review of contemporary planning history and recent urban development in eleven major cities in East Asia (Tokyo, Seoul, Beijing, Shanghai, Taipei and Hong Kong) and Southeast Asia (Manila, Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur, Singapore and Jakarta). To assess the present health and future prospects of these cities, the editors use a lens of urban “resilience,” one which takes into account both the risks the cities face and the mechanisms they have adopted to respond to them.

Countries in Asia tend to be macrocephalic, with a single dominant capital city or metropolitan region that exerts a disproportionate influence over the rest of the country and its external linkages. The twin forces of industrialization and rural-urban migration have contributed to the rise of these Asian megacities. Such cities represent an unprecedented phenomenon that is not fully understood, and this book is a welcome addition to this emerging field.

What the authors mean by “resilience” is the capacity of a city to meet the challenge of potential crises — environmental, economic, political, demographic, etc. They argue that this involves adopting an appropriate mix of urban policies, governance structures, planning methods, and social initiatives. The book thus reflects the recent, gradual shift away from the notion that a “petri-dish perfect” type of sustainable development. Rather, it espouses the idea that cities need to constantly adapt and manage the impact of shifting risks in an unbalanced and uncertain world.

There are many risks faced by Asian megacities. For example, the editors point out, many are situated in low-lying areas around the Pacific Rim where they are exposed to natural hazards (such as flooding as a result of seismic or volcanic activity). Such danger is only exacerbated by poor environmental management. Asian megacities are also at profound risk from the impacts of climate change such as agricultural disruption and sea-level rise. The specter of terrorist attack is also present, as is the impact of the increasingly globalized world economy, to which Asian countries have become inextricably linked (as demonstrated by a series of recent economic shocks).

Attempting to make some sense of these issues and the capacity of Asian cities to respond — the scope of the book — is both an ambitious and daunting task. Not only are the issues wide ranging, but the eleven selected cities are quite heterogeneous in their planning histories. They also face very different challenges — even in those cases where they may be located in the same country.

The editors have wisely opted to structure the book to comprise twelve chapters. First comes an introduction by the editors that outlines the main themes and issues and draws out the pertinent aspects of the discussion on the selected cities. This is followed by a chapter on each city, written by a eminent urban planning scholar with knowledge of local conditions. Like other edited publications, the major challenge here is to tie the case studies together within a reasonably cogent framework. In this regard, the editors should be praised for eliciting chapters that take the same approach: each provides an overview of planning history in its respective city to provide background and underlying context, evaluates the city’s evolving role as a “world city” and the impact this has on people and place, and analyzes the risks and challenges faced by the city and the strategies being developed to meet them. However, since each author was not limited to a strict template, differences in focus and writing style inevitably emerge. As a result, this is perhaps not a book to be read at one sitting; nor will its chapters probably be read in the order in which they are presented. Since each chapter is self-contained, I suspect most readers, after reading the introductory chapter, will pick and choose among the rest, reading those that interest them, and accessing the others only when needed.

On the whole, the book presents a commendable survey of the current situation in the eleven cities vis-à-vis urban resilience. Hamnett and Forbes’s opening chapter also provides an excellent introduction to this complex theme, as well as a succinct summary of the issues raised in each of its succeeding case-studies. What is clear from this discussion is that there should be great urgency today to increase the capacity of urban systems to manage impending shocks, and that the fundamental role of political leadership should be to enable urban planners to get on with this job. Unless this is achieved, Asian cities will become increasingly vulnerable to future crises.

I look forward to a second edition of this book, perhaps in ten years time, that evaluates how the resilience capacity of each of the surveyed cities has or has not improved.

Ng Wai Keen
National University of Singapore

The notion of critical regionalism first appeared in print in the early 1980s, introduced by the authors of this book, Liane Lefaivre and Alexander Tzonis. Broadly speaking, it embodies an approach to design which gives priority to the ecological, social and cultural identity of the specific sites to which building projects belong, rethinking architecture through the lens of the region. This contextual concern is combined with the Kantian concept of “critics,” which stresses a responsibility to examine one’s own tools and assumptions. The use of the concept of regionalism is thus distinguished from its unself-conscious use by previous generations. If understood this way, regionalism is an approach to the future of the built environment complementary to critical historical inquiry.

In the preface to this volume Tzonis (a professor at Tsinghua University and professor emeritus at the Technical University of Delft) and Lefaivre (chair of Architectural History and Theory at the University of Applied Arts in Vienna and a research associate at the Technical University of Delft) clearly define the object of this study along with its tasks. In the process, they make reference to their previous writings: Die Frage des Regionalismus (1981); Why Critical Regionalism Today? (1990); Tropical Architecture: Critical Regionalism in The Age of Globalization (2001); and Critical Regionalism: Architecture and Identity in a Globalized World (2003). The book is in debt to this series, especially the last title, but it differs from it because it contains no section of case studies. Rather, this volume enlarges the theoretical apparatus, presenting itself as an introductory book on the theory and history of regionalist architecture, in an effort to examine the degree to which architectural regionalism may provide a vital alternative to globalization.

The book is structured through a discussion of different instances of architectural or cultural regionalism, which follow one another in chronological order. This is intended to allow regionalism to emerge as an aspect of identity that may serve as a counterbalance to global systems. The first chapter traces this dichotomy back to the Classical era, especially to Vitruvius. The second focuses on the Casa dei Crescenzi, built in Rome 1,200 years later. The next two chapters shift to an investigation of the garden villas of papal Rome during the Renaissance and their imitation around Europe — especially in France and England at the dawn of the eighteenth century — as attempts to capture the particular identity of the region. The fifth chapter looks into the English picturesque, French physiocratie, and German regionalism, recalling Rousseau and Goethe; the sixth highlights the situation in France and Germany at the end of the eighteenth century; the seventh examines the figures of Pugin, Ruskin and Viollet-le-Duc; and the eighth looks at the connection between globalization and regionalism in Europe in the second part of the nineteenth century.

After this European section, the book turns to an examination of the world situation in the twentieth century. Chapters nine and ten explore the North American contribution from the 1930s to the 1950s, centering on the influence of Lewis Mumford (who the authors knew well), the New York Museum of Modern Art, and the main architects of the period. The final two chapters present a chronological overview of regionalist architectures from across the world.

Since the book is sparsely illustrated, with its few black-and-white images concentrated in the later chapters, it requires an expert reader who is able to call to mind the innumerable projects the authors refer to. Nevertheless, a readership of scholars might be disappointed by the book’s structure, which jumps in time and space from one example to the next, leaving unexplored fragments in the middle. The result is that some arguments are very well developed, while others seem very synthetic, and the link between the different pieces is sometimes weak.

The investigation of architectural regionalism goes hand in hand with the story of cultural and political movements which have participated in the regionalist debate. Ironically, this constitutes one of the main contributions of the book, but it also represents a critical difficulty, since the space given to the historical events is out of proportion to the space left for the discussion of individual works of architecture. The authors seem to prefer the former, avoiding deep engagement with the regionalist features of the projects they mention. In this reviewer’s estimation, the book could also have benefited from an introduction to the regionalist lexicon, one that might have stressed the etymological difference between the terms “regional” and “regionalist.” This might have revealed the inner limit of the concept of regionalism, which can only be defined through approximation, not directly.

Overall, the book deserves credit for observing regionalism within a vast critical historical perspective, comparing architecture to cultural and social phenomena. The authors believe that architectural regionalism is a function of political and cultural movements, and they are clearly experts on this topic. For a researcher interested in architectural regionalism, the book provides an interesting and valuable resource, offering new ideas for study. Regionalism emerges as an approach concerned with long-term processes, not mere
forms. Over the centuries, however, this focus has changed, merging with an environmental and ecological view of the world. Thus, in our time it addresses specific problems and priorities different from those of previous eras.

Elisa Brusegan
IUAV University of Venice, Italy


Colonial Frames, Nationalist Histories is an ambitious collection of essays that adds much to the growing body of scholarship on global histories of modern architecture and urbanism. Many of the essays in this volume will be welcome not only by historians of the built environment, but by social and cultural historians of empire, historians of nineteenth-century material and visual culture, and art historians interested in the representation of landscape through photography and illustration. The editors have cast a wide net in an attempt to tease out the ways that the British, and to a lesser extent the French and American, colonial projects shaped the institutions, forms and spaces of a global modernism. One of the innovations that the editors bring to this investigation is to underscore the dialectical character of the colonial encounters, nationalist imaginings, and postcolonial self-fashioning through which modern architecture was forged. By assigning a more vital role to the interconnections between metropole and colony, this collection does much to challenge modernism’s dominant narrative of diffusion, which privileges the European avant-garde as a driving force.

The ten essays here are organized into three sections. The first examines colonial taxonomies and the epistemological foundations of the nation by looking at regimes of knowledge that circulated between metropole and colony. Drawing on nineteenth-century Indian case studies, the three chapters here look at how the architectural profession, travelers’ accounts, and the technologies of printing and photography shaped the formal creation of knowledge and its institutions and the circulation of images and modes of viewing the colony. Bernard S. Cohn’s Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge is a frequent, if sometimes unacknowledged, touchstone in these chapters, which affirm and extend his argument that modern forms of knowledge enabled the British to classify, categorize and bind the vast social world of their colonies, in the interest of controlling it.

The second section looks broadly at what the editors describe as “Imperial Designs and the Nation’s Fragments.” The sustained focus of the first section, bound together by common regional and historical interests, becomes much
These chapters nicely unsettle earlier scholarship on race through urban planning and architectural preservation. In the third chapter in the series, Cecilia Chu unpacks the racialized character of the shophouse typology. Using legal documents, maps, and building plans from the colonial period, she examines how it was deployed in the building of Hong Kong into a modern international city. These three chapters will be of great interest to scholars of race, urban studies, port cities, and preservation and planning.

Mrinalini Rajagopalan’s insightful excavation of literary and visual representations of the Kashmiri Gate in Delhi raises questions not only about her intended subject but about writing histories of global modern architecture in general. Reading Walter Benjamin’s characterization of architecture’s collective reception in a state of distraction as “uncharitable,” Rajagopalan argues that technologies of reproduction transformed the Kashmiri Gate from “mere architecture to a work of art” (pp. 90–91). While this analysis of Benjamin’s foundational essay on the mechanical reproducibility of the work of art doesn’t allow a consideration of the ways in which such technologies made possible the serialization and dissemination of monuments and relics that were taken up as logos of empire and nation, it does point to a crucial problem that architectural history has inherited from the discipline of art history. Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, quotidian and accessible buildings were valuable to political regimes but not to an art history that was driven by a canon that privileged the avant-garde. As the work in this book demonstrates, examining architecture that lies outside of this canon of exceptionalism seems much more important to understanding modernism as a global phenomenon than arguing for the inclusion of additional monuments in an expanded canon.

While this book furthers discussion of race and the built environment, the use of the term “elite” in several chapters points to a lack of more incisive class analysis. A shorthand invented by the political scientists Vilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Mosca in the late nineteenth century, the term “elite” was originally intended to describe those who had power by virtue of merit, not birth (like aristocrats and noblemen), and who controlled positions within longer-term corporate hierarchies. Today, the term seems inadequate for discussing the sometimes competing and sometimes mutually sustaining relationships between different classes in the colonial political economy. A clearer understanding of the ways that a modern comprador class and new, migrant forms of labor circulated in the nineteenth- and twentieth-century world building economy could further illuminate the relationships between the colonial project and the project of modernization.

Lawrence Chua
Hamilton College
In the *Neoliberal Deluge*, editor Cedric Johnson and collaborators critically examine Hurricane Katrina’s 2005 devastation of New Orleans through the lens of neoliberalism. As Johnson argues, “There were many dimensions of this disaster that were not meteorologic at all but rather a consequence of human agency and ideological prerogatives” (p.xix). The book’s main argument hinges on this assertion, and it positions neoliberal governance as the main channel through which these prerogatives were revealed. Of particular concern is neoliberalism’s focus on individual and corporate gain, free-market enterprise, privatization of government services, and limited government.

Johnson and the individual chapter authors argue that public officials at all levels supported these ideals, and thus government’s failure to act quickly was not surprising given decades of public policies and actions facilitating neoliberalism. They further suggest that government’s retrenchment, combined with heightened private-sector participation, created the opportunity for nonprofit organizations to fill the void in social-service provision — disparagingly referred to as “grassroots privatization” or “humanitarian-corporate complex” (p.xxxii). As a result, those residents most in need — the urban poor — suffered acute short-term consequences. These were vividly portrayed in the media at the time, and they are examined here by Paul A. Passavant, who details the lack of public services and government response in the weeks following the hurricane. However, longer-term effects also appeared during the rebuilding efforts. This book shines a spotlight on this “actually existing neoliberalism” (p.xxiv) through case studies across multiple issue areas, including housing, education and immigration.

The book uses an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on scholars from political science, history, sociology, geography, race/ethnic studies, and communications as well as science, technology and society studies. The volume contains four core sections of three chapters each: “Governance,” “Urbanity,” “Planning,” and “Inequality.” The range of topics is to be commended, with several chapters that could be stand-alone readings for graduate- or undergraduate-level courses. A noteworthy chapter that challenges common conceptions of New Orleans along a black/white racial binary is Nicole Trujillo-Pagan’s depiction of Latino construction workers and the challenges they continue to face in terms of worker safety, immigration status, and living environments. Another chapter by Adrienne Dixon draws out the complexities of school closures as a result of the disaster and the subsequent public policy of looking to charter schools as the predominant mode of rebuilding. Dixon argues that families were left with fewer education options while they also searched for limited affordable housing, because the new schools were highly selective as to the students admitted. Two chapters (by Johnson and Barbara L. Allen) also focus on new single-family home-building spearheaded by the private and nonprofit sectors. These highlight the gains that were made, yet they detail a more problematic effect: “such projects obviously entail an ethical commitment to those in need but [they] simultaneously promote market-centric approaches to disaster relief and seek to manage inequality through the inculcation of neoliberal technologies” (p.71).

The book makes some mention of poor urban residents trapped in New Orleans without proper transport. Given the critical nature of this issue in the days and hours immediately before and after the hurricane struck, the volume could have been strengthened through a deeper engagement with transport planning as well as emergency services planning. In addition, it is uneven when it comes to its presentation of research methods and data sources. Thus, in some chapters it was unclear what evidence was used, and how it was collected. Lastly, a final chapter or epilogue would have been useful, setting out the editor’s concluding thoughts and helping tie the preceding chapters together. This could also have included Johnson’s visions, or recommendations, for the future, to help satisfy readers who may be left wondering “What next?” This is especially true in light of the quote from Mark Purcell’s *Recapturing Democracy: Neoliberalization and the Struggle for Alternative Urban Futures* (New York: Routledge, 2008), used to introduce chapter 6 by John Arena (p.152):

> Those who oppose neoliberalization must do more than merely point to its contradictions. . . . We must also find and make known the resistance already taking place. . . . We must understand and learn from their experiences, and we must contribute to their success.

Karen Trapenberg Frick  
University of California, Berkeley