
Arturo Almandoz’s Modernization, Urbanization and Development in Latin America, 1900s–2000s is a tour de force. The ambitious work discusses the birth and development of urbanismo and urban planning in Latin America in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, touching on both the more spatial European influence of the former and the more sociocultural and technical American influence of the latter. It presents a comparative analysis of the evolution of modernization, urbanization and planning in Latin America, which it describes as encompassing “the aggregation of the former Hispanic and Portuguese colonies after their independence in the first decades of the nineteenth century” (p.9).

Almandoz has been cooking this impressive masterpiece for more than two decades while living and conducting research in several countries of the region. The book’s eight chapters focus primarily on five cases — Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Chile and Venezuela — but include examples from other countries, especially Colombia and Peru, and from the former Spanish Caribbean colonies of Cuba and Puerto Rico. The work fills a wide void in general and comparative studies on Latin American modernization and development. With it, Almandoz has propelled urban historiographic scholarship from Latin America into the twenty-first century.

Almandoz’s comparative standpoint is both historical and territorial, and the special attention he pays to cultural change will make the book valuable to “a new field that can be called urban cultural history” (p.5). With careful craftsmanship and well-selected examples he traces “the conversion of positivistic ideals, such as order, progress and civilization, into twentieth-century conceptions of industrialization, urbanization, modernization and, eventually, development” (pp.xi–xii). The book also deliberates on the role of neoliberalism and globalization in the region.

With references to both classic and less-known works, Almandoz weaves political, intellectual and literary discourse together to compose his urban cultural history. He explains that disparate factors led to the region’s stagnation and underdevelopment through the “lost decade” of the 1980s — dictatorships, hyperurbanization, guerilla movements, and conflicts with the United States, to name a few. Despite these forces, however, Almandoz attributes a variety of successes to the project of modernization in the region: better education for the middle and working classes, greater gender equality, constitutional reforms, administrative decentralization, and stronger local governments. Recognizing the present divergent paths of some countries, he points out that social conditions are also converging across the region to reduce poverty and increase literacy — while also producing the challenge of growing urban criminality. Nevertheless, according to his analysis in Chapter 1, “tensions between liberal globalization and populist nationalism challenge the whole notion of development in the subcontinent, much of which is still poverty stricken” (p.11).

In Chapter 2, “Nineteenth-Century Antecedents,” Almandoz begins his historical tour with a sweeping panorama of postcolonial change in the region and the development of bourgeois cities. He convincingly argues that historical tensions between civilization and barbarism were more prevalent in Latin American than in U.S., as projected through conflicts between unionism and federalism, conservatism and liberalism, and capital cit-
ties and provinces. Urban renewal and Europeanism (Hausmännization) were used to modernize colonial settlements in Mexico City, Buenos Aires, Montevideo, Santiago, Rio de Janeiro, and Caracas. On the other hand, sanitary concerns did not spark the same concern for housing reform as in Europe and the U.S., because industrialization was less intense in Latin America.

Chapter 3, “From Arielismo to World War I,” then discusses the tumultuous relationship between Latin America and the U.S. in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including the Monroe Doctrine, Theodore Roosevelt’s “Dollar Diplomacy,” and “Arielismo” — which invoked “the noble spirituality that the young republics of the South should adopt to defend themselves against the utilitarian Caliban lurking in the North” (p.43). The influence of Europe’s Belle Époque began to give way in the 1920s, and Americanization picked up between the two World Wars. The first centenary of Latin American republics also found their bourgeois capitals being transformed into metropolises. Thus, the embellishing of their central districts went hand-in-hand with suburbanization, as the bourgeoisie sought new cosmopolitan styles, including garden-city principles.

In Chapter 4, “Good Neighbourhood, Masificación and Urbanism,” Almandoz examines how, in the interwar period, Latin America underwent a transition toward the welfare state and progress in political rights and citizenship, despite some turbulence. At the time, urban-renewal projects in city centers and mass housing also contrasted with the emergence of self-built settlements on steep slopes and on the urban periphery, which accentuated socio-spatial segregation. In the late 1920s, universities in Chile, Mexico, Brazil and Argentina introduced the earliest courses in urban planning and design, and planning administrations started in a few metropolises of the region. Foreign advisors, mostly of European descent (e.g., Alfred Agache, Henri Prost, Maurice Rotival, and Le Corbusier) also had an influence; and although many of these plans were ultimately unrealized, they were influential in establishing the tradition of urbanismo among professionals and academics.

Chapter 5, “Developmentalism, Modernism and Planning,” takes on the transition from urbanismo to planning, which involved epistemic, technical and spatial transformations propelled by post-World War II Americanization. But Almandoz convincingly demonstrates that an imbalance between urbanization and the productive sector ultimately frustrated the developmental “take-off” of most Latin American nations in the mid-twentieth century. Hyperurbanization, underindustrialization, and the underdevelopment of agriculture created a surplus population in cities — a population which ended up living in slums and working in the informal economy. All the while, the alliance between governments and modernist architects, following CIAM principles, produced impressive university campuses, housing projects, and government buildings.

“Between Cold War and Third World,” Chapter 6, discusses the variegated and tumultuous experience of Latin American countries during this period, including the rise of anti-imperialist and revolutionary movements. Urban-development debate and practice focused on issues of concentration and primacy, migration and poverty, the school of dependence, a culture of poverty and marginality, and problems of exclusion and insufficient housing. As discussed in Chapter 7, “Dismantling a Model,” however, the state-led model of development that had prevailed in the region since the 1930s gave way in the late 1970s to the advent of political dictatorships, an oil crisis, and economic neoliberalism. Neoliberal reforms, in particular, accentuated trends of informal economy, poverty, and socio-spatial inequality. In this context, strategic planning, decentralization, territorial restructuring, and peripheral globalization had both positive and negative implications.

Almandoz ends with an ambitious concluding chapter, “New Century and Old Demons.” In his words, “[h]aving recently celebrated two centuries of republican life, most Latin American republics, now demographically urbanized, still face the dilemma of whether modernization and development are to be attained through free-market or state-oriented models” (p.187). This fundamental dispute is indeed at the heart of recent electoral results in Argentina and Venezuela and debates over impeachment in Brazil. After more than a decade of state-oriented development, this ideological rivalry is not over in the region, and will continue to determine the future of its modernization, urbanization and development.

Clara Inzábal
Columbia University

Drawing upon 35 years of experience, this book is a comprehensive primer to the professional practice of heritage conservation. While this field is burgeoning — with university programs, scholarly literature, and professional associations proliferating around the world — there is a curious lack of practical advice for the fledgling practitioner going about the hands-on business of conserving a historic place. Harold Kalman’s book attempts to fill that void. Organized in a straightforward and accessible manner, with handsome illustrations and a generous use of real-life examples, it provides a clear overview of how to manage change at historic places. With its focus on built heritage, it will appeal particularly to architects and planners — though it was written with a wider audience with mind, such as archaeologists, lawyers, and, indeed, anyone with a role in the increasingly multidisciplinary process of heritage conservation.

The book’s main thrust is to help readers become familiar with the principles and processes of values-based conservation (or values-based management, as it is alternatively known). Kalman traces in brief how values-based conservation has gained momentum as the primary approach — within certain circles — to heritage conservation in the last twenty-plus years. Enshrined in professional guidelines and normative frameworks ranging from the Australian Burra Charter (1979, revised 1999) to the Operational Guidelines of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, this has largely supplanted the older approach codified in the 1964 Venice Charter. In that more conservative model, expert preservationists were charged with finding technical solutions to keeping physical fabric intact. The contemporary view is based on the notion that each heritage place has an ensemble of sometimes dissonant values — aesthetic, social, scientific, etc. — which must be teased out from a wide group of stakeholders. The heritage significance of a place must today be negotiated and defined on the basis of these values, and the job of the heritage practitioner is to help craft a process to identify these and manage subsequent change.

In Part 2 of the book, Kalman deftly guides the reader through the role of the heritage practitioner as facilitator rather than all-knowing expert. He introduces the various steps of understanding a heritage place — from conducting historical research, physical investigation, and community-engagement exercises to identifying heritage values and assessing heritage significance. In the following section, on managing change, he then instructs readers how to define goals for heritage conservation, identify appropriate uses for historic places, select conservation treatments, apply appropriate tools and incentives, including heritage impact assessments, and develop and implement a conservation plan.

It should be noted that values-based conservation has gained operational traction primarily within those countries from which Kalman draws his examples (and in which he gained his professional experience) — namely, Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. In reality, conservation decisions in many countries are still largely undertaken on the basis of technical solutions to structural- or material-conservation problems. Even the global behemoth of World Heritage only officially adopted statements of significance as a linchpin of site management in 2005. Increasingly, however, with the infiltration of ICOMOS and other professional conservation bodies into professional discourse and practice, an ever-increasing number of countries are adopting at least the language of values-based conservation. This book will be useful in helping practitioners in these places make the leap of putting words into practice — assuming that values-based conservation remains the dominant mode in the field.

With regard to this latter point, this reviewer would like to note that the book is largely a distillation of developments that took place up to the turn of the millennium, and that it draws largely from a British legal framework, with extensive case studies from the author’s own practice in North America. The first half of the book, which covers principles, does provide tantalizing, yet brief nods to some of the new developments that are embattling the field: the growing vociferousness of critical scholars whose work has questioned assumptions about heritage practice as is; new challenges and responses from Asia and other locations grappling with heritage in forms and cultural contexts unfamiliar to the West; and the increasing popularity of new heritage frameworks, particularly those related to the historic urban landscape or to intangible cultural heritage, which call for treating heritage places according to a more holistic framework.

For instance, the book counsels practitioners to deploy intangible cultural heritage as fodder for interpreting heritage places. But there is growing recognition that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in its own right enriches the continuity and transmission of cultural identity. This is particularly relevant within living historic places. Moreover, methodologies for dealing with intangible cultural heritage privilege the role of communities above all else, and this view calls into question the role of the heritage practitioner as it currently exists — and is presented in this book.

To be fair, the author issues a disclaimer early on that these entanglements will largely not be addressed here. And
so it is to be expected that a diverse range of philosophical heritage issues, principles, and practical methodologies were not included. That said, the author also does not mention some of the shortcomings of the values-based conservation approach that have been raised within the author’s own school of heritage practice. One in particular is the high transaction cost of formulating a site’s significance, which makes it difficult to revise it as circumstances, stakeholders or values change. And this, in turn, renders management regimes rather less flexible than they should ideally be. Given the new conundrums facing the heritage field today, this reviewer wishes Kalman had taken on a few of these knotty issues, which would have broadened the relevance of his book and extended its life in a more forward-looking manner.

Montira Horayangura Unakul
UNESCO Bangkok


The scope of this book is at once expansive and focused. In it, Michael Jenson attempts to map the forces and agents of globalization involved in the production of architecture, and present a toolkit for architects who are, or will be, practicing in this realm. The underlying critique here is clearly aimed at those who work within the reductive framework of the Modern Movement, as limited by globalization.

Yet, in many senses, Jenson’s book is also one of observation, as many of the events he describes have already come to pass. He identifies deterritorialization — aided by advancements in transport technology and the advent of cyberspace — as globalization’s most profound impact on modern society. The book’s running theme is that architects need to reconstruct their interpretive frames of reference if they are to intellectually grasp the complexity and influence of these forces.

Focusing on the agency, meaning, and ethical context of contemporary architecture, the book’s central figure is the global architect — vis-à-vis modes of practice and fields of operation, the representation of the discipline, and contemporary methods of training, knowledge acquisition, and the formation of design ideas. Toward this end, the book’s ten chapters are organized around three theoretical frames: (I) practice, (II) representation, and (III) education. Yet Jenson also offers the reader the option of engaging with his material in no particular order. This is in some ways logical: six of the chapters were written as independent essays in architectural and interdisciplinary publications, and they point to the wide range of issues involved in, and the forces influencing, architecture’s role in the twenty-first century.

By way of introduction, Jenson acknowledges the problematic nature of globalization by identifying and locating the production of architecture within two divergent views — real and ideal, cynicism and exuberance. He then makes a case for the globalized architect expanding beyond the conventional architectural project to engage with the social and political sphere. The architect must be an artful visionary who can master a form of political persuasiveness to work in multiple fields. More importantly, he or she must be sensitive and empathetic to conditions of alterity or difference.

Jenson turns to philosophy to provide the methodology by which architecture may become more adept at addressing the complex social, economic and cultural networks defining global events. In the first frame, he explores its potential (through Heidegger’s phenomenology) to develop broader architectural agendas that better navigate the complexities of a globalizing world. He argues that such a return to a consciousness of architectural production might reduce unforeseen collateral damage to cultural constructs and individuals. In the Anthropocene, this would likewise imply a more equitable relationship between nature and humanity.

In the subsequent frames, Jenson explores how globalization influences politics, culture, and economic conditions through architectural modes of operation. Using specific examples from America and China, he likewise examines how globalization affects how contemporary architects think and act on the built environment. Seeking a contextual, contingent and particular kind of architecture, Jenson critiques the rhetoric of the International Style, and he ultimately proposes replacing Le Corbusier’s Five Points of Architecture with his own five-point “manifesto” for a modern, globalized architecture: 1) more involvement in the building process and more inclusive building integration; 2) redefinition of monumentality beyond scale and style; 3) development of an ethical attitude and methods of technological implementation; 4) the integration of technology into the design process; and 5) the cultivation of an integrative construction and design ethic.

In the final frame, Jenson discusses the importance of economic cycles and their effect on urban infrastructure. The chapters here are directed toward a reconceptualization of architecture and design as “an operational mode of an interpretive situatedness.” For Jenson, BIM (building information management) technology signifies the global phase of studio culture, whereby the reflexive space of architectural
education is continually dislocated, allowing the full complexity of design and construction to become visible. He argues for an architect who can translate culture and orchestrate economic and material expertise.

The illustrations in the book tell a particular and parallel story. Interestingly, its survey of this global topic reflects an unusually strong visual emphasis on Chinese urbanism, including analysis of Thames Town on the outskirts of Shanghai and the *hutongs* in Beijing. In this regard, it seems Jenson could not avoid the pitfalls of oversimplification and cultural essentialism. For example, he criticizes the fetish for anything Western in China, which leads to writing off Thames Town as inauthentic, and is simply another colonial lens. In fact, the Chinese city is at once a problematic and promising site for innovation and critique. Notwithstanding, Jenson’s work is productive in checking the histories perpetuated by architects, historians, developers, institutions and governments — and as propagated by publications such as the *Global Architecture* (GA) series founded in Tokyo in the 1970s.

Jenson’s exploration of utopian vision in the global age calls for radical change in the mindset of the architect — to innovate a form of practice that is inclusive and interdisciplinary. Among architects operating in strange places around the world in the past two decades, this innovation has arguably already occurred. Yet this book is a good reminder that such an architect must be a knowledgeable, open-minded, and highly adaptable figure. Such a view also begs a more rigorous definition of inclusivity, an unpacking of interdisciplinarity, and an exploration of the physical and conceptual limits of these frameworks. Taking the necessary steps towards globally equitable relationships and a global design consciousness, architects need to persist in learning how to navigate transcultural collaborations and mindsets.

**Eunice Seng**

*University of Hong Kong*

---


Undoubtedly, a book about borders seems necessary in a time of planetary urbanization, when frontiers have become key elements for comprehending present-future cities. Carolyn Loeb and Andreas Luescher came up with the idea for this book after co-chairing a session at a 2012 conference in Detroit. Each of its twelve chapters provides an interesting perspective on borders. Loeb and Luescher have organized them into three primary sections (“The Border as a Line through Space,” “Border Buildings,” and “Spatial Ambiguity and (Dis)Embodied Memory”), plus an introduction. Even though not all the chapters are written to rigorous academic standards, and the selected study cases are geographically biased, I consider it worth mentioning them all to put most of the ever-changing global border features on the *TDSR* reader’s table. However, let me explain my strategy:

“No traditional” reviewers of such an edited volume prioritize personal opinion to establish which chapters are better than others — or if it’s even worthwhile to read the book. Although this may be helpful, most people interested in such books are researchers or scholars seeking information. For them, such volumes play the role of conversational partners, with whom they can “talk” to enrich ideas, organize seminars and projects, and transform hypotheses. These kind of readers move beyond obvious limits; they “dance” in a border zone. Hence, a review of such a book should provide more of a safety net, a map-guide that allows the construction of ongoing maps, where common gestures become the elements of the network. Thus, one book could be many volumes — and the book in question could be at least two. The first is the original one that begins with chapter 1 and ends with chapter 12. But this reader would like to change the chapter order to create a more “accurate” conversational partner. This other book would be organized thus: [Ch.8] [Ch.2] [Ch.1] [Ch.9] [Ch.6] [Ch.12] [Ch.7] [Ch.11] [Ch.5] [Ch.3] [Ch.10] [Ch.4]

In contemporary times, the Berlin Wall is the benchmark for talking about borders, so it seems appropriate to start with the two chapters that consider its legacy. Julia Walker’s “In the View from Above: Reading Reunified Berlin” [Ch.8] suggests the idea of intangible frontiers beyond material borders, concentrating on the 1992 reunification
project for Berlin. The main concept of this project was “allegory,” meaning the contradictory joining of cohesion and spread. Hence, the frontier remains “empty space,” even after integration. The Wall was replaced with border-buildings not integrated into the city but elements of the same vague limit line. In the other Berlin chapter, “Occupying No Man’s Land in the Lenné Triangle: Space, Spectacle, and Politics in the Shadow of the Berlin Wall” [Ch.2], Kristin Poling emphasizes the border places in the outline of a wall frontier. She explains how material borders are virtually normalized, and how they can shift the dynamics of using or redefining the urban politics of everyday life. Border-walls recast the spaces around them, re-creating mental and physical frontiers beyond their actual existence. In the end, the reflected shadow seems more important than the border itself.

Moving on, one of Conor McGrady’s pieces, “Division and Enclosure: Frankie Quinn’s Peaceline Panorama Photographs” [Ch.1], next analyzes frontiers as barriers which, in some cases, create a separation marked by the “perpetual other.” Using Quinn’s work on the Irish peace process, McGrady brings attention to the monolithic walls, known as Peacelines. Although walls leave a scar on those who live within their immediacy, they can also be used as indicators of progress (or the lack thereof) in urban reintegration. Tina Potocnik’s “Gorizia and Nova Gorica: One Town in Two European Countries” [Ch.9] then examines another city divided as the result of geopolitics. After World War II, the “original” city of Gorizia was separated between Italy and Yugoslavia. The new border assigned the urban center of Gorizia to Italy and the suburbs to the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. With the center beyond the border, Yugoslavia’s government decided to build a new town close to the old one. And the frontier provided a point of departure for this project, a mirror for the simulacra. Gorizia thus became two different cities based in nostalgia: one invented the center, the other the periphery. The new frontier emphasizes that borders, as instruments of political power, are always about in/out.

David Monteyne’s chapter, “Pier 21 and the Production of Canadian Immigration” [Ch.6], next explains that piers work as gates in geographical borders. The architectural artifact indicates outside/inside zones, the perception of which is determined by spatial experience — meaning the ongoing negotiation between everyday life, memory, and the built environment. “There is such a terrible oppression coming over me. I am afraid to go up those steps . . .” (p.109). But architecture is only the physical and old face of multiple boundaries that make up contemporary national frontiers. During the time that immigrants spend in these border-buildings, they cross different levels of outsideness before they can reach the “inside.” Conor McGrady’s second piece, “The NSK State and the Collective Imaginary” [Ch.12], then investigates deterritorialized spaces, abstract places without tangible borders — for example, any social organism. Here, identity works as boundary. In the chapter that follows, “Bordering on Peace: Spatial Narratives of Border Crossings between Israel, Jordan and Egypt” [Ch.7], Eric and Yael Aronoff analyze the narratives created across borders, while arguing that borders constitute liminal spaces. They ultimately suggest that there is a narrative built beyond constructing identities of within and without, a narrative of the crossing itself.

“Mediterranean Frontiers: Ontology of a Bounded Space in Crisis” [Ch.11], by Antonio Petrov, next proposes a new territorial order: an “idea of borders in which the chalk circles are constantly traced . . .” (p.228). Focusing on the Mediterranean as a complex region, Petrov uses Sabine Sörgel’s and Rem Koolhaas’s alternative conceptions to suggest that a specific region is always a simultaneous expression of territorial conditions and of the inhabitants who built it. Richard Kurdiovsky’s “House Number 1: The Vienna Hofburg’s Multiple Borders” [Ch.5] then provides an overview of the relation between border-buildings and wall-frontiers. Working as functional barriers that divide “spaces of elites from those of people of subordinate status” (p.89), for example, the Hofburg separates the city of Vienna from its peripheries. Considering this context, Kurdiovsky suggests that border-buildings can be both crossable or completely closed. This is followed by Garth Myers’ chapter, “Remaking the Edges: Surveillance and Flows in Sub-Saharan Africa’s New Suburbs” [Ch.3], which analyzes gated communities as security borders built along African cities. Myers emphasizes the colonial influence in this safekeeping strategy, which is designed to maintain control over expanding periurban informal settlements. Here, what walls and gates keep out are the nodes that connect the entire region.

The next essay, “New Urban Frontiers: Periurbanization and (Re)territorialization in Southeast Asia” [Ch.10], by Michael Leaf, suggests overcoming the idea of monolithic borders and welcoming the multiple and shifting frontiers represented by periurban regions. Leaf argues that in a globalizing world, city borders are constantly redrawn as rural areas are reterritorialized as urban zones; thus, changeability is inherent to the idea of border. This phenomenon could represent new forms of urbanism. Finally, Giovanna Guidicini’s “Imagining and Staging an Urban Border: The Role of the Netherbow Gate in Early Modern Edinburg” [Ch.4] walks the reader through the first use of a wall-gate, emphasizing its double role as a dividing element as well as a joint. Guidicini argues that city gates were places where community activities took place and civic identity was expressed. During the early Modern period a gateway thus represented a link between the realities that it delimited: borders were flexible areas of exchange between inside and outside.

How better to conclude than by reimagining the lyrics to “History of Everything” by the Canadian rock band Barenaked Ladies, the theme song for the popular television series “Big Bang Theory”: 
Our whole universe was in an urban state,
Then sedentary process started. Wait . . .
Gatherers and hunters, proto-cities, agriculture
Villages — cities — citadels
We built a wall,
Cultural interchange, civic identity, gates,
Center-periphery, outside, inside,
geopolitical divisions, outside again
flexible borders, settlements as frontiers
Urban revolutions unraveling the mystery
That all can be restarted with another big bang . .

Diana Maldonado
Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo Léon, México


This volume is an important contribution that fills a glaring gap in literature on the theory and practice of Indigenous architecture. The authors, Janet McGaw and Anoma Pieris, are scholars based at the School of Architecture at the University of Melbourne, in the southeastern Australian state of Victoria. The geographical relevance of this association is that the book moves between three distinct spatial scales of analysis — Victoria, Aboriginal Australia, and an international sweep of connected case studies from the U.S.A., Canada, France, Finland, and New Zealand.

The title, Assembling the Centre, refers partly to the design of Indigenous cultural centers, but also to the role of such centers in metropolitan settings. Chapter 3 raises an important theme: that Indigenous groups from the major capitals and regional cities (Victoria being a prime example) need such a base to assemble and transmit their cultural identity. Their problem to date has been their relative inability to effectively make land or native-title claims under current Australian law due to a deep colonial history of alienation of traditional owners from urbanized land tenure. The authors argue for the increased significance and economic feasibility of a metropolitan cultural center as a vehicle for establishing a process of cultural revitalization for such people. This is in contrast to the situation of Indigenous people in the more rural and remote parts of Australia, where traditional connection to country has often been better maintained, but where there is less economic viability for establishing a self-sustaining cultural center (even though little empirical evidence is presented for this proposition).

McGaw and Pieris set out a challenging set of four research questions for the book:

What are the politics and processes of Indigenous place-making in settler cities? How is place territorialised, de-territorialised and re-territorialised? How is (Indigenous) social identity constructed in settler-colonial nations and how is this represented in architecture? And what processes are neglected in the production of architecture for Indigenous cultural centres? (p.8).

The book examines architectural representations of Indigeneity in chapters derived from the architectural-practice topics of “Land,” “Programme,” “(Im)materialities,” and “Skin.” The one-word title of each chapter is followed by three different catchy subtitle words in each case, and these embody subject metaphors for a three-step theoretical argument in each chapter about cultural change in general in Aboriginal Australia (albeit with some divergence to international examples and often a narrowing focus on Melbourne or Victoria). The cultural-change analyses mostly follow the pattern of the situations in (a) the classical Aboriginal time period, (b) the colonial period, and (c) the postcolonial period, when Aboriginal rights and self-identity become somewhat strengthened. Within this structural framework, the authors attempt to portray the material and expressive practices of Indigenous architecture using a particular set of thematic arguments:

Site is reconsidered through Indigenous understandings of land; programme is reconsidered through Indigenous concepts of time; materiality is reconfigured through temporal cycles from emergence to disappearance; and surfaces are considered in relation to the bodies they inscribe (p.183).

Each of these analyses culminates in two detailed case studies of Indigenous cultural centers (or related facilities or installations), which aim to further elucidate the particular chapter theme. However, the reader will find varying success in the engagement and/or fit of particular case studies with these architectural themes.

The fourteen case studies, each about five to seven pages long, include one from each of the aforementioned countries as well as eight from Aboriginal Australia. Readers are likely to be familiar with the international examples — such as the Te Papa Museum in Wellington, the Musée du Quai Branly in Paris, the Sami Cultural Center in Inari, Finland; the National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, D.C.;
and the National Museum of Australia in Canberra. But the lesser-known Australian case studies will also be of interest. One limitation here is that the case studies largely draw upon existing literature sources (published and unpublished) rather than new empirical sources (with some exceptions). The lack of Indigenous voices evaluating the success or non-success of the case studies is also a weakness (there are a few exceptions). The potential power of the case studies is in their assemblage to contribute to the overall theoretical analysis, rather than making a strong new contribution to scholarship on these individual projects.

A number of Aboriginal voices are heard in the theoretical sections, albeit in modest doses. These include Dillon Kombumerri, the Sydney-based architect from the Yugambah people of southeast Queensland who for some years led the Merrima group, the first all-indigenous architectural practice in Australia; Bruce Pascoe of the Bunorong people of Victoria, who is also the author of the controversial Dark Emu, Black Seeds (Magabala Books, 2014); and Carroll Go-Sam, an Aboriginal architectural research scholar from the Jirdabal people of the northern rainforest.

Along with various other publications, this book was generated from an Australian government competitive research grant. Another of these publications is Indigenous Place: Contemporary Buildings, Landmarks and Places of Significance in South East Australia and Beyond (Indigenous Architecture and Design Victoria and University of Melbourne, 2014). That volume had a similar geographic centricty, with the balance of place units oriented to the southeast of the continent. Assembling the Centre can also be seen as a companion to J.M. Molnar and F. Vodvarka’s New Architecture on Indigenous Lands (University of Minnesota Press, 2013), which deals with case studies only from North America, but which is far more handsomely illustrated.

Most scholars of tradition and environments will find something of interest in Assembling the Centre, whether it be the anthropological theory, the cultural-studies theory (albeit at times full of wordy terms, especially in Chapter 1), or the case studies. For my part, I was interested in Chapter 4 with its emphasis on the integration of hybrid economies into cultural-center projects. I was disappointed, though, that the book failed to deal convincingly with the period of the 1970s, when the first indigenous cultural centers and “keeping places” emerged following a shift in national policy from assimilation to self-determination. In relation to this critical period, various key references are also omitted, including Preserving Indigenous Cultures: A New Role for Museums, the proceedings of a regional UNESCO seminar in 1978, which included presentations from around the Pacific Rim (Australian Government Publishing Service, 1980).


There is considerable scholarship on the close relationship between modern art and architecture, particularly how movements such as Cubism, De Stijl, Suprematism, and Constructivism influenced modern architecture’s spatial, aesthetic and material attributes. However, the relationship between modern architecture and photography remains inadequately investigated.

Claire Zimmerman’s book is a worthy addition to this literature and may help raise the profile of scholarship in this area.

There are several existing investigations of the relationship between architecture and photography that deserve mention. Among these are the Canadian Centre for Architecture’s \textit{Photography and Architecture}, 1839–1939 (Callaway Editions, 1982); Andrew Higgott and Timothy Wray’s \textit{Camera Constructs: Photography, Architecture and the Modern City} (Ashgate, 2012); Neil Levine’s “The Template of Photography in Nineteenth-Century Architectural Representation,” \textit{Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians}, 2012; and Maria Antonella Pelizzari’s \textit{Traces of India: Photography, Architecture, and the Politics of Representation}, 1850–1900 (Yale University Press, 2003). These works focus on images as signifiers, the ideological power of architectural photographs in the service of capitalism and colonialism, and the relationship between building and drawings. They are by and large predicated upon the photograph as a signer and the underlying practices and politics of the photographic representation.

\textit{Photographic Architecture in the Twentieth Century} goes beyond these concerns to explore how the scopic regimes of photography have actually transformed the visual, aesthetic, spatial and material practices of architecture. Zimmerman thus contradicts the historiographical notion that buildings and their images operate in different realms. Instead, she sets out to demonstrate how the production and consumption of photographs shaped particular moments and practices in the history of modern architecture, from the early twentieth century to the 1960s.

Zimmerman uses the term “Photographic Architecture” to analyze how the spatial, planar and material transformation of architecture by means of new construction technologies and materiality — particularly large planar surfaces and huge expanses of plate glass — lends itself to cinematic and

\textit{Paul Memmott}  
Aboriginal Environments Research Centre, University of Queensland
photographic effects. Using Mies van Der Rohe’s Barcelona Pavilion and Tugendhat House as objects of analysis, she thus attempts to blur the divide between architecture as an object that operates in the realm of spatiality and materiality and the photograph as a representational object that operates in the optical and chemical sphere.

This leitmotif constitutes the first of the three sections of the book. The second and the third sections are then devoted to the question of how modern architecture’s production, representation, trans-Atlantic circulation, and reception intersected with changing technologies of architecture and photography in the interwar and postwar period.

In particular, Zimmerman investigates the impacts of the internalization of commercial photography into architectural practice. She demonstrates how compositional norms and the optical constraints of the camera shaped new ways of spatial perception and consumption of architecture. And she richly illustrates her analysis with more than 150 black-and-white photos that trace the trajectory of modernism from Germany to the Bauhaus émigrés in the United States, and finally the Smithsons and James Stirling in England.

In Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media (MIT Press, 1994) Beatriz Colomina inaugurated scholarly inquiry into the way modern architecture has been epistemologically and ontologically defined by modern media. Zimmerman carries this line of inquiry forward with a vanguardist approach that makes a strong case for the transformative agency of photographs.

Photographic Architecture in the Twentieth Century is a delightful tour de force that examines the interdisciplinary relationship between photography and architecture. Its themes include the optical advancements in the technologies of cameras and the industrialization of architecture, the epistemic regimes of photography and the spatial and material transformation of architecture, and the tremendous power photographs exert on architectural design as a consequence of their mobility and capacity to provoke the imagination. This book, of great intellectual rigor, is an outstanding contribution to the field of architectural history, history of photography, media studies, and art history.

Vandana Baweja
University of Florida


In this richly illustrated volume, Annabel Wharton, the William B. Hamilton Professor of Art History at Duke University, presents a collection of essays on buildings and their tortured pasts. Roughly half the examples are set in Jerusalem, the subject of her earlier Selling Jerusalem: Relics, Replicas, Theme Parks (University of Chicago Press, 2006) — a place she describes as having “a longer history of trauma than any other continuously inhabited city in the world.” None of the structures described here can be found in standard surveys. Rather, they serve as case studies and demonstration pieces for a different approach to the history of the built environment, one aptly hinted at in the book’s provocative subtitle.

In the case of the Cloisters Museum in Manhattan, for example, readers learn about the gaping wounds that the transfer of architectural remnants that was used to create it left at their places of origin — largely dismantled European monasteries. Their reassembly at the north end of Manhattan island, financed by John D. Rockefeller Jr., created a vaguely monastic space, but its incoherence deprives the exhibited works of art and relics of a convincing environment. The Palestine Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem, also financed by John D. Rockefeller Jr. and opened in the same year (1938), provides another case study. Established under the authority of the British Mandate, it is now, the author tells us, the victim of intractable political conflicts that stifle urban development in East Jerusalem — frozen “in a cataleptic coma . . . dying from paralysis.” On tourists’ itineraries, it has long been eclipsed by the Israel Museum, with Fredrick Kiesler’s Shrine of the Book and James Carpenter’s sensible recent extension.

Another case study deals with the Hostal de los Reyes Católicos in Santiago de Compostela, the old royal hospital, transformed under the fascist dictator Francisco Franco in the late 1930s into a luxury hotel (destroying much of the original fabric in the process). It still operates as such today, as does another building Wharton describes, the Palestinian house of Rabbah Effendi al-Husseini. Located in one of the first neighborhoods built outside the walls of the Old City of Jerusalem in the 1860s, it was originally occupied by one
of the most prominent Palestine families of the city. The building’s function later shifted several times, however—at some point it even housed a messianic Christian commune. It is now the five-star American Colony Hotel. According to Wharton, the building has not fallen victim to Jerusalem’s “urban toxicity.” Instead, it has managed to “sustain the well-remembered past” rather than mask it, performing “hospitably in a deeply inhospitable city.”

In another chapter readers also learn about the German Colony in Jerusalem. Originally built by an extremist Lutheran sect in the nineteenth century, it is now one of the city’s most prestigious and sought-after neighborhoods. Wharton also discusses Meah Shearim, the famous Orthodox quarter, designed at the same time (also by a German Protestant), but today the most introverted and unwelcoming area of the entire city.

A long, well-observed chapter looks at the current state of the Las Vegas strip—not its architecture per se, but the way its spaces are actually used. And a final chapter introduces a number of video games. One is “Assassin’s Creed,” whose treatment of Jerusalem not only reveals the delightful influence of the nineteenth-century Orientalist painter David Roberts in its hauntingly beautiful graphics, but also exhibits its designers’ underlying political assumptions (and/or ignorance). Wharton also observes how one of the two Domes of the Rock in the online playground “Second Life” was constructed by the Israel Department of Tourism. Even here, she points out, buildings “are political agents.”

These are all well-researched and entertainingly written pieces that make a convincing argument for considering “the whole of [a building’s] history”—its “biography.” Architectural historians, Wharton claims, have tended to focus exclusively “on a building’s origin and its ur-form.” Yet, even if this point is well taken, it should be noted that the field has evolved in recent years to include noncanonical buildings, document buildings’ entire lifespans, and engage other disciplines such as history, sociology, anthropology, etc.

The weakest part of the book is the theoretical framework meant to hold these examples together. The titles for the book’s three sections—“Death,” “Disease,” and “Addiction”—seem forced. Likewise, its central claim, ascribing “agency to buildings,” to make the case “that buildings exert a force on the world, independent of human intention or even human consciousness,” remains unconvincing. An astute observer, careful historian, and skillful writer, Wharton is least sure-footed when endeavoring to theorize her material. Her claims for a “posthistorical” or “posthuman” present come across as too facile—as does the suggestion that Gaston Bachelard’s “phenomenology liquidates the past.”

In her final chapter, Wharton valiantly provides a tour d’horizon of spatial theories (even “thing theory”) in the writings of Heidegger, Deleuze and Guattari, Habermas, Lefebvre, and Foucault. But she ultimately concedes that “theory” can be just as much “a hindrance to understanding” as a “provocation to thinking.” Indeed, the delightful and richly annotated essays in this volume make their arguments and methodology perfectly clear on their own.

Dietrich Neumann
Brown University

The House, the home, or the in-between?

Dichotomies or binary oppositions of public/private, house/home, male/female, transformation/adaptation, genuine past/declining present, introvert/extervert, homogenous/disrepair, generosity/poverty are the recurring themes in this work. Mohamed Gamal Abdelmonem provides an in-depth account of Cairo’s alleyways (hawari) and an in-depth socio-spatial analysis that highlights the mechanisms of organization of daily human experience. He thus clearly identifies the relationship between Cairene value systems, social networks, and everyday spatial practices.

In these enclaves of medieval Cairo the quality of life has traditionally been determined by the relationship between socio-spatial diversity and a highly fragmented urban fabric. But, rather than reminisce about their history and present decay, Abdelmonem proposes to learn about city form by studying how their essence as places emerged from a dialectic of physical space and social relations. Similar to Lefebvre’s observations about “the right to the city,” in these hawari, it was a “right to difference” that produced authentic experience, and that “liberated” defensible territory. It was their very in-between quality — between the public and private spheres — that created conditions for waves of events that constructed inherent memories.

As an urban historian, Abdelmonem is successful here in harnessing the tendency to view the past as pure, authentic and religious. Instead, he intertwines historic scholarship with a view of the present as meaningful, systematic, and rich with internal organization. Is it the individual or collective memory that shapes these spaces? Is it the humans or the houses that shape the built environment? His approach to such questions is comprehensive and interdisciplinary in that it combines analysis of archival records and deeds with first-hand socio-spatial mapping of everyday activities. The result is a snapshot of the contemporary Cairene “life story.”

He further challenges notions of the house as enclosed and isolated, exploring how it merges with outside public space. It is such an “archaeological” study of ordinary people that allows him to show how their lives infuse the environment with meaning, character, and a sense of identity.

Although the focus of this book is clearly on the historical development of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Cairene homes, an extensive portion of the book also considers the concept of home and the role of architects in this process. Abdelmonem’s comprehensive account of the production of houses, while taking away from the overall interdisciplinary nature of the work, clarifies the complexity of its form and components. Following the lead of Hassan Fathy, Christopher Alexander, and Peter Hubner, he refers to architects as “agents of change.” However, he also regards the actions and interactions of users as being the force that drives human-building interaction. From extending coffeehouses, to hosting commercial activities, to preparing for weddings and displaying the bride’s mattresses and furniture in the street, residents of these areas have traditionally blurred the boundary between private and public space and created an array of different social spheres.

The novelist Naguib Mahfouz is a key player and actor in this work. For many Cairenes and scholars of Cairo, the city comes to life best through his writings. It is through interpretation of his vivid descriptions of social and built environments that many residents have come to appreciate their city — and in some cases combine their experiences with his. Abdelmonem adds another layer to this dynamic by merging Mahfouz’s rich work with “ordinary” inhabitants “real” experiences. In some cases, one wonders if Mahfouz was not the one being interviewed, or interacting with present-day inhabitants of Cairo.

Abdelmonem’s analysis of the social activities and spatial organization of “the architecture of home” in Cairo enriches understanding of both interior and exterior domestic space in this vibrant city. The Cairene home is not just a physical boundary; it is also a set of social spheres that redefine and interpret the meaning of architecture. Do buildings decay? Do our memory of buildings fade? Or do we generate and associate them with new identities?

Heba Farouk Ahmed
Cairo University