
Stuart Elden, a political geographer from Durham University, opens his book with a reference to a television broadcast in which an unidentified U.S. president addresses the American people about air strikes taken abroad in response to terrorist attacks. “My fellow Americans, our battles against terrorism did not begin with the bombing ... nor will it end with today's strike. It will require strength, courage, and endurance. We will not yield to this threat. We will meet it, no matter how long it may take. This will be a long, ongoing struggle between freedom and fanaticism; between the rule of law and terrorism” (p.xi). As Elden demonstrates, this address could have been given either by George Bush, in the wake of the 9/11 attacks, or Ronald Reagan, perhaps after launching air strikes on Libya in 1986. However, the words were actually spoken by President Bill Clinton in 1998 after the bombing of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. What Elden thus makes clear is that searching for the origins of “the war on terror” is not only complicated but an incredibly misguided task. Where does one begin? Is there a beginning?

In this book, Elden seeks to understand how it is that states define certain acts as terrorism when they themselves employ terror as part of their strategic response to it. In the course of five chapters and a coda, he provides an in-depth analysis of the war on terror through a genealogy of territory as well as its connections to sovereignty, violence and power. As the title might indicate, the term “territory” is much more complicated than it seems; and certainly after reading this book, Elden will convince you of it.

Using September 11, 2001, as a starting point, one of Eldon’s purposes is to deconstruct Western conceptions and images of terrorism. These include weak states (particularly those that harbor terrorists), neocolonialist ideas of “democracy promotion” and “freedom,” and neoconservative geopolitical theories that effectively rationalize certain acts as “terrorism.” He also makes the point that while the “war on terror” has been largely defined as a “deterritorialized” threat (on the basis that agents of terrorism, such as Al-Qaeda, operate through multiple geographies and employ a decentralized network), it has been fought, justified and strategized in very specific places. To borrow from Benjamin Barber’s 2004 Fear’s Empire: War, Terrorism, and Democracy (New York: W.W. Norton), it is this “tortured logic” that illuminates the ways in which territory informs the contemporary dynamics of sovereignty. It is also this that Barber was referring to when he wrote that the United States prefers the states it can locate and vanquish to the terrorists it cannot find.

The relationship between territory and sovereignty is the real challenge of this book — and what makes Elden’s analysis particularly compelling. He argues that territory provides the “container within which sovereignty is said to operate” (p.177), and that borders define the limits to that sovereignty. These two aspects formulate the doctrine of territorial integrity as defined by international law in Chapter One of the U.N. Charter. “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other matter inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations” (p.140). How is it, then, that the war on terror serves as the logical explanation of U.S. intervention abroad, undermining...
the very territorial integrity that the terrorist acts of 9/11 fundamentally violated?

Elden explains this through the concept of “contingent sovereignty,” which he discusses thoroughly in Chapter 5. This is the view that a state’s sovereign rights depend on a series of obligations and privileges. States are increasingly under pressure to uphold their internal responsibilities, and failure to do so will lead to humanitarian and military intervention by the international community under the “responsibility to protect” (p.152). Elden describes how, historically, intervention has been justified by international law in three situations: the inability of a state to protect its population from genocide or other crimes against humanity; the failure of a state to protect its citizens from terrorist threats, and thus to allow terrorists to operate within its territory; and where there are clear threats to international security (p.172). Effectively, in such exceptional circumstances, the norms of sovereignty do not apply, and the requisite conditions are established for the international community and/or single nations to take action to ensure their self-defense. Hence, sovereignty is made “contingent” on these terms.

These conditions are clearly evident in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, where the war on terror served to justify U.S. interventions — or what was advertised as “humanitarian” and military action to maintain territorial integrity. In the case of Afghanistan, intervention was justified because the state broke international law by allowing “terrorist” activities within its borders. The Afghan government at the time did not exercise adequate sovereignty over its own territory, and therefore failed to uphold its obligations. In the case of Iraq, discussed at length in Chapter 4, conflicting claims were used to justify intervention. These included Saddam Hussein’s treatment of the Iraqi people; the harboring of terrorists; threats to neighboring states; and, of course, the most potent of all, the possession of weapons of mass destruction. Elden describes how this list was both a “confused, and intentionally confusing, rationale” (p.112).

In short, Elden illustrates how the war on terror has arguably posed the most comprehensive challenge to contemporary forms of sovereignty. The notion of contingent sovereignty, in which states are required to act responsibly, fundamentally compromises territorial integrity as an absolute in international law. The argument to support intervention in Afghanistan, and later Iraq, through the extension of the “responsibility to protect,” was hinged on this notion. But the interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq have been anything but humane, and thus they call into question the basis of the “responsibility to protect.” Protect whom? And from what? It’s been almost eleven years since 9/11, and yet all effort to find Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan or weapons of mass destruction in Iraq have failed — incredibly! Meanwhile, territorial integrity has been severely compromised on all levels.

Overall, Elden’s book deserves wide and careful reading. It will appeal to geographers, historians, and political theorists interested in the polemics of terror and territory. Readers of TDSR will find it valuable because of linkages it draws between tradition, terrorism (as a fundamental ideology rooted in traditional orthodox values and beliefs), and the ways in which space is appropriated as the ultimate arena and medium of struggle. Elden employs theoretical literature throughout the book in varying ways, including references to Agamben, Heidegger, Foucault and Lefebvre. While the maps and images lend little support to the rich analysis, Elden has written an important and timely book, making a strong case for the presence of territory as a continuing theme in global politics. 

Meigian Massoumi
University of California at Berkeley

Our understandings of the world as a solid place are constantly under assault. Surface vocabularies illustrate this, and terms which used to convey fixity and security such as “nation,” “tradition” and “location” are giving way to more semantically slippery expressions such as “mobility,” “globalization” and “dislocation.” The new terminologies convey uncertainties, indeterminacy, disruption and insecurity.

The edited text Travel, Space, Architecture falls within a small but growing and important category of books premised on the new uncertainties and openness inherent in the concepts of multiple mobilities. Jilly Traganou, one of the editors, conveys her own angst in two thoughtful and thought-provoking opening chapters of theoretical reflection. In them she maps out the extensive landscape of shifting metathemes where the relationships between architecture and travel are entangled. She does an excellent job of elaborating the complex tensions relating to self and other, home and away, rootedness and displacement, and the real and the imagined, which are deeply inscribed in architecture as practice, in “architectural thinking,” and in architecture as culturally understood.

This volume seeks to examine the “conceptualization, representation, and production of space in its various scales and modes — architectural, urban, geographic, social, cultural and political” in relation to travel as both an action and idea. The idea of travel is conceived of widely to include notions of leisure travel, displacement, immigration and colonization. As such, the editors intend to shift away from the idea of architecture as solid, in theory and practice, into “an understanding of the presence of open-ended networks of relationships (of subjects and sites), as well as bringing architecture scholarship to a more productive and engaging dialogue with academic and professional fields.” This is a challenging but welcome aim, which the book partially meets.

In addition to the introductory chapters, the book consists of a further sixteen chapters organized in three sections that move the reader from the early modern period to the present and the idea of globalization (as if this were a contemporary phenomenon). The first section, “New Vision and a New World Order,” deals with the ways in which the opening up of the world through travel, technologies, and circulated narratives throughout the eighteenth century and into the twentieth provided a new impetus and an expanded source of ideas and influences for architects, urban planners, and designers. The discoveries of the world — whether the spectacular 360-degree landscape panoramas of English and French cities in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century (Luescher), or the urban gardens of the newly colonized and emergent cities of the southern hemisphere (Brand), or the experiences of Robert Venturi and Tod Williams in Rome (Milovanovic-Bertram) — are attended to as archaeologies of influence, made possible through travel and through the discourses and narratives of travel.

The second section of the book, “Questioning Origins, Searching for Alternatives,” maintains the theme of travel as influence (at times a reverse inspiration), but with the context of displacement, colonization and postcolonialism. A number of chapters deal with both the presence and absence of an intersection between architecture, urban planning, and local identities. Traganou, for instance, looks at the ways the Spanish architect Santiago Calatrava, commissioned to design the Sports Complex for the 2004 Athens Olympic Games, seemed to bypass national and local identities. And Shannon looks at the way the development of the Vietnamese city of Hue (a World Heritage Site) has been heavily driven by international tourism, missing opportunities for an urbanism that might serve local communities and break with imposed postcolonial imaginaries and influences.

In the final section of the book, “Global Mobilities,” the contributors look at the idea of the mobile architect and mobile architecture, and also at the various ways in which people themselves — as the often forced agents of mobility (what Zigmunt Bauman refers to as the “vagabonds” of globalization) — are interacting with architecture and urban forms. The last three chapters which deal with the Asian/Indian diaspora of the San Francisco Bay Area (Metha), refugees in Athens (Tzirtzilaki), and immigrants in downtown Athens (Vyzoviti), are powerful contributions, and demonstrate the ways in which urban forms are being adapted and are having to adapt in the face of the sadder realities of globalization.

Overall, this is very good volume and worthy of closer reading. My criticisms do not run deep, and to an extent reach beyond the text itself to how the wider academy engages with the triad of travel, space and architecture. First, and notwithstanding the importance of the historical context and the identification of influence through travel, I would have liked the contributors to have engaged more with the contemporary field of travel and the ways in which architects and planners are engaged with the pace of mobility and the constituent challenges it raises for local, regional and national identities (and the ruptures this can cause in the use/abuse of space). A second criticism relates to a broader need to engage more nonarchitects over these issues. Every discipline becomes locked within its own frame of reference, and it is often difficult to adopt wider perspectives. But, as the editors themselves point out at the start, we need engagement and
genuine cross-fertilization between architects, anthropologists, geographers, sociologists, and the like. Fortunately, architecture is a broad church. But some of the cases raised here could have benefited from the insight of other disciplinary perspectives.

My third criticism is one of the text, and relates to the lack of a final synthetic chapter which could have drawn out some of the continuities and the themes shared by the contributors in order to move our understandings forward. This is a common issue with regard to what is essentially a collection of essays, and easier to recommend than to write. None of these criticisms should detract from what is a valuable book, and one which I hope will spur others to deepen the interrogation of this complex and challenging set of relationships.

Mike Robinson
Leeds Metropolitan University


This quietly ambitious collection of essays, edited by Jean-François Lejeune and Michelangelo Sabatino, dismantles the mythology surrounding modern architecture’s “machine-age” origins and its geographic location in northern Europe. Heavily illustrated and carefully written, the essays move through the biographies of some of modernism’s most famous organizations and individuals, including Team X, Le Corbusier, and Bernard Rudofsky, to reveal contradictions that corrupt historians’ understanding of inter- and postwar European architectural production. Going beyond regionalism, the authors work to undermine the foundation of scholarship on International Style modernism, unearth ing from the archives documents revealing a spiritual and humanist strain that emerged from the imagined vernacular landscape of the Mediterranean. The authors steer clear of strongly political readings, and focus primarily on the architectural object and the documentation surrounding its production.

The editors define Mediterranean modernism as “modern architecture that responds to program with cues derived from vernacular buildings so as to infuse spatial and material concerns with context and culture” (p.6). Although northern architects dominated the intellectual development of modernist architecture, anonymous Mediterranean dwellings, the authors claim, transcended academic debates to ground the forms and imaginations of a generation of designers. Thus, Andrea Bocco Guarneri writes of Bernard Rudofsky’s promotion of “architecture without architects,” an idea that permeates the entire collection. While Rudofsky’s dismissal of modern design played into the dualistic definitions touted by promoters of the International Style like Philip Johnson, the collection as a whole demonstrates how architects watching northern European cities urbanize and industrialize came to view southern vernacular forms as symbols of an idealized premodern world and the basis of a utopian future.

Modern Architecture and the Mediterranean, which resulted from a seminar held in Capri in 1998, is broken into two sections. “Part I: South” encompasses six essays on the work of early modern architects working and living in Mediterranean countries. These include essays on a “rational” vernacular in Italy (Gravegnoulo), the Algeria/Marseilles
connection first articulated by Le Corbusier (Crane), and national versus regional identity formation in Spain (Lejeune). Typical of Part I, Ioanna Theocharopoulou’s chapter depicts interwar Greece in a vivid and theoretically challenging way, using mythological metaphor and literary reference to weave together debates on language, national identity, and the poetics of place.

“Part II: North” is comprised of six essays on architects who worked primarily north of the Alps, but who were nonetheless effected by the Mediterranean ideal. If in Part I the authors establish the Mediterranean as a category of thought and practice essential to modern architecture’s development, in Part II they unsettle dualistic readings by introducing hybrids of modernity and tradition that arose in both north and south to meet local climactic and cultural conditions. In the first chapter of Part II, Kai K. Gutschow discusses the German architect and critic Paul Schultze-Naumburg, an avowed racist and “anti-Mediterraneanist,” who, despite himself, shared many of the goals of southern regionalists. By promoting local craftsmanship over universal forms, advocating for both timeless designs and for technology in the service of tradition, Schultze-Naumburg was part of a trend throughout Europe that actively rejected CIAM modernism at the very moment of its inception.

While the collection is well crafted, at times the essays become pedantic in a way that raises questions about the nature of architectural scholarship today. The editors use the concept of the Mediterranean to critique the academicism and historicism of modernism, yet they often take an expert tone that might alienate nonacademic readers. In some cases authors successfully break though the north-south/east-west dichotomy. In other chapters academic manipulation obscures the political and ethical consequences of the local/universal being examined. This is the case with Francis E. Lyn’s chapter on the “Mediterranean Resonances” of Erik Gunnar Asplund. Here description and clumsy cross-referencing of the specifics of Asplund’s buildings with the work of Gottfried Semper and Henri Labrouste leave the reader feeling both overwhelmed and unclear about the intended message.

What, then, does the concept Mediterranean modernism add to the current study and practice of architecture? While an interest in the Mediterranean reflects the European Union’s efforts to unite a geographic region based on shared interest and heritage, more importantly, the book’s focus on local specificity, climactic appropriateness, and a visceral connection between architecture and place parallels current trends against globalization and the perceived homogenization of native cultures. Contemporary architects and scholars can take cues from Ezra Akcan’s chapter on Bruno Taut’s work in Japan and Turkey. Akcan distinguishes between the inherent hybridity of the modern condition and an intentional “cosmopolitan ethics.” He notes that “being a hybrid in itself does not prevent the ideological separation between ‘West’ and ‘non-West,’ nor is it an antidote to chauvinistic nationalism or ethnocentrism” (p.210). Instead, cosmopolitan ethics must be used to negotiate universality and locality by translating shared norms without sacrificing local aspirations.

Today architects still struggle with place-making, technology, and invention using typological studies, abstract ideas of landscape, and claims of authenticity. This collection goes far in crafting a gradated picture of the social and environmental influences that structure how architects interpret, appropriate and advocate for both tradition and progress. By seeing existing regional environments as fresh, functional and relevant, early modern designers produced some of the most evocative and inventive architectural solutions of the twentieth century. Those who fear the homogenization of the globalizing world and those who follow technological determinism to its extreme limits can perhaps use works like this to construct a different way of seeing the world: not as one of stark contrasts, but as a complex, layered landscape where innovation and continuity can coexist.

Anna Goodman
University of California, Berkeley

With The Future of the Past, architect Steven W. Semes has planted his foot hard in the tense area between architectural innovation and historic preservation. Semes advocates for a traditional language in design for urban historic contexts. His case is strong, and the book offers well-chosen illustrations and examples that demonstrate his grasp of the evolution of historic preservation as an influential movement, both worldwide and in the United States.

Semes does not so much stake out a middle ground between contemporary architects and historic preservationists as articulate a third position that is nearly irreconcilable with either. Although he thus seems to cast a pox on both houses, many outside the preservation and design communities may see his position as common sense. Semes argues that new architecture built in historic urban contexts — in particular, additions to historic buildings and the construction of new buildings in historic districts — should be informed by a “conservation ethic” that regards the existing fabric as a “man-made ecosystem” that can change (indeed must change) to remain viable. Departing from mainstream preservation philosophy, which holds that nonhistoric contributions to these landscapes should be visually distinct in order to separate the wheatey historic from the chaffy nonhistoric, Semes advocates design that uses traditional language to fit into historic contexts — even though it may create confusion with existing historic buildings. Calling for a much stronger design continuity than most architects attempt (or that most preservation boards allow), he states, “...the criterion that matters most is the appropriateness to its setting of a proposed intervention rather than conformance with currently fashionable ideas” (p.29).

Semes carves out a strong argument in favor of freshly designed architecture that relies on traditional language. Ideally, it will look historic and feel historic, but it will serve current needs and sensibilities. Noting that the twentieth-century Modern Movement turned its back sharply on traditional forms and associations, Semes lays the blame for visually jarring architecture that intrudes into older historic contexts at the feet of contemporary modernists. But by narrowing his focus to established historic districts and historic urban buildings, he also narrows the usefulness of his argument.

In particular, his focus allows him to presume that all settings are valued both by architects, whose job it is to design change, and preservationists, who value inherent historic importance. With recognized districts and buildings, this may be the case, but for many historic areas without designation, this is much stickier. Historic landscapes without designation may not benefit from such an ethic, although its application could go a long way toward saving their eligibility. For example, postwar residential landscapes are frequent targets of “redevelopers,” who scrape the ground clean and rebuild “traditional” designs that are wildly out of character for their settings. To advocate traditional design over modern in these contexts flips the issue on its head. If the dissonance caused by the intrusion of current architecture on historic contexts is a problem — and Semes makes a strong case that it is, calling into play numerous examples — then the conservation ethic should also address the intrusion of these “traditional” designs into landscapes that, although less easy to love, are just as historically significant.

Although this book is most likely to be valued by preservation architects, it raises questions that everyone involved in historic preservation needs to think about. Semes thus deserves enormous credit for tackling a complex issue that is playing out in myriad ways all over the world. He is right in understanding the problematic norm to be the intrusion of modern designs into historic contexts. However, he seems to over-dichotomize. Thus, he advocates sequestering new modern designs in preestablished modernist contexts. But by doing so, he diminishes the historic value of the architecture of the Modern Movement. It is just as possible to overpower a Gio Ponti design with an inappropriate addition as it is to overpower a McKim, Mead & White. Increasingly, preservationists are coming to understand that their mission should be to include the former as well as the latter.

Kathleen Corbett
Architectural historian, Denver, CO

During one of my most recent visits to my parents’ place in the countryside, they proudly showed me the fruit trees they had planted; and when we walked by a specific tree, they told me that a graft had not been successful. This personal story provides the context for a review of Lineu Castello’s recent book, Rethinking the Meaning of Place.

Castello is a professor at the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul in Brazil, and this book displays his dedication to reinterpreting the roles of place, placemaking, placemarketing, and urbanity in cities at the turn of the twenty-first century. Many other scholars have researched, theorized and written about the importance of places. However, it is commendable that Castello set out to question many of their assumptions. Central to his book is the hypothesis that cities benefit from places of cloning (e.g., theme parks, shopping malls, regenerated historic areas), and that these new places are eventually assimilated into cities, resulting in enhanced memories, auras and pluralities.

Castello argues that the qualities found in one place may be copied and re-created elsewhere, almost in a copy-paste approach. Critics of such approaches often categorize those places as unauthentic and artificial. Castello’s quest, however, is to show that “the intentional construction of places can bring favorable effects to the quality of contemporary cities” (p.xiii) — either through copyright or creative-commons types of approaches. This leads him to further hypothesize that the places of cloning may become endowed with the desirable quality of urbanity.

The book is structured into five chapters and a conclusion. Chapter One provides an introduction to places, their perception and typology. In chapter Two, the concept of place is approached from the perspective of different disciplines, including applied social sciences, the humanities, environmental psychology, philosophy, and architecture-urbanism. Chapter Three begins a discussion of how places can be approached from the perspective of different disciplines, including applied social sciences, the humanities, environmental psychology, philosophy, and architecture-urbanism.

Chapter Four then reviews variations in perception of place. It argues that “the play between placemaking and placemarketing leads both to spatial and behavioral variations,” which can stimulate plurality, aura and memory differently (p.167). Chapter Five reviews several places in Rio Grande do Sul: the Gasometer Power Station in Porto Alegre, the Serra Gaúcha, the Town of Serafina Correa, and the DC-Navegantes commercial district.

While Castello’s book represents an impressive research effort, I question three of its main conclusions, which seem to justify the inevitability of a “clonedestine” future for our cities and towns. My first question pertains to the irrelevance of authenticity. The author writes that “people are more concerned with benefiting from what a place has to offer than with its authenticity or lack of it, whether it is genuine or imitation — real or hyper-real” (p.226). My second regards the effect of time in cities. In the author’s words, “it doesn’t matter if the place was created dozens of years ago or yesterday” (pp.229–30). My third question concerns the overall validity of places of cloning with regard to assessments of urban livability. Castello concludes that “each place can aim to become a specific utopia,” because “there is sufficiently accurate evidence that the results attained have been good” (p.231).

The book does not discuss to any great extent the socio-economic implications that homogenized urban landscapes resulting from too many cloned places (and places of cloning) may have for the character, distinctiveness and identity of our cities. Loss of genetic diversity caused by the erasing of authentic places can threaten the survival of fragile urban places, and even contribute to the collapse of the unique environments that make cities enjoyable for all. In the U.K., for instance, placemaking and urban design techniques, complemented by placemarketing efforts, are being used to accentuate the DNA of successful places and reverse the spread of “clone towns.”

In spite of these concerns of mine, the book is very likely to generate fruitful debate among those interested in planning and designing better cities.

Carlos Balsas
Arizona State University

Art of Building in Yemen, a revised edition of a landmark publication of the early 1980s, is a carefully documented and comprehensive survey of traditional buildings in Yemen. Using photographs and drawings, it depicts and discusses typologies of vernacular buildings from all over that country, examining their use of materials, techniques of construction, and variations in style, decoration and detail.

The author, Fernando Varanda, a longtime member of IASTE, is an architect who spent several years during the 1970s in Yemen working for the United Nations. Later, under the auspices of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in Lisbon, he undertook the study that resulted in this book. In the foreword to this second edition, he writes that it "reproduces [the work] brought to the public by AARP (Art and Archeology Research Papers, London) in 1981 and MIT Press in 1982." As he explains, "both text and images appear here as they were," although "corrections deemed essential have been introduced." Additionally, the new edition contains "examples collected from the south during a survey undertaken in 2006." At the time of the original publication fieldwork there was limited due to political circumstances. However, the 1990 Reunification of the north and south opened perspectives to the reading of the country's space as a whole.

Part One, "Space and Form," addresses control of the physical environment and terrain through dams, terraces, wells and fortifications. It provides examples of various local vernacular forms of shelter, from cave dwellings, tents, reed buildings, and thatched-roofed mud huts to spectacular mud and stone "tower houses" rising to six or seven stories. It also surveys other vernacular structures such as bathhouses, fountains, stepped reservoirs, places for worship, and places for trade. The section documents local mastery of building techniques and the skillful, pragmatic and artistic use of materials, including raw earth, mud, lime plaster, stone, baked brick and reeds for architectural elements such as foundations, roofs, ceilings, walls, doors, windows and fanlights — together with decorative woodwork and wall painting. Examples of typical settlement types and space components in dwellings provide a comprehensive survey of the traditional architectural use of space and form, including approaches to household sanitation and waste disposal.

Part Two, "Regional Surveys," breaks the country into geographical zones — namely, the costal lowlands, the midlands and highlands, and the east and southeast (eastern slopes and lowlands). It then documents regional variations in typologies of buildings and settlements as well as materials, architectural style, and decoration.

Part Three, "Architectural Synthesis," which did not exist in the original edition, addresses the architecture of towns and large, rapidly growing urban areas such as Sanaa. It illustrates and discusses changes and transformations, including "contamination" of the local architectural traditions as a result of external forces, among which are modernity, increasing wealth, new materials, industrialization, globalization, new building types and needs, new building sites, and the sense of national identity. Part three ends with an expression of hope that new concerns and sensitivities toward conservation and continuity of architectural traditions will influence the direction of building in Yemen. These conditions have resulted in part from publicity derived from the naming of Sanaa and Shibam to the UNESCO architectural heritage list and the fact that both cities have received Aga Khan Awards for architecture.

Interestingly, the book contains only a limited amount of text. This reflects the author's intent that the photographs and drawings "speak for themselves." The publication suc-
ceeds in this approach by providing hundreds of excellent photographs, combined with numerous carefully hand-drawn and hand-rendered plans, sections and details. Maps with the names of places and iconic elevation diagrams of buildings at the beginning of each chapter are also very useful and add a personal touch. Included is a glossary of terms, but there is no index or bibliography. This new edition is a valuable and comprehensive resource for scholars, architects, and all who appreciate the complex, rich and beautiful building traditions of the Arabian Peninsula in general, and Yemen in particular.

Joseph Aranha
Texas Tech University