colonial authorities as evidence of the early modernity of colonial rule, before archaeology required the segregation of historical structures as protected monuments. Repurposing contributed to the palimpsestic reading of the city for Glover through which the new occupants both borrowed from the prestige of the Mughals while also demonstrating their ability to remake the city for modern uses. From here, Glover shifts to a study of the manner in which colonial authorities charted the rural, suburban, and urban divide of Lahore. He argues that the transparency of the rural and the suburban, compared to the dark opacity of the old city, automatically nudged the colonists toward a modernist reinscription of the city in the suburbs. Unlike British cities, which modernists considered as irredeemable sites of industrial squalor and, as such, the motivation for the hygienic modernist city, the old city of Lahore, usually castigated for similar squalor and lack of hygiene, was considered to be impenetrable and inscrutable, a quality that, Glover argues, “excluded it physically from the colonial state’s modernizing reach” (97).

With the suburbs as the site, Glover examines the deployment of Indo-Saracenic architecture and the role of Lahore’s Mayo School of Art under the Arts and Crafts enthusiast J. L. Kipling (Rudyard Kipling’s father). Glover documents the work of English architects such as Swinton Jacobs, and the writer Flora Annie Steel (the latter also being a rare example of a women designing in colonial India), who were designing imperial institutions such as courts and colleges, and also that of Indian architects trained in colonial institutions, for example, Bhui Ram Singh and Ganga Ram, who were designing Hindu civic institutions such as the Dayanand Anglo Vedic College. By differentially participating in a conjoined project of modernity, their combined architecture, Glover argues, “transformed the conceptual bases upon which the city was understood” (98).

In this context, one of the most interesting of Glover’s discussions describes the establishment of a “model town” in Lahore, a “remarkably faithful reproduction of [Ebenezer] Howard’s progressive ideal—more faithful, perhaps, than Howard himself would have attempted” (154). Reading from a memoir by an Indian who grew up in this model town, Glover concludes that socially the town remained rather conservative with continued segregation of the sexes and focus on religious institutions. Thus, a “neat Western-type ‘New Town’,” Glover argues, did not result in the destruction of the Indian way of life. Rather the residents “took as much of the garden-city model as they wanted or needed, holding on to those elements of family and social life they wanted to preserve intact” (157).

Glover’s model town discussion is significant not only because similar towns were developed throughout India (particularly in Punjab) but also because the life portrayed by these towns, along with that embodied by the British civil lines (i.e. the residential sectors of the military cantonments), became the model on which much of urban design and development was done in India and Pakistan immediately after Independence in 1947. Understanding the motivations of such modern institutions is thus critical to understanding the direction taken by much of the urban development in postcolonial India. Furthermore, the discussion of Lahore’s Model Town is, of course, particularly significant because it provides us insight into the thinking of the bureaucrats and elites who eventually decided to make India’s replacement for Lahore also in the form of a model, modern city. While Glover does not explicitly mention this, one can see in Lahore’s Model Town that the roots of Chandigarh’s modernism do not unilaterally lie in Nehru’s fascination with the latest from the West but also in the discourses of modernity already in circulation in pre-partition Punjab.

Glover’s book ends with a critique of the hybridized spatial and cultural accommodations necessary to make the British bungalow work as a social institution. Examining the uneasy give-and-take that such accommodations involved, Glover finally zeroes in on the question of comfort and “feeling at home” that bungalow life was meant to enable. Home life in the bungalow, Glover argues, was “shot through with anxiety and ambivalence over who, master or servant, was in the end more at home” (183). Dwelling on the unease of this situation, Glover adduces Sara Suleri’s reading of Rudyard Kipling to underscore “the essential precariousness of a colonial power that shares with its subject population a congruent ‘economy of desire’” (183).

In Making Lahore Modern, Glover describes a hybridized and mutually implicated world of relationships between the colonizers and the colonized, governed by a shared reaching toward an uncertain modernity. What we learn is that modernity was not a simple ideal imported from the West and imposed in the colonies, but a rough construct, at best an outline, that was differentially appropriated by colonizer and colonized, by men and women, in the cities and in the villages of colonial India. This notion points to a revised understanding of modernity and modernism itself, not as a Eurocentric construct that was variously regionalized around the world but as a polycentric, global event, differentially appropriated and fleshed out in various parts of the world, as in various registers of life. Such a polycentric rendering of modernity is a horizon that we have yet to work our way to.

Vikramaditya Prakash
University of Washington

Jonathan Alfred Noble
African Identity in Post-Apartheid Public Architecture: White Skin, Black Masks

Rebecca Ginsburg
At Home with Apartheid: The Hidden Landscapes of Domestic Service in Johannesburg

It can be argued that nowhere during the twentieth century were the spatial dimensions of politics more nakedly visible than in South Africa. Even before the official adoption in 1948 of apartheid and its detailed laws governing racial classification and segregation, the South African state enforced policies of forcible
resettlement and restricted movement aimed at ensuring strict separation of its population. The built environment played a key role in establishing racial identities and maintaining segregated spheres, and the legacy of this social rupture remains clearly visible in the architecture, cities, and landscapes of South Africa. Two important new books by Jonathan Alfred Noble and Rebecca Ginsburg add significantly to our understanding of the design disciplines’ relationships to apartheid.

Noble and Ginsburg explore the spatial dimensions of South African politics from very different perspectives. The former analyzes specific examples of state-sponsored architecture designed to represent a fully integrated, post-apartheid society, while the latter examines domestic spaces in middle-class Johannesburg during the 1960s and 1970s in order to study closely apartheid’s concerns with gender, labor, movement, and visibility. Both books are rooted in the extensive research of their authors’ doctoral dissertations and make significant contributions to the growing body of literature on the built environment in modern South Africa.

Noble examines five projects built since the end of apartheid in great depth in *African Identity in Post-Apartheid Public Architecture*. The diversity of architectural expression he discusses reflects the broad range of concerns driving South African architecture and landscape architecture. Most important among these is the question of how to represent a pluralistic, post-apartheid democracy and its multitude of regional cultures, geographies, and climates. Noble highlights the importance of design competitions in South Africa, which he portrays as a democratization of the design process analogous to the country’s political reforms. The author, a professor at the University of the Witwatersrand, pays close attention to the juries’ deliberations and discusses the non-premiated entries at length. Noble offers valuable insights into the positions taken by non-architects in shaping the built environment of post-apartheid South Africa, and unearths a number of exchanges between designers, clients, critics, artists, artisans, and the public that have helped shape contemporary architecture in South Africa.

*African Identity in Post-Apartheid Public Architecture* is a systematic, rigorous, and exhaustive work. Though sometimes repetitive and excessively self-conscious in its prose, the book is full of valuable insights and represents some fine scholarship. Noble takes advantage of a wide range of source materials, including archival documents and interviews, and analyzes his subject matter from the varying perspectives of architects, government officials, and a general public that is far from monolithic in its attitudes toward grappling with the legacy of apartheid and expressing its aspirations for a democratic future.

Two chapters deal with new legislative buildings necessitated by the reorganization of South Africa’s provinces in 1994. Nelspruit and Kimberley, for example, became provincial capitals and the sites of architectural competitions that quickly became the key venues for debating the nature of public architecture in South Africa. The value of opening the book with these two studies, rather than the national Constitutional Court building, which is the subject of the third chapter, is that it allows Noble to dig beyond the broader questions of representing national identity and democratic processes in order to study the range of local concerns (e.g., climate, geology, and regional culture) addressed by the regional legislature buildings. The Mpumalanga Provincial Legislature in Nelspruit, for example, was designed with great sensitivity to its environmental context, yet was also linked to a secretive land deal that determined its location. Noble gives due consideration to the forces, ranging from the strikingly poetic to the bureaucratically prosaic, driving the design of these major works, as uncovered through his painstaking research.

*African Identity in Post-Apartheid Public Architecture* has the admirable quality of focusing on recent projects that were under construction during Noble’s doctoral dissertation research. Yet the book’s narrow scope leads to significant omissions among South Africa’s important contemporary architects, such as Jo Noero, whose Red Location Museum of Struggle in Port Elizabeth is one of the iconic works of post-apartheid-era architecture; Peter Rich, whose Mapungubwe Interpretation Centre is an eloquent essay in site specificity; and the brilliant Mozambique-based architect Amancio “Pancho” Guedes, who appears in Noble’s text only as a competition juror. Such lacunae are to be expected in a book that focuses closely on a select group of case studies rather than attempting a broad survey, but the reader needs to be aware that this book offers only a partial view of the extraordinary public architecture built in South Africa since 1994.

Noble is at his best when describing and analyzing buildings and landscapes. His interpretation of formal gestures and spatial relationships is sharp and incisive. His extensive treatment of unbuilt competition entries is particularly important, and he frequently demonstrates that the problem of constructing civic monuments in the Rainbow Nation extends beyond the difficult questions of political representation. *African Identity in Post-Apartheid Public Architecture* is an important contribution to the literature on South African architecture in the last two decades.

In *At Home with Apartheid: The Hidden Landscapes of Domestic Service in Johannesburg*, Rebecca Ginsburg examines the experiences and living conditions of African women who worked as domestic servants in the comfortable middle-class neighborhoods of Johannesburg. The internal contradictions of apartheid, in which the labor system depended on huge numbers of deracinated migrant workers who needed to remain as hidden as possible from a public realm reserved for white South Africans, resulted in residential neighborhoods whose neatly kept homes each had a “back room”—a freestanding structure with a single bedroom and toilet for an African woman on whose labor white employers depended. Ginsburg delves into the lives of the African women who inhabited these back rooms while serving as maids, cooks, laundresses, and nannies in houses where they often were not allowed even to sit down.

Ginsburg’s remarkable research includes scores of personal interviews with women who had worked as domestic servants, as well as with their employers and the children for whom they cared. The author engaged her informants with carefully developed techniques (such as questions
designed to encourage lengthy narrative responses) that elicited frank insights into this world. Her book details the myriad ways African women subverted the apartheid laws represented by their back rooms, including opening their meager homes to travelers, family members, and male companions. At Home with Apartheid draws a compelling portrait of a world designed to be invisible.

Ginsburg, who teaches landscape architecture at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, also takes note of the social divisions among white South Africans. Far from appearing monolithic in their beliefs, they are shown to have exercised different attitudes toward their domestic servants based on their own experiences, which were rooted in differing ethics formed by class, ethnicity, language, religion, and gender. The homes and servant quarters described by the author manifest the different aspirations and anxieties of the women and men who inhabited them, reflecting the broader social conditions of a nation divided by race, by gender, and by class.

The difficulty of bridging two worlds—one rooted in the village life of largely Bantu-speaking people, the other a cosmopolitan realm of global commerce and culture—introduces and concludes At Home with Apartheid. Ginsburg notes the shock experienced by women who migrated from villages (or the black townships established by the government) to Johannesburg, where vastly different streetscapes and residential configurations provoked confusion and anxiety. The author discusses the effects of the reverse migration, when domestic workers returned to their villages and transformed their homes in response to their encounters with the houses and neighborhoods of Johannesburg.

Curiously absent from this story are the designers (architects, urban planners, interior designers, and others), as well as the tastemakers, publicists, and propagandists who grappled with the question of how to house middle- and upper-class white South Africans in proximity to black servants while maintaining racial hierarchies through strict codes of spatial segregation. Pathways through the city, such as alleys, streets, and transit networks, were designed to ensure segregation and limited visibility of African residents, yet the author does not discuss the processes that shaped these networks. Nor do we learn much about the design of the houses themselves: were they speculative houses whose plans were repeated, or custom-designed homes whose segregated spaces reflected a particular family’s concerns? Was segregation a theme of design discourse, either in professional journals or popular magazines? The exclusion of the design community from the book is a significant omission, especially when contrasted with the author’s meticulous study of the women who inhabited these spaces.

Another shortcoming of At Home with Apartheid is the difficulty Ginsburg has with accommodating exceptions to her thesis. For example, she notes that in some cases domestic servants enjoyed a measure of security in their employment and housing that they did not have in the state-owned housing of the black townships, where women lived in fear of being evicted from their homes if they did not please their male partners. Elsewhere, Ginsburg notes that African women in Johannesburg sometimes lived in better conditions than their male counterparts in the mineworkers’ hostels. Both points partially contradict her powerful, and largely accurate, opening sentence: “Apartheid was good for no one, but there was nobody for whom it was worse than African women.” Nevertheless, At Home with Apartheid is a vitally important work for anyone seeking to understand the deeply political nature of domestic life in apartheid-era South Africa.

Noble and Ginsburg have produced scholarship of great value to readers interested in the ways the built environment shaped South Africa during and after apartheid. Both have carefully unearthed significant source materials for future research and have provided two distinct historiographic models for the study of South African architecture and urbanism. Their books differ greatly in scope, focus, and time period; Noble’s work examines buildings and landscapes designed specifically to facilitate post-apartheid processes of reconciliation and unity, while Ginsburg excavates the built environment’s pervasive service to the cause of segregation at the height of apartheid. These two books operate at somewhat opposite poles of the same concerns: architecture’s capacity for establishing and enforcing social identities, and our collective role in questioning that capacity.