

to include various global and transnationalist factors and effects. It documents to what extent changes in cityscapes, gentrification, economic globalization, racial marginalization and displacement are global phenomena currently affecting a number of major cities. This approach extricates New York, and by extension United States cities from being seen as exceptional or as Krase notes, as 'spectacle'. It also allows the reader to understand better the global implication on translocal policies and mobility. On the other hand, it is not clear why Krase chose these cities, both in the United States and abroad, for his comparisons. There are a number of cities that are currently undergoing extensive urban dislocation and change: London, San Francisco, Mexico City, Los Angeles, Shanghai and Chicago to name a few. This was a curious omission, since Krase is careful to explain his methodological approach and reasoning throughout the book.

Krase does a good job of including race, ethnicity, culture, immigration and assimilation throughout his study. Yet, he includes very little in regards to gender and sexuality. Do women see things differently? How does the gay and lesbian community create and articulate spatial meaning? As works by Doreen Massey and Christina Hanhardt argue, spaces are gendered and rarely neutral. Hanhardt for instance, examines how the gay and lesbian community use and reconfigure definitions of violence and safety to access and privilege gentrified spaces in San Francisco and New York. One of the most pressing issues when it comes to urban change, redevelopment and gentrification is how safety is defined and understood by different communities.

Seeing Cities Change is an important and necessary intervention in how we 'see', understand and negotiate cities. What we tell ourselves as a community and what we choose to remember and forget as individuals. Krase has done an excellent job of not only providing a theoretically and methodologically rigorous explanation of why and how cities change, but also in how we create meaning and discourse around changes we often have so little control over.

Nancy Raquel Mirabal

San Francisco State University

Carl H. Nightingale, *Segregation. A Global History of Divided Cities* (Historical Studies of Urban America). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012. 536pp. \$22.99/£24.50hbk; £14.94 kindle.
doi:10.1017/S0963926813000941

No discussion about it: we live in an 'urban world'. What this entails, however, is a matter of hot debate among urban scholars across disciplines. One feature of this urban world is clear though: it is a highly segregated world. In *A Global History of Divided Cities*, Carl H. Nightingale argues that segregation is historically a key characteristic of all urban settlements: the history of urban development is a history of segregation. More specifically, it is a history of racial segregation. The breath of his transnational and historical analysis is impressive, though the underlying argument of the book is familiar to post-colonial and critical scholars: segregation is propitiated and sustained by the convergence of international dynamics that involve the interplay of land agents and property markets who benefited from colonial enterprises and administrators, who in turn trusted to urban planners and intellectuals the task of shaping and producing cities and urban populations that would grant and protect the white supremacy.

The book is an impressive piece of transnational urban history – it describes the ‘networks of intellectual exchange’ that supported colonial and imperial projects in spreading the justifications, practices and management of ‘city-splitting’ from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries to the present. Although, according to Nightingale, the history of segregation begins in Mesopotamia, 70 centuries ago, when in the midst of human cities the gods demanded the construction of special places to live. Those proto-instances of segregation, however, are pale when compared with the levels of urban inequality experienced with modernization. Mainly organized following a chronological vein, the book moves from this early form of city-splitting to ancient and medieval forms of categorizing populations through the urban fabric. Despite these arguments, it is clear that not all separation strategies have a segregationist and discriminatory underpinning. A key question, then, is when did this practice of separation and classification become segregationist? The author’s answer is the major achievement of the book: a description of the interconnected colonial histories that have made race and colour-lines a distinctive pattern of urban development. Nightingale places the modernization project of capitalism, its hunger for private property and its expansion through imperial projects as a core cause of cross-colour patterns of segregation that aimed to justify white superiority. Following a civilizational and urbanization endeavour, colour-lines spanned through the Atlantic across the world: from imperial England and France to India, China and the Pacific, with examples also in the Middle East, Latin America, Africa (especially focused on South Africa), the US (especially focused on Chicago) and brief references to Nazi Germany. The book reveals the interconnectedness of these histories in making race fundamental to urban development and central to segregation as we know it.

The period between the 1890s and early 1920s is described as a time of ‘segregation mania’, namely times when the imperial projects promoted through public policy, especially with health and sanitation reforms, produced an ethos of segregation that influenced not only city planners and managers, but most strikingly shaped the demeanours of lay city dwellers, justifying segregation as a reasonable strategy of urban expansion. This mania of segregation, however, reaches its peak levels of ‘archsegregationism’ during the Nazi Holocaust and in the long-lasting experiences and experiments of urban segregation in South Africa and the United States, outlasting civil rights movements and anti-racist campaigners.

Neither the market developments, nor the democratic revolutions or the enterprises of scientific knowledge production have been colourblind. Yet, Nightingale recognizes that the pervasive logic of colour-lines has been ‘messy’ and also contradictory at times. For instance, when the same segregated population is obligated by its rulers to build or pay for the devices that segregate them, or – even more conspicuously – when despite the existence of a division lines, populations move across borders to provide various forms of menial and domestic work and illegal exchanges, demanded by those same populations that aim to segregate.

This ‘messy’ feature of segregation is also a consequence of the ways in which it mutates and adapts according to the populations and landscapes involved. Another way of phrasing this messiness would be to acknowledge it as intersectional: colour-lines are emphasized or made more elusive and obscure when they are ensued by other dynamics such as class divisions, power dynamics, religion rivalries and, not least, gender. This ‘world history of urban segregation’ is successful in identifying the connecting patterns of urban segregation across the globe, while establishing a clear description and categorization of the

prevalent dynamics that made segregation in Chicago also different from that in Johannesburg.

Segregation charts out the multiscale connections, causalities, contingencies and contrasts of a phenomenon that characterizes our contemporary cities in this otherwise described 'planet of slums'. It is clear that even today, policy and urban developers, academic and political discourses keep on observing and discussing segregation in terms in which there is a 'vilification of the "slum" and a glorification of the exclusive suburb' (p. 79). Despite the great contribution this book makes to understand and frame how and why this has happened, the task that remains is for the slum dweller, or those segregated, to be able to tell their story by themselves. Most importantly, those of us who live under supposed conditions of non-segregation must be able to recognize the extent to which we do so at their expense. We are active partners in reproducing the segregation patterns that shape our cities; the hope is that we can also recognize our partnership in a plea for urban justice.

D. Vicherat Mattar

Leiden University College, The Hague

Nikhil Rao, *House, But No Garden. Apartment Living in Bombay's Suburbs, 1898–1964*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. ix + 300pp. 39 figures. Bibliography. \$90.00 hbk; \$30 pbk.
doi:10.1017/S0963926813000953

Development at the urban fringe has been occurring ever since the first city began to expand, and Bombay certainly saw plenty of growth in the latter half of the nineteenth century. But it can plausibly be argued that its self-conscious suburbanization was triggered by a serious outbreak of plague in 1898. Accordingly, that is when, in *House, But No Garden*, historian Nikhil Rao begins his groundbreaking account of suburbanization, and suburbanism, in Bombay through the early 1960s.

The book is original in three ways, all important. First, Rao traces continuities between the colonial and post-colonial periods in a way which, for Bombay as for almost every ex-colonial city, is rare. In this case, it was a particular challenge because, when Bombay annexed territory in the 1950s, it expanded from 22 square miles to 186. Second, he demonstrates how conventional suburbanization happened in an urban area outside of Europe, North America or Japan and, moreover, without focusing on squatter or pirate settlements. The process that he describes, then, is 'formal', if unfamiliar in form. Third, and most importantly, Rao does an effective job of disentangling the reciprocal connections between social change and the physical development of the urban fringe. The result is a fine piece of scholarship that could profitably be read by anyone with an interest in South Asia, colonial cities, suburban growth or the built environment.

At the turn of the twentieth century, Bombay's population was approaching a million. Most residents lived in cramped and unsanitary conditions in the middle and southern portions of the island of Bombay. In 1898, a Bombay Improvement Trust (BIT) was established; it was soon planning slum clearance schemes, together with street widenings and extensions. One of its largest projects was