Company Towns:
A Neocolonial Perspective

PETER SCRIVER
University of Adelaide

INTRODUCTION: CORPORATISM AND COLONIZATION

In her book, *Building New Communities: New Deal America and Fascist Italy*[1] Diane Ghirardo makes a politically delicate but convincing case for comparing the "new-town" planning histories of the ostensibly diametrically opposed polities of Democratic Party governed America and Fascist Italy in the interwar years. Ghirardo's study reminds us of the importance of carefully distinguishing structure and form from content in historical analyses. Whereas the political aims that these governments served — and the values these enshrined — were historically divergent, the actual "colonization" practices (as Ghirardo characterizes them) through which the public works agencies of both states developed new towns were a technocratic middle-ground with many striking similarities. Foremost among these were the Arcadian character and the inherent corporatism of these settlement schemes.[2]

At the apex of the machine age, the visions of the *citta nuova* that these governments promoted conspicuously eschewed the transcendent metropolitanism that had been anticipated in Italy by Sant'Elia and the Futurists, or by Hugh Ferris and the skyscraper builders of America. Rather, new town development was regarded as an opportunity for the resettlement of a potentially alienated urban proletariat as stakeholders in a reconsolidated agrarian order of model farms and townships. Such resettlement, it was hoped, would redeem not only the productivity of the land, but the spiritual health of the citizenry as well. Both Italians and Americans could call upon idealised traditions of rural colonisation in their own social histories to inspire and legitimize these schemes. Italy could look all the way back to the Roman Empire and the "civilizing" influence of its colonies throughout the Mediterranean world and beyond.[3] America was itself a "post-colony" that was only just distant enough from the actual experience of conquering and disciplining the North American wilderness[4] to forget the hardship, while remaining nostalgic for the rural virtues and cooperative ethics of a pioneering society.

Practically and politically, however, the corporatism of large scale capitalist enterprise offered the most efficient and expedient management models with which such logistically complex projects could be organised and implemented. Inevitably, perhaps, the new towns these governments created had the paternalistic stamp of the "company towns" that their industrialist collaborators tended to build for their own workers. "With each government occupying the dual — and often conflicting — roles of benefactor and creditor, they had the power to reclaim what they had given and to expect and demand conformity to their expectations in labor, behavior and attitude."[5]

This paper is concerned with this problematic elision of *colonial* and *corporate* norms in the design of purpose-built settlements. Ghirardo's careful comparative study gives one indication of how much more widely such norms may have pervaded the practice of modern architecture and urbanism than canonical histories would lead us to believe. At the risk of a more conjectural if not polemical level of discussion, my intention is to posit an even wider and riskier comparison, between an actual history of colonial-modernisation outside the Euro-American world, and the increasingly overt corporatism and neo-colonial sentimentality of the so-called "New Urbanism" of exclusive new-town developments in the post-modern '90s.

With reference to both colonial and contemporary experience of actual "company towns" in India, the paper considers the paradoxical relation between the self-imposed spatial and social constraints of planned industrial "townships" and housing "colonies," and the relative status, security and freedom from broader social responsibility that such strictures seem to insure for their residents. The racist and classist discrimination of the elite colonial enclaves of the past was overt and unquestioned. The neo-colonial incorporation of such norms in the planning of private industrial townships in post-Independence India has been no less obvious. By contrast, colonial America is idealised in a relatively unproblematic light in the traditional neighbourhood development conventions of the "New Urbanism." Consider the opening lines of Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk's "Traditional Neighbourhood Development Ordinance": "This ordinance is designed to ensure the development of open land along the lines of traditional neighbourhoods. Its provisions adopt the urban conventions which were normal in the United States from colonial times until the 1940s."[6]

I propose that other colonial/postcolonial experiences outside the Euro-American purview furnish a pertinent frame of reference for the critical assessment of such influential trends in the on-going privatization of the communal realm, worldwide.

In the rest of the paper I adopt an intentionally personal stance to reflect critically on initial conjectures and observations with regard to these issues that arose in the course of fieldwork I was conducting in India in the early 1990s. It was a moment of significant social tension and political intrigue. After almost half a century since independence from colonial rule, many of the norms and forms of "modernization" that had guided India's social and economic development unquestioned had now come under siege.

WEST BENGAL: DECEMBER 6, 1992

I finally reached the Tribeni Tissues staff colony after a grinding bus ride of over an hour from the nearest rail station. The train ride itself had been a gruelling affair, packed into a crowded carriage for the hour and a half suburban milk run up the steamy banks of the Hooghly out of Howrah. There had been a distinct sense of excitement in the air that Sunday afternoon, increasingly ominous as the crowds surged out of Calcutta towards evening. By the time I

alighted from the train the news had broken about the day's momentous events in the north Indian city of Ayodhya where thousands of Hindu zealots and political agitators had just torn down a controversial 15th century mosque literally with their bare hands. Local politicians were already in the streets with their bull-horns. The emotions and the muscle of the masses were being mobilized before the anticipated curfew could dampen their frenzy.

Four days earlier in Allahabad I had witnessed that passion and the potential violence to come when I attempted in vain to take a State bus to Varanasi. All buses had been diverted to Ayodhya by order of the partisan state government. At the Allahabad railway station — my next recourse — armies of saffron-scarfed young men were disgorging from trains converging from every corner of India. The platforms and waiting halls resounded with their rousing chants and slogans as the human tide flowed forth towards the bus station. Overwhelmed, I took refuge in the foreign tourists' booking office — the vestigial legacy of the First Class waiting rooms of the colonial past, accessible only to Europeans. This was, for me, a rare resort to privilege. Always an outsider in India, I had nevertheless presumed to be an ordinary traveller, an aficionado of the 3-tier hard-berth. I preferred to mix and took pleasure that my conspicuous "difference" so often provoked such inquisitive fascination and genuine exchange. But, for the first time in my extensive experience of India, I was frightened. In their euphoria the Ayodhya bound pilgrims seemed to look right through me, as if they might trample me in their path if I did not give way. I retreated and cowered in the air-conditioned refuge of the booking office, numbed and disturbed by this novel sense of alienation.

In the days and weeks ahead, political pundits and opinion makers would proclaim the events at Ayodhya as the definitive end, at long last, to decades of incarceration in a neo-colonial bind of contrived secularism, while others deplored the destruction of the mosque and the widespread communal violence that ensued as long term consequences of the colonial construction of religious communalism in the first place. On either side of the debate there was the sense that Ayodhya would prove to be a major new threshold in the long process of decolonization.[7] For the time being, however, in the conceptual if not the spiritual order of contemporary India and in its material culture — not least the buildings and settlements that were the focus of my research — the legacies of colonial precepts and practices were still everywhere to be found.

The stacks of the Tribeni textile plant rose up out of the paddy fields like a surrealist mirage just as night was falling. The bus dropped me, alone, outside a heavy metal gate which slowly opened to admit me upon presentation of my credentials. After all the clamour, the tension and the passions of the preceding days, I slipped inside the compound feeling almost guilty for the sense of relief I felt to have arrived finally at this unlikely destination. Although now quite dark, the relief arose from the distinct hush of the place and its conspicuous propriety; the lush and orderly greenery of the manicured gardens and the grassy common of the management staff quarters, faintly visible in the soft glow of the street lighting. This was familiar, comforting. I felt I had been here before.

It was a sense of *deja vu* to which I had become accustomed. Over the preceding two years my research had caused me to visit scores of similar enclaves throughout the Indian subcontinent-company and institutional townships, government staff colonies and the gated communities of the "foreign-returned" NRI elite (ie. "Non Resident Indian"); and the cantonments and former "civil lines" of the old colonial administration. The latter were the antecedents for the planned communities and normative designs of the postcolonial era, I had hypothesised, and the fieldwork had sought to test this and document it substantively if possible.

JAMALPUR: A COLONIAL "MODEL TOWN"

Just the day before I had stepped off a train at another more

remote "company town," 300 miles further up the line from Calcutta in the backwaters of north eastern Bihar. Jamalpur, the former maintenance headquarters of the old East Indian Railway (EIR), was a destination few travellers would think of visiting. For Phineas Fog, the technophilic protagonist of Jules Verne's *Around the World in Eighty Days*, it was the railway town's smokestacks and its uncanny degree of English efficiency and industriousness against the bucolic backdrop of the Gangetic plains, that captured his fleeting glances. "[Jamalpur] is a more than European town, for it is as English as Manchester or Birmingham with its iron foundries, edge-tool factories, and high chimneys puffing clouds of black smoke heavenward."[8] But it was the gently mocking dispatches of another celebrated writer of the day that had led me to Jamalpur a century later: As a young roving newspaper correspondent in British India in the 1890's, Rudyard Kipling had actually visited the town and observed its norms and its forms at some length. He too was evidently impressed with Jamalpur as a paragon of such order and industry amidst the heat and dust of the Indian plains. "...When it was laid out, in or before the Mutiny year, its designers allowed room for growth, and made the houses of one general design — some of brick, some of stone, some three, four, and six roomed, some single men's barracks and some two-storied — all for the use of the employes (sic.)." But his description of the place was more knowing and discerning than was Verne's merely impressionistic opposition of British industry and Oriental sloth. There was something unique evolving from this colonial superposition; the ostensively familiar was still somehow strange, and intriguingly so:

> There is a holy calm about the roads — totally unlike anything in an English manufacturing town. Wheeled conveyances are few, because every man's bungalow is close to his work, and when the day has begun... you shall pass under the dappled shadows of the trees, hearing nothing louder than the croon of some bearer playing with a child in the verandah or the faint tinkle of a piano. This is pleasant and produces an impression of Wateau-like refinement tempered with Arcadian simplicity.[9]

Transposed to late 20th century America, Kipling could have been describing the Arcadian stage-craft of idyllic neo-colonial enclaves such as "Seaside": Consider these further excerpts from Duany and Plater-Zyberk's "Traditional Neighbourhood Development Ordinance" of 1989[10]

> Traditional neighbourhoods achieve certain social objectives:
>
> By reducing the number and length of necessary automobile trips, traffic congestion is minimized and commuters are granted increased personal time.
> By bringing most of the needs of daily living within walking distance, the elderly and the young gain independence of movement.
> By walking in defined public spaces, citizens come to know each other and to watch over their collective security.

But-back in British India-Kipling couldn't disguise his incredulity at the almost absurdly fastidious propriety of Jamalpur and its nostalgic detachment from context:

> There is a dreary village in the neighbourhood which is said to make the most of any cholera that may be going, but Jamalpur itself is specklessly and spotlessly neat. ....[E]verything has the air of having been cleaned up at ten that very morning and put under a glass case. ...[The settlement] is laid out with military precision to each house its just share of garden, its red brick path, its growth of trees, and its neat little wicket gate. Its general aspect, in spite of the Dutch formality, is that of an English village, such a thing as enterprising stage-managers put on the theatres at home.[11]

Beyond its orderly buildings and its shady streets, Kipling was ultimately most intrigued with the ethos of exclusivity of Jamalpur and the single-minded obsession of its expatriate inhabitants with "The Company" that was the township's creator and their sole reason for being in India:

> The E.I.R. only exists for outsiders. Its servants speak of it reverently, angrily, despitefully, or enthusiastically as "The Company"; and they never omit the big, big C. Men must have treated the Honourable the East India Company in something the same fashion ages ago. "The Company" in Jamalpur is Lord Dufferin, all the Members of Council, the Body-Guard, Sir Frederick Roberts, Mr. Westland, whose name is at the bottom of the currency notes, the Oriental Life Assurance Company, and the Bengal Government all rolled into one. ...the Company is a "big" thing — almost big enough to satisfy an American.[12]

It is in this paternalistic relationship between the inhabitants of planned communities and the creators of such that we can best observe the elision of colonial and corporate norms with which this paper is concerned. Intrigued by Kipling's account of the 1890's, I had journeyed to Jamalpur to observe what had become of this colonial "model town". Although built by and for a private railway company, it was among the earliest civilian settlements produced under the pervasive norms and regulatory directives of the British Indian Department of Public Works (PWD)-the government design agency that was the object of my research. An earthquake early in the present century had destroyed most of the original 19th century building stock, I learned, but what had been built to replace it could hardly be distinguished from the original Kipling described. A die had been cast which had evidently had no subsequent cause to be broken.

TRIBENI: A NEO-COLONIAL ENCLAVE

The Tribeni colony was the last case I was to look at on that trip and somewhat of a long shot at that. As the "company town" of a private corporation, built after Indian Independence, it could not be regarded as a direct product of the colonial Public Works Department. However, the norms of colonial settlement planning — suburban dispersion, segregation and typological stratification by social category[13] — had been rendered concrete in the ubiquitous built environments associated with the former British Raj in which the post-colonial elite had subsequently installed itself. With little more than cosmetic differences in architectural style, new towns like Tribeni had seemingly reproduced rather than transformed that received order. Cognitively therefore, if not by the route of direct institutional agency, these norms evidently had a compelling degree of inertia.

The autonomous "township" or institutional campus and staff "colony" (the nomenclature is telling![14]) were briefs with which many private architectural practices in India had become as well experienced as the design departments of the Public sector over the years since Independence. When the Tribeni township was built in the 1950s, newly established firms such as Kothari & Associates, Kanvinde & Rai, and Stein, Polk & Chatterjee were busy with many similar commissions for the burgeoning industrial sector. In heavy industries such as steel, government, in the guise of state corporations, was the principal client.[15] But an emergent corporate plutocracy of industrialists such as the houses of Tata and Mody were in many respects equal if not leading players. Indeed, as early as 1909, long before the departure of the British, the Tatas had created India's first steel town, Jamshedpur. But though this was a relatively radical undertaking, against the grain of colonial policy, even the Tata's original design consultants — an American firm of Pittsburgh based industrial engineers and planners — saw fit to emulate the colonial settlement model with exclusively segregated enclaves for manag-

ers and each of the different grades of workers.[16]

What was intriguing about the Tribeni case was the fact that the corporate client had seemingly tired of the received norms, a generation and a half after the original factory and staff colony had been built. Moreover, it had decided to commission new design input to bring about some change to the status quo. I was intrigued personally because the designers who had been flown in to break the mould were two of my own former students.

The initial innocence and ignorance of India of these bright, idealistic young Canadians ostensibly freed them of the rote prejudices of Indian experience that might have constrained their imagination. But, inevitably, they had arrived with their own cognitive baggage of preconceptions and intentions. Foremost was "the question of technology," the ideological fixation of their particular moment of reckoning in the uncertain course of recent architectural thought. In their undergraduate lectures with Alberto Perez-Gomez at McGill University, they had begun to articulate their own passionate critique of the problematic philosophical and methodological relationships between Modern Science and Western Architecture. As zealous new recruits in the crusade against the dulling "scientism" of the *ancien regime* of Functionalist modernism, they had become greatly enamoured, alternatively, with the perceived mysticism of India's autonomous architectural traditions. The students' Tribeni commission had begun as a hypothetical studio project in cross-cultural urban design in which they had taken a quixotic tilt at the architecture of India's heroic era of postcolonial industrialisation. Their strategy was to counteract the anomie of the existing company town at Tribeni by designing for it the communal heart that its original designers had seemingly denied it with their adherence to the secular rationalist ideals of the "Modern" India of the 1950s. This new "heart" was to be a community center in the form of a Hindu temple which, they brazenly proposed, would be unprecedented in its formal sophistication and phenomenological richness. The proposal had greatly impressed one of their assessors — the expatriate Indian principal of the international architectural firm that was actually engaged in the Tribeni renewal project — and the two students were subsequently offered the opportunity to go to India to develop and implement the design directly.

The ingenuous intentions of these precocious young designers were pardonable, even inspiring considering the genuine passion with which they had embarked on their design — which was indeed uncommon and sophisticated, at least in form. But the economic and political circumstances in which this exceptional opportunity had been engineered were more problematic. As far as they were concerned, the enthusiasm of their boss and his clients for their temple proposal was sincere. In the larger picture, however, these students were really just pawns in the much bigger game of an international design practice. Their employer was a worldly and successful corporate architect whose multi-national firm was engaged in marketing design expertise globally, a game in which local and historical cultures and their architectural signs — such as this designer temple — were simply commodities to be exchanged and consumed. On the side of the corporate client — the managers at Tribeni — the real issue was not one of architecture and environmental design, but of persistent labour unrest over wage and policy disputes, which was undermining productivity at the plant. But it was also a moment of more general social disaffection, when architecture was very much on the minds of any Indian who read the daily press. Over the preceding two years skilful politicians had exacerbated the atavistic religious alignments of Indian society through a popular appeal to build a monumental new temple at Ayodhya on the disputed site of an existing mosque — another architectural artefact of a long history of colonization. Back at the Tribeni staff colony in Hindu dominated West Bengal, the managers had rationalized that the investment of a little surplus in a "designer" temple would serve as a potential palliative to allay the disaffection of their irrevocably backward workers. But rather than incite the sort

of revolutionary action that had ultimately broken out at Ayodhya, the Tribeni temple might conversely have proved effective as an "opiate," in this case, to anaesthetise the workers and distract them from their demands for any truly substantive changes to the status quo. I could imagine that Marx was turning in his grave![17]

Coming together at this company town on the banks of the Hooghly River were various threads of my personal and professional engagement in the South Asian arena. Meanwhile, the thicker, knottier strand of India's turbulent postcolonial history-in-the-making seemed to be unravelling with alarming speed, along with neo-colonial precepts such as the modernist ideals of secularism, and of rationalism itself. This conjunction was poignant and more than a little paradoxical, it seemed to me, in the light of that particular day's events, when an entire nation had been paralysed and brought to the brink of social breakdown over the destructively determined will of some to erect a certain building. More ominously still, this single, symbolically significant piece of architecture seemed to signal an ultimate, fundamental intolerance not only to the architectural symbols of India's colonial past, but to the whole conceptual legacy of norms and values that these buildings had seemingly framed and preserved for so long.

The modest stakes in the case of the Tribeni temple project were seemingly incomparable with those of the Ram Temple project at Ayodhya, but the anti-colonial/anti-rational rhetoric was disconcertingly similar (however ironic it was that the authors of the Tribeni project were such unwitting neo-colonial agents in their own right). Architecture, as form and as a discipline, was a framework in which Indian society had perennially negotiated its questions and disputes concerning identity, both spatially and conceptually. But the violence and the passion that such had just shown it could inspire at Ayodhya was humbling. As symbolic form, Architecture was a potentially even more coercive and traumatic tool of power than the technocratic framework of environmental determinism and control of colonial design practices. Paradoxically, it was within the gates of Tribeni — that same vestigial framework of colonial norms and forms that my young student friends had been commissioned to transform — that we found security and comfort from the communal madness outside.

LIMITS: WILFUL CONSTRAINTS IN UNCERTAIN WORLDS

In a recent essay about the mentality of the former colonial administrators of British India, the eminent Subaltern historian, Ranajit Guha, considers the anxious duality implicit in the following passage from the memoirs of one such colonial servant:

> I had sometimes a sense of isolation, of being a caged white monkey in a Zoo whose patrons were this incredibly numerous beige race... I shivered at the millions and immensities and secrecies of India. I liked to finish my day at the club, in a world whose limits were known and where people answered my beck. An incandescent lamp coughed its light over shrivelled grass and dusty shrubbery; in its circle of illumination exiled heads were bent over English newspapers, their thoughts far away but close to mine.[18]

Guha draws attention to the tension between the increasingly contemptuous self consciousness of an anomic colonial sub-culture and the necessary comfort afforded by its own idiosyncratic forms and institutions — the little "world" of the European colonial settlement "whose limits were known." In the humble comforts of their standardised bungalows and clubs, he proposes, the colonials could stave off though never fully defeat their "pervasive anxiety about being lost in Empire."[19]

In the present paper I have begun to consider some aspects of how the self-constraining delimitation of that colonial built environment, among the more conspicuous cultural practices of the British in

India, may have served to allay their sense of alienation. The normative designed environments produced by that colonial regime did tend to circumscribe exclusive domains in which the very rigidity of the familiar walls and rules that bounded them preserved for the expatriates whatever freedom "to be at home" in India they could experience, enmeshed as they were in the web of their own asymmetric and hence unstable system of imperial control.

The postcolonial case of company town planning at Tribeni, with its recent anxieties about renovation and re-centering community in architectural form, suggests a rather important question for further study. Do the postcolonial elites who have appropriated the managerial status and the exclusive environments of the former colonial rulers, and who have continued to reproduce those normative socio-spatial systems over the past fifty years, experience a comparable anxiety of "not being at home" in the society they dominate? A similar question might be put to the elite residents of the new "gated communities" of Europe and America.[20] The colonial and postcolonial experiences of the non-West furnish a pertinent frame of reference for the critical assessment of such influential trends in the on-going privatization of the communal realm, worldwide.

NOTES

[1] Diane Ghirardo, *Building New Communities: New Deal America and Fascist Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

[2] Ibid., pp. 3-7.

[3] The restoration of that long lost imperial glory of the past was also an ideological ploy for Mussolini's imperial venture into North-East Africa in this same period. The ill-fated settlement schemes of the Fascists in colonial Africa were also closely allied to their internal resettlement program. For Ghirardo's account of new community building in Italian East Africa, see Ibid., pp. 88-109.

[4] and on much the same gridiron template with which Roman surveyors had mapped their empire 2000 years earlier.

[5] Ibid., 7. For the corporatism of both Fascist and New Deal programs, see also ibid., pp. 12-13, 18.

[6] A. Duany and E. Plater-Zyberk, "Traditional Neighbourhood Development Ordinance," as quoted in C. Jencks and K. Kropf, eds., *Theories and Manifestoes of Contemporary Architecture* (London: Academy Editions, 1997), p. 191.

[7] A sampling of the various positions articulated in the ensuing debates — although far from thoroughly representative, notably from the "secular" point of view — is presented in Jitendra Bajaj, ed., *Ayodhya and the Future of India*. (Madras: Centre for Policy Studies, 1993). A more critically sophisticated retrospective analysis of the Ayodhya events is offered in Sanjay Srivasteva's recently published study of the institutional construction of "modernity", "citizenship" and the technocratic elite of post-colonial India. See Sanjay Srivasteva, *Constructing Post-Colonial India: National Character and the Doon School* (London: Routledge, 1999).

[8] Verne appears to have confused the name of the town with nearby Monghyr, but the foundries and settlement of the railway people are the only obvious object of his description: Jules Verne, *Around the World in Eighty Days* (London and New York: Dutton, 1926). See in particular Chapter XIV.

[9] Rudyard Kipling. "Among the Railway Folk," in R. Kipling, *From Sea to Sea* (New York: Doubleday and McClure, 1899), pp. 251-252.

[10] A. Duany and E. Plater-Zyberk, "Traditional Neighbourhood Development Ordinance," pp. 191-192.

[11] Rudyard Kipling. "Among the Railway Folk," pp. 251-252.

[12] Ibid., p. 251.

[13] For the original, and still seminal study of these settlement patterns and their socio-cultural implications, see A.D. King, *Colonial Urban Development: Culture, Social Power and Environment* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976).

[14] Anthony King, and more recently Tom Markus, have both underscored the crucial cognitive associations that can derive historically between buildings and the everyday language that cultures use in normal situations to give these names and functional meaning. For King and colonial Indian instances in particular, see A.D. King. *Colonial Urban Development.* See also Thomas A. Markus, "Social Practice and Building Typologies," in K.A. Franck and L.H. Schneekloth, eds., *Ordering Space: Types in Architecture and Design* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1994), pp. 147-163.

[15] The work of the emigre American architect, Joseph Allen Stein, at the new steel town of Durgapur in West Bengal in the later 1950s is of particular note. For a comprehensive study of Stein's fascinating career, see Stephen White, *Building in the Garden: The Architecture of Joseph Allen Stein in India and California* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1993). For more general historical and critical accounts of post-colonial architectural developments in India, see: Vikram Bhatt and Peter Scriver, *After the Masters: Contemporary Indian Architecture* (Ahmedabad and New York: Mapin, 1990), and J. Lang, M. Desai and M. Desai, *Architecture and Independence — The Search for Identity: India 1880 to 1980* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997).

[16] Blair Kling, "Shaping the modern worker through architecture and planning: the case of Jamshedpur," In Vikramaditya Prakash, ed., *Theatres of Decolonization: Architecture, Agency, Urbanism.* Proceedings of the Second Other Connections Conference, Chandigarh, India, January 6-10, 1995, vol. 1 (Seattle: College of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of Washington, 1997), pp. 75-85.

[17] There in communist-ruled West Bengal, however, the Tribeni labourers have proved themselves more sophisticated politically than their bosses had assumed. The company was eventually compelled to cancel the project and dismiss their consultants, although they apparently still intend to build the temple as soon as labour union issues are sorted out. E-mail exchange with Eric Bunge, one of the two student designers of the Tribeni Temple project, October 1997.

[18] Francis Yeats-Brown, *The Lives of a Bengal Lancer* (New York, 1930), pp. 4-5. As quoted in Ranajit Guha, "Not at Home in Empire," *Critical Inquiry*, 23 (Spring 1997), pp. 482-493.

[19] Guha, "Not at Home in Empire," pp. 482-483.

[20] For a useful overview of the scope and variations of the gated community phenomenon in contemporary America, see Edward J. Blakely and Mary Gail Snyder, "Forting Up: Gated Communities in the United States," *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 15:1 (Spring, 1998), pp. 61-72.