

Of Mimicry and Modern Museums. Le Corbusier and Sector-10 in Chandigarh.

Dr. Iain Jackson

Lecturer

Liverpool School of Architecture

ijackson@liv.ac.uk

t- +44 [0]7980907728

t- +44 [0]151 794 2602

The Liverpool School of Architecture

Leverhulme Building

Abercromby Square

Liverpool

L69 7ZN

UK

Abstract:

This paper considers two museums located in Chandigarh, India: one is an art gallery, designed by Le Corbusier in 1962, the other a city museum designed in 1980 by a team of Indian architects who previously worked with Le Corbusier on the Chandigarh scheme. The paper investigates the historical context of the colonial museum and how Le Corbusier and his Indian protégées responded to museum design in the post-colonial era. Le Corbusier adopted incredibly similar plans for three museums located in the 'Orient' and the museum designed by the Indian architects is a 'copy' or reinterpretation of Le Corbusier's Heidi Weber Pavilion in Zurich. How was the museum as an institution and container for collective memory to operate within the new post-colonial context and is a mimetic approach to architecture an appropriate solution?

Of Mimicry and Modern Museums. Le Corbusier and Sector-10 in Chandigarh.

The capricious division of the Indian subcontinent following the Act of Partition in 1948 resulted in the city of Lahore being part of the newly created Pakistan and left India without a capital for the state of Punjab. It was decided that a new city should be procured. Beyond the necessity of housing government office, the proposed city was also to be a symbol and political metaphor for a modern India. The initial phase of city named, 'Chandigarh', was finally built between 1951-54 after changes in architects, political squabbling and financial constraints. It adopts a gridiron plan, arranged in numbered 'sectors' each forming a self-contained unit complete with schools, markets and housing. It is a Modernist city, with the masterplan and government buildings designed by Le Corbusier, and Pierre Jeanneret, Maxwell Fry and Jane Drew designing the more quotidian structures. The story of Chandigarh's development has been discussed at length by Kaliaⁱ, and recently there have been more critical evaluations of the city's developmentⁱⁱ. As Perera explains the issue of authorship lacks critical discussion and the desire to present Le Corbusier as the sole heroic author is finally being reviewed and readdressedⁱⁱⁱ. The city is often discussed as a unified complete whole, rather than a complex, increasingly fragmented and fluid urban setting. Whilst the initial city plan needs careful academic study, there are many components, individual buildings and additional townships that are lacking research.

This paper considers Sector-10, the cultural sector of Chandigarh located within the tranquil 'leisure valley', with particular focus on two museums, one of which was designed by Le Corbusier, (the Art Gallery, from 1960) the other by a team of Indian architects heavily influenced by him (Chandigarh city museum, 1980). (Figure 1)

Sector-10: Chandigarh Art Gallery

Although India had been independent for 13 years the advice of London's Victoria and Albert Museum was sought regarding the prestigious Punjab art collection that was currently residing in inappropriately converted dwellings. The V&A recommended that a purpose built structure was required to protect as well as properly display this predominantly historical collection. Le Corbusier had included a cultural sector in his masterplan for the city and it was decided by the Punjab Government that this would be an appropriate site for the museum. Le Corbusier accepted the commission with Pierre Jeanneret overseeing the construction and technical details on site^{iv}. The design was finally approved in 1962, although the layout of the museum was far from a new design concept for Le Corbusier. He utilised the ideas he had previously developed for the "Museum of Continuous Growth" project originally proposed in 1930. The building is square on plan with two additional projecting forms that house the lecture theatre and café (figure 2). The main façade, whilst resembling stack-bond masonry is actually clad tiles, which supported on pilotis creates the illusion of solidity and mass whilst seeming to float above the expansive concrete plateau (figure 3). The roof contains a series of clerestory fenestration each with its own guttering system that feeds into an over-sized concrete gutter projecting beyond the building line and a cornice is created with fins of brise soleil (figure 4). The gutter pours the rainwater into a sunken pool below utilising a similar detail found at the High Court building in Sector-1 (figure 5).

The museum is positioned with a large flat concrete esplanade, enabling it to be viewed in elevation, again, like the buildings in Sector-1, but is less expressive and lacking the mystic symbolism of those buildings. Unlike the High Court where the internal ramp is revealed externally or the Assembly building with its portico and dramatic roofscape (figure 6), the museum is introverted and reveals very little from the outside. It is a closed box, a cabinet of curiosities that only reveals its secrets upon closer inspection.

The overhanging heavy mass of the bricks casts a large shadow on the first

exhibits that are experienced before one enters the building proper. This outside gallery takes the role of the classical portico, but the effect of the shadow and change in temperature as one ventures closer to the entrance gives the feeling of entering a cave or temple complex. The artefacts on display are also predominantly antiquarian and of sacred origins at this point. In their 'original' setting they would have been viewed externally and it seems fitting for them to be exhibited in an exterior, albeit semi-protected exhibition. The museum has become the new 'temple' complete with its iconography. The large pivoted entrance door, a classic Corbusian motif, becomes a ceremonial movable wall and creates a seamless threshold that entices the visitor into the main space (as well as helping to cool the interior, figure 7). Internally, avant-garde pieces were specially commissioned by leading artists such as M. F. Hussain, Jamini Roy, Rabindranath Tagore, and these works are exhibited directly alongside the iconographic and sacred pieces. There are very few partitions and the columns are exaggerated beyond their structural requirements, subtly restricting certain views as well as offering unforeseen glimpses. The vertical circulation is provided by a muscular concrete ramp that cuts through the triple height space. It is very much part of the experience and its alternative vantage points generate a, 'variety of events and encounters at every step, at every turning, giving unusual perspectives and thought-provoking presentations'^{iv} (figure 8).

Between the Primitive and the Nationalist

Independence prompted a desire for a 'new India', and as such a new 'imagined community' had to be formed^{vi}. In Chandigarh this was significant as the vision decreed that there was *no history*, no past upon which a shared commonality could be found. The site was almost entirely *cleansed* of all previous traces of habitation to make way for the new city and considered by the architects to be a blank piece of paper – the existing farms, villages and temples that occupied the site were bulldozed^{vii}. Prime Minister Nehru's desire for Chandigarh to be, 'unfettered by the past', is frequently quoted, and as Correa writes it became a

city without 'umbilical cord'^{viii}. Significantly, the Kiran cinema in sector-22 was one of the first cultural buildings to be constructed, through which the popular medium of film could share nationalist objectives^{ix} (figure 9). In a similar vein the Art Museum would also contribute to the creation of identity through its collection of objects, as MacDonald elaborates,

individual identification with the nation-state and the numerous unknown “brothers” could not rest on experienced *social* relations it had instead to be *cultural* – a matter of shared knowledge and practice, of representation, ritual and symbolism^x

This was all the more pertinent in Chandigarh – a city made up entirely of migrants and refugees, and despite the city being ‘Modernist’ and idealistically detached from history, there was still felt the requirement for a museum – for the Indian’s to establish their own collections and to construct their own histories and collective memories through fresh interpretations of objects. By constructing and curating these collections the idea of nationhood and the process of de-colonisation was able to take place. Furthermore, the commissioning of new ‘modern Indian’ art specifically for the collection suggests a break from the historicised and ‘museumised’ colonial portrayal of India. Thus we see *sacred art* displayed alongside the *secular avant-garde*. The Chandigarh Art Museum is located between the territory of the ‘knowing modernist’, selecting and displaying ‘primitive art in civilised spaces’^{xi}, as well as the ‘Indian nationalist’, carefully constructing a lineage and connection between the art of ancient *Bharat* and the modern forward thinking democracy of India. In one sense Chandigarh, through this museum, declares that there is no history (we begin from now with modern architecture); equally, it acknowledges a particular past and sets about containing it within a modern depository as well as building on that culture through the acquisition and display of contemporary objects.

In a new city, without the weave of old and new, temples, markets and shrines,

the Art Museum filled this gap. Unlike other Indian cities, where the 'living history' of India is found on the streets, in Chandigarh one no longer has to walk amongst 'history' and 'tradition' with all its flaws, smells and contradictions (Figure 10). Instead 'history' is *experienced* through the sanitised gallery, where everything is organised chronologically and beautifully presented in cabinets. The stories of the objects are complete and resolved with the disparate and fragmented collections attempting to, 'stand in for the whole'^{xii}. It demonstrates a knowingness, an awareness of (or at least a fresh creation of) one's past, self-consciously organising, displaying and controlling 'a past repressed by colonialism'^{xiii}. The elite of Chandigarh also saw the Museum as providing moral and cultural instruction. When lack of finance threatened the project, Dr. M.S Randhawa, the Chief Commissioner of Chandigarh made an impassioned plea,

unless the hearts and minds of the people are exposed to works of art and elevated to a higher creative plane, they generally tend to remain at the animal level below the texture line of civilisation which we wish to build in our country^{xiv}

Museums in the Colonial Context

'one might consider museums to be the epitome of a colonial institution...'^{xv}

'It [the museum] is still considered a colonial tool and belonging to the larger international history of bourgeois culture'^{xvi}

The decision to include museums (in the traditional western sense) in Chandigarh seems contradictory. A complex scenario was created that attempted to blend the pursuit of a 'new beginning' with a reassessment of India's cultural heritage coupled with the deployment of radical European

architects to determine how this might be physically housed. In addition, museums within India are interwoven with Imperialism, during the British Raj they served as treasure troves and souvenir cabinets rather than representations of the people.

It is within our museums and collections that we hold our most prized, rare and symbolic objects, however a collection takes on a different meaning if one group assembles it on another's behalf. The British defined the Indians through their collections and representations of *them*, in effect *museumising* the colonised people and fixing India in an ever ancient and ruinous position.

Goetz, writing not long after Independence states that collections were, 'started, though rarely developed systematically: often they did not grow beyond sets of hunting trophies'^{xvii}. Most of the important items were removed and shipped to the centre of Empire. The few museums developed by the British in India attempted to demonstrate an almost dynastic lineage between past empires and themselves. The Albert Hall, a museum in Jaipur, is a curious blend of styles and 'a showcase of India's past as organized and classified by its colonial rulers, an Indo-Saracenic structure - whose architectural forms reflected precisely the same enterprise - was altogether appropriate'^{xviii}.

Breckenbridge and Appadurai note that in India, a place that has a, 'living past found in its sacred places' and where 'the separation of sacred objects...from objects of everyday life has not really occurred'^{xix} the position of the postcolonial museum is precarious. They go on to state, 'as far as India is concerned, museums seem less a product of philanthropy and more of a product of the conscious agenda of India's British rulers'^{xx}.

Despite these claims, the museum was very much part of the postcolonial agenda and was used to further the nationalist objectives of the time. The National Museum, New Delhi was the first museum to be developed following Independence and was conceived in 1949 with the first of its new buildings inaugurated in 1960^{xxi}. The Vice-President of India at the time, Dr. S Radhakrishnan, delivered the museum's inaugural speech and illustrated the

importance of museums to India through their ability to show, 'the antiquity, the continuity, the prolific creativeness and outstanding vitality of the people of India'^{xxii}. The location of the New Delhi National Museum (NDNM) is crucially inserted at the point where the Janpath crosses the Rajpath^{xxiii}, possibly two of the most political symbols and metaphoric demonstrations of imperialism injected by the British into Delhi. The positioning of the museum and the choice of a Mughal-like sandstone façade redefines and attempts to reclaim this territory and its history.

The old residence of the Maharaja of Jaipur, located in Delhi, was converted into the National Gallery of Modern Art (NGMA) in 1954 and the Vice-President of India also opened this building. The reuse of that particular structure for the location of Modern art is also significant. The latest and most radical art being produced in India was placed within a palace and a symbol of India *before* colonialism. This firmly inserts the Modern art into a lineage of Indian culture confirming its validity and national importance. Equally, in a similar outlook to the French Revolution and consistent with the socialist ideology of Nehru, the old palace now belongs to 'the people', and can be accessed by all.

The museum was utilised by the Independent government as a symbol of Modernity, freedom and enlightenment for India, however the Indian elite (often educated within the UK) were in effect using the same syntax as the colonial regime.

Architectural Déjà Vu

Le Corbusier's approach to museum design was not context specific, nor was he attempting to create an 'iconic' building that would serve as a metaphor and symbol of newly independent India. Instead he deployed a pre-conceived solution, a type, that was developed thirty years previously, which viewed the museum as a container or plinth, rather than a site-specific artefact embodied with meaning. In adopting this approach he avoided having to represent the

people or the state's agenda and as such his architecture lacks the hieroglyphs and narrative of the sector-1 buildings.

Le Corbusier had developed a type that he believed could be deployed in any location and indeed he had already used very similar designs to the Chandigarh Art Museum in two other locations.

The Sanskar Kendra was built in Ahmedabad in 1958, and The National Museum of Western Art was constructed in Tokyo in 1959 – the resemblance to the Chandigarh Art Museum is clear to see (figures 11 and 12).

Although it would be possible to accuse Le Corbusier's recycling of ideas as architectural laziness and of simply rolling out the same designs to different sites there are a number of subtle differences. In addition, Le Corbusier had been working on the *problem* of museum/display/collection for most of his life and therefore his museum designs are the outcome of this research. He had satisfactorily solved the problem in his sketchbooks rendering the built outcome, exhibits and to a large degree the context as secondary^{xxiv}. Alternative forms – or answers, would imply a lack of resolution and lead to even further accusations of *formalism*^{xxv}. The Sanskar Kendra is capable of being extended, using Le Corbusier's principles of 'unlimited growth' and standard structural elements, whereas the Chandigarh Art Museum has a lecture hall that would prevent such simple expansion (although according to Chandigarh architects, the Chandigarh Museum is considered 'the best – architecturally and functionally'^{xxvi}). The other major difference is the presence of a central courtyard at Sanskar Kendra that should contain a pond. This courtyard and water were intended to help cool the building as well as introduce light into an otherwise 'deep' plan. The circulation ramp also faces into the courtyard creating a protected but open solution to circulation.

Le Corbusier died during the construction of the Chandigarh Art Museum, and it was left to the Indian team of supporting architects to complete the build, along with Jeanneret. Jeanneret was also of an advanced age, and the Indian

architects managed most of the construction detailing and everyday site attendance, working in accordance with Le Corbusier's drawings. Despite this combined effort, the plaque on the museum wall cites Le Corbusier as the sole author, with the Indian architects listed as mere associates.

Sector-10 Chandigarh City Museum: Follow my leader

It was these Indian architects that were 'trained' by the Europeans (some of whom eventually secured the rights of accession to Chief Architect) who went on to design an additional museum in Chandigarh. Directly opposite Le Corbusier's Art Museum is the Chandigarh City Museum (figure 13). Although this building was shown on Le Corbusier's masterplan its form and exact purpose was not prescribed. Nevertheless a building designed by Surgit Singh, H.S Chopra, A.S Mendiratta and Shiv Dutt Sharma was constructed in 1980 and used as a 'Pavilion for Temporary Exhibitions'. At the city's fifty-year anniversary in 1997 it was decided to convert the building into the Chandigarh City Museum (undertaken by Aditya Prakash and Shiv Dutt Sharma), the aim of which is to explain the procurement of the city through the many original architectural drawings, models and sketches that were previously held in the city archive. The plan of the museum is composed of two misaligned squares both of which are shaded by the elevated pyramidal-parasol roof structure. Entry to the museum is at basement level where appropriately belowground the archaeology of the city's history is explained, shedding light on the era BC (Before Corbusier). As one ascends through the space the growth of the city is explained, along with Le Corbusier's Modulor system and very briefly the role of the other European architects. The Indian 'architectural trainees' receive almost no mention whatsoever despite producing most of the drawings for the city and designing hundreds of Chandigarh buildings^{xxvii}. At the third floor the future of Chandigarh is pondered and various new builds are showcased (although this section is not regularly updated despite many new additions, extensions and modifications to

the city masterplan). The final exhibit is the city itself, viewed from the roof terrace café and under the shelter of the concrete parasols (figure 14). The visitor doesn't retrace their steps and departs the museum via a projecting and contorted ramp that terminates back at ground level, alongside a sculpture of the 'modulor man' and an example of the specially produced Chandigarh manhole covers. The museum functions as the classic Corbusian 'promenade architecturale' and can be considered one of the artefacts on display.

Mimicry: 'Almost the same but not quite...' ^{xxviii}

Most of the Indian architects involved in the Chandigarh scheme, although described as students and assistants, were in fact practising young architects who returned to India from around the world to work with Le Corbusier on the city during the early 1950s. According to the familiar story of Chandigarh, these architects were being trained in the Corbusian school of thought, the modulor and CIAM manifesto rather than the basic rudiments of architecture. Although this is an overstatement as Le Corbusier was only in India for two months per year and left most of the work (and training) to Jeanneret, Fry and Drew. Through the Art Museum however, the Indian architects demonstrated their ability to deliver a Corbusian scheme using Le Corbusier's own measurement system and in effect, became better than Le Corbusier at designing a Le Corbusier building. The Indian architects designed a structure that is remarkably similar to another of Le Corbusier's buildings; the Heidi Weber Pavilion in Zurich (figure 15). This Pavilion was one of the last buildings to be designed by Le Corbusier and demonstrates, 'a new alternative to the concrete aesthetic of massive volumes set in opposition'^{xxix}. The formal and heavyweight cast brutalism of Chandigarh was abandoned for a carefully manufactured kit of parts, assembled and bolted together.

Back in Chandigarh, the Indian architectural team responsible for the museum had all worked with Le Corbusier and Jeanneret. The architects were fully aware

that they were 'copying' the form of another Le Corbusier structure. Modernism is deeply committed to newness and *originality*, yet here we see not so much a replica, but more of a parody. The difficulty we face with this work is due the postcolonial arena within which the Indians were practising. Partha Mitter, in discussing Art and Modernism notes that,

influence has been the key epistemic tool in studying the reception of Western art in the non-western world: if the product is too close to its original source, it reflects slavish mentality; if on the other hand, the imitation is imperfect, it represents a failure. In terms of power relation, borrowing by artists from the peripheries becomes a badge of inferiority. In contrast, the borrowings of European artists are described approvingly as "affinities" or dismissed as inconsequential...^{xxx}

It is exactly this scenario that is demonstrated in Chandigarh. Le Corbusier, at will, can borrow/cite from cooling towers, bulls horns, Janta Mantar, Pinjore gardens (not the mention William Curtis' extrapolated interpretations^{xxxix}) and so on without question, yet for the Indian architects who naively viewed Le Corbusier in a deistic light the problem of appropriate design in Chandigarh was burdened with the specter of Le Corbusier. If something different was proposed, it would still be judged against the Le Corbusier backdrop, as Prakash notes, 'once one has worked under a "Master", one can spend the rest of one's life trying to break free from under there'^{xxxii}. Prakash describes his father's difficulty in this area, 'he has written three books, and produced elaborate plans of his own utopian city, in order to establish his own voice'^{xxxiii}.

At the Tagore Theatre, designed by Aditya Prakash in 1960-61 (with Jeanneret still in Chandigarh as the chief architect), we again see a striking similarity between the Theatre and the Art Museum (figure 16). The arrangement of the concrete frame and the brick infill is remarkably alike, re-appropriated for a different function. It was satisfactory for Le Corbusier to duplicate form, but the

Indian architects clearly felt an obligation to design in this manner. Again, the Neelam Theatre in Sector-17, also designed by Prakash can also be compared to the Sector-1 Corbusian work, although perhaps less obviously so than the other cases in point^{xxxiv} (figure 16). The Indian architects whilst highly competent at designing in this manner, struggled to work within the framework of Chandigarh whilst simultaneously developing as creative agents and instigators of new design. They could neither break the mould nor work in the Le Corbusier tradition without being labeled as inferior, copyists and their work described as 'derivative',

The influence of Le Corbusier is clearly evident in many buildings completed in India between 1960-1980. During the early part of that period - the first phase of his impact - the work of his followers was highly derivative but it evolved into a second phase in which his ideas were more evident than his forms^{xxxv}

In this sense the Indian architects are no different to other architects around the world, but for some reason there is an expectation that architecture produced outside of the Western / Modernist Centre should demonstrate a degree of indigenoussness. In post-war West Africa for example, the term 'tropical architecture' is given to Modernist works built in that region. The new term gives the architecture a local grounding, in some way buffering it against the accusations of being imported, and somehow illegitimate. Despite the early Modernists claims of universality it became tweaked and tempered to suit local peculiarities and conditions.

Architectural Lampoon or Translation

'Architecture is always a mimic to itself, all architecture is already mimetic, is already mimicking what has been previously stated, constructed, even the most 'extreme' avant-garde projects maintain the mimicry of social and cultural programming^{xxxvi}.

'To some architects, Le Corbusier was simply a provider of a new architectural vocabulary - a set of patterns that they could adopt and adapt...to other architects he was the progenitor of a whole new line of thinking. There is still work being executed in the former mode of thought but it is architects whose cognitive processes - analytical and synthetic thinking - were shaped by Le Corbusier who seem to have made a continuing impression on India^{xxxvii}.

The remaking of the Heidi Weber Pavilion in Chandigarh was not due to lack of ideas or inability to create other forms. The Indian architects had designed many buildings in Chandigarh not of the typical "Chandigarh style", such as the student centre (designed by B.P. Mathur, figure 18). Indeed, Pierre Jeanneret himself signalled a break from the Chandigarh style with the design of Panjab University and the Gandhi Bhavan building (Figure 19). The City Museum is a deliberate homage rather than mimetic duplication and demonstrates a *knowingness*, and cultural liberation, however it could also suggest a hesitancy in deciding appropriate form. Rather than continuing to develop their own architectural ideas in the wake of Le Corbusier and Jeanneret, the Indians still felt an obligation, especially as they were designing a building located alongside one of Le Corbusiers. The City Museum becomes one of the exhibits on display outside the Art Museum. Rather than appearing to compete with Le Corbusier, the Indian architects have caricatured one of his other buildings thereby avoiding the problem of deciding upon an apposite architecture, and at the same time demonstrating the knowledge to design in the Corbusian manner, altered sufficiently to demonstrate mastery. Yet, designing in this style, twenty years after Le Corbusier and still using a 'concrete aesthetic of massive volumes' possibly indicates a time lag and a trailing behind, forever in the wake of the present^{xxxviii}. This is not, as Mitter writes a 'slavish mentality', or a, 'badge of inferiority', far from it, rather a conscious and premeditated homage. The Museum can be viewed as a 'translation' of Le Corbusian form and in doing so

the Indian architect's have created something new, for each translation is an act of renewing, remaking and reinventing^{xxxix}. Whilst the Tagore Theatre and other such buildings were built in the 1960s when architects were testing Le Corbusier's ideas and forms throughout India, the City Museum was built much later. In designing a Corbusier building *better* than Le Corbusier himself they were perhaps freeing themselves from their master, showing the world, as well as themselves that, 'we can do it too'. They may have severed their own umbilical cords to Le Corbusier, but they also denied the opportunity for a museum that reflected how they lived in and responded to the city. Instead, they played to the crowd and the international visitors (mainly architects) who make pilgrimage. Chandigarh had rapidly developed as a city by 1980 (and certainly by 1997), yet the museum is content to revel in its Corbusian associations, rather like a bore name-dropping and recalling anecdotes from the good old days. The exhibits within the City Museum are important historical artifacts and should be preserved and where appropriate displayed, however, Chandigarh is much more than the masterplan and Le Corbusier. The museum continues the tradition of 'top-down' official display and museum as state endorsed history, rather than as a place for discussion and critical review of the experiment that is Chandigarh. The Museum should remain the place for displaying the Corbusian treasure, but must also facilitate the review of new works, present research, ideas and trials. Code violations, Greek revival houses and petty political arguments may be inconvenient to pedant Chandigarh and foreign architects wishing to preserve the Corbusian fantasy, but they are as much a part of Chandigarh as the dramatic forms of Sector-1. The process of collecting, display and finding appropriate spaces within which to perform these activities is difficult, contradictory and inevitably an unsatisfactory event, especially in Chandigarh. Museums have a crucial role in India, but the manacles of Imperialist mindsets live on through the stasis of tired exhibitions and the reluctance to challenge the orthodoxy and inertia of the 'cultural elite'.

-
- i Kalia, Chandigarh: The making of an Indian City .
- ii Perera, N. 'Contesting Visions: Hybridity, liminality and the authorship of the Chandigarh Plan'.
- iii See Joshi 'Documenting Chandigarh' and Sarin, 'Urban Planning in the Third World: The Chandigarh Experience'.
- iv Although Pierre Jeanneret's contract was only three years long (1951-54) he decided to continue to live in Chandigarh and remained there until 1966.
- v Bahga & Bahga. *Le Corbusier and Pierre Jeanneret: Footprints on the sands of Indian architecture*, 259.
- vi Anderson, *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*.
- vii The only exception to this demolition was a tree-lined street in sector 22, the village of Kensal (see Prakash) and a temple.
- viii Correa, Charles. 'The Public, the Private, and the Sacred', 102.
- ix Jackson and Bandyopadhyay, 'Authorship and modernity in Chandigarh: the Ghandi Bhavan and the Kiran Cinema designed by Pierre Jeanneret and Edwin Maxwell Fry,' 697-713.
- x Macdonald, S. 'Museums, national, postnational and transcultural identities,' 2.
- xi Price, Susan. 'Primitive Art in Civilized Spaces'.
- xii Boyer, C. *The City of Collective Memory: its historical imagery and architectural entertainments*, 132.
- xiii Herwitz, D. 'Reclaiming the Past and Early Modern Indian Art,' 213-218.

-
- xiv As quoted in Bahga, S & Bahga, S *Le Corbusier and Pierre Jeanneret: Footprints on the sands of Indian architecture*, 255. The museum project was in danger of being aborted due to the Indo-China war.
- xv Kaepler, A. L. 'Paradise Regained: The Role of Pacific Museums in Forging National Identity'.
- xvi Duncan, Carol. *Civilising Rituals*.
- xvii Goetz, H. 'The Baroda Museum and Picture Gallery,' 15-19.
- xviii Metcalf, Thomas. 'Architecture and the representation of Empire: India, 1860-1910,' 50.
- xix Breckenridge, C & Appadurai, A, 'Museums are good to think: heritage on view in India'.
- xx C. Breckenridge & Appadurai, A, "Museums are good to think: heritage on view in India"
- xxi McCann, G. 'The National Museum, New Delhi in Museum,' 67.
- xxii McCann, G. 'The National Museum, New Delhi in Museum,' 67.
- xxiii The layout of New Delhi was predominantly designed by Sir Edwin Lutyens, and commissioned by King-Emperor George V in 1911.
- xxiv Although Le Corbusier's work in Europe was changing towards more experimental forms such as the Philips Pavilion.
- xxv T. Benton, 'Building Utopia,' 155.
- xxvi Sharma, S. *Corb's Capitol: A Journey Through Chandigarh Architecture*, 66.
- xxvii See the Fry and Drew Collection at the RIBA Collection, London

xxviii Bhabha, Homi. *The location of culture*, 89.

xxix Jencks, Charles. *Le Corbusier and the Tragic View of Architecture*, 166.

xxx Mitter, Partha. *The Triumph of Modernism: India's artists and the avant-garde 1922-1947*, 7-8.

xxxⁱ Curtis, William, *Le Corbusier: Ideas and Forms*, 193-197.

xxxⁱⁱ Prakash, V. *Chandigarh's Le Corbusier: The struggle for Modernity in Postcolonial India*, 4.

xxxⁱⁱⁱ Prakash, V. *Chandigarh's Le Corbusier: The struggle for Modernity in Postcolonial India*, 5.

xxx^{iv} I am indebted to Vikram Prakash for this observation.

xxx^v Lang, Jon. *A Concise History of Modern Architecture in India*, 72.

xxx^{vi} (Rakatansky, 2004, p103)

xxx^{vii} Lang, Desai & Desai, *Architecture and Independence: The Search for Identity - India 1880 to 1980*, 214.

xxx^{viii} The concrete may offer more climatic advantages, but it was likely the choice of this material was to fit in with the surrounding buildings.

xxx^{ix} Benjamin, W, *The Task of the Translator*.

Reference List

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London; Verso, 1991.

Bahga, S & Bahga, S. *Le Corbusier and Pierre Jeanneret: Footprints on the sands of Indian architecture*, New Delhi; Galgotia Pub. Co, 2000

Benjamin, W. 'The Task of the Translator'. *Illuminations*. Translated by, H. Zorn. London, Pimlico, 1999.

Benton, Tim. 'Building Utopia' in Christopher Wilk (ed) *Modernism Designing a New World 1914-1939*, London,: V&A Publications, 2006, 149-223.

Bhabha, Homi. *The location of culture*, London: Routledge, 1994.

Boyer, C. *The City of Collective Memory: its historical imagery and architectural entertainments*, Cambridge Mass: MIT Press, 1994.

Breckenridge, C & Appadurai. A, 'Museums are good to think: heritage on view in India' in Ivan Karp, Christine Mullen Kreamer, and Steven D. Lavine (eds), *Museums and communities : the politics of public culture*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.

Correa, Charles. 'The Public, the Private, and the Sacred,' *Daedalus*, 118, no. 4, (Fall, 1989): 92-113.

Curtis, William, *Le Corbusier: Ideas and Forms*, London: Phaidon, 1986.

Duncan, Carol. *Civilising Rituals*, London: Routledge, 1995.

Goetz, H. 'The Baroda Museum and Picture Gallery', *Museum*, 7, issue. 1 (1954), 15-19.

Jackson, Iain and Bandyopadhyay, Soumyen. 'Authorship and modernity in Chandigarh: the Ghandi Bhavan and the Kiran Cinema designed by Pierre Jeanneret and Edwin Maxwell Fry,' *The Journal of Architecture*, 14, issue 6 (2009): 697-713.

Jencks, Charles. *Le Corbusier and the Tragic View of Architecture*, Harvard University Press, 1973.

Kaeppeler, A. L. 'Paradise Regained: The Role of Pacific Museums in Forging National Identity' in F.E.S Kaplan (ed) *Museums and the making of ourselves. The role of objects in National Identity*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1996.

Kalia, Ravi. *Chandigarh: The making of an Indian City*, New Delhi; Oxford University Press, 1987

Kiran, Joshi (Ed), *Documenting Chandigarh*, Ahmedabad; Mapin, 1999

Lang, Jon. *A Concise History of Modern Architecture in India*, Delhi: Permanent Black, 2002.

Lang, Desai & Desai, *Architecture and Independence: The Search for Identity - India 1880 to 1980*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Macdonald, S. 'Museums, national, postnational and transcultural identities' *Museum and Society*, 1 (2003): 1-16.

McCann, G. 'The National Museum, New Delhi,' *Museum International*, 14, Issue 2, (1961): 65 – 72.

Metcalf, Thomas. 'Architecture and the representation of Empire: India, 1860-1910', *Representations*, No. 6 (1984), 37-65.

Mitter, Partha. *The Triumph of Modernism: India's artists and the avant-garde 1922-1947*, London: Reaktion Books, 2007.

Perera, N. 'Contesting Visions: Hybridity, liminality and the authorship of the Chandigarh Plan' *Planning Perspectives*, no. 19 (2004): 175-199

Prakash, V. *Chandigarh's Le Corbusier: The struggle for Modernity in*

Postcolonial India, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002.

Price, Susan. *Primitive Art in Civilized Spaces*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Sarin, Madhu, *Urban Planning in the Third World: The Chandigarh Experience*, London, Mansell, 1982.

Sharma, S. *Corb's Capitol: A Journey Through Chandigarh Architecture*,

Chandigarh: Abhishek Publications, 2009.