ACKNOWLEDGES THE GENEROUS SUPPORT OF

O PATRONS
Bissell Associates, Newport Beach
Killingsworth, Stricker, Lindgren, Wilson & Associates, Long Beach
William L. Pereira Associates, Los Angeles
Ridgway, Ltd., Newport Beach
David & Mary Robinson, Sausalito
Clement Ziroli, West Covina

O SPONSORS
Welton Becket Associates, Santa Monica
Barry A. Berkus, AIA, Santa Barbara
Daniel L. Dworsky, FAIA & Associates, Inc., Los Angeles
Kaplan/McLaughlin/Diaz, San Francisco
Joe Molloy Graphic Design, Los Angeles
Cesar Pelli, New Haven

O DONORS
Bobrow Thomas Associates, Los Angeles
Fred M. Briggs, Inc., Architects, Laguna Beach
Leo A. Daly, Los Angeles
Danielian Associates, Newport Beach
Kermit Dorius, FAIA, Architects & Associates, Corona del Mar
Kamnitzer & Cotton, Los Angeles
David & Mary Martin, Redondo Beach
Dale Naegle, FAIA, Architecture & Planning, Inc., La Jolla
John Pastier, Austin
SWA Group, Sausalito, Laguna Beach, Houston, Boston, Boca Raton
Johannes Van Tilburg & Partners, AIA, Santa Monica

Arts and Architecture invites you to become part of our charter group benefactors. Welcoming us back with your support at this time will assist us through the first years of publication and allow us to maintain the highest standard of quality.

Please see page 58A for details.
ED MOSES
RAW WOOD PAINTINGS, DRAWINGS, MONOTYPES, ETCHINGS

PETER SHIRE
FURNITURE AND CERAMIC SCULPTURE
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"Four Houses, Four Cities"
Aspects of contemporary architecture
in Southern California
Curated by Elizabeth McMillan
July 16 to September 4
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The Gallery Paule Anglim announces its new address
14 Geary St.
San Francisco
California 94108
[415] 433-2710
When called to the telephone for urgent business, William Randolph Hearst would frequently reply, "Tell them to wait — I'm busy gardening." Like all devoted gardeners, Mr. Hearst knew that gardening is a way of life — that gardens are an intimate expression of the people who create them, care for them and live within their borders.

**GARDEN DESIGN** invites you to explore this way of life...to experience the garden as fine art. Lavish color photography takes you on a personal tour of private gardens, with gardenmakers and professional designers as your guides. If you're drawn to garden life — it's the magazine you've always wanted.

**GARDEN DESIGN.** For the fine art of residential landscape architecture.
Progressive Architecture announces its 30th annual P/A Awards program. The purpose of this competition is to recognize and encourage outstanding work in architecture and related environmental design fields before it is executed. Submissions are invited in the three general categories of architectural design, urban design and planning, and applied architectural research. Designations of first award, award, and citation may be made by the invited jury, based on overall excellence and advances in the art.

Jury for the 30th P/A Awards
Architectural design: George Baird, architect, urban designer, author, Editor of Trace, Toronto; Alan Chimacoff, architect, Associate Professor of Architecture, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ; Mark Mack, architect, Batey & Mack, San Francisco, and lecturer, University of California, Berkeley, and Editor of Archetype. James Stirling, Hon. FAIA, James Stirling Michael Wilford & Associates, London; Urban design and planning: Stanton Eckstut, AIA, partner, Cooper Eckstut Associates, New York, and Director, Columbia University Urban Design Program; John M. Woodbridge, FAIA, architect and urban design consultant, Berkeley, CA; Research: Sandra Howell, PhD, MPH, Associate Professor of Behavioral Science, Department of Architecture, MIT, Cambridge; Marietta Millet, lighting consultant and Associate Professor of Architecture, University of Washington, Seattle.

Judging will take place in Stamford, CT, during September 1982. Winners will be notified—confidentially—before Oct. 1. First public announcement of the winners will be made at a presentation ceremony in New York in January 1983, and winning entries will be featured in the January 1983 P/A. Recognition will be extended to clients, as well as professionals responsible. P/A will arrange for coverage of winning entries in national and local press.

Eligibility
1 Architects and other environmental design professionals practicing in the U.S. or Canada may enter one or more submissions. Proposals may be for any location, but work must have been directed and substantially executed in U.S. and/or Canadian offices.
2 All entries must have been commissioned, for compensation, on behalf of a client with the power and intention to execute the proposal (or in the case of research and planning entries, to adopt it as policy). Work initiated to fulfill academic requirements is not eligible (but teams may include students).
3 Any project is ineligible if it has been, or will be before Feb. 1983, the subject of publication, on one full page or more, in Architectural Record or AIA Journal. Prior publication in P/A is not a factor.
4 Architectural design entries may include only buildings or complexes, new or remodeled, scheduled to be under any phase of construction during 1983.
5 Urban design and planning entries may include only proposals or reports accepted by the client for implementation before

P/A Awards program
30th annual competition for projects not yet completed in architecture planning and research
publication agreement
4 If the submission should win, the entrant agrees to make available further information, original drawings or model photographs as necessary, for publication in the May 1983 P/A and exhibition at NEOCON in Chicago.
5 P/A retains the rights to first publication of winning designs and exhibition of all entries. Designer retains rights to actual design.
6 P/A assumes no obligation for designer’s rights. Concerned designers are advised to document their work (date and authorship) and seek counsel on pertinent copyright and patent protections.

Entry form:
International Furniture Competition

Please fill out all parts and submit, intact, with each entry (see paragraph 11 of instructions). Use typewriter, please. Copies of this form may be used.

Entrant:
Address:

Entrant phone number:
Category:

I confirm that the attached entry meets eligibility requirements (paragraph 1-3) and that stipulations of publication agreement (paragraphs 1-6) will be met. I verify that the submission is entirely the work of those listed on this form (or an attached list as necessary).

Signature

Name (typed)

Submission requirements
7 Submissions WILL NOT BE RETURNED.
8 Drawing(s) and/or model photo(s) of the design should be mounted on one side only of one 20” x 30” foamcore board presented horizontally. ANY ENTRY NOT FOLLOWING THIS FORMAT WILL BE DISQUALIFIED.
9 There are no limits to the number of illustrations mounted on the board, but all must be visible at once (no overlaps to fold back). No actual models will be accepted. Only one design per board.
10 Each submission must include a 5” x 7” index card mounted on the front side of the board with the following information typed on it: intended dimensions of the piece of furniture, color(s), materials, components, brief description of important features, design assumptions, and intentions. This information is to be presented in English.
11 Each submission must be accompanied by an entry form, to be found on this page. Reproductions of this form are acceptable. All sections must be filled out (by typewriter, please). Insert entire form into unsealed envelope taped to the back of the submission board. P/A will seal stub of entry form in envelope before judging.
12 For purposes of jury procedures only, projects are to be assigned by the entrant to a category on the entry form. Please identify each entry as one of the following: Chair, Seating System, Sofa, Table, Desk, Work Station, Storage System, Lighting, Bed. If necessary, the category “Miscellaneous” may be designated.
13 Entry fee of $25 must accompany each submission, inserted into unsealed envelope containing entry form (see 11 above). Make check or money order (no cash) payable to Progressive Architecture.
14 To maintain anonymity, no identification of the entrant may appear on any part of the submission, except on entry form. Designer should attach list of collaborators to be credited if necessary.
15 Packages can contain more than one entry; total number of boards must be indicated on front of package.
16 Deadline for mailing is January 26, 1983. Other methods of delivery are acceptable. Entries must show postmark or other evidence of being en route by deadline. Hand-delivered entries must be received at the address shown here by January 26.

Address entries to:
International Furniture Competition
Progressive Architecture
600 Summer St.
P.O. Box 1361
Stamford, CT 06904

(Payment)
Your submission has been received and assigned number:

Entrant:
Address:

Entrant:
Address:
The John Storer Residence, 1923. A Los Angeles treasure and National Register landmark. Wright’s first steel reinforced textile block house. Living room with city views opens to roof gardens. 3 bdrms, 2 baths, library, maids and bath. Now available for private acquisition at $790,000.(213) 275-2222 Office is located in the Lloyd Wright Studio, 858 North Doheny Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90069
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Although a place to live is one of the most basic human needs, we live in a society which has a housing problem. The cherished American dream of home ownership seems less and less attainable. Although new houses are being built, they seldom respond to current social or economic needs. The factors which created this situation are complex; and the lack of solutions is partly the result of rising interest rates and land costs. But, there are ways that architects can respond.

The original Arts and Architecture Case Study House Program was a novel idea that promoted the use of mass produced materials and modern aesthetics for the design of the single family house. It also championed new ideas about site planning, indoor/outdoor living and "open plan." Although at the time local architects did not see the Case Study Houses as unique, to outside observers the program symbolized an entirely new attitude toward the single family house.

The housing problem today is different than it was in the forties, fifties and sixties. The traditional four-person nuclear family is no longer the norm. People live in more varied domestic situations, they move more often, and need flexible living arrangements. The traditional concept of the single family house needs to be reconsidered.

In order to evolve more relevant forms of housing, architects must become instigators as well as designers, less absorbed in pure issues of style and more concerned with content. They also need to become involved in the economic mechanisms which make housing happen, to see the current situation as a challenge rather than an obstacle.

Arts and Architecture magazine hopes to make housing a major editorial concern; and in this issue we examine the work of several architects who have taken a lead. Their efforts, while not yet fully realized, point toward a more active role for the designer. Milica Dedijer-Mihich, wanting an inexpensive and energy efficient place to live, designed and built her own house on a tiny infill lot in Venice, California. An urban house sandwiched onto a miniscule piece of land, it provides surprisingly generous standards of interior space. In nearby Santa Monica, several young architects have acted as their own developers for a group of townhouse condominiums. Although the houses reflect the inflated land costs of their fashionable location, they provide a high standard of design, space and light, without any cost premium.

With this issue of Arts and Architecture we begin a continuing examination of housing, exploring the problems and potentials of new ideas. We hope that this investigation will act as a catalyst for further experimentation.

Barbara Goldstein
August 1982
September 18–November 28:
Native American Painting: Selections from the Museum of the American Indian
A traveling exhibition illustrating the development of Native American work, from its origin in the 19th century to the present day. Around 50 works will be presented, by artists including Fred Kabotie, Ernest Spybuck, Jerome Rider, and Monroe Tsatoke.

Tucson Museum of Art
40 North Main Avenue, Tucson, 5705. (602) 624-2333
Through September 6:
Arizona Biennial ’82
A celebration of work by Arizona artists. One hundred forty-eight pieces have been chosen as the best in painting, drawing, photography, mixed media, printing, craft and sculpture.

Artisans
78 East Blithedale, Mill Valley, 94941.
September 7–October:
The Birth Project
Initial needleworks completed by the Birth Project, a participatory art-making group founded by Judy Chicago. The birth process involves the translation of Chicago’s ideas on birth and creation into works of thread, by people all over the country. The finished products will be accompanied by supporting documentation.

California Academy of Sciences
Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, 94118. (415) 221-4214
Through September 6:
Ansel Adams: The 80th Birthday Retrospective and The Unknown Ansel Adams
Birthday tributes to the pioneering modern photographer. The first show surveys his career in 120 works dating from 1919 to 1979. The second casts new light on Adams’ work with 60 images culled from his negative files and never before exhibited.

Craft and Folk Art Museum
5814 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, 90036
August 4–September 12:
American Porcelain: New Expressions in an Ancient Art
An extensive catalogue of contemporary work. One hundred-eight objects from different artists were chosen to illustrate a variety of forms and techniques. Their purposes range from utilitarian to esthetic, and they include tableware, assorted vessels, and sculpture.

M. H. de Young Memorial Museum
Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, 94118. (415) 558-2887
September 11–November 14:
Max Klinger
Prints by the important 19th century German artist noted for his anticipation of surrealism.

The Bay Area Collects: Art from Africa, Oceania, and the Americas
One hundred objects of applied art from private collections in San Francisco. The pieces were chosen on the basis of esthetic quality; and so while the exhibition does not achieve a cultural balance, it does communicate the strengths of local collections.

La Jolla Museum of Contemporary Art
700 Prospect Street, La Jolla, 92037. (714) 454-3541
September 4–October 24:
Italian Re-Evolution: Design in the 80’s
Five hundred objects created between 1945 and 1981 which document Italian industrial, commercial and domestic design. The show is more than a mere catalogue, for it includes the recreation of various Italian scenes, such as the car, church, bar and market, which encourage the viewer to understand the artifacts within the context of Italian urban culture.

Los Angeles County Museum of Art
5905 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, 90036. (213) 857-6111
Through September 26:
An American Perspective: 19th Century Art from the Collection of Jo Ann and Julian Ganz, Jr.
An outstanding private collection of American art offering a distinctive view of 19th century taste through more than 100 paintings, watercolors, and sculptures. The Ganz collection defines this country’s mid-19th century academic tradition of precise rendering and high finish, and reflects the idealism of America’s Victorian age. Important pieces include Winslow Homer’s Blackboard and John Singer Sargent’s The Sulphur Match.
Through October 31:
*Studio Work: Photographs by Ten Los Angeles Artists*
EIGHTY-ONE WORKS BY JERRY BURCHFIELD, JACK BUTLER, JOANN CALLIS, RON COOPER, EILEEN COWIN, BARBARA KASTEN, MICHAEL LEVINE, STANLEY MOCK, PATRICK NAGATANI AND LELAND RICE. This show demonstrates the wide variety of experimental studio images that have been produced in Los Angeles during the last five years.

Los Angeles Municipal Art Gallery
4804 Hollywood Boulevard, Los Angeles, 90027. (213) 660-2200

September 14 – October 10:  
*Paul Wonner: Abstract Realist*
Oils, acrylics, watercolors, gouaches and drawings by a California artist spanning the period from 1958 to 1981. The early work is evidence of Wonner's association with the Bay Area school of figurative painters; the later of his admiration for Dutch still lifes.

Oakland Museum
1000 Oak Street, Oakland, 94607. (415) 273-3402

August 7 – October 17:  
*100 Years of California Sculpture*
Survey coincides with the Twelfth International Sculpture Conference, also in Oakland.

San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
Van Ness Avenue at McAllister Street, San Francisco, 94102. (415) 863-8800

Through September 19:  
*Twenty American Artists: Sculpture 1982*
A biennial survey of new work coinciding this year with the Twelfth International Sculpture Conference in Oakland. Artists include Lita Albuquerque, Scott Burton, Mark di Suvero, Michael Heizer, Edward Kienholz, Bruce Nauman, Isamu Noguchi, Georgia O'Keeffe, Claes Oldenburg, Joel Shapiro, Michael Todd and William Wiley. Many of the works have never been publicly exhibited.

Through September 26:  
*Collage and Assemblage*
Work selected from this museum's permanent collection. Since its invention at the beginning of the 20th century, collage has been a part of every major art movement. Examples in this show by Joseph Cornell, Edward Kienholz and Bruce Conner show how American artists have expanded a flat medium into its three-dimensional equivalent: assemblage.

September 3 – November 7:  
*Contemporary Color Photography*
Color comes out of the closet. Using contrived settings and developing techniques, Mary Ahrendt, Reed Estabrook, Bernard Faucon, Vahé Guzelian, David Haxton, MANUEL, Lucas Samaras, Cindy Sherman and David White all manipulate their subjects to create images which finally are giving color photography the acceptance it lacked.

September 9 – November 7:  
*Images of America: Precisionist Painting and Modern Photography*
First major study of Precisionism in 20 years. One hundred-sixty works demonstrate the influence of 34 artists on each other. Among the painters represented are Ralston Crawford, Charles Demuth and Georgia O'Keeffe; photographers include Paul Strand, Alfred Stieglitz and Ansel Adams.

Schindler House
835 North Kings Road, Los Angeles, 90069.

July 10 – September 30:  
*Juan O’Gorman*
Memorial photographic exhibition of work by the Mexican architect and muralist who died last January. (See article on page 36.)

University Art Galleries
University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles, 90007. (213) 743-2799

September 12 – October 23:  
*Edward Munch: Paradox of Woman*
Woodcuts, lithographs and etchings assembled around the theme of Munch's ambivalent fascination with the female. The works show women assorted roles and in various forms evoke psychological distress. On view will be some of the artist's most famous works: *Madonna, The Scream, Vampire*, and *Sphinx*. All pieces are taken from the largest private holding of Munch prints in the country, the Epstein Collection.

Colorado

Denver Art Museum
100 West 15th Avenue Parkway, Denver, 80204. (303) 575-2295.

August 3 – October 31:  
*Outdoor Sculpture*
Five large pieces in stone, steel, pipe tackle and polyurethane, commissioned for the recently renovated sculpture garden of this museum. The artists include Elaine Calzolari, Charles Parsons, Robert Mangold, Chris Byars and Richard Miles.

**CUSTOM-MADE TILE**

Fifty-two rows of tile tapering from one inch to 12 inches in increments of 1/8". Glazed in blue and white. Placed in two shallow reflecting pools at the base of the Security Pacific Bank Headquarters, Los Angeles. SWA Group, Landscape Architects, Sausalito, California.

Designed and made by

**HEATH CERAMICS**

400 Gate Five Road
Sausalito, California 9496
(415) 332-3732

Circle number 7 on Reader Inquiry Card.
Colorado Photographers
Charles Roit, Myron Wood, Ronald Wolhauer and W. S. Sutton shoot
vide open spaces; Vidie Lange
explores tinsel town; and Rich Baume
locums urban decay in Denver.

**NEW MEXICO**

Maxwell Museum of Anthropology
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque
(505) 277-4404.

September 19–
Testas of San Juan Nuevo
Testas of San Juan Nuevo: Ceremonial
art from Michoacan, Mexico
A recreation of five annual religious
rituals in the town of San Juan Nuevo.
He 300 artifacts employed are rarely
seen apart from the occasion of their
recreation, and include costumes, masks,
ernies, household furnishings, and
ceremonial art objects such as dough
mamets, flower and paper decoras,
candles, and lace.

**TEXAS**

The American: Collage 1950–1982
Second in a series organized by this
museum to examine traditional topics
in American art. This show will dem-
strate the American development of
collage in over 150 works by more than
60 artists, including Billy Al Bengston,
Judy Pfaff, Jasper Johns, Robert
Rauschenberg, Julian Schnabel, and Cy
Twombly.

September 26–November 14:
The Painter and the Printer:
Robert Motherwell's Graphics
A comprehensive survey of the artist's
graphic work from 1961 to 1980. Bet-
ter known for paintings and collage,
Motherwell began making prints partly
to escape the loneliness of his studio.
He is the only early Abstract Expression-
ionist to work extensively in graphics.

**WASHINGTON**

Seattle Art Museum
Volunteer Park, Seattle, 98112.
(206) 447-4710

Arthur Dove and Duncan Phillips:
Artist and Patron
An exhibition of work by painter
Arthur Dove, and an investigation of his
relationship to patron Duncan
Phillips. Dove was one of the artists
most associated with Stieglitz's gallery,
An American Place. Phillips was
the devoted supporter who, in his own
words, found in Dove's work "that art
whose appeal was exclusively visual.
"This show, organized by the Phillips
Collection in Washington, D.C.,
includes two of Dove's little known
charcoal works, as well as various pastels,
constructions, watercolors, and
many oils.

September 2–October 17:
Deborah Butterfield
Seven new life-size sculptures of
horses, made of steel wire, air-condi-
tioning duct and wood. In the words of the
artist, "the horses . . . are the most
recent in a progression of work using
found materials . . . . These horses are
no longer hollow shells but are built up
from within and reveal the interior
space . . . ."

---

**HANK BAUM GALLERY**

**JULY & AUGUST**

**BRUCE KORTEBEIN**

**recent collages**

**SEPTEMBER & OCTOBER**

**JOEL OAS**

**recent paintings**

**REPRESENTING:**

James Bolton
Martín Camarata
Guy Diehl
Georg Heimdal
Dick Kakuda
David King
Bruce Kortebain
Robert McGill
Joel Oas
John Ploeger
Richard Wilson

**ORIGINAL PRINTS BY:**

Anusczewicz
Ay-o
Chryssa
Conner
Cuevas
D'Arcangelo
De Forest
Dine
Francis
Hinterreiter
Ikeda
Indiana
Krushenick
Lichtenstein
Lobdell
Mattix
McLean
Neri
Nevelson
Oldenburg
Ortman
Paolozzi
Pearlstein
Pomodoro
Ramos
Saul
Stella
Voulkos
Wesselmann
Woelffer

**2140 Bush Street**

**San Francisco**

**California 94115**

**(415) 921-7677**

and the finest largest collection of works on paper in the West
COMMENT

ARNESON'S BUST

On December 7, 1981, the San Francisco Art Commission voted 7-3 to reject a sculpture of former Mayor George Moscone who had been assassinated in 1978. Half the fee had already been paid to sculptor Robert Arneson. He was asked to return it. The story made Page One headlines and the San Francisco Chronicle set up a call-in public opinion poll which drew a heavy public response, averaging 15 calls a minute during the 24-hour period the poll was open. Sixty-one percent of the 22,314 callers answered “No” to the question “Do you like the Moscone sculpture?” while 39 percent said “Yes.” The opinions of artists and critics poured in spontaneously. On the surface, it was a controversy between artists advocating free expression and politicians demanding good taste and decorum.

The bust was intended for the main lobby of the brand new $12.6 million dollar Moscone Convention Center. The former Mayor had worked to get this facility as a boost to the city’s important convention industry. The sculpture consisted of two parts, a bust showing the Mayor’s head, and a pedestal. Described by the artist as a “montage of graffiti, something like the New York City subways,” the pedestal contained bright red glazed bullet holes, the imprint of a Smith and Wesson 38, and the yellow mark of a cream-filled Twinkie to symbolize the diminished capacity “Twinkie defense” used by convicted assassin Dan White’s counsel. Other comments included personal expressions of the Mayor such as “Duck soup” and “Is everybody having fun?” and allusions to the assassin, “He hated to lose” and “Oh, Danny boy,” the place of the murder (Room 237), lax security at City Hall (“Leaky as a sieve”) and the words “Bang, Bang, Bang” (three shots had been fired). The Mayor’s wife, Gina Moscone, was reportedly shocked by the pedestal and, at her request, it was covered by a red shroud on opening day.

The sculptor was unfazed by the controversy. He did not attend the Commission hearings and instead went to New York to attend the opening of his show at the Whitney. Before leaving, Arneson made it clear that he was unwilling to modify the work or separate the bust from the pedestal. He vowed he would “Do a Mickey Mouse before he bowed to any pressure to change the piece. “This work is not being redone,” he declared. “I’ve made a total, complete artistic statement.” He added that no San Francisco official had the authority to “deface a work of art” and a negative response by any member of the Art Commission would be “irrelevant.” He intimated that an attempt to separate the bust from the pedestal would probably result in a lawsuit since “You can’t damage a work of art.”

The San Francisco Art Commission found itself caught between opposing forces. On the one side we have politicians, local citizens, and the former Mayor’s widow who found the work in bad taste, and on the other were found most members of the art community who supported a commissioned artist’s right to make a complete statement without modification. Commissioners were annoyed that the controversy centered upon a pedestal whose form they had not expected. The artist had submitted some “sketchy” preliminary drawings which he later said to be for the graffiti comments. The Commission decided that in effect the artist had delivered something other than what they had contracted for as since he was unwilling to change the piece, they had no alternative but to remove the work and ask for their money back.

Among the specific issues raised the controversy was the apparent deception of the artist in not informing his clients of his plans for the pedestal. It is a reasonable guess that the sculptor would never have received the commission had he revealed them in advance and that he therefore kept silent in the hopes of creating a work of art that would deal with important themes in American life. Profession artists do not have a code of ethics requiring full disclosure of intent at the legal aspects of the case would only be considered by the courts if either party sued the other for breach of contract, which neither saw fit to do. The issue of intent is clouded by the sculptor’s reputation by doing carte blanche images and caricatures. Arneso’s favorite type of work is the self-portrait and among these are grotesque portraits of himself sticking out his...
tongue, chewing a cigar, whistling, and vomiting. His earlier pieces include a life-size sculpture of a toilet and a six-pack of beer. Terms such as funky, cynical, and macabre run through reviews of his work. To the degree that the Commissioners should have been able to anticipate the final product from the artist’s previous work, they did get what they bargained for in terms of a representative piece of sculpture.

Another specific issue was the appropriateness of the work as a commemorative piece in a memorial building. Sacramento Bee critic Blake Samson castigated the complete work—bust, pedestal, and all—as to its unsuitability for its intended purposes. Samson regarded the pedestal as “in obvious bad taste,” sensational, and an insult to the former Mayor’s memory” while the bust itself was “in coarse, garish, cartoon–style . . . with the features crassly handled . . . color and glazing sloppy.” Samson reflected the traditional view that a memorial should convey the best side of a person’s life. Memorial paintings of notable individuals show them at the prime of life rather than old, wrinkled, or writhing in pain from an assassin’s bullet. An exception is found in crucifixion art. Immolation is part of the Christ legend and countless artists have depicted this in painting and sculpture. However, this does not apply to political leaders. Few, if any, portraits of Abraham Lincoln or John F. Kennedy show them with mortal wounds even though their deaths are the subject of considerable mythology and controversy. In depicting the bloody end to the Mayor’s career, Arneson violated conventional expectations about the form of a memorial to a political figure.

Amidst these specific controversies over style and decorum, larger issues of the nature of public art were obscured. The sculptor and his supporters showed little recognition of any difference between a commission for a public building and one for a private client. Gallery Director Price Amerson referred to “so-called public art” as if this were merely studio art displayed in a public location. Arneson’s colleague, Ralph Johnson, saw the controversy as an attempted infringement on the artist’s freedom of speech. The arts community reacted strongly out of the fear that once limits to artistic expression were established, they would quickly spread.

The Art Commission was not attempting to interfere with anything that the sculptor did in his studio for sale to private clients. They were not objecting to Arneson’s right to caricature the former Mayor or exhibit the work. The notoriety increased the value of the sculpture and the artist’s reputation many times over. The Art Commission suffered from the affair in its seeming laxity in not supervising the contract more closely and in hiring an artist with a reputation for producing ironic work to do a memorial piece. It also lost esteem in the arts community for appearing to cave in to political pressure. However, all was not negative. The controversy brought visibility to the arts. It has been a long time since sculpture made prime time TV news.

The debate opened raw wounds left by the assassination of San Francisco Mayor by a former member of the Board of Supervisors. Memories of the assassination and its aftermath still percolate into consciousness. The California Legislature recently passed a bill limiting the diminished capacity defense used successfully during the trial. At the time that he shot the Mayor, the assassin also gunned down fellow Board member Harvey Milk, the first avowed homosexual Supervisor in the city’s history. White’s conviction on the lesser manslaughter charge provoked riots in the gay community and subsequent charges of police brutality in suppressing the disturbances. Many local residents, including current Mayor Dianne Feinstein who was in City Hall when both Moscone and Milk were shot, wanted to put the tragedy behind them and remember the warmth, humanity, and vitality of George Moscone. The sculpture was forcing them to confront the assassination whether they wanted to or not. Although sculptor Robert Arneson based his public defense on self-expression and artistic license, he was attempting to educate the public about the violent nature of American political life.

What is so intensely frustrating to me about the entire controversy is that I like the work, admire the artist for having the strength of his convictions, agree with the messages (anti-violence, anti-gun, irreverence to political office), but I also decry the artist’s deception in not informing the Arts Commission of what he was doing and for creating a work unsuitable for its context. The artist produced a stronger and better sculpture than what was called for in the commission. In commissioning an artist with a strong reputation for Pop Art statements to do a memorial piece, the Art Commissioners may have confused Pop Art with Populism, hoping that the artist’s style would catch the earthiness of George Moscone, but such a commission only added to the cynicism and sarcasm of Pop Art. Warhol’s famous Campbell’s soup can was not celebrating the advanced technology of the American food industry or the nutritional value and unabashed good taste of hot tomato soup on a cold day, but instead used it to symbolize the banality of American culture. The Art Commission also failed to educate the sculptor as to the compromises required in public art between personal expression and creativeness on the one hand and functionality and public acceptance on the other.

Public art does not need to be bland or second-rate. The church paintings of the Middle Ages were strong expressive pieces that suited and did not overshadow their surroundings. The distinguishing characteristics of public art are that the client, location, surroundings, and the audience are known in advance. This knowledge
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COMMENT

imposes special responsibilities on the artist. With studio work that is created for an anonymous client and an unknown location, it is the purchaser who is responsible for ensuring that the work fits context and audience. A work can be as garish and provocative as the artist chooses to make it without the artist being concerned about its appropriateness for a particular site. The studio artist must still be concerned about its aesthetic appropriateness, but not in relation to any particular location or audience.

The mandate of the Art Commission in approving proposals for public buildings derives as much from the use of public space as from the use of public monies. The source of funds can actually be irrelevant, as in the case of the controversial Vietnam Memorial whose design was paid for by Texas millionaire H. Ross Perot. If the Moscone bust had been donated by outside sources, it would still have been controversial. People who work inside a public building or pass by on their way to other places cannot escape the art placed there. The role of the artist in raising the public consciousness on important social issues must be balanced against the impact of the work on the people who cannot avoid exposure to it. Consultation with the people affected or at least their representatives, in the form of a public-arts agency or arts council, is an important responsibility of the artist who creates art for a public location.

Advance knowledge of setting and audience is both a challenge and a burden to the painter or sculptor charged with the task of creating public art. The challenge is to integrate creativity and personal expression on the one hand with community values and function on the other. The need for this type of integration makes the task of the serious public artist more difficult than that of the studio artist who need only bring together muse and medium. The public artist must expand the dialogue to include the cacophony of the community. This is no invitation to lesser art but a challenge to create art in a broader social and environmental context.

A dialogue is necessary among artists, critics, sponsors, and art commissioners to clarify the special nature of public art. If sculptors and painters interpret every suggestion from potential viewers as an infringement upon their presumed absolute freedom of expression, then we will indeed have second-rate public art. In accepting a commission from a public body to create a particular type of work for display in a public location, the artist may feel higher loyalties to the muse or to some political cause, but to follow these and neglect the original charge is a violation of public trust and probably of contract.

San Francisco lost an opportunity to acquire and display an important piece of sculpture. Art Commissioner Dmetri Vedensky maintained that the work was "of such great distinction that it would be a crime for the city of San Francisco to lose it." I would have preferred either of two possible solutions. The first would be to keep the bust in the Convention Center but cover up the pedestal as was done on opening day. The hidden pedestal would have latent messages for the knowledgeable viewer and serve as a time capsule for future generations who could remove the cover when passions subsided. A conventional portrayal might easily be relegated to a storeroom at some future time, but this work will continue to stir comment whenever it is shown.

Another option was to accept the work and then display it in a museum rather than in the Convention Center. The Commission would then have to face the criticism that they had purchased work that they had not ordered and that mocked the former Mayor and offended public sensibilities. Instead the Commissioners decided to cut their losses, reject the statue which the artist was unwilling to modify, and ask for their money back.

Arneson makes it clear that artists should play a role in raising public awareness. In terms of engaging the public consciousness, his work deserves high marks. It succeeded as memorial, but only in the technical sense of helping people to remember something. However, there was a crucial difference between the artist and his critics wanted to remember. It is worth noting that the ceramic he itself shows no sign of the assassination. All the gore and messages are contained on the pedestal. This is a compromise between the artist's conception of a memorial and his desire to make us learn something from the Mayor's death. However, the compromise proved unpalatable to those who held the more traditional view of a memorial piece.

After the Art Commission refused to accept the statue, everyone was bewildered rapidly. Arneson gave back the $18,500 and sought another buyer. An offer of $50,000 from a Chicago resident was reported, but the artist preferred a local buyer. In mid April 1982, the Moscone bust was sold to Foster Goldstrom, owner of a San Francisco art gallery, for $50,000, which was $12,000 more than Arneson would have received from the Art Commission. Because of the public interest in the work, Goldstrom said he would allow the piece to travel around to nearby galleries for the next 10-15 years.

Robert Sommer, a Professor of Architecture at the University of California at Davis, is the author of several books, including Personal Space, Design Awareness, and Street Art.
Dreamhouses


Building the Dream by Gwendolyn Wright weaves between insightful evaluations of housing trends and America’s early settlers, and a dry and repetitious recitation of boring facts. As a tronicher of history, pulling together diverse and plentiful research on housing styles, Wright is masterful. As an entertaining writer—well, at least here are the photographs.

In the case of this book, one picture is worth a thousand words. Thankfully, Wright describes the jumble of bric-a-brac and fashionable architectural ornamentation littering a typical middle-class Victorian living room—captured it all in a frozen moment in Dr. J. G. Bailey’s home. A woman, presumably Mrs. Bailey, reads her newspaper, nearly lost in statuary of nymphs, paintings; the bust of a muse; the dresser in a prominent position; the bread of a muscular gentleman and much more, uttered confusingly about her. Then Wright enriches the scene with witty asides about daily use of this space, and concern for the elaborate even tried to Fanny Farmer’s recipe for oatloaf in crackers wrapped like a box.

It is in these moments when people’s lives become real, when the interaction between static walls, furniture and floorplans is crystallized, that Building the Dream shines. Here we impose families not so different from our own, striving to make the best of their circumstances while pressing individuality and pride.

Wright contributes with her recto, no punches pulled assessments of social, political and psychological influences on housing throughout U.S. history. She discusses all social strata and answers questions about historical alters that now seem removed from our experience. Why were slaves used in rows of barracks? So plantation owners could maintain strict labor and architectural revisions to house design that have been developed in our era and heralded as innovative and sophisticated and developed.

Dolores Hayden’s book, The Grand Domestic Revolution, challenges this notion by reminding us that many of the feminist critiques of the division of labor and architectural revisions to house design that have been developed in our era and heralded as innovative and sophisticated and developed.

At times, however, Wright becomes bogged down in political planations and presents the same in a redundant way. It is as if whenever a found rich sources of information, she couldn’t resist mining them of irony notation, despite their failure to enhance the overall flow and direction her work. Wright also tends to offer stories and ideas without sufficient explanation, such as her casual mention of Taylorism in reference to twentieth-century efficiency in homes, assuming the reader is familiar with the concept of “scientific management” Taylor pioneered.

The most lively section of Building the Dream focuses on the future rather than the past. Wright looks ahead to possibilities for housing in the 1980s, citing the growing power of women, changes in family structures, grassroots politics and changing economic policies. The textbook-like recount of history becomes a discussion of contradictory and complimentary social forces fascinating to the reader because they’re readily observable now. Wright prefers to let facts speak rather than directly offering her opinion, but it is clear she sees cooperation and assistance for those excluded from the tightening housing market as keys to resolving inevitable squeezes.

It’s unfortunate that Wright’s assessment of the present situation doesn’t precede her lengthy history. If the Dessert had come before the hearty but sometimes indigestible meal, Building the Dream might appear not only to academics and those involved in architecture, but to anyone curious about their domestic surroundings.

Diane C. Elvenstar is a social psychologist and the director of Learning/Communications Center.

Feminist Housing


The ideas of the Modern Movement, including faith in the liberating possibilities of technology and a conviction that the future will be better, have recently come into question. But although the present engenders pessimism about the future, most people still accept the idea of “progress” even if the world isn’t getting better, ideas and technology are at least becoming more sophisticated and developed.

Dolores Hayden’s book, The Grand Domestic Revolution, challenges this notion by reminding us that many of the feminist critiques of the division of labor and architectural revisions to house design that have been developed in our era and heralded as innovative and sophisticated and developed.

Hayden’s impeccably researched book presents the history of feminist schemes for alternative domestic arrangements developed in America during the late 19th and 20th centuries. The rapidity of change in the heyday of industrial capitalism produced a variety of female thinkers who developed domestic architecture geared to their visions of the emerging world of socialized work. Hayden labels these thinkers “material feminists” because of their integration of economic, archi-
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The Preservationist

perfect and feminist concerns. The plans they developed included kitchenless houses, public kitchens, cooked food services, settlement houses, cooperative housekeeping arrangements, and entire communitarian towns.

Concurrent with the growth of material feminism, however, American society was developing toward a stricter separation of home/woman’s sphere, from work/man’s sphere; so the ideas of the material feminists were largely swallowed up by the entrenchment of the sexual division of labor and the ideological promotion of the single family home. Hayden points out that we have, as yet, developed a fragmentary understanding of this entail, the townhouse community a well-developed critique of the sexual division of labor has been formulated in the last two decades. Hayden points out that the inequities of the sexual division of labor have not correspondingly decreased. Likewise, the product of the community of the single family home has not received enough scrutiny. Thus, while the material feminists might seem timid by today’s standards in the unwillingness to involve men in the performance of domestic work, their assumptions that people would readily adapt to communal living seem utopian. Today, collective living schemes are routinely dismissed as vanishing relics of the counterculture.

The interest in alternative housing that was so important in the earlier years of the Modern Movement has recently been confined to the periphery of architectural debate, having been upstaged by questions of formalism at one end and cost considerations at the other. Hayden chronicles developments in domestic architectural design in London, New York, and Los Angeles in the first half of the century. The immediate singleness out by Hayden in Los Angeles—the bungalow court, the socialist community of Llano del Río, and the Schindler Kings Road house—have not served as prototypes for recent domestic design. The primary multi-family building type in Los Angeles today, the townhouse condominium, cannot reproduce the shared communal spaces of its predecessor, the bungalow court, because cost considerations dictate that new housing developments occupy most of their lots. Llano del Río provided a uniquely high level of community services to its residents, a plan which has not been copied by suburban new communities other than in the inclusion of isolated amenities such as a recreation center that clearly adds to the sales price of an individual tract home. Finally, the Schindler house has been primarily imitated for its stylistic elements of open plan and indoor/outdoor integration and not for its domestic rearrangements and intended use by two families.

Hayden’s presentation of the ideas of a grand domestic revolution and the attacks against them does not fully explore the murky territory between the ideas and their implementation, where an idea either seems possible or far-fetched. All of the schemes presented a brief lifespan, if they were executed at all, and were developed in hostile environments. Hayden establishes that the emotional climate today is similarly un receptive to communitarian designs that deviate from the single family home norm, even though the single family home is decidedly ill suited to an increasing percentage of the population including singles, working mothers, and the elderly. However, she doesn’t directly confront the issue of what needs to happen in the immediate future for elements of alternative domestic arrangements to be considered acceptable rather than utopian. The impact of The Grand Domestic Revolution instead rests on reassessment of the socio-political components of domestic design and on visions of what might be possible in design and use of domestic space.

Laura Chase is a planner who has studied early forms of multiple housing in Los Angeles.

Imperfect Guide


The preservationist is accustomed to treating buildings as examples of various architectural styles, and as artifacts connected with events and personalities of local interest. Thus, to the preservationist, architectural history is sometimes reduced to the activity of placating buildings in their proper stylistic pigeonhole, and maintaining the associations to personalities and events. A critical attitude becomes secondary.

This attitude is evident in The Architecture of Los Angeles, by preset vationist and urban planner Paul Gleye. In a volume which is one half textbook and one half coffee table picture book, Gleye does a workman job of summarizing previous research and analysis of his subject. The photographs, taken mostly by Bruce Boeher and Julius Shulman, are excellent, although they frequently appear out of sync with the text. The result is a book which no floorplans or sections which might explain internal functional or spatial relationships. This omission might be understandable in a guidebook, or a book devoted exclusively to architectural imagery, but it is a good deal more difficult to forgive in a book which bills itself as “The Story of the Architect of a Great City.” Even the range of architectural imagery covered is not quite complete, as post World War II pop architecture is neglected. The book’s coverage of building types in Southern California architecture has gaps. While movie theater palaces of the 1920s and 30s, and World War I
BOOKS

The idea for this book began with Mimi Jacobs. Her steadfast dedication to photographing artists encouraged Hopkins and San Francisco publishers Chronicle Books to embark on this joint venture. Jacobs took up a career in photography ten years ago at age sixty. Her portraits, all taken in natural light, have a soft, thoughtful quality. Most of them capture fleeting, unguarded moments which make them memorable.

Of the 28 northern and 22 southern California artists Hopkins selected, only about half were born in the state. However, we still don't expect Californians to be native-born, and are usually surprised when they are. Most of the artists are between 45 and 60 years of age, in mid-career. Eight are women. Included are Richard Diebenkorn, Sam Francis, Judy Chicago, Mel Ramos and Peter Voulkos, to name a few of the most well known.

The 50 artists represent a range of art and philosophies as diverse as California's lifestyles. One reason for the state's appeal to many artists has been—besides its benevolent climate and captivating scenery—its atmosphere of tolerance, anonymity, and even critical indifference, allowing artists to flourish and expand their talents. How, indeed, if this environment will change as "cultural parity" comes to California, will be interesting to observe.

An attractive introduction to California art, 50 West Coast Artists is designed to appeal to a wide audience. As such it is eye-catching and accessible. Since the artists were given fairly free rein of expression, their comments are fascinating—sometimes surprising, often amusing.

Sculptor Robert Arneson remembers his youth: "I was born in Benicia, California. As a youngster I used to draw comic books featuring myself as a super sports hero. I drew while lying down on the front room floor, which often caused a pain in the chest. I remember spilling a bottle of black India ink on the carpet. Mom almost ruined my budding artistic career. Fortunately Dad came to the rescue and I got on with the next chapter."

Robert Irwin on his work: "I now work in whatever form or material that seems appropriate to address my questions. I have become a questions addict."

Rebecca Ellis is an art historian with a special interest in contemporary painting and fine arts.

PRIVATE VIEWS

West Coast Artists

Henry Hopkins with portraits of artists by Mimi Jacobs, Chronicle books, Oakland, 1982, 127 pp., paperback $16.95, viewed by Rebecca Ellis.

Hopping on the West Coast art scene in the shadow of New York, dependent on East Coast exhibitions, art magazines and galleries for recognition and acceptance, West Coast Artists provides a Critical Selection of Painters and Sculptors Working in California, is, therefore, in its own small way, something of a landmark. It is the first such documentation of contemporary California artists.

Each individual is documented in a traited introduction by Mimi Jacobs, is accompanied by the artist's own vision of a representative work and ament on it, together with a short obitographical statement. Henrykis, Director of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, states in his introductory essay that the "book can be read lightly, like a high school rbook," or taken as a "serious attempt to put more documentation of this vast creative arena down on paper." He warns that the book "is not intended to be a tome filled with critical content but rather a document which provides the reader with a chart for recognition." A list of the artists' galleries at the back of the book indicates where interested readers can see more of this art.

The first such documentation of the West Coast scene is the 50 West Coast Artists. It is a document to be read lightly, like a high school rbook, or taken as a serious attempt to put more documentation of this vast creative arena down on paper." He warns that the book "is not intended to be a tome filled with critical content but rather a document which provides the reader with a chart for recognition." A list of the artists' galleries at the back of the book indicates where interested readers can see more of this art.
FLAVIN INSTALLATION AT HAUSER & WIRTH

A MUSEUM OF MOVABLE WALL

by Hunter Drohojowska

Photographs by Toshi Yoshimi
he softly lit word "Hauserman" invites the visitor into a showroom luminous with rain­jw auras of light. Neutral walls divide the space into neat geometry providing structure for an environment of fluorescent color. The light, in turn, defines and illuminates the walls. This radiant installation by artist Dan Flavin and Vignelli Associates proves to be an unusual example of corporate support for the fine arts.

F. Hauserman Company, designers and manufacturers of interior wall systems, opened a new showroom in Los Angeles' Pacific Design Center and selected Flavin and Lissimo and Lella Vignelli to design the space. Working collaboratively, the artists created a light environment that would draw attention to the company's product—movable wall systems—as well as function as an independent work of art. The concept is a practical extension of a museum without walls, the work of fine art displayed in a popular, commercial ace. This idea comes full circle in the near future when a part of the Flavin installation will be donated to Los Angeles' nascent Museum of Contemporary Art.

The environment itself consists of three corridors of light, each standing eight feet square, gazing back diagonally to a mirrored wall. The center corridor is open, striped with ice blue fluorescent tubes mounted at 45 degree angles. The two flanking corridors are closed,ross the middle with tubes of light. The Sawyer can pass through the open center corridor to see the flanking corridors from two different sides. The first contains horizontal lines of fuschia light which reverse on the back to Shell station yellow. The opposite corridor is divided by a screen of vertical tubes of same yellow backed with acid green. The thickest yellow tube is omitted to permit a wash of green light of escape.

Flavin uses light to recall aspects of painting and sculpture. The barriers of fluorescent tubes have the appearance of an abstract geometric canvas, an early Stella, perhaps. The halos of ethereal, refracted color activate the larger space to create a sculptural surrounding. As the viewer walks about the space, the open and closed corridors produce alternate sensations of confrontation and invitation. The initial seduction by beautiful lights dissipates and one is left both mesmerized and dizzy. The impact is exaggerated by the mirrored rear wall demanding acknowledgement of one's reflection seen bathed in the multi-colored light. The complex experience is ultimately both sensuous and disturbing. It is this tension that makes the piece more intriguing and compelling than just a roomful of disco lights, an oversized lava lamp.

The Hauserman installation seems an encouraging example of corporate decoration. Rather than purchasing the convenient and conventional paintings and sculptures, the company chose a temporal, site-specific installation. The project thus becomes a collaboration of conceptual as well as material concerns, and a valuable method of integrating sophisticated, ephemeral work in a public space.

Hunter Drohojowska is Art Editor of the LA Weekly and a contributor to Art Forum and Art in America.
uscha’s art
eals with different kinds and senses of space,
ces measured by the eye and spaces
measured by the mind,
and the humor of all the ways these spaces
move into and out of sync.

One of the things I have enjoyed most as an art critic has been not writing about Ed Ruscha. More than any other contemporary artist, he is a happiness I’ve reserved for myself, a source of absolutely unreflecting pleasure and inspiration, a closet of no-browism in my art-analytical machine works. Once Ruscha asked me for an introduction to a book of his drawings, and that was a close call; he and the publishers ended up accepting an already-written poem about Los Angeles. But now I’m obliged to ask myself what it is about Ruscha that makes fandom, for me, seem an appropriate as well as irresistible attitude.

Ruscha represents a kind of innocence to me—an innocence that is the opposite of naïve or unworlthy, more akin to the legal definition: not guilty. Of course, the only people pronounced “innocent” in that way have first been arrested, booked, arraigned, and tried. A criminal charge was confidently tailored to “stick,” but it hasn’t; it has fallen off. These “innocents” step forth as pure and glistening as Venus, emerging from the half-shell of a nasty suspicion. This suspicion does not thereby disappear from memory but it can never threaten them again, by the rule of double jeopardy. What am I talking about? What crimes can possibly be associated with the career of the West Coast’s favorite artist?

Well, isn’t being “a West Coast artist” at least a misdemeanor, to begin with? Many West Coast artists seem to think so, judging from the vehemence with which they deny being any such thing. Ruscha, by contrast, glories in it, and with good reason. His art and attitude and archetypal personal history (Oklahoma to Southern California) couldn’t live and breathe so luxuriantly anywhere else. This has been stated, in one way or another, by almost every critic who has written about Ruscha. It is impossible to miss.

Why can’t we get a conviction on it, then? the prosecutor fumes. What is it that keeps slipping, like wind, out of the cultural precinct and giving jolts of recognition to people who never laid eyes on California? What universals get activated by this intensely local art?

I’d like to relate the question to architecture somehow, given the fact that architecture is modern culture’s number one licensed criminal activity. It seems obvious enough that Ruscha’s art deals with different kinds and senses of space, spaces measured by the eye and spaces measured by the mind, and the humor of all the ways these spaces move into and out of sync. But that’s just the game-playing part. What’s uncanny is how specific, though indefinable, the ambience of each work feels. I fantasize that a sufficiently virtuosic, intuitive architect could look at any Ruscha and come up with the idea of a space—a room or outdoor area, if not a whole structure with plumbing, etc.—attuned to its nuance of mood and style. Maybe the architect would reinvent the exact same space in which it was conceived.

A Ruscha cannot, in any case, be imagined coming into being just any old way, just anywhere. It presents itself as the result, the concretion, of an environment and state of mind tantalizingly almost guessable: the neighborhood, the slant of light, the blood-level of caffeine or alcohol or whatever. . . . It’s a kind of abstracted naturalism, as if the place and circumstance of the work were its real author, addressing some place and circumstance elsewhere, or everywhere. The notion that a particular person is responsible—Ed Ruscha the honest craftsman, the layout-and-design man—doesn’t scan. Valéry said poetry is written by someone other than the poet to someone other than the reader. That’s Ruscha for you: dumb jokes that grow in the idle mind on banal afternoons until they seem identical with those afternoons, as big and impersonal as weather.

continued on page 26
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He is the archeologist of language, dusting off words and phrases from the rubble of a syntactically shattered culture, like so many keystones of meaning leveled by an ancient catastrophe.

The only other Los Angeles artist I like as much as Ruscha is Raymond Chandler, the poet of being in the wrong place at the wrong time, every time. If Ruscha were a character in a Chandler novel, what would he be? A corpse, probably. Philip Marlowe would keenly have described the elephant-treed, 1920s court where Ruscha has his studios. Getting no answer to his knock, Marlowe nudges the door, which swings open—and there’s old Ed, a beautifully tailored stiff, his face a study in handsome repose lacking only the slow watchfulness that used to make everyone so nervous and impress. Well, the point is that Chandler could never imagine a living character as interesting as Ruscha or as himself. Otherwise he would have been Dostoievsky. He would have been “serious.”

The exploitation of an extraordinary talent strictly for fun and diversion in “easy” forms is a crime of which the Grand Inquisitor suspects Chandler and Ruscha. But the more our divine prosecutor inspects the accumulating evidence, the less he like his case. Who is to say that fun can’t be serious? Look where we are, for chrissakes: Los Angeles. If you’re not having fun here, I mean actively and alertly enjoying yourself you’re in a kind of trouble never dreamed of by the Russian peasantry. Without a pleasurably focused subjective attitude, you’re a wreck, pal. Chandler laid down the L. i cognito: I wisecrack, therefore I am. Ruscha goes along with this principle of self-entertaining hostility, though at a higher, disembodied (no Marlowe) artistic level. If modern art means anything, it’s not having to deal with demands like plot and plausibility. Ruscha can have a murder without murderer, weapon, or even victim. Try going to a jury with that.

Only in his painting The Los Angeles County Museum on Fire (1965-8), that I can think of, has Ruscha openly uncorked his violence. That peculiar arson charge seems to me beatable by appeals to revolutionary justice and the muse of architectural criticism, but the act was uncharacteristically hysterical. More usually, Ed the Knife seems disciplined by the stricture “Don’t get mad, get even. Through it all, he polishes innumerable aliases and alibis. His aliases include the plodding her professor taxonomist of the architectural jungle, putting parking lots, banks, gas stations, condos, and Every Building on Sunset Strip into hunky-dory order.

He is also the archeologist of language, dusting off words and phrases from the rubble of a syntactically shattered culture, like so many keystones of meaning leveled by an ancient catastrophe.

To be happy in Southern California is to be on friendly terms with the physical, cultural, metaphysical Void. Good Los Angeles artists can be divided into those like Robert Irwin for whom the Void comes drifting in from the sea, with a scent of the Orient, and those like Ruscha for whom it spills over the mountains with memories of prairie and desert heartland, 100-mph straight shoots on empty two-lanes and skies like thought balloons in cartoons God drew. Ruscha likes what happens when the Void is violated by language, as in the lithograph I’m looking at right now, on my wall: an expanse of empty horizon with, in the middle, the tiny words “KANSAS, OKLAHOMA.” It’s the comma that kills me, breaking my American hear as cleanly as the common border of Kansas and Oklahoma abstractly ruptures the sublime continuity of universal space, universal possibility. Not that Ruscha is protesti
Chandler laid down the L.A. cognito:
I wisecrack, therefore I am.
Ruscha goes along with this principle of
self-entertaining hostility,
though at a higher, disembodied artistic level.

Like any true outlaw, he loves laws, because they give him his orientation. He'd be miserable in a state of anarchy.

Ruscha is a wit, then, rather than a satirist. He does not stand apart from his cultural environment, but lets it penetrate, implicate, civilize him. This is the precondition for his work's absolutely thrilling lack of any redeeming moral, social, or otherwise critical value whatsoever. He's so mixed up with the world he views that he couldn't shoot at it without hitting himself in the foot, and he knows it. His mainspring is the mere despicable necessity of personal survival, in a world ganged up against it. I'm not talking "macho artist" here, that being one of the West Coast's more readily negotiable fake personas. I'm not talking ego, just humble, dumb self-possession and self-enjoyment against tall odds, not caving in to the world's definition of oneself and also not withdrawing.

I think I'm in the vicinity of why I'd rather not write about Ruscha, rather not make him an object of my professional function. He is more valuable to me as a spiritual companion or guide. When I first spent some months in Los Angeles I drove the streets in psychic pain, suffering the bends of popping into the bright vacancy after many years in New York's pressurized medium. Then I'd see something and think, "That reminds me of a Ruscha" or "I'll bet Ruscha would like that"—or not even looking at anything, just getting the sympathetic quaver of a Ruscha-like attitude, a sweet stabilization of in-here and out-there. And, though I continued to feel completely screwed up, I didn't feel quite so forlorn. Since then, I've found a lot of things to like about Los Angeles, but nothing to match the fact that it is Ruscha country. In New York, his talent would have been forced into a narrow channel—like Saul Steinberg's, say. In Los Angeles, he gets to be a complete, great artist, a Dillinger of the modern imagination.
Ruscha is a wit, then, rather than a satirist.
He does not stand apart from his cultural environment,
but lets it penetrate, implicate, civilize him.
Ed Moses has always made good-looking paintings. The critical "book" on him is that he might—and he does—he cannot escape his taste and its symptomatic elegance. Perhaps this elegance is just purism, or maybe it's a personal battle with the tasteful romanticism that modernism has tried to destroy. But the conflict is always present in his work.

Moses' contribution to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art's bicentennial exhibition, "Seventeen Artists in the Sixties" typified the dilemma. In contrast to the familiar signatures of Sam Francis and Richard Diebenkorn or the high chroma and machined products of his more immediate peers, Ed Moses' pieces, a series of modest and unfamiliar drawings, seemed both out of place and out of time.

The Rose Drawings shown at LACMA date from 1963. Taking their collective title and shared motif from the pattern of a Mexican oil-cloth, the drawings consist of a simplified flower repeated across the paper and finally buried in a dense field of close pencil hatching. Moses' obsessive drawing, with its smooth and leaden glossiness, creates a palpable surface that lies in conscious contrast to the rough absorbancy of the paper. Monochromatic on handmade and separate surfaces, the Rose Drawings are characteristically Moses in spite of their unfamiliarity. They acknowledge his ongoing concern with line. He continues to build his work—paintings as well as drawings—with a line that is neither outline nor gesture. It is simply a mark, a statement of presence and a record of placement.

The unfamiliarity of the Rose Drawings and their curious out-of-place-ness are, again, typically Moses. Their uncomfortable position at LACMA symbolizes Moses' equally uncomfortable position in the Los Angeles art world. Jeremy Gilbert-Rolfe wrote of his work that it retained "the funky look of West Coast art while adopting an Atlantic, analytic involvement with pictorial morphology."

Moses undermined his position in the art world with three paintings—one red, one yellow, one blue—that continue to control his public image and critical reception. Exhibited in New York and Los Angeles in 1979, the five foot square monochromes were too late for their Atlantic audience, and were suspect on their home turf, in an art community that depends on an active eschewing of the mainstream for its dignity.

Moses' monochromes are polemical and literary paintings. They exist as explanations, defining painting—as Moses does in print—by naming and enumerating its parts: "one color, two dimensions, one surface." This definition ties the monochromes to the Rose Drawings; they share not only Moses' concern for surface but also his mark. He defines painting as the record of the act of painting, as placed paint. In spite of their closed and hermetic surfaces, the monochromes lie closer to Abstract Expressionism than to painting-as-object of minimal art. In a sense, they are literal action pieces.

With the works that follow the monochromes, Moses makes the act of painting an explicit part of his definition. The four panel paintings are a compendium of painting acts; each panel is a discrete surface and a separate piece of action. Moses works each plane individually and quickly, without stepping back and composing. He stains, splatters, rolls and overpaints one layer with another, or scrapes and sands through to layers beneath. In a number of panels, he mixes two incompatible media—oil-base and water-base paints. Each resists and bounds the other, and the resulting work is an image and its opposite. The swirled paint becomes a pointed reference not only to the act of painting, but also to Abstract Expressionism and its gestures, with Moses' version being gesture manque.
Although strident, the mark lacks the conviction and direction of the heroic or historical. Held back from the courageous by its size and position, its intentions are experimental. Moses' mark, done from the wrist rather than the body, is more detail than gesture.

Since 1975, Moses has conducted an ongoing, if sporadic, restatement of the architecture of painting--its support. At the Texas Gallery in 1978, he hung two opposing walls with newly constructed panels. Framed with two-by-fours, covered with sheetrock, spackled and taped, each of Moses' panels was a scale model of the wall on which it was hung. Each was notched on one corner, echoing the room's entrances, and hung upside down so that the replicated passageway was diagonally across from its prototype. Part of each surface was primed and painted in decorator colors—one pink, the other turquoise. The rest was left obviously muddied. Over the finished half, with the tools with which it was painted—a roller and a paint pad—Moses added an awkward arabesque, a deliberately amateurish, meandering swirl. His swirl mimics and almost becomes graffiti, a mark that like the gesture states the identity of its maker along with its own identity as mark and act. The graffiti's message is that painting is partly painting out--defacing.

The first exhibition of the raw wood paintings—Moses' most recent works—coincided with the bicentennial exhibition at LACMA. With these, Moses substitutes raw mahogany sheeting for stretched canvas, a support with questionable allegiances and obvious familiarity. The new support has its roots in his Texas Gallery walls and, like them, is impermeable. The wood's visual and physical density and its strident identity deny the paint entrance, leaving it on the surface as, once again, an act.

Like the four panel paintings, the raw wood paintings are a compendium of acts, only increasingly intricate. Worked individually, then joined, the panels are sprayed, sanded, spattered, overpainted and drybrushed. They recall earlier paintings that were masked, gridded and striped.
You can actually make things that are perishable, that don’t have to last forever. Wall paintings are the most powerful kind of natural tribal instinct by kids, territorially reacting and responding with vicious drawings on the walls. When they first put their graffiti on the walls, people were really mad. The kids were putting their mark down in a really primitive way. I’d like to make paintings that could hit that hard but I can’t. I’m coming from a different angle; I’m not a primitive or a street person.

However, unlike the investigative and polemical stance of the four panel paintings, the raw wood paintings are stately and elegant. Balanced and symmetrical, colored and “finished” the wood’s rich tone, they recall medieval screens and patterns of Navajo blankets. They share both their handsomeness and reference to the past, to a ritual ordering.

Moses’ index of painting processes reads as a vey of accidents, the inadvertent residue of king something else. His wooden armature keeps stuff of walls, floors and tables. It’s an area of oversprayed shadows and leftover patterns of work long since removed, or accumulated; the quick dry strokes of an habitual act of lining paint out of a brush.

In the most recent of the raw wood paintings, Moses has temporarily settled on a centered and hierarchic five panel format with a particular mark. The middle panel is often processed—smeared, squeegeed or sanded. The outer panels are marked with an irregularly spaced and overlapping pattern of four long parallel stripes, an inch wide and an inch apart, anchored at the panel’s edge. The parallel bars are the residue of Moses’ stencil. He fashions them by painting strips of one inch lath, three dimensional wooden “things” that make their absence felt more clearly than masking tape. But the image he manufactures with them is an undeniable statement of presence—presence in the painting and presence in the world. In size, spacing and number, Moses’ parallel bars are fingers, and his mark is a handprint, a shared and perceptible symbol that still avoids overstatement. Moses’ hand is simply the act of manufacture; it stops short of manuscript. Acknowledging, even separating, it does not name.

Moses’ hand on the wall is tied not only to graffiti’s declaration of individuality in a public place, but to the crude figures on the cave walls of prehistory. The cave painter fashioned paintings which became spiritual and cultural bonds with future societies. The graffitist fashions painting as an immediate, uncontrollable, declaration of the individual. It is through his mark that Moses and his line are united. Neither out of place nor out of time, they reflect the central paradox of modernist thinking.
I decided I was going to make a “sky piece” in the Rico Mizuno Gallery. I wanted to make high walls that you would look through so the sky would be like a flat plane above. The gallery walls weren’t high enough, and the ceiling was pitched, so I pulled the ceiling out, exposing the raw wood above. Then I inserted new walls, redefining the space. When I took the first layer of tarpaper off, the light came through these slots and set up and described the space in a totally weird way. It was filled with light. I threw rice polishings up in the air, and they would stay suspended in the light rays for a long time. You could just walk through this forest of light rays; it was uncanny. When you would look up, if an airplane or a bird went by, the sky would take on a kind of volume and space that would recede then dissipate. It could be a flat plane of blue or blue grey, then it would shift when something came across and brought in a reality orientation.
The original concept for the winery was a sod covered volume, like a hill or a mound. Later, it became a three sided pyramid with the faces pulled apart covered with uncultivated, natural terrain. It sits in the valley, alien, but part of the landscape because of its covering. At the edges of the pyramid are slots coming down to three big doors made out of giant wine casks. When the doors open, you go in and floating at the apex of the pyramid is a glass cube, the wine-tasting room. Outside the room, two balconies face the vineyards, and one faces Lake Berryessa.
I rented a big billboard on Rose Avenue and Main Street in Venice and had it painted partly institutional green. It was plywood and had one notch cut out. I would take friends b and point it out. They’d look at it and say, “it sort of looks like one of your paintings,” or something like that. That’s all they’d say. It was a nice piece.
The Death of Juan O’Gorman

by Esther McCoy

Photographs by Marvin Rand

El Pedregal, the residential subdivision designed by Luis Barragan.

Library, University of Mexico, designed by Juan O’Gorman.

Approach to the house.
is fitting to be writing a last story on Juan O’Gorman in
Arts & Architecture, where my first one on him appeared in
August 1951. The Mexican architect and artist, best known for
his mosaic-covered library at the University of Mexico, died in
January in San Angel. His fantasy house in the Pedregal was part
of an issue on Mexican domestic architecture, which included
a story on Luis Barragan’s land planning and landscaping for the
new residential development, Los Jardines del Pedregal.

Barragan had seen the austere beauty in the ten-square-mile
va flow which had been left by the eruption of Xitle three
tousand years before, and his program for the development
seemed to safeguard it. Two thirds of the land was always to
be in open space; homeowners could remove no more than
5 percent of the lava, and this from only the top cap of the
0-foot thick basaltic blanket. He specifically protected the ten­
sor green palo loco trees and other natives growing out of the
umus collected over the centuries in the crevices of the lava.

O’Gorman’s site in the Pedregal was at the edge of the develop­
ment, near the road leading to the new campus of the
iversity of Mexico. He had bought the most unlikely spot in all
ie Pedregal for his house. The back part was a stormy sea of
va, rising in waves as high as 20 feet; the middle part falling
to deep declivities, rills and hollows. The only near level
ption was at the front, where tradition required a gate house.

ut O’Gorman had an x-ray eye, an eye tutored by the cross­
ctional terrain of Guanajuato, the silver city where his father
as chief engineer of the mines when Juan was a child; a city
amically composed on many levels, with elegant neo-classi­
l houses backed up against a high cliff, artisans’ shops
owing out of rock, and streets like roller coasters; a city
deed in which the zero point in the elevation was ever in flux.

All of which may explain the layered compositions in many of
O’Gorman’s murals and easel paintings.

The deep cave and natural grotto that O’Gorman found at the
back of the two-acre site became two walls and part of the roof
of the living room. The interior was lighted by French doors on
two sides and a skylight over the grotto at the entrance. An
opening on one wall was enlarged to make a fireplace. The top
of the natural cave was extended to form roof and ceiling, the
roof becoming a terrace off the second floor bedrooms.

The core of the plan was a spiral form which coiled up over the
roof and terminated in a profile of the Rain God Chac, the inner
surface of the spiral a winding stair whose treads cantilevered
from the rock. From the second floor terrace were cantilevered
steps leading to a detached studio for Helen O’Gorman, an artist
and botanist who wrote and illustrated a book on Mexican
native plants. From her studio the steps continued to O’Gorman’s
studio above the bedrooms.

At the opposite end, the terrace wound up to a small cave, and
near it steps had been cut into the rock to lead down the steep
tank to the middle section of the lot. Later O’Gorman built a
studio for himself there. He picked a low point which was
protected from a road winding up to the house by a lusciously
planted declivity.

Most visitors came on foot from the entrance gate, and although
the pebble-paved road to the house is short, the extraordinary
planting, the curves and changes of level make it long and
eventful. At first one sees nothing but the planting, then as the
road rises one looks down into the declivity and sees an ancient
Aztec sculpture enshrined in green; it is a moment before the
eye continues to the lower point where O’Gorman’s studio is half
hidden because of the reflection of trees in the glass of the
top section of the catenary arch and the moss growing on the
curved roof. It could be mistaken for a natural berm. Then the
misty color at the end of the road strengthens and takes form.
It is the house, completely covered with mosaics.

But in 1951 when I first saw it, many of the mosaics were
lacking on the exterior—only the interiors were finished. The walls
were the purple-black or gray of the lava, some of cut stone,
others cast in place by nature’s baroque agent, Xitle. It was
May third, the Day of the Masons, when all buildings under construc­
tion were decorated with a cross and garlands in tribute to
Santa Cruz, patron saint of the masons, who protects the house
from evil. The cross crowned the head of the rain god at the end
of the spiral. It was magnificent as it was. Then I saw the
mosaics on the wall of the grotto. The constant shift in scale
was an act of poetry: a butterfly reigned over the dog, the
dog outweighed the jaguar.

Each year when I returned more mosaics had been added to the
exterior; on the parapet walls appeared parades of animals, of
symbols from prehispanic cultures, figures from myth and the
folk arts. The entrance became ceremonial: flanking it were two
mosaic Judases, drawn from the paper-mache figures strung
with fireworks, paraded and mocked and set afire in Mexican
villages at the end of Easter Week. Above the French doors were
glass areas in the shape of truncated pyramids; crowning these
was the spread eagle on the parapet.

I often stayed in O’Gorman’s top floor studio when I was in
Mexico, and on the first morning when I looked out of the two
eye-shaped windows I saw that the studio had been oriented to
the great volcanos, the Sleeping Woman and Popocatepetl, just
as prehispanic and colonial buildings recognized their presence
in the orientation. I noticed something else—in the foreground,
between the volcanos (surely not by chance) was framed the
mosaic-covered stacks of the library on the campus.
Terrace over living room.

Living room.
In the morning air the muted colors were part of the landscape. They were indeed landscape colors: O’Gorman had spent many months searching throughout Mexico for his palette for the mosaics, often traveling by burro to remote quarries. The nine colors he selected were from quarries all over Mexico—the only color not a volcanic or sedimentary rock was the mineral blue.

The house was more than a delicate exercise in fitting living and working spaces to a billowing site. It was a laboratory for testing color of the rocks and scale of the figures for the library walls. O’Gorman was 45 before he executed his first stone mosaic murals, although at age 17 he had painted his first mural. He had learned painting from his father, Cecil Crawford O’Gorman, a Sunday painter born in Dublin and educated in England in mining and chemical engineering, who came to Mexico in the 1890s to visit an uncle. The uncle was an erstwhile consul to Mexico, who had married into a prominent Mexican family. Cecil O’Gorman followed in his steps. He married his uncle’s daughter, and they settled in the pleasant suburb of Coyoacan, where Juan, one of three children, was born.

Juan was promised to medicine, as his brother was to philosophy. But as Juan left his classes in anatomy he stopped to watch Diego Rivera and Jose Clemente Orozco painting murals on the courtyard walls. When he had learned all he could he found a pulqueria wall and painted his own mural. He broke the news to his father that he wanted to be a painter; Cecil O’Gorman made a pact with him: he could switch to architecture if after he finished his studies he would build him a house.

In architecture Juan fell under the spell of Le Corbusier, and upon his graduation built the first three modern houses in Mexico in 1930—one for his father, one for Diego Rivera and one for himself. In 1932 he was appointed by the Ministry of Public Education to direct the design and building of 30 public schools, all in the International Style.

He moved easily from architecture to mural painting to easel painting, doing panels for the Mexico City airport and walls for a Patzcuaro library. As he discovered Frank Lloyd Wright, and became steeped in prehispanic forms, he abandoned the International Style. (His first study for the library was a truncated pyramid in lava rock, and when it was rejected, he accepted the boxlike stacks on condition that he could cover the walls with murals.)

After the library came commissions for mosaics for walls of two public buildings, a wall in Taxco and then murals for Chapultepec Castle. But by 1965 the endless hours in cold and heat on scaffolds painting murals and correcting the color of mosaics had begun to affect his health. Reluctantly the O’Gormans decided to sell the house and move back to their small house in San Angel. By then the mosaic house in the Pedregal had become a national cultural asset; although not registered with the Secretaria del Patrimonio Nacional for preservation, its wide publication in books and periodicals brought thousands of foreign visitors.

The O’Gormans awaited a buyer who would preserve it and allow the public to view it. The “right” buyer miraculously appeared—Helen Escobedo, director of the art gallery at the school of architecture at the University of Mexico, whose father, an attorney, taught at the law school. She agreed verbally to preserve it, and the house changed hands in July 1969. By the end of the year most of it had been destroyed.

When I heard about it, I telephoned Juan. Outwardly he accepted the loss stoically in the tradition of the true Mexican who fraternizes with death, accepting disaster with brave jokes.
The mask cracked when he wrote me a month later, in January, 1970: "I really have to tell someone in this world about it because it has caused me a trauma that I must get over. This house was, I consider, the only true creative work that I have done."

He recounted how he had been duped by Helen Escobedo. "St assured both Helen and me that she would not destroy the house. 'I am no barbarian,' she said. One week after she bought the house she started to demolish it... The demolition was done in such haste that she didn't wait for a permit. There is a six-story building being finished on the other side of the street and with the high wall and the noise of construction the demolition was well under way before the inspectors noticed. The city ordered her to stop and to file plans of intended building."

"After construction stopped and an outcry rose," Juan continued. "Helen Escobedo admitted that she had planned to build on the site a house 'to be designed by an architecture student as he went along... without plans.'" Helen Escobedo's father proved to be "a rough customer," pointing out that there was no written agreement to preserve the house. There were veiled threats that if the O'Gormans made trouble they would not be paid the balance of the agreed price.

Juan's postscript was a request for me to "send copies of whatever is published about the house so I can add them to the history of the events of my life."

After that, I heard little but sad news about Juan. His health continued to deteriorate until he had to give up painting the murals at the Chapultepec Castle, and finally even easel painting was difficult.

On January 8th this year Juan gave up the struggle. He took his life. Decisively. This time the mask would not crack. The act took place in the garden, so the benevolent spell the masons had put on the house in 1930 went unbroken.

He lay in state in Belles Artes, whose walls over the years had accommodated a show of landscapes by Cecil O'Gorman, the watercolors of Helen O'Gorman's native Mexican flowers and plants, and the paintings of Juan—tender, sardonic, layered, mocking and filled with the wonder and bravery and bloodshed and anger of Mexico. But there was nothing in Juan's Mexico evil and brutal as Helen Escobedo who, "with malignant and abandoned heart," as 18th century law books describe murder, did willfully destroy a living and unique work of art.

Esther McCoy is a Contributing Editor of Arts and Architecture. She has written extensively on California architecture and her publications include Five California Architects, Richard Neutra, and Vienna to Los Angeles: Two Journeys.
From Today
Photography Is Alive

Drawing with a Camera:

Stephen Spender, April 9, 1982
35 x 30 inches

Recent Work
by
David Hockney
In February, March and April of this year, David Hockney undertook a series of drawings using a Polaroid SX-70 Camera. At that time, he met with Fred Hoffman to discuss some of the ideas underlying these works. These comments are excerpted from their discussions.

Accompanying my exhibition, “Looking at Pictures in a Book,” at the National Gallery of Art in London last July, I wrote an essay discussing why we take such delight in pictures, and why a reproduction may or may not give the same “buzz” we experience from a painting. As I noted, “the connection between the ideas that can be communicated in painting, experience that can be shared by paintings, things painting can do that other arts cannot do is what we delight in.” When you look at a drawing of a seated figure, for instance, and there is distortion used, it doesn’t read as distortion. Rather, you look at it and think it’s true to life. So, in a sense, the distortion denies what I call one-eyed fixity. Picasso had two eyes, he never bothered with the one-eye effect, never. That’s what was marvelous about him. Even in his very naturalistic pictures, he did not use a one-eye viewpoint. This, to me, makes for a richer experience than photography, because it’s magically close to how we really see.

In the same essay I went on to suggest that photographs depicting illusionary space are more stylized than we think. We tend to think that what photographers depict is “true,” that photographs tell us the truth. I suggested that we are being naive in believing this, that isn’t the truth at all. The photograph has many flaws, especially the one-eye viewpoint. In another 50 or 100 years, photographs are both to look stylized because we won’t look at things in the same way. A traditional, or, as I like to call it, “old fashioned” photograph doesn’t tell us how we look. Drawing and painting tell us a great deal more, and certainly have since Cubism.

I have never asked photographers what they thought of Cubism; and until now it’s never occurred to anyone that Cubism has had no influence on photography. Why didn’t it have any influence? Because photographers could never escape their one-eye thinking. It all had to do with being there. There’s nothing fixed at even the idea of something being beautiful in itself. Visual artists point this out, poets point it out first; and these verify that it’s true. It is the process of looking that one finds beauty, not in the object we are looking at.

In putting these ideas into photographs, it amazed me what happened. It solved some problems and raised a lot more. First of all, I could get away from the idea that the one-eye photograph is true to our experience. My photographs are closer to what we experience when we look—which is what any picture must be about. It isn’t about a real thing, it is about going beyond the surface of things. The moment we’ve broken the idea that the photograph, the same old picture, is not the truth, we’ve smashed a lot of other beliefs as well.

I’m beginning to think that the beauty of a thing is in the process of looking, not in what we see. If you think about it, this has very complicated implications. Other artists, such as Van Gogh, have told us this. His subject matter could be anything. It was the process, not th
beginning to think

that the beauty of a thing

is in the process of looking,

not in what is seen.
Sunday at the Pool, April 13, 1982
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The number of women architects increases every year, but as relatively few have their own offices, it is not easy to determine the roles they play in the design process. In large offices, where many have jobs, their work is usually indistinguishable from that of the men. Unisex usually starts in school where women students want to be judged not as women but as architects, but as the only rule of judgment was set up by men, women suppress certain characteristics that are purely feminine.

"We are brainwashed in school," Ena Dubnoff (USC, 1960) said. "Women design more intuitively and emotionally, men more intellectually, and although the results may be similar, the process is different. Men think of windows intellectually in terms of view, the light coming in, and the patterns; women experience the view, the light and the patterns."

Milica Dedijer-Mihich recalled that when she came to USC in 1960 from the school of architecture at the University of Belgrade, where half her class was women, she had three strikes against her. "I was a woman, I had a foreign accent, and I was married." She tried to design boldly like her peers. It was a role she slipped out of often.

"For the third year design project for housing in the Hollywood Hills," she recalled, "I used poured-in-place concrete, with curves, to allow more sun in the apartments. All the men used steel. They were embarrassed when I put my drawings up. They averted their eyes. They were too polite to give me a crit."

She laughed good humoredly as she finished the story.

Women seem to have been given greater responsibility in English and Italian offices, although the rare instance in which a woman was raised to a principal in the office is that of (Franco) Albini and (Franca) Helg. One encouraging straw in the wind came from a touching revelation in Architectural Design's issue on women in architecture that women took their babies to the office in their prams.

What a woman brings to a design is illustrated here in the most autobiographical of building types: a house for one's self. There is indeed the presence of a woman. You hear the voice of a woman in the program; it reads a little like a life support system for host and fetus. Dedijer charges the house to produce its own heat, to distill its own drinking water, to build a rain water reserve for the drip irrigation of vegetables grown in the two-story projecting greenhouse to feed a family of four. The children are aged five and seven. The father is architect Glen Small, widely known for his famous "Green Machine" megastructure and Biomorphic Biosphere.
Small and Dedijer have rarely worked together, although now they both teach at SCI-ARC. His office is on the ground level of the house and hers on a balcony above the kitchen. (A bit of symbolism.)

There was little discussion about who would design the house. By the time they could afford the 30 by 60 foot substandard city lot in Venice, overlooking the terminal (and graveyard) for city buses, the budget afforded little beyond basic shelter. There was very little chance that they would be able to get financing on the kind of universal systems design that Small was then engrossed in, so he deferred to Dedijer.

Dedijer spent more time in research than on the board; the heliodon tests to determine the orientation; model building to demonstrate to the city that the multi-layered space was only two stories; and of course the study of existing alternative energy systems, the adaptation of these to her purpose, or the design of new ones.

There were also studies of ways to close out the wretched views and take full advantage of the benevolent ones. The front of the house faces the bus terminal on the north, and to avoid this and reach out to the distant view of the Santa Monica Mountains required a deck at a high level of a house restricted to a 30 foot height. The result is almost as much square footage in decks as roof.

The north elevation seems at first glance Corbusian—the white skin, the pipe railings; but Dedijer is closer to the Corbusian ideas, the full length suspension bridge—"l'esthetique de la vie moderne." She blends the curve into the right angular line or surface as if she were bringing the yin and yang into equilibrium. There are subtle retards and accelerations, an effortless change of time and key as she moves from clear to liquid, from cerebral fugue to emotional lied—and all in a small composition, not designed for the full orchestra, more a chamber ensemble.

An image that flitted in and out of her mind was of the great-aunt's miniscule Palladian villa in Bellgrade, with its oval entry hall echoing in living room and the shape of the terrace facing the river. Dedijer had worked for several years on her own projects and Bernard Judge's in his office in the Schindler house, and she paid certain tributes in the design to Schindler. She spoke of his way of putting an elegant bath-room in a lowcost house. (Her bathrooms have curved walls, are lighted from two sides and have round tubs 6 feet in diameter.)

She and Small had owned and restored one of the Horatio West beach cottages designed by Irving Gill in 1919 as a workmen's court. "I had a reverence for his humble spaces," she said. (She followed Gill's habit of raising the closet floors to keep out the dust.)

These things all lay in her mind. She drew from them intuitively. In the end she achieved a conceptual house in which there are rich intuitions.

The focal point of the house is the two-story greenhouse on the south, attached like a papoose to the parent structure. The major purpose is for the growing of food, but equally important are the south light, the air and the view it gives the major rooms. The central high space in the house is not the living room but the dining room, and pointed toward this, like horizontally staggered boxes at the theater, are Dedijer's office on the east, and the living room on the west. The kitchen, below Dedijer's office, is close to the food supply in the greenhouse.

The living room, the highest point in the house, is an evening room where the family and guests gather. During the day the meeting place is the sunny dining room. Small area, low and sheltering, the living room is released from the rectangle by a big-radius curve joining two sides; the room is open to the high space of the dining room, and glass doors lead to the north deck. A low concrete platform, extending around the curve and the dining room side, is covered with continuous composition, not designed for the full orchestra, more a chamber ensemble.

Food Production Analyst: Debi Strozier

General Contractors: Milica Dedijer-Mihich and Roland Tso, AIA

Architect: Milica Dedijer-Mihich

Energy Systems Design Consultant: Terry Rainey

Mechanical Engineer: Jerry Sullivan

Structural Engineers: Frank Lucas and Leslie Fejes

Electrical Consultant: Saul Goldin

Waste Disposal System: Carousel model by Eviroscope

Water Distiller: New World Distillers

Solar flat plate collector components: Phelps Dodge
Above: A view from the living area across to the studio shows the generous space at the heart of the house.
Right: View from the greenhouse into the dining area. Below left: A view from the kitchen to the living area above. Below right: The dining area joins the kitchen and the greenhouse.
Curved walls envelop circular tubs in both bathrooms.

The greenhouse provides the house with solar heating, extra floor space and an area for growing food.

The stairway walls are washed with blue, reflected from the carpeting.

The house from an adjacent rooftop shows it in context with the neighborhood.
The architect’s intention was to “investigate the responsiveness of the individual living unit towards the basic life support systems (sun, water, air, nutrients and waste)” and to “minimize dependency on the existing urban energy systems such as municipal water, sewage and drainage, as well as electrical power, natural gas and food supply.”

**Solar Design Research:**

An initial design decision was made to use solar energy to accommodate the space heating, domestic hot water, water purification and food production needs of the house. It was decided that a greenhouse would be the most appropriate structure to respond to all of these requirements. The greenhouse could act as a heating plenum for the space heating, as a framework support for the solar collector in domestic water heating, as a support for the photovoltaic cells for water purification, and as the volume within which food production would take place.

Research then began in order to find the plan of maximum solar exposure on this suburban 30’ x 60’ site. A heliodon test was conducted by erecting a 1/6” scale model of the proposed building mass including the surrounding tightly packed homes. The sun’s yearly path was duplicated, and the results of the tests established the maximum solar exposure plane to be 18’ above ground level with the ideal orientation at the southeast property line off the rear alley. The greenhouse was located beneath this plane. The greenhouse plan is a right angle isosceles triangle with the right angle facing approximately true south.

**Space Heating System:**

*Passive:* There is direct solar gain through the greenhouse to the main living areas during the day.

*Semipassive:* There are cylindrical return and supply duct stacks located at the base angles of the greenhouse. The return air duct sucks hot air from the top by means of a counterflow fan from the back-up furnace down to the 310 sq. ft. rock storage area underneath the ground floor of the house. The air heats the rocks and is then returned to the greenhouse floor by the supply duct located at the opposite angle from the return duct.

**Space Heating Controls:**

*Heat Storage Mode:* A differential thermostat activates the downflow furnace fan when the temperature in the rock storage area is less than the upper portion of the greenhouse.

*Space Heating Mode:* A two-stage room thermostat senses the room temperature in the house. Upon a call for heating, the first stage of the thermostat closes the greenhouse rock storage duct circulation system and opens the residence duct circulation system. This extracts the heat stored in the rocks, distributing the hot air through the small ducts leading to the upper level rooms. If there is inadequate heat in the storage system, the room thermostat turns on the back-up gas furnace required by local building codes. During the 1981-82 winter, the only back-up heat required was supplied by the wood-burning Fire Drum II fireplace in the sitting area at night. The average monthly electrical bill was six dollars for operating the counterflow furnace fan.

The space heating system has several built-in options including a motorized louver damper which can bypass the bottom of the rock storage and channel the heat gain from the greenhouse across the top of the rock storage directly beneath the concrete floor slab, and a separate air return connected from the highest portion of the interior of the house to the main rock storage area. This is operated by two motorized dampers facilitating air circulation when the temperature of the rock storage is higher than the temperature of the upper portion of the house. All windows except the south-facing double-glazed.

**Space Cooling:**

All the main living rooms are cross-ventilated. The greenhouse is equipped with a top projecting vent on the roof slope and double hung windows on the side wall, oriented to catch prevailing ocean breezes. The slopes have been installed in the main chase shaded with suspended nursery fabric to reduce glare. The greenhouse catwalk acts as a sunscreen for the kitchen-dining area during the summer; and the solar flat plate collector acts as a sunshade for the study and sitting areas.

**Solar Hot Water Heating System:**

A conventional 60 sq. ft. flat plate collector was integrated into the top portion of the greenhouse. An 80 gallon hot water storage tank is located on the roof just above the collector plate. The hot water from the collector plate is thermo-siphoned up to the storage tank which is placed horizontally and gravity feeds the water to the house. There is a back-up gas heater to assist the system if necessary.

**Water Purification:**

An electrically operated distilling unit will purify drinking water for the house. All the necessary low voltage wiring and water supply lines have been installed in the terraces. The unit will be run by photo-voltaic cells; and it has been calculated that the cost of installing the cells and distilling unit will be amortized in two years based on the present cost of bottled water.

**Water Conservation:**

An aerobic waste disposal system is planned to minimize the dependency of the house on municipal sewage and water systems. This will be a waterless digester of food and human waste. The traditional tank top toilet uses four or five gallons per flush. The digester toilet utilizes a vacuum to pull the wastes into a compost/digester. The wastes are broken down into fertilizer. The minimum amount of heat necessary for digestion of organic material is supplied by the space heating system. A regular tank-top toilet is also installed to comply with municipal occupancy codes. All the necessary plumbing and installation is included in the compost unit that has not yet been purchased.

A rainfall storage system is in place between the 3’ wide built-up planter walls; the sides of the property. The terraces serve collectors and distributors of rainfall into the storage system. This water can then be used for food growing and landscaping. In desert climates such as this, potable water comes scarce, so a rainwater storage system is important.

A turf-block material in the driveway catches water run-off and uses it to grow ground cover.

**Food Production:**

The greenhouse floor, walls and slop roof members as well as the terraces have been structurally reinforced to support the weight of large triangular planters which should supply the nutritional needs for a family of four. All the terraces have water supply for easy maintenance. Proposed landscaping for the exterior ground level consists of assorted fruit-producing trees appropriate the coastal zone.

Marsha Zilles, a senior draftsman in the office of Welton Becket Associates, formerly designed and built solar greenhouses for the New Alchemy Institute.
Since 1976, a distinctive genre of townhouse condominium has appeared in Santa Monica, California. Designed by a group of like-minded young architects, these buildings combine architectural exuberance with a pragmatic accommodation of code requirements and market forces. Their designers show a casual lack of concern for the intellectual issues of architecture, freely borrowing from and reinterpreting the imagery of the Modern Movement while dispensing with much of its ideological content. Like the anonymous designers of vernacular buildings, these architects seem unaware of the more profound connotations of the stylistic elements they employ or the rationale behind their selection and composition. This attitude is fairly typical of Southern California which has bred many skilled architectural stylists over the years.

The condominiums' pop/futuristic shapes and eye-catching colors make them a loosely matched set of place markers in their neighborhood. Their use of color reflects contemporary Los Angeles fashion in the decorative arts, while their expressionism represents a continuing local tradition of experimentation with a popularized vocabulary of modern architecture.

The use of the relatively adventurous language of modernism for speculative buildings was encouraged by three main factors: the free-spirited cultural climate of Los Angeles that has long encouraged new ideas; the realized market potential of younger, well-educated buyers with careers in the arts and professions; and the design leeway allowed by the architects financing and contracting their own buildings. Many of the architects chose to act as their own developers in order to gain design control over their projects and a larger portion of the profits.

The floor plans of all the 1500-1800 square foot townhouses are similar. Typically, there are two bedrooms and bathrooms on the ground floor, and a double height living room/dining room area on the second floor, with an open loft level on the third floor overlooking all. The second and third level spaces are bright and airy, lit by clerestory windows and skylights. The interiors are simple, punctuated by exposed metal ducts, pipe rails, and fireplaces.

The inclusion of a loft level is typical of the designers' dual concern with meeting zoning requirements and satisfying the housing market. Santa Monica zoning prohibits the construction of bathrooms on the third floor, and this level can be no greater than one-third the size of the second floor. The designers used this restriction to their advantage by creating an open loft. This gives the townhouses a desirable amount of flexibility, as both the loft and downstairs bedroom are easily adapted for use as home office space, an important consideration for many of the buyers.

A code requirement for fire access was responsible for another feature common to the condominiums—second and third floor roof decks. The designers took advantage of this constraint to create a romantic Corbusian modern landscape. Level changes, bridges, metal staircases, and pipe railings give the decks qualities of a jungle gym, as though they were intended for open air calisthenics. This vocabulary also echoes earlier modernist concerns for health and cleanliness as evidenced in buildings such as Richard Neutra's 1929 Lovell house in Los Angeles.

The designers of these condominiums are a group of young Southern California architects who have worked in a shifting series of collaborations. Many of them attended the Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCI-ARC), and have studied or worked with Eric Moss, whose techno-pop influence is evident in their work. Santa Monica was the logical location for them to build: most of the architects live in or near this area which occupies a highly sought-after position at the ocean edge of the fashionable Los Angeles West Side. Furthermore, the steep rise in land prices experienced throughout the area in the 1970s was especially dramatic in Santa Monica, making it an attractive venue for further real-estate speculation.

Steve Andre of Urban Forms was motivated to become a developer-architect because architects have very little influence on most projects: "The developer's lawyer, or his framer, is far more important to him than the architect. The developer's potential profits are huge. I went after his piece of the pie." Andre began his independent architectural practice by buying a
single lot and building a house on speculation. Working rapidly in order to recoup his investment, he completed the design and working drawings in one week. After the first house, he went on to build a five unit condominium at 1017 Pearl Street, designed in collaboration with Allan Tossman. Since then, Andre has acted as architect and developer on six projects, although his future as a developer is presently in doubt because of the current collapse of the housing market.

The 1981-2 condominiums at 116 Pacific Street in Santa Monica by Stafford-Binder treat parking areas in the opposite manner. While other condominiums have their garages hidden behind berms or sunk partially into the ground, the concrete block garage of the Stafford-Binder condominiums is exposed, creating a plinth for the building. Because this "rusticated" concrete block base is symmetrical, as is the X-motif which crosses the second and third story, the building has a strong, ordered division into parts. The X-motif and the terraces which are cut into one edge of each unit help define the condominiums as thirty-foot cubes. This definition is also expressed in the plan, where most elements are symmetrically disposed around a central stair hall.

The modern style which the condominium architects chose to adopt is the modernism of 1920s Europe, particularly the work of Le Corbusier. However, while there was often a polemical element in early heroic modernism, this is usually lacking in the work of these young architects. Whereas Le Corbusier used a set of ideas to propose an architectural principle, such as the free plan generated by the column and slab system at the Maison Dom-ino, these architects have simply appropriated his use of details such as pipe rails and steel-framed windows. This revival of modernist imagery was first seen in the work of the New York Five, who used a Corbusian language in the 1960s and 70s to bolster their campaign for abstract formalism. In Santa Monica, this interest in abstraction has been further simplified to a Sunbelt code of playful composition and decoration.
The revivalist style of the condominium architects is eclectic rather than dogmatic, and besides Corbusian modernism, there are other influences on current architectural taste at work in these buildings. The screen walls of the 1981 Tossman/Day condominiums at 835 Grant Street, for example, seem simultaneously indebted to Charles Moore and the New York Five; and the primary forms of recent European rationalism crop up in the Stafford-Binder condominiums of 1962.

However, the condominium architects are generally uncomfortable when the notion of style is applied to their buildings. They view their choice of forms as naturally appropriate to the buildings' function and locale, and consequently styleless. In fact, the condominiums belong to that most ephemeral aspect of style—fashion—and the fashion they follow most is high-tech, the media-propagated decorating fad in which objects are valued for their drop-dead cool/industrial associations. The hardware of the condominiums is perhaps their most symbolically important decorative feature. Red pipe railings, gridded formica and exposed bulb fixtures in wire cages are seen as indicators of progressive cultural aspirations, and of professional class social status.

Townhouse condominiums began to appear in Santa Monica around 1973; and one of the first to employ aggressively modern imagery was 632 Pacific Street, designed in 1976 by Michael Folonis of A Design Group while he was still a student at SCI-ARC. This building differs from later condominiums in two respects: it is finished in wood, rather than stucco, and the bedrooms are located on the second floor, rather than the currently favored first. The project won a Los Angeles AIA award in 1977, and was followed with a succession of condominium projects designed by Folonis in conjunction with his partner, David Cooper.
Sun-Tech Townhomes
David Van Hoy and Steve Andre, Urban Forms, 1981
Photos: Glen Allison

Above: 28th Street facade.
Left: Dining area.
Right: Courtyard walkway.
Below: Living area, overlooked by loft.
Largest and best planned of the condominiums is the Sun-Tech Townhomes, also the recipient of a Los Angeles AIA award, designed by David Van Hoy and Steve Andre of Urban Forms and built in 1981 at 2433 Pearl Street. Sun-Tech has three plan types, volumetrically expressed as alternate arrangements, made up of the same block-like components. The tightness of the narrow passageways between the townhouses and the repetition of forms create the appearance of an urban village. A simple, orthogonal site plan at Sun-Tech attempts to foster a sense of community among its residents, in contrast to recent residential construction in Southern California which has often produced the opposite effect. Unlike many new townhouses in Los Angeles, with their individual entrances directly off subterranean garages, the staircases at Sun-Tech lead to communal pathways. Residents enter their houses via stoops which step up a half level to the second story; so that exits and entrances, like in nineteenth century rowhouses, become a public event. The project's roof decks, joined together by catwalks, are also part of the communal space.

The downstairs bedrooms that face onto walkways are the least attractive feature of Sun-Tech. The first floor location, and the nearness to the walkways, is inimical to the concept of privacy necessary for a bedroom. The bedrooms are dark, as well, because their gloomy position at the bottom of the building is made gloomier still by an earth berm placed over the parking garage as a nod to landscaping. This gives some ground-floor rooms the feeling of a basement.

Social acceptance of the luxury townhouse spread in Southern California during the 1970s because, fitting on a small 50 x 150 foot lot, it is the only type of new development possible in existing urbanized areas in which each unit retains a separately defined identity. The condominiums are usually arranged as bands of rowhouses, one unit deep, thereby retaining the personal scale characteristic of earlier solutions to this problem, such as the bungalow court or the duplex. Development of this kind made up a large part of Los Angeles' new multiple unit housing between the first and second World Wars. Some of these buildings were clothed in the Moderne style, a popularized vocabulary of modern forms which bears a relationship to more sober high art modernism much like that of the Santa Monica condominiums.
However, it seems unlikely that the pop-mode rowhouse will become so widespread in Los Angeles that it will be the housing type that symbolizes the 1980s in the same way that the stucco box apartment house dominated the 1950s or the bungalow dominated the teens. High prices and financing costs, a city moratorium on condominium construction, and a continued popular taste for period revival imagery all conspire to make investment in modern condominiums risky, if not impossible. Land zoned for condominiums in Santa Monica is expensive, averaging 50 to 60 dollars per square foot, compared to 15 to 20 dollars per square foot in an area such as the West San Gabriel Valley. The Santa Monica condominiums cost another 50 to 60 dollars per square foot to build, and the finished product will cost its new owner 200 to 250 thousand dollars, well above the Los Angeles median house price of 114 thousand dollars. The housing market collapsed just as the building of modern condominiums peaked in Santa Monica—the 1980 census revealed that almost one quarter of the city’s condo units were vacant.

Consumer preference for period revival style has also acted to keep the number of condominiums employing modern imagery to a minimum. One hundred and fifteen condominiums were given their first approval by Santa Monica in 1979; of these only a handful actually employed overtly modern forms. The adoption of those forms, of course, no guarantee of aesthetic integrity, as developments that appear to be simplified and poorly realized versions of this prototype have already appeared.

Currently, there is a city-wide moratorium on any condominium construction, imposed in May of last year, while Santa Monica reviews its zoning policies. This is only the latest in a series of moratoriums which began in May of 1979, shortly after a new pro-rent control, anti-development city council took office. When and if condominium building resumes in Santa Monica it will do so burdened with yet another layer of regulations and conditions levied, such as mandatory inclusion of low-income units.

Given the constraints of government policy, an uncertain economy, and the vagaries of popular taste, it remains to be seen what role the pop-modern speculative condominium will play in the Southern California cityscape. This genre building may colonize other, less expensive sections of the region, while it is equally possible that they will become instant period pieces of the late 1970s and early 80s.
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“Mexican Bauhaus” is the name that Peter Shire gives his style, working in an additive process that brings together forms, colors and materials with utter disregard for traditional combinations. A ceramic teapot has a re-bar handle held on with cotter pins; a plywood storage cabinet perches on cement pilings under the shelter of a fiberglass roof. His ceramics are without the plasticity that seemed inherent in the medium until he laid hands on it; his furniture marries ephemeral paint to eternal concrete. Somehow, these
surprising unions emphasize the intrinsic qualities of each element.

The pieces miraculously retain function in the midst of these kaleidoscopic patterns of form and color. Like a happy child at play in a scrap box, Shire includes all the possibilities along the way to the finished product. "I can't stand to have two elements alike. If I'm eating out and someone in the group orders the same dish as me, I have to change my order so that there won't be two of the same on the table."

There are similarities between Shire's work and that of Italian designers, most notably Ettore Sottsass, but their work evolved independently. "I'd seen their work in magazines, but not really known it. I can't read Italian and the stuff wasn't here to look at. I loved the mystery of it in photos. Crazy camera angles, whacky pieces—you didn't know what you were looking at. I wanted my pieces to have that quality of puzzlement."

Although he worked with stoneware and porcelain in the 1960s, they denied him the color he sought. After college, Shire returned to the low-fire clay and glazes that he had worked with in high school. "I bought an old high-fire kiln, but it fell off the truck and that was it for me and high-fire."

The recent expansion into furniture was easy. "My dad was a cabinetmaker so I've always been around that process of fabrication. And since my pieces have never meshed together, since they've always been groups of shapes that are sort of bolted together, the transition to other materials came naturally." A trip to Italy in 1980 brought Shire into contact with Sottsass and his design crowd. Six months later, the newly formed Memphis group asked him to design some pieces for the 1981 Milan furniture market week. While visions of furniture danced in his head, Shire also produced some one-of-a-kinds for exhibition at his Los Angeles gallery.

The creation of a set for the production of Stravinsky's opero-ratorio "Oedipus Rex" at the Hollywood Bowl is another recent Shire project. "I made a city with only the monuments," says Shire. His geometric elements assume additional meaning as they symbolize the ancient Greek city of Thebes. A pink sphere turns to reveal itself as a cache for the narrator; a lilac pyramid becomes a throne as Oedipus rises through the top; both palace and temple are represented by a mauve ziggurat; and heroically scaled crescents, dots and squiggles climb the arch of the Bowl, becoming the sun, moon and air of Thebes.

Currently, the cheerful constructivist has returned to an ongoing exploration of the teapot that he began in 1968. Peter Shire's insatiable delight in variety and joyful indulgence of whim continue to create objects that make you smile while they get the job done.

Deborah Perin is Managing Editor of Arts and Architecture magazine.
If the Chinese were to update their calendar, this would be the Year, not of the Dog but of Neon. Two major movies, a new museum in Los Angeles, and a preservation society in San Diego celebrate a medium whose resources are being steadily enriched by artists and designers nationwide, but especially in Southern California.

In Coppola’s *One from the Heart*, neon illuminates, colors and defines a Las Vegas of fantasy, capturing its brittle gaiety, its surface masquerade. It is used to reproduce the downtown casinos, revive past signs, invent new effects and play tricks with scale. It makes believable a world in which a girl can emerge from a flashing sign, walk a high wire over a surreal junkyard, and frolic in a cocktail glass. By contrast, Ridley Scott’s *Blade Runner* is a dark fantasy, a nightmare city of the future that is lit by neon as though it were hellfire. The bazaars of Hong Kong, the cartoons of *Heavy Metal*, and Times Square sex shops inspired a world that is strange, yet disturbingly familiar. Neon is the link.

In May, Lili Lakich and Richard Jenkins opened the Museum of Neon Art (MoNA) in downtown Los Angeles. She is a 17-year veteran of the medium, and the museum (temporarily housed in her studio) is a labor of love, a place to show restored signs and innovative art works. Two of her major works—*Blessed Oblivion* and *Love in Vain*—appeared in the opening show. Both are large allegorical panels that exploit the dramatic linearity of neon—its magic crayon property—and its potential to illuminate such additions as silk-screened photos and a bunch of paper flowers. Lakich has also created inventive commercial signs and is an accomplished art director.

Another featured artist, Larry Albright, began by making mad-scientist assemblages, and he still has a touch of Dr. Frankenstein. Electrical charges of 20,000 volts are fed through glass spheres and cylinders filled with neon or krypton gas. The effects are dazzling: lazy wreaths of light, pulsating tendrils, flailing bolts of lightning. One such piece was featured in *Battle Beyond the Stars* to simulate the ultimate weapon; others are displayed at Disney’s experimental city in Florida (EPCOT) to symbolize the fusion of art and technology. Albright worked on *Close Encounters*, and fabricated the title and miniature casino signs used for the credits of *One from the Heart*.

Eric Zimmerman is represented at MoNA by the neon-trimmed birthday cake he created to celebrate LA’s Bicentennial. It is an uncharacteristic flight of fancy; most of his work is severely abstract. Through the use of mirrors and computer programs, he transforms simple geometric shapes into beguiling illusions of depth and motion. His large-scale pieces are located in shopping centers in National City and Las Vegas, and in a lounge of the Sheraton La Reina, at LA International Airport.

In San Diego, three artists have established the “Save Our Neon” organization to rescue the once-rich heritage of a city whose council, afflicted with a new-found sense of propriety, is busy forbidding its continued display. Gloria Poore, Juliet Mondot and Greg Calvert have rescued a score of signs, restored several, and are currently seeking a good home for two orphaned movie marquees.
All this activity demonstrates that neon, having gone through its first life cycle, is now embarked on another. The first began as novelty (LA’s first sign, in 1923, stopped traffic), became glamorous (in Warner Bros. musicals of the early ‘30s, Busby Berkeley wired chorines, violins, pianos and bathtubs to create moving tapestries of neon), peaked in the late ‘40s and sank into disrepute in the ‘50s, as maintenance declined and plastic advanced. Artists began to exploit the medium in the mid-‘60s; today, old signs are being recycled, new work created.

There is a special pleasure in seeking out the old signs that have survived. Line and lettering are expressive of period: geometrical deco of the late ‘30s, Busby Berkeley wired chorines, violins, pianos and bathtubs to create moving tapestries of neon, peaked in the late ‘40s and sank into disrepute in the ‘50s, as maintenance declined and plastic advanced. Artists began to exploit the medium in the mid-‘60s; today, old signs are being recycled, new work created.

There is a special pleasure in seeking out the old signs that have survived. Line and lettering are expressive of period: geometrical deco of the late ‘30s, baroque curves of the ‘40s, spiky mannerisms of the ‘50s. Pictures are equally revealing: a tubular bellhop (for a suburban motel!), Astaire and Rogers entwined above a dance studio, a muffler-shop rocket, a flying saucer cafe.

New wave signs are as eclectic and self-mocking as their titles would suggest: Cadillac Ranch, Vinyl Fetish, China Club, and Jazz are a few of the gems on or near LA’s Melrose Avenue. A vintage clothing store features a jitterbugging couple; and the now defunct Flipper’s Roller Boogie Palace suggested a deco movie marquee. Neon is used as an accent in a window display or billboard, to light an artist’s studio and to create a cloudscape in a television commercial.

Neon in its purest form has the quality that distinguishes vintage Chuck Jones from the assembly-line cartoons of Saturday morning television. It is hand-drawn, not stamped out. A suggestive outline by day, at night it can appear as a line of liquid fire or as a sinuous trickle of candy sugar. Its repertoire includes cocktail glasses, sombreros and shoes, alongside such intricate performance pieces as dripping faucets, fire-breathing dragons and girls diving into swimming pools.

Neon is one of several inert gases (argon, krypton, xenon, and helium are others) that yield different colors and intensities of light when charged with high voltage current in a tube of clear, phosphor-coated or painted glass. Mercury is usually combined with argon to increase its brightness. “Neon” is commonly used to designate any one of these gases.

Neon pieces are generally the result of a collaboration between the artist/designer and the glassblower. Nearly all of the projects described above were fabricated by one company, Amerijon Neon and Graphics. It is one of the few that is able to produce large commercial signs (notably the ten miles of neon in One from the Heart) to accommodate the special requirements of artists as Hayden, Lakich and Zimmerman.

All photos by Michael Webb, except where specified. The Museum of Neon Art is located at 704 Traction Avenue, Los Angeles 90013.CLA in neon design are conducted by Lakich and Jenkins at MoNA and through UCLA Extenso. For information on “Save Our Neon” write to: Gloria Poore, Grade, 701 Island Avenue, San Diego 92101.

Michael Webb, a Contributing Editor of Arts and Architecture, is a writer and a photographer. A traveling exhibition of his neon photographs has been commissioned by the Smithsonian Institution.
Akich with her artwork, *Blessed Eon*.

Sphere created by Larry Albright.

Kinetic neon art work by Eric Zimmerman.

*Generators of the Cylinder*, neon art by Michael Hayden at the International Jewelry Exchange.
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1982–172 pp.—500 illus.—$9.95

"Expert selection . . ."
—Los Angeles Times

Vienna to Los Angeles: Two Journeys
by Esther McCoy

Esther McCoy documents the early careers and personalities of Southern California's foremost practitioners of modern architecture. Publication of many heretofore unpublished photographs and documents gives the reader a fascinating look at the private and professional lives of Schindler, Neutra, Frank Lloyd Wright, their clients and the avant garde of Los Angeles in the 20s.

1979—155 pp.—93 illus.
Cloth $17.50—Paper $10.95

"This very important book is a treasure of insights into the drives and personalities that make architects and architecture."
—Cesar Pelli, Dean, Yale University School of Architecture

"Marvellously precise and alive . . . the best piece of architectural history I can remember reading."
—Robin Middleton, architect and critic, Faculty of Architecture, University of Cambridge, England

Fan Vaulting: A Study of Form, Technology and Meaning
by Walter C. Leedy, Jr.

Professor Leedy documents and analyzes the emergence of a new mode of building in medieval England, tracing the origins of fan vaulting back to certain essential characteristics of the English interpretation of Gothic. The book contains a complete catalog of known fan vaults with a description and technical analysis of each.

1980—250 pp.—243 illus.—$16.95

"Outstandingly good. Excellent scholarship. Professor Leedy has broken new ground in his interpretation of vaults."
—Sir Nikolaus Pevsner

"Fan Vaulting is a major contribution to the field of studies of medieval architecture . . . It presents material which is otherwise inaccessible."
—Professor Stephen Murray, Indiana University

"Leedy has illuminated a whole period of English architecture."
—Society of Architectural Historians Journal

by David Travers

A down-to-earth manual which removes the uncertainties and clarifies the process of producing top-notch, effective general capabilities brochures. It takes the reader confidently through each step—planning, budgeting, scheduling, organizing, designing and producing a brochure.

1978—125 pp.—60 illus.—$9.95

"Excellent manual."
—Journal of the American Institute of Architects

"Any design firm contemplating the preparation of a brochure should have this book. A thorough and very useful guide."
—Interiors

"Everything you ever wanted to know about architectural office brochures."
—L.A. Architect, Journal of the Los Angeles Chapter, AIA

Order by mail or phone:
Arts+Architecture Press
1119 Colorado Avenue, Santa Monica, CA 90401 (213) 395-0732
Art 1982 Chicago Poster

An original image by Jack Tworkov has been commissioned by Art 1982 Chicago.

The poster is 27" x 39" high, edition of 2000, printed on 300 gram Dove 500, 100% rag paper. The image without type is 27" wide x 28" high, limited edition, printed on 300 gram Arches Cover Mould-Made paper, signed and numbered.

Sponsored by The Lakeside Group

For information write or call:
Chicago International Art Exposition
600 North McClurg Court
Chicago, Illinois 60611 USA
Telephone: (312) 787-6858
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