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“Works of art are to be lived with as unduplicable, irreducible self-sufficient realities. By means of them, we complete ourselves, improve the daily world and grasp the import, texture and nature of reality in a way no other enterprise permits. Despite their uniqueness, they have features in common. If they did not there would be little warrant for treating them all as instances of one single distinctive enterprise.” An amplification of Mr. Weiss’ thesis is given in a liberal sprinkling of opinions quoting from various sources further appended with brief remarks by the author, all of which give credence to his thesis.

Architecture, sculpture and painting are discussed as a triad of spatial arts; music, story and poetry as a triad of temporal arts; music, theatre and the dance as a triad of dynamic arts. To understand the temporal arts, the reader is required to understand five different kinds of time, all defined by Mr. Weiss. If this would seem complicated it is well to note that the author avoids much philosopher-talk and presents his essays in a readable and stimulating manner.

DESIGN GRAPHICS by C. Leslie Martin (The Macmillan Company).

This is a general graphics textbook for the student of architecture, engineering, design, city planning, industrial design—or for anyone concerned with the process of drafting and representation wherever drawings and renderings are required to indicate the designer’s creations.

In addition to the elements of drafting, the author elucidates multiview drafting, paraline drafting, perspective drawing and offers chapters on shadows on drawings and rendering techniques. For clarity and convenience the illustrations are placed facing the text page, and the text is developed in the book from simple to more complex concepts of drafting techniques. Primarily a college textbook, it is also a useful reference for the advanced designer in need of a basic refresher. Mr. Martin is Professor of Architecture at the University of Cincinnati.

PLANNING THE STAGE by Percy Corry (Pitman Publishing Corporation, $7.95).

A guide for architects and stage designers concerned with planning new theatres and altering existing ones. Mr. Corry considers stage planning, stage equipment, portable and moving stages for the orthodox or “picture frame stage”, and includes a chapter on unorthodox stages: theatre in the round, open and apron stages, and the adaptable stage. There is also a section on planning data. While essentially British, the book offers pertinent information to stage designers everywhere.


This splendid book offers a magnificent array of the art treasures of the Vatican and St. Peters, in what is probably the most sumptuous of the Skira volumes to date. 85 color-plates offer choice examples of early Christian art, the early Renaissance, the High Renaissance and the Baroque. Impressively displayed are the works of Fra Angelico, Botticelli, Pollaiolo, Michelangelo, Bramante, Raphael, and Bernini; lovers of the goldsmith’s art, enamels, bookbindings and tapestries will find marvelous examples to behold. A rich collection of important works of art. Recommended.
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CONFERENCE AT WINGSPREAD: AN INDIVIDUAL REPORT

Beauty is not an object or a measurable factor, nor does it require specific intellectual resources in maker or recipient; it is a relationship, the coral of the sands above Kanab, Utah, that one distinguishes instantly from the other iron-reds of the area; the wind-swept textures of overlying rock edges above Zion Park; the monumental shapes of the free-standing red-rock masses at Sedona, Arizona, resembling the massive red brick public buildings still standing at Aspen, Victor, Cripple Creek; the massive heights and overtopping grandeur within Zion Canyon. These suggest absolutes, yet we put names to assimilate them, as in Bryce Canyon the weather-sculpted figures have been "placed" or domesticated by naming.

I went down the switchback of the Navajo Trail at Bryce, slopping the red mud around drifts of pea-sized hail from the previous evening's storm, and on around to the Queen's garden, presided over, as the postcard picture shows convincingly, by a very real massif that might well be the Empress of India in abstract mass and massive height and towering grandeur within Zion Park; the wind-swept textures of overlying rock edges above; the right one I cannot be certain; for me she was the Queen of Heaven, severe, upright, and no more a portrait than the curvilinear Kwan Yin I saw above the trail going back. I did see a larger massif that might well be the Empress of India in abstract and on one projecting rim a shapely head above white shoulders that exactly resembled the familiar portrait of the Young Queen.

The Johnson Foundation provided the monetary basis and the meeting place. A stray holdover from the old longhorn Western idealism—what the toughened cultural cynic these days calls "naive"—Ed is a man who wins confidence. His effort deserved the best that we could give it.

The conference brochure lists biographies of 83 participants, all in one way or another institutionally affiliated, except Kenneth Burke, the philosopher, Merce Cunningham, the dancer, and myself. Among the affiliated—and I make the distinction not implying reproach but as a cultural indication—we painters, sculptors, dancers, poets, authors, musicians, actors, photographers. However you take it, the artists were outnumbered by the administrators. A small group from Washington spoke for the administrators. A small group from Washington spoke for the administrative powers. Among the affiliated and active respondents to every challenge were several Deans of the arts and humanities from large state universities. The duties of these men do not end at the campus boundaries or in "research" abroad. These men comprehend the problems of regional art; they are grappling with these problems, hampered by the lack of communication that blinds and deafens these immense hierarchical regional institutions. Yet recalling my talk with them I feel a wave of hope for a new university-inspired growth of participatory arts. They are aware of the overriding danger of institutional conformities. At the first panel discussion I raised the name of Harry Partch, who has been kept productive for several years by special grants from the University of Illinois. During this time he has produced under university auspices one full-length ballet and two musical dramas of his own composition. Though members of the university music faculty worked closely with him in these productions, the Music Department has refused to employ him as a teacher, and as of July 1 this year he has been let go. Partch is a major American composer and dramatist, by any measure except the criterion of personal success: we don't respect that criterion, but we obey it. He has been the creator of a new musical idiom, a designer of new instruments, an important musician (wherefore established musical theorists do not like him), and nowadays to much art and more religion, hoping thus to cherish them.

The purpose of the Conference at Wingspread was to discuss the possibility of establishing Regional Art Centers. For a model we were given Lincoln Center in New York. A model that within a few hours after the conference began a majority of the conferences seemed, by my observation, to have rejected. What did we have to put in its place? Various speakers pointed out that Lincoln Center is not, in the first place, regional, and it is not an art center, but an expansive, privately controlled art foundation.

Ed Kamarek, editor of Arts in Society, a substantial magazine published by the University of Wisconsin Extension Division, had worked two years preparing the Conference. To do this he was required to climb a ladder of administrative authority, until he could prop this heaven-supported ascent upon a committee of 18. At the same time he went looking for a Foundation, thought he had one, inadvertently popped the name of another rival Foundation into the talk and didn't see the first one vanish. No more talk; it just went. Eventually the Johnson Foundation provided the money, the staff, and the meeting place. A stray holdover from the old longhorn Western idealism—what the toughened cultural cynic these days calls "naive"—Ed is a man who wins confidence. His effort deserved the best that we could give it.

The Johnson Foundation is the latest work of the same industrialist (wax) who commissioned home and office buildings from Frank Lloyd Wright. As a patron he gives evidence of playing the game right: he was not referred to as a personality, nor was his name mentioned in the conference brochure. He has recently enabled the Foundation to buy anonymously more than a hundred paintings, each by a living American, and assemble them for a permanent traveling exhibition of American art. When he established the Foundation he gave it the home, Wingspread, a building with a personality as impressive as its maker's, to be the offices and conference facility. Here amid splendid grounds we assembled, supremely well fed from a kitchen in the building, excellently serviced by unobtrusive attendants, and able to complain only of the folding chairs, which do not support the back. There was a deep glass of sherry before lunch and in the late afternoon cocktails. To deserve these favors we met on Friday from eleven to eleven, Saturday from nine to eleven, and until afternoon Sunday.

The conference brochure lists biographies of 83 participants, all in one way or another institutionally affiliated, except Kenneth Burke, the philosopher, Merce Cunningham, the dancer, and myself. Among the affiliated—and I make the distinction not implying reproach but as a cultural indication—we painters, sculptors, dancers, poets, authors, musicians, actors, photographers. However you take it, the artists were outnumbered by the administrators. A small group from Washington spoke for the administrative powers. Among the affiliated and active respondents to every challenge were several Deans of the arts and humanities from large state universities. The duties of these men do not end at the campus boundaries or in "research" abroad. These men comprehend the problems of regional art; they are grappling with these problems, hampered by the lack of communication that blinds and deafens these immense hierarchical regional institutions. Yet recalling my talk with them I feel a wave of hope for a new university-inspired growth of participatory arts. They are aware of the overriding danger of institutional conformities. At the first panel discussion I raised the name of Harry Partch, who has been kept productive for several years by special grants from the University of Illinois. During this time he has produced under university auspices one full-length ballet and two musical dramas of his own composition. Though members of the university music faculty worked closely with him in these productions, the Music Department has refused to employ him as a teacher, and as of July 1 this year he has been let go. Partch is a major American composer and dramatist, by any measure except the criterion of personal success: we don't respect that criterion, but we obey it. He has been the creator of a new musical idiom, a designer of new instruments, an important musician (wherefore established musical theorists do not like him), and...
the innovator of a radically new combining of musical and dramatic speech. Now that he has been let go, what is to be done about him? He is a character as independent as any rugged American industrialist. Are we to say therefore, let him swim or sink?

Official voices responded: Partch has had many grants; without these he could not have accomplished what he has done. (It's a long time between grants. The most rugged industrialist does not hesitate to demand government help when his industry is in trouble.) Partch is known to be a difficult personality to argue the point, I answered: no more difficult than Beethoven.

Can he teach? (He has taught many groups of professional musicians, amateurs, and students to read his notation, play his instruments.) Oh but—it was a despairing admonition—you don't realize how hard it is to persuade any university to accept such a person as a teacher of students. (At the University of Illinois he wrote into Recitational in the Court House Park music to include participation by members of the gym squad; they in turn invited him to compose music to open the NCAA championship gym meet. When I spoke at the University the day after this event I praised the man who could gather about him such a varied concourse of persons who maintained otherwise silent urged me to continue fighting. Face-to-face acknowledgment of differences and agreement brought forward the question: "This is my problem (our problem), what can we do about it?" From a few I felt the cold blast of dislike.

The antagonism developed from the first question thrown to the two panel members at the first afternoon discussion session. John Rood, Professor of Art at the University of Minnesota, has been for the past three years national president of Artists Equity Association, which exists to help artists get paid for the work they do. He asked whether we didn't believe that it is fundamental that an artist should be paid. I played it straight back to him by saying: "No. How many of the elegant pseudo-classicists who today seek in Mozart's music a consoling refuge are convinced that for the greater part of his compositions he received little or no payment? At the time of his death only a handful of his compositions had been printed, and these for the most part except for commissioned work. His work was extensively performed in this country during the year after his death, and the American public had not yet had his music brought before it, and he would not receive help except for commissioned work. His work was extensively performed in this country during the year after his death, and the American public bought it, concerts, sheet music, records, with an enthusiasm that has not ceased. I said: the first requirement is to find the artist and bring his work to the public. More than he needs money he needs recognition for what he is (not the critical opinion of what he is not), and as he receives recognition the monetary help will be provided.

Herbert Blau, my fellow panelist, took it from there. My experience, apart from writing, has been in the concert activities of Evenings on the Roof and the readings of Poetry Los Angeles; has been in directing the San Francisco Actors Workshop, a burgeoning theater that has been seen at the Brussels and Seattle Expositions. Altering the emphasis he agreed that the artist's act must come first. No one can make him an artist by paying him. In his work may have neither time nor patience to stand waiting for or come seeking money. And of course the artist should be paid, subsidized, encouraged, rewarded—even venerated—when you find him—but not at the cost of social requirements that distract him from his work. Yet in the meeting summary the secretaries quoted us insisting "that money destroys the artist's integrity; that is, money in the form of subsidy. It was because of this potent misunderstanding of our argument that the strong minority who favor immediate government subsidization of the arts turned its dislike against us.

When the quoted statement appeared in the preliminary conference report, I amended it thus: "Money can destroy the artist's integrity, but the artist has no objection to support in any form, including money. The artist speaks for the integrity of society. Society, when it wishes to deceive itself, will try to cajole or to buy the artist. The artist must therefore insistently, and intently, scrutinize the nature of the gift. He must be prepared, in conscience, to reject the gift." Herb Blau initiated this amendment, and the final report will have the correction. But the preliminary report will continue to circulate uncorrected.

Max Kaplan, Director of the Arts Center of the School of Fine and Applied Arts at Boston University, gave at a later meeting the outspoken example which demonstrates from another angle what Blau and I meant. He was invited to serve as consultant to the student program of Lincoln Center in New York.

Reporting for work one Thursday morning he was summoned inside to an emergency session. He was told: a most distressing thing has happened. Carnegie Hall, which was to have been torn down, had been saved from the wreckers. The papers were full of the story. Dr. Kaplan would be given $100,000, with which over the weekend he must devise a project for spending it that would divert the headlines back to Lincoln Center. He worked up a student project that would cost $47,000 and is no more with the Center. He told us this in full awareness that in the day a spokesman would be there to speak for Lincoln Center.

Saturday afternoon Kenneth Burke and Max Kaplan worked up together a statement of the objectives of a Regional Art Center so satisfactory that it was adopted as the sense of the meeting at which it was presented. If we had done no more (Continued on page 10)
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rather than endorse these objectives, the Conference in my opinion had done its work. Each point weighs. I insert it here in an impacted layout to save space.

"1. PHILOSOPHICAL functions of the arts: A. Art as used to glorify an individual or group (glorification); B. Line people up (unify within varying aspects of social structure); C. Art as theory or escape valve. 2. GENERAL objectives of the arts: A. Raising and setting of standards (but concern for dignity of artist, don't improve values on artist, respect artist and leaders, allow to each his own); B. Public understanding of the arts and develop in public a grasp of the special language of the arts; C. Permissive climate for the arts; D. Good physical facilities for the artist (tools); E. Public recognition (Arts Councils as fund raiser—side issue); F. Develop skills of both the artist and the audience (rapport between the two and finding levels of communication for the two poles.) 3. SPECIFIC objectives for regional art centers (variation on whether this should be a physical facility or a climate for the arts or a combination): A. Who produces art? Recognition of artists and establishing rapport among professional, amateur, producer and consumer; B. Distribution of the arts (production and clearing-house functions); C. Problem of consumption—making better art and art forms available; D. Process of education—teaching language of the arts. CENTRAL IDEA: Decentralization of arts—disperse good art throughout the countryside."

Dr. Kaplan put the matter somewhat differently: We deal fundamentally with two broad functions of art: The aesthetic, or independent functions: the ineffable, universal qualities of art as art; and the social, or interdependent functions: a. collective possession, to tie man to his group; b. personal possession, to release man from his groups; c. moral and symbolic, to represent other values of the group; d. incidental functions, all the way from art as propaganda to the juke box. "For the ultimate theme of an arts center is art and the affirmation of life itself through the arts. The arts are an ongoing celebration of man's mind, spirit, and collective wisdom, the instruments through which man can perceive and understand the world in all of its colors and moods, the tools by which men can realize their full growth and search for whatever they may become. Art is, indeed, a source of knowledge and a form of the highest knowledge."

Saturday morning we were invited to submit written questions for discussion. Two of us wrote out substantially the same question: In the midst of so much institutional activity, what is the place of the artist? By the end of the morning the discussion, in plenary session, was still so vigorous that Norman Rice, the tolerant Chairman of the Conference, invited us to return after dinner for an unscheduled meeting and continue it. So much had occurred in the meantime that when we reassembled no one could recall where the discussion had ended. Into the silence a modest voice projected a diversion: that the administrators and institutions of art should get on about their business, leaving the artist to attend to his own business outside. What he meant was, as he later informed me, that the administrator and the institution have their business to do, and the artist has his. The artist works better independently of the administrator and the institution; the administrator cannot divert his larger efforts or the institution be upset for the sake of individual artists. But the affect was that of a Modest Proposal to leave administration to the administrators and exclude the artist.

Though the intent was serious, the wording was facetious. The maker of the proposal had not anticipated the serious fury with which Glenway Wescott (novelist, past president of the National Institute of Arts and Letters, also representing the American Academy of Arts and Letters) answered him on behalf of the artist. (After one meeting I told Wescott I liked sitting beside him, because his boiling point is lower than my own.) Then arose a feminine voice to announce that it was sick and tired of "the artist," his narcissism and proclaimed "disaffiliation." I tried to explain "disaffiliation," quoting from Tocqueville: "... As each class approximates to other classes, and intermingles and excludes the artist. forget his ancestors, but it hides his descendants and separates his contemporaries from him; it throws him back forever upon (Continued on page 32)
There is an international relatedness, a coherence of things. The physical world, the universe, provide a highly structural and intricately formed environment for man. And man is a unit in the endlessly complex pattern; he is a form, within a form. Man's need for, search for relationship, order, springs from a primordial sense of consistency. This is the motive of inquiry, discovery, creativity; this is the basis for logic. But sometimes we see man, in his paradoxical attempt to destroy himself, deny and work against this innate sense of order. We find evidences of this contradiction in highly civilized societies where men inflict chaos upon themselves and then retreat in escape to overcrowded mental hospitals and psychiatrists' couches.

The superstructure of modern day man's institutional life is marked by a spreading disintegration. Specialization in occupations, compartmentalization in social activity separate human need from related human need and divorce human capacity from its use and fulfillment. The aesthetic experience enables man to bring the bits and particles of his life into an ordered structure, and it provides for the interaction of the human organism with environment.

Man, the artist, seeks to disentangle the most essential strands of existence and weave them into a beautiful fabric of intense validity, characteristic of himself and his culture and his time. The order and form we find in a work of art are not superimposed; they originate in the human act of creation and are an organic event.

Just as philosophy is characterized more by the formulation of its problems than by its solution of them (incomplete patterns possess their own inherent elan), and mathematics by a tendency toward completion, so the realm of art is a condition of this tendency toward completion, a search for order and harmony. Thus, when we speak of art as order, we really cannot narrow our thinking to some formula for peace and serenity that the realm of art offers man as a way of life.

The art experience, for child and man, is the manifestation of the human and universal search for order out of chaos; the work of art is the embodiment of this search. We can respect it and be grateful for it as such, in these times when the tendency toward order and form is more and more frustrated and inhibited.

The child is separated from his parents, the parents are separated from each other, the family members are separated from the community, labour is separated from work and further separated into parts, each compartment is again separated, science is separated from art, philosophy from religion, and religion is splintered into opposing bits, formal education is separated into endless departments, the senses are separated from the intellect, and man is separated from man.

Man is, basically, filled with the urge to form, with the need to find harmony and build order. But it can happen that as societies and civilizations become more organized, more compartmentalized, more categorized, man becomes more confused, defeated, and dehumanized. For there can be order without integration; man can establish a system that puts the fragments of his existence into a rigid order. He can tightly regiment the moments of his life, thus making for himself an orderly plan by which to live. But the very neat and precise order he builds can become a series of separate prisons that divide and hold the many aspects of his being apart.

The synthesis of intellect and emotion is possible only on an aesthetic level of experience. Establishing relationships between the world of fantasy, imagination, thought, and the physical world of objective reality then is a function of art. For, when the artist externalizes his visual image, he gives form to it and it becomes a fact.

It is the problem of the integration of man, of society, that has long concerned philosophers, psychologists, educators, and all who study human need and behaviour.

Today the entire society of man is becoming aware of its own separateness, emptiness, purposelessness. We are a human race in search of meaning, in need of form to shape the welter of incoherent fragments that enter our experience. Only when art has reintegrated, rehumanized society will the human race be ready, in Goethe's words, to live manfully in the whole, the good, and the beautiful. If we are to find new motivation, new direction, new harmony for our life, we must turn to art, for the plan and model is there.
STEEL HOUSE BY PIERRE KOENIG. ARCHITECT

WILLIAM PORUSH, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER
The site of this house on the Pacific coast, near Los Angeles, is on a leveled lot on a gently sloping hill. The clients' request for an unlimited view and complete pool integration with everyday living were met with a pavilion of glass in a rigid steel frame. Maximum use of the 100x175' site was obtained by utilizing a rectangular plan parallel to a rear bank and far enough away from the front slope for the 18x60' swimming pool. Mechanical pool equipment was placed at the bottom of the slope, out of view from the house.

The informal dining area, living area, and study face the pool on the west side of the house. Light blue louvered sun screens protect the west and south elevations. Additional thermal control was provided by Fiberglas roof insulation. Sliding doors, 23 feet wide, open onto the pool deck.

Two patios on the east side provide outdoor eating and fire pit areas. A canopied entryway separates these two wind-shielded spaces. The service and storage areas are adjacent to the carport for sound isolation and are related to the house by the entryway canopy.

The open kitchen, which can be closed off by interior sliding doors, is centrally located to four eating areas and the pool deck. The kitchen and the two baths form a central core that separates the general

(Continued on page 30)
When the head of the New York World’s Fair, the president of Yale University and the author of a life-or-death book on American cities all take it upon themselves in the space of a few short months to correct the errors of a lone elderly citizen, it would seem that he is receiving adequate attention.

Curiously, he is not.

For Commissioner Moses, President Griswold and Mrs. Jacobs have trod the footsteps of a host of earlier commentators on Lewis Mumford, fastening on a piece of his thought as though it were the whole, reducing complicated arguments to simple ones, and so diminishing the stature of the man. If Mumford himself is partly responsible for the ease with which his opinions can be condensed, there is yet more to him than even his admirers have thus far set down on paper.

Of course, one barrier to knowing him is that there are many Mumsfords. There is the war critic, the historian of technology, the moral essayist, the community-planning critic, the literary biographer, as well as the critic of architecture. “The Mumford terrain is so vast,” a well-known scholar wrote me recently of his biographical attempts, “that I sometimes turn back in despair.” This vastness holds for the single area of architectural criticism:

Many who have followed Mumford’s New Yorker utterances on Manhattan traffic, the United Nations and the Guggenheim Museum know nothing about his articles on such larger issues as the conflict of architectural Function and Expression. Or, if acquainted with these two sides of his work, they are likely to be vague about his architectural opinions back in the 1920s and 1930s.

While to be judged is the critic’s inevitable and ironic fate, to be understood is not in the least inevitable. Mumford’s career illustrates both points. It is as though having given him their passions, his auditors are reluctant to part with their minds.

A good place to begin is with his applied criticism, for it is as a practitioner of that perilous art that Mumford is best known to Americans. Here his readership has consisted mainly of those whom Commissioner Robert Moses once damned as “the sophisticated clientele of The New Yorker.” These sophisticates, who live everywhere from the halls of the Long Island State Park Commission to the shores of Neutra’s California, having come to expect in the author of “The Sky Line” column a severe judge of new buildings, new parks, new highways in and around Manhattan. In preparing himself for the Sky Line (averaging some 2000 words, most years about once every two months), Mumford has followed sound reporting tradition: he has done his own legwork. Since November of 1931, when he wrote up the George Washington Bridge and the Starrett Lehigh Building (praising both), he has attended the crumbling of almost every architecturally important skyscraper, public or commercial building, restaurant, zoo, apartment house and housing exhibition in New York City.

The variety in these New Yorker columns may astonish readers who have seen them at random or for only a few years. Each column has usually dealt with more than one building or other subject, has frequently been based upon interviews with architects, builders, owners, not to mention Mumford’s customary first-hand inspection of the premises.

This period, when architects are flourishing, schools of architecture expanding and critics sprinting the length of every cantilever, when comment on new buildings occupies precious space in magazines so unlike as Time and The Nation, it is difficult to recapture the prevailing American attitude toward architectural criticism when Mumford took over the Sky Line. A recent article in Progressive Architecture (August 1959) on libel suits against critics may have refreshed our memories. As Judge Bernard Tomson pointed out there, the “graphic and sarcastic” remarks which lost a court case for the New Yorker critic in 1927 (and also cost the man, one of Mumford’s predecessors, his job) would quite possibly not be thought libelous today. (A sample, quoted by Judge Tomson, decorously refers to the Fifth Avenue building in question as causing “older members of the profession, wending their way heavenward at the Century Club, to burst into tears.”)

Though the very notice paid this case suggests how seldom such cases have occurred, the plaintiff’s sensitivity to criticism appears to have been representative of most members of his profession at the time. As late as the 1920s American architects were not yet accustomed to the serious evaluation of their work. Accustomed to appreciation, yes, and description, but not to criticism with depth and perspective to it.

In architecture, to be sure, there are reasons beyond those in the other arts or sciences for a certain reserve regarding criticism. Whereas the financial or related damage a novelist may suffer because of hostile judgments by critics is usually confined to himself and his family, the critics’ censure of a building may affect the reputation, incomes and future not solely of the architect but of his colleagues and of a whole corps of technical and office workers as well. For no creative person, therefore, are legal immunities merely capricious. For both the creator and his society, they are as essential as any laws.

What are the reasons that American architecture itself was safe—but from what? From the more rapid advance in design and materials, from a profounder idea of purpose, that a lively architectural criticism might have stimulated.

A representative year was 1937, during which he evaluated the Grand Central theatre, two banks, the Doubleday-Doran bookstore, restaurant and store façades, a Museum of Modern Art exhibition on English architecture, a model community center, books by Behrendt, Gropius and others, the projected layout of the New York World’s Fair, Jones Beach and other work by Robert Moses (favorably reviewed), the formal gardens in Central Park, the Corning Building, and assorted commercial structures.

Although Mumford’s practical criticism is rightly thought of as issuing from the New Yorker, he had occasionally done similar work in the 1920s for the New Republic, the Nation and American Mercury. But the bulk of his applied criticism, and the best of it, has been executed for the elite, once-experimental journal first edited by the late Harold Ross.

The case with which we can fix Mumford’s place in the history of American practical criticism is a measure of his achievement. Before him, there was only one practicing critic of consequence, Montgomery Schuyler. A founder of the Architectural Record in 1901, Schuyler at his best wrote lively, perceptive and expert criticism on a wide range of subjects, including Richardson Romanesque, steel bridges, skyscrapers, the Beaux Arts school, Sullivan and Wright. But as the editors of a recent collection of his essays have pointed out, Schuyler’s commitment to criticism was somewhat less full-blown and serious than one could wish. In any case, his death in 1914 opened an era of some 17 years without any major architectural criticism in the United States.

LEWIS MUMFORD AND THE DESIGN OF CRITICISM

These days, when architects are flourishing, schools of architecture expanding and critics sprinting the length of every cantilever, when comment on new buildings occupies precious space in magazines so unlike as Time and The Nation, it is difficult to recapture the prevailing American attitude toward architectural criticism when Mumford took over the Sky Line. A recent article in Progressive Architecture (August 1959) on libel suits against critics may have refreshed our memories. As Judge Bernard Tomson pointed out there, the “graphic and sarcastic” remarks which lost a court case for the New Yorker critic in 1927 (and also cost the man, one of Mumford’s predecessors, his job) would quite possibly not be thought libelous today. (A sample, quoted by Judge Tomson, decorously refers to the Fifth Avenue building in question as causing “older members of the profession, wending their way heavenward at the Century Club, to burst into tears.”)

Though the very notice paid this case suggests how seldom such cases have occurred, the plaintiff’s sensitivity to criticism appears to have been representative of most members of his profession at the time. As late as the 1920s American architects were not yet accustomed to the serious evaluation of their work. Accustomed to appreciation, yes, and description, but not to criticism with depth and perspective to it.

In architecture, to be sure, there are reasons beyond those in the other arts or sciences for a certain reserve regarding criticism. Whereas the financial or related damage a novelist may suffer because of hostile judgments by critics is usually confined to himself and his family, the critics’ censure of a building may affect the reputation, incomes and future not solely of the architect but of his colleagues and of a whole corps of technical and office workers as well. For no creative person, therefore, are legal immunities merely capricious. For both the creator and his society, they are as essential as any laws.

What are the reasons that American architecture itself was safe—but from what? From the more rapid advance in design and materials, from a profounder idea of purpose, that a lively architectural criticism might have stimulated.

So palpable was the state of mind among architects and public during this period that the late Talbot F. Hamlin found it necessary in 1930 to entitle an article for a trade magazine, "Criticism Might Help Architecture: Let’s Try It!" At present, he wrote, "the architectural press (is closed) to any definite attempt to evaluate current work, save by means of praise or simple description; adverse criticism can only be hinted at in the most general terms." Hamlin considered this timidity especially undesirable just then, because "there never was a time when a rigid and relentless architectural criticism was more necessary." Traditional standards of taste had rapidly been breaking down, he pointed out; architects needed to escape the quicksand of mere eclecticism, and even those who embraced "modernism" often did so as a fashion, not because they knew what it was, or what it meant, or how it would grow. At the
same time, public interest in architecture was high, perhaps at its high-
est since the eighteenth century. Without guides, however, this interest would be simply confused or dissipated.

Hamlin concluded with this plea: "Let some architectural magazine establish a column of serious and careful criticism of current work. Think of the controversies it would start and how vital and stimulating to us all such controversies might be!"

It was four years before a professional journal responded to this call. In June 1934, Pencil Points (now Progressive Architecture) did begin a series of more or less critical articles by the elderly architect, H. Van Buren Magonigle, but upon his death in mid-1935 allowed two years to lapse before resuming the feature with Hamlin. As early as 1931, how-
ever, Mumford had taken over the Sky Line department of the New Yorker, quite outside the profession, and so launched the first continuing column of serious practical criticism since the death of Schuyler. As Peter Blake has remarked ruefully, Douglas Haskell dispassionately, and some editors of The Exploding Metropolis hopefully, the column Mumford brought to life has furnished critical leadership in the United States to the very present.

To the criticism of architecture he carried much more than the authority of authorship (by then he had published five books, two of them partly or wholly on architecture), the knowledge of a native Long Islander and Manhattanite, the contemporaneous interests of a free-lance journalist or the cosmopolitan awareness drawn from travel and reading. He carried also an impressive tenacity of purpose. It was just this austere rigor, a quality possibly deficient in Schuyler, that enabled Mumford to make one of his contributions to American practical criticism—the restoration and maintenance of critical standards.

For support, for disagreement, or simply as a point of departure, critics explained—would find Mumford's criteria broadly the same as in 1931. Offended by the new Airlines Terminal on Park Avenue, for example, he told New Yorker readers gloomily (on March 8, 1941) of his visit there. "The effect of the interior is dull; the gray floors, the dark-gray columns, the dull gold of the walls, the steel gray of the counters, the dark-powder-blue ceiling with its inset lamps, are all somehow needlessly depressing. The whole architectural treatment is massive, ponderous, earthbound; even the circular gray-terrazzo counters that serve for newsstand and information desks look as if they were designed to resist heavy artillery fire." The emphasis is on effect, but the statement is not purely descriptive. Here the telling word is, of course, earthbound. It points both to a personal feeling and to an idea expressed by the experience. The statement is, in a word, symbolic. Architecture should not simply be; it should mean. "An airline terminal should express" its own nature, Mumford believed. "Here is a building in which new materials might appropriately have been used in a new way, in which the traveller might have been given an anticipatory touch of exhilaration, a sense of space irradiated by sunlight..."

A building should function well, please its viewers, and should convey appropriate meaning, Firmness, delight, and perhaps (if the idea is enlarged to include the symbolic) commodity—traditional principles indeed, to judge for instance by Geoffrey Scott's reading of Sir Henry Wotton's adaptation of Vitruvius. Merely by emphasizing the desirability of architectural symbolism, or expressiveness, Mumford would have been unique among the intellectuals of postwar American architecture. But the distinctiveness of his point of view was due more especially to his making two other demands: a building should function, please and signify in broadly human and social contexts.

As his biography and many other writings attest, Mumford's convictions have always been strongly humanist. Translated into a architectural language, this humanism became a call for greater awareness by designers, engineers and the public that buildings were after all means for human ends (a point few experienced architects would overlook), and that these human ends were not restricted to such rudiments as the copper plumbing or glossy exteriors architecture had traditionally found it sufficient to provide. "An organic architecture... will take into account the functions and purposes of the whole man... This whole man is a much more complex creature than builders have customarily built for. If he is one thing complex, more unpredictable, than even Mumford has ordinarily argued, the fact remains that alone among American—or English—architectural critics in this country, Mumford has repeatedly urged his fellow users and practitioners of the architectural world to broaden their vision of human behavior. (From an empirical direction, Neutra's attention to the complexities of human physiology advances a similar plea.)

This humanist principle has been most prominent in Mumford's...

(Continued on page 19)
VIEW FROM THE GARDEN: MASTER BEDROOM TERRACE AND LIVING ROOM TERRACE WITH SHADING Pergola; FAR RIGHT: STUDY AND GUEST ROOM WING, SET BACK

HOUSE DESIGNED BY J. R. DAVIDSON

ENTRANCE GARDEN WITH FOOTBRIDGE; SEPARATE DOOR TO THE STUDY TO THE LEFT; MAIN ENTRANCE COVERED WALK TO THE RIGHT
The site is a fairly level lot in West Los Angeles, 75' wide at the street, 25' at the rear, 232' deep, and surrounded by hills on almost three sides. An open storm drain is located 90' from the front of the property, and the building of enclosed space across this ditch was prohibited by city ordinance. It was, therefore, decided to use the space between the street and the storm drain for a motor court, carefully landscaped, and screened from the street by a dense acacia hedge. A footbridge leads to the entrance of the house, and an automobile bridge to the carport with cantilevered roof.

One of the requirements of the owners, a psychiatrist and his wife, was for a study and a small waiting room, sufficiently separated from the rest of the house, with their own entrance, exit, and patio. The large terrace, living room with dining area, breakfast room and kitchen have been treated as a continuous space, with the living room and breakfast room divided by a low, built-in buffet. The north end of the breakfast room has a pleasant view onto a small garden with rare plants. The structure is post and beam on a 7' module and a span of up to 21' 6" parallel to the living room, bedroom and study glass walls so that these walls might be uninterrupted by posts. The combined ceiling and roof deck throughout is of 2"x4" specially grooved Douglas fir T & G with 1½" rigid insulation and composition and gravel roofing. The concrete floor slab is radiant heated; the study is air conditioned.
OFFICE BUILDING DESIGNED BY CRAIG ELLWOOD ASSOCIATES

This 11-story office building has been designed for a corner lot on a major boulevard in Beverly Hills, California. The site is 153.9' x 158.0': 24,316 square feet. The building code limits gross office area to four times the site area, therefore the office area has been held to 97,000 square feet. To comply with the building code, the 97,000 gross footage of office area required 307 automobile-parking spaces. In the area above-grade parking is preferred to multi-level subterranean, therefore there is only one level of parking below grade. One-half of grade level is parking, and space for 210 automobiles is provided above grade on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th levels.

The client's program and a restricted budget imposed several limitations. Also a difficult design problem resulted from the need to extend the parking structure to property lines while limiting the office tower to one-half of the site area. The solution was to effect a visual separation between the two volumes by recessing the glass wall on the parking structure roof, creating a roof garden on the 5th level. Prime rental area is on the ground floor, therefore an open, covered plaza could not be considered. For design consideration, however, the glass wall is set back under the parking structure. The building code also requires that exterior walls of unventilated parking structures be 50% open. Thus these walls are to be some type of screening which has not yet been selected. A change of wall materials between parking and office units is possible because of the change in wall planes and the “break” at roof garden level.
DESERT HOUSE BY RICHARD NEUTRA, ARCHITECT

The house is situated on a high desert plateau, above Lone Pine, 300 miles east of Los Angeles. A winding mountain road leads to this vast, but arid piece of land, with two huge rocks rising in the north-east corner. The north and west masonry fronts are composed of stones collected by the owner from the site. Other building materials had to be hauled over long distances.

At the entrance a low bookshelf separates the hall from the living quarters which, near the fireplace, develop into the informality of a family room. Beyond it, a few steps to the south is the almost square kitchen with an island eating counter and built-in electric range. The children’s quarters and a playground are to the south; the master bedroom, dressing room and bath are on the north end. The mitered glass corner of the master bedroom and its wide easterly opening make the entire scenery visible, the twin rocks which rise some ninety feet high, and the snowy mountain chain. A spacious swimming pool has been blasted out of a flat rock.
COLLABORATION: ARTIST AND ARCHITECT

Throughout history architecture has served the noble purpose of bringing artists together for mutual achievement. Most often the record of this collaboration has pointed out how well the beauty of one art form may be enhanced by another. Much architecture of this century has ignored the added life which the artist can invest in a structure. It has been a period during which the architect, pressed by the client to solve a continuous series of economic problems dealing with the construction and use of building space, appeared to neglect the other arts.

In themselves, the practical preoccupations of the architect have been a strong force in keeping the arts separate. Yet, beyond that force there was a professional ideal of the architect that for a generation made the separation near complete. Unbound by the structural limitations of the past... with new materials and methods of building to express form, texture and volume... the architect was challenged to make his structure a thing of beauty sufficient unto itself.

Now there is evidence that this attitude is changing. We are being reminded of the value of aesthetic collaboration, and, in turn, we are becoming aware of a new association between the architect and the artist. But the relationship appears to be different from that which existed in the past. It is one conceived in a manner that satisfies both the sensitive and the rational man. It is less an attempt to integrate, than to give meaning to space by relating form and use of human proportions and by rejoining the arts under a common roof.

In presenting examples of this new development, we hope to foster closer relationships among all creative people who work together to produce an architecture truly expressive of our time.

DAVID R. CAMPBELL, DIRECTOR
ALEXANDRA KASUBA: MOSAIC PANEL, REINFORCED CONCRETE, NATURAL STONE, MARBLE AND GLASS, 6" X 3'

ABRAM SCHLEMOWITZ: SCULPTURE "THE DECALCOMANIE QUEEN (CROSSOVER #6)", WELDED BRONZE AND COPPER, 60" X 28" X 18"

ISAMU NOGUCHI: STONE SCULPTURE GROUP FOR THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, SKIDMORE, OWINGS AND MERRILL, ARCHITECTS

FROM AN EXHIBITION AT THE MUSEUM OF CONTEMPORARY CRAFTS, NEW YORK

WOLFGANG BEHL: PANEL POLYESTER PLASTIC, 66" X 49"

WOOD MOLDS FOR CASTING HARRIS AND ROS BARRON'S 240-FOOT CONCRETE RELIEF; HARTFORD JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER, CONNECTICUT; WALTER GROPIUS AND NORMAN FLETCHER, ARCHITECTS, EACH MOLD 6" X 4'6"
This community center is planned to be located adjacent to a lake in a sprawling Midwestern tract housing development area. It relates an association of educational and recreational facilities for adults which are most needed in this type of community.

The nature of these facilities requires multilevel spaces such as balconies for spectators, and lockers in the gymnasium; balcony seating in the auditorium and dining areas; and multilevels for bookstacks in the library, etc. The accommodation of these multilevel volumes determines the plastic composition of the forms. And the gradual stepping of these volumes both vertically and horizontally further articulates this accommodation and accomplishes the reduction of the huge masses into the sum of the parts, the profile of which can be more easily related to the human scale. These stepped forms can create a most lively play of shadow. The orderly yet playful articulation of these stepped volumes results in a sequence of spaces between the buildings which are as important to the overall design as the building forms them-
selves. They can actually be the justification for the building forms. These spaces can be used for social gatherings, dances, concerts, and many such functions can occur at the same time due to the various separations of these outdoor spaces by the building forms. Steps become a focal point for these gatherings.

The structure uses post-tensioned, precast concrete vertically, and prestressed concrete horizontally in the form of trusses. These trusses can permit natural light through their openings where desired. Glazing also occurs in the vertical plane between the vertical concrete elements. Precast concrete planks span between the trusses.

**MOTEL**—The motel was designed with the following objectives in mind: to create a sense of privacy for each room; to give individual expression to these rooms in the overall design; and to relate the automobile successfully to the building. The site is in Northern California adjacent to a slough which is to be widened slightly.

In each room, the six-foot wide, floor-to-ceiling glass opens onto a balcony. Walls are extended on both sides of the balcony to give privacy and a sense of protection, and the glass area may be left uncurtained. By staggering the rooms it is possible to avoid a dull linear arrangement and express the individual elements of the total composition. This also creates an enclosure of space between the groupings of rooms. Parking is divided into two areas and located near the entrances to the rooms. Small “dollys” may be used to transport luggage from the farthest cars to eliminate the need for parking at each doorstep. This arrangement permits pedestrian sequences of spaces and views which are not obstructed by the automobile.

The construction will be tilt up concrete walls, with the precast roof and floor slab fitted into preformed slots in the walls. The exterior will be whitewashed and the interior plastered but unpainted. The general color scheme of the doors and furnishings will be olive green, terracotta and ochre yellow.
CHURCH—The project is an Episcopalian church planned for an area south of San Francisco. The form of the church is derived from an assemblage of the functions of the individual parts. The heights of these parts vary according to their functions, and the resultant spaces between the different heights provide a source of light. Basically the elements of the church are an entrance pavilion; a glass link which connects the entrance and the nave; the nave; the bell tower which also contains the sacristy; another glass link which separates the nave and the altar; and the altar and choir which is only partially seen.

In designing a religious space it is necessary to create a sense of mysticism. This can most effectively be done by the nature of the indirect source of light. In addition to the clerestories at the change in roof levels, light also filters through a space between the upper and lower parts of the walls. The upper part of the wall is on the outer surface of the deep column and the lower part is on the inside surface. At night this is also the source of artificial light which projects onto and reflects from the ceiling. The pilgrimage begins in a sequence of spaces: first low under an entrance plane, a canopy; up a few stairs into an open courtyard surrounded by classrooms to the left, social hall to the right, and, then, under a low overhead plane into the high entrance to the church.

Construction is of wood laminated timber columns; built-up plywood box girders with clerestory above; and a wood deck supported on the columns of the clerestory. The exterior and interior stud walls, the plywood box beams, and the laminated timber columns are covered in bleached redwood board and batten siding.
The building podium is separated from adjacent properties by an access driveway to parking stalls at the rear. A bifurcated and cantilevered concrete ramp rises two feet from the sidewalk to podium level at the patients' entrance court. All waiting rooms face the courtyard. Doctors and staff enter the building from side or rear entrances.

The problem was to design a building without interior columns or bearing walls so the tenants might erect, change, or omit interior partitions according to their special requirements. Interior corridors were needed so that some laboratory facilities might be shared with least disruption from inter-office traffic flow.

Brick cavity walls form the building shell. Narrow windows along exterior walls regulate privacy, reduce noise and air conditioning load.
NEW FABRICS

TOP TO BOTTOM:
FIRST ROW:
"APRIL," DRAPERY PRINT, 48" WIDE, REPEAT 21"; BY ALEXANDER GIRARD FOR HERMAN MILLER, INC.
"FRISCO," SPUN RAYON WITH A SLIGHTLY STRIATED WEAVE AND AN EXCEPTIONALLY WIDE RANGE OF 45 COLORS; CAN BE USED AS CASEMENT, OR LINED FOR DRAPERY; FROM KNOLL ASSOCIATES, INC.
100% COTTON FABRIC, 60" WIDE, AVAILABLE IN BLACK, GRAY AND WHITE PLAID; ALSO IN BROWN, BEIGE, GRAY AND WHITE; WOVEN IN FINLAND, DESIGNED BY TIMO SARVANIVA FOR KARELIA TEXTILES; DISTRIBUTED BY FREDERIK RUNNING.
"PRIMAVERA:" 100% VELVET COTTON SILICONED 46" WIDE; DESIGNED BY DON WIGHT FOR JACK LENOR LARSEN, INC.
"MINDA" NEW BLEN FOR PRINT IN THREE COLOR COMBINATIONS, 52" WIDE, AVAILABLE ON A VARIETY OF FABRICS;
"GODOLAS:" DOUBLE PRINT IN BROWN AND CHARCOAL ON WHITE CASEMENT FABRIC; BY MARIANNE STRENGELL.
"PUMPKIN SEEDS" DRAPERY PRINT, 45" WIDE; BY ALEXANDER GIRARD FOR HERMAN MILLER.

SECOND ROW:
"CRISS CROSS JUMBO," DIAGONAL WITH SHARP PRIMARY TRIANGLES ON FIBERGLAS BOUCLE; AVAILABLE IN ORANGE, GOLD, BLUE, BLACK; FROM LAVERNE.
HEAVY UPHOLSTERY FABRIC, WHITE ON BLACK WARP; WOOL, COTTON AND LINEN, BY MARIANNE STRENGELL.
"BANGLES" 48" WIDE ON BELGIAN LINEN, GLASS FIBERS, DACRON, AND OTHER FABRICS FOR LIGHT AND TEMPERATURE CONTROL; BY ROLAND CARTER FOR LIEB/MEYER.
"BISCAYNE:" 50" WIDE, 100% ACRYLIC FIBER; CAN BE WASHED, DRY CLEANED, DYED, FLAME-PROOFED; OYSTER ONLY; FROM LIEB/MEYER.
"JUBILEE:" JEWEL TONED UPHOLSTERY MATERIAL WOVEN OF WIDE BRAIDS WITH A NYLON BINDER, 50" WIDE, LATEX BACKED; THREE COLORINGS: SAPPHIRE, RUBY AND AMBER; FROM JACK LENOR LARES, INC.

THIRD ROW:
"DELPHE:" COMPANION PRINT TO "MINOA," AN ALL OVER PRINT IN SMALL CLOSELY ARRANGED PATTERNS FORMED BY ITS TWO COLORS; 46" WIDE, 5" REPEAT; AVAILABLE ON A VARIETY OF FABRICS; FROM HEN ROSE.
"LINGS:" LINEN AND COTTON IMPORT WITH THE COTTON WARP FEATURED IN RELIEF ON THE FACE OF THE CLOTH; IN WHITE OR NATURAL; FROM KNOLL ASSOCIATES, INC.
"NAFTH:" DRAPERY PRINT, 46" WIDE, 65" REPEAT; BY ALEXANDER GIRARD FOR HERMAN MILLER, INC.
"TOGETHERNESS:" BY SAM PROVAN FOR LIEB/MEYER; 48" WIDE, ON BELGIAN LINEN, GLASS FIBERS, DACRON AND OTHER FABRICS.
"CHIT CHAT:" CRISP TWO-COLOR PRINT WHICH CAN BE TURNED INTO TWO DIRECTIONS, AVAILABLE IN THREE COLOR COMBINATIONS: YELLOW AND ORANGE; GREEN AND BLACK; RED AND BLUE, AGAINST A WHITE BACKGROUND OF COTTON, FIBERGLAS BOUCLE OR DACRON FOR LAVERNE, INC.
critiques of mass-housing projects. Of many such projects he has evaluated from the late 1930s on, Stuyvesant Town on the lower East Side drew his heaviest attack. "Though the buildings are not a continuous unit," he observed (October 30, 1948) after inspecting the unit a second time, "they present to the beholder an un

The same humane standard made it possible for Mumford to praise what he took to be a housing project well conceived. Fresh Meadows in Queens seemed to him one such development, and that gave it the very "human qualities" Stuyvesant and similar "towns" were lacking.

There is, finally, Mumford’s social criterion. No structure is either conceived or executed in a social vacuum. Both facts should be faced, Mumford believed, and embodied in design. To put it extremely, and he often has, architecture is always community planning. This is the principal assumption underlying his assault of nearly forty years on the American skyscraper, beginning with the book Sticks and Stones and continuing to yesterday. Vastly as skyscrapers look from land miles away or from the air, rarely have they been erected on sufficiently realistic or responsible sociological grounds. Often created with as little regard for their urban surroundings as an isolated country house, they have brought havoc to New York and now every major American city. The shots of Manhattan automobile traffic at a ludicrous standstill in the 1939 movie The City (for which Mumford wrote the script) would seem quaint were they not even more applicable everywhere in the United States today. And traffic congestion, Mumford has unceasingly reiterated, is merely the most obvious, difficult and typical of those social enormities spawned when the client’s and architect’s conceptual model is the lone building, standing free of its social environment. Particularly in those half-dozen Sky Line articles gathered in the small volume, From the Ground Up, the practical relationships of skyscrapers to traffic to highways to bridges to total community design are incisively demonstrated.

A second glance at Mumford’s work shows just how apt a scrutiny of his critical premises really is. Principles not only point the direction of his judgment; they dominate it. This is one reason Mumford’s great virtue and great fault as a practicing critic. He comes uncomfortably close to practicing what John Dewey described as “legalistic” criticism, conceiving his task not (in Dewey’s words) as “an act of intelligence performed upon the matter of direct perception in the interest of a more adequate perception,” but as “a process of acquittal or condemnation on the basis of merits and demerits.” Over the years his five criteria have been employed less as conceptual tools than as touchstones. Too often, he has been the schoolmaster. If a structure were highly functional, attractive to him, aptly symbolic, and so on, it passed; if not, it failed. A minus for Lever House; a flunk for the UN Secretariat.

Mumford has never been merely juridical, nor naively so. His conception of architecture is too complicated to allow that. Nonetheless, at bottom his mind works deductively, moving not from the ground up but from the top down, more at ease with the abstraction than with the fact, restless under the restraint of detail, parsing phenomena not as evidence but as illustration. Hence the more perfunctory tone of many of his building critiques, the freer enthusiasm of his essays on such larger themes as the regionalism of Frank Lloyd Wright. Hence his habitual carelessness with exact dates and names (how fortunate that he has the New Yorker with its platoons of fact-checkers!). Hence the controlled quality, the apparent lack of spontaneity, in all but his very best criticism. For Mumford appears seldom to have approached a new building truly willing to be surprised, ready to be overwhelmed by the utter beauty of the thing. Impressionist though he was, impressions meant less to him than ideas. This is one reason he has so long withstood the sheer aesthetic splendor of Le Corbusier’s more overpowering creations: he could not dissociate their frankly pictorial appeal from their sociological anarchism. The same is true of his reactions to the other major Internationalists, such as Mies, whose perfectionist craftsmanship and exploitation of novel opportunities Mumford believed to be his symbolic devotion to the machine.

There is of course a certain irony in the fact that to one so squarely identified with treatises for the humane side of architecture, an immediate personal response to a building counted for less than an impersonal analysis of it. But Mumford is an immensely aware person, and his architectural ideas, particularly in the last fifteen years, have disclosed what is very likely an effort to compensate for his own abbreviated emotional reflexes by affirming their importance on principle. Mumford’s viewpoint, or that of any critic, is never simply a matter of content; it is also a result of temperament, and of a specific quality of mind. Much of Mumford’s criticism, indeed his very conception of it, makes a good deal more sense when we realize that he does not really look at the world empirically. His detailed inspection of structures for the New Yorker critiques seems to contradict this, as does his repeated, implicit, pragmatic query of a building, a park or whatever: Does it work? But Mumford’s pragmatism strikes me as acquired, not natural, and spasmodically at odds with his more ideological turn of mind.

In this century we need hardly be reminded of the perils of doctrines too strictly held. In architecture or its criticism, as in other spheres, strong conviction shades easily into rigidity, tenacity into dogma. Mumford has always been susceptible to ex cess, and excess yoked to an a priori sensibility often leads, at the very least, to mistakes. Preoccupied with generalizations, Mumford has too frequently ignored exceptions or failed to draw crucial distinctions, as when, in urging that “architecture” be integrated with “society,” he has commonly neglected to differentiate the varying degrees or kinds of integration possible in urban, suburban, rural and still other types of buildings, or in public as against domestic buildings. He has also tended to disregard the possibility of an a priori sensibility often leads, at the very least, to mistakes.
wood homes of Wurster from those of Harris, or the glass boxes of Johnson from those of Mies.

Or, I should say, the particularities that enable us to distinguish them. For another defect of Mumford's apodictic approach to criticism, in my opinion, is its inhospitality. Too often his pronouncements fail to invite either our affection or consolation. Like the dark Monadnock slab he has long admired, Mumford's verdicts loom massively over the city, so solid in their engineering as to seem opaque, so opaque as to seem wholly final. If his conclusions compel us to attend, too little do they take us beyond themselves—to a more intense appreciation of particular buildings or bridges, to successively unfolding perceptions. Only in a critique so inductively conceived and therefore so dense with observed detail as that of Lever House are we likely to find ourselves feeling and thinking our way through the structure with Mumford. As a rule, we are struck less by the object of his investigation than by the mind carrying it out.

Mumford's weakness here is that of any artist who does not handle his materials in such a way as to lead us persuasively and by degrees to the revelation he wishes to have. To ask Mumford to do so is possibly to ask too much of practical criticism, trapped as it often is by printing deadlines and similar exigencies. The idea points, in any case, to what Mumford does not do. His appeal to us is not artful but direct; he does not care to have us love the buildings but to understand them as he does, in the main socially and abstractly. This preeminently rational intent, reinforced as it is by a rather restless and syllogistic intellect, is both more powerful and less effective in its workings than a different kind of sensibility would probably be. It is less effective because rational argument, even when forcefully presented, is not ordinarily sufficient to move men's minds. But its unyielding candor exerts power nevertheless, if in a smaller circle than greater art would permit.

Perhaps that smaller circle was the one that mattered most in those anarcho years after the first world war when the long siege of architecture by eclecticism needed so badly to be lifted—that circle of architects, designers, planners, engineers, teachers, students, critics, and laymen who wanted the enlightenment that only a reconsideration of fundamental aims could bring. If criticism was to help further this enlightenment, to fill one of its traditional functions as a guiding intelligence, then it had to break away from its servility to the accustomed. It had to supply conscience, to provoke and stimulate. Partly by chance, Mumford was there when the occasion demanded; and the very qualities that circumscribed his audience made it possible for him to serve it. Seeing more in architecture—as Lethaby had asked of the critic—than taste or scholarship, Mumford brought the criteria he thought relevant to bear upon the judgment of it. His insistence on these criteria furnished exactly the sort of architectural criticism for which Talbot Hamlin had petitioned, a criticism "rigid and relentless." Not for all time and every place but in the '20s and '30s, Mumford supplied what was needed.

Whether he has continued to do so is perhaps more questionable to many persons. There was a time after the second world war when most references to Mumford were in the past tense. While the last ten years have seen him markedly revived in general esteem, he is still sometimes identified rather narrowly with the architectural mentality of about 1930. True of many of his ideas about literature and painting, this notion is a good deal less true of Mumford on architecture. Temporally conservative in many ways, he has adapted almost remarkably to a second and strikingly different postwar world. Unlike Mencken, he did not fade with the 1930s, or with Granville Hicks in the '30s. One reason for this, of course, is that the modernism he was among the first to champion has now come to power. Another is that his critical principles, though tentaculously held, had a built-in flexibility. Usefulness, beauty, expressiveness, humane and social considerations are not absolutes. The actuality of each is partly relative to circumstances. And the evolutionism underlying that wonderfully ambiguous word "organic"—the main word Mumford has applied to his own critical point of view—took it for granted that architectural forms would never become permanently fixed. Although his tributes to Organic building sometimes sound like ritualistic incantations, he has always called for an architecture responsive to the living forces in its own culture.

Moreover, American architecture hardly seems to have reached that plateau of stable self-discipline and social responsibility where it can dispense with criticism in general or Mumford's point of view in particular. That plateau, always green and always vanishing, is after all a mirage. Criticism will remain necessary, if only because architecture is always in process; it is eternally being built. So that to the extent alternatives are possible in design, criteria which the most serious criticism provides can help define and shape the architectural future. That should be axiomatic in the profession, but to judge by the modest pleas in our architectural journals for critical writing, it appears not to be axiomatic at all.

And Mumford's point of view: that five-fold cluster of impos-sible and therefore exasperating and exciting demands. Magisterial, impertinent, grave, impassioned, unyielding, adaptable, violent and humane—the paradoxes of his criticism have a peculiarly American ring, or may simply be those of any highly rational individual whose expectations run to hopeful extremes. As Americans are now in the ranks of architects who lead the world, Mumford's sternly cautious optimism is surely one useful kind of instruction. The spirit of boyish enthusiasm with which we have long been prone to scatter glass and granite across the landscape now extends to other lands as well. If architects and citizens have learned well the lessons of utility and beauty which Mumford has not been alone in teaching, if they have begun to reappreciate the possibilities of symbolism through Mumford, Giedion and others, not sufficiently have they remembered Mumford's humanistic and especially his social counsel.

If architecture were cut to one pattern, then we should all despair. That there can be other patterns than his is a view that Mumford has probably recognized too little, not so much by what he has said as by his uncompromising posture. That architecture should be patterned at all—here is one of the great reminders for which many of us, if not all, are indebted to this solitary critic.
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himself alone, and threatens in the end to confine him entirely within the solitude of his own heart."

But the battle had been joined. Kenneth Burke rose to point out the danger in our assuming that "creativity" is a good; it can be equally an evil—and I recalled his study, written in the 1930s, of Mein Kampf. Art cannot override morals on a spate of talent. Blau, now heartily sick of disaffiliation, rose to defend the word and to disdain it. The artist must stand apart from society, but he cannot be outside society; he must observe dispassionately but then act. This is of course one answer to Tocqueville's fear that true democracy must end in isolated individualism.

And then old Gilbert Seldes heaved himself to his feet and rumbled into the conflict, his words roaring the challenge of his lifetime battle to improve and authenticate the mass media in terms of an improved communication with the growing needs of the mass audience. What significance does art have ultimately apart from the mass audience? If the artist wishes to live isolated, let him, but don't make the people responsible for it. Seldes is exactly right, and I'm all for him; but he forgets the time-lag in dissemination, complicated by the resistance of the interested professionals who act on the assumption that the audience wants only what it knows and so withhold whatever is not surely wanted—the producers, the directors, the writers of purpose of a Regional Art Center. Love the classics as we may, overcome the contemporary narrowness of the choice is another Beethoven or Tchaikovsky; and after two or three generations to decide, might even develop a taste for it. Any majority, asked to name its favorite musical composition, will choose from uninformed or dishonest criticism, the performers who prefer to play it safe with a sure thing, the prohibitive costs of failure isolated, let him, but don't make the people responsible for it.

That is surely wanted—the producers, the directors, the writers of a Regional Art Center. Love the classics as we may, overcome the contemporary narrowness of the choice is another Beethoven or Tchaikovsky; and after two or three generations to decide, might even develop a taste for it. Any majority, asked to name its favorite musical composition, will choose from uninformed or dishonest criticism, the performers who prefer to play it safe with a sure thing, the prohibitive costs of failure isolated, let him, but don't make the people responsible for it.

But the battle had been joined. Kenneth Burke rose to point out the danger in our assuming that "creativity" is a good; it can be equally an evil—and I recalled his study, written in the 1930s, of Mein Kampf. Art cannot override morals on a spate of talent. Blau, now heartily sick of disaffiliation, rose to defend the word and to disdain it. The artist must stand apart from society, but he cannot be outside society; he must observe dispassionately but then act. This is of course one answer to Tocqueville's fear that true democracy must end in isolated individualism.

And then old Gilbert Seldes heaved himself to his feet and rumbled into the conflict, his words roaring the challenge of his lifetime battle to improve and authenticate the mass media in terms of an improved communication with the growing needs of the mass audience. What significance does art have ultimately apart from the mass audience? If the artist wishes to live isolated, let him, but don't make the people responsible for it. Seldes is exactly right, and I'm all for him; but he forgets the time-lag in dissemination, complicated by the resistance of the interested professionals who act on the assumption that the audience wants only what it knows and so withhold whatever is not surely wanted—the producers, the directors, the writers of purpose of a Regional Art Center. Love the classics as we may, overcome the contemporary narrowness of the choice is another Beethoven or Tchaikovsky; and after two or three generations to decide, might even develop a taste for it. Any majority, asked to name its favorite musical composition, will choose from uninformed or dishonest criticism, the performers who prefer to play it safe with a sure thing, the prohibitive costs of failure isolated, let him, but don't make the people responsible for it. Seldes is exactly right, and I'm all for him; but he forgets the time-lag in dissemination, complicated by the resistance of the interested professionals who act on the assumption that the audience wants only what it knows and so withhold whatever is not surely wanted—the producers, the directors, the writers of purpose of a Regional Art Center. Love the classics as we may, overcome the contemporary narrowness of the choice is another Beethoven or Tchaikovsky; and after two or three generations to decide, might even develop a taste for it. Any majority, asked to name its favorite musical composition, will choose from uninformed or dishonest criticism, the performers who prefer to play it safe with a sure thing, the prohibitive costs of failure isolated, let him, but don't make the people responsible for it.

Seldes is exactly right, and I'm all for him; but he forgets the time-lag in dissemination, complicated by the resistance of the interested professionals who act on the assumption that the audience wants only what it knows and so withhold whatever is not surely wanted—the producers, the directors, the writers of purpose of a Regional Art Center. Love the classics as we may, overcome the contemporary narrowness of the choice is another Beethoven or Tchaikovsky; and after two or three generations to decide, might even develop a taste for it. Any majority, asked to name its favorite musical composition, will choose from uninformed or dishonest criticism, the performers who prefer to play it safe with a sure thing, the prohibitive costs of failure isolated, let him, but don't make the people responsible for it.
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oven, sink; carefully crafted in walnut, paper or vinyl grounds. You may

furniture. Matching wallcoverings, on

Color Selector" at no additional cost.

murals, contemporary lighting fixtures

fabrication of decorative metal work.

door, 2-speed rotisserie, scientifically
designed aluminum Broiler tray, are
debut, and have safety bolt to prevent acci
dental lockout. Catalog and price list

350a) Appliances: Thermador presents

two new brochures. The 14.9 Refrigerator-Freezer model is 

sliding doors: The product line of Bellevue

353, Wilmington, California.

353a) Window Wall Systems: New

8-page catalog presents the Arcadia

600 Series Window Wall Systems of

aluminum framing for self-contained

floor-to-ceiling installations. Any de

sired configurations of fixed and slid

ing panels, spandrel or transom panels,

doors or frames are possible. Write to Northrop Archi

executive buildings, restaurants, cocktail

showrooms: Carroll Sagar & Assoc.,

8835 Beverly Blvd., Los Angeles 60.

Bacon & Perrin Architectural

Decorative Center, Dallas 7, Texas:

Executive Office Interiors, 528 Wash

ington St., San Francisco 19, Calif.

Castle/West, 2300 East 3rd, Denver 6,

colo. Frank B. Ladd 122 West

Knoxie Street, Chicago, Illinois. For

furniture, experience and craftsmanship:

experience in your designs or ours in

wood, metal, plastic, etc. in our mod

cern 30,000-square-foot plant. One let

or phone call may solve your exhi

bition problems. Brand, Worth & Asso

10231 South Maple Avenue, Garden,


furniture & accessories brochure on

leading line of fine contemporary

furniture by George Kasparian. Experi

enced custom contract dept. working

with leading architects. Wholesale

showrooms: Carroll Sagar & Assoc.,

8835 Beverly Blvd., Los Angeles 60.

Bacon & Perrin Architectural

Decorative Center, Dallas 7, Texas:

Executive Office Interiors, 528 Wash

ington St., San Francisco 19, Calif.

Castle/West, 2300 East 3rd, Denver 6,

colo. Frank B. Ladd 122 West

Knoxie Street, Chicago, Illinois. For

further information, write on your

letterhead, please, directly to any of

the above showrooms. Kasparian

7772 Santa Monica Blvd., Los An
geles 46, California.

384a) Wall Furniture: Broad and

versatile line of wall-hung furniture,

manufactured and warehoused in Los

Angeles; the Peter Wessel line wall

furniture line is of the highest qual

ity and workmanship constructed of

genuine walnut, oil finished. Special

custom finishes, color matched to cus

omer’s selection available. Ideal in the

home, office, and institutional use.

Write for catalog and price list to:

Peter Wessel Ltd., 5000 Santa

Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California.

(347a) A new abridged 24-page
catalog, containing 95 photos with de

scriptions of dimensions and woods, is

offered by John Stuart Inc. Stuart

furniture produced from original de

signs by distinguished international

architects, is a storehouse for well-tho

ought overhead lattice work. Write for il

lustrated catalog. Nomad Associates,

Box 353, Wilmington, California.

(357a) Contemporary Danish and

Swedish Furniture. Outstanding de

sign and quality of craftsmanship.

Information available to leading con

temporary dealers and interior decora

tors. Pacific Overseas, Inc., 476 Jack

son Street, San Francisco, California.

(358a) Norwegian Furniture: Com

plete collection of outstanding Nor

wegian imports. Upholstered furniture

and related tables, dining groups,

specialty chairs, modular seating, and

walnut.

For further information write Peter

Wessel, Ltd., 3008 Santa Monica Bou

levard, Beverly Hills, California.

(383a) Knoll Furniture Guide—Illus

trated 30-page brochure of the Full

collection of contemporary furniture

designs for residential and commer

cial interiors. Includes chairs, sofas,
tables, chutes, cabinets, desks and

conference tables by internationally

distinguished designers including Flor

cence Knoll, Eero Saarinen, Harry Bertoi,

Mies van der Rohe, Isamu Noguchi,

Eero Saarinen, Harry Bertoia, Mel

Nelson, Raymor Lamps, Omni Wall Sys

tem, Gunnar Schwartz, String Shelves,

Tempo, Vista, Hans Wegner designs,

Peter Wessel Wall System. Peter Wes

sel, Beverly Hills. Imports, Heath Ash

trays. These lines will be of particular

interest to architects, decorative design

ers. Inquiries welcomed. Car

roll Sager & Associates, 8833 Beverly

Boulevard, Los Angeles 48, California.

(370a) Contemporary Furniture for

the Home: Open showroom to the trade,

featuring such lines as Herman Miller,

Knoll, Dux and John Stuart.

Representatives for Architectural Pot

tery, Bailey-Schmitt, Brown-Jordan,

Brown-Salman, Costa Mesa Desks,

Edgard Danish Furniture, Glenn of

California, Howard Miller, Nessen

Lamps, Omni Wall System by George

Nelson, Raymor Lamps, Pacific Fur

niture, Raymor Omnibus Wall Sys

tem, Gunnar Schwartz, String Shelves,

Tempo, Vista, Hans Wegner designs,

Peter Wessel Wall System, Peter Wes

sel, Beverly Hills. Imports, Heath Ash

trays. These lines will be of particular

interest to architects, decorative design

ers. Inquiries welcomed. Car

roll Sager & Associates, 8833 Beverly

Boulevard, Los Angeles 48, California.

(381a) Furniture and accessories brochure on

leading line of fine contemporary

furniture by George Kasparian. Experi

enced custom contract dept. working

with leading architects. Wholesale

showrooms: Carroll Sagar & Assoc.,

8835 Beverly Blvd., Los Angeles 60.

Bacon & Perrin Architectural

Decorative Center, Dallas 7, Texas:

Executive Office Interiors, 528 Wash

ington St., San Francisco 19, Calif.

Castle/West, 2300 East 3rd, Denver 6,

colo. Frank B. Ladd 122 West

Knoxie Street, Chicago, Illinois. For

further information, write on your

letterhead, please, directly to any of

the above showrooms. Kasparian

7772 Santa Monica Blvd., Los An
geles 46, California.

(384a) Wall Furniture: Broad and

versatile line of wall-hung furniture,

manufactured and warehoused in Los

Angeles; the Peter Wessel line wall

furniture line is of the highest qual

ity and workmanship constructed of

genuine walnut, oil finished. Special

custom finishes, color matched to cus

omer’s selection available. Ideal in the

home, office, and institutional use.

Write for catalog and price list to:

Peter Wessel Ltd., 5000 Santa

Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California.

(347a) A new abridged 24-page
catalog, containing 95 photos with de

scriptions of dimensions and woods, is

offered by John Stuart Inc. Stuart

furniture produced from original de

signs by distinguished international

architects, is a storehouse for well-tho

ught overhead lattice work. Write for il

lustrated catalog. Nomad Associates,

Box 353, Wilmington, California.

(404a) Herman Miller Inc. offers a

series of coordinated brochures illus

trating the Herman Miller Collection.

Also available is a Comprehensive

Storage System Workbook and a Re

port. Write to Herman Miller, Inc.,

Zeeland, Michigan.
**SCHINDLER — SACHS HILLSIDE VIEW APARTMENTS**
(LoS Angeles)
Under New Management
Vacancies occasionally

Woodbury
NO. 44763

**LIGHTING EQUIPMENT**

(409a) Recessed and Accent Lighting Fixtures: Complete range contemporary recessed and surface designs for residential, commercial applications. Holiday pendants, pendants, color combinations of handblown colored or satin opal glass as well as metal shades. Light-form fixtures—soft satin, thermoplastic in glowing geometric shapes for unusual decorative effects. Precolite Manufacturing Corporation, 1251 Doolittle Drive, San Leandro, California.

(369a) Contemporary Fixtures: Catalog, data good line contemporary fixtures, including complete recessed surface mounted lens, down lights incorporating Corning wide angle Pyrex lenses, recessed, semi-recessed surface-mounted units utilizing reflector lamps; modern chandeliers for widely diffused, even illumination. Luxo Lamp suited to any lighting task. Selected units merit specified for 3rd Avenue, New York 22, New York.

**PHOTOGRAPHIC REPRODUCTIONS**

(340a) The Averycolor reproduction is a color-fast, non-glare, satin-finish print of durable photographic stock, not acetate base material. Two years of research coupled with years of experience in the photographic field have resulted in a revolutionary change in making reproductions from architectural renderings. Other services include: one-by-one—and-white, colored, and black and white transparency, custom dry mounting and display transparencies. For further information write: Avery Color Corporation, 1200 North Cahuenga Boulevard, Hollywood, California.

(390a) New Proportional System—The Kidgel Cali-Fro is a new instrument which provides the discovery of the one universal ratio for all proportions in design, modern and classic, and spacial harmony in all types of layout. This new found ratio solves the secrets of proportions as achieved by the ancient Greeks, now brought up to date in a precision-built, light-weight instrument, easy to use. For detailed information write: Maurice Kidgel, Kidgel-California, Inc., 1012 Piikoi Street, Honolulu 14, Hawaii.

(391a) Information on all plastics for building, samples, design data on structural plastics, translucent sandwich panels, curvilinear panels, skylights, partition wall panels, and luminous ceiling materials available. Kidgel-California, Lucite Flat Sheet and sandwich panels are the most corrosion-resistant, lightweight and color stable panels available for exterior application; sandwich panels adapted to the variable design and skin features of curvilinear panels and partitions. For consultant and engineering staff, detailed design and cost data available. Write to: Plastics In Architecture, 4335 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles 48, California, O.L. 3-7777.

(392a) Stained Glass Windows: 1" to 3" thick chipped colored glass embedded in cement reinforced with steel bars. A new conception of glass colored in the mass displays decomposing and refracting lights. Designed from the pure abstract to figurative modern in the tradition of 12th century stained glass. For brochure write to Roger Daricarrere, 1937 San Fernando Road, Los Angeles 65, Calif.

**SPECIALTIES**

(393a) "Ideas from Architects' Own Redwood Homes," a 16-page color brochure, shows how architects in every part of the United States are using redwood for siding, paneling, beams, columns, stairs, doors, columns, beams, and interior finishes, as well as for doors and window frames. "Redwood Goes to School," 16 pages of outdoor living ideas, "Redwood Goes to School," showing latest ideas in wood school design. "Architect's File" containing the above brochures and a special section of data sheets; individual data sheets answering thousands of questions about redwood. REDWOOD NEWS, 276 Sacramento St., San Francisco, California.

(394a) New 24-page brochure, "The pleasure of planning your home with Mosaic Tile." Different patterns of this useful material, a new brochure of tile, presents a variety of home planning ideas, large selection of handsome color photographs. Tiled steps, hallways, tiled fireplaces, kitchens, bathrooms, patios and swimming pools show the versatility and wide color choices as well as low maintenance costs and lifetime advantages of ceramic tile. Brochure may be obtained by writing The Mosaic Tile Company, 131 North Robertson Boulevard, Los Angeles 5, California, or calling O-Leander 5-7083.

(395a) Ceramic Tile: Brochures, samples and catalogs of Pomona Tile’s line of hard and soft-fired wall tiles, available to architects, designers and consumers. "Distinctive Designer Series of Sculptured and Decorator Tile. This series features unique designs by many of America's foremost designers including George Nelson, Paul Mccoy, Saul Bass and Dong Kingman. Pomona Tile also offers a complete line of glazed floor and wall tile in 45 decorator colors. For further information write to Pomona Tile Manufacturing Co., 621-33 North La Brea Avenue, Los Angeles 36, California.

(396a) Surface Treatments: La Vene Originals offer practical and practical wall and ceiling treatments — wallpaper handprints, fabric-supported wall covering in a new group of 3-dimensional deep-textured wall coverings. This is the only source in the world for The Marabella Mural—stock sizes 21 X 2 feet to your measurements. All Laverne products available in custom colors. An unusual feature of Laverne for special projects. Write for complete brochure. 1501 1501 East 57th Street, New York 22, New York. Phone Plaza 9-5545.
True MONUMENTALITY with intimate HUMAN SCALE and TEXTURE expressed in MOSAIC MEDLEY

THE MOSAIC TILE COMPANY
Member: Tile Council of America, Inc. and The Producers' Council, Inc.


For your copies of the Mosaic Pacific Coast Service Plan and the Mosaic Harmonic Color Catalog, write The Mosaic Tile Company, 131 N. Robertson Blvd., Beverly Hills, Calif.

PLASTOVEIL TRIMPLATE

One of the many innovations in the new Marco-Illumiline collection. A perforated lath fills the area between the fixture trim in the ceiling and the aperture. This lath can receive plaster...or acoustical tile and other ceiling materials, so that a continuous surface is achieved, broken only by apertures. For re-lamping, the plate is easily pulled down on torsion springs. Result...a typical Marco solution: maximum light, minimum fixture intrusion. Use coupon below for handsome Illumiline catalog illustrating over 100 new recessed lighting fixtures.