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Eisenman and Wolfe: Our House and Bauhaus
Stern on Frampton: Giedion's Ghost
Peter Brooks: Prostitution and Paris
Scully and Meier: Remembering Breuer
Skyline Rises Again

Most of us have recognized for some time that architecture is not just a discipline. It is a culture. Viewing architecture as a discipline is too narrow; it reduces architecture to a trade guided by rules and skills picked up in architecture school and then applied dogmatically the rest of one's life.

Viewing architecture as a cultural entity acknowledges that architecture has its own characteristic values and attitudes, customs and traditions, languages and ideologies—and of course its own artifacts. Yet it is integrally tied to our larger western culture, owing the same social, economic and political forces that shape it.

Unfortunately, however, the examination of architecture as a culture has not frequently and certainly not systematically been undertaken by the press or by the general media. Instead architecture has been treated on as a small subcategory of society's manufacture—a manufacture or product you take for granted as so much real estate, or a product you cannot fully try to understand—an esoteric art object. From either perspective, architecture is being robbed of its full impact and meaning on all of our lives.

There is no need for another trade magazine to deal with architecture as a business venture. There is no need for another intellectual journal to keep it esoteric and hermetic. What is needed is a publication that can expose the full range of architecture's dimensions to public scrutiny. It should be a fast-paced substantive newsmagazine that will both survey the full range of architectural activity and focus.

Skyline is a publication that will consistently and conscientiously examine and analyze architecture in all its forms and facets, tangible, intangible, abstract and concrete, ephemeral and long-lasting. It will promote the understanding of architecture as a way of thinking—of perceiving—in a way the rest of the interested world can understand.

Skyline will promote that understanding with the people who create architecture, who influence that creation, and the people who are affected by it—who respond to it. It will evaluate, investigate and interpret those complex interrelationships, ideas and events that go into making architecture. It will not be equivocal or even polite, but it intends to be fair. It is for those who are willing to recognize architecture is a tough demanding complex endeavor. It deserves a hard-hitting, demanding publication.

Suzanne Stephens
City Report

Working the RR Yards

On the fast-becoming-fashionable West Side, plans are well underway for the largest development in the history of Manhattan under the auspices of Lincoln West Associates, a partnership between Observation Realty Corp. and the Abraham Hirschfeld family. In January Lincoln West unveiled a preliminary proposal for a privately financed, $1-billion, residential, commercial, and recreational development on the site of the 60th Street Penn Central Yards. With 76.4 acres in all (14.5 underwater) the project extends between 59th and 72nd Streets along the Hudson River.

The master plan was developed as a joint venture by Kreezen & Partners/Rafael Vinoly, Architects and Planners; they will also continue to be involved with the design of individual buildings. Other buildings or sections are being designed by I.M. Pei & Partners; Cesar Pelli & Associates; Edward Larabee Barnes, Kohn, Pedersen, Fox & Associates; and Mitchell/Giurgola. In addition, there are four landscape architects working on individual sectors: Kiley-Walker; zoning; Quennell-Rothschild Associates; and Vreeland & Guerrerio.

The development will be of low-, medium-, and high-rise buildings, organized along a north-south boulevard with a waterfront park to the west. In working on the proposal and subsequent design development, the developers held informal discussions with the concerned community and planned considerable public amenities, including highway and subway station improvements, extensive green space, waterfront renovation, and an amphitheater. They are also working with the Urban Development Corp. on the possibility of accommodating some of the freight transfer to TOFC terminal facilities that would be replaced by the new building. In addition, the luxury housing project as proposed will not require any form of federal, state, or city subsidies. Ground-breaking is scheduled for the spring of 1982, and construction, planned over a period of ten years, will average 400 apartment units completed each year.

Lincoln West is intending to have the formal submission to the city completed in September. This will be followed by 60 days of community board review before final permission is achieved, and Lincoln West will exercise their option to purchase the site.

M.G.J.

Who’s on Third

The newest game in New York is counting how many big buildings are under construction (how many jelly beans in this jar?). The latest hot spot for the crane-watchers, running neck-and-neck with a few blocks on Madison Avenue, is a somewhat longer stretch on Third. Parents assembled a number of years ago, the land is only now being developed after the recent recession and push eastward spearheaded by the construction of the Citicorp tower between 53rd and 54th Streets, Lexington and Third Avenues.

Between 58th and 49th on Third a thin, polished red granite tower by SOM is scheduled for completion in 1983. The fifty-story office building, by partner Paul de Armas, is being built as-of-eight; a simple, tall, thin structure, with its structural cross-bracing revealed in the window pattern, the tower is set back on the site with open plaza space on three sides.

Developers are the Cohen Brothers Realty & Construction Company with the Cadillac Fairview Corporation. On 50th, at 805 Third, the Cohen Brothers have another site, bought from the Durst Organization, on which an Emery Roth behemoth is nearing completion. A building that had three stories lopped off due to community opposition, it is of reflective glass and stainless steel with a three-storied retail base to be known as the Crystal Pavilion (this designed by Bromley & Jacobsen).

SOM is adding another punch to the city fabric with a 14-sided, 29-story office tower at 875 Third designed by Bruce Graham of the Chicago office. Well under construction, there will be an 85-foot-high atrium on the ground floor and three other atria within the bulk of the building. The ground floor contains a three-level retail area and provides a through-block arcade.

Between 53rd and 54th, a block north of the SOM project, Houston developer Gerald Hines has possession of a block-front site. Johnson/Burgee are working on a design, but it is reportedly not yet in model form.

On the block north of Citicorp tower, on land acquired from Sam Minskoff & Sons, Jacob Finkelnber is developing 900 Third, designed by Cesar Pelli & Associates with Rafael Vinoly in association with Emery Roth & Sons. The tower is to have a base modeled after the Citicorp Center and will include a landscaped plaza on the avenue and a curved greenhouse at the top.

Beyond these there are plans for large residential structures. Alexander’s department store, which has most of the block between 58th and 59th, and

Lincoln West, massing study

Bloomington of Soho?
The persistent and unsettling rumor that Bloomington’s, the world-renowned emporium for the person who wants anything, is planning a store in SoHo, crustwhile home of art and crafty, remains unsubstantiated. Plans have not yet come before the Landmarks Commission, a must for the area, but word has it that P-dale’s has its eye on the R & K Bakery building on Prince Street between West Broadway and Wooster, though some say that this is not a likely possibility.
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900 Third, Cesar Pelli Associates

Lexington and Third, is planning redevelopment of its property. Between 60th and 61st, the Bowery Savings Bank is moving ahead with plans for a multi-use tower — 29 stories of apartments with a 6-storied retail base — to be developed by “a prominent New York developer” with Kreezen & Partners Architects. Across the Avenue, one block north, the Trump Organization is also planning a large condominium. The architect for the project is Philip Birnbaum, noteworthy for his mediocres plans that appear puzzed together. All this activity will effectively mar—if not destroy—a generally low-scale area of small buildings, identifiable shops, and favorite restaurants.

One Block Over

The Canadian company Cadillac Fairview has bought two-thirds of the block on the east side of Lexington between 52nd and 53rd from the neighboring Citicorp. Real estate people estimate that cost them somewhere between $45 and $100 million. Edward Larabee Barnes is reportedly working on a tower design; we have also heard that there has been some discussion between CF and Seagram, who have their tower one block over on Park Avenue, about an air rights transfer from Seagram that would call for a plaza designed, it is reported, by Phyllis Lambert.

M.G.J.
Biltmore is now Less

The clock—famed in fact and fiction—was the first thing to go: then the rest of the Palm Court and other great spaces on the ground floor were demolished and only the 19th-floor ballroom remained intact by Tuesday, August 13. On Friday night, the owners of the Biltmore Hotel on Vanderbilt Avenue in New York had closed the doors and began tearing apart the interior. Plans to convert the hotel into an office building for the Bank of America—stripping the 1913 Warren & Wetmore hotel (sister to the recently reclad and "restored" Commodore) down to its skeleton and constructing something in granite and glass—had been known of for about a month, but it was not until Thursday, August 13 that all the financial arrangements for the building’s conversion had fallen into place.

Why the hate? The Biltmore is not a designated landmark, but the Landmarks Commission had been talking with the owners—the Milstein family—about the possibility of naming some of the interiors as landmarks, thus requiring review of any intended reconstruction. Meanwhile the Milsteins, alerted, went ahead before the Commission acted, avoiding the sort of public intervention that prevented the tearing down of the Grand Central Terminal. New York City Landmarks officials were taken by surprise.

Architects at Stake

Milstein Properties, recently selected by the New York State Urban Development Corporation as one of the six developers to build 1,809 units of housing at Battery Park City, has already made a tarnished name for itself by its graceless and speedy sacking of the Biltmore. Its style was not that much different, according to various reports, in the way it sought the award of a dozen sites at Battery Park City.

Evidently Milstein and architect Peter Berman rounded up a "high talent" squad of Johnson/Burgee, Gwathmey/Siegell, Richard Meier, Paul Rudolph, Ehrlich/Portman, Mitchell/Giurgiuolo, Marcel Breuer Associates, Cuklin Rossant, Ada Karmi Melamede, the Villas Group, Joseph Wills and John Carl Warnecke to present as bait to UDC. Their argument was that one developer could not be left out and that the site was a jewel. "ought to be kept."

One was offered to Johnson/Burgee, who declined.

Whitewash on White Way

The Portman Hotel controversy keeps on brewing, even while the hotel has obtained its $22.5 million in UDAG money, will get its tax abatements, and even while rumors constantly spin about the hotel still not having enough financing for the 2020 room project at 45th and Broadway. Opponents of the hotel, including the Actors’ Equity and The New Yorkers to Preserve the Theater District contended that the Environmental Impact Statement submitted to the City in August did not sufficiently address the question why the new hotel could not be built over the existing Helen Hayes Theater, the Morocco Theater, and the Bijou. The Helen Hayes is the only one considered and found "eligible" for the National Register of Historic Places, which seems only to mean that detailed drawings will be made for the Historic American Building Survey before it is demolished. Meanwhile lawsuits are still being pursued, based on procedural and substantive matters—e.g. eligibility of the Morocco as a "landmark," or the UDAG and City Board of Estimate approvals being passed before the E.I.S. was submitted.

Meanwhile architect Lee Pomroy has been working on a feasibility plan for saving the three theaters by building over them. The need for the three small theaters to be kept instead of being replaced by a large 1500 seat new theater is simple: many of the Broadway shows thrive on small audiences.

To this observer the real issue has not so much to do with historic architectural significance as with what is being lost and what is not being gained aesthetically with the proposed hotel.

What is being lost perceptually are three theaters that say "Broadway." The long, low, spread-out canopies, their solid and ornate marquises with glittering lights, and their intimately scaled buildings festooned with ornament constitute one of a kind urban ambience, dense now along 45th. If you walk down one of those streets in the theater district, you know you can be only one place in the world. It does not matter whether the buildings are architectural jewels or not. They form a unique and memorable ensemble—they must all be kept.

Another part of this issue is that no "Architectural Impact Statement" has been done on the Portman Hotel. Its design is monstrous. The narrow 50-story tower is hovenked by side walls of monolithic slabs that carve whole chunks out of the midblock sections of the theater district. If this is saving Times Square it is doing so by making it look like Atlanta. All the statistics by Vollmer Associates, Fred C. Hart Associates and Design Development Resources cannot gloss over the ineceapable disfigurement to the area.

S.S.
The Sky is not the Limit: Midtown Zoning

Suzanne Stephens

Flatly put, much of the problem with zoning has occurred in the values and attitudes that have shaped zoning through the years. When the New York City zoning ordinance was adopted in 1916 (the first comprehensive ordinance in the U.S.), it sought to defend compatible uses by separating certain ones from others, and to preserve sunlit and air by limiting the height a tower could go straight up from the street before stepping back.

By 1961, and many amendments later, it was becoming clear that open space on the street level was being sacrificed. The new zoning ordinance reapportioned the bulk to encourage the creation of plazas. Developers were allowed to go straight up without setbacks if buildings occupied only 40 or 50 percent of the property (depending on height). If pulled to street line, these buildings did not have to step back at such an extreme angle. The Seagram tower, built three years before, served as the ideal model—even though it only occupies 25 percent of its site.

By the late 1960s the City Planning Department had realized that multiple towers and plazas were too single-object oriented; in the urban aggregate they created a superfluity of vacant spaces at ground level. By 1970 a complex array of incentives were being introduced to keep certain types of buildings that impart character to a particular district (theaters in Times Square; stores on Fifth Avenue). To allow a wide range of public spaces that would make new developments more urbane.

By the mid-seventies one could see that bulk was being traded for bulk, not for open space. Whereas plazas outside buildings had been considered desirable, now the favored space was an atrium, inside a building. More often it was a lobby with a waterfall. The public amenities were becoming more privatized—the domains of owners and tenants—as well as interiorized. Furthermore, because of special permits required for the special bonuses and special districts, developers were making very special deals.

The City Planning Department was more often than not caught playing it fast-and-loose. While the Board of Standards and Appeals is always blamed for the variance on height and setback for those bulky behemoths, zoning consultants Kwartler/Jones and Davis Brody found that City Planning had passed variances affecting 28 million square feet of building in the years 1961-1980, while the Board of Standards and Appeals had voted on only 1.6 million.

So, with public outcry the attitude has shifted once again. Sunlight and openness outside are again valued; yet it is too late to get back what is lost. The real question is, can zoning assure that those qualities of the environment held in esteem by its citizens will in fact be preserved? Valuing light and air the time around produced setbacks buildings that were criticized as being poor "wedding cakes." When plazas were valued, the results were usually disappointingly bleak stretches of pavement. When the full gamut of bonusable amenities was assessed, those final results were often just bland non-spaces. The problem for the most part lies not in what zoning wants to keep, but how zoning—usually written to define things quantitatively—can assure a qualitative response.

This sticky wicket regarding methods has occasioned a year-long study from City Planning to figure out a watertight way of satisfying developers while at the same time creating a city filled with all the ideal urban characteristics everyone—including developers—travel to Europe to see.

Bulky Buildings Meet Floor Area Ratio

In the 1916 zoning laws builders were not restricted to deter the proliferation of larger and bulkier buildings in east midtown and redistrict growth to the lower-density west midtown area. City Planning now proposes keeping the base FAR all over the east midtown area at 1.6 (with limited incentives the FAR would allow extra floor space to total a FAR of 18 in the mid-blocks of midtown). The mid-blocks of the East Side will be kept at the lower FAR of 1.2, while mid-blocks on the West Side will be allowed by a FAR of 15.

Frankly this isn’t much of a “lift” on East Side growth, except for keeping down large assemblages more tempting under one FAR. The base FAR is 15 now; if the developer wants to build on the East Side, he’ll just restrict his choice of amenities to the ones the city allows, and still be built a FAR of 15 (as-of-right) and 18 (with special permits)—the FAR of the IBM and AT & T buildings. It is probable, however, that since the city is offering a base FAR of 18 plus tax abatements and more incentives on the west side of midtown, it will be able to entice growth there too. Highrise growth will be evenly spread out.

The limitation of FAR in the mid-block areas sounds at first hearing as if it can do more than it will to save midtown’s one-residence buildings, brownstones and townhouses containing shops and restaurants on its side streets. The pattern of lower buildings along the cross streets owes much to happenstance: the shorter length of the blocks along the side avenues, along with the 1/2 FAR setbacks provisions, which were tied to the width of the street, meant that it was easier to assemble land and build taller towers on the avenues. The shift in scale and ambience between new glassy towers on avenues and low-rise brownstones and townhouses on side streets has made midtown a more relaxed, varied, perceptual experience—one that city planners began to acknowledge too late.

Still, most of the blocks of townhouses only reach a FAR of about 0.6 to 1.2. Developers have often bought the air rights of low-rise mid-block buildings and assembled them with city planners to allow them to count the land on which the buildings sit as FAR. The result, not in order to beef up the numbers in the FAR formula. When this practice, exemplified by the weighty 44-story Fisher building on 54th Street, was applied to mid-blocks, the effect was visible. With the proposed planning changes, developers would not be able to shift the same amount of floor area earned on the avenue to mid-block assemblage, a factor that will keep large-scale development down and encourage smaller towers on smaller lots. The irony, of course, is that zoning-lot marges do help retain older buildings. The builder may be less inclined to tear down a brownstone if he can not only use its air rights, but also use its site for something else.

The city also proposes certain “growth corridors” in midtown: between 39th and 34th Streets on Fifth Avenue; 42nd to 43rd on Sixth; and along 34th from Fifth to Eighth Avenue. The blocks between those areas, would be allowed to go to 15. These growth corridors, replete with tax abatements, will no doubt begin to reflect the change in FAR soon enough. The stores in the mapped growth area, such as Lord & Taylor’s at 33rd Street, will probably feel the pressures first—not

Following the publication last June of its final report on the midtown’s growth, the zoning, the New York City Planning Department is currently writing and mapping the zoning legislation. The regulations will then go before community planning boards for hearings, a review by the City Planning Commission, and finally an approval by the Board of Estimate. The following is a discussion of the proposals, their apparent strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Photos: Laurence Kutnicki
Analyzing a building according to the amount of sky it blocks is an important move, but it doesn’t guarantee low-rise buildings will stay.

To give some flexibility to architects for the tower forms, city planners Patrick Ping-tae Too and Michael Parley came up with various ways the rules could be modified. They defined another sky exposure curve, called the “%I curve,” that sets up a second envelope limit to which the building bulk may reach beyond the regular sky exposure curve, if it compensates for the encroachment by setting back or receding from the curve at another point on the lot.

The second tier allows towers to score “daylight points” rather than having to conform to sky exposure curves. This tier, based on the proposal submitted, extends the City Planning Department, Davis Brody Associates and Kwartler/ J ones, allows bulk to be judged on a “performance basis.” Thus this tier is tied to a Daylight Evaluation Chart where building bulk is plotted according to the Waldram Diagram to determine how much sky is blocked by proposed development if one stands in the center of the street or looks at the building in profile down the block. The building must attain a certain score, based on the 70-degree average that the buildings set back according to 1916 zoning, and the 75-percent sky “dome” around most buildings.

In this a building’s reflectivity is given importance, since the qualities of certain materials affect the perception of bulk. Kwartler/ J ones found out that a mirrored glass building like the Fisher building may have only 20 percent reflectivity, while the Cinerama building, clad with a light aluminum skin, has a 40 percent quotient.

The consultants had proposed making the Waldram Diagram and this “performance” approach the main part of the zoning revisions. However, their proposal met with resistance from architects, developers, and city planners, who thought it would be too difficult to use this means to determine how much sky the building would block out.

While it would seem that a computer could easily do the calculations, City Planning decided just to make this method an alternate to the sky exposure curve methods. Even in the second tier, the Waldram Diagram only plots the amount of sky the new development will block, not the amount of sky left over from developments on either side. Naturally, there are a lot of arguments against getting too “contextual,” but there are certain zones, Madison Avenue in the 50’s, for example, where new buildings should be very low in height to compensate for sizable towers on either side.

While this performance-oriented tier allows more flexibility to the architect, it will only be a backup system. Therefore, the developer who wants to make his life easy will probably follow the tower shapes suggested by the first tier. Certain towers will no doubt become stereotypes. Just as the 1916 zoning resulted in “wedding cakes,” and the 1961 zoning encouraged “shoe boxes” stood on end in a plaza, this zoning curve, called the “%I curve,” has certain rules like the “Diagonal Compensation Rules,” the first tier, with its “sky exposure curve” refers to the sky exposure plane and setback provisions of the 1916 zoning. This curve begins above a given maximum street wall height, and like that of 1916 setback, is adjusted to the street width. For example, it would slope upward and inward from the street line, starting at a 90-foot height on a 60-foot-wide street.
The street district is aimed at making street wall heights adjust to existing development. Every site would be evaluated in relation to a perceptual field measuring 1000 feet in both directions. With each new development the City Planning Department would look at the dominant street wall heights and the range of variation; then try to adjust the new wall to that height. The street district would have also addressed the problem of a building fronting a corner property; now if a building on an avenue is allowed to go to a certain height, that height wall can wrap around the building for a length of 100 feet into the side street, where it doesn't belong.

Much of the midtown zoning report makes a lot of sense, although (naturally) it should have been proposed years ago. The cautious approach to incentive bonuses (which, nevertheless, should not be tossed out completely) and the reapportionment of bulk on the sites all show a strong, well-thought-out redirection. Most important, by applying a performance way of thinking to city planning, along with criteria for daylight and openness, the city is acknowledging the importance of the pedestrian's perception in appreciation of the built environment.

No longer are new developments being understood as if one is viewing them from an airplane; they are being evaluated, as most people see them—from the ground up. This is commendable. However, many specifics of the zoning proposal will have to be scrutinized closely. The FAR "limits" sound as if they limit more than they do: they will still allow high construction to go up in the east side of midtown, but just block less of the sky. Low-rise buildings over most of midtown are doomed to disappear, except in a few instances where they are declared landmarks or occupy specially designated mid-blocks. In the end there will still be many buffly designed, boring-looking towers, just with some slightly new shapes.

The most dubious parts of the City Planning report concern the areas the proposal only touches upon. For example, the Clinton residential neighborhood, west of Eighth Avenue between 43rd and 57th Streets is in trouble. It was given a low-density, low-rise special neighborhood preservation status in 1974 because of community objection to the growth expected if the New York Convention Center had been built as planned at 44th Street and the Hudson. The residents should be worried again, for there is specific mention of revising Clinton zoning and "looking into the feasibility of a new kind of high-density residential district for the housing market that is essentially Midtown-oriented." Sounds like luxury highrises for Clinton.

As disturbing is mention in the report of the establishment of a New York City Economic Development Corporation to provide assistance in site assembly through its powers of condemnation "if necessary." Does the ease with which developers may level parts of midtown—obviously older and potentially more historic fragments—have to be aided by the city? The condemnation clause will help preempt "holdouts," the developers' curse. But it robs those who own their own home or business of a little stability in this sea of change.

The midtown zoning report's intentions and the concrete proposals are sound. But unless vulnerabilities and ambiguities are addressed in the coming months, it won't do much good. There will still be "overbuilding"—it will just be in different places.
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Palladio, would have helped to place Palladio's 
contribution in perspective and thus amplified 
the true significance of the exhibit. Likewise, a 
photograph of Hayon's archaeological "restoration" 
done in 1811 for the Temple of Fortune at Palestina 
could have clarified Palladio's brilliant pyrotechnic 
inventions on the same theme.

Other works in the show reinforce Palladio's 
importance: While Bramante's Tempietto in Montorio 
is a vital reassemblage of ancient parts, Palladio's 
Tempietto at Maser recombines various architectural 
forms, such as the temple front, the cruciform plan, 
and the centralized dome, without compromising any 
of their separate qualities. Palladio studied the 
Roman Imperial baths and extrapolated their 
symmetrical and hierarchical organization into a new 
kinds of volumetric ensemble: the villa at Meledo. This 
remained an important organizational paradigm well 
into the twentieth century, and enabled modern 
programmatic and technological problems to be 
solved with a purely classical vocabulary of forms.

Anders Neece

Portrait of Andrea Palladio by C.B. Magasza. 
Courtesy of Counts Angelo and Paolo di Valmarana

Last spring at the Institute for Architecture and 
Urban Studies there happened an unlikely series of 
"conversations" under the rubric ReVisions. 
Organized by a diverse group—Deborah Berke, 
Walter Chanham, Christopher Hubert, Rob Lively, 
Mary McLeod, Joan Ockman, and Alan Platt— 
better left unexamined, culminating in a meeting of 
young architects (those under 35), the intention was to 
provide an alternative to more traditional 
symposia and lectures where an establishment 
embrace and inhibit more general participation. It 
was to be a forum without fear of recrimination, 
reproach, or reproof.

The schedule—a dozen Monday evenings with topics 
like "Post-Modernism, Who's Generation?"; 
Small-Scale Projects; and "Politics, Taste and the 
Avant-Garde"—ranged from the abstract to the 
actual, hinting at opportunities to see real work, 
history, criticism, and theory. It started from 
the printing on the poster, however, that we should 
ot expect the "same old stuff."

Unpredictability was the most promising aspect of the 
series. As we are in the midst of the most 
advancing and most bizarre period in the history of 
architecture, anything may happen. Parties 
with mud pies or raspberry soufflés—and both were achieved. 
The variations were provoked by the differing 
characters of the organizing committee members, 
supplemented by an equally diverse, often tested, 
succession of presentations, and complemented by 
the unexpected elements of the audience.

An important premise of ReVisions was that the 
audience would be instrumental in determining the 
agenda, direction, and level of the discussion. Most 
surprising was that the group remained large 
and fairly diverse throughout. Although it was often 
disappointing in its self-restraint, the audience 
generally served to keep discussion directed at what 
we felt was the point, abetting or beating down the 
flights of the presenters. One observer remarked after 
the last successful evening that "understanding what 
just happened is like trying to untangle Sleights 
that children have left tangled on the stairs."

A few specific observations remain to be made in 
retrospect:

—Curiously, architects seem more stable than artists 
when faced with having to explain themselves. 
Mayan mythology, when combined with Heidegger 
and Hesse, is too heavy to be translated to the young; 
particularly to associates in large firms who 
are not yet ready to make the leap. 
—Politics, philosophy, and social well-being 
no longer appear to be acceptable as prima 
generators of architectural respectability. 
—Sources are a very personal matter and often 
bespeak the tastes of those who write them.

—Top marks should go to all those who had 
the character necessary to put personal 
expression in review before a jury of peers; extra applause for 
those who had work built. 
—There is little hope for Columbus Circle.

This last point brings up the concluding event of 
ReVisions. As the questions, accusations, and 
generalities have been aired, an "unholy" dinner was 
held calling for a redesign of Columbus Circle. The 
product—if you will—rewrote the wide variety of 
concerns and the balance of perspectives and 
talent that had become apparent during the series. 
The projects involved imaginative solutions that revealed 
realism, astringency, whimsy, or humorous 
objecthood; there were many "don't-you-wish-it-could-be" fantasies of 
various degrees of imagination and 
strictly graphic musings of many derivations. 

Since it was intended in its very inception to be 
[360 854 370 854] inconclusive, there can be no final judgment on 
ReVisions except recognition of the experience itself.

M. G. J.
**Breuer**

During the summer the Museum of Modern Art in New York presented a retrospective focusing on two of the talents of Marcel Breuer. "Furniture and Interiors," curated by Christopher Thomens (Thomens: 1958 Years of Furniture) 1951, displayed, in a very Breueresque manner of straightforward and elegant organization, the objects and qualities that made Breuer famous very quickly and a continuous influence on modern design. The tubular steel furniture that he designed for six brief years, from 1925 (1958) to 1931, and the apartments and pavilions of the late 1920s and early 1930s are exemplary of the essence of Modern design, defined by the synthetic, holistic vision of the Bauhaus master. Designers are indebted to this day to Breuer’s invention and the spirited search it represented.

After his last tubular steel design, Breuer experimented in aluminum, bent or laminated wood, cut-out plywood, and even stone. Both furniture and interiors slowly lost the geometric rigidity of the Bauhaus designs, developing an increasing massiveness and texture; the furniture acquired qualities inspired by Aalto and Hans Arp, the interiors those of New England stone. Although the later work is more problematic than the early innovations, it is naturally in sequence part of a logical, seamless progression: metal to wood to stone, and furniture to rooms to houses to larger things.

Breuer’s furniture as seen at the Modern was the result of an imagination and intuition exploring, as by necessity, the use of a material to its most characteristic capability. In the exhibition and the comprehensive catalogue, we are witness to the solution of Breuer’s vision, his curiosity, and his increasing inventiveness.

M.G.J.

**Ventris flat, London, 1936**

*Courtesy of the Museum of Modern Art*

"The Drawings of Andrea Palladio" was first seen at the National Gallery of Art in Washington. During October it will be at U.N.C./Chapel Hill and is traveling from there to San Antonio, Harvard, and Memphis. The magnificent exhibition catalogue contains all the examples from the show, accompanied by an introduction and notes on the work by Douglas Lewis, curator of the exhibition. The book was produced to accompany the show by the International Exhibitions Foundation in Washington.

**The End of the Road**

To most of us, road culture means Fords on the freeways and shopping malls in the suburbs. But alongside (or underneath) that road lies another—the road of the move west, of the gas pump, the Mom-and-Pop diner and the motor hotel; of strips and drags and Route 66. Alarmed that this road may be at an end, John Margolies photographed it. Five years, 100,000 miles, and 15,000 slides later, he has a record that is both a celebration and a memorial: "The End of the Road: Color Photographs by John Margolies," which was on view at the Hudson River Museum from July 18 to September 13.

These photos are fun in a nostalgic way (remember Mobils' flying red horse?). The real interest, though, is almost semiotic and yet, fortunately, Margolies does not decode these signs and symbols. Rather, he photographs them straight, and captions them with an essay that suggests how they came to be. Road culture, he writes, depended on three things: gas, everyone's car—the Model T—and asphalt. By 1910 the culture had emerged; 1920 to 1935 was its Golden Age, the period of diners and drive-ins. Then, corporate America slowly ate up all the Eats and teepee motels, and the country road became a monotonous Monopoly board of McDonald's (1955) and Holiday Inns (1953). (Named after the 1942 movie with Bing Crosby and Fred Astaire, the chain, significantly, modeled its sign after a movie marquee.) These rooms at the farm passed from the cabin to the bungalow court to the mega-motel. Giant logs like the Golden Arches replaced local signs, as the corporate logic ("the best surprise is no surprise") was pounded home by ads on TV.

What really redrew the map was President Ike's Interstate Highway system. A defense measure (remember, this was the time of the backyard bomb shelter), it was designed to evacuate cities. In many ways, it did just that. The highway network rerouted traffic, bypassed towns, and with the new high speeds and zone restrictions, changed the nature of roadside architecture.

Indigenous and diverse, the old-road culture has a kitschy allure. Its architecture shows a genius for the literal, as when shops serve as their own signs. One of Margolies' best examples is Bob's Java Jive in Tacoma, Washington—a coffee-shop in the shape of a coffee-pot. The road also shows a love for the sham/authentic: many of the old diners were made to look like old railroad cars. When the product was standardized, as in the case of gas, early roadside dealers would resort to the kitschy and core, such as the dinosaur station in Wall, South Dakota, "The Only Dinosaur Station of its kind in the World."

The true test of design ingenuity came when there was nothing on the road, so much nothing that a stop somewhere was necessary. Such was and is the dubious raison d'être for the "roadside amusements"—attractions that exist as such and often nothing more than to generate the "I've Been To . . ." bumperstickers.

Margolies ends with a plea for revivification and "preservation." Road architecture, we are told, is our "definitive contribution to the art of design in the twentieth century." Margolies exaggerates, and the hyperbole is pointed, for if such architecture is our "definitive contribution," it must be "preserved. But how can we "preserve" an "architecture" that is improvised, often ephemeral, by nature? It almost seems we should also preserve it from a museological status—the status of a tradition to which it never pretended, let alone knew. To place examples of roadside architecture in a museum would give it a false aura; to place photographs of such architecture in a museum as Margolies does begin the process. Kitsch creations can also be made sacred objects.

And yet, this is our own "folk architecture," one that modern design largely effaced. John Margolies rightly insists on its importance, although occasionally he seems to use the salvation of Bob's Diner as an excuse for the "prequel" to its decline. As the Post-Modern architects—the Pop artist in architectural academia, the Friend of the People in the "compound." It is hard to see The End of the Road apart from the polemics of Post-Modern architecture. Both Philip Johnson and Robert Venturi are important to Margolies—Venturi, in particular. He is, of course, the spokesman of the "vernacular"—that is, of an architecture that conflates commercial signs with architectural symbols. In fact, The End of the Road catalogue reads like a "prequel" to Learning from Las Vegas (1972) by Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour. Both books stress that road architecture is best comprehended from the car, and both note that signs often signify a building type more than its actual form. More important, both acquiesce to "low culture." ("It proves that what we are best at is being tacky and commercial.") But Margolies' roadside architecture is different from Venturi and Scott Brown's: These Mom-and-Pop businesses are pre-Vegas, i.e., pre-consumerist culture. The End of the Road could not be described—as Kenneth Frampton described Learning—as "ideology in its purest form," one that "condones . . . ruthless kind" and "revives the brutality of our own environment.

Hal Foster
Robert Moses, New York's supreme master builder, public works genius, Power Broker, and former godlike shaper (and mis-shaper) of 20th-century New York City and State urbanism, died a somewhat ignominious death at age 92 in West Islip, Long Island, on July 29. Since his resignation in 1966 of the all-powerful Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority in 1968, he had been almost forgotten by the millions whose lives he had directly influenced. Moreover, he left a mere $5,000 in personal assets, although he spent a total of $472 billion of city, state, and federal funds on projects initiated during his years of power (1924-68).

Moses' reign as city builder and wielder of power through "fourth avenue government," or Public Authority, included the forging of some 627 miles of highways in and around New York City; building 13 bridges and tunnels, among them the Verazzano-Narrows, the Bronx-Whitestone, the Queensboro and Triborough. Moses himself never learned to drive a car and never paid a toll. He created at total of 2,567,250 acres of state parkland, built 635 playgrounds, and sculpted beaches for the public. Moses' Jones Beach, which opened in 1930, is, according to Paul Goldberger, "an elaborate seaside Xanadu for the masses," though there has been much doubt as to Moses' plans to include nonwhite minorities in recreational facilities as part of those masses.

Moses' "monsters" included numerous housing and "urban renewal" projects, often laced with graft and corruption on the part of the developers. Moses, however, was never implicated, nor was he criticized for these scandals in the press. The Massie-Gagnon and Title I debacles of the '50s were discussed openly only in the Post, and it was not until "The Battle of Central Park," published in 1967, that Lippman and Side matrons were photographed weeping against a background of bulldozers (Moses' henchmen, who were then tearing down the Green on the Green to make way for a parking lot), did public and press finally associate the name of Moses with the image of a bulldozer. A New Times editorial signaled Moses' downfall, and television helped to spread the word. Moses' destroyed parks in addition to creating them.

Moses' conservation in politics (FDR was his bitter enemy) was reflected in the legislation he drafted, circumventing the democratic process and抔ching his authority to control funds and back forests, and to manipulate on a grand scale properties, funds, and politics, treating New York "like a giant Monopoly board," according to Robert Caro's Pulitzer Prize-winning biography, Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York (Knopf, 1974). In chiseling highways, thousands of elderly and poor tenement residents were uprooted—in a single mile of the path of the Cross Bronx Expressway, 1500 apartments.

Moses' character appeared to be riddled with contradictions: Calvanistic, "idealistic," fighter for government reform at city and state levels, lover of poetry and literature, but man of fiction and "black" as well as "white," to quote one of his admirers. As "the man who did it all," he also is a man that New York could not do without, a man well suited to the job, a politician, a construction baron, a general of the war of the highways. He was, in a way, all the things he was not, and more.
Marcel Breuer, who died after a long illness on July 3, was born on May 22, 1902 in Pecs, southwest Hungary, the son of a dental technician. At 18 he left home to attend the Akademie der Bildenden Kunste in Vienna, worked in an architect’s office there, and soon after left for Weimar, to attend a new art school—the Bauhaus. Breuer graduated from the Bauhaus in 1924, and began teaching there in 1925. His close association with Walter Gropius was to last for many years, and he later took up an architectural practice in Berlin 1928-1931. He began teaching in 1931 in the Accademia delle Belle Arti in Venice, an architect’s office there, and the Akademie for Dental Technician in London 1960—1961. He moved to New York City and established his own office there in 1961, the already ailing architect received Knoll International, which was accepted by his wife Constance. The firm, known as Marcel Breuer Associates will continue under the leadership of principals Beckhard, Robert Gatje, Tician Papachristos, and Hamilton Smith.

Marcel Breuer
1902-1981

Research Center for IBM France, La Gaude, 1960 Flaine Resort, Haute Savoie, France, 1960

Richard Meier

In the late 1950s when I came to New York to work I was naturally drawn to Marcel Breuer’s office because of the high quality of architectural work he had produced. The office, located above Schrafft’s on the northeast corner of Fifth-seventh and Third, was small—only about a dozen or so people in 1960, though by the time I left three years later it had already expanded to about twenty. The commissions were large and many young people came to work, as I did, for this architect famous for his high level of design, craftsmanship, and detailing. Even more compelling was his attention to the way materials could be combined. He intuitively knew how to play one material against another to create an integrated architectonic whole. Just look at the way he used wood, glass, and stone in the Connecticut houses of the 1940s and ’50s, where both rough and smooth textures, massive and planar walls are all contrasted with each other extremely elegantly.

Sometimes his use of materials was too elaborate for me. The house’s hierachy plans, separating private and public areas by an entrance way, had their limitations. But generally the spatial character, quality of light, and detailing were exemplary. Moreover, the Breuer house was a space that you see in the early Neutra houses you see again, but Breuer adapted successfully to the specific setting.

One of my favorite Breuer projects was a very early one—the Dunham House in Princeton, New Jersey in 1934. The simplicity in which the complex program was adjusted to the light site, and the way the whole project held together, plus the highly differentiated character of its various elevations have always held an enormous appeal for me. By the beginning of the 1960s Marcel Breuer’s office had quite a few large-scale commissions. The UN office was completed, and St. John’s Abbey was under construction. I began working on the ski resort project in Haute Savoie and the Temple B’nai Jeshurun in Short Hills, New Jersey (a project later realized by Kelly & Gruzen).

The IBM office in La Gaude was also being designed then—a project that indicated Breuer’s beginning absorption with precast concrete and concrete poured-in-place structures. It seemed that after IBM, many projects presented variations on the IBM frame and system. In fact I was surprised to find that even Flaine, a ski resort, would also be seen as an opportunity to develop the precast concrete solution. Even a special manufacturing and assembly plant was erected specially for this project.

In retrospect, it seems that there was a greater diversity in his work when the commissions were smaller in scale. But Breuer was quite committed to concrete. And he was very pragmatic. He didn’t have the luxury of choosing the technique necessary for his own development.

Since the technology was there and factories could produce the precast paneling economically, Breuer felt committed to it—even though it was ultimately to force him into a box-like solution limited by his vocabulary. In his large-scale work he began more to search for a more inventive structural form rather than concentrating on the spatial quality of the architecture, as he had done with smaller commissions.

Breuer had definite ideas about the way he wanted things done. It was not in his personality to discuss problems with the young architects in the firm, and he was not a person to communicate with his clients. When clients were approached—Hamilton Smith, Herbert Beckhard, and Robert Gatje, Tician Papachristos, and Hamilton Smith—Breuer came away from the experience with a real sense about how a small office doing quality work was perceived, and how a hierarchy of design was formulated, and how a hierarchy of design was formulated, and how a hierarchy of design was formulated.

I’ve been surprised and saddened by the approach taken in the obituary of Breuer or in the view of the show “Marcel Breuer, Furniture and Interiors” on view at the Museum of Modern art through September 15. Emphasizing Breuer’s furniture design seems to negate the value of his architectural work in the last thirty years. Although it is easy to disagree with his architectural point of view, the important projects he executed had an enormous influence on architecture at the time.

The furniture, of course, is innovative. Breuer’s use of furniture to mold the spatial character of an environment in particular influenced my thinking about furniture and interior design. He saw furniture in context—Breuer did not just place the furniture in a room, but combined it with the architecture to create an integrated part of the overall design object. This vision was consistent down to the smallest detail. The scale and the proportion of the furniture, the detailing and craftsmanship of his design and architecture, the play of contrasting materials, and the interaction between space and enclosure are all qualities in Breuer’s work that were to be particularly influential in the formation of my own approach to architecture.

Vincent Scully

The first time I met Marcel Breuer he courageously expressed contempt for the work of Frank Lloyd Wright. This was at a Museum of Modern Art symposium entitled “Where is Modern Architecture Going?” I next met Mr. Breuer while paying a visit to Philip Johnson’s new house in New Canaan in 1949. He was Russell Hitchcock was also present and consistently referred to Breuer as "Lajko" or something of that sort. This confused me; I thought his name was Marcel. I happened to have some plans with me of a house that Wright had designed for me, and Breuer expressed his contempt for those as well. I ventured to suggest that Gropius had been directly influenced by Wright at Cologne and elsewhere, but Breuer said that was a long time ago and Wright was no longer (ah, the zeitgeist of our time).

Later it turned out that Wright’s design—though naturally, supremely beautiful—was in fact about doubling my budget. So I hopefully designed my own house, which was entirely different—not supremely beautiful, certainly. But when I needed a siding detail to help create a very cheap wall with a diagonal bracing it was Breuer’s use of diagonal siding on his own house in New Canaan, 1947, which was used to find that sanctioned for me the use of a similar detail. So, in the end, Breuer influenced me at the critical moment much more than Wright did. I thought that Johnson’s calling him a “Peasant Mannerist” at that time was amusing but a little cruel. Thinking back though, it now seems to me to have been exact. Breuer could design much smaller house-out in the country, the way my house and Villa Madinah. And those little houses had a kind of authenticity. They were Breuer’s own and what the times were. They are still Breuer’s best work in America. He could never build a large building for reasons self-evident from the above. His work was small, Peasant-Mannerist, and for a few years after World War II, and in a few very buildings, he was probably the best at it in the world.

Neutra out in California, though somewhat older, should be considered his proper contemporary rival, and Neutra probably built more good houses than he did. But Breuer had that funny tension and somehow that air of紀錄，economic. But everything I just described, a dream of neo-Bauhaus design exercise combined with a program almost wiped clean of history and of cultural reference other than that to the past twenty-five years and occasionally, for decoration, to the debris of primitive societies. But more immediate traditions, such as those of the American Indians, the Indian Style, with which we had held so on, were there all right but neither valued, nor really recognized. Their ghostly presence of course adorns 5.6 the invisible tensions involved. Why hung this hut in a tree?

Marcel Breuer and his wife Constance, at home in New Canaan, 1947.
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Q. Peter Eisenman:

Your earlier books seem to have been an attempt to terrorize the reader by exposing him to anarchy and alienation, and saying, “Look, this is what is in your society.” I had thought you would introduce the same nihilistic approach to the architectural “compounds” you discuss in your book.
A. Tom Wolfe:
Nihilism? Terror? I only wanted to discover new slices of life and bring them alive in print; now I want to show how architects compete with one another in tiny, sectarian "compounds," and create styles millions are stuck with. I'm talking about Modernism and its latter-day guppies.
P.E.: But to the bourgeois-reading public you made a dramatic cultural critique couched in a dissimulating but nevertheless literary style. To serve it up to the bourgeoisie was an anachronic gesture; it shook the very roots of that
class. What I do not see in this book is the blasting apart of architecture. You catch the current scene accurately but without that devastating cultural critique? To what extent is this merely an "insider's" view, backroom gossip, or is it to be considered for architecture what The Painted Word was for the art world?

T.W.: For a start, there is no bourgeoisie in America; but there are several others. The American bourgeoisie I refer to is the small owner, the hand-printed paper news. The Painted Word began to see there were many similarities between painting and architecture. In both fields you have artists devoting all their energies and talents to illustrating theories. The theories have nothing to do with the country they are living in and nothing to do with them and their personal vision. A half-century of architecture in America — the very Babylonian slums — has been based on the work of a handful of architects in Germany and Holland who were designing sectarian and sectoid forms for worker housing and the rubble of the First World War. The basic principles of 1920s Middle-European Modernism — of "expressing" structure, banishing decoration, and designing in code so as to be the bourgeoisie — remain in excellent health in American architecture today. Robert Venturi says he believes in ornament, but he really doesn't know how. He has been defying his aesthetic to make his attempt a new piece of ornament. Look at his Knoll showroom ceiling. He does an Adam ceiling in backlit plaster. He does a decorative plaster decoration — which would be hopelessly bourgeois — in backlit plastic — which is nonbourgeois. Thus he pulls himself back from the jaws of apostasy at the last minute. This is the Venturiesque, that is to say the designer who would like to violate it. Incidentally, I'm only using the word "bourgeois" because architects think this way. They believe their own myth. Or look at the way Venturi, Graves, and Moore combine classical motifs — bourgeois — with cardboard walls — nonbourgeois. Charles Moore's Piazza d'Italia in New Orleans looks like a set for a resort community production of Aida. The implication of classical ornament is masonry construction — bourgeois — but the thin skin of the Modern wall — nonbourgeois — saves the day. Venturi and the others always "flatten" and "generalize" classical motifs, to use Venturi's terms, whereas the natural tendency of classical ornament is toward embellishment and enrichment. Once again: violating the taboo without violating the taboo. Venturi stays within the compound, within the monastery walls, or, rather, he runs along the top of the wall doing one-and-a-half-gainers. At any moment you think he will fall off, but he doesn't.

With Robert Stern's latest writings you see this business of running up on top of the walls getting too dizzying. We may be headed for a period of sheer cerebralism like the late 19th Century. But I don't think straight cerebralism will gain prestige. You still have to stay within the walls. Now, Venturi knows how to stay out on top of the wall. Sterne's going to get nowhere if he insists on — as he seems to be doing — a return to "classicism." I haven't seen his buildings, but if he really becomes a revivalist, he will lose points in the compound. Philip Johnson is perilously close to becoming the new Edward Durell Stone. Although he is subtle, sophisticated and urbane, he doesn't seem to understand the need to stay within the walls as well as Venturi. He probably has gone too far — as did Stone, who also started out as an orthodox modernist. He is beginning to be talked about in that tone accompanied by that knowing shrug and the arched eyebrows that you see when someone is referred to who is falling out of favor. The top of the AT&T Building was going too far toward sheer rationalism. Same with the crystal battenings he is designing for Pittsburgh. Graves is much more hip in that sense. It would be a marvelous time for somebody to step forward with a new approach.

P.E.: But why don't you make your position clear about who that would be? It has not seemed to me an interesting in an ideological position in architecture. If there is an attitude, it is about populism.

T.W.: I have no interest in playing John the Baptist or in populism for that matter. The most important part of the book From Bauhaus to Our House will probably get the least amount of attention. It has nothing to do with whether modern architecture or post-modern architecture is good or bad, or in or out; the aesthetic question is the least important in all this. The most important part is the process by which a handful of artists in one sectarian context could create an architectural style that could take over the United States, a style that has nothing to do with this country.

In effect Gropius, like van Doesburg, was saying, "The old order has had it. We, the artists, now have exclusive possession of the legitimacy and divinity of art." Here you have in a nutshell the strategy of the "compound," which was actually first developed by the Vienna Secession in the 1890s.

P.E.: In one sense you could argue that had there been no French Revolution there would have been no need for a compound. There was certainly no functional need for the compound's form or strategy. Its genesis really can be blamed on the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie wanted to get inside the walls of the compound, and therefore gain status At the compound is clearly the center of the bourgeois wants. The artists create these compounds so there will be a place for the bourgeoisie to penetrate. Actually the situation is not much different from what Hugh Hefner did with his Playboy mansions, or the trend today.

But the compound was consumed in the process. That is why we have no avant-garde. The middle class has achieved what it set out to do — absorb the avant-garde — and we are all the victims. You and I are victims of what we do not do. Nothing. This is a serious weakness, for if the bourgeoisie has encircled the walls of the compound and melted them down, where is art?

T.W.: In America the "bourgeoisie" or "middle class" wants nothing, intends nothing, and takes no action, because it has no existence other than as the modern intellectual word for what used to be called "the mob." The whole business of the "compound" has no meaning outside of a civilization that had a monarchy and a nobility, and in which there was a divine aura for artists and architects to have. In America never had a monarchy or a nobility. When the Bauhaus or de Stijl compounds were created, conditions were entirely different. There was no bourgeoisie in the U.S. and there still isn't. The bourgeoisie in Europe was the merchant townspeople as opposed to the landed nobility. Without a nobility or the tradition of one, the notion of a bourgeoisie loses all meaning because the bourgeoisie was imported by writers in the early 1920s, along with the rest of the European culture.

Starting with World War I, developments in the world of art and literature shows we have nothing to do with the world outside. The styles and fashions have their own mechanisms. The competition is between avant-garde and the world outside matters for naught. It hardly matters whether there is a bourgeoisie or not.

P.E.: But certainly what the society seems to want now is entertainment and the fulfillment of things that might be bought, consumed, and thrown away. The concept of art becomes less powerful in this context. The bourgeoisie always managed to keep art and architecture on the periphery of power. For example, someone like John Portman has power in the society, but no status in the compound.

T.W.: Portman has lost on the second level of the competition. There is a two-track competition among architects. Architects on the first track build. The second track of the competition is quite intellectual and depends on a thoroughgoing knowledge of what is happening in the world. There is competition for an architect to build almost nothing and to have a major reputation on the second track. The most striking example would be John Hejduk. He has executed only one commission I know of, and that is the renovation of the interior of Cooper Union. Yet he is an extremely well-known architect. I wouldn't be surprised if some corporation or government figure said ten years hence, "Rebuild Hell's Kitchen." And we'll have Hell's Kitchen rebuilt along the principles of half a circle, half a diamond, half a square. Robert Venturi is still the prime example of the importance of the second track. Even today clients are baffled by his architecture.

T.W.: From most architectural critics today you will learn nothing of this, nothing of the actual dynamics of architectural styles and fashions. Instead you get weather reports. To an Ada Louise Huxtable or a Robert Hughes, or a Douglas Davis, Modernism or any other prevailing style arrives like a Bermuda high. It's a big shift in the weather. Somehow it just happens in the air. Once it arrives, they blink and try to be avant-garde — "there you are," they keep saying, "there's the zeitgeist for you." But the zeitgeist doesn't create architectural styles. People do; architects, architects in specific competitive situations. What is important to me is to show exactly how this happens.

Next month in Skyline, Part II: Wolfe and Eisenman discuss the critics and writers about architecture today. What kind of criticism is needed to fully address the issues facing architects? Are architects today truly revolutionary and breaking out of the compound of modernism? Are all movements consumed and exhausted as Eisenman suggests has happened? Will or can architects have power in any other way?
Nebraska Competition

In May of this year a jury of peers decided on the commission for the Wick Alumni Center at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. This was the second stage in the judging, choosing between two finalists. The jury was: James Murphy, Executive Editor of Progressive Architecture, Helmut Jahn, James Ingo Freed, Charles E. Lawrence, and Bob Wick, sculptor and son of the major donor, Milton Wick. Following are excerpts from the commentary on the winning scheme by Gwathmey/Siegler.

Site: Corner.

James Murphy: What I find amazing is the absolute commitment to an idea.
Bob Wick: Yes. It’s crystalline. Yet I feel a terrific hardness to that front side. I was hoping there would be more indication of the verticality of the shaft at the center of the building.

Helmut Jahn: I’d like to discuss the possibility of that corner, where there’s nothing really going on inside.

Energy Competition

Ground has been broken in Princeton, New Jersey, for construction of an all-too-unnatural project, the result of an unusual series of partnerships. In 1979 Prudential Insurance Company approached Alan Chimacoff and the Princeton University School of Architecture to research methods of conserving energy in office buildings and to explore the effect of energy conservation on architectural form and expression. At the time, physicist Theodore B. Taylor was working at Princeton on the concept of an “ice pond,” which involves making ice during the winter and using it to cool buildings during the summer. Meanwhile, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill of New York and Flack & Kurtz Engineers were commissioned to work with Chimacoff on the design and to provide overall construction services.

The outcome of this collaboration is two very different prototype solutions for conserving energy in office buildings. The two buildings are part of an integrated “office park” site on the University’s Forrestal Campus. Architecturally they reflect contrasting expressions: The south building, by Chimacoff, uses passive means to achieve its objectives; it is basically solid, with windows cut through the limestone facade designed for the particular orientation of each elevation. The north building, by SOM partner Raul de Armara, demonstrates that an all-glass structure is equally viable: it is a double-layer wall: two layers of glazing with an 18” air space between; a thermal storage wall beneath the building is used to heat circulating air. Shading and ventilation in both buildings act to prevent heat buildup in summer, and skylights and “light slots” provide additional natural light on the interior.

Back to Taylor: an ice pond is incorporated in the complex. It covers one acre, an average of fifteen feet deep. During the winter the pond is filled through a process akin to snow-making on ski slopes, and in the summer the melt-water is enough to cool the buildings through the entire cooling season. The pond will be covered by a lightweight fabric structure. Estimated annual energy consumption for each building is 30,000 BTU/s.f.

This project is exemplary of the kind of research necessary to illustrate that energy-efficient buildings need not be restricted to high-tech aesthetics, overwhelming mass, or underground spaces; nor do they have to be smaller than a bread box. As energy-conscious design is becoming more and more attractive (and necessary) on a commercial level, no longer can lack of design flexibility be used as an excuse for awkward energy-efficient constructions.
Franzen's Champion H.Q.

Suzanne Stephens

In spite of the Modern Movement's declasé status, its principal force, the office tower, continues to thrive. The building Ulrich Franzen & Associates designed for Champion Illustrated magazine has a typical level of refinement that this type can achieve following an idiom where formal geometries and character elements are basically tied to structure, materials, and site conditions.

Champion's immediate surroundings in downtown Stamford are filled with showy reflective glass and metal buildings. The buildings of varying shapes and stylistic persuasions that do everything to capture one's attention, including an inverted pyramid that literally stands on its head. Franzen's more modest rectilinear form—no swooping curves, intersecting zigzags, reflective glass skins, shaped or chamfered corners—is by comparison stringently elegant. The building's success—and its weaknesses—pose interesting points for discussion as one looks at the building as a single entity, then analyzes it as an ensemble, then views it in terms of its context.

The most striking feature of the building is the pewter-colored aluminum panel system sheathing the spare tower form. The tower itself is composed of two rectangular prismatic parts in place, where elevators and service core would be installed.

While the plan and structure scarcely breaks new ground, the solution solves quite nicely the problem of accommodating the 460,000-square-foot principal site within their footprint. The ground plan is subdivided into two zones, each with ample views and multiple corner offices.

Instead of treating the tower as a box wrapped in a curtain wall, the architects have been forced to the premodern tripartite organization with a base, a middle, and a top. Although the tripartite scheme was developed from architects' perception of 19th-century towers as analogous to columns, replete with bases, shafts, and capitals, the slab configuration at Champion still lends itself to this. In this case, an 18-foot-high loggia, set within the exterior volume, codes the lobby as a lobby, while the unbroken porticos, also set within the volume, forms the base.

The elevations themselves vary in detail according to their orientation to the sun and the width of the particular elevations. For example, the wall facing north has flush fenestration, with windows tinted with their simmering coating. On elevations facing south, horizontal aluminum louvers cross in front of the recessed windows, while on the narrow east and west walls vertical louvers screen the window. The architects point to the 20-percent reduction in sun load resulting from this treatment, but one also notices that the louver pattern emphasizes the horizontality of the long slab walls and the vertical thrust of six short-end walls.

In order to dramatize the entrance path from the street corner to the lobby, Franzen placed an open cube clad in aluminum on a diagonal to the building. Based on the 30-degree angle of the column-and-beam structural bays, this "portal" establishes a grid-like geometry that is repeated throughout.

Nevertheless, lapses in the design execution weaken the impact of the concept. For example, the glass tube at the "portal" painted white inside doesn't keep up the metallic rectilinear geometry of the rest of the processional space leading to the lobby. The smoky strip of glass separating the two tower skins above the entrance lacks the brightness and hardness of the aluminum panels or the requisite reflectiveness of an "invisible" sheet. Materials inside the lobby continue the polished grid-like aesthetic—scored granite, aluminum paneling, glass block. The handling of the materials is not enough: nothing happens spatially as the diagonal axis of movement meets the orthogonal grid.

View of the entrance

The design of the Whitney Museum branch, which Franzen did not do—does little to reinforce the architectural concept. The Whitney, to be sure, has made an important gesture to Stamford, as has Champion Paper, which brought the museum there. The gallery space, designed by Charles Froom, provides a nicely compact subdivided space for viewing art. However, the gallery design generally follows its own system of proportions and materials for walls and ceilings. An opportunity for making the comprehension of architecture and the apprehension of art into one experience was lost.

Paradoxically, other parts of the architectural ensemble that Franzen & Associates did execute seem as if they too were designed by other hands. It is not easy to make an 8-story garage for 1000 cars sympathetic to the 15-story aluminum-clad tower. The scale and material of the concrete structure, fronting the main street and edging the plaza, overwhelms all else in size, texture and mass.

The plaza between the garage and tower is over-designed: curving lines and pink granite walls and pavers add a tone quite different from the gridded-paving pattern and the use of another disengaged cube of aluminum framing members. This time the cube is set on axis with the neoclassical post office across the street, and looks as if the architects were genuinely thinking about reinforcing that modular progression of open to closed shapes.

The planting of a diagonal path of trees is too controlled. The bosque-like setting, gradually taking over the man-made one, should have been pushed as counterpoint to the grid, thereby loosening it.

The architectural ensemble of the Champion headquarters, located at the edge of Stamford's new office development near the railroad station, faces what is left of Stamford's old and seedy main thoroughfare. The sleek, metallic Champion building would not be called "contextual" in terms of referring to the style and scale of these older buildings—only in terms of acknowledging the street itself. Yet even accomplishing that, in addition to placing the building's lobby and the Whitney branch at the street level, is a major contextual move in comparison with other new construction downtown.

Champion headquarters adjoins an urban renewal area in which a number of office buildings called the Stamford Forum are being developed by F.R. Rich. The developer's vision calls for the buildings to sit on podium-like garages with pathways and parks elevated high above streets. This vision so far makes the new construction look like vestiges of the end-of-the-world flood scene in the latest disaster picture.

View of the plaza from garage

Like other Connecticut cities that benefited by the corporate exodus from New York in the 1970s, Stamford has been able to attract a lot of blue-chip corporations. In recent years developers and corporate clients have been bringing in big-time architects to add a little "class" to the architectural operations—heretofore dominated by the sci-fi kitch of Victor Bisharat. The next question, of course, is, will the "good" architecture do much good? Frankly, so far the newcomers like Mitchell/Giurgola haven't turned the image around. Instead it looks as if most of the buildings have caught the Bisharat version of elephantiasis. It is too difficult to speculate what buildings by Hugh Stubbins, Coen Pells and Arthur Erickson, and Moshe Safdie planned for the area, will add to the mix.

Because Franzen's building is simple and polished, and does acknowledge the fact that it might be in a town with pedestrians and streets, it stands out all the more; but even it is not enough to generate a sense of place or impart a feeling of urbanity to the entire section. Isolated examples of "good" architecture without "good" urban design can't do it.

Most of the new buildings are anti-urban additions to a town already so torn apart by new speculative development that whatever character it had has long since disintegrated and would have to be reconstructed in a particularly thoughtful and imaginative way. One wants to believe that if enough small steps are taken, that somehow, accidentally, urban character will begin to form. But cities that do have that character were developed over time and within an urban framework.

Meanwhile, until that urbanity is offered in the surrounding environment of downtown Stamford, Champion International's employees will do quite well. Not only do they have the Whitney Museum right downstairs, but they also have half-a-door devoted to gymnastic equipment, a barber shop, showers, plus two floors of dining rooms. The main dining rooms—with rock-bottom prices—are outfitted to resemble the elegant modernity of big-city-chic restaurants; the upstairs top-see dining rooms simulate the interiors of private businesses' clubs. No one will have to take business contacts to nearby luncheonettes or drive 15 minutes to the "posh" frozen-French-food restaurant located in the shopping center. No one will have to leave the building. If one chooses not to leave the building, that person could be anywhere, except, of course, 245 Park Avenue, the company's former address.
I.M. Pei’s West Wing

El director Constantine

Attached to the side and back of Gay Lowell’s 1909 Beaux Arts building, the new wing contrasts sharply with that venerable, iconoclastic icon to Fine Art. Lowell’s and Pei’s structures each embody a particular vision of how art ought to be approached, and a particular notion of how they should be translated into architecture. A century apart on a time line, the two museums reflect largely different artistic and formal ideology of their respective eras. In their efforts to be “your kind of place,” museums equate and judge each other by design. Pei’s East Coast museums in particular, dowagers of the fine arts tradition, are among the most uncertain crisis—a crisis reflected in the situation with the Boston Museum of Fine Arts addition.

What does the West Wing say at the twilight of the twentieth century? By the exterior, the horizontal box preserves the total silence of a shopping center or an office park. In different surroundings, it might well be mistaken for either. Although its chief critic comparison to Pei’s earlier East Wing of the National Gallery in Washington, the West Wing is in fact a variation on another more recent Pei design, the projected New York Convention Center. In plan, the two showplaces are almost identical, with two or three stories of exhibition floors opening off a central multistoried gallery. Some effort has been made to revamp the Convention Center for this other place and purpose; to attach it to the old museum and to give it an artistry, rather than commercial flavor.

The West Wing attempts to be contextual. The flat Horizon is at the moment a row house, a low profile behind the vertical Beaux Arts facade on the major story. The Marine granite with which the new addition is clad comes from the same quarry as does the stone used to construct the original museum. But in this building, where the stone is piled into a temple to art, in the West Wing the same material shrinks the building with expensive-looking, anonymous casing over a concrete frame.

This apparent deference to the older building is deceptive. Pei’s blank box is now the museum’s official face. The West Wing has been designated the Museum’s main entrance (conveniently next to the parking area), and from now on Lowell’s porticoed and pedimented facade will make Gyanmian proclamations about a vanished culture to the desert of rundown Huntington Avenue.

If the West Wing’s exterior maintains a misleading silence vis-a-vis the original museum, its plan promises to make the old structure that it fails to deliver. From the bird’s-eye perspective Pei favors, the West Wing can be neatly into the figure-eight circulation loop of the Museum on two levels. Since Pei’s addition is now the main entrance, the aerial view implies that the new wing is intended to serve as an atrium to the succession of galleries in the two levels above of the older building. But on ground level, where spatial relationships have more dimensions and are more complex, the addition is less successful in introducing visitors to the rest of the Museum. The West Wing is all too clearly tucked onto the back side of the existing Pei’s lobby connects to the old building’s minor gallery contains art of the same lower quality. By contrast, Lowell’s building describes the hierarchy of the collection it contains.

Boston Museum of Fine Arts, main entrance

Pei’s addition dissonants; the West Wing sends mixed and confusing messages. Like a suburban mall, the new wing caters to the automobile, admitting pedestrians almost reluctantly. The entrance does into the corner is indicated primarily by the sweep of asphalt driveway (flanked by a much smaller sidewalk). On the interior, where one might expect a grand staircase ascending to the galleries containing Art, as in the classical type of museum, here one passes a reception desk and takes an elevator to the second-floor level of the “galleria” which, one senses, is where the action is.

The galleria is the climax of Pei’s design and it is spectacular. Long, light, white, and covered with a 200-foot-long barrel vault of glass, this three-storey nave of the new wing illuminates and organizes the structure, dividing the exhibition space on the first and second floors from the museum shop and the restaurant above.

Here Pei has brought all his particular skills to bear. High Modernism reigns: strong modern materials are rendered with cool geometries. Pei has once more achieved the effects for which he is famous: gapping big spaces; balconies and glass enclosures that operate as both stage and opera box, making everybody in the building simultaneously actor and audience.

Here too, Pei has used details that have come to identify his style in new ways. His familiar board-marked concrete is utterly juxtaposed with lacquered wood (one looks like wood but isn’t, the other doesn’t and is). The lamps along the wall of the galleria are two-dimensional renditions of his well-known glass globes.

Cognoscenti will spot Pei quoting bits of others’ work as well as of his own. There’s just a whiff of Aldo Rossi’s proportioning in the fenestration at either end of the galleria; and a stronger smell of Rossi’s much-reproduced Galleria housing project in the long, lintel-like elements placed over the row of tall white columns of the galleria’s open side.

But the architect to whom the West Wing owes the most—and to whom it owes an apology—is Louis Kahn. The West Wing borrows several elements of Kahn’s Yale Center for British Art in New Haven, completed in 1977, after Kahn’s death. For example, the deeply coffered skylit ceiling of the West Wing’s major exhibition gallery closely resembles the skylit coffered ceilings of the Yale Center’s two interior courts.

But Kahn’s large coffers, each spanning one of the Center’s twenty-foot bays bring the structure of the building into play as decorative articulation. Pei’s skylit coffers are neither as powerful nor as integrated with the rest of the design and construction. They are smaller and shallower than Kahn’s, and admit less light. They brood three feet overhead rather than soaring three stories above.

Certainly the coffers of the West Wing are a clever solution to the problem of introducing natural light into the huge, low exhibition gallery and breaking up its otherwise sprawling, boxy space. They will offer greater flexibility in that partitions can be attached to their edges to subdivide the large gallery in a way that does not appear temporary. But where Kahn used them with the force of surprise to cover focal points, I.M. Pei Associates spreads them evenly over the entire expanse of gallery ceiling, like wall-to-wall carpeting.

The problem is that not the West Wing borrows Kahn’s vocabulary, or Rossi’s, or echoes earlier Pei, but that it fails to make its own statement. In Kahn’s design, all formal elements express a coherent vision the museum’s function, providing the aesthetic and physical framework for the better contemplation of art. This does not entail a subservient or silent architecture; on the contrary, the Yale Center provides a unique running commentary of light, space, and form on the art it houses.

In sharp contrast to the Yale Center’s conception, the West Wing assembles a cacophony of elements to solve a variety of curatorial and structural problems and create architectural fireworks.

The West Wing delivers, dutifully, the list of the program’s requests: both natural light and open-plan galleries; a huge museum shop, three cafeterias, one small auditorium, and a couple of offices. But the ingredients remain disparate. The wing thus accommodates ancillary programmatic functions and supplies splashy architectural effects. Of the 80,000 square feet in the West Wing, only 10,000 square feet are exhibition space. Art is a token presence.

As built descriptions of the self-image the grand old Fine Arts museums of the East are now trying to project, the West Wing and its kin reveal a profound insecurity and confusion on the part of these traditional institutions. The West Wing shares with its cousins in New York and Washington a singularly introverted quality, a single-minded dedication to space effects. What is true of the externally ornamented Beaux Arts facade of Lowell’s BMFA proclaimed the building a public institution devoted to culture with all the neoclassic facade the architectural vocabulary of its age could muster, Pei’s box offers no hint as to its function. The contradiction and the change that has taken place in the image of the museum—and indeed, in the image of all civic buildings, these new museum additions function as corporate and commercial buildings, and they have adopted the impermeable and placeless expression of these bastions of private enterprise.

Thus they become arrogant. They are not interested in relating to traditional museums, older cities, or art. Is this the architecture to bring art to the man in the street?
Architectural historian Anthony Vidler criticizes the arguments presented by his colleague Charles Jencks in his recent publication, *Post-Modern Classicism*.


*Cooking up*

Connecticut farm house, 1979, front elevation, Allan Greenberg
The idea of a new classicism that would purify architecture of its excesses, return to the rules and reestablish the true order, has been, since Vitruvius first criticized the "improper taste of the present" in Augustan Rome, a recurrent theme in architectural pedeme. In late-seventeenth-century France, it was raised against the "un-natural" distortions of Bernini and the Italian Baroque; later, the Rococo came in for the same treatment by the Abbe Laugier and his followers in "neo-classicism"; it was certainly a refrain of the 1920s, when Paul Valery, Le Corbusier, and others made common cause with the musicians against expressionism; fueled by Rudolph Wittkower's *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism*, the British brutalists tried out Golden Section rectangles in the fifties, at the same time as Mies van der Rohe was selling his version of the Temple to the U.S. corporation.

And now, that relentless encyclopedist of modern life, Dr. Jencks, tells us that it has surfaced yet again in a colorful display of classical references abstracted from the projects and buildings of almost anyone you might think of, a "new synthesis" is proclaimed, a "post-modern" classicism, that is no longer content, as was the Modern Movement, with a classicism by abstraction. Rejecting the apparatus of Modern Classicism, with its grids, proportional theories, references to Palladian plans, and ideals of typification drawn from Plato and Aristotle, this post-modern classicism, we are told, embraces the literal reference, the fragment of allusion, the wholesale revival of stylistic components, even the total image of the Orders. Realist as opposed to Formalist, populist as opposed to elitist, it revels in colorful plays on ancient and Renaissance, Beaux-Arts and Edwardian polychromy; it celebrates the eclecticism of the nineteenth century; it abhors social purpose in puritanical guise. Unashamedly consumerist and pluralist, it claims to "relate" to "what people want" directly by image, rather than typically by structure. This kind of classicism, however, seems in this definition to have little to do with what we normally understand by the term.

The Idea of Classicism
Classicism, as defined self-consciously by the theorists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was a doctrine that found its basis in the concept of beauty at once derived from what was termed "the imitation of nature" and from careful attention to the monuments of antiquity (generally Roman). Nature was the ideal, and it was thought that none had achieved its imitation so perfectly as the ancients; the harmonious laws of nature were to be found embodied in antique proportions; the laws of unity and order likewise. The academics of the seventeenth century referred continuously to rules, truth, nature, and the antique as the synonymous foundations of
their theories. Neoclassicism, while retaining much of this doctrine, expanded it in two ways: on the one hand by finding even more perfect sources for antique beauty in the art of Greece; on the other by making an explicit and moral connection between art and politics. While classicism was inherently a doctrine of the power of the court, neoclassicism was a doctrine of political “morality.” The state of the arts, it was held, was at once dependent on and a determinant of the state of political health of a nation. Classicism strove for an eternal calm, reflecting the unchanging principles of the universe: neoclassicism tried to find a primitive simplicity and strength, mirroring a new and fundamental republicanism. In Greece, a democratic and happy people favored by climate and health, living in a state of balance with nature, were a logical referent for the first generation of true revolutionaries.

As a doctrine, taught as a set of more or less conventional principles, the apparatus of classicism was preserved in the Neoclassical art: the Georgian Vicarage, Quatremer de Quincy, ruling the Ecole des Beaux Arts until 1830, was only the most tenacious of those who persisted until the end a stylistic eclecticism and a medieval revivalism that in the nineteenth century opposed to the ideology and the styles of the Modern; it hates the reference to mass society, industrial production, and government politics, which it finds creeping into so many modern movement polemics; it believes that such recognitions of twentieth-century reality as good as caused the collapse of the old order. It dreams of a return to a pre-Edwardian age, when all there was about was Upstairs and the people were respectful. It therefore characterizes as “historicism,” that is, Hegelisationism, or Marxism, and Darwinism all attempts to master the question of the now, preferring to remain in the ‘classical age’.

Then there is the kind of “classicism” that responds to Modern Movement architecture, on the stylistic level alone; this kind, colorfully captioned by Thomas Gordon Smith and Charles Moore, simply tries to copy, as faithfully as modern materials and workmanship allow, the forms of past classical Orders.

There is that “classicism” which, a development of neorationalism, has come to preoccupy Leo Krier, Maurice Culot, and their students, as the appropriate hand-aid with which to bind up the wounds of Modernism. Mr. Krier’s urbanism, an early-totalizing return to the classic even asks for a refusal of modern materials and modern techniques of building in favor of a new stone masonry. In this, even though much of the stylistic apparatus remains classic, the ideology is not far from that of a communal socialism of Ruskin and his followers, as they tried to rebuild the first age of industry with medieval methods.

Finally, there is the host of single or multiple references to the classic that may be found, from Venturi’s “iconic” column at Oberlin to the keynote motif in Michael Graves’ work; these “quotations from the classic” do not call for a return, nor do they stand entirely opposed to the modern. They utilize classical motifs, ideas, and even from history, as a widening of the lexicon of modernity.

Certainly these references abound in contemporary work. In case of any doubt, our art historian reminds us of project after project that has, in the last thirty years, utilized a classical column, a keystone, or even an arch in its composition. The sources of these allusions, as befits a scholarly treatise, are carefully displayed. Thus Venturi and his Claude Perrault and Edwin Lutyens. Moore has been the most vociferous of all, is a combination of Wendell Dätterlein (who supplies the transformation of the classic to the modern) and Treu, who donates the idea of attached ornament; Palladio, who is the supplier of ABA rhythms; Fischer von Erlach, who invents the temple, and Trevi, purveyor of the fountain. The list is endless; each architect is given an appropriate label. Of the classic and late-historicism sources, a pedagogue assures us that we are not looking at a thoughtless eclecticism, but rather a careful and conscious transformation of precedent. The eye of the critic is sharp, picking out from the mine of history inventively and resourcefully in order to persuade us of the existence of his post-modern classicism.

Sticky Labels

Stylistic categories are essential to art history: they allow the dominant tendencies of an age to be discussed, the identification and dating of works to where no written record exists, the comparison of different arts during the same periods, and, perhaps most important, when properly deployed, they permit judgment and discrimination among works of a similar genre. Since the end of the eighteenth century, in fact, the identification of styles has formed the major method of the art historian’s work. Stylistic categories are also among the most heatedly debated of art historical conclusions; they have led to often enervating and long, drawn-out discussions, little more than semantic nit-picking, over the proper use of terms; the hierarchy of the decades around categories like “mannerism” and “baroque,” “neoclassicism” and “romantic classicism” is a case in point. Repugnance is called by the “discovery” of a style hitherto thought subordinate, about, above, below, or even outside the general classifications. This was the case with the founder of the genre himself—Winkelman—and it was incredibly put to another use here toward the end of the nineteenth century. The revaluation of previous categories has become, since Dr. Jencks himself has demonstrated, the first step toward a promising career. At their best, stylistic categories are filled with content, supple, and intellectually challenging; at worst, they seem like labels covering the essential characteristics of their subject, or applied willfully and without insight as the easy substitutes for explanation.

Criticism, of the kind that illuminates the nature of a work of art, its internal structure, and external relations, has always been wary of style labels. The best criticism of the salons, from the spirited invention of art criticism by Diderot in the 1760s to the idiiosyncratic assessments of Baudelaire, has avoided categorization. The best criticism of contemporary architecture, too, from Momford to Rowe, has similarly tried to present the work directly and analytically to the reader, the alternating description of La Tourette by Colin Rowe is an example.

Recently, art historical categorization and contemporary criticism have become entangled; the modes of the one are being adopted by the other, with an aura of legitimacy. Dr. Jencks, from his first excursions into the labeling game, has been the foremost exponent of this new genre. In an attempt to sound “historical,” he has gathered together the productions of the moment under important-sounding titles; he has traced the “history” of these titles from year to year; with charts and evolutionary diagrams, he has tried to prove the applicability of his labels in every conceivable case. While few architects so labeled would necessarily find the attention unwelcome, the increasing catch-all quality of the

categorizations has irritated many. With the collection Post-Modern Classicism and a more recent article replying to his critics, “The Battle of the Labels,” Dr. Jencks has displayed fully his theory of history, his motives for labeling in every what does, in a way that was only intimated by his earlier work.

We are presented with a clear paradigm for reading the present: indeed, a mini-history of contemporary architecture is presented by Dr. Jencks’ table: first, Modern was attacked by Post-Modern, then, allowing for survivals of Late Modern, a new category of architecture, Post-Modern Classicism emerged. In subtitling his book The new synthesis, Dr. Jencks means what the trajectory he has traced, a sort of Hegelian dialectical scheme where Modern is the thesis, Post-Modern the antithesis, and Post-Modern Classicism the synthesis.

Self-service History

Nietzsche once typified three types of historian: the monumental, who draws from the past in order to support, legitimize, give mythical value to the present; the academic, by whom he meant one who sees the present as so much of an uninterrupted continuation of the past—who resurrects the past as a work of art, who finds meaning and style outside this tradition is impossible; and the critical, or he who destroys myths, interpretations, and even history itself in order to create a new one. We may recognize these types in the recent architectural scene: there is the new-historicist architect, picking it will from Ledoux to Lutyens, in order to bolster his sense of a heroic action of will in the present; there is the holistic revivalist, who cannot move from the direct imitation of precedent for fear of losing a grip on the roots of his art; and there is the critical historian, exploding received opinions, breaking open historicizing patterns, refuting old prescriptives of “what actually happened.” We need name no names. But to characterize Dr. Jencks we need a fourth type:
of post-modern. Thus, like Lacocoon fighting off the
snakes, Dr. Jencks teases, draws out, and wraps
the strands around his little finger:

The theory of the strands is, of course, as old as
classicism itself. The heroic Hesiod gave us the system
of the Four Ages of Man—from the Golden Age to
the Silver to the Bronze to the Iron Age. He was
followed by Renaissance historiographers like Vasari
and idealist historians like Hegel. In comparison to
these, however, even Hesiod's formula has not, I think, been fully appreciated:
Hesiod, after all, was only putting a variety
—wholes rose and fell, entire galaxies decayed and
disintegrated, dynasties of Gods and their
children were eviscerated and the fall of man: Vasari, in his own evolutionary formula, only
spoke of a century or two; Hegel took his historical
theorizing from the beginning (before Egypt) to
the modern period; but, Dr. Jencks, with all the
temporal compression of post-Bergsonian man, gives
us no more than ten years to pass from modern to
post-modern, and little more than five to reach a
new, post-modern classicism. We can now see the full
import of post-modernism. Rather than the willful
negation of modernism, the deterioration of
modernism into kitsch and populist demagogy we

one who labels. We should not call him a "classifier"
—this term ought to be reserved for the natural and
physical scientist, the philologist, the antiquarian.
Nor would we call him a "critic," for this would
impute to him a discrimination, a capacity to judge,
which the very activity of "labeling" holds in
contempt. No, "the labeling," ugly as it is, is the
better term. And, indeed, if we are reminded of that
species, so necessary to our consumption needs, who
roams the supermarket with stamp and tape, deciding
what is "dry goods" and what "paper products;"
moving packages from one shelf to another, for our
convenience, we would find a suitable analogy.
Another kind of labeling in our world would be the
bookseller, for whom we have infinite respect, but
who, armed with assumptions of "everyman," decides
whether the book we wish to read is "classical
literature" or "fiction" or "current detective
fiction." The librarian, more methodically with
the Library of Congress designation, decides similar fates
for writings of every kind.

The labels Dr. Jencks has bestowed have become
rapidly the commonplaces of a media discussion; they
have given rise to a veritable "battle of the labels," to
cite the title of his latest labelling; they have in
addition served to cover, wrap, distort, mislead, and
hide. This, after all, is the true function of labels:
where would consumption be without the little
detective games that are necessary along the aisles of
the supermarket, hunting for an elusive brand name?

Darwin on the Run
But despite the ubiquitous nature of labels in the
world, we must remind ourselves that the attributions
of historical style, laboredly arrived at by
generations of nineteenth- and early
twentieth-century historians of art—Gothic,
Renaissance (in its different varieties of early, high,
and late), Mannerism, Baroque, Classic, Rococo,
Neo-classic, eclectic or historicist—do not exist, nor
have they ever existed either as facts or essences:
they are whatever their derivation, simply convenient
ways to refer to a more or less loosely related set of
concepts, events, tendencies, and sensibilities in a
specific period; they are "defined," if that is the
proper word, in terms of formal properties that seem
to hold among different works in the same
—sometimes different — art. Charles Rosen reminds us
that "the concept of style does not correspond to an
historical fact but answers a need: it creates a mode
of understanding. . . (it) can only have a purely
pragmatic definition, and it can at times be so fluid
and imprecise as to be useless." Historians from Biedr
and Panofsky to Henri Zerner and Meyer Schapiro
have been acutely aware of this fact. In his own
extreme form of empiricism, Gombrich has even
rejected the use of style labels altogether.
It is therefore surprising to find Dr. Jencks referring
to styles as if they were some kind of living species as
he does with this statement: "when neo-classicism
came in roccoco went out, or rather transformed itself
and led an underground existence until it reemerged
in another guise as Art Nouveau." The
"underground" history of Rococo—"the chameleon" —
Art Nouveau might make good reading as a
tuppeny dreadful, but it ain't history. At least, not of
a contemporary kind. Dr. Jencks gives us our history
as if we were latter-day Darwinians, or better,
Spencerianists, but on the trail of the evolution of the
species: he speaks of the "evolutionary tree" or the
"evolutionary chart;" of "cyclical tendencies" that
wound beneath the "snakes" of conscious movements
of species; of "strands" and "bundles" of strands that
transform themselves in relation to each other; or
"ways" and "wase-like evolutionary species." The
"species" International Style, for example, got up
one day, and, like some giant python, "swallowed" alive
"Expressionism, Purism, de Stijl, industrial
design, Art Deco, Constructivism, together with
almost all the organic architecture of Wright." No
wonder the resulting indigestion brought on an attack

thought it was when it was first discovered by Dr.
Jencks, it now emerges as a vital intermediate stage
in the development—one hesitates to say evolution —
of the new synthesis. How silly of us: we should have
known that no dualistic structure could survive
the march of Dr. Jencks' dialectic. The recipe for
post-modernism tested in his own kitchen was, I
quote, "half-mod plus half-post-mod." This
sweet-and-sour dish was hardly likely to last. So the
blend of the two halves is now used to yield a
high-classic cuisine.

Jencks' labels are evidently drawn from and applied
according to an idea of architecture as "sign,"
communicating its meaning on the surface by its
"image" quality. Such categorization of Jencks' architecture, and especially good architecture, an
evernuous discernive: it reduces understanding of the
work, it denies its participation in a host of other,
more important, "meanings," social and formal; and
above all it implies that the principal task of the
architect is to supply the critic with easily classifiable
images. What Jencks calls "the semantic dimension"
cannot, of course, be ignored: perhaps, although it is
far from proven, certain modernists ignored it to the
detriment of their architecture; but to erect it as the
sole criterion of recognition and judgment is to deny
architecture all possibility of quality, let alone any
purpose in the world. It forbids discussion of the
formal structure of the object; it reduces recognition
of formal coherences or distortions to two
dimensions; it refuses all social, political, or even
functional questions in favor of a generalized
"pluralism." It is this last, the idea of "pluralism" as the
"spirit of the post-modern age," that is perhaps
the most pernicious of all Dr. Jencks' historicisms.
For, disregarding the fact that much the same
phenomena of difference and diversity might have
been identified from the late seventeenth century on
and, most especially, in the modernist period itself,
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Vidler on Jencks

Skyline October 1981

"The critical issues to be broached in writing a comprehensive but concise history are first, to decide what material should be included, and second to maintain some kind of consistency in the interpretation of the facts. I have to admit that on both counts I have not been as consistent as I would have wished; partly because information had to take priority over interpretation, partly because not all the material has been studied to the same degree of depth, and partly because my interpretive stance has varied according to the subject under consideration. In some instances I have tried to show how a particular approach derives from socio-economic circumstances, while in others I have restricted myself to formal analysis." (p.8)

Giedion’s Ghost

In spite of our propinquity as faculty members at Columbia University, and with more candor than discretion, I herein undertake an assessment of Frampton’s “critical history” of “Modern” architecture. I do so because it is a sincerely felt and provocative book, because it will be influential (or at least widely read), and because I hope it will be the last of its kind—that is, a book that sees architecture as built ideology and that unquestioningly conflates the history of modernism in architecture with that of moral virtue in the past 100 or 150 years.

Frampton is torn between his sense of himself as an historian and as a critic. He wants to believe in the ethical efficacy of modernism despite the fact that he is too knowledgeable an historian to overlook ample

"As far as possible I have tried to allow for the possibility of reading the text in more than one way. Thus it may be followed as a continuous account or dipped into at random. While the sequence has been has been organized with the lay reader or undergraduate in mind, I hope that a casual reading may serve to stimulate graduate work and prove useful to the specialist who wishes to develop a particular point." (p.9)

evidence that calls the claim into doubt. There is an inherent contradiction in Frampton's self-set task: the very notion of a "critical history" is surely open to question; I am reminded of Gertrude Stein's admonition apropos the Museum of Modern Art that you can't be a museum and be modern.

Nowhere does Frampton set out an explanation of, or an argument for the idea of "critical history." In actuality, the idea of a "critical history" is not new; as far as I can see, historiography has always been a look at the past through a particular lens. Therefore, it seems to this observer that Frampton's lenses are of a very special polaroid type, outdoors so shaded he can barely see the buildings; inside a library, poring over a text under the shadowless glare of
technologically advanced fluorescents, he can read the words written about and by architects only too easily. For the truth of the matter is, the book is much more a document of the architects and much less a history of buildings. Frampton is uncomfortable with the idea of architecture as an artistic discipline; buildings often seem no more to him than actors in a play speaking lines written for them either by their architects, by theorists, or sometimes—shades of Giedion—by the "spirit of the time." "Many unthaw works feature in that count," Frampton writes in his introduction, "since for me the history of modern architecture is as much about consciousness and political intent as it is about the buildings themselves."

Not only does Frampton refrain from a definition of his concept of "critical history," but he also never comes to terms with a conceptual or even a chronological definition of "modern architecture." Nor does he marvel at the arguments for its use as a stylistic label for the "advanced" work of the 1920s and '30s. The closest he gets to defining the term, which is surely the essential one for the book, is to place the origins of the Modern era in the mid-18th century, when technical innovations brought about a "definitive split between engineering and architecture...around 1747 (p. 8). Such a definition is wildly inadequate, not to mention out-of-date, ignoring as it does issues of cultural and political organization that surely must be taken into account and that seem to force a broader conception parallel to that of modern history itself—one that begins with the breakup of the largely homogeneous medieval world, the emergence of capitalism, vernacular language, and so on—in short, one that sees modern architecture as the architecture of Western humanism.

This failure to satisfactorily map out a territory is reflected in a disorganized sequence of chapters. Surely, the opening three chapters, loosely grouped together as a single section on "Cultural developments and predisposing techniques, 1750-1939," offer very little that Giedion's Space, Time and Architecture did not forty years ago. Frampton avoids Giedion's false polarity between "constituent" and "transitory" facts and substitutes a far more convincing frame of reference in which Classicism, metropolitanism (which he describes as "territorial transformations"), and "technology" are seen as the three constituents of modern architecture between 1750 and 1939. That one has to do with building composition and cultural rhetoric, another with urban growth, and the third, at least in the limited way it is handled, with building production, is nowhere specifically addressed, nor are the terms satisfactorily defined in relationship to a broader context of world history. Nor is it made clear whether the three constituents are parallel branches of the same river that coalesce—presumably after 1939—or whether they are separate rivers that only reach maturity in the post-Depression era. The three concomitant ingredients of modern architecture

Frampton presents in relationship to a rather fixed and somewhat preposterous chronological framework extending between 1750, when Romantic Classicism emerged (a much better term than the currently fashionable but misleading "neoclassicism"), and 1939, when Pevsner patented a system of prestressed concrete construction. He has these determinants extend, on the one hand, from a grand artistic movement inextricably linked to a sociocultural revolution to, on the other hand, a modest advance in the "fabrication" of the building technology occurring amidst—but seemingly aloof from—equally titanic political and social upheaval.

The actual "critical history," which is presumably the raison d'être of the book, somewhat confusingly begins in 1835, and not with a bang but a whimper: Pugin's conversion to Catholicism. Equally confusingly, it concludes with an equivocation—"The Eclipse of the New Deal: Buckminster Fuller, Philip Johnson and Louis I. Kahn, 1954-1964." Between we are treated to twenty-five tightly packed chapters in which Frampton struggles mightily to tell everything he knows about the history of architecture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As if he is attempting to appease the gods of codification, clarification, and interpretation without stepping beyond the domain of capitalism, Frampton frequently resorts to more cataloguing of names and buildings. To have written a book as large as it ambitious would have certainly made a fine out of the "critic" genre, and made it unmarketable as well. Yet to pay the price with so many mentioned but unillustrated buildings seems to the reader's patience, as it calls to question the author's interest in artifacts at all.

It is possible that the term "critical" does not mean "formulated," as suggested earlier, but "evaluative." It is possible that important buildings are so regarded not only for the ideas that stand behind them or the consequences of their creation, but for their aesthetic appeal. Frampton does not do much to support this view. Often, when he presents a building that he admires, he assumes not only that the reader knows the building, but admires it as well. Frampton makes almost no effort to justify his admiration for certain buildings in terms of their aesthetic qualities; that is to say, he never succeeds in giving the reader a clear sense of their importance as artifacts, which is what presumably drew us to studying the history of architecture in the first place. As a result, we are given a chapter on the Bauhaus that examines its role as an institution but never focuses on its Werkbund building or on its remarkable buildings and objects of decorative art that were designed in its workshops.

Frampton's discussion of Le Corbusier's Villa Stein at Garches, largely based on Corbusier's own interpretation, is just fine as far as it goes. The trouble is that the book it does not go far enough, while on the other it does not begin at the beginning. That is to say, it never really engages the reader in the building because of its qualities as a limpid exemplar of mechanomorphological Classicism, nor does it succeed in putting Rowe's interpretation into a wider context. Thus, though the grotty photo may serve to satisfy our curiosity as to what the building looks like, Frampton never helps us to sense what it feels like to approach it, to be inside it, to live in it. The assumption appears to be that everyone knows it's wonderful, therefore why bother to say so or describe the reasons for its excellence. This seems a ridiculous stance for a "critical" history. Shouldn't the architect be on the limitations of the masterpiece as well? Their technological naïveté, their urbanistic hermeticism, the inherent dilemma of their revolutionary forms and their bourgeois programs?

While Frampton frequently seems distant from the material he knows best—he is often just plain trapped in his own erudition—he is frequently passionate and, ironically, more convincing (because more engaged) with material he does not know as well. I found the discussions of Frank Lloyd Wright far more interesting than those devoted to Le Corbusier; I felt I was given very little about the buildings and so getting me to look at them with him similarly. The few sentences on Aalto's Villa Mairea succinctly captured the mood and the meaning of the place, the building, and its enigmatic architect, which seldom comes through in other people's writings. Also, his satisfying assessment of the last phase of American metropolitanism reveals a fresh and concisely group of the issues; skyscraper modernism is characterized as a "...highly sympathetic style, the need for which seems to have arisen out of a spontaneous desire to celebrate the triumph of democracy and capitalism in the New World."

Given Frampton's commitment to ideas over buildings, it is hard to know how he can possibly do sufficient to define those ideas so that the book could be released from the cult of individual personality that governs its predecessors. (As with the twenties-seven chapters in the main body of the text revolved on personalities it is the work of individual architects.) Insufficiently resolved; also, is Frampton's attitude to the political implications of the subject; given Frampton's lack of interest in formal issues, it is hard to understand why work for the French Communist Party could not engage without diplomatic strain. What, for example, is to be made out of his high praise (as a successful attempt "to realize an ideal setting for a society which would be at one and the same time both rationally organized and culturally classless...while the work of American eclectics of the 1920s like Raymond Hood are cast aside as pandering to the same deemed associational tendencies in a democratic capitalist society that others were doing in totalitarian regimes (among which presumably Italy would be counted)? "There was in fact a sense of symbiotic propriety comparable to that which obtained according to "party line" in totalitarian countries: one style for the office, another for the suburban retreat, and stil another for the idyll of the university..."

"Are we to believe that progressive modernism, (which Hitchcock characterized as the "New Tradition") is at fault as an expression of capitalism because totalitarian governments shared some of its values? Or that the values are bad by association? In my college days, this kind of criticism by innumera was very popular when the senator from Wisconsin, only then the critique came from it's dislike of the book..."

The price paid for the book's compaction and density is high; not only are many buildings talked about that are not illustrated, but also individual buildings and even whole careers are discussed. Wright's California work is overlooked, as is the work of Moholy-Nagy & Greene. Of course, in the case of these figures, it may
be that Frampton just doesn’t find them important. But he surely can’t plead lack of space, given the lengthy discussions of Le Corbusier’s work (who is given more than twice as much space as either Wright, Mies, or Aalto).

Perhaps the most astonishing aspect of this central portion of the book is the almost total omission of any discussions of what has been characterized as the “spread of modernism” and the concomitant problems that such proliferation has brought. Surely a “critical” history of modernism must come to terms with the delimitation of modernism’s temple almost from its completion: the commercial work of Le Corbusier in the 1930s, SOM, Harry Seidler and countless others in the ‘50s should be tackled side by side with the heroic masters; for the work of the masters had been within them the seeds of their own undoing, and the experimental work of Eero Saarinen, whose work is mentioned only in passing (p. 241), as well as that of Eames, Yamasaki, Breuer, Gardella, and others, most of whom are omitted or are only perfunctorily mentioned, ought not to have been left out. True, Kahn’s work is discussed in some detail, and should be seen as a criticism of the work of others, but it also grows out of — and is very much part of — a milieu that is otherwise left undescribed.

In limbo as well is the work of Auguste Perret, whose early buildings are discussed, but whose late work at Le Havre, perhaps the greatest descendent of Garnier’s urbanism, is completely ignored. Philip Johnson is not passed by, but rather merely honored in the brevity, being relegated to a special limbic, his name included in a chapter heading with Fuller’s and Kahn’s, his work as an architect barely discussed or illustrated.

All of this may already sound to you, dear reader, as the carping of an academic, but at the risk of boring you further, I feel it important to note that the book is not without problems of proofreading and that there are a number of minor but annoying errors of dating, spelling, and once in a while, a fact that, given the ten years or so that the project has been undergoing research and revision, and given the quality of the team who has helped the author, should have been corrected in galleys. Was De Chirico’s The Enigma of the Hour painted in 1911, as in the caption, or 1912, as in the text? The American architect was Gmelin (p. 220); Hitchcock and Johnson’s book was called The International Style (p. 223). The exhibition they organized was called “Modern Architecture.” Space, Time and Architecture was published in 1941 and not 1954 (p. 123); the Racquet (singular) Club was built in 1917, not in 1817 (p. 237); Lonberg-Holm is the Danish-American architect’s correct name, (p. 239); George Howe did not edit Perspecta (p. 242), he founded it (p. 239).

Daunting though Frampton’s show of erudition is, it is not without noticeable flaws. Terms are often left undefined: what is “a space of human appearance” (p. 197); and what is the origin of the “Lectoral Style”? (p. 204); why are foreign terms like Heinuntait (p. 83), Deblignement d’art (p. 96), or book titles such as Loos Trotzdem left untranslated? or long quotes such as the one of Charlotte Perriand (p. 218)? And why is the English language made to read so stuffy? What does it mean to say of Sterling’s late work that “It is as though the formal mastery of his syntactical imagination came to discern the critical place-creating potential that he himself had once posited in his village infill housing of the mid-1950s” (p. 200).

Though there are no footnotes, the chapter-by-chapter bibliographical listings at first glance appear extensive and very helpful, pertinent, and thorough from the scholarly point of view. But, checking the chapters I find myself particularly comfortable with, I am disappointed to find that one shouldn’t rely on first impressions. In the notes to the chapter covering the work of Fuller, Kahn, and Johnson, there are some egregious omissions: Scully’s Louis I. Kahn (1962), the only scholarly monograph on that architect’s work to date, is not cited; nor are Scully’s books, Modern Architecture (1961), and American Architecture and Urbanism (1969), which contain important discussions of Kahn and Johnson; nor is my own New Directions in American Architecture (1969, revised 1977) referred to. Jacobson’s book Philip Johnson (1962) is not cited, nor is the monograph covering Johnson’s early period, 1906-1934, published in 1977. This is surely a lapse in judgment, but the larger problem is far more serious. The book is in fact a monumental work of scholarship, full of research and documentation, and yet it is a trifle distressing to read such a repetitious statement as: “Scully, my teacher, and one of the few to raise the subject above a litany of names and dates and the limitations of mere ideology, is so systematically expunged from Frampton’s bibliography. Given Frampton’s respect for the Modernist writings, which I too admire, I think he might do well to note the extent to which that historian has acknowledged an inevitable debt to Scully.

All this pales in the face of the concluding four chapters of the book, gathered together under the heading “Cultural Assessment and Extension into the Present, 1929-1970,” which had been waiting for; the part where Frampton, apologist for continuing modernism, critic of post-modernism in general and American post-modernism in particular, would offer up a rich account of the near future that would set the new trend in place, while marking the debut of a new generation of movers and shakers into the ranks of canonical historiography. In short, this is the part where Frampton was to have fact become the Giedion of the next stage of modernism, identifying and influencing its new course, and canonizing its true priests, and either expunging or excoriating those in the flock who are wayward, or, those worse yet, who are nonbelievers.

That there is disappointment and/of relief in many quarters is a certainty. Once again Frampton equivocates; we are not given the history of the recent past at all. Close comrades are ignored (the New York Five, for example), as are powerful adversaries such as Charles Moore, who is not mentioned at all; or Robert Venturi, who was mentioned, but only as a theorist.

How said it all; to be so suffused with Spenglerian gloom (if dressed up for the 1980s in Heideggerian drag) as to be barely able even to look at buildings, to barely able to see anything but ideology and not in art. To be so apologetic for the joylessness, for brutality of scale and harshness of materials, for buildings that prove a point only because of their failure as architecture. Yet he persists in its support. Perhaps what Frampton means to write is not a critical history of architecture at all, but a theory of “built ideology.” In this he may have succeeded; but that is another story . . . .
West 34th Street between Seventh and Eighth Avenues. Philip Trager, photo.

If somewhere in the world of ideal forms there floats a prototype for the coffee-table photography book, it might well resemble Reinhart Wolf's New York: its dimensions are such that possession of a coffee table is a virtual necessity for its proper viewing, and its relatively high price ($50) effectively determines its placement in the class of luxury items. The book, containing 31 mammoth color plates of the tops of buildings photographed by Reinhart Wolf, a preface by Edward Albee, an accompanying text by Sabina Leitzmann (the American correspondent for the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung), an interview with Wolf by Andy Warhol, captions on the architecture by Christopher Grey at the back of the book (where the photographs are again reproduced in small-scale, black-and-white form), an afterword by the book's designer, Villon Vasata, which is a reverent homage to Wolf's photography, and last of all, a biographical note on Wolf. The very quotes used in Leitzmann's essay become supporting elements of this elaborate production in that their various authors (Henry James, Jean-Paul Sartre, Thomas Wolfe, et al.) are cited on the title page under the rubric "statements." While all of this might be seen as coffee-table—book overkill, each of these elements appear calculated to endow the book with a particular kind of cachet—to affirm its urbanity, cosmopolitanism, and chic. For this lavishly produced tribute to a fantasy Gotham is intended less as a souvenir item for rubes from Iowa City than for the delectation of the well-heeled and worldly.

As far as Wolf's photography goes, New York is of little interest. For the most part, these are conventional color photographs that profit from the dramatic light effects of the rising and setting sun, the impeccable color printing done in Germany, and the unusually large format. Using an 8 × 10 view camera placed in neighboring skyscrapers, Wolf has photographed buildings from a vantage point that permits one to see details and tops that are not seen from ground level. Like the Gothic cathedrals to which they are typically compared, skyscraper architecture is best seen from either heaven or a helicopter, and can never be wholly apprehended from the base. But Wolf has really done little beyond placing his camera in the appropriate site to obtain these views, waiting for the right light, and carefully isolating the photographed building to obtain the most "graphic" and instantaneously legible image. By excluding the context of the architecture—both the surrounding architectural landscape and its base on the ground—Wolf vignettems the buildings he photographs as though they were expensive pieces of jewelry.

This is, of course the stuff of fetishism: the transformation of architecture into an object of desire and veneration. Photography—and advertising photography in particular—is ideally suited to fetishizing, and such, to a great extent, has been the history of its uses. It thus comes as no surprise to learn that Wolf is one of the most successful commercial photographers in Europe.

Inasmuch as Wolf's photographs of recent skyscrapers are even more relentlessly pedestrian than those of the buildings constructed in the '20s, it seems likely that it is the earlier skyscrapers to which he is most drawn. For an European especially, the fanciful spires and ornamented towers of '20s skyscrapers conjure up the mythic vision of Gotham, the Metropolis of the movies and popular culture. And given Wolf's fixed format, the detailed facades and elaborate tops yield richer lodes than do the glass curtain walls of 1 Astor Plaza or 1 United Nations Plaza. Lovers of '20s skyscrapers would do better, however, with a book such as Cervin Robinson and Rosemarie Haag Bletter's Skyscraper Style: Art Deco New York.
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Fall Periodicals

Cornell Architectural Journal Edited by Michael Markowitz with articles by past and present faculty, including Mike Davis, Fred Keteiler and Colin Rowe, and students.

Oppositions 22 A special section on the Japanese architect Hiroshi Fuji and an article by Kenneth Frampton on "Lusitania: Reasserting the Connection" highlight the issue. MIT press for the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies. $15.


Other News
Arts and Architecture has resumed publication under the editorship of Barbara Goldstein, editor of L.A. Architect. The magazine will focus on the area from the Pacific North West to Texas, its first issue appearing in October. Subscription rates are $18.

Domus Moda The May issue was the first two per year on fashion, for this Italian architecture and design magazine supplementing the regular 11 issues of Domus.

Heresies I A special issue on "Making Room: Women and Architecture". Articles by Delores Hayden, Deborah Nevin, Susana Torre, and Diana Bereskin, among others. Shindler House, 835 North Kings Road, Los Angeles, CA 90069, 13/651-3112. Subscriptions are $18.


The new issue of Pumps reviews and reprints some of the most salacious definitions of classicism, and will be published by St. Martin’s Press.

In Brief


Disney Animations: The Illusion of Life by Frank Thomas and Ollie Johnston (Abbeville Press, New York, October 1981. $49.95). Written by two of the men who made Disney animation, the book has more than 1,300 illustrations; 300 in color.


Another of Classical America’s continuing efforts to bring serious attention to neo-classical architecture and practice, not to mention promote the discipline of observation and the art of arrangement and drawing, this book is the first translation into English of Fragments d’architecture antique. The 12 plates are some of those originally collected for publication by Honoré d’Uzès, a teacher at the Ecole des Beaux Arts, in 1905. The exquisite drawings are selections of work sent back to Paris by Grand Prix de Rome winners. It is the first time in three years studying ancient remains and reconstructing them in ink wash renderings.


This book, which coincides with the tenth anniversary of SITE’s founding, provides a coherent record of the firm’s oeuvre. It is a view of both built and unbuilt work. The approach is an understanding of this iconoclastic and often unorthodox group as a "graceful" one. SITE presents its approach to architecture, the partners, -Alison, Kelly, Emilio Sousa, Michelle Stone, and James Wines. -But for the term "Dearchitecture." In an essay on SITE’s approach to architecture, SITE expresses a rejection of the tradition of architecture as design and instead claims affinities with traditions of art—content, information, commentary, communication, and "a commitment to the sociological and psychological content of architecture." The work, on the other hand, speaks very well for itself. Governed by a sense of internal logic germane to the laws of sculpture, the project of SITE reflects and expresses the synthesis when the perceived as architecture. Curiously the work of SITE has always been considered more seriously in Europe than in the U.S. In his introduction, Bruno Zevi proclaims that "in SITE’s philosophy I see an extension of the most authentic American culture." This should give us pause.


Gerwinis and Kaminsky have made a record of the essence of Old Miami Beach, the one square mile area that was awarded historic landmark status in 1975. They did a catalogue of something that is considered valuable, and, more important, an imaginative and illustrative way of why we find it so. The text is brief and informative, and full of both facts and explication, and photographs that evoke the special qualities of the strangely American agglomeration of buildings.

The woods
Ornamentalism, a compendium of the current trend toward the decorative in architecture, craftsmanship, (including stenciling), furnishing, painting and sculpture. The title of a book now being prepared by Robert Jensen and Patricia Conway. The book with 250 color plates is scheduled for fall 1982 publication by Clarkson N. Potter.

An Introduction to Urban Design, written by Jonathan Barnett will appear in January. Publisher is Harper & Row. On a similar topic, Roberta Gratz is addressing the topic of what we are doing to our cities (tentative title in a clock to be published by Random House. . . .

Charles Jencks is already coming out with a book on Free-Style Classicism in the winter—the classical tradition will be analyzed in a broadened "non-canonic" approach. The book will challenge, he reports, some of the most sacrosanct definitions of classicism, and will be published by St. Martin’s Press.

Turning from Reinhart Wolf’s New York to Philip Trager: New York is to be made fully aware of the difference between a coffee-table book with photographic illustrations and a well-produced photography book. Trager’s photographs of the urban landscape are black-and-white, but his images are composed and constructed as photographs, utilizing facial features, vertical and horizontal elements of the camera. Photographing the facade of the New York Telephone Company building (as part of the W.R. Grace Building), Trager produces—completely straightfowardly—a near-abstraction of white pillars and windows; the strings of lights above, the Chrysler Building photograph, he is less concerned with isolating its campier motifs than in playing off its vertical and horizontal elements against neighboring buildings and the angles created by the crop and frame. Light, shadow, angle and perspective are firmly, positive and negative spaces constitute for Trager, as for most formalist photographers, the lexicon of photography, and enable him not simply to depict architecture, but to translate it into a photographic identity. This is not to say that Trager does not compose his own fictions on the world; on the contrary, Trager’s New York is empty of people, and in many cases, empty even of cars. While some of his photographs suggest the work of Berenice Abbott and Alfred Stieglitz, others recall that of the French architectural photographers of the Second Empire; photographs such as the one of the Cooper Union Building or the entrance to 418 Central Park West are closer to the work done in the 1860s than to that of the 1960s. To what extent Trager consciously modeled his work on earlier traditions of architectural photography I do not know, but the evidence of the work indicates that Trager is aware of the tradition within which he operates.

Architectural photography is in fact one of the oldest genres in the medium. Within weeks after the public announcement of Daguerre’s process, photographers had set up their cameras before the famous monuments of Paris. The mid-19th century was a period of Gothic cathedrals, was widely practiced, highly esteemed, and often exported to the U.S by French photographers who were supported by the government. By the end of the century, two traditions in architectural photography were established: physiognomic portraiture of individual buildings, and documentation of the urban environment per se. The two masters of the nineteenth and early twentieth century.—Marville and Atget—did both. And while Marville street scenes and architecture worked for a multitude of reasons, Atget’s represented a deserted city as an aesthetic choice. Although clearly influenced by Marville and Eugène Atget, who his photographs are apparently influenced by the poetic fiction of Atget. Where Trager finally fails is in his inability to strike a balance between authenticity and sensibility. His elegant, contemplative, and intelligent photographs are marked by a rather chilly academicism that breaks no new ground.

Walter Benjamin suggested that the capacity to assimilate works of architecture in the age of mechanical reproduction was related to their miniaturization in photography. If, as Andy Warhol proposes in his interview with Reinhart Wolf, “the art critic is the art critic’s two true art critic,” it is interesting to speculate on the terms of their current relationship to each other. In Wolf’s book, photograph presents architecture as fetishized commodity; in Trager’s, the photographs depict New York, but they are the two books, in the arts now, it is interesting to speculate on the terms of their current relationship to each other. In Wolf’s book, photograph presents architecture as fetishized commodity; in Trager’s, the photographs depict New York, but they are the two books, in the arts now, it is interesting to speculate on the terms of their current relationship to each other. In Wolf’s book, photograph presents architecture as fetishized commodity; in Trager’s, the photographs depict New York, but they are the two books, in the arts now, it is interesting to speculate on the terms of their current relationship to each other. In Wolf’s book, photograph presents architecture as fetishized commodity; in Trager’s, the photographs depict New York, but they are the two books, in the arts now, it is interesting to speculate on the terms of their current relationship to each other. In Wolf’s book, photograph presents architecture as fetishized commodity; in Trager’s, the photographs depict New York, but they are
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Architecture and Panoply: Observations on the Royal Wedding

Martin Filler

Royal weddings are rather like eclipses: both phenomena occur infrequently, strike an atavistic chord in the hearts of otherwise reasonable men, and possess a strange fascination even for those without a more specific interest in astronomy or monarchy. Thus the latest installment of "The Royal Show" (as its ranking role character has self-deprecatingly called it) recently prompted many citizens of the Republic to arrive at an hour early enough for a lunar eclipse in order to witness the extraordinary proceedings live from London via the miracle of television satellite. The pretext in question, of course, was the marriage of HRH The Prince of Wales to the Lady Diana Spencer on July 29, an event heralded as nothing less than "The Wedding of the Century."

The Briggadon-like reincarnation of the British Royal Style seemed especially phantom-like, an astonishingly anachronistic, coming as it did during one of the most violent outbreaks of civil unrest in recent British history. The ease with which international attention was shifted from the riots to the royals says something about the staying power of the English Crown. If the throne of Great Britain survives into the next century with Charles Philip Arthur George Mountbatten-Windsor upon it, it will be in no small measure thanks to his family's shrewd understanding of the public-relations value of their great ceremonial occasions and their skilful sense of how to conduct them. The recent royal wedding extravaganza was a well-orchestrated media event that combined architecture, urban design, costume design, music, and dance (which is what all that marching about really is) into a remarkably comprehensive theatrical production.

The major architectural departure from recent royal tradition was the Prince of Wales' decision to be married in St. Paul's Cathedral, rather than in the universally expected Westminster Abbey. The stated reason for the switch to St. Paul's was that the cathedral could hold five hundred more guests than the Abbey. A more likely explanation is the Prince's perception of the superior symbolism of St. Paul's, which was not only the emblem of London's survival of the Blitz, but is in an extended sense the architectural ensign of England's endurance as a nation. No doubt a lifetime of seeing both Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's in use on various state occasions gave Prince Charles ample opportunity to think it over. Westminster Abbey is ancient and venerable, but its interior seems incredibly tiny in person. No match for the great Gothic York Minster or Lincoln Cathedral, at best it exudes a kind of pastelboard quaintness. St. Paul's, on the other hand, is still the crowning architectural feature of London, despite recent and unfortunate incursions on the city's predominantly low-rise skyline.

St. Paul's is farther from Buckingham Palace than Westminster Abbey is, and thus the Prince's decision also extended the parade route considerably, making it visible in person to hundreds of the royals rather than to the crowds more of the loyal. On the day of the wedding, the interconnecting Mall, the Strand, and Fleet Street were cleared of traffic to create a single, monumental boulevard two miles long between the palace and the cathedral. One of the more important symbolic moments of the procession came a third of the way to St. Paul's, as the royal carriages passed through the central portal of the triple-gated Admiralty Arch, built to the designs of Sir Aston Webb in 1910. Normally closed to traffic, the middle gate of the arch, which links the Mall and Trafalgar Square, is opened only for parades in which the monarch takes part. Though it is undoubtedly a gesture that does not seem remarkable to most of those who witness it, the rare opening of the sovereign's gate of the Admiralty Arch is a striking architectural reminder of the hierarchical nature of British society. But it is a characteristically understated symbol, too, however fraught it might be with semiotic significance — a subtle reminder that the secret of the British Royal Style might well lie in its essential and eloquent simplicity.

The public decorations for the royal wedding were virtually non-existent if compared with the elaborate conceptions of the 16th and 17th centuries, when such gifted architects and theatrical designers as Inigo Jones dreamed up stupendous allegorical pageants and public tableaux to glorify the temporal power of the Crown. The closest the recent festivities came to encompassing the massivemanifestations of previous reigns was the huge fireworks show given in Hyde Park the night before the wedding. A re-creation of the famous pyrotechnical display in Green Park held to celebrate the end of the War of the Austrian Succession in 1749, it included a reproduction of the temporary neoclassical temple designed for the original event by the French architect and scenic artist Jean-Nicolas Servandoni. But now such extravagances are the exception, and it is the richly varied and generally pleasing architecture of the city of London itself that must provide the major source of visual interest during these sporadic royal progresses. Though the overall effect is thus more mundane than that of earlier royal festivals, the success with which the city meets the challenge nonetheless proves how far good urban design can go toward supplying a sense of occasion.

The bride, a tall and attractive young woman, was encumbered by an ungainly and unflattering dress, an extravagantly bouffant affair with an enormously full skirt and huge puffed sleeves that looked like a pageant of an MGM Fairy Princess production—num ber costume. Together with a heavy veil that rendered her features almost invisible and a freakish 25-foot-long train, it gave the appearance of a bizarrely exaggerated fell figure in an ancient fertility ritual — which, to some degree, this was. A BBC commentator remarked with somewhat indeclicate, though undoubtedly semi-autistic humor, "She looks like a potato." Once inside the cathedral, though, the details of even that immense dress were dwarfed by the size of the great church. Actually, St. Paul's has always worked much better as an urban set piece than as a church. Its lack of an internal decorative program ambitious enough to give necessary scalar counterpoint to its vast spaces leaves St. Paul's with a rather chilly feeling that is not totally dispelled even when the cathedral is filled to capacity. The inside of Sir Christopher Wren's famous dome, for example, is not alive with a sublimity, glittering tumbler of the heavenly host, as are Roman churches contemporary with it. The difference is not just a case of Protestant restrictions versus Catholic exuberance. St. Paul's had wanted a mosaic treatment for the dome interior, but did not get it. Rather, the cupola of St. Paul's was painted en grisaille by the forgotten Sir James Thornhill with staid scenes from the Acts of the Apostles, set within a trompe-l'oeil architectural framework — an interesting but not particularly involving variant of Baroque ceiling treatments.

Below down the dome, most of the congregation were seated in modern metal and molded-plywood stacking chairs in the ubiquitous David Rowland design, which are nice enough for a high-school graduation in a gymnasium, but absolutely inappropriate for a royal wedding in a landmark of world architecture. The whole, old-fashioned woodwork is to be found in several English cathedrals would have been a much better solution.

But when the ceremony was over and the newlyweds emerged onto the portico of Wren's masterpiece, all could be forgiven. Here was one of those rare and memorable moments when great architecture and great occasion become one. As the carriage bearing the Prince and his Princess swung down Ludgate Hill, the cathedral formed a backdrop of truly noble grandeur, a reminder of just how central architecture is to the self-image of a people. England may have lost her Empire, but she's still got St. Paul's. As the royal wedding demonstrated, that is some consolation.
One film explores the city fantastically through adventure, the other realistically through private drama

Superman II and Atlantic City develop around two different narrative structures; the former, fantastically, through the adventures of an interloper, the other, realistically, through the private drama of an interloper. It is not the artistic qualities of these films as such that makes them worthy of criticism, but their potential for a reflection on the subject of the relationship between film and architecture.


The whole movie is presented as a documentary, to be considered with extraordinary implications. Superman, as an epic is shown as a sensationalist, a city, the place where architecture is based and becomes the backdrop for the film's main action. Superman's city, the place where architecture appears, is the only thing that remains constant, being the same. It is thus that Superman's city presents as a metaphor for the epic and the fantastic, with its fantastic, cinematic elements of destruction and reconstruction. Superman's city is not only a fantastic place, but also a place where reality and imagination converge, creating a sense of defined space that is not only perceivable through time, but also through the power of the imagination. Superman's city is a place of wonder, a place where the ordinary and the extraordinary coexist, creating a space that is both real and imagined.
Paris by Night: the Cite, the Prostitute, the Novel

Peter Brooks

It had none of the glitter of Times Square, but in mid-nineteenth-century Paris the Île de la Cité became a magnet for curious and adventurous members of the upper classes, visited by the thrill of danger. The medieval center of Paris, the Île de la Cité was until 1858 a labyrinth of tortuous cobblestone streets and alleys with open gutters in their midst, a densely packed agglomeration of ancient houses, an urban jungle that would be cleared out over the next decade as Baron Hausmann went to work, under the orders of Napoleon III, in the vast redevelopment project that created modern Paris. If in the 1850s, the Île de la Cité had ceased to be the heart of Paris, it was generally regarded as its center of crime, its heart of darkness, where all manner of assassins, cutpurses, pimps, and prostitutes lurked and plotted the shadowy network of activities that constituted underworld Paris.

What gave the middle- and upper-class public an awareness of this urban Amazilia and its denizens, and suddenly put it on the map of tourist attractions, was a novel—Karl Marx’s Les Miserables de Paris—which ran in serial form in the daily newspaper, the Journal des Débats, from June 1842 to October 1843, and was possibly the most popular novel of all time.

The novel’s hero, Rodolphe, was an aristocrat who, in an expiation of past sins, undertook to build a kind of urban Robin Hood: dressing in proletarian garb, speaking the slang of the streets, fighting hand to hand in the manner of the best of punks, he would hang around the tapas-francs, the low cabarets of the Île de la Cité, always on the lookouts to rescue some soul redeemable from the criminal world, and to punish those who preyed on innocence and persecuted the virtuous. It was a measure of the novel’s immense success that elegant young men all over Paris began to carry real-life imitations of Rodolphe, donning the worker’s blouse, taking lessons in the no-holds-barred boxing known as inaudible, organizing nocturnal visits to the Cité. Slumming was the order of the day. A curious result of the attempt to keep up with Rodolphe was that his colorful, earthy, and self-appointed task of patrolling the streets to generate more and more deeply into the life of the urban poor, to discover and expose the more picturesque and horror aspects of crime, but its causes and conditions as well, in the pauperization of the urban artisan. As that pauperization advanced, it became more serious, more disruptive to the system, offering proposals for new institutions of social welfare. By the time the novel was done, Sue was ready to proclaim herself a socialist, and indeed went so far as to elect socialist deputy from a working-class district of Paris following the Revolution of 1848, then to be one of the banished from Napoleon III’s Second Empire.

At the center of Sue’s topography of crime, at the very heart of the darkness, stands the figure of the prostitute. Fleur-de-Marie, the hooker with the heart of gold, the frail flower anomally blooming in the urban slime, who remains unaccountably virginal in appearance and attitude, is the mirror and horror of her existence, offers Rodolphe the perfect opportunity for exercise of his “police of virtue”: his self-appointed task of patrolling the social depths for those who show signs of being redeemable, and sometimes even of being able to change the nature of sin.

In the best traditions of melodrama, Fleur-de-Marie will eventually be revealed to be Rodolphe’s own daughter—lost through a tryst when she was an infant, brought up on the streets of the Cité by the highest orders of Paris to adulthood and sold into prostitution. The story of her rehabilitation is one of the most important of the many plot lines that interweave through Les Miserables de Paris. She is brought eventually to the threshold of marriage with a German prince, but then all turns tragic, as she realizes that she can never efface the memories of her past life, can never be sufficiently reorganized to become a bourgeois wife and mother. Fleur-de-Marie has indeed been indelicately marked by the Cité. Instead of marriage, she will seek the convent, and there she will die.

The treatment meted out to Fleur-de-Marie by her creator drew the wrath of none other than Karl Marx, who devoted many pages of The Holy Family to a scathing critique of the kind of sentimental socialism one finds in Sue. Marx demonstrates how Rodolphe’s “savior” Fleur-de-Marie by first transforming her from prostitute into repentant sinner, then from repentant sinner into nun, then from nun into corpse. This is accomplished by teaching her to internalize her fault, to turn it into sin. From a simple condition of her existence, prostitution becomes an abstraction in terms of which she must judge and condemn herself. Fleur-de-Marie’s exploited and sold body has become the sinning body.

We can say that Sue has simply capitulated to bourgeois morality, understanding that redemption extends only so far, that it won’t do to have ex-whores make proper marriages, whatever the Romantic clichés on the subject. Yet there is something more interesting going on. It is as if Sue had to punish Fleur-de-Marie finally because she is to him not simply the sold body, not primarily the sinning body, but the erotically deviant body that led him into the labyrinth of the Cité in the first place. Marx makes too much of the role of religion in creating Fleur-de-Marie’s guilt. Rather, Fleur-de-Marie herself emphasizes the sanctification she feels at meeting an unsullied girl of her age, Clara Dubevill, and hearing the story of her “simple, calm, happy life”—and then being asked by Clara to narrate her own life. Fleur-de-Marie’s own life is not narratable, it is unspeakable. Yet, and here is the paradox, it is not the calm, happy life that Sue has chosen to narrate, but the deviant, criminal existence. Sue is, of course, but one among many (though one of the very first) nineteenth-century novelists who would discover that the interesting narrative lay among the criminally deviant of the urban underworld: the world exploded in novels by Balzac, Dickens, Victor Hugo, Wilkie Collins, Dostoevsky, Zola, and so many others. If traditionally stories were brought back by travelers to exotic realms, in the nineteenth century, perhaps because travel itself had become increasingly banal, that exotic realm was more and more found to be in the city, in its depths: a storied realm beneath one’s feet, so to speak. And the most storied creature of that storied realm—who presumably has a deviant, alluring, seductive story to tell—is the prostitute.

Upon reflection, we can see that the prostitute holds a special place in the annals of the nineteenth-century narratologists because she has a special and exemplary destiny. An essentially theatrical being, undefined by any one social role or style, she has a special capacity to cross social barriers, to exist in all milieus, to make it to the top, but through a kind of demonstration that the top is not different from the bottom. The prostitute seems to deserve that label applied in American gangster lore to the automatic pistol: “the old equalizer.” She speculates on the universal libido, on her capacity to make everyday succumb to his erotic needs, each according to his means. As a character in Balzac’s novel Splendours et Misères des Courtesains puts it, “At age eighteen, that girl has already known the highest opulence, the lowest misery, men on each social story. She has a manner of magic wand with which she unleashes the brutal appetites so violently suppressed... There is no woman in Paris who can say as well as she does to the Animal: ‘Come out!...’ And the Animal leaves its cage, and wallows in excess.” The underlying image here is no doubt Cirić, turning men into pigs. In her transformational role, in her capacity to provoke metamorphoses, the prostitute is not only herself narratable, she provokes the stuff of story in others.
The novelists' fascination with the figure of the prostitute was not, of course, unmotivated. If prostitution is as old as human civilization, as an organized, everyday, visible phenomenon, it has close ties to urbanization and industrial capitalism. Prostitution in Paris took on new dimensions with the large increase in population in the first half of the nineteenth century and the creation of an improved urban proletariat. As Louis Chevalier has written in his remarkable book, *Labouring Classes and Dangerous Classes*, "Prostitution was a basic phenomenon of urban life, more particularly of working-class life, during the first half of the nineteenth century." Furthermore, it became to be discovered; to be object of medical, legal, and reformist attention. In 1836, Dr. A. J.-B. Parent-Duchatelet published *De la prostitution dans la ville de Paris*, an extensive and serious study that detailed the geography of prostitution and categorized its species, from the fille a carte (the constant streetwalker obliged to carry her police card) and the fille a numero (occupying a brothel) on up to the femme galante and femme de parties, and explained the manner of governance by the police. From Parent-Duchatelet's work emerge the contours of an entire subsociety, a subterranean world with its own social organization, its manners, even its language—its special slang—analyzed and documented with great authority. It is not surprising that the study was of the greatest interest to novelists fascinated by the social underground—the "sub-basement of society," as Balzac sometimes called it—and that writers such as Balzac, Dumas, Hugo, and Sue put Parent-Duchatelet's research largely to use. Having read Parent-Duchatelet, one easily recognizes the frequent moments at which the novelists give free reign to him, with suggestive details on the protagonist's manner of life to create the figure of such characters as Fleur-de-Marie.

The great question of the nineteenth century was to be that of social ministry, destitution, and—like Louis Chevalier's book so well demonstrates—it came to the fore when the most extreme form of prostitution, the commercialization of criminality: the threat from the dangerous classes. Before the proletariat becomes an object of serious and sustained attention it is the criminal act and the criminal mind which, from Balzac to Dostoievsky, open the lower depths to novelistic treatment. The novel tends to plot its course between exploration of the most threatening social deviance on the one hand, and the counterpart of the police on the other. It is no accident that the detective novel and cops-and-robbers fiction are nineteenth-century inventions. While Sue eventually discards this powerless, the destitute artisans of Paris, what interests him first of all are the discontents of power, those in the depths who use it in reverse, perversely. Ultimately, the deviant power of the underworld is one that crosses to the underworld is most readily gained through the Circe's den of prostitution.

Sue's descent into the Paris underworld often smack of commerce from the eighteenth century to the present. As Prostitution is at a subject itself fraught with the ambiguities of Sue's attitudes; it is never certain whether the novelist's interest is primarily in the sold body or in the erotically deviant body. The issues of sex and money, the erotic and education of human beings, the erotic and the profound, are central. There is also a parallel imagery of psychological descent, into the unavailing erotic, where in darkness and secret the beast is liberated.

The figure of the prostitute no doubt allowed nineteenth-century novelists to deal with the dangerous and fearful subject of female sexuality in a manner not possible when portraying women of the upper and middle classes. It is striking that Fleur-de-Marie, in whose name some of good parents, is promised an attempted rehabilitation, is preserved from too much personal sexuality (as opposed to the male sexuality she has simply endured) by pairing her with another prostitute, La Louve. Fleur-de-Marie's Falstaff—a name that both frightens and somewhat frightening. La Louve's sexual presence acts as a "lightning rod" to draw away any undue worry on the reader's part about Fleur-de-Marie's relationship to the sexuality on which her trade is founded, and thus allows her to speak of prostitution solely in moralistic terms. La Louve is deviant erotic body, while Fleur-de-Marie becomes exclusively sold body: body alienated from its spiritual inhabitant. Yet of course it is Fleur-de-Marie who will succumb to the mark of the Cité, and die repining for an unreturnable purity. Whereas La Louve, rehabilitated through Fleur-de-Marie's good offices, marries Martial who, once a poacher and prostitute's consort, becomes a gamekeeper, legitimate husband, and father of a numerous progeny. The reason La Louve can survive rehabilitation while Fleur-de-Marie ultimately can't be attributed to social class: a prostitute can be reclaimed for the proletariat, become an honest worker's wife and, but not for the bourgeoisie. There are limits.

Parent-Duchatelet's *De la prostitution* is itself not exempt from these ambivalent attitudes. As a piece of socialistic fiction, it is extraordinarily advanced, rejecting prejudice and received ideas in favor of a scurrilous examination of records and statistics. His medical histories of prostitutes show considerable freedom from folklore concerning female sexuality, and he finds the causes of prostitution to lie in poverty, illegitimacy, lack of education, rather than moral turpitude. Yet many chapters begin or end with sententious homilies on female chastity, "the most important of duties," and Parent-Duchatelet's Introduction to the study makes its apologia for the material to come by a comparison of this investigation to his earlier inquiry into the condition of the Paris sewer system: "Why should I blush to enter this other kind of cesspool (a cesspool more frightful, I admit, than all the others) in the hope of doing some good . . . ?" We might say that Parent-Duchatelet's study itself marks an exercise of power over the lower depths: it belongs to a generalized nineteenth-century project of organizing and policing urban deviance. Even its scurrilous exposition of the organization of prostitution society conveys a surveillance of the criminal body, to use the terms suggested by Michel Foucault in his book on nineteenth-century penalogy, *Surveillance et Punition* (Discipline and Punish). Like the "carceral institution" itself, the text of criminality—Parent-Duchatelet's, even Sue's—responds to the deviance of the underworld by the power of sight: the perfect vision of the panopticon prison.

A recent and thorough study of prostitution in France from the eighteenth century to the present, Alain Corbin's *LesFilles de noces: Miseure sexuelle et prostitution*, makes clear the connection between police, surveillance, and the work of medical pioneers such as Parent-Duchatelet. For most of the nineteenth century, prostitution was regarded as a necessary social evil that needed to be carefully regulated: the one thing was to keep track of it, to confine it, and to eradicate its clandestine forms. The great fear was that prostitution might spread in covert forms, threatening the absolute demarcation between legitimate bourgeois (desexualized) female sexuality and the permitted outlaw variety—the confusion that would result were Fleur-de-Marie to be permitted to gain a legitimate bourgeois spouse. The abolitionist campaign came later: during most of the nineteenth century, prostitution was a hidden but acknowledged subsociety whose existence was tolerated so long as it could be observed through various great urban "panoptical" institutions—the prison and the hospital.

Sue's discourse on prostitution is generally compassionate and enlightened, insisting on its near inevitability in sectors of the proletariat where families are piled together in one room, where incest is common, where a girl's only salable commodity is her body; and being a powerful inducement (which immediately became famous among reformists) of a system that not only creates and accepts prostitution, but regularizes and registers it throughout the entire civilized world. Sue's discourse even more extended treatment of prostitution in *Le Mystere de Paris*. Like the broader setting of Paris, Sue'sentailment in *Les Mysteres de Paris*, the means of access to a seductive and frightening lower world, the place where the manhole lid lifts up. The bourgeois touches the proletariat by means of relation of erotic curiosity and liberation mediated by money. No doubt this is a curious and ambivalent way to open up the question of the social depths, but perhaps historically it was a necessary first step.

Finally, it may be significant that the serialization of Sue's novel in *Le Journal des Debats* ended with an open letter from the author calling his readers' attention to a new periodical, *La Ruche Populaire* ("The Beehive of the People") written and produced exclusively by workers, which takes as epigraph, concerning the idea of the "police of virtue"—and indeed its main inspiration—directly from *Les Mysteres de Paris*. Sue closes his novel with the announcement of a newspaper that will continue his work; and he ends his open letter by recapitulating a four-point legislative program aimed at the relief of social misery. The novel passes into the world of the present. It has discovered and shaped, putting itself at the service of a political dynamic brought to light by the melodramatic fiction that began in the "picturesque" slums of the Cité. It is in the logic of Sue's text that the value of the study—that pauperization should have been discovered through criminality, the laboring classes by way of the dangerous classes, the sold body from the deviant body. With the inelegant mark of the Cité on Fleur-de-Marie's body, we have entered into an incalculably urban fiction.
I am an unashamed Scandinaviophile, a student of the differences between elk and reindeer roast, gravlax with or without crust, and a — the distinctions that midnight sun and moon darkness do not, in fact, Friend. They bring the night and again to brave the vagaries of Nordic summers where a particular architect-touring has convinced me that here modern architecture achieved goals that remained wishful thinking elsewhere. Indeed, modern Sweden is a product of the total victory of functionalism, which, masterminded by Gregor Paulsson, was permanently solidified to the modernization of the country in the 1930s.

Young architects in Sweden and Denmark do ponder their paradoxical fate. They suffer from the strength of the “good design” tradition — a national orthodoxy, the longevity of some of its practitioners, and a sense of isolation that the relative ignorance of the history of Scandinavian architecture elsewhere has increased. The cult of the immeasurable Aalto obscures the real accomplishments of Danish and Swedish heroes, and the success of the exportable Ralph Erskine and Arne Jacobsen. Viking invaders of England, and of the South Pacific explorations of Utzon, are immobile. Professional magazines (and a new Danish architectural history journal) are solid and responsible, but news from abroad comes mostly in the predigested form of books copied from the mother country.

Little wonder that “Post-modernism,” conceived à la Jencks, is met with wonderment and even — as lately, when Charles Moore spoke in Copenhagen — with hostility. Under the summer solution, in Sweden and Denmark, or more precisely in punk and art nouveau have, to say it without a stilt and on the granite promontories of the Stockholm archipelago, I tracked the illusive, rare, and perhaps mythical Scandinavian post-modernist.

In Lund, cultural rival of Stockholm and close Swedish neighbor to Copenhagen, architects like “Jim” Askland and Thomas Helmskjaer are far from provoking the kind of architecture Swedish, Polish, Catalan and midwestern American were made mutually comprehensible with the aid of the best hot in Sweden. For Jim, the Scanian south where, the proverb has it, farmers complain that they must get out or perish for lack of fertile arable land agriculturally. His private practice, ranging from film scripts for Danish television to self-designed beach houses to an almost hand-made building for local clients with international tastes, is thriving. Disclaiming “post-modernist” objectives, Askland has evoked a restrained Lutyens-like answer to the functionalism of Lund’s many local masters as well as a tribute to their 19th-century Russian contemporaries.

Thomas Helmskjaer and Bianca Heymowska also view tolerantly the architecture of the “30s, who as recently as last year were termed that “beautiful” was a forbidden word. Their Magazine Tussin, a quarterly reminiscent of the first Architecture in its size and coherence and of Opposites 1 in its editorial quality, in Lund to the answer to the poetic rhetoric of the “ins” of functionalists. The title, Tussin, refers to the two great Nikodemus Tessins (1654-1736 and 1709-88), who have a certain sensibility unintended, and in Scanian Swedish, melodic homage to the modern Ticino architects, admired by the editors.

In general, however, the quality of architectural criteria can only be termed self-satisfied. For example, Stuart Jaffe’s design, the post-modernist, symmetrical presentation of Coman Asplund inspired the indignant printed response, “We Swedes known more about Asplund.” (He’s Finnish.) This art historical self-confidence was belied by last year’s 1930-1980 exhibition, for not one a single original Asplund document from the Architectural Museum archives supported the panels of the Museum of Modern Art (New York) traveling show. My review (Architettura, 1, 32) again functionalism, which, masterminded by Gregor Paulsson, was permanently solidified to the modernization of the country in the 1930s.

In Copenhagen, Ernst Lodse directs the Green Studio without, however, the green spectacles of his A.A./Archigram training. At the next Copenhagen festival (May 1962), he will install Venice Biennale-sized interpretations of the ancient city gates, all in site. An exhibition at the Louisiana Museum in October will exhibit his and other individual efforts. Goaded by the dynamic Finnish curator Juhan Pallasmaa, the old orthodoxy admits the existence of the new, and these, clear voices should be heard before the din commences.

The following account begins a series of investigations conducted by Skyline into the offices of well-known architects to see if working there is as rewarding as practitioners’ research, compiled from anonymous sources over several months, will provide the information for the Insider’s Guide. Needless to say, the partners and upper-ranking associates were not involved in the survey. Nor did Skyline rely on sources of income for their fees; the material has been culled from conversations with past and present employees.

Gwathmey & Siegel, 154 West 57th Street, N.Y.C. Architects in firm: 25
Dollar volume: $32 million in the office currently.

Outsiders have various impressions of what it would be like to work for the firm? Do partners Charles Gwathmey and Robert Siegel take advantage of their reputation to exact huge monthly fees from their architects? Does Charles Gwathmey’s tough macho personality present publicly pervade the private domain of the workspace?

Straight away, starting from the most practical viewpoint, architects at Gwathmey & Siegel make good money in comparison with other similarly-sized offices: it is estimated that a starting architect would bring in $18,500 a year, and is paid for overtime. The firm also offers a “very good insurance policy” and even (shades of corporate life) a profit-sharing plan. One employee remarks that when the firm obtains sizable commissions the partners have been known to give across-the-board raises. Employees also get raises twice a year(). However, fringes or layoffs might occur just as rapidly and more unceremoniously. Nevertheless, turnover is supremely low, there’s no “two-year stint,” common among entry-level positions. Office morale is relatively high, aided by small signs of appreciation from the partners, such as a "fast-bus" for from the office, or a later than usual departure. It is not unusual for Gwathmey to take the gang out for dinner.

The firm has grown so fast in the last few years that some seasoned observers fear Gwathmey/Siegel hasn’t been as discriminating in its hiring as it was when the firm had only about a dozen architects two years ago. A more vocal complaint concerns the imminent move of the firm to 37th Street and Tenth Avenue. Some of the staff are worrying about the imposed isolation of that location.

The two partners show discernibly different styles in working with their employees. Gwathmey, in spite of a lack of tact and a reportedly misogynistic streak, is likely to be quite open to discussions about a particular design — as long as the employee is tactful, Siegel, warmer in demeanor, is more businesslike and pragmatic. He impresses his employees as less interested in taking chances and more devious of adhering to the formal approach that has proved so successful for the firm in the past. Siegel is admired for his acute sense of planning and problem-solving. Gwathmey for his “art.” Both partners work out the details of projects in their own ways of a different design from the ranks.

They make good use of their well-trained architects. One must have high standards backed up. If she or he will leave the firm with strong experience of a focused, rather than general nature. Physically or he or she will be tired, well-fed and thin-skinned.
Eli Atittu, commissioner of 101 Park Avenue, who formed his own office two years ago after ten years as a deputy archivist, is planning a facade renewal partnership with Bradford Perkins, Jr. Perkins was a partner and general manager of the New York and Washington offices of Perkins & Will... David DeLong, associate professor of architecture at Columbia, took over recently as the director of the Historic Preservation Program at the University's Graduate School of Architecture and Planning. He is replacing William J. Mongiardo, director for twelve years, who has become vice-president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The Historic Preservation Program has been plagued in recent years, since the departure of James Marston Fitch, by frequent turnover in directors; DeLong, coming from within the School, already has the respect of faculty, students, and alumni. It is hoped that DeLong, a scholar and good administrator, will begin to solidify the program and that it will regain some of its former stature and identity within the School... Wolf von Eckart, architecture critic of The Washington Post, has left the paper to do the job for Time magazine. He has been replaced at the Post by Benjamin Forgey, last seen as art editor of the luckless Washington Star. Although he couldn't be found for comment, we believe that von Eckart continues to work from the capital.

Going public

Jody Foster, Yale student, actress, and object of desire for every architect, has managed to review Vincent Scully for Interview magazine in the May 1981 issue. Admitting to a grizzly crush, Foster asked wide-ranging questions, J.F.: "Do you ever act?"; V.S. (known for his embracing performative style): "All our architects are professors. Also, I am terrified. I could never speak someone else's lines." Next on the Interview agenda was Michael Graves, interviewed by Wilson Kidder and Lars Anderson for the September issue. Questions and answers concentrated on Gravean's predilection for color, problem-solving versus form, and commitment to total design. Graves commented he would like to design a toaster: "I need to go into things I don't know as much about." A cartoonist, he has drawn a "74! ("The things I'm doing now... play back into the architecture and the architecture plays back into them.")"

Who is next? Robert A.M. Stern was already interviewed last year by Steven M.L. Aarmon, who is including a chapter on architecture and architectural color, problem-solving versus form, and commitment to total design. Graves commented he would like to design a toaster: "I need to go into things I don't know as much about." A cartoonist, he has drawn a "74! ("The things I'm doing now... play back into the architecture and the architecture plays back into them.")"

Who has clout

A one-man show Stanley Tigerman's work, scheduled for April at the Max Protetch Gallery in New York, was recently canceled. According to Tigerman, Protetch explains that the cancellation was due to "a number of certain parties" whom he would not name. Tigerman responded by withdrawing his work from Protetch and hooking up with another 57th street gallery, Rosa Esman. Tigerman is now scheduled to have a show at the Max Protetch Gallery at Spring, when his book Post-Modernism as a Jewish Movement (working title) is to be published by Rizzoli.

Chic mystique

No chintz in the chic sections of the June Country. The panache of elegance, virtue and well-considered good taste goes into the "personal, professional environments" of eight of New York's leading architects. Aside from the fact that the lighting for the photographs is bad, the color printing off, the angles from which many of the portraits were taken distorted, the photographs by Arnold Newman project some interesting comments about T&C's way of setting up the photographs (or the architects). The spread begins with the stringently linear and dark-office-like "home" of Philip Johnson, keeps up the portrait tradition of the 1950s with Paul Rudolph and the spacial prickliness of Charles Gwathmey's living-galley. The treatment softens for Ulrich Franzen and Robert A.M. Stern's curved and luminous living spaces, getting more "natural" with Richard Meier's living room (oddly) showing wood floors, books, plants, and finally works itself into the woody naturalness of Edward Larraeae Barnes' country home, and the bookish confessions of De Scult's library. Attire follows similar patterns beginning with Johnson's stringently dark tailoring and ending up with Barnes and De Scult's natural casual gray sleeves and open blue shirts. Words has it that J.C. visited Peter Eisenman's apartment twice but did not find it sufficiently photogenic. Skyline expects that Eisenman's suspenders switched the spread.

Whitney tower still rising

Conversation recently has focused on the architect to be selected for the design of the Whitney Museum Tower, next to the current Marcel Breuer-designed museum at the corner of 74th Street and Madison. While the Whitney has not made its plans public, October seems to be the month when the decision (and confirmation that there will indeed be a tower) will be made. The tower is reportedly not much higher than 12 stories. And the architect? Reportedly the Whitney is looking at architects other than I.M. Pei and Edward Larrabee Barnes. The names most often heard mentioned include Ulrich Franzen (architect for the Whitney sculpture court at the Philip Morris building now under construction); Gwathmey/Seigal, Richard Meier, Davis, Brody Associates, SOM, Michael Graves, Murphy/Jahn and... Marcel Breuer Associates.

Critical awards

The 1981 CICA Awards (Comite Internationale des Critiques d'Architecture) were announced during the summer. The prize for a book on architecture went to Manfredo Nicoletti for L'Architettura delle Caserme; the prize for an article on architecture was shared by James Marston Fitch for "A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Eighties" in the AJA Journal, and Philippe Rotthier for an unpublished manuscript for "Du neo-produttivismo au post-modernisme" in the Revue de la Question Internationale. The 1981 AIA gold medal for an international competition for "The Loos Building" was awarded to the Richard Meier Architecture, and a special international mention was given to Macmillan Building, the book "Architecture and the Contemporary City" (London, 1980). The CICA Annual Prizes are awards of honor only; the jury included Bruno Zevi, Dennis Sharp, Michele Chiamessi, and Jorge Glusberg.

On his own

De Scultt's answers, that he did not leave Swanke, Hayden, Connell & Partners over differences on the design of the Tishman-Speyer "elephant's foot" monolith nearing completion on 54th and Madison (as reported in New York magazine in August), Scott, the design chief for the firm, says he left because of "management differences." Incidentally, according to sources close to city planning, the design of the tower was the choice of developer clients from more than two dozen proposals. They could build it as-of-right under current zoning.

Scott, now on his own, is working on several large projects, among them the design for a new tower for the Trump Organization. As they begin planning the model, we understand that the tower will be about 70 stories high and, although Scott won't acknowledge the relationship, the construction of the tower should go smoothly now that the site of the Barbizon Plaza Hotel on Central Park South and Sixth Avenue that Trump just acquired.

Complex revisions

At Lincoln Center, remodeling continues. Earlier this year it was announced the Philip Johnson and Cyril Harris — architect and architectural engineer responsible for making Avery Fisher Hall workable — are set to work on the insides of the New York State Theater. More recent are plans for work on the inside of the Vivian Beaumont Theater. Constant complaints have been made of this theater — usually involved matting of prosenium and thrust stages. Since Day One: the audience could sometimes hear and sometimes see, rarely both and often neither, and actors found that they had to concentrate too much on being heard (or seen) to both movements and one another; that it was difficult to perform. The Beaumont was designed by Eero Saarinen in collaboration with a second architect; it is one of the much more successful Newhouse downstays) within a building done by Saarinen jointly with SOM. Current plans call for what one Beaumont spokesman described as "a major overhaul and broadening of the thrust stage, just the stage and auditorium. The work is scheduled to begin in January or February; designs are expected to be ready in late fall. Oh yes — the job is being done by an architect rather than a theater designer: I.M. Pei & Partners.

Words from Europe

The Philippe Rotthier Foundation is sponsoring a European Award for the Reconstruction of the City. The prize, a total of £10,000, will be divided into two awards. The first will be given for an architectural exhibition, and one for a traditional structure. The announcement specifies that "the works must be carried out mainly in durable materials and should contribute to the reconstruction of a world that is coming to an end, permanent, solid, and beautiful." The prizes will be awarded on the judgment of a portfolio that should contain information essential to the assessment of the project (location, plans, cross-sections, photographs); the portfolio should be 3/4 sheets, one resolution, and one for each author and another for the description of the materials and the production method. There will also be a prize of £3,000 for an unpublished essay on classical and traditional architectural culture.

The prize will be awarded for the first time in January 1982. Submissions must be received no later than November 30, 1981 at: Archives d'Architecture Moderne, 14 rue Deafacq, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium. They will be Mr. Maurice Cas, Robert-L. Delevoy, Wolfgang Hefner, Bernard Haut, Francois Loyer, Leon Krier, Manfred Sundermann, and David Watkin.

Hood's Marks

Manhattan's Forty-Second Street does have a few things that will always be and they belong to Raymond Hood, all 62 buildings. The building between Second and Third Avenues, an Art Deco classic in line with its neighbor Chrysler, has been named a landmark by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Across town, between Eighth and Ninth, the McGraw-Hill blue-green beauty is getting cleaned and painted — on the outside, that is. Since a recent change in ownership and consequent changes in tenancy, many of the inside offices are undergoing redesign; most worrisome is word from the Landmarks Conservancy (which has offices there) that the owners are also talking about "redlining" the lobby — which is not protected by the building's landmark status.
Exhibits

Boston
Le Voyage Bleu et Jaune
Through Oct. 9 A study of light and shade by five French architects at the Villa Medicis, and their development of a new three-dimensional synthetic perspective. Harvard Graduate School of Design, Gund Hall, (617) 495-5320 for information

Eleanor Raymond
Through Nov. 1 Selected projects by this pioneering Cambridge architect. A book entitled, "Eleanor Raymond, Architect" by Davis Cole will be published in conjunction with the exhibit. Institute of Contemporary Art, 955 Boylston Street, (617) 267-4090

Harvard Square
Oct. 13-Nov. 6 A show of the design for the rapid transit station and square by Skidmore Owings & Merrill. Gund Hall, (617) 495-5320 for information

Chapel Hill
The Drawings of Andrea Palladio
Through October 30 Ackland Art Museum, University of North Carolina, Columbia and Franklin Streets, (919) 966-5736

Chicago
Highrise of Homes
Through Oct. 13 A housing solution proposed by NITC that will accommodate people's conflicting desire to enjoy the cultural advantages of an urban center while sacrificing the amenities of suburbia. Young Hoffman Gallery, 215 West Superior Street, (312) 951-8828

New Haven
An Ideology for Making Architecture
Through October 22 Work by 6 former students of the School of Architecture at Yale University - Joel Levinson, C. William Fox, Marshall D. Meyers, Peter Millard, Harold Roth, and Roy Vollmer. Yale University, School of Art and Architecture, 180 York Street, (203) 436-0550

Raimund Abraham
Through November 4 A show of work by this New York architect. Yale University, School of Art and Architecture, 180 York Street, (203) 436-0550

New York City
Spectacular Veneerade
Through Oct. 13 A show of traditional desert architecture from Africa and South West Asia. Columbia University, Avery Hall Exhibition Gallery, (212) 280-3414 for information

The Second Avenue Court House
Through Oct. 22 "An Architectural Portrait" of the Court House, with plans for its restoration and renovation as the new headquarters of the Anthology Film Archives. Seagram Building, 375 Park, 4th Floor

A Selection of Posters by Armin Hoffman
Through Oct. 25 Museum of Modern Art, 11 West 53rd Street, (212) 956-2648

Art of the Avant-Garde in Russia
Oct. 16-Jan. 3 Selections from the George Costakis Collection, including 275 paintings and works on paper by Russian artists from 1908-1932. A catalogue will accompany the exhibit with text by Angelica Rudomin and Malcolm Rogers. The Guggenheim Museum, 1071 Fifth Avenue, (212) 860-1300

Buildings in Progress II: Midtown Office Towers
Oct 19-Nov. 13 Models, drawings, and photographs of current construction in midtown. The Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue, (212) 935-3960 for information

The Zoning Game
Oct. 19-Nov. 13 An explanation of zoning - its rules, terminology, and principal players. The Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue, (212) 935-3960

Manhattan Photos
Oct. 27-Feb. 21 Group show of contemporary color photographs of New York from a book of the same title, to be published by Harry Abrams in the fall. Museum of the City of New York, Fifth Avenue at 103rd Street, (212) 534-1672

Manhattan Additions
End of October-Dec. 31 Drawings and models of two Manhattan apartment buildings by Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas to begin construction in late 1981. The Lobby, 369 Lexington Avenue

Princeton
Bernini Drawings

Washington
Alfred Bendiner, FAAA: A Retrospective

London
Sir Edwin Landseer Latymer
Nov 17th on. An exhibition of work. Hayward Gallery, Belvedere Road, South Bank, (01) 928-3144

Verona, Italy
New Chicago Architecture
Through Nov. 11 Photographs, models, and original drawings of work by 15 "new" Chicago architects - Thomas Beeby, Laurence Booth, Stuart Cohen, Deborah Doyle, James Goetch, Gerald Horn, Helmut Jahn, Ron Krukar, James Nagle, Anders Nereim, Peter Pran, Kenneth Schroeder, John Syvertson, Stanley Tigerman and Ben Weese. The catalogue will have essays on this "school" by Charles Jencks, Christian Norberg-Schulz, Norly Miller, Heinrich Klotz, and John Zukowsky. Gran Guardia Vecchio, Verona.

Events

Austin
The Classical Tradition: The Wave of the Future
Oct. 2 A conference sponsored by Classical America. Speakers include John Barrington Bayley, John Blair, Pierce Rice, and Arthur Ward. School of Architecture, University of Texas. For further information call: (512) 471-3123

Boston
Harvard Lectures
Oct. 6 Peter Shepleard, Dean Emeritus and Professor of Architecture, Harvard University. Graduate School of Fine Arts. Oct. 20th: Grant and Development, Nov. 30th: Design and Techniques

Gropius' Legacy
Oct 21 Lecture sponsored by the Boston Society of Architects on "TAC: the Heritage of Walter Gropius." Chip Harkness will examine designs by Gropius and discuss recent work by TAC. Boston Architectural Center, 320 Newbury Street, (617) 267-5713. 3:30 pm

Detroit
Tomorrow's Work Place
Oct. 4-5 First north American conference on industrial architecture. Speakers include Kenneth Frampton, Paul Kohnen, Delmar Landon, Donald Ephlin, and Edward Deming. To be held at the Hotel Pontchartrain. For further information call AIA in Washington: (202) 626-7364

Galveston
Conference on Urban Design/Galveston
Oct. 28-31 Third international conference on urban design using Galveston as an "urban laboratory" to study the issues of historic preservation, zoning, urban migration and the role of philanthropies in downtown development For further information call: (908) 323-6536 ask for Locator A-129, or contact the Institute for Urban Design: (914) 253-5527. The conference is sponsored by the Institute for Urban Design in cooperation with Rice University and the Texas University at Austin.

Houston
Tall Buildings Talk

New Haven
Yale Lectures

New York City
Discover New York Walking Tours
Through Oct. 25th Tours sponsored by the Municipal Art Society every Sunday at 2:30 members, 5:30 non members. Call (212) 935-3960 for information
GRAU comes to New York
Chicago goes to Verona
Lutyens alive in London

Tour of Upper Fifth Avenue
Oct. 4th—“Upper Fifth Avenue: the Town House and the Private Palace” led by Henry Hope Reed of Classical America. $5 nonmembers, $2 members. A picnic lunch is available by reservation. Museum of the City of New York, Fifth Avenue at 103rd Street, (212) 534-1672. 2 pm

Waterfront Lecture Series

Review of Reviews
Oct. 7: A round table discussion by journalists of architectural and art critics as reported in the press. Sponsored by the Architectural League, at the Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue, (212) 753-1722. 6:30 pm

Lecture Series by P.B. Wight

Lectures at Columbus

Young Architects Lecture Series
Oct. 13, 20, 27 Steven Forman, Ralph Lerner, Richard Reid, Steven Holl, Diode Ackley, David Robertson, David Spiker, and others present their work. Sponsored by the Architectural League, The Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue, (212) 753-1722. 6:30 pm

Symposium on Contemporary Roman Architects
Oct. 15 Panel discussion by Alessandro Asnelli, Massimo Bruni, Pietro Antonio Toesca, Kenneth Frampton, and Romoldo Giugola on participants in the show of “Contemporary Roman Architecture.” Friday, Oct. 25: “L’Italia in Italia” at the Auditorium, Avery Hall. For information: (212) 280-3414

Richard Pommer Lecture
Oct. 19 Richard Pommer, Professor of Architectural History at Vassar will speak on “Recent Architecture and Mother Nature.” City University Graduate Center 33 West 42nd Street. 7:30pm

Lunchtime Lectures
Sponsored by Urban Center Books. Oct 20: G.E. Kohler Smith on his volume work, Architecture of the United States. Discussion by Arthur Drexler, Director of the Department of Architecture & Design at MoMA. Oct. 27: Lella and Massimo Vignelli on their work, introduced by Stephen Swid, Chairman of Knoll International. The Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue, 12:30-1:30 pm. Free

The English Landscape Garden
Oct. 22 A lecture on Stourhead and the creation of the English landscape garden by Thomas P. Burr.

Information on lectures, exhibits, and other events should be sent to Skyline at least six weeks before the date of publication.

San Francisco

Toronto
Jailhouse Tech
Oct. 1-3 A conference and current emerging technology for providing secure environments in correctional facilities. Sponsored by the AIA Committee on Architecture for Justice in cooperation with the Toronto Society of Architects. $135 per person. For more information call: (202) 626-7365

Washington
Smithsonian Lecture Series

Toronto
Jailhouse Tech
Oct. 1-3 A conference on current and emerging technology for providing secure environments in correctional facilities. Sponsored by the AIA Committee on Architecture for Justice in cooperation with the Toronto Society of Architects. $135 per person. For more information call: (202) 626-7365

Washington
Smithsonian Lecture Series

October Events at the Architectural League
457 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022 Telephone: (212) 753-1722

Review of Reviews
A monthly mandable discusson by journalists of international events as reported in the press Sundnt Aherbrichter, AIA Journal
Nery Miller, Progressive Architecture
Mildred Schenck, Architectural Record
Michael Sorkin, The Village Voice
Suzeon Stephens, Skyline

Tuesday evening, October 13th at 6:30
Drewing in the Cracks I: Fragments and Figments
Robert Gwyszcz, James Sanders and Roy Strickland, David Spolid

Tuesday evening, October 20th at 6:30
Drewing in the Cracks II: Proposals and Possibilities
Doral, David Cagle, Alexander Gofus,
Michael McDonough, Mark Schmietenti

Admission: League Members: Free. Non-Members: $5.00

New Architecture Books from Rizzoli

CHICAGO ARCHITECTURAL JOURNAL
Edited by Anders Nerelim. An important new annual journal on architecture in Chicago and featuring essays by Alan Greenberg, Stanley Tigerman, Judith Wurin, George(Runtime) Tombs, and others. 80 pp. 99 b&w illus. Paper: $15.00

DESIGN BY CHOICE
Rayner Banham. A collection of fascinating and widely diversified essays representing the seminal thought of one of the foremost contemporary design historians during the last 20 years. 152 pp. 150 illus., 8 color pages. $27.50

DESIGN: VIGNELLI
Introduction by Emilio Ambasz. Display and discussion of the myriad products created by Lella and Massimo Vignelli, two of the most prolific designers of our time. 108 pp. 91 pp. photos. Paper: $15.00

FRANCO ALBINI
Edited by Frances Helg, Antonio Piva, Marco Albini. The first study of the influential Italian architect and interior designer. Text in Italian and English. 175 pp. 145 ilus., 28 in color. Paper: $17.50

THE HEROIC PERIOD OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE
Alison and Peter Smithson. Invaluable record of an extraordinary period in architecture: just before and after World War I. 90 pp. 234 illus., 24 in color. Paper: $12.50

IDEA AS MODEL
Richard Pommer and Christian Hubert. Twenty major architects who submitted models for the 1976 Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies exhibition now submit 1980 models for inclusion and comparison with the original material. 120 pp. 150 illus., 12 in color. Paper: $17.50

IVAN LEONIDOV
Rost Koolhaas. Gerrit Oorthuys. Introduction by Kenneth Frampton. The first book devoted exclusively to this important architect of the Russian Revolutionary period. 100 pp. 150 illus., 4 in color. Paper: $17.50

LATE MODERN ARCHITECTURE

LE CORBUSIER'S FINKY MICH
Essays by Anthony Eardrey, et al. The first monograph on Le Corbusier's last project, including color, original handwritten notes, sketches and models. 120 pp. 150 illus., 12 in color. Paper: $17.50
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