Schorske on Freud and the Psycho-Archeology of Civilizations

Special Christmas Book List
The Agrest—Gandelsonas Tower Controversy
Robert Hughes Interview
Insider’s Guide to Architecture Schools
Plus Galleries, Symposia, and an Assessment of Albert Speer
The opinions expressed in Skyline do not necessarily reflect those of the publishers or the sponsors.

Skyline
December 1981

Notes on Contributors
Olivier Buissonière, a French journalist specializing in architecture, recently published a book of profiles on Frank Gehry, SIEE, and Stanley Tigerman.

Eileen Constantine, former associate editor of Progressive Architecture and Architectural Record, is now pursuing a degree in law and urban design at Harvard.

Magdalena Dabrowski is an assistant curator in the drawings department at the Museum of Modern Art.

Martin Filler frequently writes criticism on architecture and design.

Robert Hughes, art critic for Time magazine, has made many critically-acclaimed films for television on the visual arts.

Michael Kimmelman is an editor of Industrial Design and has written for a variety of art and design magazines including The Commodore and Horizon.

Barbara Miller Lane has been writing about Nazi architecture and politics for a number of years. She is Andrew Mellon Professor of History at Bryn Mawr College.

Peter Papademos, an architect practicing in Houston and professor of architecture at Rice University, is a contributing editor of Progressive Architecture.

E. Rohrschneider was Dayton-Stockton Professor of History and director of the European Cultural Studies program at Princeton University until his retirement in 1986. He is also a Fellow of the New York for the Humanities and a Trustee of the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies.

Abigail Solomon-Godeau is a freelance photographer critic who has written for Art in America and Arts magazine.

Robert A. M. Stern, John Massengale, and Gregory Gilmartin are currently writing a book, New York 1900 (Rudall, 1982).

Christopher Wilk is a freelance writer, curator, and author of Breuer: Furniture and Interiors and Thonet: 150 years of Furniture.

Board of Sponsors
Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendelsohn
Davis/Brody Associates
Philip Johnson and John Burgee Architects
Paul Koh], (Canal Road Scott, Inc.
Murphy/John Architects/Engineers
J.M. Riddle
Cesar Pelli Associates
Kevin Roche, John Dinkeloo & Associates
Paul Rudolph
Robert Stern
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Swanke Hayden & Connell

Skyline would also like to acknowledge the continued and generous support of the National Endowment for the Arts and would like to thank Gravers & Partners for their support.

Views: Breuer Debated

To the Editor:

I had looked forward to the rebirth of Skyline under your aegis. I found it an elegant and lively publication. Nothing, however, pleased me more quickly when I read Vincent Scully's statement on Breuer.

Criticism of course is legitimate, and Richard Meier expressed his reservations with sensitivity and eloquence. Scully, on the other hand, went after the fast kill, and his brief paragraphs cannot be read as serious critical analysis. He had done this before and was known as an enemy of Breuer.

Breuer had a strong sense of himself. He lacked the instinct for promotional cultivation and bonding so prevalent today and found it difficult to nurture friendships with critics and the press. Scully's motives, for one, may have an origin there. Breuer deserves much more.

I would like to doubt that Scully's editorial board and sponsors find it necessary to pepper its copy with venom and facile name-calling, but then I wonder why, with so many able minds and critics, architecture, this choice was made.

Sincerely,

Ticani Papachristou

It is Skyline's policy, when seeking opinions on projects, works, or people, not to censure any comments that are made, as long as they are made by persons who have a stature in the intellectual community, and who, in the last analysis, must assume responsibility for their expressed views. We asked Vincent Scully to write this reminiscence note because we had no idea of his comments beforehand, but because he had known Marcel Breuer and is a respected scholar and teacher of architecture.

Ed.

Vincent Scully

To the editor:

Thank you for sending me Mr. Papachristou's truly awful letter. It remains a constant wonder, though banal enough, to see how people can ignore their own worst feelings to others. "The fast kill" indeed. I am nobody's "enemy," and I recognize none. I do care seriously about buildings, which is why I disliked Breuer's later work. From the uncouth box on Madison Avenue and the minuscule table ornamentations of Saint John's Priory, to the folded paper in New Haven and the primitive slab with which he was eager to replace Grand Central Station, Breuer's designs for large buildings suffered from two fundamental neo-Bauhaus weaknesses: an inability to handle large scale, and a lack of sympathy for the context of the contemporary city. For this reason they tended, like many other buildings of their era, to be ubitarian and destructive and therefore had to be opposed on occasion as vocally as possible. "Emnity" has nothing to do with the question.

Breuer's small suburban houses did not suffer from those limitations, and it seems certain that history will regard them, along with Breuer's furniture, as his best and most important work. For that reason I concentrated upon them in my memoir, and as requested of me, personal, brief, and, I thought, useful and flavorful. As an architect, recently published a book of profiles on Frank Gehry, SIEE, and Stanley Tigerman.

The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies
Trustees
Armond Bete, Chairman
Charles Goulahern, President
Douglas H. Baker
Richard F. Bater
A. Bruce Brownridge
Calvin W. Croom
Walter C. Frank
Paul H. Greenberg
Ulrich Franzen
Frank O. Gehry
Donald H. Dines
Elle Jacobs
Philip Johnson
Edmund Hollander
Gerald M. McCone
Robert M. Levy
Paul Rudolph
Carlton Schmit
Frederick S. Taylor
Matteo Tere
Massimo Vignelli
John F. White
Peter W. Rice

Skyline is published ten times a year by Rizzi Communications, Inc. for the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies. ISSN 0123-4567 © 1981 by The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies

Editorial offices: Skyline, 8 West 40th Street, New York, New York 10018; phone: (212) 995-7974.

Contents

2 Views
3 City Report: New York
7 Notes & Comment
10 In Memoriam
10 Interview: Hughes and Eisenman
11 Galleries/Symposia, Events in Verona and Houston
18 Books of 1981
27 The Insider's Guide to Architecture Schools
28 News and Trends in Architecture of Civilizations
32 History: Herts & Tallant
34 Deadline 31 December '81

French Elucidation

To the Editor:

An editorial addition to my article in Skyline, November 1981, noted that Breuer's "political agenda was anti-intellectualism of the worst period of American architecture as a business, during which significant journalistic criticism became impossible. Apparently that attitude is not dead, at least amongst the less enlightened members of the profession. If Skyline is to have a serious future it may well be a stormy one.

Sincerely yours,

Vincent Scully

Invitation to Editor:

An editorial addition to my article in Skyline, November 1981, noted that Breuer's "political agenda was anti-intellectualism of the worst period of American architecture as a business, during which significant journalistic criticism became impossible. Apparently that attitude is not dead, at least amongst the less enlightened members of the profession. If Skyline is to have a serious future it may well be a stormy one.

Sincerely yours,

Vincent Scully

Invitation to Editor:

From the sociological terms of Pierre Bourdieu, my guide to French society.

The editorial decision to run the names of philosophers discussed in "Paris Since 1960" across the top of pages 10 and 11 gave Bourdieu pride of place among the influential architectural figures. The idea was not successful, as evidenced by the extensive and often harshest criticism of the publication. Bourdieu's response to this was to write a letter to the editor.

It is the nature of a cultural field to have a dynamic structure, much like a magnetic field, where (in the absence of external perturbations), the changes in position of any one element results in the repositioning of all the elements, with a readjustment of forces that is neither intentional nor invariant. My own attempts to reveal structures that are not necessarily apparent to members of the milieu, and as for their intentions, it can be said that most successful strategies are unconscious.

These observations derive, as I said, from "the sociological terms of Pierre Bourdieu, my guide to French society."

The architectural figures discussed in "Paris Since 1960" are significant for their place in the architectural field. It is a wry and ironic comment on the dangers of making allusive references to other's culture, to see how the intellectual class, when they speak about the architectural-intellectual, is wont to do. Wry, because it illustrates that at any time and with little capital?..
Cory Porter

The City of New York - in the form of the Public Development Corporation (PDC), the City Planning Commission (CPC) - and the New York State Urban Development Corporation (UDC) are currently reviewing proposals submitted to them for the 42nd Street Development Project, a massive plan for the rehabilitation of 42nd between Broadway and Eighth Avenue.

Bids were received in September from 26 developers, including the Brandt Organization, which owns or has long-term lease-holds on many of the area's theaters, Cadillac-Fairview Urban Northeast, a part of the Canadian company that is now developing 90 blocks in downtown Houston among other properties; the Helmsley Organization with Portman Properties; Midwest Properties/New York Mart/The Brandt Organization; Olympia & York; the Rouse Company; and the Shubert Organization. In addition, these are the fewest possible number of developers involved, but, if necessary, there may be another one on each of 10 sites. The UDC reported that its timetable was adhered to on all sites.

The design guidelines, prepared by Cooper Eckstut Ignazetti, divided the project into three general sections. Office towers on the blocks adjacent to Times Square would be the first, one million square feet of retail use. Although originally considered as an option, the Times Tower itself was removed from the bidding. Crucial to these sites is the projected rehabilitation of the Times Square subway station - a "given" that is one of the essential considerations of the project.

The mid-blocks on both sides of 42nd Street include 8 theaters, as well as the Candler Building, which is not being offered, and a number of infill sites intended for retail use. A minimum of 175,000 s.f. of retail space is included in the project now; more may be substituted for other uses. The major characteristic of the plan for the mid-block sites is the insistence on rehabilitation of the theaters to legitimate theater use - and" given" that is one of the essential considerations of the project.

The Eighth Avenue sites are slated for a hotel or apartments on the north and a major wholesale market of about 2.4 million s.f. between 46th and 42nd Streets, with a pedestrian bridge to the Port Authority Terminal. This area of the plan appears to be the most problematic. Despite assurances of market viability, the idea of a mart has met with resistance from the garment industry - considered the most likely occupants - since it was first proposed for the old Madison Square Garden site by John Portman in 1960. The industry argues that a mart would require the reorganization of 5,500 companies throughout the district in workshops, showrooms, and offices - both an economic and psychological barrier to a competitive industry ensconced in its ways. The viabilities of the hotel option is naturally linked to the success of the market, and apparently developers bid on them as a package.

Opposition to the overall plan has been raised by several property owners that would have to educate, but fundamentally it has met with support. In October more then half of the candidates were announced that they were thinking of becoming condominium owners in the Times Square offices, collecting some of their resources in the Inns of Court.

At the conditional selections, several months of negotiations will ensure the final proposals go before the Board of Estimate and the UDC, with a completed Environmental Impact Statement, for approval. The UDC then becomes responsible for implementation of the project, using its power to acquire land and facilitate proceedings wherever possible. The final word is that when the developers sign with the UDC, "then we know it's going to work." - M.G.J.

The Temptation of St. Bartholomew

The unveling of the 59-story, 760,000-s.f. tower by Edward Durell Stone Associates last month for St. Bartholomew's Church in New York was greeted by gasps, not of pleasure, but of dismay. The designer for the architectural firm, Peter Capone, argued he was attempting to make the building "contextual" by designing what looks like a stalagmite of reflective glass hovering over Bertram Goodhue's Byantine-style 1939 church. In studying this $130-million tower to be built on land leased from St. Bart's where the community house presently exists, one is struck by two prevalent assumptions that underlie the thinking of the architects - and of the architectural consultant to the church, Robert Geddes.

The first assumption is that any tower could go on this site without seriously undermining the architectural and urbanistic identity of the ensemble. The second assumption is that the reflective glass tower would be sufficiently invisible to provide the best solution.

Mr. Geddes, deacon of Princeton's architecture school, was encouraged that such a development was possible because of the sensitive juxtaposition that exists between St. Bartholomew's and the 1931 GE Tower behind it, designed by Cross and Cross. But the GE tower is removed at a discernible distance from the church as to form a wall along with the new tower by the Egers Group at 599 Lexington, also of red brick. The GE tower, especially complements St. Bart's because of its dark color, its opacity, and its richly detailed ornament. The relationship between these two buildings barely means that another tower next to St. Bart's would achieve the same result.

The second assumption, that a tower can be invisible, is found in Mr. Geddes' suggestion that "the success of any addition to the St. Bartholomew's group of buildings will depend not only on the spatial composition, massing, and surface treatment, but also on the quality of light that will be created." While reflective glass may bounces light, there is a difference between light reflected and light admitted to a very much needed open "room." The argument is frequently made that a mirrored glass form gives the city back its own reflections and makes the building disappear. Only the first part of the statement makes sense. Reflective glass towers are eye-catching forms largely because of the play of light on their surfaces and the pictorial way the images are distorted. Even if they do not appear chunky and massive, like concrete buildings, they do dominate the field of vision by virtue of their activated and advancing planes.

The Edward Durell Stone design, done in conjunction with developer Howard Rosen, may have seemed to Mr. Geddes (whose church credits selecting the design) to be more sympathetic to the church than the schemes of runners-up Elia Atta and developer Donald Trump; or Richard Dattner and the Cohen Bheren. But if there are more difficult decisions called for than selecting the least offensive solution. Those are decisions neither the architects nor the consultant wanted to make.

Meanwhile, opponents inside the church are questioning the economic safeguards the church will have in case the developer goes bankrupt on the building. The opponents outside the church are questioning the legal issues involved in its landmark status. Both aspects of this case will continue to keep attention focused on St. Bart's in the months to come. - S.B.

Glossing Wright

Frank Lloyd Wright, Hoffman Display Room for Jaguar, New York City. 1965. Photograph © Ezra Stoller/ESTO.


At the end of October, Mercedes-Benz unveiled the "newer" version of their flagship showroom on Park Avenue at 56th Street. Frank Lloyd Wright was originally commissioned to do the showroom in 1933. It was built and opened in 1935, but not to original specifications. Apparently due to budget constraints and technical problems, the mirror Wright had reportedly wanted didn't seem possible back then. About a year and a half ago, Mercedes realized that they had a unique property in shamsbles - design "modifications" and deterioration had affected it over the years - and set about restoring it to the "original" design with the assistance of Taliesin Associated Architects. Isn't it just too bad?
Tradition of the New

Suzanne Stephens

In mid-November the Landmarks Preservation Commission turned down a 15-story tower proposed to be built on top of a 6-story townhouse at 22 East 71st Street. It considered the scheme an "inappropriate" addition to the existing building in the Upper East Side Historic District. The tower, designed by Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas in association with Gruzen & Partners, became a cause célèbre in the final days of the landmark hearings, largely because of its architectural design. It wasn't that the design was considered poor or ill-conceived; many of the commissioners described it as "splendid." In the 6-5 vote that narrowly defeated the scheme, the reasons given for denying it a Certificate of Appropriateness revolved around the issues of adding a tower to that block, and placing this scheme on top of this particular neo-Italian Renaissance townhouse.

In this controversy, the first major debate to focus on the Upper East Side since the May 19 designation by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, the opposition sought to prevent the tower from being built largely because it is sited on the northeast corner of the Frick Museum block, one of the last entirely low-rise (six stories maximum) blocks in the district. The townhouse itself, although not a landmark before the district designation, is considered of strong architectural value. Designed in 1922-23 by C.P.H. Gilbert, it is commended by Landmarks Commission for its unusual width, the limestone facade, its arched entrance, and imposing mansard roof.

Originally when Agrest, Gandelsonas, and the Gruzen Partnership drew up the scheme, the district did not have landmark status; in fact, the architects had gotten their plans approved by the Buildings Department last December. Since they stayed within the bulk limits of the area, the building received no special dispensation. It did exceed the current height limit established by the City Planning Department by 35 feet (the height limit for the Madison Avenue Special District is 210 feet), but the architects were prepared to top off that excess amount if the need arose. In terms of the pending zoning amendments (p.6) they had met informally with city planners, and both parties found that the scheme fit generally within the new plans to remove the height limit and require more setbacks.

After the building permit was granted, Agrest and Gandelsonas ran into delays in financing, and, therefore, delays in arranging for a contractor. By the time the contractor was selected and able to pick up the permit, a freeze had been placed on new construction in the historic district. The tower then had to be submitted to a process of hearings, including a session with Community Planning Board II, who approved the building, and a session with the Landmarks Commission for the final vote. At first the discussions centered around modifications to the mansard roof; finally the controversy expanded to the tower. In the meantime, the votes themselves were changing: the early vote, without a majority, came in favor of the project; the second vote, without a majority, was balanced against the third, a 6-5 vote, with only one vote, was against the scheme by a margin of one vote.

Architecture vs. Development

Public support of the opposition's case often is based on the assumption that the Upper East Side landmark designation was undertaken to prevent towers from being built there. (For details on what the designation means vis-à-vis new development, see news story.) The area is known, not only for its assemblage of architecturally distinctive buildings, but also for its generally low-scale character. In New York, low-scale can range from 3 stories to 20, and still appear as one urban ensemble; this is certainly the case with the Upper East Side Historic District. Needless to say, developers looking at all that blank sky and open space are not alone in desiring something other than nebulous qualities like character and amenity.

To complicate the Agrest-Gandelsonas affair, their design isn't the usual speculative developer "luxo" modern shoe-box standing on end. Their scheme is not like a tower anyone has proposed for New York in some time. The tower is clearly designed with the neighborhood's architecture taken as a reference point. The choice of configuration like the steeply-pitched roof, the molding, cornices, and recessed windows, relies on vocabulary of traditional elements. The choice of materials follows the pattern. The architects planned to clad the tower in 5-inches of Indiana limestone, deepened at the corners by an 8-to-10-inch facing. The top of the tower shaft would be covered with marble, the roof with copper; detailing of the coping and stringcourse would be in stone. Embedded in the 15-story shaft, 45 by 50 feet wide, would be long fragments of curtain-wall-like windows—a monumental gesture, executed to bring light into the building. The shaft would be given a different facade treatment on three elevations to adjust the design to the particulars of the architectural context in each direction.

The tower design uses the past as a repository of forms and meaning; the new building adds to the old in a way that seeks to acknowledge the original style of the Gilbert building and the buildings next door. But it attempts to play off of those buildings in such a way that the new tower form still creates a distinct statement.

The tower is also consciously designed to continue an investigation of the city's evolving tower types that had to respond to the patterns of urban growth and use in New York, as well as the more general architectural and technical developments. The project invokes many designs of early 20th-century towers—slender setback forms terminating in needle-like spires—that grew out of zoning constraints and technical possibilities, as well as the architects' visions. Faced with new heights possible in building, they summoned up a vertical expression borrowed from previous examples of bell towers, church spires, and clocktowers. Thus Raymond Hood's American Radiator Building, William van Alen's Chrysler Building, and Shreve, Lamb & Harmon's Empire State would represent the culmination of a particular formal expression that dominated New York in the 1930s, to disappear with the advent of the post-World War II glass-and-steel slab.

Agrest and Gandelsonas' tower uses a tripartite division in its massing that also can be traced back to even earlier skyscrapers, when architects were trying to anchor the tower to the street as well as have it read as part of the skyline. Thus they designed towers analogous to columns, with a top, middle, and base, an approach that was first seen clearly in Bruce Price's American Surety Building of 1895 (now known as the Bank of Tokyo) in lower Manhattan.
design can still be deemed inappropriate: The conclusion has generated one of the most heated debates between architects and preservationists in years.

Architecture vs. Preservation
For these reasons, the decision made by the Landmarks Preservation Commission was seen by many observers as an issue of architecture versus preservation; that is, the only argument that the opponents could reasonably make against the building was the desire to “freeze” the neighborhood from any development. This sentiment may be the basis to the opposition, but it is not the official position of the Landmarks Preservation Commission. On the contrary, the Commission argues quite cogently that the area can accept moderate growth and development as long as it fits in with what already exists. Some commission members have said they would like to see the building on another site. Since this tower was designed for this particular site, and with the Gilbert townhouse as the “base,” one has to look at the tower in relation to the objections to it at the present location. The opposition’s argument that the tower, located at 71st Street and Madison, would visually overwhelm the Frick Museum, which is best seen from Fifth and 71st to 70th Streets, overestimates our spatial perception of buildings; a tower at that remove would spatially flatten into the background of other Madison Avenue towers, allowing the Frick to dominate the foreground.

As for the effect on its own specific location at 71st Street and Madison, particularly the Gilbert townhouse, the charge that it would dominate the ensemble is again debatable. The tower, set back 25 feet from 71st Street, would not be easily seen from the pavement. The perceptual span of the pedestrian would primarily take in the base of the existing buildings. The actual tower shaft could only dominate the perceptual field: 1) if it were moved to the same frontal plane of the street walls formed by low-rise buildings; 2) if it were very much larger than the 45-feet-wide-by-50-feet-deep shaft; 3) if it were of a material and color that arrested the attention of the viewer: as everyone knows, bright surfaces and bright colors (e.g. bronze reflective glass) jump out at the viewer; dark colors recede, but this building is clad in gray limestone; 4) if the design created a dissonance with surrounding architectural context by its use of different rhythms, proportions, lines, or materials. Modern Movement forms stressed such breaks and unfamiliar juxtapositions; this tower is conceived with a more engaged attitude toward its predecessors.

As such the design would have established a positive architectural precedent for a type of tower form that could be inserted into the urban fabric without the destructive impact prevalent in so many “graph-paper” highrises. Furthermore, it experimented with a solution important to issues of preservation: how to add onto an existing landmark without either replicating it or creating something antithetical to it. Thus Elliot Willensky, an architect and historian who sits on the Landmarks Preservation Commission, commented that the role of the Commission was to “preserve materially and poetically, but certainly not literally. . . . We preserve the metaphor of that historic past so that it can serve as a stockpot of our urban and architectural future.”

The commissioners voting against the project were not very specific about its visual inappropriateness, a problem always inherent in any decision that is basically aesthetic. They couldn’t really resist to the “no-tower-on-tha-block” or “no-tower-in-the-district” arguments of the public opponents, since the Landmarks Preservation Commission had not designated that block accordingly, and since the district’s zoning allows towers. The 22 East 71st Street case then revealed serious unresolved issues facing the Commission. Our commissioner remarked that Landmarks is in the business of saving old landmarks, not creating new ones. If Landmarks Preservation is going to try to create a situation where change and growth will occur sensitively, then the Landmarks Preservation Commission is going to have to consider what kind of “new” architecture it wants, and encourage that.
A series of zoning amendments for upper Madison Avenue have been drawn up by the Manhattan Office of the New York City Planning Commission to complement the Upper East Side Historic District designation of the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

**Zoning for Context: Upper Madison**

**Suzanne Stephens**

When the Landmarks Preservation Commission’s designation of the Upper East Side Historic District went into effect, the Board of Estimate lost many observers expected a knock-down drag-out fight. The Preservation Commission, headed by Kent Barlow, had to wage a campaign against real estate development interests who want to make sure the low-rise, high-scent area was not “frozen.” By announcing it was developing a series of zoning amendments to complement the historic district, the City Planning Commission proved quite helpful, so it seems, in getting the historic designation past the real estate interest groups. The Board of Estimate upheld the designation with a unanimous vote of support.

The Landmarks Preservation Commission designation of the Upper East Side Historic District’s 1044 buildings does not affect bulk or density controls (the amount of floor space allowed in relation to lot size) and density (number of inhabited rooms per building) are controlled by the City Planning Department. The Landmarks Preservation Commission, however, must approve of the demolition of a building in the historic district, and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for any visible modification, addition, or new construction. For example, numbers 52 and 54 East 22nd Street are slated to be torn down to make way for middle-income housing. The developers can carry out this plan, they had to get a permit of demolition, and then a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new tower. In addition, property owners are not able to simply tear down a building and leave a hole.

New development must not only obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness, but must also conform to the existing zoning regulations of a FAR of 10 along the avenues, or 7 to 8 on the streets, and height limitations for buildings on upper Madison (600th to 96th) limiting development to 16 stories or 210 feet in height. Upper Fifth (59th to 110th Streets) and Park (58th to 98th) belong to a “park-improvement” district, whereby new construction is limited to 25 stories or 300 feet whichever is less, and the builder may build up to the lot line, with no setbacks required, if he contributes money to the city’s park fund.

**New Regulations**

The new zoning revisions now being proposed by the City Planning Department’s Manhattan office under the guidance of Senior Urban Designer Peter Zeidel would keep the FAR of 10 but remove the height limitation along upper Madison. In effect, the amendments would encourage taller, skinnier towers to be built within the historic district (and beyond), as long as these towers met certain conditions regarding street wall heights, a sky exposure plane, and setback requirements. Generally these new regulations would increase FAR, FAR’s being current rules of the game, are currently being proposed by City Planning for midtown (October skyline, p. 3).

New construction on upper Madison would have to obey a street wall height at 20 feet and the street wall extends horizontally more than 60 feet, indentations or recesses are required to break up the monotony of these expanses. Like the 1936 zoning, the height of the street wall is conceived in proportion to the width of the street; above this height, the building is set back according to a sky exposure plane. In the case of Madison Avenue, the 120-foot height limit is about 400 feet to the side of the street. The 120-foot high street wall may wrap around a corner and extend a length of 50 feet into the mid-block zone. The mid-block buildings are limited in height to 60 feet.

In computing the setback angle for Madison Avenue buildings, the City Planning Department is proposing a method slightly different and more simplified than that of the two-tier system being applied to midtown. Here the tower setback is determined by a formula in which the width of the building at its base, say 100 feet, is divided by the width of the tower, say 50 feet. Then the figure is multiplied by a factor—that is, a number that City Planning has worked out according to the width of the street and type of development in the area: for Madison it would be 2. The resulting number indicates a ratio. In the above example it is 4, meaning the building can go up 40 feet in height for every 10 feet it is set back.

Between these setbacks along the avenue, and the 60-foot height of the mid-block street wall, would be a “mid-block transition portion,” where new construction would have to step down to break the massing between the avenue and side streets. These mid-block transition portions would be waived if the developer were to preserve an existing building deemed of “high architectural quality” for that transitional site. As far as Fifth and Park are concerned, the proposal calls for removing the bonuses for extra floor area now available to developers in return for contributing to a park fund.

**Considerations and Caves**

By requiring the building configuration to obey a street wall and setback formula proportionate to the street width, the city would be encouraging a pattern of building in line with much of the city’s traditional urban configurations. By using a setback angle calculated according to the building’s own dimensions for its base and height, the new tower forms should obey internal proportions as well. It seems as if the department has tried to take care of all the slippery variables that afflict zoning, including required dimensions for recesses and indentations at ground level, just in case the architects of the new buildings envision vast expanses of glass or concrete. The transitional stepped-down portions of the new construction on the side streets would ease that disjunction between existing townhouses and the larger towers. And having a height limit for the mid-block would effectively keep a lid on growth.

But there are several nagging considerations: One is that of methodology. A developer using the two-tier system in midtown might be impatient with having to obey yet another formula for calculating the setbacks and sky exposure planes along upper Madison, even if he can understand that the two development situations do not share the same level of complexity. The second consideration concerns the street wall height along Madison. Many of the buildings are no more than 3 to 6 stories high, and new development will create a very alternating discontinuity for these particular buildings. Their street wall is quite a bit shorter than 120 feet—more like 60 feet. The new street wall height would be more sympathetic if it encouraged the the tower-on-a-base configuration displayed, ironically, in the rejected Agrest-Candelasous scheme at 22 East 71st Street (preceding page). Here the setback occurs about the 6th floor, the height of the townhouse from which the tower would have risen.

The final nagging consideration may seem very minor, but should be given some attention. A high street wall, instead of a low one, means that less and less sunlight will be hitting the pavement of Madison Avenue as new construction takes place. Several special qualities make upper Madison the promenade route in New York: the presence of high-quality shops, the small-grain texture of its low-scale buildings, and the fashionably dressed people. On a sunny afternoon in the fall, winter, and spring, everyone turns out to stroll and up and down the avenue; on the colder days, people crowd the east sidewalk as the sun begins to drop in the west. The sunlight pattern now is broken only in a few stretches by towers in the lower 60s and low 70s. Any new construction higher than 6 stories along the western edge of Madison will cast shadows along the promenade. The highest the street wall allowed before setbacks, the more bulky the shadows.

It is difficult to figure out why urban places are popular, and more difficult to figure out how to keep them that way and allow for change. It usually means coming to terms with the perceptual qualities of the place—a very uncomfortable phenomena for those forced to deal with political and economic facts. Obviously the City Planning Department is beginning to do this, and it will be interesting to see how far they can go.
Skyline congratulates Ada Louise Huxtable for being named a MacArthur Prize Fellow in recognition of her architectural criticism.

The Photographic Text

Architects have been getting a lot of coverage in the media lately—especially those who design tall buildings. We think there is more to the composition of the photographs, however, than merely the format of a double spread (Life) or a magazine cover (New York Times Sunday Magazine). We notice that in the Life magazine shoot (left to right), Stanley Tigerman, Bruce Graham of SOM, Helmut Jahn, James Stirling, and SOM, John Vinci, and Jerome Butler of the Public Works Commission are standing in sunlight, but in a formation around Jahn. This indicates to the paranoid observer that Chicago is still open to development (hence the sunlight and spread-out space in the foreground), but that its architects are worried about any strong-armed incursion from outside intruders (i.e., architects from other cities); hence the flanks formation around a gang leader. As far as New York goes, the photo of architects John Burgee, Cesar Pelli, Der Scutt, Philip Johnson, and Raul de Armas give off different messages. They are all standing in shadow (because, of course, New York is overbuilt), and they are all relaxed, that is, not worried about intruders. Whereas Chicago architects pretend nonchalance by putting their hands in their pockets, New York architects affect a churlish solemnity by clapping their hands in front of them.

Personnel

Peter Papademetriou, Houston architect and Rice University architecture professor, has been made the editor of the Journal of Architectural Education, published by the A.C.S.A. It looks as if the new design for the magazine will be executed by Chernayff & Geismar.

You're Wrong and You're Wrong

Skyline’s interview subject for October and November, Tom Wolfe, was later interviewed on television by William Buckley. While we are not trying to set up unfair comparisons between Skyline’s interviewer Peter Eisenman and William Buckley, we observed that Buckley managed to pronounce Pruitt-Igoe Housing as “Pruitt-Ego,” and Wolfie did go about Le Corbusier’s bumbling color “Pntitt-Ego,” Buckley.

The Preservationist/ Mercenary Rides Again

John Zacottti, former chairman of the City Planning Commission, created a number of special neighborhood preservation districts during his reign in order to keep intact the character of distinct segments of the city. More recently, he was a leading lawyer representing Milstein Properties, which gutted the Biltmore Hotel just as the Landmarks Preservation Commission was contemplating designating its interiors (Skyline, October, p. 6, and November, p. 6). Now Zacottti is one of the lawyers representing the development team for the tower proposed to go on top of St. Bart’s community house.

But just to show he is not always working for developers these days, Zacottti wrote a letter on behalf of Ronald Lauder to Landmarks protesting the tower proposed on top of the townhouse at 22 East 73rd Street (see p. 4). His letter, speaking for the virtues of preservation, argues that the 73rd Street tower is “incompatible with the human scale” of the neighborhood, and maintains that the tower shaft would appear as a “looming wall” to pedestrians. His arguments should be taken to heart—by the owners of St. Bart’s.

For That Architect in Your Life . . . .

O.K. You have to get a gift for an architect. You’re seen all those architects draped across the pages of Life, The New York Times Sunday Magazine, Town & Country, even Metropolitan Home, without even a mention of where they buy their clothes. To help you with your shopping, Skyline has done a little sleuthing. We are not publishing the prices, however, because that would destroy the “poor artist” image once surrounding this coterie. We are offering much advice for female architects, because tastes among this group are not yet “codified.”

At any rate, you can get the Corbusier-type round-frame glasses you see on Philip Johnson at S. Bryer on Madison Avenue; you can buy those suspenders Peter Eisenman wears at Bowing & Amundel in London. We also understand that Philip Johnson’s dark, dark pin-striped suits come from Bernard Weatherill on East 32nd in Manhattan; and that Helmut Jahn gets his more Italian attire at Ultimo in Chicago. The intricately layered and cut wing-tip shoes that Robert Stern wears can be purchased at Lobb’s in London; but if you prefer the seamless Oxford that Peter Eisenman sports, you can go to Church’s English Shoes on Madison Avenue. If sudden loafers are more your taste (they are Robert Stern’s), then you must head for Gucchi on Fifth Avenue. Skyline’s favorite, Gucchi’s navy blazers, loafers, shepherd’s, khakis and tennis whites come from Brooks Brothers. The Italian left-wing-architect laden coat can be bought at British American House on Madison. If you are looking for gifts not identified with a particular architect, the following items are still deemed of sufficient "architectural" merit: Mont Blanc pens, shirts from Paul Stewart, black steel or silver minimal watches from Georg Jensen, silver Porsche with magneton wheels. The list could go on . . . but gone are the days when architects wore tan corduroy suits and smoked beer pipes.

Odds

Edward Larrabee Barnes has done a master plan for the Durst Organization on their "scattered" properties up and down Sixth Avenue (41st to 47th). The next one to go may be the block between 44th and 43rd, but Durst says, "Wait and see;" he’s got a lot to play with and one under construction between 44th and 45th. Frank Gehry has done a plan for a downtown section of Oklahoma City—for which Philip Johnson is designing an office tower. Gehry reports plans will be done soon.
In Memoriam

Albert Speer’s death in London in September has prompted further assessment of his historic role in architecture and his historic career in Hitler’s Germany.


Barbara Miller Lane

Albert Speer died on September 1, 1981 at the age of 76. At the time of his death, Speer was in London, filming a television interview for the BBC, one of many such interviews since his release from Spandau Prison in 1966. In recent years, the minister of armaments and war production and principal architect of Nazi Germany had become something of a cult figure, for rather ill-assorted reasons. He was admired by some for the streamlined yet classicizing buildings he designed for Hitler, and by others for his public professions of remorse.

Among the Nazi leaders imprisoned by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal in 1946, Speer was unique in accepting his sentence as just. He acknowledged his responsibility for the use of slave labor on a gigantic scale, a responsibility that began when he assumed control of the German war effort in 1942. At Nurenberg, however, he denied any knowledge of the Holocaust, and appeared to be shocked when he was shown pictures of the death camps. In prison much of his energy was absorbed by the writing of two memoirs (Inside the Third Reich and Spandau: The Secret Diaries), published in Germany in 1969 and 1975, and in the United States in 1970 and 1976, in which he attempted to confront the realities of his own experience and to analyze some of the dynamics of the Nazi state. On the subject of the death camps, he wrote:

How much or how little I know is totally unimportant when I consider what conclusions would have been the natural ones to draw from the little I did know. . . . No apologies are possible.

This exceptional candor, coming from the only sane survivor among the Nazi leaders, attracted widespread sympathy and attention, which, together with the continuing fascination felt by a broad public for Hitler and the Third Reich, created a huge market for Speer’s books and public appearances after his release from prison. Yet these writings and public statements in fact did little to illuminate the workings of the Third Reich or the character of its Fuhrer. Instead they offered repeated testimony to the ambiguous and amoral qualities of the young architect, who, as he also wrote, “would have sold his soul . . . for the commission to do a great building.”

And they also revealed again and again the relentless commitment to efficiency of the young Minister, who was, he said, “too busy to notice” the most dreadful massacre in the history of mankind. Had he noticed, he explained in an interview in 1971, “the killing of the Jews would have seemed a waste”: a waste, that is, of potential forced labor. Among the Nazi leaders, as Hannah Arendt explained, evil often reached this level of terrifying banality.

The architectural commissions for which Speer sold his soul were few in number and modest in size. Although Hitler and Speer conceived grandiose projects in mile-wide railroad station, a triumphal arch (400 feet high), Speer’s executed buildings were smaller, less impressive, and generally less interesting than the contemporary work in other countries that they closely resembled. The buildings that he completed between 1934 and 1942—a new Chancellery in Berlin, a German pavilion for the Paris World’s Fair of 1937, a studio for Josef Thorak, and the Zeppelinlied stadium at Nuremberg—were the product of a broad architectural movement in the 1930s, a movement that created countless massive stone buildings whose repetitive vertical elements suggested a link to tradition, but whose rejection of ornament tied them closely to the Modern Movement. Marcello Piacentini, Paul Cret, Charles Holden, Leon Aernout, Giuseppe Valdo, Albert Shukew, and B. M. Iofan, to mention only a few, shared in an effort to create dignified, formal and dashing-looking official buildings during the 1930s and early 1940s. Their work, like Speer’s, was characterized by extreme axiality and centrality, exaggerated emphasis on the apparent thickness of the wall (which was usually masonry overlaid with steel), vertical proportions, and visual accessibility. Often referred to as “stripped classicism,” this kind of building was rarely explicitly classicizing, though it did suggest some antique prototype. Speer’s buildings and projects represented only a tiny fraction of this movement, but his reminiscences have shed some light on it. On different
As an architect, Speer rose above mediocrity only in the design of the Nuremberg Party Congress grounds and in the orchestration of the mass meetings for which they were built. Here bright flags by day and searchlights by night echoed and dramatized the vertical piers of the grandstand, and framed the complex marching patterns of thousands of Nazi delegates inside. It was this theatrical talent, together with his ability to build "at the American tempo," that endeared Speer to Hitler, who regarded architecture as a stage setting, and as instant propaganda.

If Speer left a moment to his life that should be studied and pondered, it was not his buildings, but the Spandauer Diaries, the day-by-day chronicle of his efforts to survive two decades of virtually solitary confinement. In the Diaries we see a man of middling artistic ability and limited imagination, but one who was passionately devoted to management and planning, accentuating his limits in order to endure imprisonment: He plants beans in carefully ordered rows. He measures his paces across the exercise yard and counts up how far they would take him in a straight line, outside prison. He plans, and partially completes a comprehensive history of window details. This capacity for selective vision, which kept Speer sane in prison for a third of his adult life, was the same quality that enabled him to serve Hitler and the Third Reich so well.


Martin Filler

Albert Mayer, 240 Central Park South, New York; 1941.

The death of Albert Mayer on October 14 at the age of 83 deprives us of one of the most admirable figures in American architecture of the past half-century. He was not a star, and no building he designed is likely to appear in survey books on world architecture. But his contribution was nevertheless an important one: He stood for the principles of humane architecture in which the inhabitant, and not the designer, is the central figure. Albert Mayer's sense of what architecture should be about survives him as a worthy example for other architects and planners to follow.

He is most widely remembered for his master plan of 1950 for Chandigarh and for the superb series of New York apartment buildings designed by his office from the 1940s to the 1960s. The diversity of those enterprises, however, only hints at the breadth of Albert Mayer's interests. Born in New York, he was educated at Columbia and later at MIT, where he received a degree in engineering. But his growing social awareness—characteristic of his generation in the years just after World War I—made him feel unfulfilled as an engineer, and he decided to become an architect.

By 1930 Mayer had gravitated toward the Regional Planning Association of America, that small but remarkable group of architects, planners, economists, ecologists, and critics who were at the forefront of the housing and urban design reform movement. After the RPAA disbanded in 1933, Mayer joined with two of its key members, Henry Wright and Lewis Mumford, in forming the Housing Study Guild, a social issues consciousness-raising group for the coming generation of architects and city planners. Ironically, like many of his RPAA colleagues, Mayer was not given much of a chance by the Roosevelt administration to put his planning theories into practice. His 1935 project for Greenbrook, N.J., a greenbelt town greatly influenced by Clarence Stein's and Henry Wright's design for Radburn, N.J., was scrapped because of local opposition.

That same year Mayer joined with Julian Whittlesey in forming the firm that bore their names (and later that of a third partner, M. Milton Glenn.) Mayer always had a realistic attitude toward the limited possibilities for social change under an economic system that supported speculative land development for private profit. But nonetheless he was able to work adroitly within existing conditions to produce buildings of exceptional amenity for their inhabitants, on all economic levels. His 1941 apartment house at 240 Central Park South is immediately recognizable as a structure designed from the inside out. Unlike so many other luxury apartment buildings, which often seem to move on the exterior rather than function on the interior, 240 Central Park South was planned above all to provide maximum light, air, flexibility, and variety for its tenants. This building is also a lively and satisfying addition to its surroundings, a composition that pleases the viewer and adds texture to its site. Significantly, Albert Mayer chose to make it his home for the rest of his life.

During World War II Mayer was part of an architectural team (including Rosario Candela, Andre Fouilhoux, Wallace Harrison, Ely Jacques Kahn, and Clarence Stein, among others) that produced the designs for the Fort Greene Houses in Brooklyn, a 330-unit development for industrial workers. He also served as a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in India, which led to his friendship with Jawaharlal Nehru, at whose behest Mayer later studied Indian village planning (which he sagaciously turned into an agricultural experiment) and which led to the commission for Chandigarh. After the war, Mayer kept up his parallel careers as successful corporate architect and advocate of new towns. In 1950 Mayer & Whittlesey collaborated with Skidmore, Owings & Merrill on the planning of Manhattan House, the most successful of the postwar New York apartment superblocks. Mayer was also responsible for the design of the Alcan-sponsored company town of Kitimat, British Columbia, on which he worked with Clarence Stein from 1951 to 1956. After his retirement in 1961, Mayer turned to writing and teaching.

His major publication was The Urgent Future, (New York, 1967) a synthesis of the major theories of urban planning that Mayer espoused and applied in his work. The volume was hailed by Lewis Mumford as "a book as only a man ripe in years, yet still full of youthful energy and hope, could write, with no dogmas that need protection, no vanity that calls for petting, no ego that demands inflation . . . . . . . . . . . ."] That was Albert Mayer as man and architect. He was both committed and compassionate. For years he paid weekly visits to his old friend Clarence Stein, who, incapacitated by a stroke, was often beyond knowing whether he had a visitor or not. When Stein's wife asked Mayer why, under the circumstances, he continued to come, he replied, "Because I think it changes the atmosphere." That is what Albert Mayer did for American architecture. He helped to change the atmosphere, for the better, and his good name will have a lasting place among those who work to improve our human condition.

Peter Eisenman and Robert Hughes

P.E.: I would like to talk with you about several issues: first, the politics of architectural journalism and the nature of criticism. Second, about your book and television series The Shock of the New, as it relates to the more general theoretical and cultural issues of modern art and architecture. What do you think *Time* magazine's role in architectural criticism is or has been?

R.H.: Narrow and inadequate. When Luce was alive, more was written about buildings. Only one architect has been on the cover of *Time* since I joined the magazine in 1970: Philip Johnson. But Luce took the view that a *Time* cover story was a kind of civil honor—a reward for long, successful professional practice rather than for any sort of striking contribution toward the theory of architecture, or to the debate around that theory. The cause would therefore be a succession of achievements that culminated in some major governmental or corporate work. For example, Ed Stone, a mediocre brute if ever there was one, was seen by Luce as a sort of American Bramante. One ideal cover situation was, or should have been, I.M. Pei's National Gallery East Wing in Washington a few years ago. But it didn't run on the cover, because Pei had been a cover subject before.

I haven't done many architecture stories because I am an art critic who fills in on the occasional architectural piece. Secondly, for the last five years I have been spending a great deal of time making television, which left even less time. But there is a more basic problem. Suppose you want to do a cover on Venturi—which, a few years ago, I did. You come up against the problem: "What," the editor asks, "has he built?" "Well," you say, "not a lot, but the influence of the ideas has been very great." "*Time*: so let's include him in a more general piece." *Time* is an establishment magazine, and it favors the established. But if I were to suggest a cover on Venturi now, it would probably be turned down as arixes you. "Why are we doing him now, if he's been around such a long time?" Well, I have to tell you that I don't think the coverage of architecture lies with *Time*. I write forty to forty-five stories a year, nearly all about painting or sculpture; certainly I didn't push as hard as I might have done for more space on architecture.

P.E.: Tom Wolfe said two things about journalists—specifically, you, Douglas, and Ada Louise Huxtable—he said you were all weather reporters. A weather reporter, he says, speculates on the future. But you, he says, wouldn't indulge in cultural speculation or criticism; you wouldn't even be, as he calls himself, "a good secretary." He also said that *Time*, Newsweek, and The New York Times did not, in fact, make the reputations of architects; that it was only after they had become established that they were able to appear there.

R.H.: *News* magazines deal in news: that is, built buildings and existing reputations. My job is not to discover unknowns. Apparently Wolfe thinks critics ought to be power-brokers. I don't; nor do I think I create reputations, though I may influence them with my opinions.

P.E.: Well, theater critics and film critics, in fact, do. Why would you say that you do not?

R.H.: Because they are writing about arts sponsored by mass audiences. A bad movie review may well discourage someone from paying five dollars for a ticket. Multiply that by the readership of movie reviews in *Time*, and you have power. The patronage of architecture is a different question. Instead of two million potential customers with five dollars each, you have one corporation or committee with ten million dollars. The members of that board are not likely to let simple journalistic influence pass unexamined; they will not be directly swayed by an article. It has peripheral effect, but not direct power.

As for the "weatherman" stuff—Wolfe is just babbling. He doesn't like critics; but then, his book was a critical failure. What else could he be? He did no research, showed no grasp of the social dynamics of architectural style. He thinks he is a sociological sociologist and compares himself to Balzac. He may have read Balzac; I wouldn't be sure—but he certainly hasn't the method, or the rigor, or even the elementary historical background, to write usefully about European or American building. Nobody will be talking about his book three months from now, except those American architects who are grateful for any kind of publicity about their profession. Me, I'm neither Balzac, nor a weather reporter. I just try to state intelligibly what I think is happening and has happened. On the future, I never speculate. Nothing is more unreal than the future.

P.E.: But you would agree with him that reputations are not necessarily made, so much as confirmed in *Time*.

R.H.: I think you can confirm them. I think you can get a certain way toward denying them, too. But, you see, if *Time* had real power . . . on the other hand, what does have real power in the art world?

P.E.: Leo Castelli has real power.

R.H.: Yes. The dealers have power and I think the critics have none. There are many critics who resent this. But to be powerless is not to be passive. There is such a thing as a serious, and, I hope, intelligent protest that you know isn't going to change the state of affairs, but which, nevertheless, for reasons of intellectual conviction, moral prejudice, or simple cussedness, you wish to make.

P.E.: Why, then, would a Paul Goldberger see The New York Times as a place where he would feel more comfortable? I think you are much freer, for some reason, to make those kinds of statements at *Time* than Goldberger is at The New York Times. You are more distanted from your audience.

R.H.: Because *The New York Times* unquestionably has more day-to-day influence on architectural thought than *Time*. There are thousands and thousands of words of architecture criticism to write per week in *The New York Times*. But here, you can do a more rigorous kind of thing. Here you can talk about the history of architecture, you can talk about the details of architectural thought. Here you can do a more critical and serious kind of thing.
I write forty articles a year; most of those are about painting and sculpture; a few about architecture, but not very many. I try to resist a voice in which the primary interest is architecture, then The New York Times is an infinitely better medium than Time could ever be.

P.E.: Having been educated and having taught for some time in architectural schools, how do you go away with feeling that architecture is central to the European culture. Architecture appears in every populist-Expressionist-Panoramic, every-with critical articles and positions being taken. Architecture appears in the leading journals of cultural journalism. In itself it has power, because, without having to wield power, it has a real sensibility.

R.H.: Architecture is a powerful art. It is inherently socially powerful.

P.E.: Meryl Streep is on the cover of Time magazine because she is known to people. Well, architecture is as much within the grain of the Italian culture as any Italian film star; Architecture is as much a part of the culture, and, ironically, it is built less.

R.H.: Meryl Streep gets on the cover of Time more than architects because people know that she is known to them. Americans are not aware of the extent to which they are modulated by architecture. I don't think that they have any real group of those powerful societal nexuses between the brick and the character; between the way a space directs people to walk and notions of freedom. They are not aware of the architecture in only one corner. But they think about architecture either as real property or as the display of hypotetical property. I don't think you have as intelligent an audience for architecture in this country as you do in Italy or in England.

P.E.: Literature, painting, sculpture, music, and dance, as a group, have an audience, but full-time poetry are not sustained, by journals for a mass society; there is supposedly thought to be an audience — and yet for architecture there is not. Don't you think that the next generation would be able to develop that audience? If I didn't know Doug Davis and Robert Hughes, I would certainly feel that Newsworld is more interested in architecture than Time is.

R.H.: I think you would be right. They do cover it more.

P.E.: Why do they cover it more? That is what I do not understand.

R.H.: Because, I must repeat, they have a full-time architecture critic in Douglas Davis; and I mainly write about art. You seem to think there is some plan here, but it's a journalistic accident. Time should have a full-time architecture critic. But I have more TV to do, and a book on the Australian system in early Australia; so I am not a candidate.

P.E.: There is a statement in your book that says: "And why should Mondrian's last paintings still move us, whereas the same is not true of some of our architects?" Partly, no doubt, because the space of art is the ideal one of fiction. In it, things are not used and they never decay; one cannot walk in a painting, as one walks through the street or through a building. The paintings are incompatible. They are the real adornments of Paradise. . . . Architecture and design, on the other hand, have everything to do with the body — and the unredeemed body, at that. Without complete respect for the body as it is, and the social memory as it stands, there is no such thing as a workable or humane architecture." (p. 207)

You are saying that the analogy between painting and architecture really does not hold. 

R.H.: No, it does not, because you can't live in paintings. I'm also not saying that there aren't reciprocal influences.

P.E.: You say that there's no question that buildings can speak; that buildings — certainly the ones that were built in the modernist culture — have their own language of political power; that architecture was more successful in the modernist culture than painting was. But the feeling I get from your book is: "Boys, it's over, what a sad thing. Painting in the form of Modern Art tried to bring a political and social cultural consciousness to society and failed. And look where we are now."

R.H.: It's not quite as simple as that. What I was trying to describe in that chapter ["Trouble in Utopia"] is the way in which numerous artists did try to imbue their audience with a different kind of political consciousness from the one that we pursue already. Now, it seems that on the whole they did not succeed in doing what they hoped to do simply because nobody ever afforded the way in which the mass media in particular would usurp the power of direct political speech. Painting is not a very good medium for getting political messages across to large audiences. First of all, you have to have an audience that will go on musing to see the painting. . . .

P.E.: The Russian Revolution thought that painting was one of the ways; the agitprop manifestations were one example.

R.H.: Yes, they did, absolutely. But because of the intense power that was credited to icons. It is possible to see the work of Lissitzky, Tatlin, and others as secular icons in this way. For no other reason did, for instance, Malevich and Tatlin put up their constructions in the corner — this was the position traditionally assigned to the icon in Russian domestic use. You had in Russia an architectural illusionary attitude, best communicated with by means of visual symbols. This communication had been done by the church through the icon a thousand years beforehand. It was a very reasonable hope of the Constructivists that they would be able to make secular, modern, and secular icons in a similar way in a similar manner of mass. What didn't count on was the way in which the language of abstraction would simply be above the language that they wished to use.

P.E.: I detect a certain sadness when you say that art has lost out to mass media.

R.H.: I don't think that one can say that without being said. It is one of the great cultural dramas of our century.

P.E.: But you cannot be passive about it. Is there nothing you can do as a critic?

R.H.: I think there are several things one can do as a critic. First of all, one can try to describe the situation. One may feel sorry, or glad, or neutral about this, but it seems on the whole to be a fact that paintings do not interest people. I think if you go and see a particular work of art, for instance, in the seventeenth century, or in the sixteenth, or the fifteenth.

P.E.: Assuming that there is no avant-garde, that all language has been consumed by the middle class, then the only language that does not speak to this cultural condition is the language of the interior, and that is the kind of language that is internalized within its own discipline. Yet when you talk about the language of the discipline, of architecture, or of any other discipline, you are referring to its inner reality. This seems to be incoherent with your position. For example, on Carl Andre, you say he is mute, single-minded, not metaphorical enough. This is because he is not speaking the language of mass media; he is speaking the language of the discipline itself.

R.H.: You can have a rich and flexible discourse, oriented toward all manner of experience that is not purely reductive; and to have the experience of cultural debate without rushing into the arms of mass media — look at Bonnard, Picassos, or even Le Corbusier. What I don't like in Andre is the little that is there: the small thought wrapped up in an immense critical envelope.

P.E.: You could argue that if there is no way of making a critique because it becomes absorbed in mass media, then you could go the other way and become silent. This is ideological. I am surprised that you do not see the ideological critique as important, and in Judd, and Morris. No architects have attempted such a critique, except Mies perhaps. Mies has a silence that is critical. But you yourself say "The work of art no longer had a silence in which its resources could develop. It had to bear the stresses of immediate consumption." (p. 294) As opposed to immediate consumption, painting has always been far ahead of architecture in terms of a kind of cultural critique. You might not like the art of Andre, but the critique is there.

R.H.: Yes, but why then incantate it over and over again to the same object, or in fundamentally similar objects?

P.E.: You object to the lack of painterliness or sculptural quality. And there is one thing that you disdain in the school of Greenberg — that is, the promotion of painterliness and formal quality, in works by Kenneth Noland, for example.

R.H.: I do not like art that appears to me to be empty. There is some very violent, very minimal art that seems to me to be rather full. Mies is a good example. The difficult thing is to distinguish for oneself between what appears to be the authentic silence of kensho—a true emptying out, a mystical state, if you will, and the silence of people who do not have a great deal to say.

P.E.: All right, but let's take the Picasso Guernica, which you dwell on. It made an impact for two reasons: One, because it was the first real political statement of Cubism; more importantly, it would not have had such a polemical impact except that the painting itself was good.

R.H.: Of course not. It also happened that at the time there was a great feeling about the subject.

P.E.: So you would argue that without the quality—the "painterly," or the pictorial, or the artfulness—of Picasso, the statement of Guernica might have been mute?

R.H.: I think so. Because the reasons for looking at it have to do with aesthetics. Its power to engage one's imagination depends upon that; how your imagination is politically modulated after that is another matter.

P.E.: I could argue that architecture does the same thing: First, that without the architectural component, no matter how incorrect or lacking, how much the satisfaction of the program or function, how clear the message, if the architectural component is not there, no one cares.

R.H.: I think that is true for you and me. I do not think it was true, however, for the people who were going into the Nuremberg Zeppelinfield to take part in the rallies. Bad architecture can be a powerful totalitarian background.

P.E.: But there is a certain amount of integrity in the work of Richard Meier, for example. For instance, of the chapter "Trouble in Utopia"—yet I don't see that as an architectural component; nor is there any kind of commentary on society in Meier's work other than a nostalgia for the past. The same standard of criticism that you apply for architecture, you apply for Richard Meier— in other words, both a strong metaphorical statement and a strong painterly quality, I would argue that you do not find in Richard Meier.

R.H.: There are other elements, too. I do not say that metaphor and painterliness are the sole touchstones for criticism.

P.E.: The word you used was intimacy.

R.H.: Yes; and intimacy works on many levels and in many ways. There is a somewhat restricted metaphorical statement that is nevertheless important, for example, in Tattlin's use of iron, and vulcanite, and so forth. Certainly these things are functioning as metaphorical components in a vision of ideal modernity based on technological processes. The fact that Meier's buildings are not directly metaphorical is neither here nor there; what I like about Meier's buildings is not their spatial complexity, and the elegance with which this is deployed.

P.E.: You could say that this is a quality associated with the theatrical; that when you go back, it is still the same performance and the same test. There is a suggestion of it in the illustration of New Harmony that illustrates its vias. It has enormous intensity, incredible presence, but it is also limited in its architectural construction. Wherefore, for example, an Aldo Rossi drawing in its limited intensity says a great deal about architecture.

R.H.: I should certainly have Rossi in the section.
"I want to defend the idea that works of art, including architecture, do carry social meaning without voicing their linguistic integrity; without surrendering their sovereign

**P.E.:** But you say "Modernism can now be treated as one aesthetic choice among others." That is not necessarily the case, modernism does not go away.

**R.H.:** That is certainly true; it does not go away. It exists as history. Nor do I think that Modernism is just a purely aesthetic choice for Corbu, but he is using a Corbusian *monde blanche* kind of language.

**P.E.:** For what reason?

**R.H.:** To build buildings.

**P.E.:** For good design. Because it is consumable.

**R.H.:** For good design. Whether it is consumable or not.

**P.E.:** I believe that architecture is still in the realm of Garibaldi, an aspect of history, and art and physics have gone beyond that state. If I look at architecture today, I find conspicuously absent from your book Aldo Rossi and Robert Venturi, both of whom made attempts to politicize architecture after modernism.

**R.H.:** I completely agree with you. However, I must draw your attention to the fact that that chapter is about utopian schemes and the ideal of directly influencing social behavior by means of putting something on the drawing board, and then translating it into three dimensions and having people live in it and use it; and this ideal of hope.

**P.E.:** Venturi's work seems to me symbolic of the trouble in Utopia, as is Rossi's. The end of Utopia is certainly canonized in the work of both. The trouble in Utopia, whatever its other problems, is a nostalgia for the lost white world.

**R.H.:** That is why Meier is in that chapter. I say that he is seeing modernism, seeing the white-world image as a unit of historical style that he is free to use. I am not saying that because of this he is a superior architect to Venturi or Rossi.

**P.E.:** We are not talking about superior or inferior.

**R.H.:** I hope not.

**P.E.:** I would have thought that one of the concerns of modernism, in literature, in music, in physics, biology, is what Foucault calls "the loss of the center"; that the world no longer exists except as a function of man's perceptions. Make it clear, when you talk about Johns, that he articulated that with his fusion of subject and object.

**R.H.:** It is crucial to his paintings. It is also, as you say, crucial to the modernist enterprise as a whole. It is also crucial to Cubism. It remains crucial right through to the present day. It is inescapable.

**P.E.:** You say that in Target with Plaster Casts Johns turns images into signs; the sign becomes a painting and the sculpture becomes a sign. Could you clarify what you mean by "sign" and what you mean by "image"; and what is a "symbol"?

**R.H.:** I think I am distinguishing the two by invoking the sign as an extremely simple representation that is intended to provoke only one type of response, and an image as tending to be multilayered, more complex. A good example of a sign would be the Coca-Cola ad; an equally good example of an image is that moment at which the madeline is dunked into the tea: it becomes an image in the sense that it exalts throughout every possible layer of memory.

**P.E.:** Spiral Jetty — what is it? a sign, a symbol, or an image?

**R.H.:** I think Spiral Jetty is a marvelous work of art. It is an image and a symbol — it has symbolic overtones in the sense that it is historicist.

**P.E.:** The spiral is a sign.

**R.H.:** Yes, but it does not communicate in that primary way the word "Coca-Cola" on the wall does. Even if it did, its content would make it very hard to read with the simplicity that one attributes to signs. Immediately you would have to reflect on what it is doing there, what is its use, what manner of person might have stuck it there, what does it mean? As soon as you ask these questions in all their complexity, fortified by the various historical associations attached to it, this simple form immediately takes on the complex and layered character of an image. I am not saying that all simple forms are in themselves limited to being signs. Rather, for the purposes of this argument, the essence of the sign emanating from mass media generally is that it means one thing at a time. Now, with this kind of significance, the artist can then immediately communicate the element of distance; starting from that point, as Johns does with a number, than which you think nothing could be less ambiguous.

**P.E.:** So it is a double game that he is playing?

**R.H.:** Absolutely. Part of the essential sort of passion of the work of art has to do with that act of complication.

**P.E.:** Realizing a certain nostalgia for a not-too-distant past. But you seem to be engaged in that kind of making 'authoritative' judgements on something that happens in modernism when there is no room for settling, the discourse is degenerate to fetishised, exaggerated pronouncements about quality, into the making and promoting of cliches and the assembly of unreal movements. This serves the interests of the market and the intellectual decline of avant-garde in a frantic air." (p. 394) To me, it is a perfect description of post-modernism—the kind of last frantic gasp of humanism and . . .

**R.H.:** . . . love among the ruins.

**P.E.:** . . . a nostalgia for promoting a new movement; Charles Jencks is in the spirit of that. But if the critics were not caught up in that kind of promotion, if they had a position from which to criticize . . .

**R.H.:** I am not saying that there may not be any place in which you could do that. I am describing what I think is a fact. This idea that your job is to be the continuous celebrator of cultural vitality that just goes on and on and seems to me to be utterly irrelevant. I do not see any reason to suppose that we live in a time of exception cultural vitality. I think you have to deal with what you are given. Other people make what you write on. I do think that the sense of heroic possibility that animated at least some artists and architects in the last ninety years has to a great extent disappeared. I think one of the reasons is precisely the conditions that I try to describe in that last chapter, "The Future That Was."

**P.E.:** There must be another alternative. Manfredo Tafuri suggests that when the Surrealist or Dada critique is no longer vital there is always the potential to go into the discipline itself; and into the language and internalize it.

**R.H.:** Yes.

**P.E.:** Which is something — because of your antiformalist or antirationalist bias — you would reject because it would be too unsemiotic, too unreasonable.

**R.H.:** No. I am sure that it could develop its own meanings within that context, but I would like to see the works that result, and whether they move me or not.

**P.E.:** But your definition of good art as an art of intensity — not whether it moved you, but a certain intensity — that came about through the prescription or the definition of rules and limits, that is, its grammar. It is all packed into your statement: "What makes the real patron of modernism is the complete illusion . . . but intensity; and there is no intensity without rules, limits, and architecture." (p. 606) What you are saying is there can be no art, basically, without intensity.

**R.H.:** Intensity as such does not cover that. Following from the perception of rules and limits, it plays against those rules. There is also a kind of relationship, implicit in the mind of anyone who makes something, to what he is given, what comes to him as existing language, and what he wants to express.

I don't think there can be any art without a combination of intense emotion, sensation, and thought, on one hand, and a sense of Constraint, on the other—because one of the things that art is is a model of sublimation.

**P.E.:** There is no intensity without rules, limits, and artifice; yet you say that Arikha's work demands both the transgression of rules and the denial of artifice, which would be a concern about the limits. The important thing is transgression.

**R.H.:** No, I am saying his work includes transgression. You must remember that Arikha is always getting tied up in knots about whether he can draw a single line; he is being encouraged to a hallucinatory degree with cultural consciousness about the art that he practices. What you have here, of course, is a conservative talking. I do think that the really moving work of art that does not contain a display of a high degree of internal discipline is a contradiction in terms.

**P.E.:** Heisenberg contains ideas of doubt and transgression; it is an investment of the world around us that, in turn, become subjects for commentary by art.

**R.H.:** They have been. This is part of the modernist enterprise . . .

**P.E.:** Aldo Rossi's work contains ideas of transgression and doubt. His transgression and doubt are prefigured in his drawings. That is, drawings that will become architecture, his drawings are architecture.

**R.H.:** What do you mean, "they are architecture"? They exist in two dimensions, not in three, and are not habitable.

**P.E.:** They contain architectural ideas. They are not like de Chirico or Canaletto, which represent architecture. Rossi's drawings are about architecture: they are about a combination of space that could be inhabited. They are not narrative representations of architecture. In fact, architecture is a representation of the idea first enunciated in the drawings. The drawing itself is unimportant. It is the idea in the drawing. It is not like beautiful drawings by Pierrot and Fontaine, which have to be built because that is where their real energy is. Rossi's buildings can be considered less than his drawings.

The crossing between painting, or drawing, and architecture is very direct. For example, consider Mondrian's Broadway Boogie Woogie. Both are of the best city plan of a nonsocialist, noncapitalist, nonutopian twentieth-century city. We could attempt to build it.

**R.H.:** However, before you build it you would have to start assigning functions, and uses, and three-dimensional projections to each of those intersections. On the other hand, that may be deconstructional on your part. I imagine that if I were a more avant-garde expert he might say what a magnificent, ideal painting every artist's work is. After all, even if there is no sense of the essence of Broadway Boogie-Woogie, in fact, its metaphor of transmission and interaction of energy. Which is what some architectural plans are about; and what all computer chips are about.

**P.E.:** You could never produce a computer chip like that.

**R.H.:** Nevertheless, it could be seen, to a mind already interested in chips, as yours is in architecture, as powerfully suggestive of an ideal chip as it is to you of an ideal town. There we enter upon very murky territory, but that is actually a fairly good example of the sort of complex interaction of several artistic fields that art can generate. These are metaphors that one is at liberty to
exclude; to exclude them from one’s fringe reading of the work of art is in some way to impoverish one’s response to it. Moreover, Masso’s work is hospitable to these kinds of readings in that he is a very much more interesting artist than, say, somebody like Andre, whose work is not as hospitable to this kind of reading.

P.E.: You say “All art, in some way or another, is situated in the world, hoping to act as a transformer between the self and the non-self. The great project of modernism was to propagate more ways in which this could be done.” (p. 400) You seem to be saying it was not linked to the avant-garde.

R.H.: No; that doesn’t exclude the avant-garde. The purpose of the avant-garde was to propagate more modes of seeing, more modes of hearing, more modes of reading.

P.E.: You continue: “But any view of art that insists on locating art’s meaning in its power to do what had not been done before, as if that were the only benefit of the modernist spirit.” (p. 406) What are we witnessing today in the avant-garde—dressed up as the derriere-garde, post-modernism as an attempt to eradicate the modernist spirit in a very simplistic way, doing things that have been done before. What I propose is that central to the modernist spirit was the suggestion of a new relationship between man and object, man and man, man and God, man and nature. It was not just an idea abstraction. To reduce modernism to abstraction is to miss the point.

R.H.: You are absolutely right; and you are preaching to the converted because as at no point do I try to call abstraction the essence of modernism.

P.E.: But you said that you accepted the ideological premises of modernism, yet your book concludes with “Art discovers its true social use...”—it is the true that is the loaded term.

R.H.: Well, perhaps “its fullest social use.”

P.E.: “Not on the ideological planes.”

R.H.: Let us get clear what we mean about ideology. I do not use the word “ideology” to mean political thought of any kind; I am not one of those critics who think any political thought is an ideological statement, and therefore to be dismissed. Ideology, in the sense in which I use it, connotes a certain ossification of view; ideologies tend to be the compacted remains of what was once flexible and highly critical political thought. For example, when Althusser’s disciples suggest that works of art have no authentic life of their own, that they are simply the bearers of news about alienation and deduction, carrying their emblematic content as trucks carry coal, quite passively and willy-nilly—then I think you can say these are ossifications of an ideological way. It is useful for an understanding of the work. I want to defend the idea that works of art, including architecture, do carry social meaning without voicing their linguistic integrity; without surrendering their sovereign right to mean things as art. In that sense, yes, I am a foe of ideology.

P.E.: But you would complain about Clement Greenberg overstating the integrity of the language of art.

R.H.: Absolutely. There was a famous story that used to be told about Roger Fry in the days when he was taking groups around the National Gallery of Art in London. There was an enormous fourteenth-century Trinity, Below the Holy Ghost there was a terrible and imposing Father, with a long hair, burning eyes, and then retracted within the Father’s ribs, there was Jesus. Fry concluded a long exegesis upon the form and plastic properties of the figure of Jesus, and then turned around, raised his case to the figure of God the Father, and said, “We will now turn our attention to the intellectual mass.” “The intellectual mass of that kind of attitude is wrong. It does not address itself to what the painting is trying to mean on any other than a purely plastic and formal level.

P.E.: You would also argue the other way: that to address yourself to images without addressing the plastic qualities is also defective.

R.H.: It is extremely defective. In my view, it is not just an intellectual mass that is wrong; it is the whole mass.

P.E.: It does not appear that you feel equally strongly about the defects of both.

R.H.: Certainly the bias of the book is toward the way you read painting literally rather than they way you read them as intellectual mass. This is inevitable, because the book comes out of a television series, and it is in the nature of television to emphasize that.

P.E.: If that is the case, then are certain kinds of criticism likely to be erased in the mass media if we aren’t careful?

R.H.: There are simply certain types of images that television prefers to others. It is very unlikely to abstract forms of the painting. This is because it exaggerates the iconic. People are used to looking at immediately significant, readily legible events on the screen. If you see a pattern on your screen, what is your interpretation of that pattern? That is the sticking point. That is the problem you are going to if you do a program about abstract art. To put it in the cruder possible terms: you can spend thirty seconds on a tracking shot of St. Peter’s, but if you hold a Kenneth Noland on that screen for the same time, people are going to start to walk out! TV does distort art. What you are looking at is what Jonathan Miller called “electronic corday,” electrode colors into which you try to translate a Mattise or a Brancusi by becoming. It has no relation to the actual color scheme of the painting than the shrunken head does to the character of live man. The written word is still the most finely tuned and powerful instrument for arguing works of art.

P.E.: There is no time for reflection either!

R.H.: No; because television is inherently narrative. It goes by you. You can’t re-examine the reproduction; you can’t do that sort of thing. Those are the things that you are used to doing with books. But, in modest defense, there are things that television has done better than a book. For instance, supposing that you want to make the point, as I did, about the relation between the natural forms of the landscape around Arts and the forms in van Gogh’s paintings. You could spend pages describing this, and if you are a Proust, you can bring it out. The fact is that we are not Proust and television can do that. Television is wonderful for showing and telling. It has very restricted powers of abstract argument; it is very coarse for that kind of thing. So there are limits to what it can do. They are tight, compared to the limits of the written word.

P.E.: The same argument can be applied to architecture. You are saying that architecture is only viscerally, that it can only be experienced by the body. I believe that you can know it in ways other than its physical reality. For example, buildings can be understood in black-and-white photographs because architecture is basically black and white; it is color and material added to a basically nonmaterial structure. There are certain conditions of architecture—its text—that might be better understood in a black-and-white photograph, in a plan, or in a written description.

R.H.: The same argument can be applied to architecture. You are saying that architecture is only viscerally, that it can only be experienced by the body. I believe that you can know it in ways other than its physical reality. For example, buildings can be understood in black-and-white photographs because architecture is basically black and white; it is color and material added to a basically nonmaterial structure. There are certain conditions of architecture—its text—that might be better understood in a black-and-white photograph, in a plan, or in a written description.

P.E.: Wouldn’t you say that if you really want to look at them with the full weight of your analytical powers, the building subsumes and contains the plans?

R.H.: But I could make the same argument about painting. I could say that painting is analogous to architecture in the sense that architecture is no more vicerarial than painting. You have to be there, but you can also sometimes understand a painting better in words than you can in the actual experience of it. Or, if architecture and painting both have to be experienced—that is, if you have to be in the presence of the object—then you cannot make the categorial distinction between architecture and painting. I think you could make the reverse for painting and not architecture. Painting has no plans and architecture does.

R.H.: I have always felt—clearly our experiences of the matter simply differ—that a reproduction of a painting is a pretty important way of getting to know it, at least, because it is a two-dimensional representation of a two-dimensional object, it does not falsify to quite the same extent as a photograph of a building.

P.E.: Does a plan falsify a building?

R.H.: Of course not—"the plan is the generator." If you really know how to read a plan, then a plan can be more useful than a photograph. If you can read plans, sections, and elevations.

P.E.: That is also why children, when they are asked to describe their rooms, draw plans. Minds do read plans.

R.H.: That’s right. Since the way in which the architect understands the building in the first place is by drawing plans and developing them into sections and elevations; it is not a haptic process. Nevertheless, the guy who walks into the building afterward will be experiencing it with his body. And that is why drawings, I must absolutely insist, are not architecture.

P.E.: But finally, for me, you do not, in your position on architecture, take a critical and cultural position. Since the editors of Time would not know the difference, you certainly could make that kind of statement, as you do about art.

R.H.: If you write no more than three or four articles on architecture a year, and short ones at that, you can’t construct a consistent line—unless you are very dogmatic, which I’m not. If I were to sit down and write a book about architecture, then I should have to take the stand you might as Blake did, or Venturi, or Frampton, or Tufi, or the divine Ruskin. Until that time, I do not claim to be an architecture critic, any more than you, I imagine, would claim to be an art critic—though you certainly hold opinions on art, and very intelligent ones.

P.E.: That is too dismissive. I am interviewing you not because you are an art critic, but because of the capacity you have, both in your position and in yourself, of making architecture criticism and influencing a culture about architecture. You can tell me whatever you want about how much you do not know about architecture, but because of the position you are in, you must know what you do in fact believe.

R.H.: I think what I know is pretty well inscribed on what I write.

P.E.: What you know, but not what you believe.

R.H.: Backs to the wall! You are right, I am not a deeply committed architectural critic. Writing about buildings is my y lesion d’orgres. I studied architecture for almost five years in Sydney, and then gave the course up to write a book about painting. I have always been glad of the conceptual and formal background that the unfinished course gave me. If you asked me to calculate a simple prestressed beam, I could probably do it. I can read a working drawing. But painting was my great love, and I followed it.

P.E.: But, having been trained as an architect, you are far ahead of other architecture critics writing for the public, in that they cannot see, because they have never had to draw and to build.

R.H.: Well, I can make a drawing; we used to do renderings of the Parthenon in a hundred and sixty-two washes of Chinese ink—the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, in the Pacific. Arthur Drexler comes to Gilligan’s Island. But I was never a practicing architect. I had the equipment of an amateur.

P.E.: Do you have to be Catholic to do a cathedral?

R.H.: You do need to be a cathedral builder.

P.E.: But you need also to be able to see as an architect.

R.H.: Touché. You are arguing that my sin is greater. You think that, since I may be able to see as an architect and yet do not write as an architectually committed man, this is the transgression du clown? If you imagine the thought has not crossed my mind...
The Guggenheim Museum's reconstruction of the original set for The Magnanimous Cuckold.

The latest in a series of exhibitions elucidating the innovations and revolutionary ideas of the Russian modernist art of the years 1908 to 1932 is on view at the Guggenheim Museum in New York until January 3, 1982. Directed jointly by Margit Rowell and Angelica Rudenstine, the show, "Art of the Avant-Garde in Russia: Selections from the George Costakis Collection," is the third major exhibit of Russian avant-garde art of this period in the last several years. It follows such exhibitions as "Paris-Moscow," presented in Paris in 1978, and "The Avant-Garde in Russia, 1900-1930: New Perspectives," which opened in Los Angeles and was shown in Washington, D.C., in 1980 and early 1981. These shows -- plus a number of small exhibitions at art galleries in London, Paris, Cologne, Dusseldorf, and New York -- all have turned the attention of the Western public toward the achievements of the Russian modernists.

This selection from the famous Costakis collection presents more than 275 works by some 40 artists, constituting roughly one-fifth of the original Costakis collection, the bulk of which was given by the collector to the Tretiakov Gallery in Moscow when he left the Soviet Union in 1927. These paintings, works on paper, three-dimensional constructions, as well as poster, textile, theater, and costume designs -- all showing a remarkable imagination and creative energy -- have been previously inaccessible and for the most part unseen in the West. Yet the innovative concepts they embody, in terms of content, formal or spatial conventions, and the use of simple, everyday materials, have had a strong impact on the evolution of modernism in the West and on our appreciation of its artistic values. These works dismiss the narrative content and figurative depiction of the subject in perspectival space, and introduce a new -- purely pictorial -- content, which results from the manipulation of nonassociative, nonobjective forms, organized within the flat picture plane. The interaction of color and form creates spatial effects, as in the supermatist paintings of Ivan Kliun, and, most radically, in OlgA Rozanova's "Unstable" ("Green Stripe") of 1917. In sculpture mass was replaced by an open construction, incorporating real space into the work as a pictorial element. Perceptually then it required the active participation of the viewer. The exhibition does not attempt to present a comprehensive chronological survey of the period. Instead, it highlights only certain aspects of Cubo-Futurism, Suprematism, and different phases of Constructivism. Besides presenting the work of the artists by now relatively well known to the interested public, such as Kljun, Gustav Klucis, El Lissitzky, Liubov Popova, Alexander Rodchenko, Vladimir Tatlin, and Nadzeyda Udaltsova, the exhibition illuminates the work of lesser-known members of the avant-garde, such as Mikhail Matushni and the Ender family. The Costakis collection exhibition significantly broadens our understanding of the complexities of the period. We are introduced to such rarities as several original Tatlin drawings and to a unique piece of Tatlin's artistic carpentry, a wing strut for his flying machine, Loutin, of 1929-32. Ivan Kliun and Liubov Popova especially emerge as creative and accomplished artists, both in their works on paper and in their painted works. For instance, Popova's 1920-21 painting Spatial Force Construction is particularly striking in its use of the unpainted wood background to provide spatial effects. The works on paper -- drawings and prints -- by other artists (e.g., Konstantin Medunetsky, Alexandre Vesnin, or Vavara Stepanova) are surprising in their immediacy, and, in many cases, their use of fresh color. The same can be said of the propagandistic work of the Constructivists, some of the most interesting examples of which are Kljun's 1922 designs for brochures.

Occupying a prominent place in the center of the Guggenheim's rotunda is a full-size reconstruction of the original set designed by Liubov Popova for Vsevolod Meyerhold's 1922 production of The Magnanimous Cuckold, a farce by the Belgian playwright Fernand Crommelynck. In the post-revolutionary days in Russia, the theater placed an important part in the Constructivist philosophy of utilitarian and socially useful art. In addition to architecture, poster and industrial design, it provided an opportunity for reconciliation between the artists' vision of society and their role in it and the actual living conditions in Russia at that time. The theater would allow for the synthesis of all the arts (the idea of Gerasimov's Tretiakov Gallery) where painting, sculpture, architecture, music and dance are brought together in the all-inclusive stage set. The theater would provide a medium through which the theories of the artists could be channeled so that their ideas would be enacted in a didactic, microcosmic representation of everyday life.

Popova's set for The Magnanimous Cuckold achieves the application of Constructivist sculpture to utilitarian ends, in the service of the masses. It conforms to the precepts of the final phase of the Constructivist ethos -- Production Art -- following the end of the "laboratory period" experiments at the bakhku, exemplified in the 1919-21 Constructivist works.

The exhibition "5 x 5 = 25" announced the "death of painting" in September 1921, and from then on, easel painting came to be considered an old-fashioned, outdated art form, and was rejected by progressive artists. In the search for a more mass-oriented medium of expression, they turned to industrial design, photography, theater, and film. Popova's set and the innovative acting technique called "Biomechanics" -- which treated the body as a machine operated by a machinist, introduced by Meyerhold in this production -- made The Magnanimous Cuckold the most famous of Meyerhold's performances. Considered the most complete experience in the Constructivist theater, it crucially influenced developments of the later European avant-garde theater. Bertolt Brecht, Jerzy Gosztow, and Richard Foreman all acknowledged their debt to Meyerhold. Theater was rid of its illusionistic backdrop, sets, and props, and replaced by a bare, geometric construction of platforms, stairs, wheels, and other moveable elements, which were made of raw wood and painted in bright, flat colors. This set transformed the theater into a truly three-dimensional experience, where the play of lights, the extremely simple costumes, and the movement of the actors -- as if in sculptural relief -- completed the decor-mechanics.

To fulfill Meyerhold's desire to make the theater accessible to the masses, the set was placed on the same level as the public. The intention was to unify the stage and the auditorium; the performers and the audience, and, consequently, to provide for participation of the "masses" in the artistic experience. This also satisfied the essential Production Art postulate and offered the artist the illusion of an opportunity to shape the lives and minds of the masses.

It was, in fact, the concept of Constructivist theater, so dramatically introduced by Popova and Meyerhold, that survived the longest through the years of Socialist Realism in the Soviet Union. Other manifestations of the avant-garde, such as the nonobjective paintings of Malevich, Bodzhinsky, Popova, and others, were judged "incomprehensible" for the masses by the authorities, who felt that abstract art could not teach in a didactic way the messages of their ideology. These artists' work was outlawed for being devoid of a social message, and, therefore, of artistic quality.

The economy and severity of organization in the Constructivist theater, however, had an appeal, based on the fact that the Constructivist theater, unlike the "bureaucratic" and uptight designs of Daghilev's theater (the designs of Bakst, Benois, and Dubutshinskii), was simple and without decorative or material adornment. The authorities perceived this type of theater as appropriately message-oriented, and misinterpreted it as being somehow less "modernist" than the other art of the time.

The photographs of the actual production of The Magnanimous Cuckold, taken on April 25, 1922, as well as several sketches for sets and costumes in this current exhibit, reinforce our appreciation of Meyerhold and Popova's inventiveness. The exhibition is accompanied by a scholarly catalogue, with essays by Margit Rowell, Curator of Special Exhibitions, and Angelica Rudenstine, Adjunct Curator, illuminating important aspects of the period.
Eleanor Raymond in Boston

Eleni Constantine

This supportive network imposed its limitations on Raymond's work, however. Her oeuvre consists almost exclusively of houses for wealthy women. The concerns of such an architecture are inevitably private, domestic, and anti-urban. Raymond believed that such concerns were particularly peculiar for women architects: "In general," she said, "women have an instinct about houses and how to live in them—that they can do better plans of houses. I think that they can do better houses than a man can."

Within this limited sphere, Raymond developed a talent for attractive composition and a penchant for experimentation with new materials. Her gift for composition is apparent in a very early project: her own townhouse at 112 Charles Street, Boston (1925). The street elevation is extremely deferential to its context—

In Raymond's case, moreover, such treatment seemed particularly significant. In the Institute's case, moreover, such treatment seemed particularly significant. In the Institute of Contemporary Art's case, particularly in the House Beautiful photos, from which most of the blown-up black-and-white prints were taken. Certainly some of the architect's outstanding design solutions occur at the garden facade: the decks, porches, walkways, and stairs leading from the Charles Street entrance over the equally symmetrical, composed gardens laid out as part of the design are delicate transitions of great subtlety. From here, one looks on a wall of windows of a tiny city garden in Boston, to her 1951 construction of a rustic second-story deck running the length of a country house in Ipswich, Raymond shows a consistent deftness in negotiating this critical passage.

What was unfortunate about the exhibit's emphasis on this aspect of Raymond's work was that the work was thus defined in terms of mere appearance. For the viewer, this was confusing: the absence of plans for the show made it very difficult to examine the scattered photos as built structures. (This problem was further aggravated by the models, which in several cases did not correspond to the photographs.)

More disturbing yet was the innuendo such purely pictorial treatment implied. When all that was shown was the photographs, the garden facade seemed resonant with an ancient front facade or living room), the impression conveyed was that the architect was not particularly concerned with intellectual concepts of space and structure, but preoccupied with purely visual issues of facade. Such an implication is particularly unfortunate because a woman architect is involved: it seems to reflect a view of the "feminine" creative mind as content to manipulate decorative aspects of design rather than infusing shaped space with symbolic content or grappling with structural tension and forces. The one project for which adequate plans and sections were provided was the Sun House—the implication of this selective treatment being that this project is somehow more "scientific," more engineered than the others.

In Raymond's case, moreover, such treatment is grossly unfair. What she thought women could do particularly well was plan a house. One thing that she herself did particularly well—as the ICA exhibit shows—was to plan exterior spaces. What about her interior? Surely they would say a great deal about her unique infusion of modern elements into a traditional framework.

The ICA's failure to present Raymond's buildings in a comparable manner is seriously shortchanged her work. She deserves better.

The exhibition "Eleanor Raymond: Selected Architectural Projects" was held at the Institute of Contemporary Art, Boston, from September 16 to November 1, 1981. A monograph on Raymond was also published in September entitled Eleanor Raymond, Architect, by Doris Cole (Art Alliance Press, Philadelphia; 152 pp., $35.00).
G.R.A.U.

From October 15 to November 6 there was an exhibition at Columbia University of the work of G.R.A.U. (Gruppo Romano Architetti Urbanisti). Curated by Alessandra Latour, it was the first show of work by this group in the U.S., including Alessandro Angelini, Paola Chiambone, Gabriella Colucci, Anna Di Noto, Pierluigi Erbli, Federico Genovesi, Roberto Mariotti, Massimo Martini, Giuseppe Milani, Francesco Montanari, Patrizia Nicosia, Gian Pietro Patrizi, Franco Perluigi, and Corrado Placidi.

The founding of G.R.A.U. in 1964 was based on radical critique of the Modern Movement, a fundamental position arrived at before the explosions of 1968. Rejecting functionalism and social determinism, the group proposed the recognition of the formal language of architecture as an autonomous discipline where geometry was the regulating vocabulary and history was the "real" context. The aim was to establish points of reference for a renewed unity among the figurative arts. This position was influenced both by the philosophy of Galvani Della Valpe and the work of Louis Kahn.

The exhibition showed a full spectrum of the work of the studio and one could perceive in it—from the first projects (a competition for a monument to Sveitza by Colucci, Martini, and Perluigi, and a kindergarten by Angelini) through the presentation at the Venice Biennale—the evolution of the group as a whole and as individuals. One could also see the shift of emphasis as their own language developed away from the primary concerns of "Antimodernism" to one that encompasses past, present, and future perceptions and techniques.

There is a strong abstract quality to the work, there are proportions and elements we recognize, but cannot quite identify; a complex presentation synthesizing art, architecture, and geometry.

At a symposium in conjunction with the exhibition, the discussion—Massimo Martini, Giuseppe Milani, and Anna Di Noto, with Kenneth Frampton and Alan Colquhoun—focused on the work of the group during the past 16 years and their present exploration of "the tradition of architecture." They spoke much of Louis Kahn, who "made the historical turning point possible."

If the discussion lost a little in translation, the show itself suffered in transportation. Seemingly endless similarly scaled vernacular photographs with simply a date, title, and designers' names tended to make the projects blur, and certainly stripped them of the quality they possess. A chance was lost to have many years and polemical layers of the design by the studio G.R.A.U.—who have long been well known in Europe—more accessible.

M.G.J.

In conjunction with the exhibition "New Chicago Architecture" at the Palace of the Grand Guardia in Verona from September 11 to November 11, a symposium was also held there on September 12 entitled "Chicago and Recent Architectural Trends."

Chicago in Verona

Olivier Boissière

"History," wrote Alexandre Dumas, "is a whore that you must rape to produce children"; but the Three Musketeers had no pretensions to historical objectivity (or to probability). Even to an observer bereft of cynicism, the appearance of a group of architects called the Chicago Seven—after the noted New York Five and the somewhat more uncertain L.A. Twelve—was an indication of the intentions of Cohen, Beeby, Tigerman, and cohorts not to allow themselves to be left forgotten in the amorphous Midwest. The attention-getting exhibit "Late Entries to the Chicago Tribune" of last year reinforced this sentiment; the tale of its inception ("... let's do this and give Helmut a chance."), not to mention the publicity, left little doubt about the promotional character of the competition. Strong international participation and the re-edition of the catalogue of 1922 designs, which had been impossible to find, ensured the success of the venture. This year, with the Chicago Firehouse Seven and Eight assembled in Verona, matters took a more serious, and consequently more debatable turn.

When the promoters arrive to assure you, in all seriousness, that new architecture in Chicago is the fruit of an irrevocable movement born of the epic breach of history; that beyond the plurality of positions and expressions, deep-seated common motivations animate these protagonists who found themselves together in the same innovative climate—one must raise an eyebrow! When they compare the impact and importance of this work with that of Krier and Rossi in Europe, the observer smirks: the comparison is hazardous, since their influence is only felt in the closed chapels where the tempts to "Talk, don't build!" hold sway. Finally, when the editors of the best Italian reviews gather at the round table to offer their comments on the new architecture of Chicago, and you become aware that only one among them has set foot in the city, then you surely can better gauge the weight of the event.

The exhibition itself held few surprises: no unknown or unpublished projects; a manner of representing the projects that ought to be explained someday—the treatment of the images as assemblage—like a '40s postcard—in an anecdotal fashion that more often than not obscured the project itself; and one or two extravagances by Stuart Cohen that cast an overdue glance at Mail Art.

Invited to Verona to present some of their work and background, Peter Prus, Helmut Jahn, and Larry Booth illustrated the diversity of the Chicago group. Prus, an American, an Italianized by Mies, and a fugitive from SOM, seemed to gravitate to numerous alternatives (not so opposed as they appear). He moves from a dressing-up of surface similar to the recent projects of sonoki, for example, to a tempered neorealism where a post can play the part of a column.

Larry Booth, on his part, poses deliberately as the All-American boy, drawing his sources from the vocabulary of a modern/classical regionalism that belongs to the city or the suburbs. He extols his attachment to the virtues of democracy and to the Constitution with a pretty conviction. He may be right; it is always better to have Jefferson on your side.

Helmut Jahn—is it that he belongs to one of the bigger firms in Chicago, or that he recently affected a conversion

Deborah Doyle
"There was a strong element of celebration during the dedication, with a sense of ‘All’s well that ends.’ A brass ensemble blasted away, everyone made remarks, and the party began."

translated by Margot Jacobs

Helmut Jahn
to (one hardly dares say the word) post-modernism — has cast himself in the part of the lunaire, as much in the show, where his work occupied an important section, as in his presence during the symposium. Jahn’s image, tending more and more to the F. Scott Fitzgeraldian, parallels his intention to achieve a synthesis in his work between technology and a set of images drawn from the Art Deco arsenal. In his recent projects the temptation to build diamonds bigger than the Rita places Jahn more or less midway between Johnson and Lumen, with whom he shares a certain manierism in the treatment of the skin. Elsewhere Jahn has found an unsupporter spectacle in Heinrich Klotz, who lauds in Jahn’s work all the liberties (weaknesses) that he violently denounced in Johnson’s in Conversations with Architects.

Lawrence Booth
Photographs by Donatellu Brun

The large crowd left without regrets, after a bright and paradoxical intervention by Francesco Dal Co on the parallel between architecture and language — where the common function is conservative! Occasionally somebody asked why this joining of Chicago and Venetia; the unanamous response of the organizers was that one could easily see in both cities the taste of the architects for treatment of detail. Scarpa, etc. . . . Hmm! Have you ever known an architect who wouldn’t admit he wasn’t interested in detail?

The exhibition “New Chicago Architecture” is the subject of a fairly well done catalogue if someone would explain what pages 56 and 70 refer to. Whoever really wants to learn something about Chicago and its architecture could quite constructively turn to the remarkably realistic and objective essay by Nora Miller. Why wasn’t she brought to Verona? and where was Stanley Tigerman, for example? . . .

Stirling in Houston

Peter C. Papademetriou

We were at the recent opening dedication of the new facilities for the Rice University School of Architecture in Houston (see Skys. November 1981), the first completed work in the United States of James Stirling, Michael Wilford and Associates — and in Texas at that.

In viewing the rather sensible solution, one couldn’t help reflecting on the contrast between the old building, its counterpart abroad — cowboy boots along St. Martin’s Lane, “Hi, y’ all” is in the lobby of the Rita, and such. This myth has Texas wanting to “get themselves a lil’ cultcha,” and unabashedly displaying what’s got. So there is James Stirling, a pro-yes-pro imported star architect, 1980 recipient of the Royal Institute of British Architects Gold Medal, 1981 recipient of the Peizek Prize, and what does he do? . . . why, he builds in.

Well, Messrs. Stirling and Wilford certainly haven’t done a “signature” building at Rice. Stirling wryly related that Philip Johnson claims to have gone looking for the building and couldn’t find it. With this, the long-anticipated but strangely homely result becomes all the more provocative in the Houston context, one where a coherent physical environment created by sensitive groupings of buildings is the exception and not the rule.

The ultimate accommodation for School spaces involved both the resolution and reformulation of the given geometry of the old ML. Anderson Hall of 1947 with a compatible extension of it into the development of the new wing. No great zoomy spaces à la Rudolph at Yale, or Anderson at Harvard; architecture studios at Rice are conducted in rooms. The only goody is the lateral connection between the two parallel wings, where a new, Auto-like space has been added on (the Jury Room), and a reworked erosive of the old building creates a two-story exhibition gallery. The link is a Stirling-icon: a socializing-space overlooking both collective spaces articulated by a rubber-stud floor surface and punctuated on either end by two-story entries crowned with lanterns.

There are some of those private, playful things that Big Jim indulges in, and the most notorious is a kind of plum-pink-purple color on the second-floor interior corridors. The giveaway was the appearance of the man himself at the dedication, as he sat with other dignitaries on a podium, decked out in a dark gray suit (unexpected), solid blue shirt (expected), with pink socks (knock ya’ eyes out!), perhaps a reminder to look again.

One question not asked was where everyone went during construction. Akin to a diaspora, the students had spent a year in attics and basements across the campus, while the mere shadow of an administrative center of the School worked out of boxes in a windowless room. Consequently, there was a strong element of celebration during the dedication, with a sense of “All’s well that ends.” Everyone was relieved to be a School again, and one with a physical heart.

In the days that followed, the School drew upon its friends and associates to indulge in a bit of celebration. Not exactly with Prince Charles and Lady Di, mind you, but a chance to show off and have a good time. A brass ensemble blasted away, everyone made respectable and mutually acknowledging remarks, and the party began.

Part of the scenario began with the opening of the new Farish Gallery, in which was housed a selection of some 60 exhibits representing “Architecture in Houston since 1945.” An elaborate collection of some 690 projects spanning those years had been assembled during the summer months, and were then guest-juried by Paul Goldberger (architecture critic of The New York Times), Donald Lyndon (architect and professor at Berkeley), and William Jordy (architectural historian and professor at Brown); the ultimate selection was theirs. Subsequently, the jurors returned as a part of the dedication to explain their choices in a colloquium moderated by John M. Dixon (editor of Progressive Architecture). In the end, Dixon remarked that the Stirling/Wilford design might stand to suggest a set of issues for Houston’s future as a livable place.

“American Architecture in the 1990s” was a luncheon event moderated by William W. Caudill, founder of the firm CRS and a former director of the School itself. Participating were David Wallace (partner of Wallace, Roberts and Todd, Philadelphia); William Turnbull (architect, San Francisco); and Robert A.M. Stern (nee we say: mores) — all four gentlemen participated in the Rice Preceptorship Program and currently have students in their offices. Context was again the theme, and each took a varied but related stance: Wallace spoke of regionalism, Turnbull spoke of a hands-on response to the specifics of a problem, and Stern articulated an opening-up of perceptions to a wide range of problems, including the role of collective memory in culture.

Ultimately, the events of the dedication and the new facilities designed by the Stirling/Wilford office left the participants with a proposition at some variance with the values shaping the Houston environment, and the thought that this was indeed not an end but a new beginning.
Margot Norton, Special Editor


The first monograph in English on the Italian Rationalist architect/designer. The book illustrates and discusses Albini’s major works, including interior rehabilitation of Renaissance palace/museums, remodeling of the treasury of Genoa Cathedral, and his 1963 Renanpeco department store in Rome. Color reproductions are somewhat poor in quality.


Comprehensive and graphically stunning overview of Western architecture, from antique through Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque, and Rococo to the Modern Movement. Essays are included by authorities on specific periods—in short, the basic survey, but well done.


If you like to argue or play “What’s Wrong with This Picture?”, then you’ve already read this best-seller and taken sides on Wolfe’s version of the anti-modern-architecture polemic, witticisms and all. On a bigger scale than his previous tome, the anti-modern-painting establishment Painted Word, it has drawn the same furtive response from the community on which it focuses.


Beautiful documentation of Behrens’ 1900-01 Darmstadt house, his first work as an architect. This little book is illustrated with excellent color photographs of the house, plans, photographs of furniture, paintings, glass, china, silverware, and other objects that were part of the original interior of the house, as well as drawings by the painter/architect. A perfect gift at a very reasonable price.


The largest single group of Bernini drawings, spanning most of his career. The exhibit includes both sculptural and architectural drawings, many published here for the first time. Irving Lavin, the world’s foremost Bernini scholar, has written an excellent text, of interest to art and architectural historians.


This remarkable work features many plans and sketches published for the first time.


Well-written and perceptive study. This investigation of history, people, policies, and ideologies that have influenced our lives by shaping the rooms we inhabit, from the New England frame house to the latest Sunbelt condo, should interest architects and historians alike. It lives up to the author’s previous book, Mundialism of the Model Home (U. of Chicago Press, 1980). (To be reviewed.)

William Burges and the High Victorian Dream. J. Mordaunt Crook. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1981. 642 pages, 272 illustrations, 11 in color. $35.00. Crook attempts to explain the Victorian obsession with the medieval world and the consequent search for an architecture that combined the beauties of the past with the necessities of the present—a sensibility epitomized by the eccentric and brilliant William Burges.

Contemporary Architects. Muriel Emanuel, editor; Dennis Sharp, architectural consultant; Colin Naylor, Craig Lerner, assistant editors. St. Martin’s Press, New York, 1980. 1000 pages, black-and-white illustrations. $70.00. (To be published once every five years.)

This in-depth reference work provides detailed information on 600 architects of international reputation including recently deceased major figures. Each entry includes a biography, a complete chronology of constructed works and projects, a signed critical essay, a bibliography of books and articles on and about the architect, and a black-and-white representative photographs of his or her work. The volume also includes entries for planners and theorists, landscape architects, and structural engineers.

The End of the Road: Vanishing Highway Architecture in America. Photographs and text by John Margolies; edited by C. Ray Smith; designed by Ivan

These books, selected for Skyline’s special Christmas List, appeared in 1981, with a few exceptions made for late 1980 publications.

More than just the catalogue for the Margolies 1981 show at the Hudson River Museum, this is the most handsome and least trendy or pretentious of the "vernacular architecture" books of the last few years. Lush photographs and often personal text celebrate the motels, stations, and other commercial roadside architecture that our "sophisticated" tastes have advised us to overlook.

Fragments from Greek and Roman Architecture: The Classical America Edition of Hector d'Espouy's Plates. With introductory notes by John Blateau and Christiane Sears. English translation by Henry Hope Reed. V.W. Norton & Company, New York, 1981. Hardcover, $19.95, soft-cover, $9.95. The first translation into English of the preface to d'Espouy's Fragments d'architecture antique (1905). It is a compendium of Beaux-Arts studies for architect and amateur, and a companion to such earlier classical works as those by Palladio or Vitruvius. The quality of the drawings selected constitute its strength.


A Guide to the Gardens of Kyoto. Marc Treib and Ron Herman. Shufunomoto Company, Ltd., Tokyo, 1980. 202 pages, many black-and-white photographs, historical prints, maps, and 13 color plates. $9.95, soft-cover. Designed for the layman as well as the professional, this concise yet comprehensive guide provides both practical and theoretical insights into the design of the Japanese garden, and includes entries for more than 50 temple and palace gardens in Kyoto.

The Heroic Period of Modern Architecture. Alison and Peter Smithson. Rizzoli, New York, 1981. Revised edition of the famous December 1965 issue of A.D. 50 pages, 294 illustrations, 24 in color. $12.50, soft-cover. For the neophyte and the art historian. Well-illustrated, the book contains commentaries by the authors and architects discussed, such as Oud, Wright, Gropius, Le Corbusier, Rietveld, van Doesburg, Stamm, van Esseren, Bayer, van der Rohe, Breuer, and Le Corbusier. Focusing on the years 1915-29, it is organized chronologically by year, covering the period from 1910 to 1934, in an attempt "to record . . . the flow of ideas from mind to mind as realized in buildings and projects."

Idea as Model: 22 Architects 1976-1980. Introduction and post-script by Richard Pommer. Preface by Peter Eisenman; also includes "The Ruins of Representation" by Christian Hubert. Published by the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies and Rizzoli International Publications, New York, 1981. 128 pages, over 100 black-and-white and 10 color illustrations. $17.50, soft-cover. Exhibition catalogue from 1976 show. An unusual approach to investigating architecture in three-dimensional form, this exhibition's prime intent was to test and demonstrate the hypothesis of the conceptual model; to show that models, like architectural drawings, could well have artistic/conceptual existence of their own; includes models by Abraham, Agost and Gandelsmann, Eisenman, Eames, Ellis, Graves, Gordes, Hejduk, Gwathmey and Henderson, Krier and Scolari, Leitner, Machado, Meier, Moneo, Moore, Oliver, Robertson, Stern, Tjerman, Ungers, Williams, and Wrode.

The Eye of Thomas Jefferson. William Howard Adams, editor. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, Va., 1981. Reprint of 1976 Bicentennial exhibition catalogue. 411 pages, illustrated with over 600 examples of articles in exhibit. $20.00. An inviting and reasonably priced book that reconsctucts the aesthetic and intellectual environment in which Jefferson thought and worked, from Monticello to his designs for the University of Virginia. This reprint catalogue will be of interest to American history scholars, and all those who want to learn more about Jefferson and his era in relation to building and design.


Knoll Design. Eric Larabee and Massimo Vignelli. Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York, 1981. 307 pages, 413 illustrations. $39.00 in full color. $25.00. The most comprehensive book published on the firm whose name has for half a century been synonymous with well-designed furniture and interiors. Lavishly illustrated, the book is aimed for those interested in the history of modernism and the history of design. It traces the history of the firm, including the architects, craftsmen, and, of course, the leadership of Hans and Florence Knoll, from 1940 to the present. (Reviewed in this issue.)
For Books That Have Everything


No paintings of gardens during the mid-18th century were known until Harris researched the work of Thomas Rotherham the younger, architect of the great extended gardens of his day, but documented the building of the city of Bath. This two-volume set includes 25 velvet paintings by Robin, who died in 1770, and a large sketchbook filled with over 100 drawings and watercolors that record subjects such as estates, townscapes, and a motley record during 1740 and 1750 of the building of Bath. Volume I contains 126 color illustrations and Harris's definitive text; Volume II contains removable facsimiles of 15 velvet paintings.


The Art of the Olmsted Landscape. Mary Ellen W. Herr, editor. Published by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, a division of the Department of City Planning. The Curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, September 17-November 29, 1981. 169 pages, illustrated with photographs, maps, engravings, plans, and drawings. A good survey of the Olmsted family, who, from Thomas to the last Olmsted, was synonymous with Central Park. —Fredric Law Olmsted: The text is succinct and well illustrated, with a chart of the Olmsted's history and a discussion of the "Art of Olmsted Landscape." The catalogue is richly illustrated with historical and contemporary photographs and includes contributions from James Marston Fitch, Stephen Rettig, Ian Stewart, Albert Fine and Geoffrey Bildgett, Henry Hope Reed, Jean Gardner McLintock, and Melvin Kaldas.
Building is first envisioned and then takes shape. Contributors include Wayne Andrews, Paul Goldberger, William Martin, and John Russell, writing on Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Alexander Jackson Davis, Louis Henri Sullivan, among others. (Reviewed in this issue, Tropical Deco: The Architecture and Design of Old Miami Beach. Text by Laura Cerwinske; photographs by David Kaminsky. 96 pages, 34 photographs. Rizzoli, New York, 1981. $14.95, soft-cover. An intelligent and informative text, with evocative photographs, that presents a clear argument for why this peculiarly American one-square-mile area of Old Miami Beach is of such strong cultural value.


Wallpaper in America From the Seventeenth Century to World War II. Catherine Lynn. Foreword by Charles van Ravenswaay. A Baratta Foundation. Cooper-Hewitt National Design Museum, distributed by W. Nottin & Company, Inc., New York, 1980. 533 pages, 102 color plates, and 245 halftones. $45.00. The first major study of wallpaper in America in over 50 years by the acknowledged expert in the field. This book is more than a stunning visual record—Ms. Lynn, in addition to providing a wealth of practical information for the designer and restorer, discusses the history of wallpaper in its larger social and artistic context, as a reflection of not only taste and fashion, but also of aesthetic theory, and even, in the late 19th century, a form of political philosophy.

P.B. Wright: Architect, Contractor, and Critic, 1833-1925. Sarah Bradford Landau. Provenance and checklists of the Wright Collection by John Zuckowski. Catalogue from the Museum of Modern Architecture, The Art Institute of Chicago. Published by the Art Institute of Chicago, 1981. 100 pages, 108 black-and-white, and 4 color illustrations. $14.95, soft-cover. Covers the entire career of P.B. Wright, with sections on his early years, his work as an architect, decorator, and furniture designer; as fireproofing contractor and structural engineer; as architect critic and editor; and includes lists of his publications, his buildings and projects, plus photographs of Wright, Carter, Drake and Wright, his firm, 1872-1874. A scholarly and finely edited text, it contains substantial and highly questionable reproductions—all in a worthwhile tribute to Wright.

Writings on Wright: Selected Comment on Frank Lloyd Wright. Edited with commentary by H. Allen Brooks. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1981. 160 pages, 52 illustrations. $19.95. Brooks has assembled an unusual anthology of writings, both published and unpublished, by a wide variety of Wright clients, architects, critics, and historians, with his own lucid comments outlining the evolution of Wright's critical reception as an architect both in the U.S. and abroad.
Briefly Noted


For a book with the burden of implicit promises this title suggests, this volume marches strongly into the front ranks of the surveys—with the flag of Vitruvius in the forefront. The introduction sets the standard carried throughout, explaining in basic terms the famed trio of firmatus, utilitas, and venustas, and holding them up as the outline of approach: (the book) "will show how the form, of a building depends on all three, although at different times one, two... may be dominant." The survey manages to achieve its aim with a certain ease, many works, both long and short, and wonderfully copious illustrations, not to mention excerpts of explanatory text and drawings. A comprehensive glossary is also included. Visual material is of great value as it is wide-ranging in scope and drama. On the other hand, the text can become monotonous because of a distinctly informative and composted style. It should be noted that this is not a critical or polemical treatise; it is a journalistic history of buildings, architects, ideas, and events from the informed perspective of observers trained in the history of architecture. Although the discussion may seem a bit curt, or partially reasoned, this is forgivable considering the size of the undertaking: it provides a foundation for further investigation.

Of Building: Roger North's Writings on Architecture. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1981. Edited by Howard Colvin and John Newman. 160 pages. 15 black-and-white plates and numerous drawings. $30.00. Roger North (1653-1738) now architecture as "the flower and crown of all the sciences. An acquaintance of Sir Christopher Wren, North designed the Great Gateway (1683-84), which still gives access to the Temple on Fleet Street in London, and built numerous works at Wroxton Abbey in Oxfordshire and at Rougham, his estate in Norfolk. Only fragments remain of these works, and it is his writing on architecture and building that establishes him as an architectural thinker. The treatise on building, included in this volume, is fairly technical, and written in 17th-century English, but it perhaps is the most exhaustive account of the planning and building of an English house during the period in literature. North's points illustrate general principles of building, and the text contains observations and comments on other building projects of the time, such as the construction of St. Paul's by Wren. North also discusses aesthetics, presenting his view of "natural" versus "customary" beauty in architecture. North's drawings reflect the fact that he never became a professional architect, but, placed in the margins beside the text, add a note of authenticity to the material. The introduction by editors Colvin and Newman is enlightening, as is their documentation of North's writings and drawings.


This revised edition of the original guide published in 1977 has as its principle feature the inclusion of a number of excellent engravings, photographs, and other illustrations, showing everything from Sissinghurst to J.M. Synge. The entry should be a delight to any armchair traveler who may be reunited with so many friends of fiction and their often-schizotypic creators. Anecdotes and little-known facts are well chosen to illuminate and enliven. There are the little moments of saltines, as when we discover that Sir Francis Bacon died after stuffing a chicken with snow to test the preservation of meat by refrigeration (alas)—but for joy, a fine Christmas book.

New Arrivals


Volume 2: The South and Midwest. Introduction by Frederick D. Nichols and Frederick Kooper. 784 pages, 429 photographs, 17 maps. Hardcover, $29.95, soft-cover, $14.95.


Knoll Design

Christopher Wilk

Knoll Design is the long-awaited history of one of the most important manufacturers of modern furniture. This coffee-table book measures nearly a foot square, weighs a hefty six pounds, and is 307 pages long, with more than 400 photographs, many in dazzling color. To describe it as lavish would be to render faint praise.

The book is divided into 21 chapters of varying lengths. They are devoted to designers (Hans Knoll, Mies van der Rohe, Eero Saarinen, Florence Knoll, Marcel Breuer, and Nanna Ditzel), to what is supposed to be aspects of Knoll's history (the Bauhaus, Cranbrook, and "Beginnings"), and to the firm's activities, both past and present (Textiles, Graphics, Planning Unit, etc.). The text, by Eric Larabee, former executive director of The New York State Council on the Arts, architecture critic, and author (The Self-Conscious Society, 1960, and The Benevolent and Necessary Institution, 1971), is written in a style suitable for the general reader, who will find it exhaustive, since this is presumably the book's audience. However, the text has a few shortcomings which detract from the book's usefulness and importance.

First, the text lacks critical analysis of the company or its products—it is not in the least objective. Statements such as "Knoll's importance is of all proportion to its size," (p. 222) indicate the type of congratulatory which constitutes much of the text. The author's unfamiliarity with furniture design in the twentieth century is indicated by his summary statement that "Hans Knoll's essential perception was that modern architects would eventually need modern furniture." (p. 19)

The second problem with the text is the large number of errors or omissions of fact. Larabee informs us that he made use of Knoll's oral history program, its research staff, and its archive. Yet the book is weak on dates: the author never explains if the dates given to furniture are due to that of the specimen or to that of the piece itself. The most precise date available for Saarinen's so-called "Grasshopper" chair (p. 519) did Saarinen actually design all of his metal-base furniture in 1949 (pp. 63-65), and all of the various pedestal or "tulip" furniture in 1956 (pp. 68-77)? It might also be pointed out that Gropius did not design the room illustrated on page 10—Breuer did, and that the correct date of Breuer's lounge chair for Isokon (one of many original manufactures of furniture later produced by Knoll, who, incidentally, are not mentioned in the text) is 1933-36, not 1925.

The third and final shortcoming of the text is the inclusion of a chapter on the Bauhaus, and the lavish illustrations of works of architecture not related to Knoll. Larabee never specifies why the Bauhaus book begins with the Bauhaus. Sentences such as "We were taking the Bauhaus idea of design and development and making it a part of Knoll, and we did manage to establish a "Bauhaus heritage" "(p. 9) are not enough. Those who read the text will note that the firm first manufactured a leisure chair only after the Second World War, and did not do a Breuer chair until 1960. Photographs or drawings of buildings by designers who have worked for Knoll could have been included as ancillary material in a book directed at a general audience. To offer a lavish double-page illustration of Saarinen's Inagia Lobby Rock, for example, might well evoke the impression that Knoll was involved with the building. There are many such photographs (portraits and buildings), whose only function seems to be to enhance Knoll's prestige.

Although the book has these substantial shortcomings, the collection of its items, and at least parts of the text, make it required reading for those interested in the history of modern furniture. Among the book's most valuable and interesting illustrations are those of Saarinen's preparatory drawings for the "tulip" chairs.

The book illustrates much of Knoll's past and present furniture, and—usually nearly—portraits of the designers. (A few Knoll chairs designers notably absent, however, are those of Andre Dupin and Donald Knorr.) Many of the furniture photographs are in sumptuous color, and virtually all are taken from company brochures or catalogues. What should be of particular interest in the years to come is this book's presentation of subjects not usually illustrated in furniture books, such as showroom, textiles, and examples of graphic design. The chapter on graphics is particularly good, and the firm's record of hiring talented graphic designers (above all, Alvin Lustig, Herbert Matter, and Massimo Vignelli) may even exceed their luck with furniture designers. Few firms have had such consistent quality in graphic design. The photographs of interiors by the Knoll Planning Unit are period pieces not without significance to those interested in interiors of the 1950s and 60s. And finally, the original reconstructions of designers and other employees are valuable, and, at least in one instance (a somewhat confusing discussion of the origins of the Bertoia versus Eames wire chair) of considerable interest.

The design of the book, by Massimo Vignelli, represents a series of contradictions. The style is typical Vignelli: professional and elegant. The format, and, to a certain extent, the design, duplicates the much shorter 1972 Knoll-written and produced book, Knoll au Lareure. Many of the same product, interior, and portrait photographs are used here. Knoll Design uses many full- or double-page bleed, lots of white page (mainly on the lower third of the pages), and endless amounts of color. Unfortunately, this style of design, which works very well for short brochures or sales catalogues, results in a book that is simply lavishly and colorful for its own good. (Even Knoll au Lareure was a bit much.) The restraint and sense of sophistication that characterize so much of Vignelli's work, and that are well known to readers of IAU publications, have been insufficiently employed in Knoll Design. What is lacking most of all in the design (and, for that matter, in the text) is understatement.

Knoll Design should have been entitled Hommage à Knoll, for it is more of a vanity book than a researched history. After a few decades, perhaps there will be more to write about, and the subject can be treated again. In the meantime, those interested in Knoll will have to hope that the upcoming Metropolitan Museum of Art exhibition on Cranbrook will, in a more straightforward and less self-conscious manner, tell us at least the important story of the early years of Florence Knoll and many of the Cranbrook students and teachers who went on to work for the Knoll company.


Furniture

Michael S. Kimmelman

To architects, buildings are not all that matter. Furniture, for example, has always been important to them. They have filled their buildings with it, and, not infrequently, designed it themselves. As James Stirling has said, "Every architect wants to do his chair." So to an architect, it is not that several books about furniture have appeared recently after relatively little attention to the subject in print. Although criticism of these works must be tempered by the fact of this slim competition, none is entirely satisfactory.

One of the better new books is Furniture Designed by Architects, by Marian Page. Beginning with the 18th century, Page traces the development of furniture design through biographical essays on architects. Although possibly omitted could be criticized, Page's work treats all the important figures in an intelligent manner. Of particular merit is her continuing attention to the relationship between architecture and furniture, handled especially well in the Frank Lloyd Wright section. In addition, the numerous black-and-white photos showing the furniture in its architectural settings are very useful and informative.

Strikingly similar in appearance and format, although less appealing than Page's, is A Century of Chair Design, edited by Frank Russell. Whereas Page covers architects designing any kind of furniture, Russell deals only with chairs, but chairs designed by a range of people. As a result, he can treat such seminal figures as Thonet and Josef Hoffmann; indeed, Russell's book deserves merit merely for its treatment of these modernist firms, including several important but lesser-known ones, such as Christopher Dresser and Edward W. Godwin.

Unfortunately, in the end this broad coverage generates a superficiality that makes the work little more than a string of biographical and historical tidbits.

Other problems, stemming less from content than from structure, haunt the book. In one of the few commonalities to several of the other recent furniture books as well. First, both books are devoted to the Arts and Crafts movement, and -after brief introductions, they treat individual designers within chapters devoted to general styles and periods, such as the Arts and Crafts movement, Art Nouveau, and the Modern Movement. Where, for example, should Frank Lloyd Wright be placed? Page's solution is to devote a chapter on Prairie architects; Russell in the Art Nouveau section. Does Gerrit Rietveld really belong in the Art Deco chapter, where Russell puts him—along with Aalto? Russell admits that "the Modern Movement had its roots . . . in the group which included Rietveld . . ." Or does he then belong in the Modern Movement chapter, where Page places him? And finally, why does Russell have an Art Deco section, while Page does not even mention the controversial style? The general problem stems largely from the loose application of these stylistic terms without any attempt to define them.

The second structural problem is that of parameters. Both works stop with Charles Eames, barely mentioning design after the 1930s. Certainly these works cannot cover everything; but both books betray their choice of limits. In Russell's work the choice seems arbitrary. Page gains added support from the fact that the Eames-Saarinen architectural generation was the last until very recently to devote so much energy to furniture design. But why did most young architects stop after them, leaving the job primarily to industrial designers? Similarly, why have architects such as Michael Graves, Robert A. M. Stern, Richard Meier, Charles Gwathmey, and Robert Venturi not returned to furniture design? Page offers no opinions.

In the end, Page has produced a much better work, both books make useful contributions to the scanty literature.

Two other works, which take different approaches to much of the same material, are Marcel Breuer: Furniture and Interiors, by Christopher Wilk, and Innovative Furniture in America From 1800 to the Present, by David A. Hanks. Coincidentally, both are the outcome of current exhibitions, the former originating at the Museum of Modern Art, the latter at the Cooper-Hewitt.


G. Collinson. Curved armoire presented at the Great Exhibition of 1851.

Hanks' work does not pretend to be far-reaching; it "narrows" rather than broadens the scope of technological interest and innovation in the U.S. only during the last 180 years. This reduced scope is probably one of the reasons for the work's relative success. Following a forest that originally used in Sigfried Giedion's Mechanization Takes Command, Hanks discusses individual objects under general topics, such as materials, portability, and multiple functions; brief biographies of designers are given before each object description. Many standard and very many nearly-seen designs are shown, always accompanied by good photos or drawings and excellent captions. The text itself is extremely well documented, supplying a wealth of information, from basic production techniques to obscure design and social material. What prevents this from being an excellent book is that there is no coherence, unifying idea or theme tying the work together. This is particularly disappointing considering Russell Lynes' introduction commenting on the relationship between furniture design and social change. Hanks does little with the connections between concepts of comfort and structures of manner, however; yet it is a theme which could have fruitfully been followed throughout the work. In the end, Hanks' approach makes the book more a reference text than a coherent thesis. The often dry writing style does not help.

Even more narrow in scope (and, perhaps consequently, more successful is Wilk's monograph on Breuer. Tracing the designer's career from his early De Stijl-like designs through his tubular works, his travels, and to his eventual settlement in the U.S., the book offers a detailed, sensitive analysis of Breuer's furniture and interiors. All of his designs are described by Wilk; but by often relating them to the work of his contemporaries, he creates an entire architectural evolution, Wilk avoids writing a mere catalogue raisonnée. Particularly worthwhile is his treatment of the lesser known aspects of the designer's career: his Isokon designs, for example. Illustrations and captions are used to the designer's best advantage to create a photographic panorama of Breuer's work. While there are no revelations or drastic revaluations of Breuer's position or thought, the book presents a well-done, useful, and comprehensive survey.

One book deserves mention. If you've ever wanted to see the inside of Valentine's yacht, Charles Addams' van, or Ralph Lauren's bathtub, take a look at Living Well, edited by Carrie Donovan. The book is a compilation of Home section articles (or their equivalents) taken from The New York Times with light-weight writing that is sometimes informative and even helpful. This is certainly not what this book of the launch, filled with beautiful color photographs. It is interesting that the section entitled, "On Next to Nothing," i.e., where money cannot help, is the only one entirely in black and white.

If none of the books discussed seem to be major contributions to the history of furniture and design, that does not mean they are without value, for all (except Living Well) shed light on some aspect of architectural history at a time when history is returning to the field of design. We may not have the architects' thoughts, more of these books will come to fill their shelves.

Jaquelin Robertson

American Heritage is one of the more venerable names in the culture of the American Establishment. Like the Vougeographic, Antiques, Audubon, English Country Life, and the old Time/Life books, anything bearing the eagle-and-shield imprint has come to speak of the quiet sensibility of the secure setting. Not all aesthetic and intellectual insights, after all, derive from anxiety.

Some years ago, after a period of visible decline, Heritage was rescued by a new owner, who set about restoring the old roster, and, at the same time, bringing the magazine (and its associated book division) into a more forceful position in the trendy scene. This season saw a book: Three Centuries of Notable American Architects. Why do I like this book? First, because it deals with a number of important architects not generally known to the public, such as Charles Bowditch, Alexander Jackson Davis, Richard Morris Hunt, Bernard Maybeck, Raymond Hood, and Eliel Saarinen (one misses William Burchell, Robert Mills, Frank Furness, and Bertram Goodhue), and this is instructive not only to laymen who know primarily Thomas Jefferson, Stanford White, and Frank Lloyd Wright, but also to professionals, because too many of us are not aware, for example, that Bullfinch was commissioner of police and planning in Boston and thus able to control development there or that he expanded both his and his fortune on real-estate development of his own design (the architect as developer) and was forced therefor to have to see the city, and thus subtly affect his art. Certainly his story is inspiring for those who work for government.

So that no one feels cheated, there is also good coverage of the usual names: Mies, Wright, Eero Saarinen, Louis Sullivan, Henry Hobson Richardson, White, Frederick Law Olmsted, McKim, Mead & White, Louis Kahn, even Eero Saarinen—as well as a questionable section on "Architects of Today." (The latter is a still-changing chronicler, you will be able to bring your own personal experience, or what we already hear daily as "great, great, glories." I suspect the editors just could not resist the "now" pressure, but it creates a confusion at the very end that is unnecessary; historians cannot work in close harmony. Somewhere these people are not yet architectural history.)

The second reason I am attracted to this new American Heritage book is that it is based on the sound cultural association that a person's life gives meaning to his work, and not just vice-versa: that, very simply, it is crucial to our understanding of works of art—especially buildings—for what the architect is or, more accurately, what he is not, but an inanimate symbol, that we know something about the man. We are not interested in mere cataloging, in the creation of "results" to any intention or purpose and to the panoply of contemporary societal prospects and constraints. One goal of architectural history—not the only one mind you—is to connect buildings to people, to the living, breathing men and women who created, commissioned, criticized, and used them. Biography, even the summarized, popularized biography that this is, is far preferred to the crotchety, ornery, and, to a mind, personally instructive form of historical investigation, for it links us back through time to people not dissimilar to ourselves, reinforcing that most valuable cultural notion—personality. Continuity. Biography, therefore, seems to me far more desirable as a basis for understanding, personal and individual as well as general and collective. This seems to me particularly important in connection with architecture, which is uniquely a social art; one requiring use in its appreciation. Yet the tendency regarding architecture is to create a "thick" book about the architect's object from its specific human matrix, and to move it from its setting, like an uncharted artifact, to the historian's laboratory, where it can be scrubbed clean and given some larger collective, but less personal reading. The architectural historian is not interested in a thick mass of simultaneously more mysterious and more unimportant: he becomes the historian's puppet, his work having been taken away from him and given over to some collective zeitgeist. This tendency on the part of historians and critics is completely unwarranted: the setting, the architect's thoughts, and the appreciation, and the possibility of architecture more popularly rooted in and subsequent to a culture. It encourages instead that romantic priesthood of special interpreters who can so easily break poetically havoc in the fragile world of buildings and men. Unless you know something about Thomas Jefferson's life and ideas in context with his time, you miss a great deal about his architecture. His work is fascinating enough by itself, but they do not really tell the whole story. His buildings were "models" embodying in built form his ideas about the relationship between man, nature, society; about the precedence of the past.

I have spent time on this second point very simply because I normally have not one person in any field, and to whom I am deeply committed personally, takes almost the opposite approach to the introduction to the book, much to my confusion. He is as out-of-sorts as I am with "Architects of Today," chapter, that seems almost as if we were not to be reduced by biography as a historical method: "the major relevant data are not human thoughts and actions but the results of those activities, i.e., works of art." This unnecessarily stringent warning is followed by his own synopsis of the American architectural imagination touching upon some of his favorite themes—the Shingle Style, Wright, Venturi, the American vernacular—as well as on more recent architectural perceptions—naye, the primacy of the traditional street, our increasingly depressing model of the city, the exploitation of nature, resources, the semiotic basis of American strip, solar energy, etc. Here he is condemned, trenchant, himself personal; one gives thanks again for this unshakable and passionate man who continues in his struggle against the prevalent currents and kinds of an American culture he both loves and disparages. (One almost wishes that Scully himself, and not the "Architects of Today" were the subject of the next chapter. He is our own revivalist architectural poet, whose very being seems to be an act of free will, the direct and open contradiction of his own introductory argument.

With this quick tour of each of architectural lives we see them in a variety of roles: as major civic engineers (Latrobe), as fashionable decorative stuff (White); as mail-order catalogue designers (Davis); as tireless public servants (Bullfinch); and sometimes as hardworking, hence unpublicized (Bowditch, Latrobe, Mies, Saarinen). We see them even as perennials but highly sophisticated had boys who could say publicly, This beauty and that beauty and that beauty and this beauty all probably the same, and this is exactly what I mean.

Richmond writes very well about White and McKenzie—of whom probably we have read enough—and is able to add to what we know. One feels the regret that Paul Goldberger, one of our very best architectural historians, did not write about John Elal (who was so much more interesting than Eero Saarinen), and was not able to turn his descriptive talents away from the modern world of architecture and see the credit due a tongue-tied. Joseph Kastner is particularly impressive in showing how A. J. Davis’ personality led him inductively into the Gothic Revival, and his copystyle book (Davis sold designs to people he had never seen all over the country—too bad he wasn’t for Levitt). Kastner also tells how Davis and A.J. Downing gave America its first and extraordinarily important, integrated suburban community, Llewelyn Park—a "model."—like Jefferson’s at the University of Virginia, of the very best thinking about how men and society could live together.

Probably the book’s only false and totally inexcusable note is an inconspicuous center section called a “Gallery of Visions,” a garish potpourri of Utopian schemes including the New National Capital Center (l), Soleri on the desert, and Tigerman’s pyramids-over-the-road. This section, the opening page of which looks like the menu from a Big Star restaurant, is graphically disrupting, and only tends to remind us how comforting the measured treatment of real people and real things, a grand robust history filled with every conceivable human folly and triumph. It is, therefore, required reading for anyone interested in either American architecture or American history. 
Art and Image

Abigail Solomon-Godeau

For good or for ill, photographic book publishing now observes a fairly rigid generic distinction between those books whose photographs exist in the service of their subjects, and those whose photographs are their subjects, whether organized around a theme or not. The former category is now for the most part reserved for scenic or geographic subjects (e.g. Alaska: Images of the Country, photographs by Galen Rowell; text by John McPherson) or for sociological or documentary subjects (e.g. Neighborhood: A State of Mind by Linda Rich, Joan Clark Netherwood, and Elinor B. Cain). The type of photography employed in these books tends, respectively, toward the technicolor National Geographic/Sierra Club variety, or soberly straightforward black-and-white reportage.

The genre art photography, being a more specialized organism with more refined requirements, has inevitably engendered its own variety of publishing conventions: certain kinds of layout and design, and ever-more sophisticated techniques for fidelity and precision in the reproduction of the images. While not pretending to anything like a comprehensive survey, the four photography books under review here all fall within this second category and constitute a broad range of photographic practice (and merit) within it.

Among this autumn’s most publicized photographic offerings is Deborah Turbeville’s homage to the ancien regime, Unseen Versailles. Exhibited at the Photographic Gallery, and the subject of a piously appreciative article in The New York Times Sunday Magazine, these goofily confections seem to have swept by the critical gauntlet unscathed. This is a somewhat perplexing phenomenon, unless it be that Jacqueline O’Malley’s role as impresario/editor of this etiolated exercise in fashion-magazine art photography has effectively disarmed all criticism. Suffice it to say that Turbeville’s notion of art photography is about scratching, blurring, and hand-tinting images to make them look like badly conserved nineteenth-century cahetys, this being the photographic analogue of that practice known in the retail furniture trade as “antiquing.” To evoke what Turbeville undoubtedly perceives as the poetic atmosphere of the back rooms, storerooms, and attics of Versailles (and this book does tout poetic atmosphere by the cubic ton), she dresses up models, seemingly ravaged by acute anomie (more poetic atmosphere), in eighteenth-century costume, and deploys them in limp heaps and/or languid tableaux. The effect is more post-rock-club collapse than “Après-moi le deluge.”

Scurrying to my indispensable Baedeker to false aesthetics, Gillo Dorfles’ Kitch: The World of Bad Taste, I find “what has already been . . . tried and tested, will always reappear in kitche work.” The point being that for the “tourist kitche-man,” his “recherche du temps perdu has generally been trouvée before he ever sets off.” Turbeville’s vision of Versailles and the waif-like personae with whom she gamaches it are fundamentally an aesthetized tourist vision forged more by Hollywood than by Saint-Simon.

Where Turbeville strives for art, Robert Rauschenberg, who has produced the genuine article for thirty years, strives in many of the photographs reproduced in Robert Rauschenberg: Photographs for maximum graphic clarity, confounded by maximum spatial obfuscation. The 122 black-and-white photographs comprising the book come in two chronological groups: the first covering the period 1949 to 1965 and including portraits of Jasper Johns and Merce Cunningham, and the other larger part consisting of recent photographs made between 1979 and 1980.

While presenting many of the same themes and strategies that appear in the later ones, the earlier group is perhaps more truly experimental, and occasionally more audacious. But Rauschenberg’s central preoccupation is already in place in the early work, in that the majority of his witty and elegant photographs are about fragments: of bodies, signs, of streets, of buildings, of things. Although, strictly speaking, all photographs are “fragments” from which most photographers reconstruct a synthetic totality within the frame of the image, neither synthesis nor totality is what interests Rauschenberg. In photograph after photograph, Rauschenberg chooses subjects, vantage points, or juxtapositions that function to break apart or confuse spatial reading; many images are closer to the effect of photographic collage than to

Deborah Turbeville. Unrestored bedroom of Mme. de Pompadour, with the original bed curtains.

Insider's Guide to Architecture Schools

Schools: Cornell University, College of Architecture, Art, and Planning.
Location: Ithaca, New York.
Administration: Jason Seley, dean of the college; Jerry A. Wells, chairman of the Department of Architecture.
Students: 650 in the college; 320 in architecture.
Program: Five-year Bachelor's of Architecture and two-year Master's programs.
Admission: Students must submit a portfolio of work done in high school, come for an interview, and (after all) this is examined by the department to see if there is a strong grade point average. Many freshmen will take an introductory summer session to assure a certain level of competence. Candidates for the Master's program must have a B.Arch. or equivalent — no exceptions. Without a B.Arch., a student is required to take the fourth-fifth year studio before joining the graduate course.

Course Structure
The first year consists of one class with one professor and six graduate students as teaching assistants responsible for individual critiques. Second- and third-year studios are taught by younger faculty. Fourth and fifth year are treated as a single group. Students are assigned to the seven third-year studios: highly confidential, and clearly personal, small faculty meetings; in fourth and fifth year, students can sign up for the professor of their choice, a visiting critic, or, subject to the professor's agreement and faculty 0.K., a graduate studio. There are two graduate studios of about 15 or fewer students each. These are taught by Colin Rowe (Urban Design) and Mathias Ungers (Architecture). Each functions almost as a research team in contrast to studios in other graduate programs.

Within the college, courses are structured around the design studios; exams and papers are usually scheduled to correspond. Students are expected to take one out-of-college elective to supplement the architectural coursework—which is not easy, due to stringent requirements. Most students, however, study in the New York City area, as the architecture community is almost completely autonomous within the university—in terms of requirements, faculty, and friendships.

Students
In the undergraduate program, the type of student that comes to Cornell varies greatly. Some are attracted to the school by the reputations of Rowe and Ungers, but many more choose to attend because it is the only professional five-year program in the Ivy League. Those who discover that they are not seriously committed have left after the third year. (Note that the ratio of men to women in the program is one to one.)

Generally the architecture students do not participate heavily in university politics. An architecture student organization in the past offered a forum for a few passionate forays into the realms of administrative decision-making, but at the moment action is slow. Rowes' most student activities include the first issue of the Cornell Journal of Architecture and the establishment of a sorely needed peer-counseling system. Because of the current chairman's desire to direct activity within the school, student interest in geological lecture series and exhibitions has diminished.

The school has long been influenced by the presence and personas of Colin Rowe, known for his seminal essays on Modernism and brutalism, as well as his work on contextual urban design. Since the mid-1960s, with the presence of Mathias Ungers and Rowe, the developments in the work have both had their influences, filtered down to the undergraduate level. The chairman of the department, Jerry Wells, is considered to have a definite bias toward Rowe and his thinking. Wells, however, looks on the undergraduate program as slowly developing its own identity vis-a-vis the graduate one.

Design Structure
In the first year the students are taught basic compositional concepts. "Design Fundamentals" class supplements the studio with an emphasis on the development of a parti; its elaboration; articulation of program elements; and the concepts of site strategies. In addition, history and drawing courses are offered to provide the basis for the students' later work, establishing an ideological structure and synthetic approach to the development of a design.

The second year is a continuation of the first, with closer attention paid to building form and structure. A class in Elements and Principles requires students to read a variety of architectural treatises in order to stimulate the discussion of theory and help students to generate their own "methodology." Third year is the one in which a student will make it or break it. By this time he or she is expected to be able to produce well-developed buildings, using the information with which he has been loaded in previous years. Here too, students are exposed to problems of energy-conscious design and technical considerations. Since the third year is the threshold of more independent work leading to the professional degree, professors are careful about whom they pass. All studios are graded A to F; a C-minus means the student must repeat the year—a frequent occurrence, particularly after third year.

During fourth and fifth years, after having acquired technical and structural knowledge, site strategies, design skills, and a certain amount of history, the student is expected to investigate new ideas. The work of both Rowe and Ungers figures prominently at this point. An overall program between undergraduate and graduate levels allows exceptional students to take either Rowe or Ungers' studios, thereby compressing the time it takes to get their various degrees.

Although both Rowe's and Ungers' graduate studios address issues and ideas expected to take students out-of-college electives to supplement the architectural course-work, which is not easy, due to stringent requirements. Most students, however, study in the New York City area, as the architecture community is almost completely autonomous within the university—in terms of requirements, faculty, and friendships.

The New Color Photography by Sally Ewing is a depressing example of what the marriage of photography and academicism typically produces: boring photographs, boring commentary, and pseudo-criticism. Ewing's "new color" turns out not to be so new, having become institutionalized in the early 70s. Whatever else one wishes to say about them, the gloss of nouveau is not upon the looks of William Eggleston, Steven Shore, or Joel Meyerowitz. Ewing's text is basically an endless reworking of tired strategies of Greenbergian formalist analysis applied with (appropriate changes in vocabulary) to color photography. At precisely the moment when the art world has moved beyond such Art Survey-101 bromides, the art photography world has rushed to recuperate them. Ewing's attempt at critical categories (e.g. "The Vivid Vernacular," "Fabricated Fictions," "Self-Reflections," etc.) are essentially meaningless; several of the photographs end up in more than one classification, and others can be juggled around with no great difference made. Within this ersatz critical system it is impossible to figure out the reason for exclusions. Why Bernard Fauton, but not Laurie Simmons? Why Michael Bishop, but not William Larson? But perhaps even more fundamentally, why Clement Greenberg for photography—a medium that plays no part in his methodology?

If one were to choose from all the photography books published this season the most beautiful, the most satisfying, and the one certain to be looked at again and again, it must be hands down, The Work of Artist: Old France. Underwritten by Springs Mills, Inc., who also supported the first of the MoMA exhibitions, on which this first volume is based, the book reproduces 120 photographs of farms, villages, landscapes, trees, and vegetation culled from the approximately 5000 Aget photographs in the collection of the Museum of Modern Art. Aget's grave and lucid photographs are devoid of artifice, of effect, of calculated aestheticism. They are, rather, intense and self-effacing meditations on the thing itself, be it garden door, village square, or country road. It is as though the first fresh vision of French Primitive photography of the 1850s was born again in Aget, who, like his predecessors, was engaged in an encyclopedic mission of documentation. The book is enriched further by the exemplary and impeccable scholarship of Maria Morris Hambourg in the form of critical notes following the plates, and an introductory essay by John Szarkowski.

Departing from visits to architects' offices, Skyline has decided, as a fitting end-of-term exercise, to provide an "insider's view" of architecture schools. This report was prepared for Skyline by a student at Cornell, in consultation with classmates.

Eugene Atget, Femmes de Vertieres, 1922.
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The following is excerpted from an address given by Mr. Schorske on December 2, 1979, at the second of a series of evenings on "Shapers of Contemporary Thought," sponsored by the Massachusetts Historical Society.


Freud and the Psycho-Archeology of Civilizations

Carl E. Schorske

In his last decade of life, Sigmund Freud turned once more to a question which had troubled him ever since he published his conception of the psyche in The Interpretation of Dreams in 1900: What were the implications of individual psychodynamics for civilization as a whole? His nature reflections that subject he set forth in Civilization and Its Discontents (1930). Its somber conclusions have, of course, become part of our self-understanding: that the progress of our technical mastery over nature and the perfection of our ethical self-control are achieved at the cost of industrial repression in the "civilized" man—a cost so high as not only to make neurotics of individuals, but of whole civilizations. An excess of civilization could produce its own undoing at the hands of instinct avenging itself against the culture that had cultured it too well.

One might expect that, in making a point so historical in its essence, Freud would have reached out to propose a scheme of civilization's march toward the organization of nature and the collective development of the super ego. Such was not Freud's way. He approached his problem not historically but analogically, proceeding from an analysis of the individual psyche, its structure and experience, to the functioning and future of society.

Yet to introduce his problem of his psyche and history, he had recourse to an ingenious historical metaphor. "Let us choose," he says, "the Eternal City," to represent the nature metaphor Freud asks the reader to consider Rome as a physical entity, "the most fully burning as a focused settlement on the Palatine through all its many transformations until the present day. Imagine that all the buildings known to the archaeologist and the historian situated simultaneously in the same urban space with their modern survivors or successors..."

Eternal City. Once he had conquered Rome, Freud returned to it again and again. It was the city most strongly related in Freud's mind with psychoanalysis and the one which resonated most fully with all his contradictory values and desires, compacted like the simultaneous totality of historical Romes that he had suggested to the readers of Civilization and Its Discontents.

Eternal City, the engraving of the Eternal City in the earthy life. Freud sees, at each stage of Rome's history the city's unique site on the Palatine: "Thus the Plaza of the Pantheon," Freud explains, "we should find not only the Pantheon of today as bequeathed to us by Hadrian, but on the same site also Augustus' original edifice; indeed, the same ground would support Santa Maria sopra Minerva and the old temple over which it was built." Freud wishes us to struggle with this multi-faceted vision of the city's non-contemporaneous, the Eternal City that is the totality of its undiminished pasts. (With eyes trained by Picassos and the Cubists, it is easier for us to visualize than for him.) But this, he acknowledges, is not possible either in space or time: "The determining influences are never lacking in the history of any town," he grants, "even if it had had a less chequered past than Rome even if, like London, hardly ever has been pillaged by an enemy." Only in the mind can what is past survive, after it has been, at the level of consciousness, displaced or replaced; and there, it is "rather the rule than the exception for it to do so."

Here Freud lets the metaphor of the city as total history drop, turning our attention to the individual mind, the psyche in the world of each man. It is civilization itself—not the pillaging enemy—that destroys the traces of past experience, burying the personal life of instinct under the weight of its ceaseless denials and demands. But the psychoanalyst can, like the archeologist, recover what buried, by excavating his own history to consciousness, enable us to come to terms with its traumas and even to build it anew.

Is Freud suggesting that, if we could reconstruct the Eternal City in our minds as he has asked us to picture it, with all its past laid bare, we would redeem it? He would make no such claim; he only points to the need to recognize that those "immortal adversaries" that inhabit the depths in each of us, Eros and Thanatos, are active and in/er in the collective life too, and that the earthly city must deal with them. The model of the individual psyche helps Freud to diagnose the collective life, but not to formulate a social therapy.

Freud's use of Rome in Civilization and Its Discontents is highly intricate. One can imagine an unattainable, condensed summary of western historical life. Forty years earlier, when he was not mellon del caimin' and at work on The Interpretation of Dreams, Freud had to conjure with Rome in a quite different way, as a central problem of his self-analysis, with the title of his book, "Rome." Within his dreams of Rome at that time, he excavated in his psyche-archeological dig an earlier Rome that belonged to the days of his childhood. The critic who, in his discovery of the unconscious life led through the

real teachers—all of them English or Scotch; and I am recalling again what is for me the most interesting historical period, the reigns of the Puritans and Oliver Cromwell."

One might have expected that the future liberator of sexuality would have defined his interest in the Puritans negatively. Not at all, for his eye was seeking civic virtue.

In his devotion to England as an ideal society, Freud only shared an attitude widespread in the Austrian liberal bourgeoisie before World War I. There were, however, different kinds of liberal Anglophiles. Most of Freud's contemporaries among the intellectuals admired England for fostering a human type who fused bourgeois practicality with aristocratic grace, business, and high style. The writer Arthur Schnitzler portrayed in a novel an Austrian Jew who, making a new life in England, embodied the typical Englishman as Austrians of the fin de siècle saw him: cool and gray-eyed, courteous and self-possessed. The poet Hugo von Hofmannsthal and his friends in the higher bureaucracy wanted to establish a public school on the English model in Austria to breed such personalities. Theodor Herzl's Jewish state too would cultivate such aristocratic realists (Schorske 1980), Adolf Loos, architect and critic of Austria's visual culture, when he founded a journal called Das Andre (The Other) "to introduce the western culture into Austria," enabled the gentlemanly values of society and practicality reflected in English clothing, interior decor, and use-objects.

Freud's Anglophiliism showed none of these aristocratic-aesthetic features. He drew his image of England from an older, more militant mid-century liberalism, hostile to aristocracy and to the Catholicism associated with it in Austria. Parliamentarism was what they prized in English politics: philosophic republicanism was their lodestar in culture. Freud studied philosophy under Franz Brentano, a leading protagonist of English positivism in Austria. Under the editorial guidance of Theodor Comperger, a classicist who, following George Castle, embraced the Sophists and radical democrats as the finest flowers of Athens, Freud worked on the German edition of the complete works of John Mill. (He
Freud... hit upon the analogy between his own procedure of digging into his own buried past as depth psychologist and the work of the archeologist.

translated "On the Subjection of Women," "Socialism," "The Labor Movement," and "Plato.") Though he does not speak of a debt to Bentham, Freud's early theory of instincts, with its duality of pleasure principle and reality principle, resonates with echoes of Bentham's hedonistic system. From the 17th to the 19th century, those whom Freud claimed as his "real teachers—all of them English or Scotch," were the protagonists of libidinal repression and the advocates of postponed gratification—whether as Puritan foes of aristocratic squandering and the Church of Rome or as secularized utilitarian moralists. They were builders, stern and rational, of the libidal ego which, for Freud, made of England the classic land of ethical rectitude, manly self-control, and the rule of law.

Freud named all his children after his teachers or their wives—except one. Oliver, his second son, he named for Colonnus. Thus the great sexologist paid tribute to the public virtues of private repression and the special achievement of English political culture.

It has become a commonplace of Freud scholarship to identify Paris with the impact of Jean Martin Charcot, the great theorist and clinician of hysteria, on Freud's intellectual development. Lastly so, Freud went as a fellowship to the Salpetriere Hospital for Women in 1881 as a neurologist exploring the organic basis of nervous disorders. Charcot turned him in a new direction, toward the study of hysteria, especially hysterical paralysis, as a disease which behaved "as if there were no anatomy of the brain." He also opened Freud's mind, even if only in informal discourse, to "la chose graudale," the sexual component in the etiology of hysteria. When Freud returned to Vienna to open his own practice, it was as a neurologist still, but one with a special interest in "nervous cases" that others found tiresome: patients who did not suffer from organic lesions of the nervous system. Thus returning from Paris with a pronounced predilection for what we would now call neurasthenics, Freud set out for the first time, boldly if only half aware, on the road region to the unconscious.
Schorske on Freud and Cities

"An excess of civilization could produce its own undoing at the hands of instinct, and it could turn itself against the culture that had cultivated it too well."

another, deeper professional crisis. Where the impact of the 1880s applied only to his career opportunities, the crisis affecting Freud was more to his personal identity and intellectual direction as well.

I have elsewhere tried to show how the seething crisis of the 1890s, both political and personal, over the power to sustain itself against the rising tide of Catholic and nationalist anti-Semitic movements, affected Freud.3 It is clear that in interpreting the fact that Freud became an intellectual isolation as a scientist, and into introspection as a thinker. The more his outer life was misled, however, the more the inner life was used, much more, Freud's personal ideal and intellectual direction as well.

For a long time, Freud's father told him of having been insulted by Christians without fighting back. Freud remembered his father's "unheroic conduct." He remembered having wished that his father had enjoined him, as Hannahs had, "to take vengeance upon the Jews once for all." Freud reported, Hannah had had a place in his fantasies. In the face of the newly threatening power of anti-Semitism in the 1890s, Freud interpreted his longing for Rome as "actually following in Hannahs's footsteps. Like him, I had encountered the other Jewry."

Two aspects of Freud's interpretation of his Hannahs identification deserve notice: First, that he had the same attitude toward Christian Rome that the English Puritans had toward pagan Rome; and, second, that he had taken on the paternal burdens of deity as a Roman Catholic. In the light of his father's impotence, he was himself now powerless to realize. Freud's Romanism, his inability to reach the city, was from this period with the consequence of guilt, of an undischarged obligation at once filial and political.

Yet Freud's actual dreams of Rome in the years 1896 and 1897 spoke a different language, one more akin to his childhood dream of Rome as the symbol of his protopy of his kingdom. All of them suggest fulfillment rather than outright conquest. All confide images of

Catholic Rome with Jewish ideas and situations.1 In one dream Romeo appears as "the promised land seen after the parting of the Red Sea in the days of Moses as Israel to Moses. The vision, though Freud does not say so, seems to express a forbidden wish: a longing for an armed insurrection, an attempt to establish a Jewish theocracy as a substitute for his strong waking conscience — and even his dream-censor — would deny him this ambition. In the other, he was shown the equivalent of our Palm Springs, a city of pleasure, rest, and cure; in short, an earthly city of recreation (reparation), of resurrection. Freud compared himself in the analysis of this dream to a poor, gentle Jewish character in one of the Yiddish stories he loved best. Because the little Jew did not have the train fare to Carlsbad, the conductor beat him up at every station; but eventually he made his way home, for he had taught himself to be a master of his fate."

How different is the Rome of the youth of the 1890s and 1870s — forbidding, hostile, bureaucratic — from the Rome of the 1900s and 1910s? In the 1890s, he was the first an object of hate, to be destroyed, the second an object of envy and sympathy. In his dream of the 1900s, he is identified with the city of pleasure (Carlsbad-Praha-Rome); in short, Mother and Father. But, as in the first, once he had dreamed Freud provided, though not in The Interpretation of Dreams, of his wish to be the lover of Rome to his surrogate mother, a beloved Greek Nanny, his new "dream-wishes to enter the city of the Roman imperial time. Tantalizingly, the train moves off before he can cross the Bridge of the Holy Angel to reach the castle of a house of both burned paganism and Christian salvation.

While Freud in his psycho-archaeological report analyzes only the first pan, Rome, identifying with his dreams in antiquity. For, Freud in his Roman neurosis, the declines in a report from a German author which occasioned his change in the course of his Roman neurosis: "Which of these... two men paced his study in greater excitement after forming his plan to go to Rome? Winckelmann or myself?" Freud uniquely answered for himself, "Hannahs," for he had been "fated not to see Rome." But Winckelmann would correspond to the other side of Freud's dream-truth, the one he failed to analyze for us. For Winckelmann, the great archaeologist and art historian, had much in common with Freud: his poverty; an acute sense of low social origins; failure to find for many a congenial position or professional recognition; a series of intense male friendships with homosexual overtones; hatred of political tyranny; hostility to organized religion; and a genial crisis at the age of 40 that resulted, like Freud's, in a "first work" of his life. Winckelmann was born near all, Winckelmann, a Protestant, overcame his scruples and embraced Catholicism in order to enter Rome, to be able to go forth upon his own ancient, his allow, to persuade his conscience for the sake of his science, his amor intellectus for Rome.

Was not Freud more scientist than general — and a "soft" scientist at that? Was he not, on his journey to Rome, following in Winckelmann's footsteps rather than in Hannahs's? Of course, Freud was not ready to go the course of Winckelmann to Rome. The Hill and the Cremnoll in the Jewish, liberal, and Anglo-Saxon tradition, dreamed也是如此, and censured his dreams by night — asserted his capacity to resist any such apostasy. But the temptation which Winckelmann faced, Freud reported, he, like Winckelmann, as Freud had encountered in Paris — the affective power of Rome to his Romanism — did not yield to his association with. Freud recognized as a deeper reality in his own psyche. It was his glory to exult in it painfully in himself and then to pen it down to the lady of his heart, in a psychological system.

After Freud finished his self-analysis and The Interpretation of Dreams in 1900, the gates of Rome opened to him at last. He saw for the first time the political and economic consequences of his personal experience of Rome, "the victory of his own mind and all the other misery which I seek to know." For it was the Rome of ancient Rome, with its "life of salvation," "disturbing," making it possible for him to see "the tempestuous Rome, and his Jewish ideas and situations."

Unlike the Jewish, liberal and Anglo-Saxon tradition, Freud's Rome is a Rome on a diaz, a dream. It is easy to see the political and economic consequences of his personal experience of Rome, "the victory of his own mind and all the other misery which I seek to know." For it was the Rome of ancient Rome, with its "life of salvation," "disturbing," making it possible for him to see "the tempestuous Rome, and his Jewish ideas and situations."
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Setting the Stage: Herts & Tallant

Robert A.M. Stern, John Massengale, and Gregory Gilmartin

New York is identified with the image of the Great White Way, a glittering, scintillating world that is a fairy-tale counterpart to its Babylon of skyscrapers. The glories of the Great White Way, which ironically achieved near-mythic stature in Hollywood musicals of the 1930s, were a turn-of-the-century phenomenon.

The theaters of cosmopolitan New York were largely clustered along the "White Way," the stretch of Broadway between 42nd and 33rd Streets that connected a fading center of fashion—Union Square—with the briefly ascendant Madison Square. Lit by gas, poorly ventilated, their exits unregulated by building codes, the theaters of the White Way were prone to a series of disastrous fires in the 1890s. When rebuilt, they followed fashion northward, hovering first around 38th Street before finally centering near Longacre Square (renamed Times Square in 1904 when the New York Times completed its tower at 42nd Street and Broadway, an event that coincided with the opening of the subway station). The new theaters were all safer, largely because they were lit by electricity, and soon architects discovered that the lightbulb could unlock an almost limitless potential for advertising and nighttime decor. The result was that by 1915 Broadway had been transformed into a Great White Way.

The establishment of the theater district heralded a new element in the city's social makeup that reflected the concept of "the melting pot." The Great White Way was patronized by two segments of society: an oligarchy of descendants of the monopolists who had founded the city's great fortunes, which was gradually abandoning the ostentatious private social events as important to their parents' social stature; and an increasingly dominant upper-middle-class, usually drawn from first-generation Americans of middle-European descent, who, effectively barred from the established clubs and the prestigious tiers of homes at the opera house, pursued their leisure in a more characteristically Continental manner. The popularization of theater-going was also reflected in the growth of vaudeville, a vernacular entertainment with roots in both the English music-hall tradition and Yiddish comedy. As a sort of respectable, sanitized burlesque, vaudeville became increasingly acceptable as family entertainment for all classes and remained the most popular form of theater until it was supplanted by films.

The great theater architcts of the composite city—that is, the New York of the period 1890-1915—were Henry B. Herts and Hugh Tallant, two young architects who more than any others were responsible for transforming the streets leading off Broadway above Times Square into a distinct theatrical world, a glittering and festive environment; an urban counterpart to Cocoey Island.

Herts & Tallant's achievement was the creation of a unique, if seminal, synthesis between the image of the theater as a public monument and as a temple of vernacular pleasures. As such it was a particularly well-developed expression of the blending of moneyed social groups that provided the impetus toward the city's great burst of culture at the century's turn. By drawing on the modern French or Beaux-Arts Banque style of the Paris Boulevards as well as on the Art Nouveau—the latter representing the most up-to-the-minute thought in European design and being almost totally unknown in America—Herts & Tallant created a highly expressive, fundamentally new theatrical architecture that was, in effect, a kind of non-Wagnerian Gesamtkunstwerk. Rather than focusing attention exclusively on the stage, Herts & Tallant extended the atmosphere of the drama into the auditorium and related public spaces, enveloping the audience in a single, sensual experience.

The two partners were highly qualified to bring to New York a breath of the Parisian Boulevard. Both were graduates of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts; and Herts, born into a family of decorators, possessed a particularly refined, highly aestheticized talent. The sometimes precious, always visually rich qualities of the firm's work led Abbott Handred Moore to speculate in 1904 that its motto was "Le Beau, c'est le Vrai." The originality of their stylistic endeavor was justified, he felt, by the fact that

Herts & Tallant was an architectural team that gave Broadway its unique theatrical identity at the turn of the century. One of their designs, the Helen Hayes Theater, is slated for demolition.
"The last major theater designed by Herts & Tallant was the Folies Bergère of 1911 (now the Helen Hayes). The dinner theater combined the traditional music hall and the winter garden."
Exhibits

Boston/Cambridge

John Exhibition Through Dec. 18. "Architecture as Synthesis"—A show of work by young Chicago architect Helmut Johns of Murphy/Johns, Gund Hall, Cambridge; (617) 495-5500

Fragments of Invention: Le Corbusier Through Dec. 13. An exhibition of 8 original sketchbooks by Le Corbusier, along with lithographs, drawings, paintings, collages, photographs, and models of his projects arranged chronologically from 1914 to 1965. The show celebrates the publication of Le Corbusier's sketchbooks by the Architectural History Foundation and MIT Press. The Carpenter Center, Harvard University; (617) 495-3235

Charlottesville

Travel Sketches of Vieloe-St-Lac Through Dec. 19. Drawings by 19th-century rationalist, Campbell Hall, University of Virginia; (804) 924-0311

Chicago

Architectural Photographs Through Jan. 3. Drawings and models of Michael Graves' Portland Buildings; exhibit co-sponsored by the Contemporary Art Center and the Cincinnati chapter of the AIA. The Contemporary Art Center, 115 East 5th Street; (312) 721-0390

Los Angeles


New Haven

Raimund Abraham Through Dec. 3. A show of work by this New York artist-architect. The catalogue includes an interview with Abraham by Kenneth Frampton. Yale Art and Architecture Gallery, 180 York Street; (203) 436-6550

New York City

Photographs of Central Park Through Dec. 13. Photographs taken together to illustrate the restoration and reopening of the Dairy—a classic example of Victorian Gothic architecture, designed by Calvert Vaux. The Dairy, 65th Street between the Zoo and the Carousel in Central Park; (212) 360-0114. Open Tues.-Sun. 10-6.

Classicism and Romanticism in the Schinkel Era Through Dec. 15. Original drawings of projects by Karl Friedrich Schinkel on the occasion of his 200th birthday. Exhibition Gallery, 200 Level, Avery hall, Columbia University; (212) 280-3414

American Women and Gardens: 1915-1945 Through Dec. 31. Drawings and photographs of public and private gardens designed by women landscape architects. Wave Hill Center for the Arts, 675 West 250th St., Riverdale; (212) 549-2035

Manhattan Exhibitions

Through Dec. 31. Drawings and models of a Manhattan apartment building by Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas. The Lobby, 369 Lexington Avenue


Dream Windows Through Jan. 2. The history of window display art and ten specially created "dream windows" by distinguished display artists. Fashion Institute of Technology Gallery, 227 West 27th Street; (212) 760-7629

Art of the Avant-Garde in Russia Through Jan. 10. Selections from the George Costakis Collection, including 275 paintings and works on paper by Russian artists from 1908-1932, and a reconstruction of Popova's set for Meyerhold's production of The Magnanimous Cuckold (1922). The catalogue is by Margi Rosewell and Angelica Budzynski. The Guggenheim Museum, 1071 Fifth Avenue; (212) 889-1300

Atget Through Jan. 5. 125 prints of the French countryside from the Berenice Abbott Collection. Museum of Modern Art, 11 W. 53rd Street; (212) 956-7000

Berenice Abbott Through Jan. 10. Portraits and cityscapes from the 1920s and 30s. ICP, 1335 Fifth Avenue; (212) 660-1733

Group Show: Open Storage Through mid-January. Work by Charles Moore, Frank Gehry, Michael Graves, Aldo Rossi, Peter Eisenman, and many more. Max Protetch Open Storage Gallery, 214 Lafayette Street; (212) 838-7436

Window, Room, Furniture Through Jan. 22. Invited from Dec. 21-Jan. 4; 108 responses to each of these elements by artists and architects including Anar Izusak, Charles Jencks, Lucio Fontana, William Turner, and Barbara plywood. The show was organized by Ricardo Scofidio and Tod Williams. A catalogue of the exhibition will be published by Cooper Union and Bazzini International, and will include essays by Juan Pablo Botta, David Shapiro, and Lindsay Stamm. The Houghton Gallery, Cooper Union; (212) 254-6300

Suburb Show Through Jan. 24. Photographs, drawings, site plans, and models of early suburban prototypes, such as the industrial village and resort community; curated by Robert A. M. Stern and John Massengale. Cooper-Hewitt Museum, 2 East 91st Street; (212) 860-6946


75th Anniversary of the Morgan Library Building Through Feb. 4. Drawings, plans, and elevations of the building designed by McKim, Mead & White. Morgan Library, 29 East 36th Street; (212) 680-5000

The European Garden Through Feb. 7. Drawings and book illustrations of 17th- and 18th-century European landscape architecture, including landscape designs of Fontainebleau and Versailles. The Pierpont Morgan Library, 29 East 36th Street; (212) 680-5000


A Tribute to Willard Van Dyke Dec. 8—13. Daily showings of his films—The City, which examines city planning and urban growth; and Valley Town, his study of the consequences of automation on an industrial town. There will also be a series of lectures on "The Documentary Film." The Whitney Museum, 945 Madison Avenue; (212) 288-9901

Kazuo Shiraga Dec. 8-Jan. 8. An exhibit of designs for eleven houses by this contemporary architect. I.A.U.S., 8 West 40th St. (212) 396-9474 for information.

San Francisco/Bay Area

British and European Architectural Drawings Recent work by Keith Wilson Through Dec. 31. 30 architectural drawings from the 18th to 20th centuries executed in pen and ink, and watercolor, from the Fisher Fine Art Collection, London. Work includes Visconti's plan and elevation for Napoleon's Tomb and drawings by Sir John Soane. Also on exhibit are oil, watercolor, and ink studies of architecture by the young California artist and architect, Keith Wilson. The Phoenix Bonfanti Gallery, 478 Green Street; (415) 781-8996

Washington, D.C.

National Memorial to Vietnamese Veterans Through Jan. 3. Designs from last winter's competition. At both the Octagon, 1799 New York Avenue N.W., and the AIA National Office, 1735 New York Avenue N.W.; (202) 683-3100 for information

London, England

Sir Edwin Landseer Lutyns From Nov. 17. An exhibition of work. Hayward Gallery, Belvedere Road, South Bank (01)928-33

Paris, France

Place Novissima Through Dec. 20. Work from the Strada Novissima of the Venice Biennale is part of the 10th Parisian Festival D'Automne—organized as a place rather than a street. Facades by: Bobil, G.R.A.U., Grues, Holleis, Kleinheyes, L. Krier, Moore, Patrin, Stern, Ungeris, and Venturi have come from Venice; those by two French architects have been added: Fernando Montes and Christian de Portzamparc. Only some of the drawings from Venice have been included with new ones from the French architects. La Chapelle de la Salpêtrière, 47 Boulevard de l'Hôpital

Rome, Italy


Steven Holl Dec. 21-"Bridge"—A show of projects and drawings by this New York architect, curated by Francesco Moschini and Paola Iacucci. Galleria Architettura Arte Moderna, 12 Via Del Vantaggio

Coming

To be seen at the Cooper-Hewitt in February and March, a film on architects, bankers, builders, and buildings, featuring The Fountainhead (1949), Skyscraper (1959), Metropolis (1926), and Metropolis (1921)...and to the Marymount Manhattan Theater, February 9-14, the world premiere of Kindmis's opera The Yellow Sound, incorporating the original score by Thomas de Hartman, conducted by Gunther Schuller. The Guggenheim Museum production will be directed by Ian Strasdogel, choreographed after Alexander Berkovitc by Hellmut Fricke-Gottchcid, and designed by Robert Israel and Richard Buddell.
**Boston/Cambridge**

Richard Sennett on Democratic Theory and Urban Form


**Los Angeles**

Urban Planning Lecture

Dec. 3: Robert Healy, "Rural Growth and Rural Land." Room 142, Architecture Department, U.C.L.A. 5:30 pm; (213) 825-5752 for information.

**New York City**

Review of Reviews

Dec. 1: A roundtable discussion by journalists of architectural events as reported in the press. Topic this time is the reviews of Tom Wolfe's From Bauhaus to Our House. Sponsored by the Architectural League and the Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue, 6:30 pm; (212) 753-1722 for information.

Lectures at Columbia


"Three Projects: One Form" Lecture Series

Dec. 3: George Ranalli, Dec. 10: Steven Holl, Dec. 17: Tall Architects from Houston. The Open Atelier of Design, 12 West 29th Street; (212) 696-0969. All lectures are at 6 pm. Admission is $11.

Birkerts Lecture

Dec. 3: George Birkerts, Higgins Auditorium, Pratt Institute, 65 St. James Place at Lafayette Street, Brooklyn; (212) 636-3407. 6 pm.

South Street Seaport Tour

Dec. 6: A tour of the Center for Building Conservation. Mark Ten Eyck and the CBC staff will discuss conservation techniques. 171 John Street; (212) 766-9062; $4.00 fee. 1:30–3:30 pm.

Forums on Form: Lectures by Authors


"Reply Time"

Dec. 10: Kenneth Frampton on responses to his recently published book, Modern Architecture: A Critical History. Sponsored by the Architectural League at the Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue, 6:30 pm; (212) 753-1722.

Bernard Tschumi

Dec. 15: The artist lectures on his work The Manhattan Transcripts, currently on view at the Max Protetch Gallery. The lecture is sponsored by the Architectural League, at the Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue, 6:30 pm; (212) 753-1722.

The Magnificent Cuckold

Dec. 13–17: Scenes from Wenceslaus Meyerhoffer's 1922 production of The Magnificent Cuckold, a farce by the Belgian playwright Fernand Croommelincx, will be performed. Production of the original theater set designed by Lucius Popova, The Guggenheim Museum, 1071 Fifth Avenue; (212) 966-1000.

**Miami**

Architecture Club of Miami Lecture


**Philadelphia**

"Evidence of Self-Respect": Lectures at Penn

Dec. 2: Romaldo Giurgola, architect, Mitchell, Giurgola & Thorp: At the GSF, Room B-1, 6:30 p.m. (215) 243-5729.

**Princeton**

Princeton Lecture

Dec. 2: Henry Glassie, "Folk Building." Betts Lecture Room, School of Architecture, Princeton University; (609) 452-3741. 4:30 pm.

**San Francisco/Bay Area**

Western Addition Lectures


Taste in Design and Elsewhere

Feb. 10–13 A conference sponsored by the National Center for Architecture and Urbanism to be held in San Francisco, Conference participants: Richard Gay Wilson, Robert A. M. Stern, Arnos Rapoport, Paul Oliver, Charles Moore, and the School of Architecture.

**Vancouver**

ALCAN Lectures


**Washington D.C.**

Smithsonian Lectures: Architecture-Theory and Practice


**Paris, France**

Presentation of Recent Buildings by the Architect. Dec. 8: Jean Nouvel on "Le C.E.S. Anne Frank & Antony. Institut Français d'Architecture, 6 Rue de Tournon; (01) 633-9056. Tuesday at 5:30 pm.

Lectures on Significant Projects outside of Metropolitan France

Dec. 11: "The Medieval City and its Evolution." by Jean-Claude Garcin, Institut Français d'Architecture, 6 Rue de Tournon; (01) 633-9056. 5:30 pm.
Recent years, Richard Haas has almost single-handedly revived the classical art of trompe l'oeil mural painting. His work is to be found throughout the United States in cities such as Boston, Chicago and New York, as well as in other countries such as Germany and Australia. His career has been devoted to creating facsimiles of architecture, from his early dioramas, to interior and exterior murals, to free-standing painted buildings, such as the Times Tower in New York, and the La Salle Tower in Chicago. Through his work he has brought an element of historical fantasy to the city. Magnificent facades have replaced blank walls; previously closed views—such as the Brooklyn Bridge from the South Street Seaport—open up into fantastic historical scenes; and bleak box-like structures turn into historical recreations of forgotten urban architecture.

This richly illustrated new book, Richard Haas: An Architecture of Illusion, includes an introduction and commentary by the architecture critic of The New York Times, Paul Goldberger, an autobiographical sketch, and a detailed overview of Haas's work. 160 pages. 180 illustrations, 40 in color. $35.00
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