An Interview with Michel Foucault

We’ll Miss You Ada Louise

Space, Knowledge, and Power Discussed;
Meier’s Seminary, Reagan’s White House, The Culture of Consent criticized

Plus: Adam, Barthes, Kallmann reviewed
To the Editor:
This is reply is to Elaine Hochman's hopelessly muddled letter in your January 1982 issue. Ms. Hochman discusses many people, events, and issues that as far as I can see have little to do with an evaluation of Albert Speer, either as an architect or as a political figure. Most of the questions she raises are dealt with at some length in my Architecture and Politics in Germany, 1918-1945 (Cambridge, Mass., 1969). But I do feel compelled to reiterate a few points from that book in connection with Ms. Hochman's bewildering comparison of Gropius, Mies, and Speer.

During the first year of the Nazi regime, when official cultural policy was still—or at least appeared to be—in the process of evolution, Walter Gropius, Martin Wagner, and many others tried to bring Goebbels and Rundschau around to their way of thinking—to sponsorship of the Modern Movement. They were not "seeking commissions"; they were trying to influence an entire policy. When they failed, they left. To equate their brief and dangerous effort, however misguided it may appear in retrospect, with Speer's lasting and ardent devotion to Hitler, is to say the least, absurd. As to Mies, I don't know why he remained in Germany three years longer than Gropius did, and Ms. Hochman hasn't enlightened me, here or elsewhere. To equate Mies' willingness to stay a little longer (or inability to leave) with Speer's eager exercise of unique power in the Nazi war effort is, at best, illogical. I guess Ms. Hochman must be right—historians haven't yet succeeded in setting the record straight about these matters. But at least we keep trying.

Barbara Miller Parker

To the Editor:
The inherent irony in Ms. Miller Parker's article on Albert Speer (Skyline, December '81) demands a response. Skyline's smart juxtaposition of this article with one on Albert Mayer is useful. When Ms. Lane implies that the selling of the architect's own "soul"—for the commission to do a great building—is simply the practice of a Nazi architect, we just have to turn our head to the right-hand page and read that "quality" architect like Mayer designed "luxury apartment buildings" on Central Park South, colonialist schemes for Chandigarh, or nuclear, family-oriented "greenbelt towns," obviously drawn with his "principles of humane architecture."

Furthermore, if by association we are led to believe that the characteristics of Nazi (and other) architecture of "extreme axiality and centrally, exaggerated emphasis on the apparent thickness of the walls" are signs of evil, do we have to make parallel conclusions when confronted with current trends, documented elsewhere in Skyline, that use similar principles?

It might be useful to hear from Ms. Lane on the different stand on caustic conflicts and the shortcomings of the system expressed by contemporary architects, who I am sure are found busy at the picket lines, demonstrations, canvases, or denouncing injustice wherever found. Or does she propose that refusal to cooperate with a system comes magically, only in widely publicized war expropriations? Ms. Lane should have offered new insights on the stereotypical composition of the victims of the Holocaust, an event that was for so long monopolized as a totally Jewish plight. As we know today, the victims of the Nazi concentration camps included religious and political dissidents (communists in particular), gypsies and vagrants, the so-called criminal elements (prostitutes among them); and homosexuals. Ms. Lane's omission prooves once more that the conspiracy of silence and the callous indifference to injustice attributed to Albert Speer are still alive today. David Fernbach, in his book The Men With The Pink Triangle, referring to the Nazi homophobic persecution, states that "The contempt to our fellow humans, and social discrimination, is the same as it was 30 or 50 years ago."

Amerigo Marras
International Union of Gay Architects
Ada Louise Huxtable in Perspective

Suzanne Stempnes

Three significant figures emerged in the relatively unknown field of architecture criticism between the years 1990 and 1980: Montgomery Schuyler (1845-1914), Lewis Mumford (born 1895), and Ada Louise Huxtable (born 1921). Montgomery Schuyler published regularly in Architectural Record from its inception in 1899 to his death in 1914. Lewis Mumford wrote the "Skyline" columns for The New Yorker between 1931 and 1963. Ada Louise Huxtable is known as the "first" full-time critic of architecture to be hired by a newspaper, The New York Times, where she wrote extensively on the subject from 1963 to her retirement in January 1982.

By the values and attitudes they espoused, by the modes of critical analysis they employed, and by their own personal writing style, they were to consolidate the position of the architecture critic in their particular medium. Concomitant with this status was a "power" they had, one that had a great deal to various audiences for its impact, but that depended much more on their special contributions for its "weight." Ada Louise Huxtable's power base at The Times cannot be denied, however, much of her power was strengthened because of the way she judiciously and courageously used it. And at her prodigious output at The Times since 1957, the year she began writing for the newspaper on a freelance basis, she impressed one by sheer quantity. As now summarized in Ada Louise Huxtable: An Annotated Bibliography edited by Lawrence Woodhave (Gardland Publishing, Inc., 1981), that number ranged between 33 and 61 articles a year.

As critics, Huxtable, Schuyler, and Mumford functioned as commentators close to the architectural phenomena they observed. Since they all were linked to monthly, weekly, and daily publications, and to the commercial world instead of the academic one, they had to work in the arena of verbal or aesthetic opinion; because the architecture critic is lacking in both verbal and aesthetic opinion; because this is implicitly important: Huxtable's insistence on "recalling" or "extracting" the essence of the details in the surrounding older architecture. "Yet such writing by Huxtable seems to have occurred with less frequency in the last seven or eight years and a mellower outlook has permeated her recent criticism.

But, while the emerging of the most accomplished efforts of modernism was understood in the late 1960s and early '70s, it has been less so in the last part of the '70s. As architectural historian Ulrich Bergholz wrote in the introduction to his book "Modern Architecture," "It is in some of the ascalar surfaces, and planes, of structure and technique as determinants of form, and the emphasis on plan and circulation at the sacrifice of the elevation, clearly a new system of values is in the air. Their contextual and historicist values and attitudes have been reinforced, if not shaped, by Huxtable's earlier attention to the value of urban settings, places, and past architectural endeavors.

Huxtable's cautionary tone regarding the newer efforts and her insistence that modern architecture is not dead cannot be argued. Her clarification of issues affecting architects at this time is difficult, if not impossible, to overestimate. But her hesitation to take hold of the newly emerged critical attitudes and values and how should they affect her own critical approach vis-a-vis ongoing modernist (and "post-modernist") efforts leaves one wondering.

How should a critic be judged? One paradoxical answer is to say that the critic is liked according to how well he or she is hated, and disliked according to how badly he or she is hated. This simplified statement of course is not altogether true.

In assessing Montgomery Schuyler, William Jordy and Ralph Cox (American Architecture and Other Writings, Athenaeum, 1964) say that the "creative" critic must "possess an aesthetic curiosity relevant to the production of his world," a philosopher that leads him to the most "creative production" of this world. But they also bring up this question the "creative critic" must raise in the arts: "Can his philosophy embrace the new vision" and transform itself accordingly? They feel that Schuyler's philosophy could not, and this apparatus might prove true of Ada Louise Huxtable's judgment as well.

Time will tell. You don't stop reading a good critic because he or she differs in opinion from your own bias. You read the critic for his or her range and depth of perceptions and for being able to articulate the insights you were coming to yourself (or thought you were). You read a critic for the principles he or she discerns and how he or she applies those principles to particular cases. You read a critic for the reservoir of ideas stored up that allows him to frame an argument to judge and evaluate an architectural work. You also read a critic for the way the argument is presented and, of course, for the style in which it is written. This is why we have read Huxtable.

But inevitably the critic will be judged on the architecture he or she likes and dislikes—immediately and over time. The evaluation of the specific situation tests whether a critic's efforts can change, improve, or strengthen various efforts and effects realty.

Clearly Huxtable's assessments of urban design issues, preservation problems, and blockbustor overbuilding have had a serious effect in changing the environment. Her mode of analysis, emphasizing the many difficult constraints, cultural and social forces affecting the art of architecture has been equally significant. Her principles, values, and attitudes Huxtable espoused, and her courageous and straightforward way she went about it made her position in the '70s, ammenably so, change.

Without the interest she has generated about architecture and the example her writings have set, other publications, such as Skyscraper, would not exist. Her absence will be seriously felt. The architecture critic for The Times, Paul Goldberger, a critic with different enthusiasms, has much expected of him. When the question "Can he be another Ada Louise Huxtable?" is asked, there is more to the question than it sounds. She has established a standard of criticism and created a myth, so to speak—that made it hard for Ada Louise to live up to. Now Goldberger has to try.
Downtown Pains in Los Angeles

Joseph Giovannini


Architects lament buildings—the great buildings that have been torn down; those that were never built. Some architects still cannot look at Hood and Howard's Chicago Tribune Tower without regretting Elie Saarinen's second-place entry in that landmark 1922 competition. In Los Angeles, many architects cannot bear to progress on the $2.3 billion, mixed-use Bunker Hill project—won by a design team headed by Canadian architect Arthur Erickson—without missing the second-place partners' entry designed by Cesar Pelli, Charles Moore, Lawrence Halprin, Frank Gehry, Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer, Ricardo Legorreta, Barton Myers, Deborah Sue Samson, and noted others.

The Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA), who called the competition for the development of a project for 11.3 billion acres downtown site in 1977, chose the Erickson scheme two summers ago. The CRA conceded in the choosing that the Maguire proposal was a close second—well ahead of the three other proposals. But it was financially weaker than the Erickson scheme, which was backed by a strong consortium of developers, including Cadillac Fairview of Canada.

After the decision there were occasional rumors that negotiations between the hard-driving developers and the CRA were rocky, and that negotiations might collapse. Indeed, talks lasted nearly a year longer than anticipated, but the union between the L.A. City Council and Bunker Hill Associates was consummated this January. Construction of the project will proceed in three phases, to last them a total of 20 years.

The document itself—reputed to be one of the most complex in real estate history—gives the developers leasesholds on city-owned land for a project as monumental as New York City's Rockefeller Center. If realized, it will house 3.5 million square feet of retail space; five acres of plaza, including a 200-foot-diameter amphitheater; a complex of 12 movie theaters; and more. As a condition of the original competition, all developers agreed to build a 100,000-square-foot museum of contemporary art (granted to the city for $20 million to the developers). In a collaborative selection of architects, Japanese architect Arata Isozaki was chosen to design the museum; his scheme was presented in late March.

Despite the agreement and the grandness of the scale, rumors persist: the cautions are not bullish on spec office space coming onto the market in late 1983 or '84—especially if that space does not have the advance commitment of a major tenant. Erickson's California Plaza, as it is called, does not. Those who are pessimistic about the whole project are necessarily pessimistic about completion of the museum. Certainly the target date of the 1984 Olympics, given the delays so far, is already dubious. Nonetheless, the January signing commits the project to an optimistic start. In late March Erickson's L.A. office will present a refined version of the original scheme.

One hardly wants to break the goodwill and honeymoon cheer necessary for the success of such an ambitious project—and one pivotal for downtown L.A.—but certain features of the plan present some cause for sobriety. Arguments about what makes a city a city are perennial, and Los Angeles, with its casual sprawl, has always raised the question of whether or not a city lacking urbanity is truly urban. California Plaza seems to be like Los Angeles in its forthright ambiguity. The five acres of plaza, left over by the biggest "footprint," wash through the project with only a vague relationship to the existing street grid. The project sits on a L-shaped site of three consolidated downtown blocks, and lines one major avenue (Olive) with a hard-edge of condominiums, softly programmed at the street with lobbies. On Grand Avenue, open plazas alternate with blank museum walls or bank lobbies, none of which can sustain a pedestrian's interest. Down the avenue (a sunken sculpture court is the only real "place"). At a larger scale, however, the project does give a center to L.A., by its critical mass alone. Its tower will be the keystone of the new L.A. skyline.

That critical mass is complemented by even more development in adjacent or nearby projects. The same Maguire Partners who lost the Bunker Hill competition has under construction, across the street from California Plaza, a restaurant pavilion and a two-tower (54- and 44-story) office complex, by the San Francisco office of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. Next door, Welton Becket Associates has designed another (27-story) tower that, like the two Crocker Center towers, is faced in granite and has acutely angled corners; together, the three towers form a visual unit. Down the street, A.C. Martin Associates has finished a gleaming, stainless-steel, 48-story Wells Fargo tower with a heroically scaled, marble-plated open atrium at its base. The atrium takes pedestrians on escalators to the top of Bunker Hill—a steep transition. The dark-green, deeply veined Vermont marble establishes the atrium as thehighest's base, and gives the insubstantial tower the detail, decoration, color, and weight inherent in the marble. The almost pharmonic hall is certainly one of the best of L.A.'s few urban spaces.

The Wells Fargo atrium and the Crocker Center restaurant pavilion, fronted with shops, do give this newest section of downtown L.A. some direct street support. But with 7 to 9 million square feet (depending on which buildings are counted) underway or imminent, there will only be a total of twenty-five stores facing directly on the street. Much of the remaining commercial space is street-side, on the far side of a plaza. Criticizing plazas in L.A. is tantamount to doubting palm trees, but they will be redundant on Bunker Hill, and especially unsnapped around the point-tower highrise. With one or two exceptions, the new crop of Bunker Hill buildings will be weak at the street, though they will certainly merge with the existing highrise, to form a skyline profile particularly impressive from the freeway. L.A. will be Manhattanized yet—at least at the skyline, if not at the avenue.
Eleni Constantine

Harvard University President Derek Bok threw the art world into an uproar by cancelling construction of a long-planned $16.5 million addition to the University's Fogg Museum, which functions both as Harvard's fine arts department and a public museum. Architecture lost big as well: the addition was designed by British architect James Stirling, Michael Wilford & Associates, in association with Perry, Dean, Stahl & Rogers. Indeed, an immediate and unanimous outcry against the administration's action from long-time supporters of the arts at Harvard, as well as scholars and museum officials around the country, has made clear that Harvard has lost not only a major work of architecture and a much-needed teaching and museum facility, but a great deal of credibility as well. Many think it will undercut Harvard's future fundraising efforts and its traditional preeminence in the fine arts field.

The decision made Bok and the University's governing Corporation was unanimously condemned by the Harvard Overseers' Visiting Committee to the Fogg, a distinguished group of some thirty-five museum officials and benefactors with major responsibility for the direction and planning of the Fogg.

According to the Visiting Committee, millions of dollars pledged to the addition have already been withdrawn following Bok's decision; the Fogg claims that $11 million in contributions will have to be returned to donors who earmarked it for the new facility. Furthermore, Harvard's main capital fund drive stands to lose substantial contributions from patrons outraged by the sudden cancellation. The Visiting Committee's denunciation of Bok's action as economically unsound and culturally insensitive certainly seems justified in light of the pusillanimous and inadequate justifications offered for the decision. On February 2, Bok explained that although almost the entire sum needed to build and maintain the new wing had been pledged, the University's governing Corporation feared cost overruns during construction and questioned the adequacy of the funds allocated for maintaining the addition in the near future.

The administration's attitude seems incomprehensible: the Committee, the Fogg staff, the Fine Arts Department, and Stirling proceeded with great deliberation in order to minimize these risks. As Bok admits, financial support is not a problem at present, the project has been generously supported by such art patrons as Arthur Sackler (who reportedly gave $7.9 million), the Krence, Kreps, and Lehman foundations; and Committee members. Why cancel such a well-planned and generously funded project at the last minute on the basis of such vague threats? The Corporation's claimed fear of repeating its mistakes in the recent building of a Medical Area Total Energy Plant (MATEP), which exceeded original cost estimates of $50 million by about $180 million and aroused steadfast opposition from the Cambridge community.

Furthermore, earlier this year, the Corporation pressed on the Fogg the idea of a limited, one-time sale of Fogg art works to finance the maintenance costs of the addition. The suggestion, adopted by the Fogg with the utmost reluctance, was decried by the New York-based Association of Art and Museum Directors. Both Bok now cites the Association's disapproval of this particular fundraising maneuver to show that fundraising for the addition cannot proceed at all. Compared with the medical plant, relatively minuscule and uncertain cost increases are cited by the Corporation as determinants—a possible rise in brick costs, a request by Stirling for some $100,000 more in fees. In the wake of Bok's decision, it became clear to most observers that the administration has no faith in Stirling, or in the committee that selected him after a one-year search on the basis of his extensive track record with university buildings in the U.K. and the U.S. George Putnam, Corporation treasurer, attacked Stirling's "general attitude," stating that the administration did not feel Stirling could complete the project within the budget. Supporters of the Fogg expansion feel this finding is particularly outrageous, considering the consistent and relatively successful efforts of the architect and Fogg representatives to meet the increasingly restrictive budgetary demands of the administration during the two years since the project was initially approved. Almost as outrageous are the administration's statements that some "more practical" addition to the Fogg will be built within the next few years. Planned by whom? With what funds? Once bitten, twice shy—it's doubtful that the Fogg or the Visiting Committee will be willing to put their own prestige and credibility on the line to plan and fundraise again.

Fogg rolls in again: As this issue went to press the latest word is that Harvard University president Derek Bok may reinstate plans to build the Fogg museum addition. Harvard is currently talking to donors who will cover costs of building as well as projected deficits. —Ed.

Portman Still Pending

On Thursday, February 11, Federal District Court Judge Kevin T. Duffy came down on the side of the big wheels. He dismissed the preservationists' lawyers' accusations that the Portman forces had used political influence in obtaining a quick-as-a-wink Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the Moscow Theater. Judge Duffy rejected the arguments and said that they were based on "unfounded speculation." The December 1981 decision of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Judge ruled, "was not tainted by White House pressure."

Judge Duffy, it would seem, used a very broad sweep of the hand to dismiss these preservationist allegations. The National Resources Defense Council lawyers had submitted affidavits from several members and employees of the Council, which stated clearly that "Jen Nitzger and James Watt made telephone calls to Council members and said, in as many words, that "either the Council rolls over on the Portman or it is out of business tomorrow." If that isn't pressure, what is?" Demolition was stayed under Judge Duffy's ruling pending appeal. On Thursday, February 18—as this issue went to press—Federal Appeals Court in Manhattan agreed to hear the preservationists' case for a new injunction on Tuesday, February 23. "We have serious doubts," said Bruce Terris, the lawyer who has headed the theaters' defense, "and they are being considered seriously by the court." It appears likely that demolition of the theaters would be forestalled until at least the end of February; another action was issued in State Court that also blocked demolition.

Other News relating to the Portman: Ken Halpern, New York City's longtime director of Midtown Planning, who did much to shepherd the Portman Project through the city bureaucracy, has a new job: he'll be project manager for a new hotel in Hong Kong—a hotel that is being built by the Portman Organization. ... The Portman has the largest Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG) ever awarded: $122.5 million. HUD recently announced that the Action Grants program will be continued through fiscal year 1983, after which time the $440-million program will disappear into an urban development block grant as part of the President's New Federalism. HUD also announced that it would pay the preservationist lawyers' fees. "The future of the theater's existence by making sure that grants were not awarded to projects that could have been funded completely by private capital. One wonders whether a Shirley, 200-room convention hotel on Broadway between 45th and 46th Streets would be funded under the new HUD regs."

---

St. Bart's Approval

Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., of the Episcopal Diocese of New York has approved the scheme for the leasing of land for construction of the St. Bart's tower that will supplant its community house (see Sklyine, November 1981, p. 6; December, p. 3; and February 1982, p. 4). Since Bishop Moore has the last word on behalf of the clients, presumably St. Bartholomew's Church will now take the Edward Durrell Stone Associates design to the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness. There are indications that the certificate will be denied, but the hearings will be hot and heavy.
**Victorian/Egyptian Installation at Jewish Museum**

Lawrence Kutnicki

The handsome installation at the Jewish Museum of 160 biblical illustrations by J. James Tissot completed between 1885 and 1902 raises serious questions about the nature of exhibition design, especially in our so-called postmodern, historicist climate. The exhibition's curator is Norman L. Kleeblatt; the installation is by architects Lynne Breslin, Dale Furman, and David Zung.

The Tissot installation is organized en suite, referring to the narrative and geography of the Hebrew Bible. One enters, beneath a cantilevered trellis, into the first room, which represents the Garden of Eden and the pre-Egypt period. The major wall of this deep-ford-green room is an imposing three-dimensional abstraction of an Egyptian temple facade that forms the entry into the second room, where the Bondage in the Land of Egypt is depicted in a series of paintings.

To the left, two formidable square columns form a gateway into the third room, which deals with the Children of Israel's passage through the Red Sea and their forty years of wandering in the Wilderness. Both the second and third rooms are painted a stone ochre. At the far end of this room—which is, appropriately, more of a large corridor—one passes to either side of a wall into a fourth, farther-red, large, square room, in which paintings illustrating the Promised Land are displayed. In the center of this final room, portrayals of the Prophets are hung on the four sides of each of four square columns supporting a square pergola. This form becomes the spatial—and perhaps also the spiritual—center of the exhibition, referring architecturally to the expository activity of the Prophets. Finally, furthering the allusion to a boudoir or a salon, wonderfully evocative "Egyptoid" furniture, most of it by Carlo Bugatti (1856-1940), has been carefully placed in the center of each of the two middle rooms and along the periphery of the last. Most of this late Victorian furniture was designed and built in Italy during the same period that Tissot completed these illustrations. The installation reflects a critical stance that is serious, yet distinctly satirical. The underlying criticism in the design concerns the "proper" place for the 160 narrative paintings, in light of Tissot's view of the Near East through a Victorian lens. Illustrating a consciousness about the use and reuse of historical images and motifs, the placement of an exhibition in a "landscape" of Victorian salons, gardens, and ancient Egyptian architecture makes the point. At the same time, history is relegated to a cartoon-like recollection of abstracted tableaux. Perhaps Tissot performed these same transformations less consciously in creating his biblical illustrations. The pseudo-Egyptian furniture, beautiful as it is, becomes an unfortunate metaphor for a superficial infatuation, both with Egyptians and with the Victorian period.

All of the layers of commentary implied in the installation subtly point to Tissot's least-prominent position in late-nineteenth-century art. The installation further suggests that Tissot's scholarship—in spite of his adventurous turn of the then-primarily unexamined Near East—remains somewhat imperfect, if not wholly interpretive. Thus the installation, often delightful and playful, presents an uneasy synthesis of intent: it is evocative of a Victorian vernacular while presenting anecdotal information incidental to the illustrations; yet it implicitly criticizes Tissot's reductive borrowing of imagery belonging to an epoch and place removed from his own nineteenth-century European experience.

The designers of the "mise-en-scène" installation, through the caricaturing rendering of Victorian settings and imagery of the ancient Near East, reinforce a simplified perception of these periods. This has generated a highly stylized setting for the art that provides an appropriate analogue to Tissot's methodology and narrative recombinations: Here present-day designers are viewing the late-nineteenth-century European observer's view of ancient biblical times through his own nineteenth-century perspective of the Near East. In the end, the problem of the exhibition is the strength of the installation—for it diverts our attention away from the works themselves—which are rich in allusions—to the manner in which the artifacts are shown.

**Adam at Cooper-Hewitt**

Peter L. Donahue

The designs of Robert Adam, eighteenth-century architect and designer, are being extensively presented to the public for the first time in this country. An exhibit at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum until April 11 unfurls various facets of this Scottish builder's unique accomplishments with actual pieces of furniture, as well as photographs and drawings of wall decorations, furniture, silverware, and buildings. In conjunction with the exhibition, a day-long symposium sponsored by the Royal Oak Foundation was held on Saturday, January 23, at Christie's Auction House, featuring lectures by Adam scholars and furniture experts from England and the United States.

Robert Adam (1728-1792) was among the first British architects to "reduce" and incorporate the great variety of classical motifs into his design. Although he worked almost exclusively in England, nowhere did the classical aspect of Adam's style become more influential than in the United States, where it was popularly translated into what is now known as the "Federal style." Adam himself never came to America—and only a few wealthy American "gentlemen architects" traveled to England—but Adam's own treatise, _The Works in Architecture of Robert and James Adam_ (1773), and architectural magazines such as _Architectural Magazine_ and _The American Builder's Companion;_ William Pain's _The Practical House Carpenter_; and Edwin Biddle's _The Young Carpenter's Assistant_ exhibited his designs and forms to American builders who then adapted Adam's details to their own particular requirements. The object of this exhibition was to give a notable exception in their knowledge of Adam's world. William Pierson, the architectural historian, postulates that because most Adam designs were made known to Americans through books and manuals, all the American architects saw were the engravings of decorations, which lacked the proper color scheme.

Thus Adam-style buildings in America became notable for exteriors of two-dimensional linearity and geometric simplicity, such as Samuel McIntire's Glimmer Glass, Fingell House of 1805 in Salem, Massachusetts. In England, however, Adam's style was distinguished by the adventurous synthesis—in the interior—of colors, shapes, and various motifs from antiquity and the Renaissance. Adam's neoclassical interiors were not entirely new, relying in part on earlier examples of Colin Campbell, Lord Burlington and William Kent, who also had borrowed from Palladian motifs. Adam's interiors, however, were free of a rigid dependence on tradition. With creative candor, Adam experimented in both the decorative and planning aspects of building, but he kept the language of classicism itself—that is, the orders and the proportions. Adam interpreted and applied it in the context of classical history.

The show at the Cooper-Hewitt, curated by Elaine Evans Dee and David Revere McFadden, portrays how Adam went about this, Pierson embellished with nontraditional scrolled patterns frame bookcases. A reffered, Panthom-inspired half-dome crowns a hall chimney piece. In addition, Adam infused many of his designs with Renaissance geometry, scale, and perspective, such as sphinxes, unicorns, griffins, and centaurs. His ceiling drawings for Mansion House in Devonshire, which he submitted from 1769 until the 1780s, but which were never realized, are particularly stunning in their combination of these motifs within a colored geometric framework.

Beyond the decoration itself, Adam considered the character of the room in relation to its application. For example, he believed that statues were appropriate for dining rooms and halls, but he advocated groups of statuettes with tapestries. This notion of coordinating the design of a room with its function also extended to Adam's planning. The proper placement and disposition of rooms in a house had been a particular concern of French architects and theorists in the 1760s and 1770s, and it has influenced Adam's thinking. In any case, his willingness to experiment with room shapes marked another departure from the more rigid symmetry of his Palladian predecessors.

James Adam was primarily a draftsman, and played a secondary role in the execution of his brother's designs. Robert Adam's father, William Adam, was an architect of some note who introduced the younger Adam to the profession between 1743 and 1768, when the elder Adam
McKim, Mead & White in New York

The number of completed buildings in the United States by the firm of McKim, Mead & White is immense, even by today's standards—close to one thousand in all. For many other architects practicing at the turn of the century, such prolific success was unheard of. Some of this work was the subject of two recent exhibitions, one at the Portland Museum, the other at the Municipal Art Society.

Though more limited in scope, by far the better of the two was the exhibit commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Morgan. The curator of the exhibit, William Voelke, presented an impressive set of studies for the original Library building and for the various decorative murals and sculptures of mythological figures adorning the interior. Unfortunately, the number of architectural drawings presented was small, owing, first of all, to Voelke's desire to limit the exhibit to those drawings that elucidated stages in the building process, rather than to include numerous technical drawings. In addition, the Morgan actually owns few drawings by the firm, and many of the architectural drawings exhibited were loaned by the New York Historical Society. Finally, the space available at the Morgan for the exhibition was small.

However, the show did feature a large plaster model, measuring about three by five feet, of the building's facade, as well as many documents that indicated McKim's own interest and role in the building's conception, such as the letter from J.P. Morgan to Charles McKim specifically requesting the use of "Habinkshaw Red Core wiring and no other" for the Library. Morgan commissioned the building in 1902 to accommodate his ever-growing collection of rare and valuable books (the number of books in his original collection is not known, but the collection has grown enormously since 1902, and at present the number of books is 150,000). The large brownstone adjacent to the Library site, in which Morgan lived (and which was later torn down for an expansion of the Library), simply wouldn't do.

Although Morgan rejected earlier designs—one by Whitney Warren, and a Palladian villa by Charles McKim, both of which were shown in this exhibit—he finally settled on McKim's severe High Renaissance structure, which promised to be almost as solid and secure as Morgan's financial empire. Based on the design of a Roman villa building in 1540 by Annibale Lippi, the rich interior, as indicated in the exhibit, also borrowed from high-minded sources: the floor pattern for the entrance rotunda came from the floors of the Villa Paia in the Vatican, and the design for the side vaults of the rotunda's ceiling owe much to Raphael's "Stanza della Segnatura," also in the Vatican.

In contrast to the precision of the Morgan show, what should have been a broad and comprehensive examination of New York's McKim, Mead & White structures on view at the Municipal Art Society in the Urban Center was instead a haphazard, careless, and tawdry display of large photographs. The title of the presentation set the tone with the somewhat awkward proclamation: "McKim, Mead & White—Lost, Damaged, Restored, and..." Fine! But after this, the first photograph with which the visitor was presented was that of a lampost in front of Low Memorial Library at Columbia University. The label below the photo read "low Memorial Library." There was no mention—let alone a drawing or a photo—of the great planning and design scheme the firm had undertaken for the university. Of course, the introductory text of the exhibit warned us about such disappointments: "If we missed your favorite building, don't cry, go visit." Fine. But is it not a reasonable assumption to expect a show like this to bring together at least some photographs of the architects' major works? Perhaps it would have been better if the organizers of the exhibit had limited themselves to drawings and photos of important works that have been destroyed or greatly altered.

The exhibit, which was directed by Michael George and sponsored by Classic America, did feature a large number of photographs of buildings that have been lost. The most notable were Stanford White's central part-North Italian-Gothic, part-Spanish, 1901 Madison Square Garden; the New York Herald Building of 1892-95; and, of course, the original Pennsylvania Station of 1899-1901, modeled on the Baths of Caracalla in Rome. But even these presentations were hampered by a careless, arbitrary organization. On one wall, for example, were two photos of the Herald Building; two more of the same building were across the room on another wall.

McKim, Mead & White were undoubtedly the greatest practitioners of conscious eclecticism in both civic and private realms of building. This reputation still does not cause one to look at the exhibits: The portraits of McKim & Mead & White were superimposed on the toposes of Lincoln, Washington and Roosevelt at Mt. Rushmore, so that the three architects, the "greatest turn of-the-20th-century interpreters of classical" could now join Thomas Jefferson, the "greatest turn-of-the-19th-century interpreter of classical." McKim, Mead & White helped establish how New York City was perceived in the eyes of the world by creating an architectural that was no longer provincial or picturesque, but powerful and provocative in the noblest historical sense. In the Morgan show, one at least got a distilled sense of this process.
Notes & Comment

Quiz: Do You Know Your Skyscrapers?

A

Midtown Zoning Progress

The Midtown zoning revisions (discussed in Skyline, October 1961, pp. 5-7) are presently making their way through the city planning procedures. Community boards have now debated their points and the City Planning Commission hearings are taking place.

Most of the criticism leveled at the new zoning scheme at a recent city hearing focused on specific issues regarding mandated street-wall heights and specific urban design components, such as parks. Concern was also expressed about the boundaries: The Clinton community is understandably worried about what the West Side F.A.R. of 21.6 will do to its district.

The "controversial" two-tier scheme for establishing bulk and configurations of towers is not meeting much resistance so far. The City Planning Department, meanwhile, has contracted Kwartler/Jones—who, along with Davis Brody, consulted initially on the new bulk regulations—to execute the computer program and scoring of the second-tier regulations. The computer setup will make it easier for developers and architects to determine how much daylight and sky a proposed tower shape will block.

Although some developers and architects have questioned whether the 21.6 F.A.R., proposed for west midtown will be high enough to lure the office and hotel market from the East Side, it looks as if interest on the West is going full steam ahead. The Equitable Insurance Company at 21st Street and Seventh Avenue has finished assembling about two-thirds of its block, and, with a long-range expansion plan in mind, is reportedly investigating the new zoning allowances with its architect, Edward Larrabee Barnes.

B

Prix de Rome

Skyline would like to congratulate the recipients of this year's Prix de Rome for independent study at the American Academy in Rome. Three awards were made to younger architects for one year's study. These went to Gela Ledebitter of Atlanta; to James Timberlake, who works for Venturi, Rauch & Scott Brown in Philadelphia; and—the Steedman Award, sponsored by Washington University—to John McDonald of SOM in San Francisco. Four mid-career fellowship awards for six months' study were made as well. Three of these, sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts, were given to Stanley Abercrombie, Eugene Kupper, and Barbara Stauffacher Solomon. The fourth, sponsored by the Graham Foundation, was awarded to Tod Williams.

Dancing Sets

One of the most talked-about theater sets of the season is on view in the Broadway production of Dreamgirls. The set, executed by scenic designer Robin Wagner—who did A Chorus Line, On The Twentieth Century, and, most recently, the Metropolitan Opera's production of The Barber of Seville—is continually whirling, moving, flashing, and blinking across the stage as it changes and molds the different spaces for each "number." Yet the set, which Wagner "architectured" with lighting designer Tharon Musser and the director/choreographer Michael Bennett, uses only basic, portable rock show equipment: four light towers holding spotlights, two moving catwalks, and some automated winches. The moving towers and catwalks, along with the computerized lighting, through which the performers dance and sing, has made this "architecture" the show-stopper. In fact, some of us think it is the best thing about the show.

Sounding Off and On at Lincoln Center

Neither I.M. Pei nor Cyril Harris has any comment about The New York Times report of their "dispute" over the design of the Vivian Beaumont Theater renovation that is currently delaying construction. According to latest reports, they are "working out their differences" and the theater will open early 1963.

Meanwhile across the plaza, Harris is also working with Philip Johnson and John Burgee on the acoustical improvement of the New York State Theater. Renovation is going on as the New York City Opera season continues. A thin membrane of plaster will soon be poured over a ceiling grid to replace the mesh one that allows sound to get lost instead of being deflected to the audience. Wall diffusers are also to be installed over the original concave surfaces to spread the sound more evenly. Meanwhile, the State Theater will be closed in July and August of 1962 so that the orchestra pit may be expanded and a new processium with petal-like sound diffusers constructed. If all this sounds complicated, it is evidently nothing compared to the Beaumont renovation, which involves the entire restructuring of everything except the rear wall and balcony.

Dreamgirls set by Robin Wagner, lighting by Tharon Musser. (Photo: Martha Swope)
Do you know your architects? and who is that man in the middle?

Sie Transit Gloria Urbani?

Scanning the spring 1982 collections, you will discover that building design appears in all sorts of shapes today, but in one size only — tall. Some of the latest creations to come off the boards of a number of firms will take the unsuspecting observer by surprise.

In the People's Eye

Having planned it for about a year, People magazine finally ran their piece on Michael Graves in their February 8 issue. Not only did they say all the usual nice things about the 47-year-old architect and Princeton professor, they also had the first picture we've seen of his Portland building.

In a photo that makes Graves look for all the world like a cement contractor (knee-level shot aimed up a roll of drawings, but no hard hat) stands the cube with character — as yet sans most windows. "Portlandia," garlands, rooftop temples, and paint. Beyond that, People, did not really do justice to the debate surrounding the building: It published quotes of local architect John Storrs ("This is a dog of a building, a turkey!"), and former MIT Dean Pietro Belluschi ("...overviewed Christmas package, ...perhaps in Atlantic City or Las Vegas, but not in Portland.") as the lights of the opposition, along with seeming support from Paul Goldberger ("If there is any building of our time that appears to speak with a firm self-assurance, it is this one.") Meanwhile, Sketch heard that Colin Rowe called Graves to say how much better he thought the building looked without all that color. It will get painted anyway, when it stops raining in the Northwest.

...other Gravesiana: the Pionek ("keystone") house is almost finished — evidently Architectural Digest has the exclusive — and the wildlife study center in Liberty State Park began construction last week.

People in the News

At Canobie, Vittorio Gregotti has taken over as editor from Tomas Maldonado starting with the February issue. Gregotti intends to turn Canobie back into a magazine about buildings. ...Another showroom to scan at NEDON this year will be the one for Hauserman. This will be Arta Isakazi's first completed project in this country. (His design for the Los Angeles Museum of Contemporary Art is expected to be released by the end of March.) A Hauserman exec said only that it was "pure Isakazi": the design is not yet complete. ...Construction begins this month on Columbia University's new Computer Science Building by Kilmeny & Halsband. The two-story building will sit on the Engineering Terrace on the University campus at 119th Street and Amsterdam Avenue.

Entering the decorator battlefield: Robert A.M. Stern was asked by House & Garden magazine to do a studio room for them using a new line of Baker furniture; Michael Graves and his Portland Building as seen in People, February 8, 1982.
More Than Form

On Paul Goldberger’s The Skyscraper

Michael Parley

To understand man-made phenomena, we need a special kind of history, perhaps one unfamiliar to us throughout our schooling. Take the following example: a person walking to work one morning strolls by the corner drygoods shop, on which a sign has been tacked that reads “Loot Our Lease—Building Coming Down.” Soon all the windows are tinted, the wrecker appears; and, two years later, in place of the old five- and six-story buildings, there is a 50-story, 900,000-s.f. tower with a peak pedestrian flow of 9000 per hour. Why does this happen? How does it happen?

The building process is born of economies; it begins when a developer figures out that the potential rental revenues of a new building will cover property acquisition, financing and construction costs, and still leave an amount that exceeds the revenue potential of competing investment opportunities. This overly glib encapsulation makes the process simple, but, of course, it is not. And it is in discovering which factors tip the balance of the build/no-build equation that certain information becomes the most interesting. Some of these factors might be the state of the national and regional economies; the nature of the local transportation system; the conditions of local market supply and demand; the relationship to desirable local geographic features or elements, such as proximity to a park; the perceived or actual quality of building services and image; and the economies of new construction techniques that reduce building costs or enhance efficiency—all of which are factors that cannot be seen simply by looking at the building’s skin. But they are absolutely essential to the understanding of highrise buildings.

Brief Pleasures

This brings us to the subject of this discussion: Paul Goldberger’s new book, The Skyscraper. Those who read the architectural criticism and commentary in The New York Times will not be surprised to hear that the book is a pleasure to read; they will also quickly discern that it is very handsomely written. Here Goldberger has focused his talents on a concise dissertation on the skyscraper. It is not the definitive work on the subject, but in spite of its brevity, the book does not fail to be interesting or delightful.

Despite its considerable virtues, however, The Skyscraper is in the book it could—and should—have been. When a good writer also researches and interprets history, the potential exists to achieve profound results, as Robert Caro did with The Power Brokers: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York (Knopf, 1974). Of course, Mr. Goldberger did not intend to perform the authoritative or interpretive tasks of the skyscraper, and, in fact, he specifically states in his introduction that the book “is a history and commentary on the skyscraper” but that “it is not a commentary more than it is history.” Fair enough. The commentary-above-historical disclaimer, however, expiates only certain ones of his entries and; six-story buildings cannot be overlooked if the word “history” is to be applied at all seriously to this book by concerned readers. And if the text is commentary, certainly we could expect a thorough interpretation from Goldberger, who is—at least as we have come to know him—a skilled journalist and perceptive critic. But we do not get enough of either straight or interpretative.

In The Skyscraper Goldberger describes and analyzes the changes and conflicts in the style of skyscrapers in three periods of skyscraper development: the formative years prior to World War I; the “golden” years between the wars; and the modern, post-World War II era.

Early Highrises Reconsidered

In the first section, after an opening chapter— one of the most interesting— in which he describes how early highrise buildings around the turn of the century strained the prevalent professional and public perceptions of buildings and city space, Goldberger discusses the differences in highrise design in the two preeminent centers of the earliest skyscraper construction: Chicago, philosophically “correct” aesthetic expression of tall buildings, which presaged the Modern Movement; and second, New York’s “theatrical,” exuberant historicism. Goldberger penetrates the era’s architectural discourse. To ornament or not? To adopt the classical base-shaft-capital separation, or the Gothic style? To emphasize horizontal expression of facade or vertical? Some of this we have heard before; much we have not. Sullivan emerges a favorite, and Burnham and Root do well in Goldberger’s evaluation. New York stylergos undergo some scrutiny when he states that “historicist tendencies achieved a new extreme.” He then refers to the Metropolitan Life Tower by Napoleon LeBrun & Sons (1909), as well as several other towers that were oversized replicas of the Campanile of Saint Mark’s Square in Venice. Frank Woolworth’s Gothic “Cathedral of Commerce” designed by Cass Gilbert (1913) receives deservedly ample praise.

The second section deals with the difficult, glorious period from approximately 1920 to 1941, when American architects struggled to achieve greater and greater heights and to simultaneously come to grips with the burgeoning Modern Movement. Goldberger’s discussion of the designs of some of our more notable tall neighbors are great fun, such as passages on the General Electric Building’s radio wave crown (Cross & Cross, 1933) and on the early schemes (fortunately discarded) for the Chrysler Building’s spire (William Van Alen, completed 1930). He takes us on delightful visits to Raymond Hood’s pioneering late work as well as to Howe & Lescaze’s PSFS Building (1931-32).

Late-Blooming Highrises

It is, however, in the book’s last section, which deals with the triumph of modernism after World War II and its recent transformation (including buildings not yet completed), that Goldberger is at his best. His observations here are most acute, and one senses that the work of this period motivated him to write The Skyscraper.

In the last three chapters comprising this section, he recounts the assimilation of the International Style into highrise design, only to be abandoned when the appetite for abstraction dazzled the architectural profession. He also examines the painful process by which the designers learned how to handle the open or public spaces accompanying their buildings (although not before many streetscapes were ruined by useless and banal plazas).

Many of the individual landmarks towers of the last thirty years that we love or loathe are given fresh analysis. Particular attention is paid to the work of Johnson/Burgee, L.M. Pei, Roche/Dinkeloo, and Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. In the last chapter Goldberger takes aim at the “new look” Eli Attia: Der Scutt; Kohn, Pedersen, Fox; Ionen, Kallmann, McKinnell & Knowles. In and, again, the exercise is surprising, delightful, and infuriating Philip Johnson. Of them he says, “The architects of the new group of sculpted towers have not, ironically, expanded their interests as much beyond those of the International Style as they might with a push to think. They are largely preoccupied with the effects of manipulating form; what has changed is that they have come to consider the boxes of a previous generation dull and have sought something more enlivening.” There is, to be fair, generally more concern with contextual relationships, but this concern is not always primary—it often serves as an excuse for more sculpting of the box.” The last chapter alone has provided points for debate within the pages of Skyscraper (see Paul Goldberger interview, Dec. 1982, pp. 65-69, and Philip Johnson interview, Feb. 1982, pp. 1440). It is, therefore, the strengths of the first and last chapters that ultimately heighten our disappointment with the book—not because of what is there, but because of what is not. Regarding The Skyscraper as any form of historical document, one sees that, in the author’s realization of the otherwise laudable objective of succinctness, much valuable information must have been lost; there can only be enough room for synthetic history. In the first two-thirds of the book, where we must rely on Goldberger as historian,
"It is, therefore, the strengths of the first and last chapters that ultimately heighten our disappointment—not because of what is there, but what is not."

The Skyscraper


many events seem to occur in no particular economic or technological context. Important transitions and advances are left unexplained. Suddenly, he declares, the heights of building doubled from three hundred to six hundred feet. Why? and how? We are not told. Goldberger tells us that New York City's 1916 zoning code affected building shapes by creating new categories of permitted forms. But why? Why? This also is not explained. He comments that we are not for the steel frame, truly high buildings could not exist, because the thickness of self-supporting masonry walls would not support a building of major height. But, how thick is "thick," and what are the limits on the height? Also absent are the important First and Second Leiter Buildings by William LeBaron Jenney, which Sigfried Giedion considered key buildings in the story of the skyscraper.

The Inner Core Not Revealed

In one of the more telling passages, Goldberger informs us that "the steel frame—the first skyscraper." This is, alas, virtually the entire interpretation of more than forty years of the skyscraper's technological evolution, which, when fully explained, reveals the architects, engineers, and developers of which, he says, were composed of "solid masonry." What Goldberger really means by "steel frame" is "iron or steel skeletal construction, where the exterior walls are supported by the frame. When he uses the term "steel frame," it is deceiving, because virtually all large buildings erected from 1870 on—and many before that date—had a frame construction (cast-iron columns, wrought-iron beams) supporting almost all of the interior floor loads, and exterior masonry bearing walls supporting themselves and a portion of the outermost floor load. Sometimes there were ornamental masonry piers. Francisco Mujica, in his History of the Skyscraper (1929), called this kind of framing "cage construction" or "cage structure," a term that would describe both the steel frame and the earlier masonry buildings.

Compounding the problems of this incomplete interpretation of skyscraper development, the author relies on the conventional account which, he apparently thinks, "true" skyscrapers possess, as opposed to the building of which he is composed of "solid masonry." What Goldberger really means by "steel frame" is "iron or steel skeletal construction, where the exterior walls are supported by the frame. When he uses the term "steel frame," it is deceiving, because virtually all large buildings erected from 1870 on—and many before that date—had a frame construction (cast-iron columns, wrought-iron beams) supporting almost all of the interior floor loads, and exterior masonry bearing walls supporting themselves and a portion of the outermost floor load. Sometimes there were ornamental masonry piers. Francisco Mujica, in his History of the Skyscraper (1929), called this kind of framing "cage construction" or "cage structure," a term that would describe both the steel frame and the earlier masonry buildings.

Goldberger's generalities lead to trouble. When he says, for instance, that George B. Post's Weslern Union Building was "of true iron skeleton type," he is describing a building that had no "steel frame," he is literally correct, because they contained no steel, but the buildings were framed extensively with iron. While their outer walls were masonry bearing, to assert they were solid masonry misinterprets the rear. The Monadnock, to examine one such structure, had an advance iron frame which was, according to Carl Condit, the first instance of portal windbracing in a frame. The frame was a skeletal-combined goods, such as Post's Pullitzer and Havemeyer


Zoning Considerations

The skyscraper was looked at from another perspective—that of land-use planning and zoning. In the late 1960s, Mayor John Lindsay brought urban designers into city government for the first time; Jonathan Barnett, Jacqueline Robertson, Richard Weinstein—the erstwhile Urban Design Group. One of the things this trio observed was that New York's revised 1961 zoning code was fostering the creation of baron plazas, owing to the fact that it contained a floor area bonus incentive for the provision of plazas. The original theory behind the zoning bonus was that it was a voluntary incentive for plazas, but this was actually a fiction. Developers assembling parcels were forced to pay for the land on the basis of the maximum floor-area ratio possible, including any bonus floor area available. This meant that the land was conveyed at a price reflecting the seller's conviction and insistence that since a plaza bonus was possible, it represented part of the inherent development potential of the site. Thus, the voluntary plaza became necessary; the buyer had already paid for the floor area (The Economic Context of Plaza). Yet the zoning code offered no description of or standards for what a "plaza" was to be, involving in forlorn expansions of unadorned concrete and stone.

Well, the city's urban designers realized that New York was going to be awash in the damned things unless something was done about it. Therefore they devised alternatives to the plaza bonus. Noting New York's frequently inapplicable environment, they recommended enclosed or covered spaces, galleries, and malls—mixing bowls of pedestrian space to humanize the skyscraper—substitutes for the plazas they knew would otherwise be required of every office development. Over the years some of the built results of their efforts were encouraging, but some other new spaces did not work out quite the way the urban designers had envisioned (they bore the burden of that). The "humanistic city" of the "humanistic zoning Proposal, is back off from offering these spaces.

New York's urban designers noted another unfortunate characteristic of the zoning then in effect: traditional zoning regulations were based on the "Kohn" and thereby discouraging the mix of uses on a site. This was backed in New York, for it destroyed the city's richness and diversity, and created single-use areas that were completely uninhabited at night. This was not an efficient use of land. Having assimilated the concern expressed by Jane Jacobs (90 per cent of good urban design and planning is common sense), planners promoted mixed-use zoning for skyscrapers, encouraging the inclusion of both residential and commercial uses on the same lot. They were correct in the theory that a mixed-use building is less burdensome to the city's infrastructure than an equally-sized single-use structure, since residential tenants occupy the site at different times of day than commercial office tenants.

Numerous skyscrapers in New York have resulted from all these land-use and zoning principles: from incentive zoning, Citicorp Center, A.T.&T., IBM, and Philip Morris, among others; and from both mixed-use and the incentive bonus provisions, Olympic Tower, The Galleria, Trump International, L, and Waldorf Astoria (and many have) about the aesthetic merits and missing of these buildings, but few dispute the wisdom of attempting to humanize highrise buildings. I mention these planning theories because the "humanistic skyscraper" is a theme Mr. Goldberger touches on—primarily in connection with the IDS Center in Minneapolis—but does not develop, much to our loss.

On the whole, although no author should be bound by the claims of his publisher, if only The Skyscraper contained more of "the people, events and forces that have shaped the skyscraper..." the architectural advances, building codes and economic pressures," that the jacket flap promises, our participation in the sense of the book and our understanding of these buildings would be much greater.
Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood at the Crossroads: The Academy of Arts and Sciences

Eleni Constantine

After Boston City Hall in 1969, a lot of observers felt that if that was what Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood meant by the "language of build" then, no, thanks, they would prefer the building of design. Sir Nikolaus Pevsner expressed displeasure with the architecture, Jane Jacobs panned the building's relation to the urban context, and the man in the street said it was "ugly." In sharp contrast, the firm's most recent work, the headquarters for the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Cambridge, Massachusetts, has been greeted with general murmurings of approval (usually prefaced with "Who would have thought...?"). Ada Louise Huxtable called the building "undeniably wonderful." Clearly, the Academy does exemplify two of the firm's strengths: their sense of planar composition (including composing on a very detailed level) and their ability to distill an extensive historical knowledge in their design. And in both these senses Huxtable's adjective is apt praise.

But a closer look reveals distinct similarities between the Academy and City Hall, resemblances that go beyond the structural expressionism that typifies Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood's work. These formal and theoretical echoes are significant because they highlight persistent design weaknesses of the firm—overly abstract notions of spatial organization and a certain insensitivity to the urban context. Ironically, Kallmann himself was among the first to take the early modernists to task for similar failings in his architectural criticism of the mid-1980s. Indeed, the Academy's shortcomings seem to be caused not by a lack of awareness of these issues, but by a degree of ineptness in their physical realization.

The siting of the structure illustrates these awkwardnesses. The Academy is located two blocks away from Harvard University, where a wooded lot slopes upward, creating at its northeast corner a broad platform that is placed tightly into this corner, sitting rather heavily atop the cleared knoll. This location effectively separates the Academy from the lower, wooded slopes to the north and west traversed by public footpaths. The architects have made the building into an artificial rendition of the local topography; the pitched roof lifted into three tiers is read as one great slope—echoing the shape of the hill.

At first glance the building's location and form indicate respect for an attention to the natural landscape. But in crowning Shady Hill with their own built hill, Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood attempt to do the hill one better. Frank Lloyd Wright, the greatest American interpreter of the natural landscape, condemned such topographical takeovers as arrogant and simplistic. Wright left the crown of the hill alone, allowing the natural landscape to speak through his design.

The urban topography is dealt with awkwardly as well. The rough trajectory of the plot is formed from the intersection of Cambridge's two street grids, one running north-south (defined by Harvard Yard and the alignment of its buildings, and the other bounding to the south of Harvard Square), and the other skewed some fifteen degrees west (defined by the old road and rail line to Concord, and governing north of Harvard Hill as a complement.

All major buildings in the Harvard area have to deal with this cramp in the city, and one indication of the degree of an architect's talent is the way he chooses to approach this problem. H.H. Richardson, for example, chose between the grids and chose right each time, placing Sever Hall in Harvard Yard on the north-south axis, but turning Austin Hall, a few hundred feet to the north, fifteen degrees west. Gropius expressed the dilemma in his Graduate Center by sweeping out the fifteen-degree arc in the complex itself; but the resulting sagittal of space sends one searching for the missing focus of his concept. Jose Luis Sert tried to ignore the cramp in his design for the Science Center and ended up with a rectangular building minus one corner, with all its doors in the wrong place.

The clear expression of the two alternative grids in the streets bounding the Academy's site intensifies the issue, and imposes an additional obligation on Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood to address it. Indeed, the question is further complicated by the fact that Beacon Street, which forms the northwest boundary, expresses the cranked grid in somewhat exaggerated fashion, being more than fifteen degrees askew.

Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood have placed the Academy squarely on the north-south grid, but have jammed its northwest corner against Beacon Street. The sharp juxtaposition of the grids is accentuated by the placement of the entrance on this side, and made awkward by the lack of attention to the axial shift. The curving driveway and parking lot that fill the leftover space do not adequately modulate the transition. Despite the fact that the front door is here, all the siting signals tell one that this is the back of the building, the disfavored side.

The Academy's problems with topography and context are remarkably similar to those of City Hall. The latter building was placed at the low point of a plaza modeled after the Piazza del Popolo in Rome, but an understanding of urban poche in the case of City Hall or the lie of the land in the example of the Academy are absent.

A comparison of the plans of the Academy and City Hall is perhaps an even better illustration of the "space problem" in Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood's work. The Academy is, in a sense, the missing center of City Hall. The latter building was placed at the low point of a plaza modeled after the Piazza del Popolo in Rome, but an understanding of urban poche in the case of City Hall or the lie of the land in the example of the Academy are absent.

The program for the Academy, a private and rather ceremonial building—used solely for conferences with a minimum of daily business operations—relieved the architect's archetypoal responsibility for those functions with which City Hall appeared least comfortable: public services. The Academy design is thus a rewriting of the architect's notions for the layout of the upper levels of City Hall, in a more elite version.

In both buildings, the play is controlled by a strict structural grid, expressed more simply on the office level, and more freely interpreted below. In both, the upper tier regulates the more expansive double-height lower tier; the office floor provides an overlay grid against which the "meeting" floor can be easily read. The larger meeting rooms on the lower floor are expressed in the plans as projections from a dominant rectangular form, but their dimensions and placement are strictly controlled by the established grid.

In the Academy and City Hall, the meeting rooms are placed on the edge of the rectangular center, forming an exterior ring; between this ring and the central space are concentric layers of interstitial space. But if City Hall operates off of its interstitial layers, leaving the center an untouched, empty void, the Academy attempts to use the center space to pull together the spaces surrounding it. In terms of prototypical layouts, where City Hall is a monastery, the Academy is a manse. The central atrium is intended to function like the great hall of Shingle Style mansions—as an area into and out of which all movement flows. The Academy design attempts to create the centrifugal force necessary by injecting a poch6 suite (library, study, and sitting area) into the City Hall doughnut layout. It doesn't work: the two spatial notions remain disparate and the suite diffuses rather than pulls together the whole.

The perceptible lack of cohesion, despite the carefully elaborated idea of layered concentric zones, and the attempt to recapture the loose centrality of the Shingle Style, seem due to the design's failure to utilize the movement of people through space as an ordering device. The Academy's plan lacks a sequential spatial ordering that shapes and responds to patterns of human movement. The building sends conflicting spatial messages—it is unclear whether the space is to be read as an intersecting group of closed volumes or as an open grid. Both ideas are expressed, but neither is developed to provide a clear ordering system. In their attempt to use the forms of both notions of space, Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood activate the philosophical underpinnings of neither. On the second view toward lecture hall (south elevation).
The Academy's plan is similar to that of City Hall in one other (similarly problematic) respect: the treatment of the edge. In both structures a separate layer of space, outlined by piers, bounds the lower floors. In City Hall this zone is clearly a buffer; concrete piers split it into segmented pockets of dead space, whose only function is the addition of sculptural depth and shadow to the facade. In the Academy the buffer zone has been interpreted in light of more residential and functional prototypes. In the rear, brick piers, impressioning the heavy cores are set away from the building to create an arcade; while in the front corner the thick brick wall is broken away to reveal an inner glass skin, with a walk indicated between the two.

But the relation of these edge spaces to the interior remains tenuous. The arcade does not signal the building's entrance, but wraps around the back, butting up against blank brick walls. But the arcade does appear easily accessible from within: although French doors give onto this colonnade, the only functioning doors to it appear to be those tucked in its corridors' corners, off extensions of the corridor. Despite the architects' efforts to activate this zone, the Academy's edge, like the center, remains as empty as those of City Hall.

Perhaps it is necessary to analyze the design's spatial shortcomings in such detail because the building is so seductive, both visually and intellectually. Each elevation is a beautifully balanced modular composition, framed by the great sloping roof, strictly governed by the same Cartesian grid that rules the plan, yet responsive to the particular function of that side of the building. The entry front is relatively closed: a brick wall steps back toward the central entry as the great roof steps up correspondingly. Square-pinned glass panels are set into the thick wall, as though portions of the brick shell had been stripped away to reveal a gridded glass skin beneath. On the south and west facades, opening onto the woods, the roof steps back to reveal the double-height arcades, while it reaches down over the two square corner protrusions (a conference room and the service block) that terminate the arcade.

brick piers of the colonnade establish a strong vertical counterpoint to the three horizontal tiers of the roof against the background grid of the two-story French doors. On the north, the service side, the roof extends almost down to the ground, save where a square cutaway to one side of the center axis marks a walled brick patio. Above, the wall, in the cutaway, the French doors reestablish the omnipresent grid.

The same careful modular composition and the themes of the square grid and triple setbacks run through the interior elevations. Walls are broken into modular panels by wooden moldings and windows are sized proportionally. Although some of the details, such as the pink granite fireplace with signage setbacks, are reminiscent of Art Deco motifs, the proportions of the elements are distinctly modernistic; the square grid never concedes to the vertical by elongation. The elevations, like the plan, are acutely conscious that each piece is an exact multiple of its neighbor.

The strict composition is saved from starkness by the rich materials used throughout. The great roof is copper, going rapidly sea-green; the French doors are framed in mahogany; the red waterstruck brick is blended to suggest the patina of age; the steps and column capitals are polished pink granite. The mahogany and pink granite continue on the interior as well, not only as frames and steps but also as moldings and fireplaces—both elegantly detailed in patterns echoing the grid. Oak flooring is covered by antique rugs; walls are painted a natural linen color or are lined-covered; cove lighting is set into padded ceiling recesses. Smaller details are simple but exquisite: brass "sconce" lamps hang in the study; carved wood panels top the fireplaces. (The building's cost has not been made public.) It's easy to fall in love with a building so rich in details and materials, craftsmanship and composition.

And the Academy is intellectual as well as lovely. The design is replete with historical allusion and imagery. Romantic allusion to a past order are implicit in the eroded esophage, the giant-order brick piers of the arcade, the crumbled brick wall of the entry facade. The external timber trusses supporting the top two tiers of the green-pitched roof evoke not only Shingle Style porches, but conjure up the famous "primitive hut" drawing used as the frontispiece for Abbé Laugier's treatise Essai Sur L'Architecture (1775). The overall pavilion image recalls the nineteenth-century's fascination with the Orient; the "Citizen Kane" effects of the interior recall the early twentieth century's intrigue with a somewhat nearer East.

The design's use of the vocabulary of the Arts and Crafts movement allows the full exploitation of the rich material.

In short, Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood have a feel for ornament that they do not for space. In terming their talent "post-modern," Ruttabale put her finger on their shortcomings as well as their achievements. Ornament, even when executed in gorgeous materials and painstaking detail, even when enriched with historical allusions, can only decorate a shell. Some architects identified with the post-modern movement affirm this limit (notably Robert Venturi), others (like Michael Graves) seem to be striving to overcome it. Kallmann, McKinnell & Wood appear to join these latter.

To succeed, it seems necessary to integrate the architectural vocabulary of ornament with a syntax developed from a world-view of the nature of space. Judging from results to date, the vocabulary appears to be relatively easy to develop to a refined level in an academic setting; the syntax seems harder. Architecture may still be showing the effects of a generation of talent deprived of the opportunity to construct. Kallmann is not insensitive to the problem; indeed, in a recent interview he described the present difficulty as a lack of an architectural language "commensurate with the demanding nature of the resuscitated layout of the late Baroque and Neoclassical periods." The design of the Academy, however, does not articulate that language: the building remains a well-modulated composition of elegant decorative elements laid over a facile and weak spatial construct.
Spacialization of Power

A Discussion of the Work of Michel Foucault

Gwendolyn Wright and Paul Rabanow

In a 1976 interview with a group of French geographers, Michel Foucault said that he had long been preoccupied with space. "People have often reproached me for these spatial obsessions, which have indeed been obsessed for me. But I think through them I come to what I had basically been looking for: the relations that are posed between power and knowledge. So, for Foucault, space is where discourses about power and knowledge are transformed into actual relations of power. Here the architecture in the forefront is that of aesthetics, of an architectural profession, of a science of planning. But, for Foucault at least, architecture and its concomitant theory never constitute an isolated field to be analyzed in minute detail; they are only of interest when one looks to see how they interact with social, political, or institutions. Then both architecture and urban planning, both designs and ordinary buildings, offer privileged instances for understanding how power operates."

Foucault is not setting out to construct a general theory of power. Nor is he implying a general theory of space. He is certainly not maintaining—as has sometimes been alleged—that architectural form by itself can have an inherent political significance or function. He claims only that spatial localization, especially certain architectural projects, have played important parts in political strategies at certain historical junctures. "Architecture begins at the end of the eighteenth century in order to become involved in problems of population, health, and the urban question..." It becomes a question of using the disposition of space for economic-political ends."

When Foucault mentions the problems of population, health, and cities, it is clear that he is referring to our modern form of power, what he calls "biopolitics," of course, architecture was involved in the machinations of power long before the eighteenth century, but in different ways. Other factors, for instance, the visibility of monuments and sites of rituals such as public squares was expressly calculated. Under regimes of "bio-power," political intervention takes place at the level of the species as a natural population to be known and controlled. This manipulation is exercised through an ever-growing complex of social institutions, and thereby in a widening number of building types hospitals, prisons, workplaces, schools, street plans, housing, and so forth. Through power cannot be reduced to these institutions, the relationships are more than pasted-on, instantaneous ornament. For example, the school is something more than its disciplinary function; the content of each individual's life is changed by the architectural and social spaces of schools; the architecture is not the essence of power, as some have taken it to be, but a strategically and intensively demonstrated form of a particular form of power. It operates effectively. If the prisoner is never sure when he is being observed, he becomes his own guardian. As the final step in the architectural refinement, the Panopticon includes a system for observing and controlling the controllers. Those who occupy the central position in the Panopticon are themselves thoroughly enmeshed in a localization and ordering of their behavior. "Such is perhaps the most abjectal aspect of the idea and all of the applications it brings with it in this form of management, power is not totally estranged to someone who would exercise it alone, over others, in an absolute fashion; rather, this machine is one in which everyone is caught, those who exercise this power as well as those who are subjected to it."

"The Panopticon is not a symbol of power for Foucault, for it doesn't refer to anything else. Nor does it have any deep or hidden meaning. Its function is to increase control wherever it is put and, in Foucault's view, to control the control. In other words, it's a way of controlling the controlling, and any materiality, all of its aspects, down to the smallest detail of Bentham is totally explicit, carrying on for many pages about minute aspects of construction in "The Inspection-House"); yields the interpretation of what it does. The architecture itself is neutral, and, in its own way, universal. It is therefore a perfect technology. When the Panopticon "invests" and influences other institutions—

Notably prisons, schools, hospitals, and insane asylums—this architectural technology takes on its own momentum. Just as the Panopticon is not the essence of disciplinary technology, so prisons are by no means the only example of an actual rather than representational exercising of this form of power. Nevertheless, they are obviously the most characteristic expression of the ways in which Western society deals with discipline, punishment, and surveillance. But prisons themselves, as well as acts on the ideal form of punishment, are only clearly articulated examples of more generalized practices for disciplining both individuals and entire populations. They are important partly because they expose so vividly the practices that remain hidden in other institutions.

In disciplinary technology the internal organization of space depends first on the principle of elementary partitioning into regular units. This space is based on a system of presences and absences. "Each individual has a place and each place is a potential community of individuals. The impressiveness of revealing that humans, and individuals can be, and are, always transformed, and observed. In this simple coding, each slot in the grid is assigned a value that facilitates the even application of disciplinary techniques. One cannot help but remark that this disciplinary spatial organization in an almost perfect analogy to the definitions of elements, relationships, and order that French structuralist thinkers take as universal principles. Here the success of disciplinary space depends on the coding of a decidedly "structural" order."

Foucault gives several architectural examples of a "structuralist" organization of space. The military hospital at Rochefort, designed in 1782 by E. Toufaire, serves as one of the earliest examples of the architectural refinement of disciplinary technologies in the Panopticon. It was a particularly appropriate locale, since the port city of Rochefort provided a fascinating, if frightening, mixing of boat sailors, deserters, thieves, vagabonds, and persons afflicted with all sorts of contagious disease. This hospital was to regulate and control these dangerous interminglings. Within its walls and somewhat later in the town itself, rigorous partitioning of space was carried out in an effort to accomplish simultaneously a number of disciplinary objectives. Control was the key. Certain patients could be quarantined; deserters could be captured; commodities could be watched. The order that the hospital operated first on control of things through space, as space was extended to identify the patients and keep them under analytic observation. The separation of the patients into categories based on age and disease was soon fixed by particular architectural elements such as wards, corridors, and pavilions. Eventually the hospital administrators carry out reforms in the port city itself, gathering the attention of administrators and attempting to alter the environmental conditions of each district.

Space in the Workplace

In factories at the end of the eighteenth century, the operations were relatively simple. Operations were equally complex. Here it was a question not only of controlling a population, but of linking this control to production. Foucault's example is the Oberkampf manufacturing plant at Jouy. The factory was divided into a series of specialized workshops separated by function (printers, handlers, colorists, and engravers in different buildings). The largest structure, which was erected in 1791, was enormous; it was

very genius lies in the combination of abstract schematization and very concrete applications. The Panopticon was, above all, flexible.

Panopticon Forms

The Panopticon consists of a large courtyard with a tower in the center surrounded by a series of buildings divided into levels and cells. In each cell there are two windows: one brings in light and the other faces the tower, where large observatory windows allow for the surveillance of the cells. The cells become "small theatres" in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible. The inmate is not only visible to the supervisor, he is visible to the supervisor alone; cut off from any connection of power to continuous, disciplinary, and anonymous. One cannot conceive the architecture as a mechanism, as long as he was in the correct position, and any discipline is imposed on it. The design is multipurpose. The surveillant could easily be observing a criminal, a madman, a worker, a schoolboy, or a wife. Bentham suggested that the Panopticon would be an extremely effective arrangement for a farm, since it would cut down the number of eunuchs necessary to watch the inmates in the cells. If the Panopticon functioned correctly, almost all internal violence would be eliminated. The inmate cannot see whether or not he is the guardian in the tower, so he must behave as if surveillance is perpetual and total. The architectural perfection is such even if there is no present guardian, the apparatus of power still

N. Harou-Romains. Project for a panopticon, 1840. A detail here pres the central surveillance tower.
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Although Foucault focuses on space as a major aspect of the exercise of power, he is not obsessed with buildings per se, as much as he is with cities and how they operate.

Alexandre Thierry: Plan for a reform school; 1897. (Photo: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)

110 meters long and three stories high. On its ground floor were 132 tables arranged in two rows. Each prisoner worked at a table with his assistant, and the finished products were carefully stacked at the end of the tables. Supervision was continual as the foreman walked up the central side between the two rows, watching the entire operation and the specific evolution of each pair of workers. More than a hundred years before "Taylorism", the early twentieth-century efficiency techniques developed by Frederick Taylor, elementary operations were defined, each variable of force—strength, promptness, constancy of skills—was observed, controlled, and assigned a particular weight. The factory architecture centralized production, separated stages, facilitated supervision, and encouraged an ever greater precision.

Hierarchical observation became an integral part of production and control in both instances. In the case of the hospital, the very form of the building changed to facilitate the doctor's rounds and his examinations. As Foucault analyzed so cogently in The Birth of the Clinic (Random House, tr. 1973), the well-organized hospital became the architectural counterpart of medical discipline. The control of bodies depended on an optic of power, and architecture refined this lens. Increased visibility became a general problematic for the architect, whether he was setting out to design a hospital, a school, a utopian settlement, or a housing project.

An important distinction must be repeated here: There are not so much architectural models that represent or embody power, but rather the means for the operation of power in space. It is the techniques for the use of these various structures, more than the architecture itself, that allow for an efficient expansion of power. Clearly, there are other dimensions of the architecture that are not disciplinary, and dimensions of discipline that are not architectural.

In fact, although Foucault definitely focuses on space as a major aspect of the exercise of power, he is not obsessed with buildings per se, as much as he is with cities and how they operate. Some of his spatial examples describe tactics that were not entirely successful; others were only temporary actions at the time of crisis. Yet through these experiments certain points about how power operated through space became quite evident.

Space and Disease

A digression to two early examples of planned environments may help clarify the point about space, rather than architecture, as a means for the exercising of particular forms of power. Beginning in the Middle Ages, Europeans used the quarantined city as a method of plague control for the duration of the quarantine, all space was controlled by its officials, and all movement through space was regulated by them. Under penalty of death, no one was allowed in the streets—with the possible exception of a limited number of ambulatory patients or the wearing of antipaste clothing and the wrappings who carried away the bodies. Due to the special circumstances, the officials even had the right to appropriate private property, for procedures of purification after a death consisted of the evacuation of the contaminated house, followed by its fumigation and sometimes its demolition. This was a disciplinary mechanism carried out in space, but it generally did not involve the design and construction of particular buildings (although there were instances of special enclosures for dying plague victims constructed outside the town walls). The quarantine, however, did entail the analysis of a geographical area; the supervision of the inhabitants; a suspension of legal rights pertaining to private property and freedom of movement; a hierarchy of information and decision-making, including the regulation of the smallest details of everyday life.

The leper colony offers the counterpoint of organization control through spatial enforcement of power. The leper was excluded from society, separated out, and stigmatized. Yet the leprosarium, although a charitable institution, was a chaotic place. Its superintendents examined potential cases and sometimes, as in Roule, restricted entry on the basis of certain criteria such as membership in a guild. The authority to locate and exile lepers into these separate communities, where they were then isolated and monitored, yet allowed an act of massive, binary division between the set of people and another.1

The point here is the authority's right to exclude lepers from one space and restrict them to another: one vision of a "pure community," which Foucault links to a set of rigid entrance restrictions, followed by promiscuous intermingling within the closed boundaries. Again, none of the spaces Foucault cites are intended to evoke a "spirit of the age" in which every dimension of the architecture or the activity is unified. Foucault selects a single dimension—sometimes a minor aspect—of these spaces and their use in order to analyze that aspect. In some his theories are different from those of Woolf, on the one hand, and of Marx.

Pierre Fournier: Plan for the hospital at Rochefort; 1782.
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Space and Class

For instance, the seventeenth-century French town of Richelieu, which Foucault diagrams in a 1978 lecture at the Collège de France, is used to make a definite point about space and class. Power, for Foucault, is not restricted to class domination. It cannot be reduced to upper-class play so to control the working classes (although Foucault certainly does not deny the use of such tactics). At Richelieu, disciplinary ordering of space formed the basis for the plan of an entire town, not just the basis for temporary restrictions. This ordering was applied primarily to the fixing and surveillance of the nobility under conditions of luxury and privilege. The planned town of 1631 was built next to the Cardinal's own chateau, and his architect, Jacques Lemercier, designed everything from the market square to the most lavish dwellings, following

Jeremy Bentham. Panopticon plan; 1790.

First, the city is a new social space, a "new universe of consciousness," and the best example of that is the Panopticon. In The Birth of the Clinic, Foucault is concerned with the evolution of power through the hospital. In Foucault, Power, Knowledge, he is concerned with the forms of power in the modern age. In "The Eye of Power," he focuses on the panopticon, which he associates with the emergence of the disciplinary power used in factories and penal institutions.

Foucault certainly does not deny the use of such tactics. At Richelieu, disciplinary ordering of space formed the basis for the plan of an entire town, not just the basis for temporary restrictions. This ordering was applied primarily to the fixing and surveillance of the nobility under conditions of luxury and privilege. The planned town of 1631 was built next to the Cardinal's own chateau, and his architect, Jacques Lemercier, designed everything from the market square to the most lavish dwellings, following
Interview: Michel Foucault

Noted French philosopher Michel Foucault talks with anthropologist Paul Rabinow about architecture and its role in political organization and social relationships.

P.R.: In your interview with geographers at Hododol, you said that architecture becomes political at the end of the eighteenth century [see article on Foucault, p. 14]. Obviously, it was political in earlier periods, too, such as during the Roman Empire. What is particular about the eighteenth century?

M.F.: My statement was awkward in that form. Of course I did not mean to say that architecture was not political before, becoming so only at that time. I only meant to say that in the eighteenth century one sees the development of reflection upon architecture as a function of the aims and techniques of the government of societies. One begins to see a form of political literature that addresses what the order of a society should be, what a city should be, given the requirements of the maintenance of order; given that one should avoid epidemics, avoid revolts, permit a decent and moral family life, and so on. In terms of these objectives, how is one to conceive of both the organization of a city and the construction of a collective infrastructure? And how should houses be built? I am not saying that this sort of reflection appears only in the eighteenth century, but only that in the eighteenth century a very broad and general reflection on these questions takes place. If one opens a police report of the times—the treaties that are devoted to the techniques of government—one finds that architecture and urbanism occupy a place of considerable importance. That is what I meant to say.

P.R.: Among the Ancients, in Rome or Greece, what was the difference?

M.F.: In discussing Rome one sees that the problem revolves around Vitruvius. Vitruvius was reinterpreted from the sixteenth century on, but one can find in the sixteenth century—and no doubt in the Middle Ages as well—many considerations of the same order as Vitruvius; if you consider them as reflections upon. The treaties on politics, on the art of government, on the manner of good government, did not generally include chapters or analyses devoted to the organization of cities or to architecture.

The Republic of Jean Bodin (Paris, 1577) does not contain extended discussions of the role of architecture, whereas the police treaties of the eighteenth century are full of them.

P.R.: Do you mean there were techniques and practices, but the discourse did not exist?

M.F.: I did not say that discourses upon architecture did not exist before the eighteenth century. Nor do I mean to say that the discussions of architecture before the eighteenth century lacked any political dimension or significance. What I wish to point out is that from the eighteenth century on, every discussion of politics as the art of the government of men necessarily includes a chapter or a series of chapters on urbanism, on collective facilities, on hygiene, and on private architecture. Such chapters are not found in the discussions of the art of government of the sixteenth century. This change is perhaps not in the reflections of architects upon architecture, but it is quite clearly seen in the reflections of political men.

P.R.: So it was not necessarily a change within the theory of architecture itself?

M.F.: That's right. It was not necessarily a change in the minds of architects, or in their techniques—although that remains to be seen—but in the minds of political men in the choice and the form of attention that they bring to bear upon the objects that are of concern to them. Architecture became one of these during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

P.R.: Could you tell us why?

M.F.: Well, I think that it was linked to a number of phenomena, such as the question of the city and the idea that was clearly formulated at the beginning of the seventeenth century that the government of a large state like France should ultimately think of its territory on the model of the city. The city was no longer perceived as a place of privilege, as an exception in a territory of fields, forests, and roads. The cities were no longer islands beyond the common law. Instead, the cities, with the problems that they raised, and the particular forms that they took, served as the models for the governmental rationality that was to apply to the whole of the territory.

There is an entire series of utopias or projects for governing territory that developed on the premise that a state is like a large city: the capital is like its main square; the roads are like its streets. A state will be well organized when a system of policing as tight and efficient as that of the cities extends over the entire territory. At the outset, the notion of police applied only to the set of regulations that were to assure the tranquility of a city, but at that moment the police become the very type of rationality for the government of the whole territory. The model of the city became the matrix for the regulations that apply to a whole state.

The notion of police, even in France today, is frequently misunderstood. When one speaks to a Frenchman about police, he can only think of people in uniforms or in the secret service. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, "police" signified a program of government rationality. This can be characterized as a project to create a system of regulation of the general conduct of individuals whereby everything would be controlled to the point of self-sufficiency, without the need for intervention. This is the rather typically French effort of policing. The English, for a number of reasons, did not develop a comparable system, mainly because of the parliamentary tradition on one hand, and the tradition of local, communal autonomy on the other, not to mention the religious system.

One can place Napoleon almost exactly at the break between the old organization of the eighteenth-century police state (understood, of course, in the sense we have been discussing, not in the sense of the "police state" as we have come to know it) and the forms of the modern state, which he invented. At any rate, it seems that, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there appeared—rather quickly in the case of commerce and more slowly in all the other domains—this idea of a police that would manage to penetrate, to stimulate, to regulate, and to render almost automatic all the mechanisms of society.

Translation by Christian Hubert
Space, Knowledge, and...

This idea has since been abandoned. The question has been turned around. No longer do we ask, What is the form of governmental rationality that will be able to penetrate the body politic to its most fundamental elements? but rather, How is government possible? That is, what is the principle of limitation that applies to governmental actions such that things will occur for the best, in conformity with the rationality of government, and without intervention?

It is here that the question of liberalism comes up. It seems to me that at that very moment it became apparent that if one governed too much, one did not govern at all— that one provoked results contrary to those one desired. What was discovered at that time—and this was one of the great discoveries of political thought at the end of the eighteenth century—was the idea of society. That is to say, that government not only has to deal with a territory, with a domain, and with its subjects, but that it also has to deal with a complex and independent reality that has its own laws and mechanisms of reaction; its regulations as well as its possibilities of disturbance. This new reality is society. From the moment that one is to manipulate a society, one cannot consider it completely penetrable by police. One must take into account what it is. It becomes necessary to reflect upon it, upon its specific characteristics, its constants and its variables. . . .

P.R.: So there is a change in the importance of space. In the eighteenth century there was a territory and the problem of governing people in this territory: one can choose as an example La Métropole (1662) of Alexandre LeMaitre—a utopian treatise on how to build a capital city—or one can understand a city as a metaphor or symbol for the territory and how to govern it. All of this is quite spatial, whereas after Napoleon, society is not necessarily so spatialized. . . .

M.F.: That's right. On one hand, it is not so spatialized, yet at the same time a certain number of problems that are properly seen as spatial emerged. Urban space has its own dangers: disease, such as the epidemics of cholera in Europe from 1830 to about 1860; and revolution, such as the series of urban revolts that shook all of Europe during the same period. These spatial problems, which were perhaps not new, took on a new importance.

Secondly, a new aspect of the relations of space and power were the railways. These were to establish a network of communication no longer corresponding necessarily to the traditional network of roads, but they nonetheless had to take into account the nature of society and its history. In addition, there are all the social phenomena that railways gave rise to, be they the resistances they provoked, the transformations of population, or changes in the behavior of people. Europe was immediately sensitive to the changes in behavior that the railways entailed. What was going to happen, for example, if it was possible to get married between Bordeaux and Nantes? Something that was not possible before. What was going to happen when people in Germany and France might get to know one another? Would war still be possible once there were railroads? In France a theory developed that the railroads would increase familiarity among people and that the new forms of human universality made possible would render war impossible. But what the people did not foresee—although the German military command was fully aware of it, since they were much cleverer than their French counterpart—was that, on the contrary, the railroads rendered war far easier to wage. The third development, which came later, was electricity.

So, there were problems in the links between the exercise of political power and the space of a territory, or the space of cities—links that were completely new.

P.R.: So it was less a matter of architecture than before. These are sorts of technologies of space. . . .

M.F.: The major problems of space, from the nineteenth century on, were indeed of a different type. Which is not to say that problems of an architectural nature were forgotten. In terms of the first ones I referred to—disease and the political problems—architecture has a very important role to play. The reflections on urbanism and on the design of workers' housing—all of these questions—are an area of reflection upon architecture.

P.R.: But architecture itself, the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, belongs to a completely different set of spatial issues.

M.F.: That's right. With the birth of these new technologies and these new economic processes one sees the birth of a sort of thinking about space that is no longer modeled upon the police state of the urbanization of the territory, but that extends far beyond the limits of urbanism and architecture.

P.R.: Consequently, the Ecole des Ponts et Chaussées. . . .

M.F.: That's right. The Ecole des Ponts et Chaussées and its capital importance in political rationality in France are part of this. It was not architects, but engineers and builders of bridges, roads, viaducts, railways, as well as the Polytechnicians (who practically controlled the French railroads)—these are the people who thought out space.

P.R.: Has this situation continued up to the present, or are we witnessing a change in relations between the technicians of space?

M.F.: We may well witness some changes, but I think that we have until now remained with the developers of the territory, the people of the Ponts et Chaussées, etc.

P.R.: So architects are not necessarily the masters of space that they once were, or believe themselves to be.

M.F.: That's right. They are not the technicians or engineers of the three great variables—territory, communication, and speed. These escape the domain of architects.

P.R.: Do you see any particular architectural projects, either in the past or the present, as forces of liberation or resistance?

M.F.: I do not think that it is possible to say that one thing is of the order of "liberation" and another is of the order of "oppression." There are a certain number of
"After all, the architect has no power over me. If I want to tear down or change a house... the architect has no control. The architect should be placed in another category—which is not to say that he is not

things that one can say with some certainty about a concentration camp to the effect that it is not an instrument of liberation, but one should still take into account—and this is not generally acknowledged—that, aside from torture and execution, which preclude any resistance, no matter how terrifying a given system may be, there always remain the possibilities of resistance, disobedience, and oppositional groupings.

On the other hand, I do not think that there is anything that is functionally—by its very nature—absolutely liberating. Liberty is a practice. So there may, in fact, always be, a certain number of projects whose aim is to modify some constraints, to loosen, or even to break them, but none of these projects can, simply by its nature, assure that people will have liberty automatically; that it will be established by the project itself. The liberty of men is never assured by the institutions and laws that are intended to guarantee them. This is why almost all of these laws and institutions are quite capable of being turned around. Not because they are ambiguous, but simply because "liberty" is what must be exercised.

P.R.: Are there urban examples of this? Or examples where architects succeeded?

M.F.: Well, up to a point there is Le Corbusier, who is described today—with a sort of cruelty that I find perfectly useless—as a sort of crypto-Stalinist. He was, I am sure, someone full of good intentions and what he did was in fact dedicated to liberating effects. Perhaps the means that he proposed were in the end less liberating than he thought, but, once again, I think that it can never be inherent in the structure of things to guarantee the exercise of freedom. The guarantee of freedom is freedom.

P.R.: So you do not think of Le Corbusier as an example of success. You are simply saying that his intention was liberating. Can you give us a successful example?

M.F.: No. It cannot succeed. If one were to find a place, and perhaps there are some, where liberty is effectively exercised, one would find that this is not owing to the order of objects, but, once again, owing to the practice of liberty. Which is not to say that, after all, one may as well leave people in alms thinking that they can simply exercise their rights there.

P.R.: Meaning that architecture in itself cannot resolve social problems?

M.F.: I think that it can and does produce positive effects when the liberating intentions of the architect coincide with the real practice of people in the exercise of their freedom.

P.R.: But the same architecture can serve other ends.

M.F.: Absolutely. Let me bring up another example: The Familistère of Jean-Baptiste Guise at Guise (1857). The architecture of Guise was clearly intended for the freedom of people. Here was something that manifested the power of ordinary workers to participate in the exercise of their trade. It was a rather important sign and instrument of autonomy for a group of workers. Yet no one could enter or leave the place without being seen by everyone—an aspect of the architecture that could be totally oppressive. But it could only be oppressive if people were prepared to use their own presence in order to watch others. Let's imagine a community of unlimited sexual practices that might be established there. It would once again become a place of freedom. I think it is somewhat arbitrary to try to dissociate the effective practice of freedom by people, the practice of social relations, and the spatial distributions in which they find themselves. If they are separated, they become impossible to understand. Each can only be understood through the other.

P.R.: Yet people have often attempted to find utopian schemes to liberate people, or to oppress them.

M.F.: Men have dreamed of liberating machines. But there are no machines of freedom, by definition. This is not to say that the exercise of freedom is completely indifferent to spatial distribution, but it can only function when there is a certain convergence; in the case of divergence or distortion it immediately becomes the opposite of that which had been intended. The panoptic qualities of Guise could perfectly well have allowed it to be used as a prison. Nothing could be simpler. It is clear that, in fact, the Familistère may well have served as an instrument for discipline and a rather unbearable group pressure.

P.R.: So once again the intention of the architect is not the fundamental determining factor.

M.F.: Nothing is fundamental. That is what is interesting in the analysis of society. That is why nothing irritates me as much as these inquiries—which are by definition metaphysical—on the foundations of power in a society or the self-institution of a society, etc. These are not fundamental phenomena. There are only reciprocal relations, and the perpetual gaps between intentions in relation to one another.

P.R.: You have singled out doctors, prison wardens, priests, judges, and psychiatrists as key figures in the political configurations that involve domination. Would you put architects on this list?

M.F.: You know, I was not really attempting to describe figures of domination when I referred to doctors and psychiatrists and people like that, but rather to describe people through whom power passed or who are important in the fields of power relations. A patient in a mental institution is placed within a field of fairly complicated power relations, which Erving Goffman analyzed very well. The pastor in a Christian or Catholic church (in Protestant churches it is somewhat different) is an important link in a set of power relations. The architect is not an individual of that sort.

After all, the architect has no power over me. If I want to tear down or change a house he built for me, put up new partitions, add a chimney, the architect has no control. So the architect should be placed in another category—which is not to say that he is not totally foreign to the organization, the implementation, and all the techniques of power that are exercised in a society. I would say that one must take him—his mentality, his attitude—into account as well as his projects, in order to understand a certain number of the techniques of power that are invested in architecture, but he is not comparable to a doctor, a priest, a psychiatrist, or a prison warden.

P.R.: "Post-modernism" has received a great deal of attention recently in architectural circles. It is also being talked about in philosophy, notably by Jean-François Lyotard and Jurgen Habermas. Clearly, historical reference and language play an important role in the modern episteme. How do you see post-modernism, both as architecture and in terms of the historical and philosophical questions that it raises?

M.F.: I think that there is a widespread and facile tendency, which one should combat, to designate that which has just occurred as the primary enemy as if this were always the principal form of oppression from which one had to liberate oneself. Now, this simple attitude entails a number of dangerous consequences first, an inclination to seek out some cheap form of archaism or some imaginary past forms of happiness that people did not, in fact, have at all. For instance, in the areas that interest me, it is very amusing to see how contemporary sexuality is described as something absolutely terrible. To think that it is only possible now to make love after turning off the television and in mass-produced beds. "Not like that wonderful time when..." Well, what about those wonderful times when people worked eighteen hours a day and there were six people in a bed, if one was lucky enough to have a bed? There is in this hatred of the present or the immediate past a dangerous tendency to invoke a completely mythical past. Secondly, there is the problem raised by Habermas if one abandons the work of Kant or Weber, for example, one runs the risk of lapsing into irrationality.
I am completely in agreement with this, but at the same time, our question is quite different. I think that the central issue of philosophy and critical thought since the eighteenth century has always been, still is, and will, I hope, remain the question: What is this Reason that we use? What are its historical effects? What are its limits, and what are its dangers? How can we exist as rational beings, fortunately committed to practicing a rationality that is unfortunately crossbred by irrational forces? One should remain as close to this question as possible, keeping in mind that it is both central and extremely difficult to resolve. In addition, if it is extremely dangerous to say that Reason is the enemy that should be eliminated, it is just as dangerous to say that any critical questioning of this rationality risks sending us into irrationality. One should not forget—and I'm not saying this in order to criticize rationality, but in order to show how ambiguous things are—it was on the basis of the flamboyant rationalism of Social Darwinism that racism was formulated, becoming one of the most enduring and powerful ingredients of Nazism. This was, of course, an irrationality, but an irrationality I think we need to remember the same time, after all, a certain form of rationality. . .

This is the situation we are in and that we must combat. If intellectuals in general are to have a function, if critical thought itself has a function, and, even more specifically, if philosophy has a function within critical thought, it is precisely to accept this sort of spiral, this sort of revolving door of rationality that requires us to its necessity, to its indispensability, and at the same time, to its intrinsic dangers.

P.R.: All that being said, it would be fair to say that you are much less afraid of historicism and the play of historical references than someone like Habermas is; also that this issue has been placed in architecture as almost a crisis of civilization by the defenders of modernism, who contend that if we abandon modern architecture for a fruitful return to decoration and motifs, we are somehow abandoning modern civilization. On the other hand, some post-modernists have claimed that historical references per se are somehow meaningful and are going to protect us from the dangers of an overly rationalized world.

M.F.: Although it may not answer your question, I would say this: One should totally and absolutely suspect anything that claims to be a return. One reason is a logical one; there is in fact no such thing as a return. History, and the meticulous interest applied to history, is certainly one of the best defenses against this theme of the return. For me, the history of madness or the studies of the prison—were done in that precise manner because I knew full well—this is in fact what aggravated many people—that I was carrying out an historical analysis in such a manner that people could criticize the present, but it was impossible for them to say, "Let's go back to the good old days when madness in the eighteenth century . . ." or, "Let's go back to the days when the prison was not one of the principal instruments..." No, I think that history preserves us from that sort of ideology of the return.

P.R.: Hence, the simple opposition between reason and history is rather silly . . . choosing sides between the two . . .

M.F.: Yes. Well, the problem for Habermas is, after all, to make a transcendental mode of thought spring forth against any historicism. I am, indeed, far more historian and Nietzschean. I do not think that there is a proper usage of history or a proper usage of intrahistorical analysis—which is fairly lucid, by the way—that works precisely against this ideology of the return. A good study of peasant architecture in Europe, for example, would show the utter vanity of wanting to return to the little individual house with its thatched roof. History protects us from historicism—from a historicism that calls on the past to resolve the questions of the present.

P.R.: It also reminds us that there is always a history; that those modernists who wanted to suppress any reference to the past were making a mistake.

M.F.: Of course.

P.R.: Your next two books deal with sexuality among the Greeks and the Early Christians. Are there any particular architectural dimensions to the issues you discuss?

M.F.: I didn't find any; absolutely none. But what is interesting is that Imperial Rome there were, in fact, brothels, pleasure quarters, criminal areas, etc., and there was also one sort of quasi-public place of pleasure: the baths, the thermae. The baths were a very important place of pleasure and encounter, which slowly disappeared in Europe. In the Middle Ages, the baths were still a place of encounter between men and women as well as of men with men and women with women, although that is rarely talked about. What was referred to and condemned, as well as practiced, were the encounters between men and women, which disappeared over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

P.R.: In the Arab world it continues.

M.F.: Yes; but in France it has largely ceased. It still existed in the nineteenth century. One sees it in Les Enfants du Paradis, and it is historically exact. One of the characters, Laurencin, was—no one mentions it—a zwinge and a pimp who used young boys to attract older men and then blackmail them; there is a scene that refers to this. It required all the nascent and antihomosexuality of the Surrealists to overlook that fact. So the bathhouses continued to exist, as a place of sexual encounters. The bath was a sort of cathedral of pleasure at the heart of the city, where people could go as often as they want, where they walked about, picked each other up, met each other, took their pleasure, ate, drank, discussed . . .

P.R.: So sex was not separated from the other pleasures. It was inscribed in the center of the city. It was public; it served a purpose.

M.F.: That's right. Sexuality was obviously considered a social pleasure for the Greeks and the Romans. What is interesting about male homosexuality today—this has apparently been the case of female homosexuals for some time—is that their sexual relations are immediately translated into social relations and the social relations are understood as sexual relations. For the Greeks and the Romans, in a different fashion, sexual relations were located within social relations in the widest sense of the term. The baths were a place of sociality that included sexual relations.

One can directly compare the bath and the brothel. The brothel is in fact a place, and an architecture, of pleasure. There is, in fact, a very interesting form of sociality that was studied by Alain Corbin in Les Filles de Noces (1978). The men of the city met at the brothel; they were tied to one another by the fact that the same women passed through their hands, that the same diseases and infections were communicated to them. There was a sociality of the brothel; but the sociality of the baths as it existed among the ancients—a new version of which could perhaps exist again—was completely different from the sociality of the brothel.

P.R.: We now know a great deal about disciplinary architecture. What about confessional architecture—the kind of architecture that would be associated with a confessional technology?

M.F.: You mean religious architecture? I think that it has been studied. There is the whole problem of a monastery as xenophobia. One finds precise regulations concerning life in order to affect sleeping, eating, prayer, the place of each individual in all of that, the cells. All of this was programmed from very early on.

P.R.: In a technology of power, of confession as opposed to discipline, space seems to play a central role as well.
Interview: Michel Foucault

"One can directly compare the bath and the brothel. The brothel is in fact a place and an architecture of pleasure . . . but the sociality of the baths was completely different from the sociality of the brothel."

M.F.: Yes. Space is fundamental in any form of communal living. Even our thought processes, which make a parenthetical remark, I recall having been invited, in 1966, by a group of architects to do a study of space, of something that I called at that time "heterotopias." Those singular spaces to be found in some given social spaces whose functions are different or even the opposite of others. The architect worked on this, and at the end of the study someone spoke up—a Sartrean psychologist—who forbade me, saying that space is reactionary and capitalist, but history and becoming are revolutionary. This absurd discourse was not at all unusual at the time. Today everyone would be convinced with laughter at such a pronouncement, but not then.

P.R.: Architects in particular, if they do choose to analyze an institutional building such as a hospital or a school in terms of its disciplinary function, would tend to focus primarily on the walls. After all, that is what they design. Your approach is perhaps more concerned with space, rather than architecture, in that the physical walls are only one aspect of the institution. How would you characterize the difference between these two approaches, between the building itself and space?

M.F.: I think there is a difference in method and approach. It is true that for me, architecture, in the very vague analyses of it that I have been able to conduct, is only taken as an element of support, to insure a certain allocation of people in space, a canalization of their circulation, as well as the coding of their reciprocal relations. So it is not only considered as an element in space, but is especially thought of as a plunge into a field of social relations in which it brings about some specific effects.

For example, I know that there is an historian who is carrying out some interesting studies of the archaeology of the Middle Ages, in which he takes up the problem of architecture, of houses in the Middle Ages, in terms of the problem of the chimney. I think that he is in the process of showing that beginning at a certain moment it was possible to build a chimney inside the house—a chimney with a hearth, not simply an open room or a chimney outside the house; that at that moment all sorts of things changed and relations between individuals became possible. All of this seems very interesting to me, but the conclusion that he presented in an article was that the history of ideas and thoughts is useless.

What is, in fact, interesting is that the two are rigorously indivisible. Why did people struggle to find the way to put a chimney inside a house? Or why did they put their techniques to this use? So often in the history of techniques it takes years or even centuries to implement them. It is certain, and of capital importance, that this technique was a formative influence upon new human relations, but it is impossible to think that it would have been developed and adapted had there not been in the play and strategy of human relations something which tended in that direction. What is interesting is always interconnection, not the primacy of this over that, which never has any meaning.

P.R.: In your book Les Mots et les Choses you constructed certain vivid spatial metaphors to describe structures of thought. Why do you think spatial images are so evocative for these references? What is the relationship between these spatial metaphors describing disciplines and more concrete descriptions of institutional spaces?

M.F.: It is quite possible that since I was interested in the problems of space I used quite a number of spatial metaphors in Les Mots et les Choses, but usually these metaphors were not ones that I advanced, but ones that I was studying as objects. What is striking in the epistemological mutations and transformations of the seventeenth century is to see how the spatialization of knowledge was one of the factors in the constitution of this knowledge as a science. If the natural history and the classifications of Linnaeus were possible, it is for a certain number of reasons on the one hand, there was literally a spatialization of the very object of their analyses, since they gave themselves the rule of studying and classifying a plant only on the basis of that which was visible. They didn't even want to use a microscope. All the traditional elements of knowledge, such as the medical functions of the plant, fell away. The object was spatialized. Subsequently, it was spatialized insofar as the principles of classification had to be found in the very structure of the plant: The number of elements, how they were arranged, their size, etc., and certain other elements, like the height of the plant. Then there was the spatialization into illustrations within books, which was only possible with certain printing techniques. Then the spatialization of the reproduction of the plants themselves, which was represented in books. All of these are spatial techniques, not metaphors.

P.R.: Is the actual plan for a building—the precise drawing that becomes walls and windows—the same form of discourse as, say, a hierarchical pyramid that describes rather precisely relations between people not only in space but also in social life?

M.F.: Well, I think there are a few simple and exceptional examples in which the architectural means reproduce, with more or less emphasis, the social hierarchies. There is the model of the military camp, where the military hierarchy is to be read in the ground itself, by the place occupied by the tents and the buildings reserved for each rank. It reproduces precisely through architecture a pyramid of power; but this is an exceptional example, as is everything military—privileged in society and of an extreme simplicity.

P.R.: But the plan itself is not always an account of relations or power.

M.F.: No. Fortunately for human imagination, things are a little more complicated than that.

P.R.: Architecture is not, of course, a constant: it has a long tradition of changing preoccupations, changing systems, different rules. The saroir of architecture is partly the history of the profession, partly the evolution of a science of construction, and partly a rewriting of aesthetic theories. What do you think is particular about this form of saroir? Is it more like a natural science, or what you have called a "dubious science"?

M.F.: I can't exact, say that this distinction between sciences that are certain and those that are uncertain is of no interest—that would be avoiding the question—but I must say that what interests me more is to focus on what the Greeks called the techne, that is to say, a practical rationality governed by a conscious goal. I am not even sure if it is worth constantly asking the question of whether government can be the object of an exact science. On the other hand, if architecture, like the practice of government and the practice of other forms of social organization, is considered as a techne, possibly using elements of sciences like physics, for example, or statistics, etc., that is what is interesting. But if one wanted to do a history of architecture, I think that it should be much more along the lines of that general history of the techne, rather than the histories of either the exact sciences or the inexact ones. The disadvantage of this word techne, I realize, is its relation to the word "technology" which has a very specific meaning. A very narrow meaning is given to "technology": one thinks of hard technology, the technology of wood, of fire, of electricity. Whereas government is also a function of technology: the government of individuals, the government of souls, the government of the self by the self, the government of families, the government of children, and so on. I believe that if one placed the history of architecture back in this general history of techne, in this wide sense of the word, one would have a more interesting guiding concept than by considering opposition between the exact sciences and the inexact ones.
Deconstructing Modernism: Meier’s Hartford Seminary

Anthony Vidler

“A villa on the dunes of Normandy conceived like one of these ships would be more appropriate than those heavy ‘Normandy roofs,’ so very, very old! But it would perhaps be claimed that this was not a maritime style!”

Le Corbusier, Towards a New Architecture, 1923

In an age when “Normandy roofs,” whether mansarded or shingled, have become the signs of a revived nostalgia for a pre-machine age world, the very survival of a style that might with justice be termed “maritime” according to the tenets of the 1920s would in itself be remarkable. It is all the more ironic that such a manner, developed with formidable consistency in the work of Richard Meier, must now be seen as a style. For while during the years 1920 to 1923, the liners Aquitania, Lusitania, and Empress of Asia were advanced by Moc. les architectes as the necessary corrective for eyes which were unable to see the coming of a machine age—the paradigms of an architecture “free from suffocating styles”—now the recapturing of such elements cannot be viewed without a sense that a specific historical period is being referred to, with all the contradictory questions that arise in such a situation. No longer can we be persuaded that the engineering forms of ships, airplanes, and cars are in some way natural rather than conventional forms; nor can we fully participate in the white crusade against a brown Victorian world in the belief that the machine will redeem where politics have failed. The slogan “Architecture or Revolution” has grown old and bitter together with the utopianism that supported it. Today, even more than twenty years ago, the idea of a continuity between the Modernism of the Heroic Period (rendered less and less heroic by historical research) and our own less confident, post-utopian sensibility lacks resonance.
Vidler on Meier

"Like some country house from the 1890s, it sprawls along an axis, asking us to read its narrative from left to right—from library, to entrance, to chapel—as if the whole story of the program were laid out from knowledge to faith; individual to community."

And yet, more than any other practicing architect in the U.S., Richard Meier presents himself as the heir to a dialectic of modernism framed on the one hand by the tenet "A house is a machine for living in," and on the other by the paradigms of the Domino House, Le Corbusier's attempt to weld classicalism to reinforced-concrete technology. In the first case, this means for Meier all the reference to shapely columns, arches, and boxes; in the other, surfaces, horizontal windows, linear plan distributions, and structural two-dimensional abstractions—what Le Corbusier himself characterized in 1923, referring to the House of the Oise, as "new architectural forms, elements both vital and intimate, yet on the human scale, freedom from suffocating styles, the contrasts of solids and voids, strong inward and outward elements . . . ." In the second case, the reference to the Domino House represents the attempt to construct such modern forms according to rules of composition based not on mechanical, but on architectural typologies. The utilization of such a purist aesthetic has provided a consistent vocabulary for Meier, in most of his private houses and many of his public institutions: the themes run clearly from the Smith House (1967) to the Hartford Seminary.

Such a self-consciously lived dialectic of modernism places a special burden on criticism: his works cannot be entirely detached from the Corbusian canon, from which they descend, nor from which their aesthetic force and conceptual unity; nor can they be totally separated from a "post-modernist" context, where the operative criteria call for them to be seen as part of a so many consumable trappings and already-eclectic style. Neither "authentically" Modern in any sense that is nostalgic for roots, however tenuous these might be, nor completely "post-modern"—insofar as the term refers to an unabashed historicism—Meier's buildings stand equi-valent and hallucinatory, suspended between past and present. Their dreamlike quality is enforced by their very perfection; untouched by time, and technically perfect; even, as in the case of the Seminary, divided from the ground by a thin black line. They seem to have been for special consideration in an age preoccupied by the ruin, the fantastic past, the comfortable clichés of children's trips to Tuscany. They are also hybrids. In spite of the whiteепaneling, the nautical imagery, and the exposed frames, they cannot be seen in quite the same way as Villa Le Corbusier. A first attempt at interpretation might well examine this primary debt to Corbusian formulas.

The Domino House diagram, invented by Le Corbusier between 1914 and 1920, was in itself simple enough. A structure of slab and frame-standing on its edge, it set out first to present the basic elements of reinforced-concrete construction in pot ential form: a kind of "primitive hut" of modernism, it demonstrated the potential for architecture to free itself from load-bearing walls, to raise itself by piers from the ground on piers, to walk on the roof as a new ground, to accept within this general frame all the specificities of modern life articulated in the free plan. On another level, the Domino diagram was a highly sophisticated aesthetic device; geometrically controlled according to the Golden Section rectangle; tensioned along its sides by the curtain-wall hung in front of the column grid; additive at its ends, like a dominion, it proposed a dynamic interplay between vertical skin and horizontal slab, virtually demanding the dialectic of frameless elements that was to inhabit it with Garches (1927) and Poissy (1929-33).

In another sense, however, the Domino was an empty frame, awaiting inhabitation by a historically derived type, which in the Chartreuse of Emont on the Villa Malcontenta. At a first level of significance, the interplay between the typological structures of Domino and the abstractions of order of the particular historical type proposed a conversation, as it were, between a universal idea of architecture in general and a cultural notion of institution: between the natural and the conventional. This conversation, brilliantly described for the villa at Garches by Colin Rowe, further elucidates this passage of some reinforcing the original type, some cutting against the received use patterns or spatial organizations.

Inhabitation of the type also demanded formal recognition; and by means of the promenade architectural. The promenade allowed the introduction of dynamism, of progressive movement, of a formal element into composition—a literal symbol of modernist futurism—while retaining for an abstract and largely spatially determined structure a link with tradition, with history itself. No longer was architecture to signify by means of historical styles, but the natural history of life inside the building would be exhibited by the interaction of ramps, walkways, galleries, and stairs that formed a system of movement interlaced with the system of structure. The first projects for Garches illustrate this dialectic in its pure form.

In Meier's most recently completed institutional building, the Seminary at Hartford (completed in summer of 1981), all these modernist accoutrements have been replaced by a technical virtuosity that seems at once to pay homage to its origins and to turn them into a working language of its own. The Domino frame is there, but, as in many of Meier's other projects, it has been replaced by an explicit decorative device in its own right; the undulating walls of the free-plan are there, but they now escape from the grid, and turned into volumetric wrappings that articulate—sometimes as walls, sometimes as roofs—the building's major functions; the promenade area, marked by stairs, walkways, and continuous railings, seems to play in and out of the building, for all intents and purposes tying together the otherwise-fragmented volumes. In the overall diagram, reference is made to the firm back wall of stairs and services, which is often found in Le Corbusier, and functions consisting as an organizing device for Meier in both private houses and public buildings.

The overall massing of the building, however, is hardly Corbusian; rather, its composition is Romantic, its volumes self-consciously assembled in favor of the random view, the chance effect. Like some country house from the 1890s, it sprawls along an axis, asking us to read its narrative from left to right—from library, to entrance, to chapel—as if the whole story of the program were laid out from knowledge to faith; individual to community. Its pattern reads more like that of the picturesque novel than of any classical position, than of Alexander Pope. We are referred away from the world of Phleibem serenity and timeless Italo-French garden in which each functional element exhibits its difference; where the total idea of the institution must be pieced together by a master narrative. Herein, humanity is provided not by the tightly controlled and overriding grid and skin of Domino, but by the envelope wrapping and the total coherence of the vocabulary.

The insistence of this fundamentally empirical genre over the classical norms that generated its style of representation is revealed in the entrance sequence, where, rather than being turned by the elaborate plays between movement and formal structure present in Le Corbusier, we are led with interpretation into and through the building; form accommodates movement as if bound by a diagram of circulation, rather than inferred by an consciousness of the meaning to be derived from the stages of passage.

In the case of the villa at Garches, for example, which was a play on the Palladian convention, the approach to the block is indirect; and it was communicated through the scale of the house, which was to resist the idea of dual identity. The visitor traverses the facade from one side to the other, turned by the impossibility of entering the servants' door, passing in from the main entrance point for any Palladian villa—and finally entering beneath the airplane-wing canopy. In the public version of this promenade, the penitent on his way to cleanliness from the streets of Paris to the Salvation Army hostel (1958-60) is moved through a series of rooms, passed to the main dormitory block before being allowed to puncture the surface of the narrow slab. In both cases the tension of the entry wall is increased, and the strength of its fragile surface reinforced.

At Hartford, however, a building equally as narrow as that of the Salvation Army hostel is entered directly from the street on axis, protected only by a frame around an exterior stair: the wall itself is pulled back, as if in reaction to this assault; a direct path links the entrance wall with the rear main stair affording the visitor only the briefest pause, on the threshold, as it were, aware of the major cross-axis of the first floor, as it passes across the entryway to right and left. Running between library and meeting hall, this passage meets some reinforcing the original type, some cutting against the received use patterns or spatial organizations.

Inhabitation of the type also demanded formal recognition; and by means of the promenade architectural. The promenade allowed the introduction of dynamism, of progressive movement, of a formal element into composition—a literal symbol of modernist futurism—while retaining for an abstract and largely spatially determined structure a link with tradition, with history itself. No longer was architecture to signify by means of historical styles, but the natural history of life inside the building would be exhibited by the interaction of ramps, walkways, galleries, and stairs that formed a system of movement interlaced with the system of structure. The first projects for Garches illustrate this dialectic in its pure form.

Above: top, Interior of the Chapel, Below: Reception area, looking along courtyard wall toward entrance to library. (Photo: Ezra Stoller/ESTO)
"Neither ‘authentically’ Modern in an age that is nostalgic for roots, however tenuous, nor completely ‘post-modern’—in so far as the term refers to an unabashed historicism—Meier’s buildings stand equivocal and hallucinatory, between past and present."

narrative key to the experience of the whole building—is here fragmented, if not ruined, as notions of a system once existing, now exhausted by the demands of empirical reality.

Perhaps the most evident divergence from Corbusian precedent, which also reveals Meier’s continuous debt to the more functionalist Gropius, is the absence of any overall referent, or type, by which we might measure the institutional value and cultural significance of this seminary among all other religious and educational buildings. Even as in the New Harmony Athenaeum (1978), we find no trace of the "museum" type as it was carefully elaborated throughout the nineteenth century, or even as it was reinvented by Le Corbusier for example, for that matter, do we find echoes in the plan of this building of the New Harmony community plans of George Rapp or Robert Owen. In Hartford all such cultural reference is eschewed in favor of a universal architecture that indeed speaks about route and passage, about entry and exit, but holds no more specific reference to its public social role than do Meier’s earlier houses to their private, individual function. Only the forecourt of the building, framed on one side by the chapel, and on another by a screen and stair to the upper deck, makes some reference to a cloister; but this is more in terms of image than in any organizational sense.

Like a beached 1920s liner, like some Robinson Crusoe of Modernism stranded on the greenward, the Hartford Seminary is at once nostalgic—an emblem of an elegant past of yacht clubs and first-class cruises—and inevitable—a sophisticated machine, wrapped in the latest of paper-thin wrappings and baked irredeemably white. It presents itself as the completion of a hope, the realization of functionalist utopia: the objective result of that evolution of technology predicted by l'esprit nouveau. It is as if what was proclaimed as future by modernism, and humbly anticipated in stucco, paint, and welded iron is here deposited as fact. What was before promised is now delivered.

We are forced to the conclusion that the Corbusian language of Meier hides a more "objective," accommodating, even pragmatic, architecture, where history is finally dispensed with in favor of the satisfaction of immediate need. In one sense, of course, this was the radical premise of a modernism dedicated to "starting again"; and we should not be displeased to find a renewed Sachlichkeit decked out in less austere clothes than the 1920s would have allowed. In another sense, however, such a relentless pursuit of fact and event marks the point at which the Modern Movement as a whole was forced again and again to admit its failure in front of society. And while a sense of the historical and cultural has, in the wake of this failure, led to much work that has to be classified as the kith of nostalgia, and to far too many singular and empty images of one past or another, it is also true that this sense of the historical, of the context in which culture develops, has stimulated much of the better work on typologies, both urban and institutional, in the last decade. If the endless debates over "meaning in architecture" have any productive end, it is in the idea that the spatial accommodation of social institutions is a matter of meaning in and of itself, and that renewed meaning can only be engendered when previous forms of occupation are taken as the starting point for our own inventions.

**Project:** The Hartford Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut. **Architect:** Richard Meier & Partners. Richard Meier and Gerald Gurland, principals-in-charge; project team: Bruce Nagel, Philip Babb, David Woolf, Paul Aheran, Alan Schweikert. **Size:** 27000 s.f. **Structure and materials:** Steel frame with white porcelain enameled steel facade. **Interiors:** Richard Meier & Partners. **Landscape:** The office of P. De Bellis. **Client:** The Hartford Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut.
"It would stick in the nostrils of the American people to have it said that the President of the United States had approved a bill overlooking appropriation of $20,000 for flower-pots for this damned old house, when the soldiers cannot have blankets."

—President Abraham Lincoln to his wife, Mary, 1862

Upstairs with Nancy and Ronne

Martin Filler

The First Family Bedroom (photo: Michael Evans/Time Life Pictures)

Third Floor Central Sitting Hall (photo: Arch. Digest)

The Reagans' new design scheme was the work of Ted Graber, a Los Angeles interior decorator who had previously done the houses of several of the Reagans' closest friends in Bel Air and Beverly Hills. Graber's approach might be termed "California Conservative Eclectic": a fairly predictable formula of English and French antiques and reproductions mixed with Oriental accent pieces and accessories. He also has an unfortunate tendency to excessive matching, color-coordinated wall-to-wall carpeting, and still window treatments that give his rooms an unpleasantly hermetic quality. This is a decidedly Non-U sensibility, the perfect background for people who own Bohemian birds and Atmos clocks, which come in sightline glass cases and never need to be wound.

A summary of Graber's aesthetic shortcomings can be quickly grasped from the first spread of the 1-page color Digest tour, in his treatment of the second-floor Central Hall and West Sitting Hall. The Central Hall, which extends from east to west as the main circulation spine of the family quarters, is an awkward space: windowless, too wide to be a mere corridor, too narrow to be a real living room. Graber has opted for a third possibility by making it look like a furniture showroom. The Central Hall is now a forest of chair and table legs growing out of vast, arid stretches of solid beige carpeting. Aside from the fact that the White House has splendid parquet floors (which are now for the most part obscured by the ubiquitous broadloom), Graber's choice of wall-to-wall carpeting was particularly ill-advised, because his numerous groupings of furniture would have been much better defined and visually anchored by smaller area rugs. Busby, boring floors (Chinese evergreens and what Jacqueline Kennedy used to derisively call "hotel palms") added to an institutional feeling that is not allayed by the dense array of bibelots and framed photographs that are meant to signify the personal touch.

One of the most egregious design errors has been committed in the adjacent West Sitting Hall. Among the White House's most distinguished architectural features are Hoban's gracefully arched fan windows at the east and west ends of the second floor. They are now covered by square-cornered curtains that cut off the tops and sides of the arches, killing their提前暗示。 (It must be added that a similar window treatment existed before the Reagan redesign, but during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations a much better curtain design revealed and emphasized the shape of the window.) Jacqueline Kennedy's favorite upstairs interior had been the elliptical room that she had redecorated in 1962 with Louis XVI antiques (a style known to have been favored by Thomas Jefferson) and renamed the Yellow Oval Room. The color remains to this day, but that is about all. Most of the fine French pieces purchased for that room have been dispersed to other parts of the house. Brand-new Louise Schmoozy gilded coffee tables with dark-red marble tops now face the yellow damask sofas, which, astonishingly, have self-protective covers over the armrests (as do the armchairs in the President's second-floor study). This is a detail so at odds with Nancy Reagan's usual "let's-maintain-quiet" attitude that it is about as explicable as her emerging from Monsieur Marc's wearing a hat. But old housekeeping obsessions die hard.
“Graber has an unfortunate tendency to excessive matching, color-coordinated wall-to-wall carpeting, and stiff window treatments that give his rooms an unpleasantly hermetic quality. This is a decidedly Non-U sensibility.”

President's Second Floor Study (photo: Michael Evans)

The President’s and First Lady's second-floor offices are a study in contrasts. His hideaway, with its eye-popping red- and-white floral chintz (the decorative equivalent of those loud plaid jackets he favors), its solid red wall-to-wall carpeting, and its fire chief’s born cleverly converted into a lamp base, could just as well be the office of the CEO of any major American corporation. Her office is pale mint green with the inevitable matching broadloom. One wall of Nancy Reagan’s office is covered with 25 gilt-framed reproductions of botanical watercolors; a photograph of England’s Queen Mother sits next to the phone. The First Lady’s upstart dressing room in the southwest corner of the second floor has the same austerity aura of murove

The motivation, the new White House china has become the single most controversial aspect of the domestic side of the Reagan's short tenure. Coming as it does during the wholesale cutback of the Federal School Lunch Program, the symbolism and the inequity of this extravagance seem nothing short of

There is no doubt that some work was necessary when the Reagans occupied the White House. The Carters, paradoxical to a fault, rarely were that much interested in their surroundings, and had serious problems to deal with without looking for new ones. Things were thus allowed to run down. True, relatively little new furniture has been bought as part of this redecoration: much was retrieved from White House storage; the Reagans brought some of their own pieces from California; other furniture and materials were donated. But faced with a bottom line of almost $250,000 for surface refurbishing and over $300,000 for china, one must ask “Was this trip necessary?”

Throughout these interiors the strong visual tension between tableau and mantels cluttered with small objects on one hand and vacant expanses of monochrome floor covering on the other provokes an uneasy sense of disproportion. That same feeling of imbalance prevails in other ways: high vernier candlesticks better suited to a massive dining table are perched atop small commodes in the Yellow Oval Room that are just slightly taller than the candlesticks themselves; strangely attenuated trompe l’oeil pediments and finials painted over built-in bookcases in the third-floor Center Sitting Hall are particularly disturbing in a house whose Classical exterior features might well have been consulted as a model.

But by far the worst interiors are on the third floor. The Center Sitting Hall is horribly overcrowded and claustrophobic. The Washington Sitting Room is no better than a pastel in a respectable Old Boston hotel. The Red Sitting Room is dominated by a curio of highly dubious

suitability: an atrocious crocheted interpretation of Jonathan Trumbull’s The Signing of the Declaration of Independence. This is the Mount Rushmore of antimacassars. And the Solarium, with its lime-green-and- white floral print upholstery, new duck decoys, and bland “contemporary” furniture is pure Marina del Rey Cundo. (The Carters’ Solarium, it should be noted, was no better, though it would be more accurately characterized as Sea Pines Plantation Cundo.) Perhaps most awful of all is the thoroughly inappropriate white wrightson and lime-green-upholstered 10-style garden furniture, crowded into the shallow Truman Balcony of the curving South Porch in a vain attempt to bring a little Pacific Palisades to the Potomac. The furniture looks as if it comes from the set for Joan Crawford’s Brentwood house in Mommie Dearest. These embarrassing pieces are shamed by the capitals of Lutrobe’s noble Ionic columns that tower above them.

There is then the issue of what works have irrevocably termed “Nancy’s China Policy.” Even before the 1980 election, Clement Conger claimed that a new White House dinner service would soon be needed, but the Carters balked at the estimated $500,000 price tag. Now, however, it’s full speed ahead. For the bargain price of an $250,000, the First Lady has commissioned a complete service (including fingerbowls) for 220 people from Lenox China, the New Jersey manufacturers who supplied President Woodrow Wilson with the first American-made White House service in 1913. The new dishes are a traditional off-white bordered with a broad rim of what has become, in the Reagan years, an almost peculiarly delicate background color for food. In the center of each dish is a raised and gilded representation of the Presidential Seal (not the most practical motif where knives and forks are concerned).

Mrs. Reagan’s rationale for her $1,000,000-place-setting china (sounds as if all those political fundraisers finally got to her) is that over the years breakfast had taken its toll to such an extent that it was no longer possible to serve a large White House dinner party all on the same pattern. (Since World War II, complete services have been purchased during the Truman Administration and as recently as the Johnson Administration; the Eisenhower added service plates.) But why should all the china for a party of 220 have to match? The State Dining Room holds only about half that number of people, and for that maximum capacity small round tables are used, rather than a long, formal table at which pattern discrepancies would be more noticeable. For parties larger than the State Dining Room’s capacity, other rooms (the Blue Room, and even the East Room, for monster banquets) are pressed into service. But clearly Nancy Reagan is the kind of woman who wants everything to be the same. Whatever

Ted Graber, left and right, for bicouidal appeal (photos: Raul Vago)
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Power and Leisure

On Victoria de Grazia's The Culture of Consent

Diane Ghirardo

It is fashionable among architects (especially American architects)—and some historians to maintain architecture's independence from political or ideological blemishes and to look at architecture only in aesthetic terms. Behind today's best-selling historians and critics stand legions of other historians who see the history of architecture as a history of "styles" and "masterpieces," which may also have some relation—but however trivial—to historical circumstances, generally referred to as "sensibilities." This is the architectural star system, wherein a limited number of examples of excellence are treated as flags for the architecture of entire generations and countries: buildings that stand in splendid isolation and transcend political, social, and ideological contingencies. Thus historians writing about architecture designed in politically undesirable situations, such as Fascist Italy, encounter dilemmas. More than a few twentieth-century architects have been stained by the brush of Nazism and Fascism—Albert Speer and Marcello Piacentini come to mind. The association of Modern Movement heroes—Le Corbusier, Giuseppe Terragni, Adalberto Libera—with the same extremist governments has placed historians in the delicate position of condemning some architects for their political associations, but at the same time declaring that politics are irrelevant to the work of others.

But how do we account for the animus that devolves on any analyses that fail to regard architecture exclusively as an aesthetic object (Robert Stern's review of Kenneth Frampton's Modern Architecture: A Critical History: Skyline, October 1981, p. 22, is a prime example)? Given the dangers of political association, the prospect of evaluating architecture on anything other than narrow aesthetic grounds always poses the threat of raising troublesome problems in which American architects and historians are likely to engage. It might, after all, lead to turning a critical eye toward the whole complex of political and social values that underlie the entire business of building in this country—or worse. The response to this potential Pandora's Box has been to pretend that it is not an issue, or that it simply does not exist.

There is also a related fear that might be summarized as follows: architecture ruled by politics or ideology would lose its purity and integrity as a unique aesthetic object. Put another way, if a Casa del Fascio (Fascist Party headquarters) bespeaks its origins in the politics and society of the time, it may be because it has a secure value only when embedded in that time. The relation to the earlier fear is obvious: when the politics are no longer fashionable—or even are damned—the architecture, torn loose from its birth, will be perceived as having no criteria of value. It would appear far safer to seek refuge in art, where the status of the work rests solely in its stature as an aesthetic object. In reality, all this does is abandon the complex reality of history in favor of the arbitrary ramens of taste. But the dangers that drive "historians" and architects into the safety of purely aesthetic criteria are more apparent than real: architecture need not suffer a loss of "objecthood," nor need it succumb to the imperatives of more or less coherent ideological systems. By the same token, history is not something to be tossed onto a building like so much ornamental confetti. Such a vision of historical analysis is as naive as it is flawed. There is, nevertheless, a possibility for historical analysis—even of twentieth-century architecture—that neither omits aesthetic considerations nor denies special stature to individual buildings; a history that is neither wapshoo and gossipy (e.g. Tom Wolfe), nor selectively promotional of self and/or others (Robert Stern, Charles Jencks, et al.). But to make it happen, authors will have to turn for guidance to the very best histories.

One such broadly architectural history is Victoria de Grazia's The Culture of Consent: Mass Organization of Leisure in Fascist Italy, a text whose chief virtue lies in the recognition of the complex and changing expectations of the Fascist government regarding leisure activities for the masses. Because de Grazia avoids a simplistic schema for interpreting the past, the value of her work for architectural historians lies precisely in the examination of the cultural politics of the regime as expressed in the leisure organization OND (Opera Nazionale Dopolavoro) and related institutions, for whom some of Italy's finest works of modern architecture were commissioned. With her analyses in mind, we can understand why certain structures were built, why they "looked" as they did, and why Rationalist architecture was acceptable to Italy's Fascist government when it was rejected elsewhere.

In order to remain in power in the 1930s, post-World War II governments began to realize that they needed at least the consent—if not the full participation—of the masses. Italy had to develop mechanisms for creating national identities to transcend traditional class lines and regional
"With this analysis in mind, we can understand why certain structures were built, why they 'looked' as they did, and why Rationalist architecture was acceptable to Italy's Fascist government when it was rejected elsewhere."

Abigail Solomon-Godeau

The publication in France of La Chambre Claire (entitled Camera Lucida in its English translation) just over two years ago was almost immediately followed by Roland Barthes' death. At the age of 64, he was struck down by a laundry van while crossing the rue des Écoles. Reading this last elegant work of his, which is as much a meditation on mortality as on photography, one cannot help being struck by those passages dealing with his adored mother's recent death, in which he resigns himself to his own: "The horror is this: nothing to say about the death of one whom I love most, nothing to say about her photograph, which I contemplate without ever being able to get to the heart of it, to transform it. The only thought? 'I have no cause that at the end of the first death, my own is inscribed; between the two, nothing more than waiting. I have no resources than this irony, to speak of the "nothing to say."' (p. 93)

Part One of Camera Lucida is in certain respects recognizably linked to the semiotic examination of photography Barthes first launched in "Photography and Electoral Appeal" (Mythologies, Hill & Wang, 1977) and elaborated later in "The Photographic Message," "The Rhetoric of the Image," and "The Third Meaning" (all reprinted in Image-Music-Text, Hill & Wang, 1977). The second part of the text—elegies, sonnets, almost shockingly personal, coming from a writer such as Barthes—is more than any other of his works informed and inflicted by his reading of Proust. Specifically, the extended metaphor of an unobtrusive photograph that forms the core of Part Two of Camera Lucida echoes and alludes to Proust's Narrator's episophous contemplation of the photograph of his grandmother; a photograph of little meaning while she lives, but suffused with significance after her death.

That allusions to Remembrance of Things Past should resonate in the pages of Camera Lucida is not surprising or unexpected. Barthes' last lectures at the College de France were devoted to Proust (and included a lecture on Proust and photography), and Remembrance Figures in Barthes' writing as a type of literary scream, a textual point of eternal return, which Barthes elsewhere described as "the reference work, the general mathesis, the mandala of the entire literature," Camera Lucida, evidently written in a state of absolute mourning ("I could live without the Mother [as we all do sooner or later], but what life remained would be absolutely and entirely unqualifiable [without quality]", during a period in which Barthes was deeply immersed in Proust, marks, as he himself puts it early on, "a desperate resistance to any reductive system."

For Barthes, as for Proust, the ultimate significance of the photograph is "the rather terrible thing there is in every photograph the return of the dead." This spectral aspect of photography has been perceived and acknowledged since the nineteenth century: the vogue for deathbed portraits, the fin-de-siècle trafficking in "spirit photography," as well as the more banal recognition that the dead, who once led us a terrestrial and a terrestrial-lifed death, have been recurring motifs in photographic commentary. Walter Benjamin observed of certain photographs by Hill and Adamsen taken in the Edinburgh cemetery of Greyfriars that it was as if the models were at home in the cemetery; a writer closer to our time, Susan Sontag, has written of Peter Hujar's photographs in precisely this context. In "The Rhetoric of the Image," Barthes had theorized that far from being simply a new picture-making technology in a continuum of image-making, the invention of photography signaled "a decisive mutation in informational economies," an anthropological revolution in man's history; "a new space-time category: spatial immediacy and temporal anteriority," which Barthes termed the "having-been-there," a notion that reenters in Camera Lucida as the "ths-has-been." In Camera Lucida Barthes locates this new anthropological space in death: "Death must be somewhere in a society: if it is no longer (or less intensely) in religion, it must be elsewhere; perhaps in this image which produces Death while trying to preserve life... With the photograph we enter in flat Death..." "Death," says Barthes unequivocally, "is the echo of the Photograph." Camera Lucida thus represents in certain respects a continuation and elaboration of Barthes' thinking about photography, and in other ways a departure from, or possibly even a rearticulation of the earlier essays. This is no doubt why much of the critical discussion of the book—particularly that coming from photography critics—reflects a collective uncertainty about precisely what Barthes intended to accomplish in these seemingly ontological reflections on photography. To the degree that these reflections represent a departure from, or perhaps the key may be found in the third essay, which culminates in Barthes' resolve to distill the fundamental feature, the unifying and universal essence that constitutes all photography:

Then I decided that this disorder and this dilemma, revealed by my desire to write an Photography corresponds to a discomfort that I had always suffered from: the awareness of being a subject torn between two languages, one expressive, the other critical, and at the heart of this critical language, between several discourses, those of sociology of semiotics and of psychoanalysis — but that, by ultimate disaffection with all of them, I was bearing witness to the only true thing that was in me (however naive it might be): a desperate resistance to any reductive system... It was better once and for all, to make my protestation of singularity into a virtue—to try making what Nietzsche called the "ego's ancient sovereignty" into an heuristic principle. So I resolved to start my inquiry with no more than a few photographs, the ones I was sure existed for me. Nothing to do with a corpus: only some bodies. (p. 8)

The constant opposition between critical and expressive languages is, of course, one of the most distinctive qualities of Barthes' writing. Encyclopedic and elliptical, erudite and conversational, simultaneously weighty and light, Barthes is at once the most utterly of critics and the most critical of writers. To attempt to define the peculiarly erudite voice of he who dispatched the very notion of such an entity is to risk making oneself ridiculous. In any case, Barthes has already described his own writing in—appropriately enough—his own biography. By insisting on the principle of subjectivity as the a priori of his photographic inquiry and by staking to distill all photography from those pictures imbued with personal meaning, he is at liberty to roam freely between such bodies as André Kertész and Robert Mapplethorpe (both having pride of place in terms of the number of references to them in the book) Richard Avedon and the Dutch photographer Koen Wessing; James Van Der Zee and Nadar, to name just a sampling. For the notion of a photographic aesthetics, much less that of individual style, plays no part in Barthes' thinking on the subject.
"Camera Lucida represents a continuation and elaboration of Barthes' thinking about photography, and a departure from, or possibly even a recantation of the earlier essays."


among those already capable of criticism," and so on. But perhaps the most significant carry-over, which forms the kernel of Part One, is Barthes' formulation of the twin rhetorical devices studium and punctum. Related, but by no means identical to Barthes' notion of denoted and connoted meaning, at least one belletristic critic has recently gamboled through the fields of photography welding studiums and puncta into as many wild-eyed swards. As Barthes has it, the studium consists of the cultural/social/historical components of the photograph, all those elements of the image that can be named, known, read. All photographs are thus endowed with the studium; the repository of all the photograph's functions that are sought out and received by the spectator. In contrast, the punctum, possessed by only certain photographs, is that which breaks out of, punctuates the studium, what Barthes describes as "this element that rises from the scene, shoots out of it like an arrow, and pierces me." Studium and punctum are clearly reminiscent of the concepts of obvious and obtuse meaning Barthes articulated with respect to the Eisenstein film stills. There he postulated that the obvious meaning (from the Latin obvious)—that which comes ahead, comprising the informational and the symbolic—is the terrain on which significance and signification are mapped out. The obtuse meaning (again from the Latin obtusus)—that which is blunted, rounded in form—comprises a third, supplementary meaning, and is that part of the image which carries an emotional charge and, in his earlier discussions of photography, the primary issue for Barthes was that of significance: how does the photograph signify, or produce meaning? how is it read? what are the structural mechanisms that both determine and yield that meaning? The photograph, like any other cultural artifact, and notwithstanding its status as "perfect analogon" of reality, was seen by Barthes as constituting a complex sign system that could be apprehended semiotically. That the photograph—a product of culture—should be generally perceived as a product of nature placed it for Barthes squarely within the domain of contemporary mythologies.

But Barthes reasoned that, unlike most other cultural sign systems, the relation between the photographic signifier (what is literally within the frame) and the photographic signified (the aggregate meanings the viewer receives from the image) underwent no mediating transformation, no institutional coding; that it was, indeed, quasi-linguistic; hence the now-classic formulation of the photograph as constituting a message without a code. Within the space of the photographic message Barthes distinguished two rhetorical systems: the denoted meaning, which appears to deliver only its literal contents, and a connoted meaning, which comprises the domain of the ideological.

"Signification," Barthes wrote in "The Rhetoric of the Image," "is the dialectical movement that resolves the contradiction between cultural and natural man." It thus follows that "thanks to its code of communication the reading of the photograph is thus always historical; it depends on a readership, on knowledge; just as though it were a matter of a real language, intelligible only if one has learned the signs." The three types of photographic imagery Barthes used as both touchstones and exemplars for those latter analyses were, respectively, the press photo (generally perceived as purely transcriptive, unmediated, transparent); the advertising photo ("Because in advertising the significance of the image is undoubtcdly intentional and those significats have to be transmitted as clearly as possible"); and some stills from films by Sergei Eisenstein.

While not exactly jettisoning any of the previous conclusions, Camera Lucida, taken in its entirety, is less concerned with the semantics of photography than with a kind of personal lexicon of photographic meaning, and, ultimately, an "ontology" of the photograph. To be sure, there are allusions, continuations, recapitulations of the previous essays (Barthes never fails to repeat himself), Baudelaire's remark on "the emphatic truth of gesture in the important moments of life," which Barthes used to characterize an Eisenstein still, serves in Camera Lucida to describe an unproduced photograph of tragedy in Nicaragua by Koen Wessing: the "that-has-been" echoes the "having-been-there." The weakness of photography as politically effective critique (this apropos of August Sander) is also reiterated ("no critique except


Far from being tools forged for deconstructive purposes, as were so many of Barthes' earlier rhetorical devices, punctum and studium represent almost a withdrawal from the field; instead of a demythologizing impulse, Barthes is here undertaking to interrogate the image for its private, rather than public meanings. When the notion of punctum reappears in Part Two, however, it is given a somewhat different sense. Regarding an 1865 photograph by Alexander Gardner of the young Lewis Payne about to be hanged for his assassination attempt on Secretary of State Seward, Barthes observes:

But the punctum is... he is going to die. I read at the same time this will be and this has been; I observe with horror on anterior future of which death is the stake. By giving me the absolute past of the face transfigured, the photograph tells me of death in the future. What preys me is the discovery of this equanimity. In front of the photograph of my mother as a child, I tell myself she is going to die. I shudder, like Winslow's psychotic patient, over a catastrophe which has already occurred. Whether or not the subject is already dead, every photograph is this catastrophe. (p. 96)

Inasmuch as every photograph is a "certificate of presence," a ratification of the "that-has-been" before the lens of the camera, every photograph constitutes a unique superimposition of present and past reality. It is here that Barthes locates the object of his search: the essence of the photograph, revealed in his search for the essential photograph of his mother. Camera Lucida is the chronicle of these twin quest: a backward and circular voyage—as was Proust's—to recover what would otherwise be lost to time. Having rejected, in the final analysis, a phenomenology of the photographic image (Camera Lucida is, in fact, dedicated to Jean-Paul Sartre's L'Imaginaire, a phenomenology of the image), Barthes offers an ontology—a theory of essence.

Running throughout the essays, particularly those in Part One, are what one is tempted to call "typically Barthesian observations": on photography in general; on specific photographs; on distinctions between the photographically erotic and the photographically pornographic. The highly condensed and elliptical form of Barthes' writing charges even the most causal-seeming observations with pyrotechnical dazzle and intensity. Confronting what he had earlier termed an "unclassifiable" type of cultural object, Barthes returned to the photograph to elicit its private meanings, as he had previously worked to elicit its public ones.

It is this intense scrutiny of Barthes' own subjectivity that makes Camera Lucida so different from his earlier essays on photography, where the presiding impulse was deconstructive—to unmask, to reveal, to denaturalize. Camera Lucida in no way presents itself as a critical system; indeed, systems were what Barthes consistently sought to oppose. Camera Lucida—lysimorphic, speculative, refusing convenient categorization—is thus an apt and salutary legacy. The sense of loss, of melancholy, that pervades Camera Lucida never diminishes the eloquence of the writing or the brilliance of the intelligence.
**Events**

**Boston/Cambridge**

**Harvard Lectures**
- March 9 Charles Moore, "Two Agendas" March 16 Moira Saffo, "Contest" March 23 Robert Boynton, "Design and Community." 3:30 pm, Piper Auditorium, Gund Hall, Harvard (617) 495-2391

**Charlottesville**

U.V.A. Lectures
- March 8 Francois Chope March 25 Barton Myers April 1 Charles Jereck April 12 Vincent Scully 8:15 pm, Campbell Hall, Room 153, Department of Architecture, U.V.A. (804) 924-0311

**Houston**

Rice Design Alliance Lectures
- Series on "Landscape Architecture and Urban America" March 24 Grady Clay March 31 Elizabeth Baro April 7 Ian McHarg (Series continues through the end of April) 8 pm, Brown Auditorium, Museum of Fine Arts, Houston (713) 527-5876

**Ithaca**

Cornell Lectures
- March 9 Haig Beck March 16 Bernard Fiedler March 18 Jorgen Swada April 6 Janis Strifling April 23 Julian de la Fuente. Exact times and locations to be arranged: School of Architecture, Cornell University; (607) 255-3206

**Los Angeles**

SCI-ARC
- March 3 Robert Marquis March 10 Sam Davis March 11 Bob Wellington Quigley April 7 Raymond Kippe April 14 Glen Small, 8 pm, Studio/ Auditorium, California Institute of Architecture (213) 852-3462

UCLA
- March 4 Ann Markussen, "Is There a New Regionalism?" The Loshapodi Sunbesh-Frost Belt Debate," 5:30 pm March 11 Esther McCoy, "Gregory Ain," 8:00 pm March 18 Susan Oliver, "Urban Crime: Tighten Your Belts, Bite the Bullet." 8 pm, Room 1002, School of Architecture, UCLA; (213) 255-3752

**Miami**

Architecture Club of Miami
- March 26 Marc Treib, "The Rationalization of Nature." 6:30 pm, Douglas Entrance, Coral Gables (305) 358-0381

**New Haven**

Yale Lecture Series
- March 2 William Turnbull March 30 Christian Otto April 6 Gerhard Kallmann April 13 Giuseppe Zambonini 6 pm, Hastings Hall, Yale School of Architecture, 100 York Street; (203) 436-0853

Architecture Film and Tour
- March 27, April 24 a showing of the film Louis J. Kahn, narrated by Vincent Scully 11 am, Lecture Hall, First Floor, followed by a discussion and tour of the Yale Center for British Art at 11:30 am. Yale Center for British Art, 1080 Chapel Street; (203) 432-4394

**New Orleans**

Tulane Talks

**New York City**

**Women and the Environment Symposium**

**Film Series**
- March 2 Full of Life (1957), The Finishing Touch (1927) March 9 Presence (1969), L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui (1933) March 16 Metropolis (1926), Manhatten (1921), 6:15 pm, Cooper-Hewitt, 2 East 91 Street; $3.50 members, $4.00 nonmembers; (212) 860-6600

**Forums on Form**

**Wednesday Lectures at Columbia**
- March 7: Merrill Pratt, "Games Architecture Play" March 10 Tour of the Library, "Cities and Planning in China" March 24 Richard Flinn, "Projects with Students Since 1967" March 31 Gwendolyn Wright, "Politics of Housing in the 1970s" April 7 James Tread (topic to be announced) 6 pm, Wood Auditorium, Avery Hall, Columbia; (212) 852-3414

**Open Atelier of Design Spring Lecture**

**Emerging Voices**
- March 9, 16, 23, 30, April 6, 13, 20 Presentations by a cross section of young, up-and-coming architects. March 9 John C. Sabinian, Dami Samuelis, and Robert H. Timme of Taft Architects; David McCloud of Friday Architects/ Planners March 16 George Rallali, Todd Williams March 23 Steven Holl, Larry Vinnell March 30 Frank Saluss, Istanbul Torre, (Series continues through April) 6:30 pm, Architectural League, Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue; (212) 718-3733. Free to members, $5 nonmembers

**Mathews Lectures / Columbia**
- March 9, 25, 30, April 13, 20 Series on "The Gothic Revival in France" by Neil Levine, professor of fine arts, Harvard University, Wood Auditorium, Avery Hall, Columbia; (617) 495-2591

**Artists and Architects: Humanism Rediscovered**
- March 27 Conference sponsored by AIA Committee on Design and the Skowhegan School at the New School for Social Research; 9:30 am--4:30 pm. Admission $25 general, $15 students. Call (212) 861-9270 for speakers

**Philadelphia**

University of Pennsylvania Lectures
- March 3 Sydney Goodman March 24 Aldo Van Eyck March 31 Fy Jones, Department of Architecture, University of Pennsylvania. All lectures are at 6:30 pm. For room assignments call (215) 243-5000

**Robert Geddes**

March 12 illustrated lecture by Princeton Dean Robert Geddes in conjunction with the show "Robert Geddes: The Forest Edge" at the AIA, 8 pm, Art Alliance, 251 South 18th Street; (215) 569-3186

**Princeton**

Princeton Lectures

**St. Paul**

Lecture Series / Minnesota Museum of Art
- March 5 H. Alfred Brooks, "The Prairie School and Sinclair Lewis: Wright, Griffin and the Architecture of Main Street" March 18 H. Frederick Koerner, "Sullivan Viewed in Relation to European Style and Movements: Such As Art Nouveau and the Vienna Secession" March 17 John H. Howe, "Prairie School Architecture: The Chicago Years" After 1925" March 24 David Gebhard, "Parcell and Elsmuse's Unbuilt Works in Minneapolis" St. Paul; 8 pm, Frederick King Weyerhauser Auditorium, Landmark Center, St. Paul; (612) 724-7631

**San Francisco/Bay Area**

Berkeley Lectures
- March 5 Leah Baus, "Park City: An Environment in Transition" March 10 Daniel Solomon, "Grids on the Port of St. Francis," Department of Architecture, U.C. Berkeley, 8 pm; (415) 442-4942. (Lecture rooms vary, call for specifics)

**Spring**

Syracuse Lectures / Syracuse University

**Washington, D.C.**

Modern Questions: Post-Modern Answers
- March 10 Bonaldo Giorgi March 24 John Blattoe March 31 Paul Rudolph April 7 Alan Chimacoff April 14 Charles Curney, April 21 David Schwartz. 7:30 pm, Nursing Auditorium, Catholic University. (202) 355-5188

**The Genius of British Architecture**
- March 27 Symposium with lectures by David Durant on Inigo Jones and the English Renaissance; Christopher Wren and the Baroque; Lord Burlington and the Palladianism: Camminati Auditorium, American History Building. 10 am--5:30 pm; members $30, nonmembers $40. Smithsonian Resident Associate Program; (202) 357-3000

**Montreal**

Alex Lecture Series
- March 2 Susan Dooly, "A Critical Overview" March 9 Leon Krier on his work March 16 Kurt Forster, "Karl Friedrich Schinkel" March 30 Michael Welford on his work April 6 Sir Peter Shepheard "Light, Water, Architecture, and Landscape." 6 pm, Maclean Building, McGill University; (514) 392-5469
Exhibits

Boston/ Cambridge

Charles Moore
Through March 12 Works from 1966 to the present. Harvard Graduate School of Design; (617) 495-5684

Moshe Safdie
March 15-27 "Context," an exhibition of Safdie's recent work. Harvard Graduate School of Design; (617) 495-5684

Chicago

Edward H. Bennett, Architect and City Planner
March 4-July 14 Architectural drawings, documents, and sculptures from Chicago Beautiful Movement. A catalogue by Joaan Draper of the U. Illinois, Chicago Circle will be available. Lectures are also planned. Art Institute of Chicago, Michigan Avenue at Adams Street; (312) 443-3625

Houston

Le Corbusier's Firmy Church
March 10-April 1 Sketches and models for the church at Firmy, Firany, Gallery Anderson Hall, Rice School of Architecture; (713) 527-9684

Los Angeles

SCI-ARC
March 1-29 Architectural Projects. Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning, UCLA; (213) 825-5752

Minneapolis

De Stijl, 1917-1931: Visions of Utopia
March 10-April 28 Paintings, drawings, architectural models, furniture and graphic designs by the de Stijl artists. A 256-page book with 12 essays has been published by Ashbee Press to coincide with the exhibition. Walker Art Center, Vineyard Place; (612) 375-7600

New Haven

James Gamble Rogers' Drawings for Yale, 1913-35 Through April 20 70 drawings by the artist who did the most to give Yale its Neo-Gothic look. Yale University Art Gallery, 111 Chapel Street; (203) 436-8982

New York City

Stanley Tigerman
March 2-27 Architectural drawings. Rosia Examan Gallery, 29 West 57th Street; (212) 621-9490

Landmarks that Aren't
Through March 11 Photo exhibit of outstanding buildings in New York City that do not yet have landmark status. Urban Center, 457 Madison Avenue; (212) 980-1297

Rem Koolhaas / Elia Zenghelis
March 13-April 3 Project drawings and models, 1972-82. Max Protetch Gallery, 37 West 57th Street; (212) 838-7436

Evelyn Hofer
Through March 13 Photographs, including images from Stones of Florence, New York Presidium, Dublin, and London. Pericon, Wiktin Gallery, 41 East 77th Street; (212) 353-1601

U.D.C.
March 13-April 2 Exhibition of work by the Urban Development Corporation. Avery Hall, Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture and Planning. 118th Street and Amsterdam Avenue; (212) 320-3414

OMA Exhibit at IALUS
March 17-May 22 Models, sketches, and photomontages of 37 buildings. On view by the Office for Metropolitan Architecture. Projects by Rem Koolhaas and Elia Zenghelis include two from the Internationale Bauausstellung in Berlin, as well as one each from Rotterdam and Amsterdam. Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 8 West 40th Street; (212) 998-9474

Architecture 1: Leeben Woods
Through March 14 Drawings about four cities based on earth, air, fire, and water. Network Gallery, 59 Greene Street, (212) 411-6500

Vienna Workshop
March 11-14 A small exhibition of frailies, embroidery designs, and graphics from the Wiener Werkstatte, a creative source for Art Nouveau and Art Deco founded by architects Joseph Hoffman and Koloman Moser. Austrian Institute, 11 East 52nd Street; (212) 539-5165

St. Bartholomew's: An Update
March 14-April 14 Documentation, including photographs illustrating the background and the latest on the St. Bart's site. Municipal Art Society, Urban Center, 427 Park Avenue, architects, including work by Louis Kahn, Richard Meier, Tony Garnier, and Frank Lloyd Wright. Spacel Gallery of Architecture, 165 West 72nd Street; (212) 787-6350

Cast-Iron in Central Park
Through March 31 Drawings, restoration documents, and photographs of cast-iron structures in the park. The Central Park, 6th Central Park East, between the Zoo and the Carousel; (212) 360-8144 for information

Manhattan Observed: Fourteen Photographers
Look at New York
Through March 31 Photographs of the changing architectural composition of the city, New-York Historical Society, 170 Central Park West; (212) 873-3300

Robert Adam and His Style
Through April 11 Drawings, furniture, and silver by this celebrated Scottish architect and his circle. Cooper-Hewitt Museum, 2 East 91st Street; (212) 890-6066

Preservation in Progress: The Seaport District
Through April 18 An exhibit illustrating the philosophy and technology of the architectural preservation underway at the South Street Seaport, South Street Seaport, 215 Water Street; (212) 776-9020

Architectural Fantasy and Reality
Through May 9 Drawings form the late-17th to mid-18th century as entries for the annual architectural competition at the National Academy of St. Luke in Rome. Cooper-Hewitt, 2 East 91st Street; (212) 890-6066

Philadelphia

Robert Goodspeed: The Forest Edge
March 19-April 30 An exhibition on the connections between landscape, cities, and buildings as seen by artist, architect, and New York architect Robert Goodspeed. Brecher, Qualis & Cunningham. Sponsored by the Fund for Architecture, AIA Doutyantat Gallery, 117 South 17th Street; (212) 259-3186
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Princeton

March 9-April 29 An exhibit of recent work by Rafael Moneo. March 16-May 15 Laurence Vincognition, "On the Theme of the Courtyard: An Architectural Research For Southwest Texas." Princeton University School of Architecture, (609) 253-3571

Purchase

Robert A.M. Stern: Tradition of the New March 28-June 20 Drawings and models emphasizing the invational nature of classical and vernacular traditions into an architectural vocabulary for the present. Neuberger Museum, SUNY, College at Purchase; (914) 253-5575

St. Louis

The City in the 1900s
Through March 14 An exhibit on the city's architectural heritage from 1803-1891. Washington University, Gallery of Art, Steinberg Hall; (314) 935-2355

St. Paul

Prairie School in Minnesota, Iowa & Wisconsin Through April 10 Photographs, drawings, furniture, stained glass, and decorative objects designed by Louis Sullivan, Walter Burley Griffin, Marion Mahoney, Perry Wright Benedict, and Frank Lloyd Wright. Minnesota Museum of Art, Landmark Center, 75 West 5th Street, (612) 224-7431

Seattle

James Turrell
Through July 28 Light environments in carefully controlled architectural space. Lippy Building, 108 First Avenue South; (206) 624-7096

Washington, D.C.

P.B. Wright
March 2-May 24 26 drawings by the Art Institute of Chicago by the architect who helped establish the High Victorian Style in America. AIA, The Octagon, 1799 New York Avenue N.W.; (202) 338-3105

Naples, Italy

New New Architecture Chicago
Through March 21 Eleven photographs, and original drawings of works by 15 "new" Chicago architects — Thomas Beeby, Laurence Booth, Stuart Cohen, Deborah Doyle, James Goetsch, Gerald Nagle, Anders Nereim, Peter Pran, Robert Roekke, James Nagle, Andrea Regnery, Peter Pran, Kenneth Schroeder, John Syvertsen, Stanley Tigerman, and Ben Weese. Museo di Castell dell'Ovo


In Eleni Constantine's review of Land by Peter Wolf (February issue, page 33) a sentence that read "For example, . . . the exercise of 'police power' with transferable development rights taken:' should have read: "... the exercise of 'police power' with transferable development rights provide a form of compensation for the development rights taken."

Editorial offices: Skywalker, 8 West 40th Street, New York, New York 10018 (212) 590-9474

Changes of address, subscription, sales, and advertising inquiries should be sent to Hearst Communications, Inc., 27th Floor, New York, New York 10010
Subscribe to Skyline!
One year: $20 ($50 overseas)
Two years: $35 ($95 overseas)

Subscriptions payable in advance, U.S. currency. Send check or money order to: Rizzoli Communications Inc. 712 Fifth Avenue, New York N.Y. 10019 attn: Leo Cueco
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Elaine Lustig Cohen
March 5 to March 27 Boxes and Collages

JANUS GALLERY
8000 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90046

URBAN CENTER BOOKS presents

FORUMS ON FORM

A series of Wednesday lunch time lectures by authors of recently published books on the built environment.

March 2 Ronald Lee Fleming and Renata von Tschabner

March 9 Lester Walker

March 17 David Naylor

March 24 Kenneth Frampton

March 31 Gerald Allen and Richard Oliver

April 7 Peter Wolf

April 11 James Marriott Fitch

April 21 Michael Graves

April 28 Jonathan Barnett
AN INTRODUCTION TO URBAN DESIGN, Harper & Row, Lecture Introduction, Peter Eisenman.

All lectures begin at 12:30 pm

URBAN CENTER BOOKS is a not-for-profit bookstore, established by The Municipal Art Society of New York in cooperation with the J.M. Kaplan Fund. The store specializes in Architecture, Design, Urban Planning and Historic Preservation. It is located in the north wing of the Vilhun Houses.

457 Madison Avenue, at 51st Street
New York, N.Y. 10022 212/845 3505

Just Published, a Handsome Tribute to the Work of Robert A. M. Stern

This is the first comprehensive monograph on Robert Stern, recognized by many critics as the leading Post-Modern architect in America. An unusually handsome book, it discusses and illustrates more than 60 projects, revealing Stern's delight in designing buildings that call to mind the accumulated traditions of Western culture. Among the projects are several homes on Long Island that blend the "Shingle Style" of seaside architecture with Modern interiors; the facade for the Venice Biennale, reminiscent of a Greek Temple; and the Lang Residence in Connecticut, which Stern describes as "a neo-Palladian Regency Art Deco farmhouse!" The book is a valuable record of the achievement of the leading exponent of stylish freedom in architecture and an inspiration for interior designers, architects, and everyone concerned with our environment.


Robert Stern
Edited by Peter Arnell and Ted Bickford
256 pages * 498 illustrations with 188 in color
Hardcover: $45 Paperback $29.95

At all fine bookstores, or write

RIZZOLI
NEW YORK
712 Fifth Avenue, New York 10019

The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies
8 West 40th Street, New York, New York 10018
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