Gerald D. Hines: America’s Developer

Current projects being developed by Gerald D. Hines Interests.
Top row: Southeast Financial Center, Miami; Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Architects; RepublicBank Center, Houston; Philip Johnson and John Burgee, Architects; Transco, Houston; Philip Johnson and John Burgee, Architects. Bottom row: Huntington Center, Columbus, Ohio; Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Architects; Texas Commerce Towers, Houston; I. M. Pei & Partners, Architects; completed 1982

Photograph of Gerald D. Hines by Dorothy Alexander
FORMICA CORPORATION INVITES YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN REVOLUTIONIZING AN INDUSTRY.

A CALL FOR ENTRIES IN THE 1983 COLORCORE "SURFACE AND ORNAMENT" DESIGN COMPETITION.

COLORCORE™ laminate is a revolutionary new surfacing material from Formica Corporation. It is the first laminate with integral solid color. This breakthrough feature eliminates the dark line associated with laminate applications where edges meet. It also makes possible unique dimensional and graphic effects through routing channels which remain the same color as the surface.

THE CHALLENGE
"Surface and Ornament" is a two-part competition inviting the design community to explore the potential of COLORCORE. Over $80,000 in prizes will be awarded.

PART I (CONCEPTUAL): Open to all professional architects, designers and students, to design an object no larger than 4" x 4" x 4" (or equivalent volume) surfaced with COLORCORE. Prizes are as follows: Professionals—1st Prize $10,000; 2nd Prize $5,000; 3rd Prize $2,000; 4th Prize $1,000. Students—1st Prize $5,000 plus a $5,000 contribution to the student's school.

Citations will also be awarded.

Scale models of winning entries will be built and exhibited at NEOCON, along with invited designs by the following prominent designers and architects: Emilio Ambasz, Ward Bennett, Frank Gehry, Milton Glaser, Helmut Jahn, Charles W. Moore, Stanley Tigerman, Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown, Massimo and Lella Vignelli, James Wines/SITE Inc. Publication of the designs and a traveling exhibit of winning projects are also planned.

See full details for Part I below.

PART II (BUILT): Open to professional designers for executed room applications utilizing COLORCORE. Current projects are eligible. Prizes are as follows: In each of three categories, 1st Prizes of $15,000 and 2nd Prizes of $5,000. Citations will also be awarded. Judging will take place March 15, 1984. For deadlines and full details for Part II, please write Formica Corporation.

To maintain anonymity, no identification of the entrant may appear on any part of the submission, except on one 3" x 5" index card which must be sealed in an envelope labelled with the entrant's pseudonym and attached to the back of the foam board. Information on the sealed card must include entrant's pseudonym, name, address and phone number.

*Colors must be limited to 12 COLORCORE colorways. For free samples, call toll-free number, (800) 543-3000. Ask for Operator #375. In Ohio call: (800) 582-3969. Entries are strongly urged to call for samples to fully appreciate the implications of this revolutionary new material. Address entries or requests for information to: COLORCORE "Surface and Ornament" Competition, Formica Corporation, One Cyanamid Plaza, Wayne, NJ 07670.

COLORCORE™ is a trademark of Formica Corporation. © 1982 Formica Corporation.
New Fall paperbacks

The Grand Domestic Revolution
A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities
by Dolores Hayden
384 pp. 123 illus. $9.95

Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century
Ebenzer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier
by Robert Fishman
384 pp. 62 illus. $8.95

The Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright
A Complete Catalog. Second Edition
by William Allin Storrer
464 pp. illus., maps $9.95

Complicity and Conviction
Steps Toward an Architecture of Convention
by William Hubbard
272 pp. 54 illus. $8.95

The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa and Other Essays
by Colin Rowe
240 pp. 83 illus. $8.95

Le Corbusier
Elements of a Synthesis
by Stanislaus von Moos
382 pp. 230 illus. $9.95

At your bookstore or order directly from
28 Carleton Street
Cambridge, MA 02142

Skyline

The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies

Tenets
Armand P. Bartos, Honorary Chairman
A. Bruce Beccarnebridge, Chairman
Charles Gwaltney, Vice Chairman
Peter O. Eiermann, Vice Chairman
John Burger
Galen Cogger
Henry Cobb
Frank O. Gehry
Gerald D. Hines
Atsuo Iastsuki
Eli S. Jacobs
Philip Johnson
Paul Korzen
Phyllis Lambert
Edward J. Logue
Gerald M. McCue
Gus Pelli & Associates
Jacqueline Robertson
Kevin Roche
Amanda M. Ross
Alde Rossi
Paul Rudolph
Edward L. Saxe
Carl E. Schroen
James Stirling
Frederique S. Taylor
Massimo Vignelli
John F. White
Peter Wolf

Fellows
Diana Agret
Deborah Berke
Julia Bloomfield
Joan Cooper
Dougill Crimp
Peter D. Eisenman
Kenneth Frampton, Chairman
Susanne Frank
Mario Gandelsonas
Christian Habert
Silvia Kolbowski
Rosamund Krauss
Lawrence Krukki
Annette Michelson
Joan Ockman
Stephen Potter
Linda Shugiu
Robert Sloman
Carla Skodimki
Anthony Vailier
Peter Wolf

Officers
Edward L. Saxe, President
Kenneth Frampton, Director of Programs
Edith L. Morrill, Director of Administration and Development
Barry Goldberg, Development Officer
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Notes on Contributors
Martin Filler is editor of House & Garden and frequently writes criticism on architecture and design for a number of other publications.
Joseph Giovanni, architectural critic for the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, has also written for The New York Times and other publications.
Barbara Jakaboff is director of exhibitions at The Lobby. Under her pen name, R.L. Archer, she was editor of the catalogue and curator of the exhibit "Houses for Sale" at the Castelli Gallery in 1980.
Helene Lipstall, who trained as a social historian and anthropologist, writes frequently on architectural history.
Richard Rose, who works for Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, taught for four years at the University of Oklahoma.
Barzel Schrammfoot has returned to her hut in the Oberwald where she is working on a dissertation at the Technische Hochschule, Charolston with the provisional title: "Eine Analyse der Sprache der Architekturkritikern Werner Hegeman während der Zeit seiner Heranwachsens von Warsofisches Monatliche für Baukunst unter besonder Berücksichtigung rhythmischer Analogien zwischen Sprache und Architektur."
Simone Swan is writer, designer, and organizer of public information for art and architecture events and institutions.
Carol Willis is writing a dissertation at Columbia University on the American idea of the city in the 1920s and 30s. She will be a contributor to the book Past Visions: Essays on the History of American Futurism (MIT Press).
Stuart Wrede is a Finnish architect now practicing in Connecticut. He has translated the writings of Alvar Alto and written a book on Gunnar Asplund, both for MIT Press. He is currently teaching at Yale and Columbia.
Gwendolyne Wright, an architectural historian, is author of Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America.

The Architectural League

437 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10017 (212) 758-7022

October 9: 6-8pm View of the Century
Cathedral Traditions

October 16: 6-8pm The Architecture of Display: Showrooms
Panel discussion with Paul Hugel, Edward Millie, Robert M. Stern, Elia and Maxim Vignelli, and James Wines with C. Ray Smith in moderation

October 19 and 26, November 2: 6-8pm Art and Architecture: Viewing with Desire
Lecture series by Germano Celant

Address contributions for students, $3.00 for non-members. Members are encouraged to contact the League for further information. These events are made possible with public funds from the New York State Council on the Arts.

THE MIT PRESS
While You Were Away:

- The disputed River Walk project (see Skyline, May 1982, p. 5), planned for the East River between 36th and 38th Streets, the United Nations Development Corp. (UNDC) is considering putting up two 24-story towers containing 400 apartments that would be occupied primarily by U.N. personnel. While the agency is being close-mouthed about its plans, it has been meeting with city officials and community leaders to gain support for state legislation allowing construction of the new housing. The project is being watched closely by the U.N. itself, who wants to make sure that the public will have access to the waterfront.

The UNDC, a little-known quasi-public corporation, gets into hot water shortly after it was set up in the late 1960s with strong support from Governor Nelson Rockefeller. With city-state backing, the corporation proposed to build the UNDC’s headquarters, a 120-story tower for use as a speculative commercial/residential venture. Angered over the planned disfranchisement of hundreds of residents and business people, community activists defeated the plan, and the UNDC put up only the U.N. Plaza Hotel at First Avenue and 44th Street. Currently, additional hotel/office space is under construction adjacent to the U.N. Plaza Hotel, and the UNDC may build more office space in the future across the street, on the south side of 44th Street.

- The planned dislocation of hundreds of residents to bulldoze the waterfront is being opposed by the city-state backing, which appears to be easing up. The city’s Community Board 6, on the other hand, will oppose the project unless it meets its community's demands.

- The project will be presented to the community board, which is meeting this month to discuss the project. The community board is expected to vote on the project at its next meeting. The project is expected to generate millions of dollars in revenue. Critics, including Municipal Art Society director Margaret Welling, who sits on the task force, warn that the proposed sales could open up a Pandora’s box of problems in the absence of any comprehensive policy, while supporters say the project will help to revitalize the waterfront.

- The Koch Administration is moving toward a precedent-setting sale of air rights over city-owned properties (see Skyline, April 1982, p. 4). Despite vehement disagreement from civic and community group representatives on a special task force set up by City Hall, the Administration is seeking to allow developers to bid for air rights over two midtown properties — a firehouse at Eighth Avenue and 44th Street and a transit subway at 126 West 33rd Street. The city argues that such sales permitting construction over lowrise city buildings or on adjacent sites will

The twin residential towers under discussion would be built on landfill or platforms between 36th and 38th Streets. There is, however, could convince the East Side’s state legislative representatives to block the project, which is why the UNDC is courting the community board. Joana Battaglia, who heads Board 6’s waterfront committee, says the group’s main concern is that the project must not isolate the public from the river. Board 6 is trying to get a walkway constructed east of the FDR Drive from 51st to 42nd Streets, and it wants this promenade to continue south of 42nd Street. “We don’t want an isolated residential island between 36th and 38th Streets,” says Battaglia. “We don’t want the security demands of the U.N. community to preempt public access to the waterfront. When they can work out a design that gives us public access, then we’ll talk about the legislation they need.”

Thomas Appleby, director of the UNDC, which sells tax-exempt bonds to finance its projects, said there was “only very preliminary thinking” about the new housing. “I don’t know if it will ever happen or not,” he said. If it is built, according to Appleby, the housing will not be restricted solely to U.N. personnel.
Lincoln West Goes Ahead

The final decision came in the wee hours of the morning of September 17. After two years of debate, months of hearings and negotiations, and frantic last-minute lobbying, the much-criticized $1 billion Lincoln West plan for luxury housing on the West Side won Board of Estimate approval by a vote of 10 to 1. The vote was hardly a surprise, given Mayor Koch's vigorous support of the project. But two big questions still remain: Whether the developer's finances are as firm as they have said, and whether city officials will seek to stop the project through a lawsuit. The opponents have hired the same law firm that helped block Westway to study whether Lincoln West would be a different matter.

Regardless of whether Lincoln West is eventually built, the long process that culminated in last month's favorable Board of Estimate vote was illuminating. It demonstrated once again the intertwining of politics and real estate in New York, and it showed what wields power in the city on major planning issues. The Lincoln West controversy also emphasized the declining prestige of the City Planning Commission and its chairman, Herbert Staut, as the agency's work came under sharp criticism.

The mammoth Lincoln West project, planned for thirteen blocks along the Hudson in the Press Central rail yards between 59th and 72nd Streets, would be the largest unsubsidized housing development ever built in New York (see Skyline, April 1982, p. 4; June, p. 7). The developers, Lincoln West Associates, is a partnership of Observation Realty Corporation, an Argentine-based firm, and Abraham Hirschfeld, a local developer and unsuccessful politician; they hired The Great Partnership and Rafael Vinoly Architects to draw up a master plan for the 76-acre site, which is Manhattan's largest remaining undeveloped property and has long been the object of builders' attention. Despite many calls for substantial changes in the scale and design of the project, the Board of Estimate reduced it by only 370 units—from 4,700 to 4,330—and kept the rest essentially intact, including the $150 million underground parking spaces, and a public park.

While other developers, including Donald Trump, had failed to get approval in the past, Lincoln West, headed by Carl Varsavsky was much swifter. It hired away James Capalino, a longtime aide to Mayor Koch who had most recently served as the city's Commissioner of General Services. It retained a politically influential team of lawyers who once were in public service—John Zaccardi, former City Planning Commission chairman and Deputy Mayor, and Judith Griswold, a onetime top legal advisor to Mayor Beame and former bent Casey—and now work for developers.

But the developer still had to overcome fierce objections from the city's other interest groups. West Side Assemblyman Jerold Nadler, along with a number of business and union organizations, urged the city to insure that construction of Lincoln West would not preclude also building a modern rail freight facility on the site. Rail freight supporters such as West Side Councilwoman Ruth Messinger argued that this facility was essential to save thousands of Manhattan's remaining printing, garment, and meat-packing industries. Designing their mini-city to allow for rail freight wouldn't be expensive for the developers, however, and they fought the idea; it was apparent early on that the city was with them. Although Koch Administration officials kept pointing to a supposed rail freight terminal in the Bronx, Nadler says studies indicate Manhattan's industry wouldn't be helped by the Bronx facility. In the end, rail freight became a non-issue because, as Councilwoman Messinger said, "the key decision-makers in the Administration" were more interested in luxury housing, even if manufacturing jobs were put up in jeopardy. But the complaints of the West Side's Community Board 7 about scale and density were harder to overcome — and it was obvious from the beginning that the developer would have to make some changes. These changes were not sought by the City Planning Commission, which was criticized over and over again for lack of planning, accepting the developer's financial arguments at face value, making no real analysis of the impact of almost 10,000 new residents on the already overburdened West Side services, and not even taking steps to insure that the

This summer, Griesa halted nearly all federal funding for the project. In a sharply-worded ruling, Griesa in effect rejected the city and federal environmental opponents' will such words as "fraudulent" and "the complete opposite of the true facts" to describe the environmental testimony presented by the government. A new environmental impact statement is likely to take one to three years to complete.

This timetable makes it virtually certain that Westway's environmental impact will still be under study on September 30, 1983 — the deadline for applying for trade-in. Unless the mayor and state attorney agree by that date to seek trade-in, the opportunity for getting $1.4 billion for mass transit and the alternative road could be lost. Nevertheless, the highway lobby and the developers who would like to build luxury highrises on the landfill continue to argue against trade-in. And the Times' editorial page, which has long promoted Westway, echoed many of their arguments. Trade-in, the Times said, is a mirage: While Westway is guaranteed ninety percent funding from the federal Highway Trust Fund, trade-in allocations would have to be approved by Congress every year. Besides, the Times said, most of the trade-in money would have to be funneled into a $700 million alternative road project. "It will cost the same, but there will be no environmental impact statement," the Times editorial said. As for Judge Griesa's decision, the Times' editorial writers said his ruling addressed "procedure, not substance," and would not kill the project.

On almost every point, the Times was wrong. The Highway Trust Fund itself is in trouble, casting doubt on whether the project of $1 billion for the Bronx Bypass would ever be finished, even if begun. This summer, a Congressional Budget Office report suggested one option was to eliminate monies only for Interstate routes, thereby saving "of local importance," like Westway. On the other hand, the Reagan Administration's Secretary of Transportation, Drew Lewis, stated flatly that Westway would be approved for trade-in. It is true that how fast the money came in would depend on annual Congressional applications, but if New York presented ready-to-go plans, the city could expect about $150 million a year, according to Marie Benstock, a leading anti-Westway activist; she notes that Boston has been awarded over $1 billion in mass transit trade-in money, while Washington received 2 billion.

While the Times insisted any trade-in funds would be largely used for a $700 million replacement road, in fact 60% of the money has been used for other projects in the Northeast. And there is no reason why a 4.2-mile local road should cost much over $100 million — leaving most of the $1.4 billion trade-in money for mass transit. Although the Times expressed optimism that Griesa's rulings left Westway very much alive, the judge's opinions dealt as much with substance as procedure: Information was withheld by state and federal agencies because, as Benstock says, "they knew if they told the truth they couldn't get a permit ... because the data says fish could be harmed." News data is likely to say the same thing.

Depending on the outcome of the next month's elections, the mayor and governor will either seek trade-in or continue to plug Westway. It is possible Congress will extend the 1963 deadline for applying for trade-in—but this remains uncertain. One thing is definite: By not moving now for trade-in, the city and state risk losing everything.
Skowhegan Charrette

During the first week of August the Skowhegan School of Painting and Sculpture hosted a five-day on-site charrette design competition, only the fifth of its kind sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts. Twelve student teams selected an architect for new facilities on their campus. The winning team was announced by Robert Page and Peter Millard of Guilford, CT; other participating teams were: Turner Bezos and Rosa Anderson from Starkstown, VT; Fred Koetter and Susie Kim of Boston; Ralph Lerner and Richard Reid, also from Boston; and John Scholtz and Jeremiah Eck from Camden, ME.

Competition Drawing to a Close

Winners of the Fort Lauderdale Riverfront Plaza Competition—a mixed-use project including 8,000 s.f. of public office space, a plaza with an outdoor stage, an "architectural element," a market place, and restaurants—were Aragon Associates of Coral Gables. Second prize, $12,500, was to Scogin, Jr., President of Heery & Heery, Architects & Engineers in Atlanta, and third place went to Thomas K. Davis and Marleen Kay Davis, graduate students at Cornell. The winning scheme was chosen from among 195 entries by a jury of James Stewart, Richard M. B. Weir, Mario Botta, and William Turnbull. Details in November.

Aragon Associates, Winning submission for the Fort Lauderdale Riverfront Plaza Competition; 1982

The program called for eighteen new studios and administration and library facilities on a campus located on the edge of a lake, spreading upward through woods to a clearing on a hillside. The land not occupied by the campus was part of a farm dating from the late eighteenth-century; many of the original buildings remain, with work spaces and studios in converted barns and chicken coops and offices in the farmhouse. Buildings added through the years have been modified to that character.

The teams worked in a temporary studio under the curious and watchful gaze of the school community. Tension certainly was in the air—not surprisingly, given the suspicion with which artists generally regard architects—and there were reports of open hostilities early in the week. A number of public workshop sessions and daily discussions were held with the faculty, students, and administration. The schemes—models, drawings, plans—were presented to the school community and jury chaired by architect Graham Gund and including architects Charles Moore and Robert A.M. Stern, painter Alex Katz, and sculptor Sidney Simon.

Winners were announced on the 7th.

In announcing the winners, Gund stated that "the jury felt this design responded most to the school's needs and captured the spirit of unpretentiousness and serenity of the Maine wilderness." The project by Page and Millard centered on an 800,000-square-foot facility, "designed to capture the essence of the original campus. Robert Stern, reporting that the jury decision was unequivocally unanimous, observed that all the schemes were good, but that the one by Page and Millard was based on a strategy that was "incredibly sensitive to the exact architectural mood of the place." The jury also awarded an honorable mention to the project by Koetter and Kim which, Stern related, was "wonderful, but not in character." The solution chosen was reportedly equally popular with the Skowhegan community.

New York State Theater Renovation

Judging by the dress rehearsal for the New York City Opera production of Frank Lehar's operetta The Merry Widow, the team of acoustical consultant Cyril Harris and architects Philip Johnson and John Burgee is bringing the Lincoln Center orchestra house to life. The trio has just finished its second renovation of a hall in the complex. They have reduced the capacity of the New York Philharmonic to accommodate the acoustical requirements of the New York City Opera and the New York City Ballet. The $5.5 million renovation, which over the last year sufficed the hall was still in use, followed the team's success in redesigning the previously acoustically elusive Philharmonic Hall in 1976. While the Philharmonic—now Avery Fisher Hall—had originally been designed by Max Abramovitz with Bolt, Beranek and Neumann, the acoustical consultants, the New York State Theater was designed in 1964 by Philip Johnson and Richard Foster and with the help of acoustical consultant Wilhelm Lauen Jordan.

Cyril Harris has won the reputation of emphasizing acoustics before aesthetics. Now, however, he feels that the acoustic performance of his halls are rare indeed. But few architects can make the adjustment required of a partnership of this kind, which explains why...

Johnson/Burgee, Architect, Reconstruction of the New York State Theater, 1982 (photo: Science and Technology Studios)

The "trio"—Johnson, Burgee Architect and Harris have now become as familiar a team in concert hall design as Rogers and Astaire once were in dance musicals. Their work for the Theater Center has been recognized by the American Institute of Architects as one of the 750 projects of public interest to the nation.

Johnson/Burgee Architects and Harris have now become as familiar a team in concert hall design as Rogers and Astaire once were in dance musicals. Their work for the Theater Center has been recognized by the American Institute of Architects as one of the 750 projects of public interest to the nation.
Biltmore-more
Since August the New York Landmarks Conservancy has been weighing an interesting legal question brought up by another demolition at the one-time Biltmore Hotel. Last fall, after demolition of much of the interior had taken place—part of plans to redevelop the hotel for use by the Bank of America—the preservation community mounted opposition. After a brief stay of proceedings, an agreement was reached between the Mithlenes, owners of the building, and the Conservancy, prohibiting further demolition in the specific area and providing a moratorium on the famous Palm Court for use as the Bank lobby. The architectural firm of Hardy Holzman had been hired to work with the Mithlenes in effecting the restoration and reconditioning work. [Skyline, October and November 1981.]

This August the wreckers were at it again. With what Conservancy director Laurie Beckelman termed "blatant disregard for the agreement we made," whatever had been left was completely obliterated. At that point Hugh Hardy, project architect with HIPA, withdrew from the project, stating that "there was no way to give you even the beginning of a creative restoration."

There has been no comment from the Mithlenes about why the most recent demolition took place. A spokesman for the family has been quoted as saying that they "want to work with the Landmarks Conservancy and "are going to restore the Palm Court in terms of space and size." The options open to the Conservancy are limited: presumably they can sue for some sort of repairs or reconstruction, which Hardy feels would not be a reasonable solution—the qualities of the Palm Court cannot be recuperated by imitation. —idity

Competitions
The Walker/Group has announced its second annual competition to promote innovation in retail design. Open to all students of accredited design schools, the competition involves developing a concept for the shopping mall of the future. The winner, or winning team, will receive $1,500; second and third place projects will receive $1,000 and $500; and the school of the winner will also receive $1,000. Walker/Group should be notified of intention to compete by October 25. Information is available from schools or Competition Director, Walker/Group, 304 East 45th Street, New York 10017; 212/689-1013. —The Harvard Architectural Review has announced a competition to be held this fall "to involve the forthcoming topic: 'Precedent and Invention.'" It will be open to all design professionals, students, and artists. More information to follow, or contact: The Harvard Architectural Review, Issue #5, 48 Quincy Street, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Other Tidbits
Activity in Anchorage: Vincent Scully is acting as advisor to the State of Alaska on a competition for a state office building. Four firms are now under consideration: Michael/Giorgio Architects, who are currently designing a museum in that city, Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates, Arthur Erickson Architects, and Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown. . . . In San Antonio, the College of Fine Arts at the San Antonio Art Institute is also looking at outstanding architects: Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown, Charles Moore, Robert A.M. Stern, and Taff Architects are reportedly being interviewed. . . . In New Orleans, Perez Associates are master planners for a fair in that city scheduled for late 1984. The theme is "Rivers of the World" and Charles Moore has been asked to design a "Wonder Wall" the length of Front Street to include a water course, arcades, and other fair amenities. . . . Near Beijing, the international hotel designed by L.M. Perl & Partners will have a "mini-opening," although the architect's office reports it won't be completely finished until the spring.

Chicago Design Fest
At the Merchandise Mart from September 30th to October 2nd. The first annual exibition sponsored (in response to NDEQ!) by a consortium of the residential showrooms at the Mart. At the same time is the Illinois Council/IAIA's 1982 state conference there: Highlights of the three-day program include workshops for Phillip Johnson on his philosophy of contribution to architecture and for "furthering historic preservation" with his efforts to rescue H.H. Richards' Gleason House, and to Paige Reese, editor-in-chief of Architectural Digest for "distinguished service to the profession." A number of seminars will feature architecst Laurence Booth, Rodolfo Machado, William Turnbull, John Carlson, Raul Hurst, Robert Timme, and Bernardo Fort-Brescia.
Bruce Alonzo Goff died in Tyler, Texas, on August 4 at the age of 78. Born in Alton, Texas on June 8, 1904—"the 37th birthday of Frank Lloyd Wright—Goff was known for an architecture that seemed based on Wright's "organic" theories, with a similar echo of Japanese aesthetics. He was sought out by colleges and universities for his unique and open-minded approach to architecture. Most of Goff's work, executed over a period of six decades, was single-family homes, each a unique blend of forms and materials reflecting a particular approach to the site, the program, and the personalities of both architect and client. Most of this work is to be found in the central states—Missouri, Texas, and Oklahoma, where Goff lived after World War II. From 1940 to 1955 Goff was chairman of the School of Architecture at the University of Oklahoma in Norman.

Goff's houses appeared to be an odd conglomeration of forms and materials somehow integrated into single structures that were apparently architecturally sound, in their own way, aesthetically consistent. His most famous work is the Bartering House in Norman (1935); a logarithmic spiral of rough stone and glass "cullets" wrapping upward around a mast, with rooms hung from the roof structure. Another house in Norman, for the Ledbetter (1947), has aluminum discs rather like spaceships settled on the terrace roof, and glass skylights from Woolworth's decorating the columns. Goff used stone, steel, glass, wood, and even coal in several houses.

Reportedly, Goff's clients were generally delighted with their houses, some, like for P. J. Cunningham. Additions to his 1956 house and other commissions that included the Shin'en Tan Museum Goff was designing showed his kind, Goff has said that some of his houses for others were too conventional for him.

Richard Rose

Bruce Goff's career as an architect began at the age of twelve when his family, visiting the young Goff to be idle, took him to the office of an Oklahoma City architect. Oklahoma, and offered the boy's services as an architectural apprentice. When told to sit at a drafting table and sketch, the young Goff produced drawings that restored the office. Frank Lloyd Wright, whom he never heard of at the time, was the architectural apprentice. Oklahoma, twelfe Bruce age 12, Bruce Goff was chairm,n of the School of Architecture at the University of Oklahoma in Norman.

In the spring of 1961, Bruce Goff was invited to return to the University of Oklahoma to lecture on the works of his favorite architect, the Catalan Antonio Gaudi. He asked for a single slide projector so that the audience could concentrate on one image at a time, and then presented almost 500 slides in a single hour. His presentation awakened the students. When Bruce Goff died, he had completed his first year as a visiting design professor at the University of Oklahoma. It reminded me of the vitality and ever-present gentleness that this man displayed in a long and sometimes difficult life. He had returned to teaching as a duty he felt to the profession that had given him so much.

O'Neill Ford, the San Antonio architect known for his lifelong advocacy for architectural education and the preservation of the Southwestern and of regional handicrafts, died on July 20 in San Antonio, at age 76. He had been ailing, yet exuberantly active, for several years.

At Ford's funeral service, John Henry Faulk, author and social commentator, described his competitor as a worldly Texan who preserved the gifts of the region in his vision, his urbaneity, and his spacious-mindedness, adding, "He also had the disposition of a Merino ram."

A number of his works were celebrated at the Ford house on Willow Way with jazz, champagne, harpsichord and a Cullum Happy Swank of Dallas played into the night.

Ford was born in Pink Hill, Texas, on the Red River. Although he studied physics and literature at North Texas State University, his only degree was from the International Correspondence School. He had not added "I. C. S." to his signature. Later, he became an architect "because a pencil," he explained to former partner Arch Swank of Dallas.

Ford's apprenticeship began in 1926 with Dallas architect David R. Williams, with whom Ford spent six years documenting the threats to historic Texas, Louisiana, and northern Mexico. They published articles promoting native forms as an expression of regional American culture, and together designed and built houses that grew out of indigenous forms instead of European styles. During the Depression, Ford became an advocate for a "New Deal" architecture, and offered the boy's services to the University of Oklahoma to lecture on his urban attraction.

Bruce Goff (courtesy of the estate of Bruce Goff)
Architecture as Photography: Notes on the Richard Neutra Show

Suzanne Stephens

Some architects viewing the exhibit "The Architecture of Richard Neutra: From International Style to California Modern" this summer at New York City's Museum of Modern Art complained that it was a typical MoMA show, with an overemphasis on dramatic photographs of pristine spaces absent of people, and an underemphasis on plans and other drawings. In other words, so the critics went, it is not hospitable to photography, not to architecture as it is experienced in real life and through time.

The show is indeed the quintessential MoMA show, in its choice of subject and in its installation. The modern architecture that MoMA has helped make known to the museum-going public since 1932 is once again recaptured in this intensive portrayal of the hard, linear, and planar aesthetic of Neutra's domestic architecture of the 1920s to the 1950s.

While the co-directors of the show—Arthur Drexler, Director of MoMA's Department of Architecture, and Thomas S. Hines of U.C.L.A.—enriched the walls of past MoMA exhibits for their installation, the use of medium gray and charcoal in glossy and matte finishes did not convince observers that this presentation represented a major departure from past efforts. Even more striking was the preponderance of black-and-white photographs. The only genuine exceptions were the lush color watercolor and pencil drawings Neutra executed in Vienna around World War II, mounted on smoky lavender walls in the first exhibit room.

In fact the photographs, showing off Neutra's cantilevered spaces and crisply attenuated planes of concrete and metal or cedar siding, were memorable not only for their light and dark contrasts, but for their compositions of deep receding perspective lines and framed views. The installation's dramatic juxtapositions reinforced the hegemony of the photographic image in communicating architectural intentions. Thus the show brings to mind Sybil Moholy-Nagy's observation in Progressive Architecture (April 1953) about the MoMA exhibit "Built in USA: Postwar Architecture?": "The triumph of Modern Architecture is the triumph of Ezra Stoller and his colleagues."

Nevertheless, in spite of current criticism, the show has presence and power. First, for MoMA to present an exhibit that makes a connection with the Museum's own history helps maintain a sense of continuity at the very moment when that continuity has been disrupted by a major renovation and expansion plan. But what makes the show even more compelling is that it attests to a certain vision now too often perfunctorily dismissed. These photographs, many of which have been in MoMA's collection since 1932, crystallize a certain attitude about modernity and modern architecture, an idea that still emanates strikingly from the photographs at a time when the debunking of modern architecture's principles is so prevalent. That idea refers to modern architecture's language and the conviction architects held regarding the power of man-made artifacts to rationally tame and purify the raw, natural world and elevate the spirit of man. Neutra's designs for houses in those natural settings—establishing a relationship whereby a balance is sustained or nature is drawn into a warm embrace—constantly redefines that idea. The photographs of his work serve to reinforce it.

For example, one photograph of Neutra's Singleton House, designed in 1959, sympathetically depicts a gradual progression of controlled and gridded interior spaces giving way to the cultivated, partially gridded exterior space just outside, and finally to the rugged vegetative world beyond. Another photograph—a romanticized composition of the VDL Research House, which Neutra built for himself in 1932—offers striking testament to the place of occupants in his scheme of things. The photo shows Neutra looking out to Silverlake Reservoir at twilight from the peaceful contemplative series of a minimally enclosed terrace. The eye is constantly drawn from the stringently vertical lines of the interior fittings and the architecture out through transparently expansive windows to the lush idyllic landscape of evergreens and water beyond.

Neutra's belief in new building techniques and the promise of the industrialized world was frequently illustrated by his houses, some of which—like the Beard house built in Alhambra in 1934, and the von Sternberg house built in the San Fernando Valley in 1933—were framed in steel, clad in steel panels, and painted silver-gray. One arresting photograph of the interior of the Beard house evocatively comments on the role that man plays in this universe: A solitary figure—in this case Neutra—stands in the corner of a room, quietly reading. Sunlight falls at a sharp diagonal across the side wall, highlighting the sinuous arc of a metal lamp and the elegant curves of tabular metal chairs, finally leading the eye to the softly gleaming grid of sash of a large window wall where the gaze is directed outward. At that point a view of rough rolling mountains is held within this rigid framework of man's invention. The interior space in the foreground reinforces the notion of national control: The man-made world is calm and serene, while the natural world is held at bay.

Neutra was conscious of the photographic means by which the idea and the essence of the architectural object would be condensed and communicated to the public. To be sure, as James Fitch has recently pointed out ("Physical and Metaphysical in Architectural Criticism," The Architectural Record, August 1982), the photograph can lie, cheat, and omit things, and is not a substitute for the first-hand experience of architecture itself. The "visually accessible surface," as Fitch puts it, has often become a seductive surrogate for reality, a surrogate other architects too easily fall for. Thus the lessons of modernism have often been dozed by the spread of half-understood impressions gleaned from images capturing a particular fragment of time and space.

While Fitch's point is convincing, it does not allow for the significance of the vision that is communicated through these very photographs. As seen in Neutra's work, the almost Platonic ideal from which the architect has tried to mold his reality is often most convincingly transmitted through the artistically composed world of the photograph. The built work—almost any built work—remains an imperfect or fractured testament to the idea that has been subordinated by the forces that shape it, including the client's needs and desires and the ravages of time and weather. Yet the original idea remains of value, for therein lies the incentive to create the transcendent work of architecture.

Modern architecture's pure, simple lines and spaces, its clean abstracted planes and glossy surfaces, its dependence on new technologies, attested to a belief in that vision and in the possibility of architecture going beyond the ordinary. That vision also allows occupants of this architecture to feel in control of the world and establish their relation to it. The photographic image may condense, freeze, and flatten the artifact, but it still does project that idea, coherently and powerfully.
**Blade Runner**

Blade Runner is a science fiction, outer space movie set on the Earth that is left behind. Based on the novel by Philip K. Dick, *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*, the movie's carefully developed plot is no less than the evolution of urban civilization over the next forty years. While the characters chase and shoot their way through a grade-B detective story, magnificently outweighed sets visually relate a second story about how our cities will have developed, and decayed, by the year 2019.

This is not the distant future, but time within our lifetimes; not an impossible future of sleek forms, sanitary surfaces and space-age jump suits zipped on a diagonal, but one with credit-card parking meters, video telephones, noodle bar chains, video Goodyear blimps—a myriad of today's realities believably extrapolated into the future and embodied in a nearly familiar context.

Unlike the future depicted in most movies, this future has a past—a past that happens to be our current present, plus our own past: 1920s Beaux-Arts highrises, 1940s fashions, 1950s cars, punks and Hare Krishna.

Production designer Lawrence G. Paull says that *Blade Runner* is a period movie, simply set in the future.

The scene of the crimes in Los Angeles, Director Ridley Scott enunciates the city with information and character, "visualized" in objects; we read the city's urban history and personality from the streetscapes. Some people in this future city wear air masks; there is a continuous acid rain and haze; street traffic is grid-locked; downtown buildings, even megastructures, are partially or totally abandoned, or in bad repair. Most people who cram the streets are visibly foreign; the city has become Third World. Many people are deformed. Meanwhile a large outdoor advertisement flashes a message hiring people to move "Off World," where the environment is "clean."

The vision is an exaggerated, grotesque portrait of the effect of suburbanization on Los Angeles and other major cities. Paull says that he and Scott were only taking the already visible signs of urban decay, overload, pollution, ghettosation and abandonment long evident in New York, Chicago, Mexico City and Hong Kong to build a vision based on that decay. This time, however, the colonization of outer space, rather than the move down the freeway, is vitiating cities by removing their middle class.

Without the middle class, there are no new consumer products because there is no viable consumer base; the expertise to maintain the city has moved Off Earth. The only way left to hold the city together is to patch it. Air ducts climb old, nineteenth-century buildings that are merely service podiums for towering megastructures, expedient crutches of corrective machinery are retrofitted over dysfunctional machines. Future gadgets like video phones have the patina of use and abuse. Graffiti are everywhere. Set designers actually created sophisticated, visually clean gadgetry, then trashed it. Assistant art director Stephen Dane found high-tech parts in airplane graveyards in Arizona to use as street-scape architectural technological elements, and high-tech trash, which he littered everywhere.

Scott used a process of successive encrustation as a guiding principle in the design of the city and the movie—an encrustation that gives all the scenes a visual nervousness or surface excitement that animates the film beyond its action. Scott, who says that a film should be like a 700-lather cake, observes, "I would go so far as to say the design is the statement" of the film. Scott would take an element off one set, like a cryogenic collin, and pit it on its side to use it as an information booth in another already crowded set. Another layer—and yet the eye, already overloaded, accepts the addition without question because it is within the visual logic of the film. The look of the film is oddly homogenous. The built environment, like the air, is saturated and precipitating in objects.

Although *Blade Runner* is largely about memory (when the androids get memory implants they become almost indistinguishable from human beings), the urban memory—the older city beneath the newer—is not a happy recollection, and certainly not one that is carefully preserved. The only "clean" set is the 700-story pyramid of the Tyrell Corporation, created by special effects experts Douglas Trumbull and Richard Yurich, in which Tyrell's rooms themselves are layered in meanings if not objects—Tyrell's are Karmak spaces, with Roman busts alluding to futuristic boeingentered android ideals. Even the Tyrell Corporation carries the "look" of the film by its somberness and threatening overtones.

The point of the movie is not that this urban vision might one day happen; it is simply the overwhelming filmic effect: urban images relentlessly compounded into what becomes a palatable, almost three-dimensional environment projected into a theater. We occupy this movie. When we come out of the theater, we are not only relieved to step out of the film's claustrophobia, but surprisingly disappointed: Our own reality has so little of the density of information, character and story of the film that our environment seems thin.

**Garp**

The most consistently memorable moments of *The World According to Garp*, director George Roy Hill's filmed version of John Irving's book, were scenes involving actress Glenn Close, who played Garp's mother, and those involving the New England and New York architects. Whether on location or recreated in a sound stage in Astoria, the architectural settings of houses, schools, and suburbs evoked the quality of life in the 1940s, 50s, and 60s in an understandably accurate manner. The stable, traditional "real world" depicted helped visually highlight the black comedy unfolding—often too heavy-handedly—on the screen.

Interestingly enough, the art director for *Garp* was an architect—Woods Mackintosh—who has become increasingly involved in the design of sets for theater and film. He was in charge of finding locations and designing and supervising construction of sets needed for special sequences (for example, a scene involving an airplane crashing into the side of a house). Mackintosh, who was graduated from Harvard's Graduate School of Design in the early 1960s, has recently designed a number of sets at Joseph Papp's Public Theater, including the set for *Rumors*, and is now working on *Jane III*, being shot in Florida. In *Garp* he worked closely with production director Henry Rumantad, who also trained as an architect—at U.S.C. in the 1940s—and has designed a number of films, including George Roy Hill's *The Sting* and *Stourney House Fen*, Responsible for the remarkably integrated period interior sets was Robert Drumheller, who was graduated from Yale's School of Drama; in order to make the sets for the film so consistent and "of a piece," research was required. For instance, while the book calls for much of the action to take place at Exeter, the school has grown too large for the requirements of the film's mood. Mackintosh and his scouts surveyed twenty schools, most of which had lost their traditional campus ambiance to ill-guided expansion plans. They finally found the Millbrook School in Millbrook, New York, a Georgian brick complex designed by Edward Shepard Hewitt in 1931, which has retained its small New England prep-school quality. Finding the right house for the story's New Hampshire coastline summer cottage was not easy either. Located finally was a house on Fisher's Island, just off the coast of Connecticut. The large shingle style house, designed at the turn of the century by Henry Hardenbergh, architect of the Plaza Hotel in New York, was perfect. Paradoxically, one of the most difficult locations—requiring a 1940s suburban clapboard house with a sloping drive and a corner site—turned up in Eastchester, New York, early in the scouting. —83
Architecture is playing a major role in a new crop of films, and landscape has a significant part in the staging of a play.

**Breathless**

Consider this actually a "restatement" rather than a remake, with the locale shifted from Paris to Los Angeles. The original French punk played by Jean-Paul Belmondo in the manner of Humphrey Bogart has been replaced by Richard Genie portraying an L.A. punk fond of Jerry Lee Lewis and Silver Surfer comics. Godard's heroine—Jean Seberg as an aspiring American journalist—has been transformed into Monique, a French architecture student played by newcomer Valerie Kaprisky; the change in meter was based on a desire to identify a profession that is attractive to women in the 80s, as journalism was in the 50s.

In addition, Richard Sylbert, the set designer, borrowed facades from the Strada Novissima of the 1980 Venice Biennale, which, appropriately enough, were built by technicians of Cine Città film studios in Rome. Part of that exhibition made its way to San Francisco, where Sylbert saw it and decided to incorporate the facades of Robert Stern, Hans Hollein, and Franco Purini into his U.C.L.A. architecture school sets. —Barbara Jakobson

Valerie Kaprisky in Breathless at U.C.L.A. with set "borrowed" from Biennale facade (photos: Blaise Voto)

**Midsummer Night’s Dream**

This summer’s New York Shakespeare Festival presentation of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* was an oddly inconsistent production from Joe Papp. The Dream in Central Park could be ideal, you think: a lyric, sylvan fantasy at the open-air Delacorte. The opportunity was one that set director Heidi Landesman made the most of, but director James Lapine seemed to have a harder time with.

Landesman says that, when contacted by Lapine, she immediately thought of creating a landscape for the set (since they could not use a part of the park itself). After doing a schematic model, Landesman—who admits to ignorance in such matters—worked with landscape consultant Diana Balmori, a landscape architect with Cesar Pelli & Associates, to make the design a reality. The result was a carefully molded Romantic English landscape that accommodated the various comings and goings of the twisted plot while almost becoming a player itself.

The major problem: the designers confronted was that a landscape on the very small stage would be compared with the surrounding park. With consummate skill Landesman and Balmori managed to effectively separate their set from its context through concentration and careful attention to scale using a well-balanced composition of trees, shrubs, and grass—the real things. Combining the tristate area for trees that could be moved, the designers found two major elements that appear custom-made: A Japanese maple spreading lightly but protectively over Titania’s bower on a rise upstage left and a Linden marking a knoll—cum—observation post stage right. These areas were further defined by a profusion of smaller trees and shrubs (almost hiding a “rustic” pavilion where the musicians were seated). A pond, replete with long fringing grasses, crept out downstage left, edging a more formal clearing for most of the action at center stage. A single vista was opened center stage, over the lake behind the theater. The definition of place and character through contours, planting, and grooming, aided by a certain amount of fog, allowed the viewer’s imagination to roam quite freely with the motley collection of lovers, players, and fairies. In all the set contained 20 trees, 92 shrubs, 214 flowers, 2200 s.f. of ordinary sod, and 500 s.f. of meadow grass spread over 2700 s.f. of pine bark.

Landesman remarked that, having imagined the set as a neutral element, she was surprised at how forcefully it was when completed—and it was. The character of the set was especially apparent in contrast to the rather vulgar, slapstick quality of the rest of the production. The costumes—which were stylistically inconsistent in place and period—and the unlyrical, fanciful reading of the play led this viewer to wish she had been left to contemplate only the set in quiet and solitude. Others will have a chance to judge for themselves: A.R.C. is planning to tape the Dream for their arts channel. —MJ
In Germany the tradition of the "Riehenausstellung" finds continued support from both local and national branches of government. It is the only country aside from Italy that exerts this interpretive force, officially encapsulating artistic production almost at the moment of creation.

It's too late to visit the Fridericianum in Kassel — Documenta 7 came down in September — but at least one can still spend hours digesting the two-volume catalogue and plowing through the reams of critical scrutiny of the exhibition appearing posthumously in art journals. While Documenta 7 undergoes post-mortems, "Zeitgeist", an international exhibition of painting and sculpture that aims to capture the spirit of the conscious and subliminal perceptions of the early '80s, will soon enliven the Martin-Gropius-Bau — a rather incredible Schinkelskope heap of a building sitting right against the Berlin wall.

In Kassel last June there was time to indulge in the major angst at those extravaganzas — "Slam the Show." Some player invariably announces the death knell of such undertakings (the rumor circulates that Kassel will "sell" Documenta to another city), citing the illnesses endemic to them all — huge budgets that evaporate in a flurry of miscalculated expenses; arrogant curators or architectural parties playing politics; artists having crises de nerfs over inclusion, omission, misinterpretation, and malplacement; and grandiose statements of purpose impossible to catch in the net of one installation.

But in spite of the inherent pitfalls, these forays in classification are useful to both professionals and the public. They stimulate discourse, allow for virtual assembly, test hypotheses, and expose a great many memorable and important works of art. There is, too, the odd by-product of travelling to a specific locale to see a Documenta or a "Zeitgeist": The concentration results in a heightened awareness of the place — of the architecture not only of the buildings that house the exhibitions, but of the surroundings — so much more intense than strolling out the front door for a visit to your hometown museum.

Recent architectural works of a retrograde or eclectic nature make one reflexes one's perception of buildings like Kassel's Fridericianum or Berlin's Martin-Gropius-Bau. The Fridericianum, a classicist work completed in 1779 by Simon Louis Du Ry, was damaged during World War II, but has undergone an almost complete restoration. The Documenta curators used the architectural spaces to establish juxtapositions with the selected art and to create potentially revelatory visual connections. Thus A.R. Penck was placed near Gilbert and George, and Joseph Kosuth near George Baselitz. In some instances, the use of the building enhanced the thesis; in others, one felt a perverse impulse to do violence to the work despite Director Rudi Fuchs' noble sentiments about creating conditions of honor, dignity, and tranquility.

The "Zeitgeist" organizers in Berlin will try to promote quite a different relation between art and architecture. It is a "staged" exhibition in that it asks the invited artists to "feel" the building Martin Gropius designed in 1877 as the Decorative Arts Museum of the Prussian state. In the halls that surround the vast central atrium, eight painters — German, Italian, and American; Salomé, Francesco Clemente, and David Salle among them — will show four related works, each 3 x 4 meters. Joseph Beuys will create a sculpture in the center of the ground floor; soaring across the skyline of this attime will be a flying figure by Jonathan Borosky. Andy Warhol has executed several paintings for the exhibit based on photographs of architecture built under National Socialism.

A tour of Berlin with IBA consultant Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani revealed the possibilities for architecture to create a new layer of meaning in the urban history of this city. IBA (Internationale Bauausstellung Berlin 1984) — a long-range attempt to address the complex political, technical, cultural, and philosophical issues that affect the human environment through architectural solutions — will be excavating several sites and starting construction of new buildings within the area staked out for renewal.
A summer visit to Germany, which included art and architecture exhibits and discussion with various participants, prompted the following observations.

Documenta 7 was held in Kassel, West Germany, from June 19 to September 29. The director of the show was Rudi Fuchs; the Arts Council consisted of Cooee van Bruggen, Germano Celant, and Johannes Gachnang; in charge of Architecture and Graphic Design was Walter Nickels. A two-volume catalogue ($60.00) accompanied the exhibit.

The project began in 1978, when a political decision was made to sponsor a large-scale building exhibition similar to Interbau 1957, which created the Hansa district—the famed group of setpieces by Asla, Gruppo, Niemeyer, Le Corbusier, etc. (Berlin's distinguished history of this form of "forced" progress is well documented in the unusually interesting IBA catalogue.) The original concept to keep the present exhibition contained within the Tiergarten district met with immediate and strong opposition, led by Wulff Jobst and Martin, an editor and preservationist. He was backed by former Berlin Senator for Building Harry Ristock. Together with a group of architects and critics including Josef Paul Kleihues and Aldo Rossi, they succeeded in breaking the convention of the old Interbau and making it virtually impossible to finish the program by 1984, the original target date.

A plan to have the project managed by a board of directors ran aground in the early stages. O.M. Ungers, initially a central figure on the board, resigned early, leaving the key position to Kleihues. IBA’s two fields of activity are urban renewal under Hans-Walther Hamer and building under Kleihues. The limits of the plan were devised, building placement and programs were decided (nearly percent to be social housing), and architects were chosen through competitions. Kleihues, with the advice of Lampagnani, selected the juries; the final results (illustrated in the catalogue) indicate occasional failures in this controlled democracy.

What will IBA produce by 1984 besides a beautiful model of the total scheme, several films, and an indoor exhibition of all the projects? Under construction is Rob Krier and Associates’ Ritterstrasse housing. Planned are housing and a leisure center in Trepp by Charles Moore of Moore Ruble Yudell; urban villas on the Rauchstrasse in Tiergarten from a scheme by Rob Krier; housing and offices in the Luttwakplatz by O.M. Ungers (meant to start construction this fall); housing in the Luttwakstrasse by Vittorio Gregotti; a group of energy-saving houses by German architects Vladimir Nikolic, Bernd Finkel, and Manfred Schröder; and maybe soon James Stirling’s and Michael Wilford’s Wissenszentrums.

The plot has developed some new twists. Among the cast from the United States, Peter Eisenman of Roanoke/Roberson is reworking his Friedrichstrasse museum and housing project to eliminate the Museum of the Artificially Excavated City and expand the housing portion; Raimund Abraham is fine-tuning his commercial-residential corner and infill buildings at Puttkammer and Friedrichstrasse; John Hejduk is adding a gatehouse around a semipublic court on Oranienstrasse to his contribution; and a new member of the cast, Richard Meier, will produce a design for housing in Am Karsebald across the canal from Mies van der Rohe’s National Gallery and Hans Scharoun’s library.

With IBA providing a progressive background sound of cranes and bulldozers for the next several years and the rest of Berlin staying as it is—a fairly rich melange of classical and new wave noise—the possibilities for the pursuit of high art and decadent pleasure will coexist in the vivid balance that gives great cities life.
European Perspectives

Scandinavian Classicism

Stuart Wrede

This year the Scandinavians celebrated their classical heritage in two concurrent events—a symposium on classicism and modernism and an exhibit of Scandinavian "new classical" architecture of the 1910s and '20s—both held in Jyväskylä, Finland. The rediscovery highlighted in these events may well be important in the development of Scandinavian architecture, although its ultimate reverberations will probably not be felt for some time.

A parallel event in Sweden reinforces the sense that Scandinavians are in the process of a major reassessment of architectural direction. Last winter a special issue of the Swedish architectural journal Arkitektur (no. 2, 1982) was devoted to 1920s classicism in Sweden, Bjorn Linn, an influential architectural historian and critic, concluded that the 1920s had represented the high point in overall professionalism in Swedish architecture—a rather startling and daring viewpoint to be advanced in Sweden, where the anti-formalist, functionalist approach to architecture (with a few outstanding examples) has served as a sacred cow for fifty years. A subsequent issue of this journal (no. 4, 1982) featured a new project by Sweden's leading modernist architect, Carl Nygren. The Mission Chapel at Lima, in an updated classicist style. Swedish observers did not comment on the irony of this coincidence of events. This observer, however, remembering the effect of the June 1928 cover of the same magazine—which featured the International Style base of Asplund's Stockholm Public Library—could not help but note its potential significance.

The second international Alvar Aalto Symposium (held every third year in Jyväskylä) took place from August 6 to 8. While the theme of the symposium was "Classicism and Modernism," and the participants dealt with the interrelationships of these two movements in general and with Auguste Perret, Mars van der Rohe, and Fascist and Social Realist classicism, a number of the talks focused specifically on Scandinavian classicism and its virtues. The papers presented, all of which were quite illuminating, included "Modernism and History" by Elias Corneliu, "Classical Trends in the Modern Movement" by Kenneth Frampton, "The Transition from Classicism to Functionalism in Scandinavia" by Bjorn Linn and Kermo Mikkola; "Alvar Aalto and the Classical Tradition" by Goran Schildt; "Modernism and Morality" by David Watkin; myself on "Asplund's Villa Stenman and Modernism," and finally, "Modern Classicism" by Domenico Porphyris. The symposium was unfortunately marred by a series of last-minute withdrawals by invited speakers: Anthony Vail of the Institute, Andrej Gutsa of Russia, Giorgio Trebbi of Italy, and Maurice Culot of Belgium.

In conjunction with the symposium was an exhibition entitled "Nordic Classicism, 1910-1930," on view in Jyväskylä for two weeks in August and currently on view in Helsinki. (The organizers hope to bring the exhibit to the U.S. next year.) While the driving force behind the exhibit was the Museum of Finnish Architecture, the show came about as a product of a coordinated effort on the part of all the Nordic architectural museums and libraries. It represents perhaps the first time that a Scandinavian-wide architectural movement has been presented comprehensively in one exhibition. As such it is the equivalent of the exhibition "Northern Light," presently at the Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D.C., and soon to open at the Brooklyn Museum, which presents Scandinavian paintings of 1880-1910 as a unified artistic phenomenon for the first time.

Purely from the perspective of architectural history, the show is wide-ranging and uncovers a wealth of previously unknown sources. The exhibit includes only original drawings, both of built and unbuilt projects. The drawings are a feast for the eyes, especially as they are framed within the box-panels, which are painted in typical 1920s classical colors. Small photographs are presented beside the drawings of the built projects to show their final appearance. If one could make a criticism of the show, it would be the emphasis on original drawings makes the whole movement seem slightly precious and unreal. More—and larger—photographs of the buildings as built would have provided the show greater relevance and the actual buildings greater solidity. The current vogue for exhibits presenting recherche imaginary paper projects makes this an important consideration.

If anything emerged from this combined event it was that the dichotomy between classicism and modernism, which initially appeared simple and clear-cut, was considerably more complicated; the two movements were in fact closely interrelated and intertwined. Equally important, the symposium helped save Scandinavia's new classicism from the obscurity of cliched perceptions; it emerged as a rich and complex movement full of vitality, one that may have considerable relevance to architecture in Scandinavia today as well as elsewhere.

In addition to intellectual stimulation, the event also provided some classical Finnish sensory stimulation: aside from the alcohol, the highlights included bathing in the smoke sauna at Aalto's summer house, and a late-night crayfish party at the Villa Mairea accompanied by beautiful, mournful Finnish folk songs sung by the architects Kimo Mikkola and Christian Gullchusen.

Exhibits and symposia in Scandinavia and France focused on the classical tradition and its influence in current architectural efforts.

The second international Alvar Aalto Symposium, this year on the theme of Classicism and Modernism, was held from August 6 to 8 in Jyväskylä, Finland. In conjunction with the symposium was the exhibition Nordic Classicism, 1910-1930, shown in Jyväskylä for two weeks in August and now at the Museum of Finnish Architecture, Helsinki.
French Classicism

Helene Lipstadt

The Laurentine Villa and the Invention of the Roman villa at Paris’ Institute Francais d’Architecture from May 25 to August 28. Also in Paris, at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts from May 11 to July 15, was the show “Paris-Rome-Athene,” sponsored by the Ecole Francais d’Athene and the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.

Several European exhibitions indicate that Neo Classicalism is once again sweeping the continent. T. F. Schinkel, who opened in Venice and moved to Rome’s Palazzo de Conservatori in May; Friedrich Weinbrenner, which opened at the A.A. in London and is currently on view at the Glasgow School of Art; and “Nordic Classicism,” which ran in Jyvaskyla in August and is now in Helsinki, and two simultaneous shows have put Paris in the vanguard of the moment. Although different in scope, content, and curatorial philosophies, “La Laurentine et l’Invention de la Villa Romane” at the Institute Francais d’Architecture and “Paris-Rome-Athene: Le voyage en Grece des architectes francais aux XIXe et XXe siecles” at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts shared a similar goal—the demonstration of the continuing influence of antiquity on 450 years of architectural experimentation and contemporary design. Maurice Calot of the Institut interpreted the task quite literally with an invitational exhibition for new designs for Pliny’s Laurentine Villa. The Ecole merely brought treasures out of the archives. But the Ecole’s catalogue and post-modern setting made abundantly clear that the 20 drawings by those Grand Prix winners who chose Greece as the subject of their major restoration projects could serve as models for present-day architects and archeologists.

A growing public exists for architectural exhibitions in Paris, and “Paris-Rome-Athene” was acclaimed as the authority and imprecision, but, as the curators explain, the results of this fascination with the past were not philological exercises but designs for contemporary dwellings. The 1982 projects, displayed alongside their prestigious predecessors, indicate that architectural quality results in part from the architect’s belief in the text’s moral authority. Those competitors steeped in architectural culture—Len Krier, whose drawings were scaled in Roman feet; Bernard Huet, drawing upon his erudite knowledge of ancient architectural publications; Jean Pierre Adam, a scholar of Pompeii; and the team Weber-Larche, familiar with archaelogical sites—all produced convincing interpretations of the past. Others chose parody and satire and interpreted the villa as a vacation complex, as did Fernando Montes, as a hoarded game of “Mono-Plym,” or as the object of a political tract on the villa as an exploitative economic system. Others, however, wallowed, producing modern-classic hybrids replete with heresies like temple fronts on long elevations. These contributions to the desired discussion were drawn in pig Latin, and one can only conclude that Calot’s cause was thereby rendered a disservice. If, as his preface implies, Calot intended the revenge of the column, his reconstructions bungled the job, and once again it is clear that squaring the pilot does not a pilaster make.

There are thought-provoking parallels to be drawn between the discovery of Greek polychrony and its influence on the new nineteenth-century architecture created in France after the 1820s, and today’s post-modernist debates. The informative, erudite, and somewhat overwhelming catalogue of “Paris-Rome-Athene” leaves little room for as one stems, and the Grand Prix winners could only conclude that the unity of the Orthen was a lesser threat than the monumental polychrony. Before the polychrony polemic, uncharted and unexplored Greek routes were held to be—like the Philhellenic champion, Lord Byron—"mad, bad, and dangerous to know." The challenge they posed to the unity of the Orthen was a lesser threat than their rumored polychrony. After the polychrony of the 1820s, polychrony was generally admitted, but few had pondered the consequences of synthetic restorations with ocre walls and sculpture painted in red, blue, orange, and green. Particularly, the Grand Prix winners followed the scholars, but on the once they site the aided the first archeologists, initiating them into the rudiments of measured drawing. The pioneer was, of course, Labrouste, whose Faustuin restoration, the first student drawing a Grand Prix, in 1857, led him on travel to Greece. Once the interlection was lifted and travel to Greece even encouraged, the Grand Prix winners exploited color to its fullest. From the fresco, color overflowed to the walls and implored in the sanctuary, where, in the absence of any more original, were the most imaginary. Finally color spilled over to the sheet itself until restoration was but an alliter for painterly architecture. Hereby thus became orthodoxy, and by the beginning of the twentieth century, was considered a dated banality. The curators—archeologists—aim at rehabilitating that success and numbers of these drawings the eyes of archeologists, whose restoration drawings are now myriad and numbered. They thus have a good word for each enough, some make one wish the temples had been white. Like its twin, the Pompeii exhibition now at the Getty Museum, “Paris-Rome-Athene” will excite the post-modernists, but the value of this splendid exhibition will be lost if contemporary architects use it only as a justification for changing their box of watercolors. Color—vulgar, shoddy, and carnivalesque—unseemly Neoclassicism when applied in tandem with strong architectural form by Labrouste and his fellows. The final beneficiary of the trip Paris-Rome-Athene was... Paris.

Several European exhibitions indicate that Neo Classicalism is once again sweeping the continent. T. F. Schinkel, who opened in Venice and moved to Rome’s Palazzo de Conservatori in May; Friedrich Weinbrenner, which opened at the A.A. in London and is currently on view at the Glasgow School of Art; and “Nordic Classicism,” which ran in Jyvaskyla in August and is now in Helsinki, and two simultaneous shows have put Paris in the vanguard of the movement. Although different in scope, content, and curatorial philosophies, “La Laurentine et l’Invention de la Villa Romane” at the Institute Francais d’Architecture and “Paris-Rome-Athene: Le voyage en Grece des architectes francais aux XIXe et XXe siecles” at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts shared a similar goal—the demonstration of the continuing influence of antiquity on 450 years of architectural experimentation and contemporary design. Maurice Calot of the Institut interpreted the task quite literally with an invitational competition for new designs for Pliny’s Laurentine Villa. The Ecole merely brought treasures out of the archives. But the Ecole’s catalogue and post-modern setting made abundantly clear that the 20 drawings by those Grand Prix winners who chose Greece as the subject of their major restoration projects could serve as models for present-day architects and archeologists.

A growing public exists for architectural exhibitions in Paris, and “Paris-Rome-Athene” was acclaimed as the museum show of the season by Le Monde. The Laurentine show’s public was architectural and attracted visitors from abroad. Nevertheless, it is probable that “Paris-Rome-Athene” will be of more lasting influence.

“La Laurentine” was a historical retrospective of three centuries of architectural responses to one of archeology’s most enduring puzzles: The appearance of Pliny the Younger’s agrarian villa close to Rome. The 350-year long competition (first entry by Scamozzi in 1615; last entry by A.W. Van Buren in 1944, with Souene, Schinkel, students at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and the Academia di San Luca, as well as a dozen others, between them) has been prolonged, and thirteen new designs added to the corpus. The competition’s only requirement was that a philosophical discussion be provoked by this exercise in codified architecture; as a result, the drawings differ in size, scale, number and type of view, and media. They proved difficult to compare, and the curators, Pierre Pinon and Calot, refrained from judgment. Controversy has surrounded the endeavor many have deemed futile.

Pliny’s text, precise in its description of the function and orientation of the rooms, as well as the pleasures they inspired, is ambiguous in all other respects. The text gained moral authority over the centuries as a guide for those who aspired to the life of the noble landowner. For architects, its attraction lay in the combination of
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"The Big Greek Column Will Be Built", Adolf Loos and the Sign of Classicism

Anthony Vidler

The architecture of Adolf Loos, together with that of Eliel Saarinen and Gunnar Asplund, has in recent years found a new audience in those who would go on to celebrate the simplicities of a reduced modern style and at the same time preserve a sense of the "classic" tradition. While each of these architects took a very different view of classicism, in theory and form, they nevertheless shared a common modernity at the turn of the century between romantic nostalgia and relentless industrial progressivism.

All tried to strip clean the nature of architectural structure and form; all tried to integrate elements taken literally from the classical language into their architecture. All, finally, were aware of the inevitability and profound difference of the modern condition as they worked to save a timeless, a historicist "classic" that united an authenticity of craft and a precision and morality of constructive form. Only Adolf Loos, however, succeeded in capturing this ambiguous sensitivity in writing; as a non-architect, he was compelled to engage in the (for him) spurious experiments of Art Nouveau and the excesses of the later Arts and Crafts movements (movements which in National Romantic guise helped form the work of Asplund and Saarinen), Loos remained resolutely faithful to the essence of design throughout his life. Detached in practice and in principle from the stylistic eclecticism of the Viennese Secession and the a-stylistic fundamentalism of the Neue Sachlichkeit, Loos was in his lifetime and has remained after his death a thoroughly enigmatic figure, irritating to those who have tried to capture him for one "movement" or another.

In provincial and easily shocked Vienna, he was, from his first project on, a radical modernist, out to make architecture relevant to the "modern" world. His writings for the Neue Freie Presse, dedicated to bringing industrial and domestic design down to size and clarifying its proper role, were similarly designed to shock — and they did. His belatedly collected essays, in their first edition, were referred to Loos: "He thought in German in 1898." But equally, despite his co-option by the "(Einprung Neuerschlossener und Freier Stil" (1911) and "Der Schuster" (1914), he was adamantly opposed — and much of his architecture supported his position — to the "transparent" modernism of the free and open "architectural" style that Loos preferred to work with solid cubic forms, hollowed out, as if least some versions of rooms and level changes. But again, unlike J.J.P. Odé — some of whose buildings were, outside at least, superficially similar — Loos insisted on introducing columns and moldings literally dissected from their classical or vernacular context without the slightest attempt at "abstraction." Sometimes, he would even design a whole house in the vernacular timber style of the mountains. Certainly such an architect raises problems in classification.

Until recently, however, English-speaking readers have had little to go on in their assessment of one of the most important thinkers and designers of this century: Franz von Stuck, certainly, with his leading the largely descriptive monograph of Münz and Künstler (1966) and a perceptive introduction or on the early and Austrian editions of his writings. With the translation of Benedetto Gravagnuolo's new monograph, Adolf Loos: Theory and Work (1982) another important study, the latest of "Scribes of Vienna", as Richard Neutra called them.

Scribes, indeed, seems not such a bad image for Loos and his architectural philosophy; especially by this we mean: 1) the compelling, willful contrivance, and above all irresistible figure depicted by Neutra. "Suspended in pre-war Vienna by the "modernists," disaffected by all of them, striving to find forms by which to express an age none of them welcomed, Loos was journalist, wit, aphorist, gauze, and archite. The festchrift compiled for his sixty-fifth birthday had contributions from Karl Kraus, the essayist and journalist, writers such as Ezra Pound and Stefan Zweig; artists such as Josef Itten, Tristan Tzara and Oscar Kokoschka; musicians such as Anton Webern and Arnold Schoenberg. It is his insistence that architecture take a replaced place in the world, confused to the tomb and theGeography, and Mining, was carried out in daily life in the flat. But the "Scribes of Vienna" was also a classical, a designer whose attempt to reconstruct what had been there in the form of the image, in modern guise led him to dismiss those of classical, just as Socrates, in Nietzsche's interpretation, remembered the philosophy of his forefathers and peers.

Loos's classicism, of interest today for a number of reasons, is to be distinguished from a number of prevailing attitudes toward antiquity at the turn of the century. Generally, the classic was understood under two heads by the preceding generation — that of, for example, Walter Pater in England, Ernst Renan in France, Otto von Bismarck in Germany, Arnold Renan in the United States. Here the notion was that naturalistic, late Romantic sense of classic, enriched by philosophical scholarship, but also distanced by it; a classic lost forever, yet the hope for a world gone mad. This was the stance of Matthew Arnold, of Pater himself, who proposed the existence of a "degenerate" but not "aesthetic" sense of cultural craft that knew and practiced its roots and an art that knew its limits; but underneath an ironic, evasive, contradictory modernist, a man of masks pure and simple, who understood the essential arbitrariness of language, who adopted many, and who identified with none. A man without qualities, possessed of all the qualities; a dandy whose snobbishness annoyed even Wittgenstein; a paisaard, who shone a light of male science on the best of terms; an acerbic, witty, fearless of none in his crusade to "introduce Western culture to Austria"; a moralist-acetic, portrayed in the guise of a fuisef faner by Kokoschka and in the manner of Nader's Baudelaire by Loos. But no one can have been, and no one ever will be, the architect who "saw" a modernity, however, no more deadly, and no one is the voice of one who knows that he "speaks to deal ears," who also knows that everything will "disappear" when the titles of his two books — but who preserves in the last recesses of language itself, whether written or built, a kind of sanity.

It is this sanity, based in the end on a belief in bourgeois common sense, that makes him distinguish between the private and the public with such relentless consistency, in fact, in this distinction, the mask is literally hidden behind the face. For Loos, as Gravagnuolo points out, there are two "faces" of Loos, the private and the public. "The mask, however, is always serious, but never deadly, and Loos is the voice of one who knows that he "speaks to deal ears," who also knows that everything will "disappear" when the titles of his two books — but who preserves in the last recesses of language itself, whether written or built, a kind of sanity.

Loos, never one to hide his secrets, gives equal credit to two theorists, Vitruvius and Gottfried Semper, and two architects, Fischer von Erlach and Karl Friedrich Schinkel. From Vitruvius he drew the comfort of a classical lore, trade knowledge, and a repository of precedent; from Semper he derived his extraordinarily sensitive perspective on the artifacts of the modern world, from the tool to the work of art; from Fischer von Erlach he seems to have derived both his macrocosm, that is, the "classicism" of his "history without tears," a seamless web of origins patted together in an enormous but non-progressive compendium of tradition; in Schinkel, finally, he found a classical architect of true classical — one who knew no better.

The publication of a book on Loos' architecture dramatically brings to public attention this architect of the root of classicism.

And the burden of Loos' Vienna circle was that it knew everything, both the sense and the non-sense. Words go ins into the abyss of meaning or the absurd, and endless relativity on the other. Few fashions were ruthlessly exposed, traditions and laws灯火 turned over. A line was made between the way the ornament was handled, the way the ornament was handled, the way the ornament was handled, the life of the chamber pot; and people might be treated, as the phrase has it, either with the chamber pot or the chamber pot, or the chamber pot was, alternatively, tried to elevate the value of the chamber pot to that of the urn. In this cold but endlessly playful Loos was in his claim to night after night his "en catharsis. Kokoschka remembered, was opened in one café or another; How to cook, how to speak, how to tell. "The Other," as Loos saw himself, took a stance outside in order to reveal the "mask" that outside was.

Henry James rather unfairly said of Walter Pater — that pale last romantic trying to stem the tide of industrial modernity with a myth of the Hellenism — that he was "a mask without a face." Of the next-generation Loos, private and the public with such relentless consistency, in fact, in this distinction, the mask is literally hidden behind the face. For Loos, as Gravagnuolo points out, there are two "faces" of Loos, the private and the public. "The mask, however, is always serious, but never deadly, and Loos is the voice of one who knows that he "speaks to deal ears," who also knows that everything will "disappear" when the titles of his two books — but who preserves in the last recesses of language itself, whether written or built, a kind of sanity.

It is this sanity, based in the end on a belief in bourgeois common sense, that makes him distinguish between the private and the public with such relentless consistency, in fact, in this distinction, the mask is literally hidden behind the face. For Loos, as Gravagnuolo points out, there are two "faces" of Loos, the private and the public. "The mask, however, is always serious, but never deadly, and Loos is the voice of one who knows that he "speaks to deal ears," who also knows that everything will "disappear" when the titles of his two books — but who preserves in the last recesses of language itself, whether written or built, a kind of sanity.

It is this sanity, based in the end on a belief in bourgeois common sense, that makes him distinguish between the private and the public with such relentless consistency, in fact, in this distinction, the mask is literally hidden behind the face. For Loos, as Gravagnuolo points out, there are two "faces" of Loos, the private and the public. "The mask, however, is always serious, but never deadly, and Loos is the voice of one who knows that he "speaks to deal ears," who also knows that everything will "disappear" when the titles of his two books — but who preserves in the last recesses of language itself, whether written or built, a kind of sanity.

It is this sanity, based in the end on a belief in bourgeois common sense, that makes him distinguish between the private and the public with such relentless consistency, in fact, in this distinction, the mask is literally hidden behind the face. For Loos, as Gravagnuolo points out, there are two "faces" of Loos, the private and the public. "The mask, however, is always serious, but never deadly, and Loos is the voice of one who knows that he "speaks to deal ears," who also knows that everything will "disappear" when the titles of his two books — but who preserves in the last recesses of language itself, whether written or built, a kind of sanity.

Adolf Loos, Villa Karna, Clarenco, Switzerland: 1904-6 (photo: Roberto Schezen, courtesy The Lobby)

In adumbrating his interpretations of these predecessors, Loos insists on two self-generated principles: One, that any "nostalgia" of origins or of history is to be encrusted in favor of a resolute acceptance of modernity; two, that this acceptance, based on the correlative principle of specialization, involves an absolute distinction among the different arts of living. Here Loos is supported by the materialism of Semper, for whom no object of use is devoid of cultural significance, and by a sort of Darwinian belief in the natural evolution of things towards appropriate form. Style for Loos exists, but it is never self-consciously invented; it just emerges out of the multifarious daily activities of a people. Differences in style are not the product of changing taste, nor the outcome of an individual artist's will, but the combination of a way of life, the natural conditions of a place, and most importantly, the natural language that pertains to each material. The architect-craftsman, a simple "mason who had learned Latin," in Loos's description, is in these terms an interpreter and investigator of his time. Not that Loos's "spirit of the age," although all-powerful, had any resemblance to that progressive model of search and invention posed by later modernists; nor that such a belief in natural style would do away overnight with all the embellishments of a perverted taste; but simply that the only authenticity to be found was in such a principle of form.

Taken in this light, Loos's theory and design seem not so much the anticipation of a post-modern sensibility that many would want it to be today; less an indictment of modernism than it seemed in its own time; but rather, more modernist than his time—and perhaps even ours—can stand. A nihilist to the end, he yet revelled in the making of a particular kind of architectural world: one where modern man would not find himself swept off his feet in free play or Dionysian dance among the pilasters, nor comforted by the illusion of a world unchanged; but one where, behind anonymous and recitent facades, pleasure might be carved out for a private instant. Even this pleasure, though, was tempered with the public role of modern man. Ease and comfort were as necessary to a Taylorized worker at the end of the day as food; for this the interior would not pretend, would not posture as what it was not. As simply itself, it would act as the neutral frame for the bureaucracy's rest. But when, refreshed, the inhabitant of a Loosian house once more sought charismas, he might turn for cultural therapy to the white wall on which a violent scene of the psyche, as painted by Kokoschka, was hung; or he might meditate on the supreme perfection of that classical world marked, in his house, by two severe Doric columns. That is why Loos wanted every city to have its own personal column, standing as a sign of perfection in the midst of functional office blocks.

In these reconsiderations, Gravagnuolo's book is enormously helpful. The text situates as no other in English Loos's positions with respect to those of his Viennese contemporaries, and with no little intellectual sophistication. The illustrations allow for a chronological journey through the work, providing startling insights both with hitherto unpublished schemes and buildings and with new photographs of known ones. The commentary to this catalogue raisonné helpfully lists bibliographical sources for each project, aiding future research. But this said, there is much here more irritating than exciting, not all, it must be stressed, the fault of Gravagnuolo. For while his preface essay contains information and critical observations of superb quality, especially with respect to the complexity and ambiguity of Loos's positions, it is unfortunately subjected to that kind of thoughtless "translation" that has spoiled many recent Italian books for the English reader—notably those of Manfredo Tafuri and his colleagues. While not as execrable a translation as Tafuri's Architecture and Utopia (1976), this one also seems entirely ignorant of English forms as it tries helplessly to deal with Italian commonplaces of rhetoric and sentence structure; with the practice of using definite articles where none are required in English; with the

single-word allusions—always in quotation marks in Italian—that refer cryptically to entire discourses, Nietzschean and other; with the long "apologies" seemingly necessary to the flow of the prose in Italian, but which when translated without cutting appear to be so much meaningless or tautological "fill." The preface, perhaps, has been sloppy, too, so that, for example, Loos's "Ornament and Crime," first published in 1908, was apparently republished in 1902 and again in L'Esprit Nouveau in 1913, before the journal was founded. This makes for a rough and uneven read. But most serious is the cavalier attitude taken toward the illustrations themselves. Not only do we see, time after time, a perfectly good illustration taken from Mintz and Kinzler reduced or enlarged, cropped badly and blurrred; but the obviously good originals of Roberto Schezen's photographs have received short shrift from the printer: Many are blurred, without definition; others seem retouched. Perhaps we have been too conditioned by the Japanese to require the highest standards from color printing, but when the subject is of such importance and the images so beguiling, this is the least we can ask. Beyond this, and hindering many of the author's analyses, there is a critical shortage of plans, elevations, and sections, which are withheld or supplied seemingly at random. A consistent documentary attitude in so comprehensive a catalogue would have been more acceptable.

In all, this tantalizing book—because on a tantalizing subject—seems more the product of haste to supply a market demand than of considered scholarship. One has only to compare it with Eduard Sckler's magnificent monograph on Josef Hoffmann (London, 1977) to relish a future work on Loos that not only discovers a detailed historical biography, but also penetrates the complexity of his intellectual relations in pre-war Vienna and post-war Europe. This, from the point of view of a scholar; but even from that of the consumer of images, this book is sadly wanting. Only with more care in the writing of commentary and criticism, history and theory, and with more comprehensive coverage in the representation of schemes as a whole—so that they may be reconstructed by the viewer—will both images and aphorisms be transformed into a critical and prospective attitude towards past, and therefore present, architecture.
Interview

Gerald D. Hines and Peter Eisenman

P.E.: This is my first interview with a member of a group that could really be labeled "architects." You represent one specific type of client, namely the developer. It is common opinion that developers are not interested in architecture, but rather in business. This suggests a whole range of questions that specifically involves you as the "maestro leader" of developers. First, how do a businessman become interested in good architecture? Second, how does good architecture relate to the success of what is good business as a developer and can the two interests be made to coincide?

G.H.: I am not sure how my interest in architecture and building developed. The only time that I ever built anything was the building I did when I was young.

P.E.: You did not go into development because you were interested in architecture?

G.H.: Initially, I was interested in making money and in the building process. As an engineer in the building industry, I understood building systems, yet I found a lack of coherence in the system and in the parts of the industry. A lot of unethical things went on in building, for example, an engineer or an architect would report he built something for five hundred dollars per ton of air conditioning. The cost seemed fine to the owner, who didn't know that there may have been twice as many tons in the plant as there should have been; so he was hoodwinked. This was the kind of thing I saw going on in engineering and architectural practice.

P.E.: If you were planning to build and develop after being a mechanical engineer, you knew a lot about construction and building systems, but not necessarily about the financing or management of construction. On top of that, mechanical engineers are not renowned for their interest in good architecture; they are interested in good engineering. Then again, many architects are not necessarily interested in good architecture. There are many architects who are great businessmen and who think that good business is good architecture and thus good for the client. Other than your personal interest in building, what made you think that the two—good architecture and good business—could operate together?

G.H.: It evolved. My first buildings were competitive. One of the first clients I had was very interested in quality building. We used an architectural firm never before used for warehouses—Golman & Rolfe—and they did a very fine building that helped us launch our reputation. The feedback from these first jobs was so positive that I continued in that vein. I was a builder without any reputation, but I was doing something different from the established construction firms. Although I did not have the financial capital they had, I had an alternative distinction; I competed with the giant financial groups. So it was an evolution—seeing something had been done as beneficial to you and proceeding from that understanding.

Again, I knew how to bring in mechanical systems at a reasonable cost and, working with the Benson Company, our first builder, I was able to learn how to bring in quality projects. Benson was the quality builder of homes in the River Oaks section of Houston and had earned his reputation there, so I negotiated my contracts with him. The combination of his work, quality craftsmanship, and general contracting, plus the architecture gave us a reputation that was considerably better than that of other builders.

P.E.: It seems that one of the things in your favor, other than this commitment to being a good businessman, a good engineer, and a good builder, is that you were willing to take a certain number of risks. You were reaching for quality without having proved that the quality was necessarily going to be good business. Why is it that other developers were not taking the same sort of risks?

G.H.: Maybe they did not get the same feedback that I did. I only proceeded step by step. The first time I built a building—in 1952—I may have invested an extra $5,000 in the whole job. We used pure vinyl tile instead of plain asphalt tile and a special brick rather than a sand brick. In the second building, a few months later, there was a whole collection of things that were maybe $20,000 extra. I cost us perhaps five percent more, but that went into items that distinguished us from other builders.

P.E.: Do you think that the clients, the people who rent office space, are aware of the difference between vinyl and asphalt tile?

G.H.: In a warehouse, they were. I grew up in a manufacturing business that had very standardized items. I was tired of being in a business in which everything, even down to the efficiencies, was almost identical. With no real difference between firms, all that distinguished individuals was who could spend the most money by purchasing the agents to get the job. I wanted to establish some other criteria. I discovered that extra quality in buildings would make our product stand out; if we found that we had a product that was differentiated, we had a chance of getting a better class of client. In early days, for example, when it was necessary to have a certain building in the market there is always a clientele that will consider value over price alone.

P.E.: When did you work on your first project with Philip Johnson? Was he the first architect you worked with from outside of Texas?

G.H.: The first major project was with Skidmore, Owings & Merrill on One Shell Plaza in Houston, around 1966-66. [It was completed in 1970.] I did not meet Philip until 1970.

P.E.: Was Pennzoil your first project with him?

G.H.: No, we had done many sketches with Johnson and Burgee on Post Oak Central before starting on Pennzoil [both completed in 1976]. Post Oak Central went through three different designs. It started as a centralized system with three prespect buildings around a core. Philip learned about mortgage packages because we had to divide the project into three parts. That was a unique exercise. I remember John Burgee’s innovation and response to the problems, we went through a lot of competition for the project. Then we had the opportunity to do Pennzoil.

P.E.: Pennzoil is an important building in terms of its relationship to the cityscape. The split building presents a new idea of the car in relation to the building and the urban scale as seen from the car. As the client, how much did you have to do with this design? Was your first reaction that it was going to be a difficult building to sell, with those two pieces?

G.H.: Yes, we were concerned with all the problems we foresaw and the fact that that sort of double building had never been done before. Because of our experience in the building business, these problems were there to be solved, not to be avoided. Most builders, lacking the knowledge of building technology, shy away from problems like that. But the fact that Pennzoil was two buildings didn’t scare us and we set out to conquer the particular difficulties involved in the design. In fact, having the two buildings represented a lower leasing risk: it enabled us to segment the major tenant, which reduced our exposure—the name of the game in the development business.

P.E.: Because you understood these things as a developer, you were able to participate in that sort of innovation. What about the new breed of equity partners—the large pension funds and insurance companies—who are a lot more conservative and a lot less knowledgeable about building? Do you think that sort of partnership is going to change your attitude or what you are going to be able to do?

G.H.: No. As long as we don’t make any big mistakes—which we do not intend to do—they accept our professionalism. The reason they have a development partner is to get that expertise.

P.E.: So these new equity partners are not really as interested in design as they are in professionalism.

G.H.: They want a professional partner with a good track record.

P.E.: What about innovation? As you know, there is a big debate in the architectural world about this phenomenon called "post-modernism" and a return to historical styles. A lot of people in both industry and commerce say it is more expensive to build in stone, to get the detail, the moldings, the historical references that post-modernism calls for. But the style is supposedly "innovative" and "creative." Do you agree?

What do you think about it in terms of commercial real estate?

G.H.: It does cost more. When the price of glass curtain walls went out of sight we could buy stone for about the same cost as glass. Now glass is less expensive and because of recent automation, there may be cost pressures to shift back to the window-wall.

P.E.: What about aesthetics? Modern architecture was where the action was for corporate America from 1945 to 1975. For thirty years the image of Modernism symbolized something that was new, growing, vigorous. Post-modernism talks about something old; it is nostalgic. How does that relate to the image that corporate America has of itself?

G.H.: The new architecture fits into the mold that corporate America imagines for itself. I think the style is very strong. For example, the RepublicBank Center project for Houston by Johnson/Burgee is a very strong statement. At first we were a little concerned about it, but it has received an excellent reception from clients.

P.E.: Do you think that the curtain and window-wall manufacturers are going to be able to counter this trend toward using stone? Do trends follow what is being manufactured?

G.H.: In many cases they do. Obviously, the clients' acceptance of a particular system really leads the trend. If your clients are buying post-modern buildings, builders are going to build post-modern buildings. But if customers can buy modernist curtain wall systems at prices lower than post-modern stone buildings, then we are going to see a move back in that direction.
Peter Eisenman talks with developer Gerald D. Hines, who is known for his support of high-quality design in the commercial market. Currently Mr. Hines has over 291 projects completed in 24 cities representing approximately 46 million s.f. He completed 6.7 million s.f. in 1981 alone, a figure that places him among the top ten developers in the United States in construction-dollar volume.

"The basic intention is to establish an identity, in a given market, with a project that is individualistic, that makes the tenant say, 'That's my building and I'm proud of it.' We consider our buildings products."

P.E.: If you are saying that styles come and styles go, would you say that selling commercial space or buildings is like selling fashion? If building is a somewhat trendy business, can it also be urbanistically responsible?

G.H.: We do not like to think of it as fashion. We believe more in a civic responsibility to increase the quality of our urban fabric.

P.E.: You said that in the past it was quality that distinguished you from other developers, gave you a slight edge, and attracted a different kind of investor and user. Do you think that advantage is diminishing? Now that more developers are building quality projects, is your edge going to have to be in some other element of the business—perhaps your experience or your track record?

G.H.: More developers are concentrating on quality, which is commendable. In fact, I am glad to see others copying us. We still get a good share of the market.

P.E.: Will you start moving into other kinds of development proposals—ones that involve more than a single building on a project basis? Will you be doing more developments that include two, three, or four buildings, which are really more statements about urbanism than about individual buildings?

G.H.: As a development company matures it does begin to seek out two-to-five building complexes; it is so hard to start from scratch every time on a single new building. On the other hand, of course, the kind of community where you can find a market for a larger project and provide the holding costs for the land is hard to find.

P.E.: What about starting your own town? Sugarland was a beginning, but it was really just a suburban development.

G.H.: It was ten thousand acres. That is probably the largest sort of project we'll try. We do not have any special desire to do a whole new town, say forty or fifty miles from an urban center. That is just too tough to do and be successful.

Gerald D. Hines (photo: Dorothy Alexander)
"I do think that personal communication will remain the focus of business activity. There are going to be tremendous changes—with desk computers, internal communications, computer systems from New York to Houston—but I do not see a lessening of the personal relationships that exist now."

P.E.: On a recent trip to Chicago I never got out of O'Hare Airport. I flew in, had a meeting at one hotel, stayed at another hotel, went to another meeting and another hotel; I never went into downtown Chicago. I could have lived in Dallas and Houston as examples. That is where most of America lives today. They are automobile-oriented cities and that will not change unless you change the automobile. But the automobile changes.

P.E.: You did not mention housing when talking about mixed use. You seem to envision mixed-use development still without housing.

P.E.: If we assume there is a new growth economy and an energy situation that continues to deteriorate, or remains as it is, don't you think people will move back into cities?

P.E.: We have not yet talked about the role government plays in urban development. There are a number of issues that you have just brought to mind. We are doing a project in Germany, which came about in a curious way. We were in the Hald competition (International Bauausstellung) and the sponsors wanted suggestions for Berlin. We did an office building scheme because we knew a developer was coming to review it. But the developer said he could not afford to build office buildings in Berlin because he was being subsidized to build housing. In a sense, all of the buildings produced by the government housing ministry are tax shelters for private investment. That seems to be a very ingenious way of providing for housing, whether it is in mixed-use centers or not. Why is it that in a country like Germany they have a government policy that supports tax shelters?

G.H.: That is just the nature of the tax codes and incentives; we could do it. There are no problems in creating tax incentives; it is simply a matter of legislative lobbying. The current situation is obviously a reflection of where we as a people place our priorities. At present there is a huge incentive in building depreciation; you can depreciate any new building in fifteen years. We certainly do not need it; it will bring a lot of speculators into the building industry, which will lead to deterioration in the quality of our building stock.

P.E.: How did that happen? Isn't there a strong lobby against that sort of thing?

G.H.: No one will turn down a gift horse. Being against such rapid depreciation is just my stand; it is not the attitude of all developers. We have found that if there are too many incentives, people join the business only for the tax write-offs. That does not foster very good buildings. We end up with a bunch of brick and mortar that is pretty ugly and not very well built. There is a happy medium.

P.E.: What about different tax incentives? If you can receive tax credit for capital investment, why can't you receive tax credit for anti-smoking—example, for purchasing vinyl instead of asphalt tile?

G.H.: That would be hard to administer.

P.E.: Don't you think that may be because we don't have what might be called a national planning policy? HUD, nobody has been very concerned with the public good, not even in socialist countries. The great cities of the past were built prior to the French Revolution. I wonder if interests indisposed for the public good.

G.H.: That is a big issue. Prior to the French Revolution, one individual could make a decision. The distribution of money will never be the same as it was when a benevolent dictator controlled it.

P.E.: Are you saying that democratic capitalism is permanently saddled with this kind of laissez-faire attitude toward public environment?

G.H.: Considering the push-pull sorts of things that take place in the legislative process, yes. One of the last examples of that individual power was the Empire State Mall in Albany [Harrison and Abramovitz, 1962-1978], where a very strong governor wanted to see a major project through. He managed it, but look at the problems he had.

P.E.: Returning to mass transit, there is no question that our government doesn't have the private funds to do it. In Europe there are great subsidies for mass transit. Why is it that European governments are willing to pay for mass transit, while ours is not?

G.H.: They are just smarter. Europeans grew up with mass transit and were slower to adopt the automobile as a popular system of transportation. The combination of our highway acts and the mass production of automobiles led America in a different direction. So in Europe there is a transit system infrastructure that was maintained, developed, and remains part of the urban fabric. Our cities are designed around the automobile; they are not designed to accommodate mass transit systems. To start to change that, to remodel it, would be a nightmare. First of all, the replacement cost is huge. Then, in adopting any mass transit system, you are only going to be able to move a small percentage of the population until the system is in place. Only then will the development patterns start to change and it will take twenty years; they will then start to correspond to the lines and more systems will be built. If there is tax increment financing the development patterns will change, but you have to bring the transit system in first.

P.E.: What about mass transit systems in the Sun Belt cities?

G.H.: I do not see that happening. Only when cities start to strangle, like Houston, do people really start to study mass transit; only when people need seventy lanes to get downtown does mass transit become the only alternative.

P.E.: Architects in this country could become decorators
"I think you will continue to see Galleria-type developments in center city. Obviously how the financing is put together will always be key.

That is the exciting part about the development business—it will change tomorrow."

in the most limited and crass sense of the word, making nice all over town polluted and partly empty rather than making urbanistically viable spaces that are also commercially viable. I do not know when an architect last designed a street or an urban space like the Place Vendôme, which has space carved out of an existing mass of buildings, with a uniform facade. We do not have "cities" in this country. There is not enough public concern other than for the mandatory "designed" street furniture and paving patterns; there is little concern for a public policy that would affect urbanism. Our cities are also the creations of developers who, while they may have a sense of public well-being, nevertheless develop on a project-by-project basis rather than according to any grand design.

Even though you made a Pennsylvan, a RepublicBank, a different tower on California Street than on Market Street in San Francisco, those buildings are essentially variations on a theme. They do not suggest an attitude toward urbanism comparable to that of the Place Vendôme. They do not produce a rue de Rivoli. Are those kinds of development beyond our capacity? An architect learns about urbanism in school, yet he is little more in practice than a packager and developer. Why ask whether the architect can do anything more or not? How can he do anything more?

G.H.: There are things being done on a very large scale—like our development out at Sugarland; we are going to have a Place Vendôme. We also have a two hundred and ninety acre tract of land in the process of developing with one of the major retail chains in the U.S. Our idea is to have a nothing that will have a distinct urban fabric. We are creating a fantastic street down the middle of two hundred and ninety acres of ground. I think that is exciting.

P.E.: How recent is that development?

G.H.: It is just in the process of starting; we have not got all of our pieces together yet.

P.E.: That did not come about through an architect's initiative, though. It must have come about through your initiative.

G.H.: It came about in discussions between our partners and us. They said, "Why do just another ordinary shopping center? Let's do something that will introduce a whole new era of shopping and complimentary use. Instead of putting the major stores in the corners and the secondary activities on the sides, let's plan it differently from day one." I think it will be a great street.

P.E.: That is the most exciting idea we've talked about.

G.H.: But it is hard to assemble two hundred and ninety acres in a viable location which are all controlled under one ownership.

P.E.: That is why I am suggesting you are in the same position as the eighteenth-century patrons. Philip Johnson has always said that the private developers could be the patrons, not the government.

G.H.: In the eighteenth century, however, the local patrons were also in their own political systems. They could internalize all the population's desires and then make a decision. It is not that easy with a democratic system.

P.E.: I have talked in the past about bringing education in business and education in architecture closer together. How would a business education help architects? Perhaps they would be more sympathetic to business interests, and more receptive to what the real problems are in financing, holding land, and putting land together. It might be that it is more important for someone with a business background to understand what design is than it is for an architect to understand how business works, because the MBA is the point man on the team. But, other than having a better understanding between architects and businessmen, what would this closeness do for development? It would not, I think, lead to a planning policy for development, as opposed to the single project mentality that exists today.

G.H.: First, as you say, it would create a climate in which the architect and developer are not poles apart. There would be a mutual understanding of the problems, which might make it easier to come to a solution down the line. Architects would understand the importance of finishing a building quickly; it is important to get a tenant in occupancy so they can start paying rent. . . . It would help them themselves. The more one knows about the other, the easier it is to sell the whole system.

P.E.: Why is it that when the government wants a legal opinion it goes to the Harvard Law School or the Stanford Law School for advice? Why is it that when there is a question of development or environmental concern, nobody goes to the schools of architecture for advice? They go to the practicing architects.

G.H.: Basically, one is in touch with, and in the business of, the real estate world. The architect is not. In the architecture the practitioners are on the cutting edge and the academicians are not considered to be on the cutting edge.

P.E.: Why is it that in business the academicians really are on the cutting edge? The Harvard Business School is a very important place.

G.H.: In comparison with the Graduate School of Development, it is a reflection of the leadership that the Business School has taken and how it is perceived by the business community and the government.

P.E.: Even practicing architects never make policy; they carry out policy. Philip Johnson, Cesar Pelli, L. M. Pei, and Kevin Roche do not formulate policy. Yet the leadership in the business community or the leaders in the legal community formulate policy. Do you think that could change or should change?

G.H.: It all depends on who the people are at those institutions. If you can assemble a group of people who are on the cutting edge, then you might achieve what you are talking about. I do not see it happening in the near future, however.

P.E.: You have selected a number of different architects for different projects in the city. Are Johnson/Burgee and Kevin Roche [who is doing a number of projects including a building for CBS, 356m St., in New York] also, you have several architects designing houses for you in various parts of the country. How do you make decisions about architects for particular building projects? What are you looking for in an architect?

G.H.: To build a house you are basically looking for someone who has a design sympathetic to what you feel should be at that site. It is much the same with a larger building. We think that there is one architect for a given site in a given city at a given time; one architect who will be best in that situation. We may say, "There are buildings coming up that will be judged in a competition, so we will use Mr. A because he will run away with the prize." Or we say, "We have had enough of these sorts of but his design was different." The basic intention is to establish an identity, in a given market, with a project that is individualistic, that makes the tenant say, "That's my building and I'm proud of it." We consider our buildings products. So we view the development of that building as a product, not just as a building. It is a product and has to compete with other products in that market.

P.E.: In working out ideas with an architect—the person designing the product—their special skills or ways of dealing with you do you require from him? Are some architects easier to work with than others?

G.H.: We are looking for someone who can be flexible in arriving at a solution. Sometimes it requires six or seven designs to arrive at something that starts to make sense. We are interested in architects who are not afraid to expose their egos in the evolution of an idea. Most good architects are willing to go through the process with you, starting with the barest sketches and making mistakes in front of you.

P.E.: What are the different sensibilities involved in doing houses or office buildings? For example, you hired Charles Moore to design a house, but would you hire him to do a higher office building?

G.H.: Probably not. He may have a great sense of certain spaces and volumes and light that is intriguing, but his may not be the type of experience needed to do a highrise building.

P.E.: Can't you harness that experience? Couldn't you ask an architect who has fascinated you with the way he manipulates light and space on a small scale to design a bigger building?

G.H.: You might try him on a four- or five-story building. We have done that. You do not try him on a fifty-story building; you do not try him on a twenty-five story building.

P.E.: Are you saying the sensitivity is different?

G.H.: In combination with experience, You could try it; you just might end up thrashing around too long.

P.E.: Why not do what John Portman does? He is an architect/designer. Why don't you become an architect, or have your own in-house design?

G.H.: That would be the worst move in the world, for the same reason that we do not have in-house tax advice; most of our tax advice is sought from people who are continually innovating. Otherwise, you would become very stale; your buildings would become stereotyped; people would buy your services for a particular look. You would end by limiting yourself in the marketplace. Also, it would be difficult to keep the quality high—if an employer is doing your designing, then you really can't be as critical. It is hard to tell your wife her taste is bad; you would have the same problem with in-house design. It would degenerate. There would be no freshness and you would lose the competitiveness for new ideas.
Gehry's Urbanism

Critique of Loyola Law School and
Spiller House

Martin Filler

Two recently completed works by Frank Gehry give further confirmation of the theory that his oeuvre can be fairly easily divided between his designs that deal with the architectural object in space and those that treat the architectural object as space. In the first category, for example, can be included Gehry's Ron Davis Studio and Residence of 1972 in Malibu, his "Collaborations" project with Richard Serra of 1981, and his incomplete Whitney house in Santa Monica, begun in 1980. The second category includes his own house of 1976-78 in Santa Monica, the Mid-Atlantic Toyota Distributors' offices of 1978 in Glen Burnie, Maryland, and the Cabrillo Maritime Museum of 1979 in San Pedro. To some extent, this division is based on Gehry's own particular emphasis on exterior form in some projects (the predominant characteristic of the buildings in the first group) as opposed to his contrary emphasis on interior space in others (the second group).

Two of Gehry's new buildings—his Loyola Law School in Los Angeles (1981), and the Spiller House in Venice, California (1980)—conform respectively to those opposing designations. And as they are both essentially urban structures in architectural expression and response to their surroundings, they are of special interest in a body of work that has been largely suburban both in setting (The Rosen Company headquarters of 1975 in Columbia, Maryland, Gehry's own house, and Toyota) and occasionally in program (Santa Monica Place of 1980-81, a transplanted example of that most anti-urban of all building types, the enclosed shopping mall).

The Loyola Law School is situated in a particularly drab lower district on the fringes of downtown Los Angeles. Gehry was therefore spared having to deal with the new skyscrapers of the central business core that form what is arguably the worst collection of bigtime construction in any American city. Rather, Gehry had to contend with mere seediness, and was faced with establishing a sense of place in an area that would need the merest descriptive powers of a Raymond Chandler to imbue it with any vividness. The site was dictated by its adjacency to the existing Loyola Law School building, a thoroughly undistinguished box built during the 1960s by Albert C. Martin & Associates. Gehry's scheme helps to diminish the presence of the earlier structure by providing a new focal courtyard around which his own buildings will be arranged, obliterating the Martin design, which Gehry will subsequently remodel as the final part of a three-phase development plan.

The main, office-classroom building (the Fritz B. Burns Building) is the first completed segment of the project. It is primarily a facade, and as dynamic as the exterior may be, the building as a whole is something of a disappointment to those of us who have come to think of Gehry as the designer of the most exciting interior architectural spaces of his time. But the Loyola office-classroom building is even more notably atypical of precedent in either of Gehry's two primary design modes for its pronounced use of classicizing references: Bilateral symmetry (although Gehry, being Gehry, puts the axis slightly off center); a pediment-like greenhouse surmounting the central axis; regularization of fenestration, with larger windows on a piano nobile above a ground-floor arcade; scoring of the stucco facade to imply masonry construction; and external stairways at both ends of the facade that give vertical peripheral definition similar to the effect of boldly articulated quoins.

The overall feeling, nonetheless, is not that of Post-Modern Classicism (though this design will no doubt be pounced upon by those eager to add an architect of Gehry's talent and stature to their own ranks). Rather, it comes closer to the more abstracted classicizing forms of the Tendenza, the Neo-Rationalists, and the young Argentinean contingent in New York. Gehry's unusual choice of historicizing elements in this project was dictated by his conviction that they are appropriate for the legal profession, the architectural iconography of which has traditionally stressed the ancient legitimacy of jurisprudence.

Even more overtly historicizing will be two smaller structures that will be built to enclose a central plaza facing the facade of the office-classroom building—another classroom facility and a most courthouse, the former relating somewhat to Gehry's World Savings Bank branch of 1980 in Burbank, the latter to American vernacular judicial architecture of the early nineteenth century. The third plaza component will be a chapel for the Roman Catholic institution, an austere apsidal form with a pitched roof that provides a Romanesque interlude to the otherwise more Roman ensemble. Gehry would like the chapel to be clad in unfinished plywood (an exterior surfacing material that he has already successfully used on one of his three Indiana Avenue houses of 1981 in Venice), which would be maintained at Loyola with periodic waxings by the faithful as a continuing act of piety.

For the moment, though, the office-classroom building stands alone, but even now it is a most intriguing piece of architecture. Gehry is a much more subtle, skillful and original colorist than his colleagues better known for their chromatic fantasies, and the cream-colored stucco of the Loyola facade is given perfect counterpoint by the deep gray-green stucco of its central exterior stairway. Frankly, it is a much more pleasing means of entrance to upper floors than the main door at ground level, which lacks even a Venturian sense of teasing anti-climax in its flinty pedestrian transition to the inside. After so much implied promise on the outside, the entry area is a small, randomly shaped space bounded on one side by the central elevator bank and leading off to nondescript corridors. The ground floor is not even Ordinary; it is merely ordinary. Student lounges, a library, and a dining hall are much the same, though they fortunately lack the cheap-but-not-so-cheerful decorative appliques that are now a standard post-modernist response to low budgets. By far the best aspects of the interiors are the ceiling treatment (capped ducts interspersed with indirect lighting, illumination that is at once satisfying and suggestive) and the upper-floor corridors (where glass-enclosed internal walls reflect and refract the light introduced from above). Despite the client's limited resources, Gehry's building is meticulously finished, a reminder that his fascination with cheap materials and unfinished surfaces is neither an inexpressable pairing nor central to his essential professional seriousness.

The Spiller House in Venice, in contrast to Loyola, is an architectural design, and it is his finest residential design since his epochal house for himself. Built on a tiny back-alley lot in that densely built-up shorefront community, the tower-like structure is clad in the corrugated steel that has become a Gehry trademark. The formal development of the composition is strongly vertical, and the sheer brashness with which the architect has triumphed over a hellishly unsympathetic site and
These two works considerably advance Frank Gehry's reputation as an urban architect. The crucial, often insurmountable, challenge for architects of the contemporary avant-garde is to make the jump from small-scale commissions to larger urban projects. In the case of Frank Gehry, there can be little doubt that he is now ready for the next major step.

**Project:** Loyola Law School expansion, Phase I: The Fritz B. Burns Building  
**Architect:** Frank O. Gehry and Associates  
**Location:** Loyola Law School campus in downtown Los Angeles  
**Program:** 45,250 s.f. of offices, classrooms, and student facilities  
**Structure and materials:** The reinforced concrete and steel frame has a stucco finish, which is painted warm yellow on facades facing the interior of the campus.  
**Completion:** 1981

**Project:** Spiller Residence  
**Architect:** Frank O. Gehry and Associates  
**Location:** Venice, California  
**Client:** Jane Spiller  
**Site:** A 30 by 90 ft. interior lot in a suburban area one block from the beach  
**Program:** Residential. 2,700 s.f. are divided between a 2-story front unit and a 3-story unit in the rear.  
**Structure and materials:** The wood frame, with exposed wood trusses, is sheathed in galvanized metal that will weather naturally. The skylights are wired glass.  
**Completion:** 1980
L.A. Update

Izaski on Bunker Hill
After eighteen months of controversy and a publicized project that architect Arata Isozaki essentially disowned [Skyline, May 1982], the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles finally has an accepted design for its building on Bunker Hill. Made public in late July, the present design, while still apparently adversely affected by the circumstances of site and politics, is generally more characteristic of what may be expected from Isozaki than the "architecture committee neutral" of the last "official" release. The structure, longer than a football field, still has the same low profile and central sculpture plaza and sunken court, but it now has a bit more distinction in its forms. These are the primary volumes found in much of Isozaki's work: A barrel vault, pyramids, prisms, and a cube on the roof. What the architect calls "symbolic forms" adds some texture to the otherwise simple boxes that make up the several parts of the building. The entrance to the museum is through a "gateway" under the barrel-vaulted element and across the sunken court. The interior plans, which include nearly 100,000 s.f. of gallery and support spaces, have remained essentially unchanged during the design process. Museum officials hope construction will begin on the building early next year; the associated architects are Gruen Associates.

Meanwhile, MacA also announced plans for what they are calling "Temporary Contemporary" gallery spaces. These, for which Frank Gehry is preparing plans, will be located on Central Avenue in two buildings to be leased from the city. Construction is scheduled for completion in late summer 1983.

Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer on Wilshire
In another part of town, the design for the 100,000-s.f. Atlantic Richfield Gallery addition to the Los Angeles County Museum is proceeding as well. The current design, approved by the museum in late June, is somewhat more refined than that released last spring [Skyline, May 1982] but, according to architect Norman Pfeiffer of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, is "not quite done yet." The windowless stone wall—300 feet along Windshire Boulevard—has been enlivened considerably by the addition of glass block banding and terra cotta details. These bands, forming the corner in a manner that Pfeiffer referred to as "a skylight detail turned sideways," allow natural light into the gallery spaces through a system of UV controls and interior louvers. The mass of the new building encloses what was the podium of the County Museum's three buildings and provides a single entrance—the sixty-five-foot high portal on the Boulevard opening on a passage to the central court. Enclosure of the central court is planned in the second phase of construction; HHPA's design at the moment calls for a steel and glass roof with a gabled profile. The museum plans to start construction on phase one, the Arco building and site work, early next year. — MGJ
Pelli in Houston

The National Capital Planning Commission has effectively killed the proposal for a Navy Memorial arch/bandstand [Skyline, April 1982] by the New York City firm Caudill, Rosasnt. The proposed 112-foot arch had been approved by the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation and, tentatively, by the District of Columbia Fine Arts Commission, but was rejected by the NCPC as incompatible, out of scale, and inappropriate. Approval from all three agencies was necessary before construction could begin. The NCPC did not have the concept of a memorial and continues to study the situation.

Meanwhile the PADC is reconsidering initiation of one of the original proposals for the Western Plaza on Pennsylvania Ave by Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown: a 22-foot high model of the Capitol and a smaller model of the White House to be set on the appropriate sites on the plaza’s terraces, which is passed with L’Enfant’s map of Washington. The third component of the scheme, two 85-foot high stone pylons framing the view down Pennsylvania Avenue, is not being reconsidered.

The House of Representatives approved a scaled-down version of Lawrence Halprin’s design for a memorial to Franklin Roosevelt; the Senate passed the scheme in March. The memorial design calls for a 14-foot high wall along Pennsylvania Avenue to the edge of the Tidal Basin near the Jefferson Memorial. The area along the 800-foot long wall is to be landscaped with gardens, terraces, pools, and sculpture. The earlier design comprised 1,200 feet of wall and a visitors’ center.

42nd Street Update

In August George Klein (Park Tower Development Corp.) announced that Washington had been named as master planner, with John Burgee Architects as consulting architects, for office towers he is developing as part of the 42nd Street Redevelopment Project. The site of the project encompasses four of the five corners/blocks forming Seventh Avenue and Broadway as they cross 42nd Street, surrounding the Allied Chemical (once Times) Tower.

The major task facing Johnson, Burgee, and Klein at the moment is to adjust the Redevelopment Project’s design guidelines, prepared by Cooper-Eckstut Associates, to the market realities and the fact that a single company is developing the four sites, which were originally defined separately. [Skyline, December 1981 and May 1982 for more information on the whole project.] Burgee reports that they are working with thirty-five separate public agencies that have some interest in the project. Only when a development plan is complete does he expect to begin the design. On the other hand, he does have a few ideas in mind. We understand that there are two separate schemes already sketched—one includes the site occupied by the tower at One Times Square, a site that was not part of the plan. A request for proposals from the 42nd Street Redevelopment Project’s request for proposals. If Klein wants to include this site he will have to purchase it from the current owner or, failing that, the Urban Development Corporation can wield its power of condemnation.... Burgee says that when all these problems are solved, he has an agreement with Klein to design the first building. Although he “can’t tell” yet which that will be, he is hoping for the one at the top of the Square—the south side of 42nd between Seventh and Broadway, as the “consummate site.

Meanwhile, the EDC, the Department of City Planning, and the Public Development Corporation are still considering the latest twelve proposals for five theaters on the north side of 42nd and a theater in the SevCnh and Eighth Avenues. In the first round of negotiations the teams could not arrive at any agreements about the theaters—the Selwyn, Apollo, Lyric, Times Square, and Victory— which are owned by the Brandon Organization, so a new request for proposals was issued last spring. Following the review of these proposals—the last one took six months—a conditional developer will be named.

Washington this Summer

Gone: The Texas Theater in San Antonio. Despite efforts by the San Antonio Preservationists, who hired architect Michael Graves to design a viable alternative plan that would include the historic Spanish Revival theater (Skyline, July 1982). The Capital Bank has torn the theater down to proceed with its original plans for a mixed-use development on the river front.

Not gone, but “changing from day to day”: The stadium of the San Antonio Spurs. For Herring Hall, Associates, which designed the former, is in discussions with a number of potential developers for the site. Only when agreement is reached on this—and the Museum of Contemporary Art will probably be able to commit themselves to any design.


Already known in Houston for a number of large-scale projects—most recently the Four Leaf Towers, completed in June, Four Oaks Place, under construction, and the Pin Oak master plan and office tower now in design—Cesar Pelli & Associates began design work last spring for a smaller one: A new building for the Jesse H. Jones Graduate School of Administration at Rice University. Located southwest of the central library, the building, known as Herring Hall, will include 50,000 s.f. of classrooms, administrative and faculty offices, a reading room, lecture hall, and student lounge.

In the design for Herring Hall, Pelli takes many clues from the original campus plan and earliest “Mediterranean Gothic” buildings by Cram and Goodhue in 1910. Because it is a free-standing building, however, Pelli’s Hall should be easier to find than James Stirling and Michael Wilford’s addition to the architecture school last year [Skyline, November 1981]. In contrast to a few recent buildings, which were sited without regard for the master plan, Herring Hall is placed in alignment with the earliest buildings on campus. The two minor axes of the building, with the four entrances, are coincident with minor axes that form paths across the green. A courtyard at the center of the design is edged by an open colonnade on three sides that links the wings to the main building. The long narrow dimensions and materials of the Hall are intended to harmonize with the earlier buildings; the salmon red brick skin has limestone and terra cotta detailing and brick courting, and the gabled roof of red terra cotta tiles links two wings topped with copper vails. For all its contextualism, however, the design still shows evidence of Pelli’s modern sensibilities: The brick is a curtain wall applied to a steel frame—the poched walls of his predecessors (and some peers) have yet to become part of his vocabulary. While this design was presented briefly at Rice in late August, there are tentative plans for a more substantial exhibition in the spring. Completion of the building is scheduled for 1984. —MJ

Projects

John Burgee Architects are working on the design of a 2-million-s.f. office building for the Mercantile Bank in Dallas; developers are Cadillac Fairview... R.M. Kliment and James Halsband are designing a new wing for Caliper Hall at the University of Virginia, home of the biology and psychology departments; it will be built in association with the master plan recently developed by Philip Johnson... In Boston, Michael Arad Associates have been chosen in a limited competition as architects for a maritime center in Norwalk, CT... And, in Atlantic City, the joint venture of Louis Kahn’s Stern Architects and Michael Graves & Associates have been selected to renovate and redesign the 11-story former Union Trust. Jones Brewer has been selected to renovate the two existing buildings of the Convention Center and to design additional space for the boardwalk facility.

In the works

A film by Michael Blackwood Productions with West German TV and Channel 4 in London is taking a critical look at contemporary architecture and its role in society. Martin Furer and Rosemarie Blettertter developed the project and chose the architects to be featured. The film will be in an interview format with voice-overs by the architects while their work is being shown. We also announce the commission of Edward Steichen’s photography of Michael Graves, Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown, Peter Eisenman, and Frank Gehry, with an appearance by Philip Johnson. The film should be ready next summer and will be available through Blackwood.

A new faculty is moving into Columbia University’s Graduate School of Architecture and Planning will inaugurate its fall quarter for the Study of American Architecture. Entitled "American Architecture: In Search of Traditions," the symposium will bring together a group of scholars, architects, and practitioners for four days in April to examine all dimensions of the subject during three working sessions on Place, Object, and Building, and a fourth on The Current Situation. Among those expected to participate are key-note speakers J.B. Jackson and Vincent Scully, Donald Hall, George Kubler, Mildred Friedman, David Handlin, William Jordy, James O’Gorman, Arthur Drexler, Richard Meier, and Charles Moore. There will be an exhibition, a concert and an official dinner on the last day. A subsequent publication. We hear that Barbara Jakobson is planning the next architectural show for Castelli Gallery in New York; it is called "Architectural Follies" and should appear in fall of 1983.

Charles Jencks is the writer and presenter of a six-part BBC television series on pre-modern to post-modern architecture. Focusing on Frank Lloyd Wright and Michael Graves, the series includes (of course) an interview and visit with Philip Johnson.
The Titan City

Forgotten Episodes in American Architecture

Carol Willis

"There are eight million stories in the Naked City. This is one of them."

The written histories of American urban architecture of the 1920s have many forgotten episodes. These "episodes"—which include exhibitions, architects, theories, and buildings, both built and visionary—have been either ignored or misinterpreted by historians who have defined the development of American modernism in terms of the assimilation of European aesthetics and ideals. When recalled, however, these elusive episodes necessitate a revision of this critical view. For example, the "Titan City" exhibition, described below, contradicts the assertion that there was in America an "absence of any consideration of the urban role of the skyscraper." Other episodes further clarify the evolution in the twenties of a dominant aesthetic of skyscraper design, which could be termed "the New York School."

In October 1925, the John Wanamaker department store inaugurated its new building on Broadway and Ninth Street with "The Titan City," an exhibition depicting New York of the future. As described as "a pictorial prophecy of New York from 1925-1929," this show was one of the most evangelistic examples of the vogue for visionary urbanism that flourished in the twenties—but it is one of the least familiar today. Unfortunately, there remains only a scant record of the show, which can be partially reconstructed from reviews and from a book of documentary photographs. Such an archeology of the unbuilt affords insights into the ideas of the modern city that dominate today and the synthesis of capitalism and idealism that inspired so much of the visionary speculation of that particularly urban decade.

Although contrived by Wanamaker's as both publicity and popular entertainment, the exhibition also offered a forum for serious speculation on the future of the city and introduced yet another provocation in the escalating debate between the proponents and the critics of the skyscraper. Harvey Wiley Corbett, the prominent skyscraper architect who directed the installation, wrote to his collaborator Hugh Ferriss in August 1925, "I think this is a most interesting opportunity to get someone to pay for the futuristic ideas we have discussed. The show proved to be a popular success—which surprised some professionals. In his review in The Architectural Record, the architect and critic Leon Solon remarked that "such an exhibition only a few years ago would have fallen flat, had any such organization the temerity to bestow upon it its valuable space," and he added, "The sudden realization was that to us that the future of architecture has become a matter of public concern."

"The Titan City" was only one section of the larger event that Wanamaker's ceremoniously dubbed "The Tercentenary Pictorial Paganism of New York." Over a hundred murals illustrating New York past, present, and future decorated the company's two adjacent Broadway stores. In the Old Building on Eighth Street, highlights of the city's history from the first settlement to the present day were depicted on 60 large panels. These vignettes, which were rather naive in execution, elicited little comment from the architectural press. A more impressive display occupied the store's tall rotunda space where these 23-foot silk banners painted by the Hungarian artist Willy Pogany recorded the complex hundred years of "progress" in the city's transportation and municipal services. The center panel pictured a composite vision of the Manhattan skyline, ascending the island as it passed through time and stretching into the future in spectral silhouettes of colossal setback towers.

The exhibition in the New Building was devoted entirely to visions of the future metropolis. Large murals and models of a spectacular skyscraper city invaded the sales areas, resulting in almost surreal juxtapositions—men's suits with an actual monoplane in their midst, against a background of megastructures. The projections addressed three major themes, which were at the same time topics of contemporary urban problems: the street, the skyscraper, and the city plan. Possible solutions for the intensifying problem of traffic congestion were proffered in a series of renderings based on the ideas of Corbett and developed by the decorative artist Robert W. Chanler and his staff. Corbett proposed multi-level traffic systems with complete separation of pedestrians and vehicles, arcaded sidewalks at ground level, and promenades on upper floor setbacks with lobbies connecting buildings in a continuous aerial grid. The perspectives of long avenues of giant stepped-back towers materialized in miniature in the store's main corridors, where a series of model skyscrapers of fantastic shapes and colors encased the piers, creating a "Grand Canyon of the Future." Other projections of the visionary metropolis rendered by Chanler included airship landings over docks and spanning the tops of tall buildings, skyscrapers built on bridges, and isolated apartment towers set in park space. Upstairs in the second floor gallery hung a group of more terrestrial, though still ambitious designs for reshaping the city which had been commissioned by the Russell Sage Foundation as part of the first phase of the Regional Plan.

The tour de force of the exhibition, however, was the series of 12-foot monochromatic murals of the city of the future painted by the consummate poet of twenties visionaries, Hugh Ferriss. Collaborating with Corbett, Ferriss visualized a highly centralized and densely built metropolis in which the commercial city clamped below while residents, perchlike like Olympian gods, inhabited the upper floors and rooftop terraces. In the night views, great tenebrous towers looked like mountains above illuminated canyons, all with an awesome scale and power—a twentieth-century Sublime. Several of the paintings were enlargements or variations of the famous drawings of the stages of the zoning envelope that he and Corbett had developed three years earlier to illustrate the effects of the 1916 zoning law on the future of skyscraper design. Ferriss invented other colonial superblock structures—skyscraper churches, apartment-bride complexes, and airport terminals. Most of these images have become familiar due to their later publication in Ferriss' classic book of 1929, The Metropolis of Tomorrow, but a few forgotten gems can be retrieved from the documents on the show, while others acquire a more accurate provenance.

Critical response to the show ranged from admiration to reproval. Leon Solon extolled it as "the first organized professional expedition into the future, a statement of structural ideals, and a proof that no problem is so vast that it is beyond the imaginative limits of the American architect." He identified in the Ferriss renderings a scale and composition that was "absolutely in accord with the ambitions of American cities, and went far towards realizing the concept of structural dignity which all progressive temperaments believe will be ultimately realized and found essentially American."
"Although contrived by Wanamaker's as both publicity and popular entertainment, the exhibition also offered a forum for serious speculation on the future of the city."

At the other extreme, the untempered optimism of this future vision provoked an emotional article by Lewis Mumford in The New Republic entitled "The Sacred City." Admonishing that capitalism was becoming the "Religion of the Future," he criticized Ferriss' perspectives for being depopulated and predicted that "immense human lives will doubtless be sacrificed to Traffic, Commerce, Property Regulated and Zoned Heights on a scale that will make Moloch seem an agent of charity." As an alternative, he described his own ideal community, which he declared, "in contrast to Mr. Ferriss' titan city... would... be merely human." Mumford's polemic is excessive, but accurate in its characterization of the orthodoxy of the faith in the future of the capitalist city. The sangine prophecies of Ferriss, Corbett, and other visionaries of the period were motivated by a fundamental belief in the idea of progress—a theory of historical change, past and future, which seemed to be validated by the American experience. Yet in the context of the booming prosperity of the 1920s, there was a revolutionary aspect to their proposals, for in the Titan City, man placed controls on the luxury-fair metropolis. While they foresaw a city transformed by technology, they also imagined a society rationalized through planning, in which the public good took precedence over the absolute rights of property. Such a view resembled the contemporary ideology of the Modern Movement; however, this was a "passive" modernism (as yet without a stylistic vocabulary) in which technological progress and capitalist energy, not architects, were the agents of change.

In his review of "The Titan City," Solon recommended that the exhibition "be kept intact, so that future generations might compare the degrees of foresight with which our architects visualized a problem which in the course of time must be solved and put into execution." Alas, neither was the problem solved, nor the show preserved. We are left with only a reconstructed record of that ambitious and utopic utopia of the twenties.

Notes
2. This account of the Titan City exhibition is based mainly on a book of black-and-white photographs of the show which is in the special collections of the New York Public Library; see "Wanamaker's, Tercentenary Pictorial Pageant of New York." The bound photos were apparently compiled by the Wanamaker company; other records of the show seem to have been trashed when Wanamaker's closed the Broadway store in the 1950s. In addition to the reviews listed in the notes below, there is an excellent description of the exhibit by the critic Ralph Flint in Art News, 24 (October 31, 1925), p. 10.
5. Corbett had been working on studies of the problem of the skyscraper and congestion for the Russell Sage Foundation from about 1922, though his interest in the separation of traffic dates back at least a decade earlier.
6. The only description of these models, which were reported to be developed by Corbett after an idea by Louis Boushe, appeared in a New York Times article on the show, "City's Growth Depicted," of October 14, 1925, p. 31. No photos of the models seem to have survived.
7. Solon, p. 94.
8. Ibid., p. 92-93.
10. Solon, p. 94.
The Imperial City

A Review of Indian Summer: Lutyens, Baker and Imperial Delhi

Gwendolyn Wright

It is still all too rare for architectural history to be set in a broader cultural context: Robert Grant Irving has taken a topic so intensely political that it demands this approach. Indian Summer tells the saga of the planning and building of the major colonial city in the British empire. It encompasses a fastidiously detailed documentation of the construction process, together with commentaries from Indian and English sources, complemented by excellent illustrations (many of them the author's own color photographs).

The story begins in 1911 with King George V and Queen Mary arriving in the colors for a lavish pageant, or durbar, attended by 100,000 people, during which they are crowned Emperor and Empress of India. At the height of the pomp George announces the decision to transfer the government from Calcutta to Delhi. The new city, to be called Imperial Delhi, would become the capital of all of British India, uniting the various provinces. The choice of the site had great symbolic weight, for Delhi had a long history of pride and defeat for Indians; it had been the locus of fifteen cities, a dozen of which had fallen into ruin before the first Moghul or Indian Muslim emperor occupied Delhi between 1526 and 1657. Irving pays only passing attention to this Indian aspect of the city's history, however. His concern — almost his sole concern — is what the British did there.

In the course of describing the architectural and planning debates and achievements following this momentous decision, Indian Summer chronicles the decline of the very empire this capital was meant to glorify. By 1926, when the city was almost completed, years behind schedule and millions of pounds over the first budget, King George renamed it New Delhi, for confidence in imperial glory had declined markedly since World War I. By the time New Delhi was completed in 1931, the name had special meaning for certain Indians, who saw its government buildings as the future seat of Indian self-rule, rather than British domination. (This transfer of power eventually took place in 1947.) Irving is conscious of the irony of this splendid monumental capital.

He also appreciates the remarkable aesthetic quality of the city. Never neglecting the architectural mistakes — such as the inclined road that hides the view of Lutyens’s Viceregal Palace as one approaches this principal focal point of the entire complex; or the uncomfortably large circular Council House, which prompted one legislator to call for an interior transept — Irving is at his best when he describes the bureaucratic bickering and architectural feuds over what to build.

Indian Summer presents architecture as aesthetics and as political controversy. Yet, in the end, Irving is not sure how to weigh the relative influence of architectural style, planning philosophy, and political maneuvering in bringing about the success or failures of this city.

Still, this very ambiguity casts a clarifying light on Sir Edwin Lutyens himself, who has received so much renewed attention of late that he seemed the perfect architect. Irving acknowledges Lutyens’s undeniable architectural talent, and gives such talent all the respect it is due. He also portrays a less than majestic personality: self-centered, disdainful, and sometimes even negligent. The derogatory caricature of Hindu construction, sent to his future collaborator Herbert Baker, evokes the worst of a colonial mentality: “Set square stones & build childwise... before you erect, carve every stone differently & independently, with lace patterns & terrifying shapes. On the top, build over truncated pedestals an onion.”

Other similar statements by Lutyens on Indian architecture, Indian craftsmanship, and most Indian people are more than eccentricities, for they say as much about the larger colonial enterprise as they do about this individual.

The problem of the choice of style for buildings in Delhi raised both architectural and political issues. Lutyens insisted upon classicism, rooted in the glorious history of the Roman Empire and translated into an English mode

Top: Edwin L. Lutyens; Vicereyl House, New Delhi; 1913-1920 (photo: Country Life, Bottom left to right: Herbert Baker; Secretariat, New Delhi; 1915-1930 (photo: Suzanne Stephens); "Tweeledum and Tweedledee" — Lutyens versus Baker; drawing by D. W. Nicholls; 1916.

Detail, entrance to East Portico (courtesy Yale University Press)
The brand of classicism that Edwin Lutyens and Herbert Baker took to India in the early part of the century was merged with India's own architectural traditions, creating a powerful and coherent style for the reigning government's offices and houses.


A product of a week-long commemoration of the "revolution" of May 1968 held at the Architectural Association School two years ago, this elegantly produced collection of essays on the architecture and teaching of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts brings together for the first time the best scholarship and criticism on the subject available to date.

Although the book does not pretend to contribute a coherent narrative, or even a comprehensive view of a historical subject, the essays move "vignettes" are carefully calculated — under the masterly editorship of Robin Middleton — to demonstrate crucial moments and explicate critical relations in the development of theory and practice in the era of high historicism. Middleton, whose unpublished Cambridge doctoral thesis on the Greco-Gothic structural tradition leading to Viollet-le-Duc has remained a goldmine of insights and information to scholars for over two decades, has long been content to stimulate others to complete the research he commenced, preferring to operate behind the scenes as a critical force and moral guide. Here his influence is patent in every piece. His own concise and informative contribution on the antiquarian debate over the polychromy of Greek temples gives the tone to the whole collection.

Revisionism in nineteenth-century studies has been the rule ever since the "heretical" exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art on the architecture of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, with its suitably monumental catalogue edited by Sigfried Giedion. In the major contributions by David van Zanten and Neil Levine. Now in this self-conscious "answer" to the Museum's over-polymoral and inevitably over-polarized show, the nuances are calibrated and the scholar apparatus is manifest in a way that helps us understand the gauziest of the Napoleonic and Viollet-le-Duc and the theory of a modern movement emerging from the pages of the famous acrobatics, resplendent in technological purity and spirit-of-the-age nakedness.

In these essays, the young and brilliant Werner Sambian demonstrates that Durand was not the abstract and technical innovator Giedion and Hitchcock had made him out to be, but simply a dried-out academician of the abstract forms of Le Corbusier and Georges Teyton, from the Venetian school of Manfredo Tafuri, analyzes the public building campaigns of the Napoleonic regime, demonstrating the political dimensions of the "programs" outlined by Durand; Barry Bergdoll, a student of Mies van de Rrose and his life and work of Edmond Duthoit, Viollet-le-Duc's most favored pupil; David van Zanten, extending his earlier theses, reviews architectural polemics in its international academic competition and archeological invention in one of his best essays to date. But of all the essays here presented, the most fascinating and most long-awaited are the two long contributions by Neil Levine, one on the competition for the Grand Prix in 1854, and the other on the relationship between Victor Hugo's enigmatic euruxion on architectural history published as a chapter in Notre Dame de Paris in 1852, and Henri Labrouste's design for the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève. The first analyses in detail the workings of a royal commission as an attempt to provide a model of history-writing and a valuable insight into the workings of education — better than any so-called "remiseances" that have become the common mode of "real" history for the Beaux-Arts tradition. The second, an archeological analysis of the relationship between Henri's essay on the "death" of architecture and the reduced but effective iconography of Labrouste's building, effectively explores the progressive myth wound around the library by Giedion, and shows it to be a neoclassical attempt to achieve a modern architectural articulation. While one would wish Levine to situate more precisely Hugo's text in its own literary tradition of discussions of the "hieroglyph," and especially to place Notre Dame, as a work written after the decipherment of the original hieroglyphs by Champollion, in a genre of nostalgic writings all trying to counter a loss of public meaning by a celebration of the printed text, this essay nevertheless definitively makes the connection between the two figures, and opens the way for more research in interdisciplinary fields.

In all, this beautifully illustrated and well-produced volume contributes more than any other to date to our understanding of nineteenth-century theory and practice.


This compact and in many ways compressed account of Peter Behrens' multifaceted life as a painter, furniture designer, self-taught architect, and industrial designer presents an informative condensation of much of the literature and research on Behrens, including magazine articles, German documents, and archival material. This readable essay concentrates on the works and the specific circumstances under which they were created. Author Alan Windsor clearly describes plans and materials of buildings, which is particularly helpful since the black-and-white photographs (of the Whitney edition at least) are muddy.

While Windsor often critically evaluates the works, or the reaction to it at the time, there is minimal revelation about Behrens personally. We learn of the impression he made on students and colleagues, and his epic design philosophy, but little about his own motivations or general thoughts regarding the social, cultural, and political milieu within which he operated. Windsor does recount Behrens' relationship with playwrights and painters in Germany and his fortuitous connection to patrons such as Ernst Ludwig von Hessen, who founded the Kunstlerkolonie in Darmstadt in 1900, where Behrens built the only building (his house) not designed by Josef Hoffmann. We learn of Behrens' years as Director of the Kunstgewerbemuseum in Düsseldorf, and his more complex relationship with Karl Emil Otto, a patron who involved Behrens in the creation of the Hohenagen Garden Suburb in Eppenhoven in 1907. Also covered is the work Behrens executed for Walter Rathenau and the AEG in Germany, as well as the various exhibitions for which he designed pavilions, interiors, and furniture throughout the years. Although specific work is given careful attention — such as the neoclassical complexes of pavilions Behrens designed for the Northwest German Art Exhibit at Oldenburg in 1905 — more could be divulged about the role of Hellenic or Antique influences on Behrens' work, or his familiarity with Romanesque architecture in Tuscany.

Much of interest is included, however — for example, the burst of antipathy from political and religious conservatives generated by Behrens' design for the Bombenhütte (Cathedral's Mason Lodge) in 1922 at the Munich Gewerbeauschau. Comparing this exercise, an expressionist brick pavilion, with the severely International Style but classically organized house Behrens designed in Northampton, England, a year later adds more to the complete portrait of this architect. Basically, then, the book is a thoughtful, serious, and fascinating introduction to Behrens: it tells you a lot quickly, and leaves you wanting more. — SS


An Illustrated History of Interior Decoration: From Pompeii to Art Nouveau. Mario Praz. Thames and Hudson, New York. 401 illustrations, 65 in color. $75.00.


Beginning with the Pioneers

Kenneth Frampton

As we approach the end of our Futurist century, we are apt to forget how young it is by comparison with the third quarter era; for the ink was no sooner dry on the Futurist page than it was rudely turned by the threat of war. With the death in 1941 of El Lisztzky—the most dynamic typographer of our century—the pioneering enthusiasm of our graphic culture turned toward its decline. Even before that, the European totalitarianism of the thirties brought the revolutionary heritage to an end with what was little more than a long and seductive afterglow. This heritage is reflected in the inexhaustible ingenuity of our present graphic designers, sustained as they are by the seams opened by the pioneers. And yet today, the archetypal Futurist designers who so arrestingly composed and structured through the counterpoint of judgeably placed typography and calligraphic displacements have faded into the blandishments of photo-lithography and the ubiquitous photographic image.

Perhaps the most surprising specimens included in this portfolio set of graphic facsimiles are those by the Italian Futurists, for apart from their trailblazing role, these works still remain among the most daring graphic achievements of our century. The as yet unmatched audacity and energy of Marinetti’s parole in liberta of 1913, derived from all probability from Apollinaire’s call, drove the Futurist graphic tradition forward until the time that Mino Somenat used wood-type massaged for overprinting the futurist newspaper Futurismo of 1926. Between this alpha and omega of Futurist typography, Futurist graphic art exhibited a remarkable range, from the “expressionistic” Jarry-like Marinetti’s Futurist letterhead of 1915—composed about a conventionalization of Giacomo Balla’s sculpture, “Boccioni’s Find-Lines Forme—Balla i Fusi Antinaturali of the same year, featuring his nationalistic green and red design, self-produced ostensively for Marinetti but usually worn by Balla.

With the next generation of Futurist artists, however, the style began to move away from calligraphic fisticuffs toward an explicitly precursive Futurist architectural style of Fortunato Depero. Depero’s predilection for strident typetfaces and printers’ rules of a decidedly sensual character represented a beautiful work date dating from 1927, proclaiming Depero’s all-purpose design office, which he called “Depero-Master.”

The strong bonds linking Futurism and Dadaism are particularly clear in Guglielmo Sannesi’s Il Perforato Burocrazia of 1930, an example of subjective Futurist photography, close in so many respects to the spirit of Dadaism. As the Portfolios 1 and 3 (“Futurism” and “DePero”) show, the Futurist Futurism has strident subversive strategies in common: First, the destruction of the format of the bourgeois newspaper, evident in the Dadant John Heartfield’s brilliant 1917 advertisement for the Kleine Groo Magec, which so triumphantly broke across the soberer columns of Weimar Herzfelde’s Die Neue Jugend; second, the categoric violation of every acceptable typographic principle in Marinetti’s parole in liberta and in Theo van Doesburg’s Kleine Grote Saitte en Rooster of 1922; and third, the subversion of the basic element of photography— from Sannesi’s Il Perforato Burocrazia to Francis Picabia’s 1911 cover for the sixth issue of his magazine 391, in which a collection of unsharpened inkblots, all built from catalogue is has been retroactively and inscribed with the words “Amour” and “Divorce” as a comment on the American woman.

Editor Arthur Cohen’s erudite commentary that accompanies the material in The Avant-Garde in Print is perhaps at its most insightful in the second portfolio, treating the work of Lisztzky, whose extraordinary stature as an artist-intellecutal makes him difficult to place in an artistic historical context. Given the erudition, brilliance, and inventive output, the selection has of necessity been somewhat arbitrary. However, some classic examples of his typographic work are well reproduced here, above all his 1920 Pro Dia Kreativa (Of Two Squares) and his 1922 brown and black cover for the three-language magazine Veshch-Gosudarstvo-Objet. Unfortunately, other Lisztzky experiments, such as his highly experimental magazine Wending or the binding for Architekturna,

Vitezman has come through rather poorly. With such a text the reader cannot help feeling that the editors might have selected more “fine-artistic” examples of his work, as indeed Herbert Spencer did in his survey, The Pioneers of Modern Typography, of 1949 (see Zwart’s NKF publicity, which he worked on throughout the thirties and forties).

Also contained in “Master Designers in Print” are typographic pieces of the late twenties, indebted in uncounted ways to the theories of the Exposition des Arts Decoratifs of 1925. The paradigms and the principles are in the elegant but nonetheless anonymous way in which the Polish Herbert Muzecki constructed a Constructivist mise en page with Art Deco typographic. His 1930 cover for magazine Perspect is certainly more than fashionably Futurist as a typographic eccentricity of the immediate post-war period is in a step.

Of particular merit is the typographic design work of A.M. Cassandre. His influence is derivable from that moment when urban middle-class French culture was able to abstract synthetically in both the French classical tradition and the ethos of Art Deco. If August Perret fell to the right in this spectrum and Michel Roger-Schauffle somewhat to the left, then Cassandre and the architect Robert Mallet-Stevens lay firmly in the middle. Cassandre’s type design, employing his type of ballet mécanique in type, the Bilan Face, designed by Cassandre for Debussy and Porgov in 1929, is at once both readable and unremarkable, both art and language. Surprisingly enough, Cassandre emerges from this collection as the unknown master typographer of the thirties.

While The Avant-Garde in Print is yet another manifestation of the cultural nostalgia that permeates our attenuated epoch, one can only regret that the facsimiles presented here, together with the cultivation of the exegesis which accompanies them. For here, nostalgia notwithstanding, one has a spectrum of work that may be used to many different ends—as a screens of the hierarchy and keyboard service, for example, to be framed for decorative purposes; and finally, and most importantly, they may perhaps be best used as didactic devices, with which to teach a new beginning into the degeneration of the sleapeless.

Periodicals

Arts & Architecture 3. An issue on Southern California, including a discussion of new works by artists Ed Ruscha and David Hockney and an essay on Joan O’Gorman. 66 pages, many black-and-white and color illustrations. $6.00, soft cover.


Threshold 1. “Images and Shadows of Things Divine.” Published by the University of Illinois at Chicago Architecture School. A new journal dedicated to the search for meaning and value in architecture. Includes essays by Stuart Cohen, Stanley Tigerman, Thomas Beeby, and John Snyder, among other professionals and students. 128 pages, 96 black-and-white and color illustrations. $15.00, soft cover.
Dateline: October '82

Events

Atlanta
Contemporary Issues in Architecture
Lectures sponsored by the High Museum of Art and the Atlanta Chapter of the AIA. Oct 6 Carter Ratcliff
Oct 13 Michael Graves
Oct 20 Lawrence Halprin
8:00pm. $6 per lecture: $25 for series. Hill Auditorium, High Museum, 1200 Peachtree Street NE; (404) 892-3600

Boston/Cambridge
Harvard GSD Fall Series
Oct 27 Latino Urbanism Nov 8 Myers Goldsmith
Nov 17 Christopher Alexander Dec 8 Emilio Ambasz, the Eames Memorial Lecture. All at 6:00 pm. Piper Auditorium, Good Hall, 40 Quincy Street; (617) 495-4122

Dutch Architecture Between the Wars
Nov 5-6 Conference, with speakers including John Habraken, Stanislaus von Moos, Richard Pommer, Helen Searing, and Nancy Troy. Department of Architecture, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; for details call (617) 253-1351

Houston
Classical Architecture in the South
Oct 6 Last in series of lectures on "The Transformation of an Idea." Andrew Baty, "Classicism and the Vernacular: A Regional Perspective." 8:00pm. Rice Design Alliance at the Brown Auditorium, Museum of Fine Arts; (713) 527-4876

H.H. Richardson's Domestic Architecture
Oct 27 Lecture by Jeffrey Ochsner, author of H.H. Richardson: Complete Architectural Works (MIT Press). 8:00pm. Brown Auditorium, Museum of Fine Arts; (713) 527-4876

Ithaca
The Preston H. Thomas Memorial Lecture Series
Francois Chosy will give four lectures entitled "Theory of Architecture: Conflicting Roles of Myth, History, and Remembrance in Alberti, Duattremonde de Quincy, and Viollet-le-Duc." Oct 14, 15 and 19 at 8:00pm, Oct 17 at 3:00pm. Statler Auditorium, Cornell University; (607) 256-5236

Los Angeles Area
SCI-ARC Design Forum
Oct 6 Bernard Tschumi Oct 13 Robert Mangurian
Oct 20 Daniel Libeskind Oct 27 Yito Acone
Nov 8 Raimund Abrahm Nov 10 Dana Binhawa.
8:00pm. Southern California Institute of Architecture, 1000 Berkeley Street, Santa Monica; (213) 829-3482

Miami
Architectural Club of Miami Lectures
Architects speak on their own work. Oct 8 Dennis Hector Oct 15 Rodrigo Marquina. Call the Architectural Club of Miami for information; (305) 858-8081

Urban Landscape Symposium
Oct 23 South Florida Chapter of the AIA Urban Workshop: "Structure and Order of the Urban Landscape." Jaqueline Robertson, moderator. Call the Architectural Club of Miami for information; (305) 858-8081

New Haven
Yale Lecture Series
Oct 5 "The Architecture of Sir John Soane" by Giles Waterfield Oct 19 "Recent People-to-People Tour of China" by Herman Spiegel and King Louis Wu
Oct 26 A talk by Ichihara, 6:00pm. Hastings Hall, Yale School of Architecture; (203) 436-0633

Kahn Film and Tour
Oct 23, Nov 13 Film on Louis Kahn with narration by Vigneron. $35 followed by a tour of the Center for British Art. 11:00am. Yale Center for British Art, 1080 Chapel Street; (203) 432-4594

New Orleans
Tulane Lecture Series
Oct 4 Tall architects, "Recent Work" Oct 11 Bernard Tschumi, "Concepts and Other Failures" Oct 18 Bobliol Macado, "Poetry, Prose and Dialectics" Nov 1 Robertson Blake, "Architecture versus the Architectural Photograph." 8:00pm. Room 903, Richardson Memorial Hall, Tulane University; (504) 865-5389

Architects' Week
Oct 25-29 "Design by Any Other Name," Lectures, workshops, films, sketch problems. Tulane University; (504) 865-5389

New York City
Art Deco Tours
Oct 2 A tour of five Art Deco masterpieces. Starts at 2:30pm at Daily News Building, 220 East 42nd Street.
Oct 16 A tour of major Art Deco buildings of the East and West 50s led by Tony Robins. Meet at 2:30pm, rain or shine, GE building, 51st Street and Lexington Avenue. For information call the Art Deco Society of New York; (212) 689-5194

Urban Life and Culture
Oct 4 The Japan Society is holding a public symposium on "Japanese Urbanism: Theories of Contemporary Myth." Speakers to include Kenneth Frampton and Fumihiko Maki. 5:30pm. Japan House, 533 East 47th Street; (212) 832-1155

Interior Design Lectures
Pratt lecture series on "Evolving Forms and Concepts." Oct 7 "Space, the Medium in which We Evolve," 12:30pm, 2nd Floor, Pratt Institute, 60 Hudson Street, Riverdale; (212) 636-3600

Vittorio Gregotti
Oct 5 The editor of Casabella speaks on the tradition and new directions of his publication. 6:30pm. Architectural League, 130 East 27th Avenue; (212) 753-1722

Maki Self-Appraisal
Oct 6 Fumihiko Maki will speak on his own work. 12:30pm. Ware Lounge, Avery Hall, Columbia University; (212) 854-3414

Columbia Lecture Series

Women's Alliance Lecture Series
Oct 18 "Space, the Medium in which We Evolve," 6:00pm. Women's Alliance at the New School, 66 Washington Square South; (212) 998-2410

Urban Center Books
Authors speak on their recent or forthcoming books in "Forums on Form." Oct 6 Peter Eisenman, House X

The Language of Architecture
Oct 6-8 Lectures, seminars and colloquia with artists and architects. All at 7:00 pm. International Center for Advanced Studies in Art, NYE Education Building, 35 West Street; (212) 979-1000

The City Transformed: Lectures and Walking Tours

Discover New York: Talks and Walks
Oct 6 Lecture on "The Brooklyn Promenade: The Heights." Oct 9 and 23 Walking tours. Meet at Brooklyn Borough Hall, 100 Borough Center (212) 598-3481

Showrooms: A Discussion

Fall Arts Review at the Met
Oct 13 "Architecture and Autoicism" series introduction by Robert Campbell Oct 20 "Urban Housing" by Lewis Davis Oct 27 "The Architecture of the Eames Era" by Richard Neutra Oct 29 "The Architecture of New York" by Paul Goldberger. 8:00pm. $43 for full series through December 15, $5 at the door. Met, Indianapolis Museum of Art, Fifth Avenue at 53rd Street; (212) 757-3949

Current Scandinavian Design
Symposium sponsored by the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Design. Oct 14 Opening reception and lectures, 7:00pm. Oct 15 Symposium from 9:30am to 5pm and Oct 16 from 10:00am to noon. Cooper-Hewitt, 2 East 91st Street; (212) 638-5600

German Celant Lectures

Cast Iron Walks
Oct 17, Nov 7 Walking tour of "Ladies Shopping Mile," major department stores from Grace Church north to 23rd Street. Meet 1:00pm at Grace Church, Broadway and 11th Street. $2.50. Sponsored by Friends of Cast Iron Architecture; (212) 369-6004

Le Boulevard Bleu et Jaune
Oct 18 "Space, the Medium in Which We Evolve," 6:00pm. Wood Auditorsium, Avery Hall, Columbia University; (212) 308-3414

Women's Alliance Amusement
Oct 21 "10th Anniversary of Space," the Medium in Which We Evolve." 10:00pm, Avery Hall, Columbia University; (212) 308-3414

Wave Hill Garden Conference
Oct 23 Day-long conference on "Selected Topics in American Garden History," 9:00am-5:00pm. $22.50 members, $25 non-members. Wave Hill, 675 West 232nd Street, Riverdale, Bronx; (212) 559-2055

Baubula Dances
Oct 30-31, Nov 6-7 Oscar Schlemmer's "Six Baubula Dances." 8:30pm. 179 Varick Street. Call the Kitchen for information; (212) 432-3015

Skyline October 1982
Competition

Formica Corporation has announced a two-part competition, “Surface and Ornament,” open to all architects, designers, and students to explore the potential of Colorcore® Luminate, a new surfacing material from Formica that features integral color throughout. The competition is being organized by Susan Grant Lewin, who has recently joined Formica Corp. in her new position of Creative Director. The first part of the competition is for product, contract, and residential design, as well as miscellaneous objects: the deadline for submissions is February 15, 1983. The second stage, to be judged in March 1984, will be for executed room designs using Colorcore®. The jury for the first part of “Surface and Ornament” includes Joe D’Urso, John Salaitine, Paul Segal, William Tschumi, and Charles Zehrenbaum, of the Formica’s design advisory board, as well as David Gebhard, Niels Diffrient, and Robert Maxwell. Scale models of winning entries will be built and exhibited at NEOCON 1983 along with invited designs by Emilino Ambasz, Ward Bennett, Frank Gehry, Milton Glaser, Helmut Jahn, Charles Moore, and James Wines. In addition to more than $60,000 in prizes, publication of designs and a travelling exhibition are also planned. For samples of Colorcore® call: (800)534-3000, ext.377 [in Ohio, (614)444-1350]. For further information: Colorcore® Surface and Ornament Competition, Formica Corporation, 1 Dynasty Plaza, Wayne, NJ 07470.

Philadelphia
Foundation for Architecture Tours
Oct 9 “The Architecture of Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown” by Steve Iannou. 10:00-4:00pm. $10 members, $12 non-members. AIA Gallery, 117 South 17th Street
Oct 16 “0dor Squares” by Robert Ennis. 10:00-4:00pm. $5 members, $10 non-members. Meet Washington Square Park 24 “Personal View of the Parkway” by Robert Ennis. $10 members, $12 non-members. 1:00-4:00pm. Meet Tourist Center, 1325 JFK Boulevard
7 “A Personal View of Spruce Street” by Thomas Hines. 1:00-4:00pm. Meet Schulkyll Park at 25th Street and Spruce. For information (215) 592-5190.
Beaux-Arts Ball
Oct 30 The ball, on the theme of “Ornament,” will be held in the Astrium of the Stock Exchange Building. For details call the Philadelphia Chapter of the AIA (215) 569-3169.

Portland
Contemporary Architecture and Ideology
Oct 13-15 A symposium to identify and criticize the ideological content of contemporary architecture. Speakers are Anthony Vihler, Kenneth Frampton, Kurt Forster and Alan Colquhoun. $30 for professionals, $25 for students. Oregon School of Design, 726 NW 14th Street; (503) 222-3272.

San Francisco/Bay Area
Bernard Tschumi Lecture
Oct 7 “Reciprocity and Conflict.” 8:00pm. University of California at Berkeley; (415)642-4942

London, England
RIBA Lecture Series

Toronto, Canada
Urban Design Conference
Oct 13-16 The Fourth International Conference sponsored by the Institute for Urban Design. Speakers are Mayor David Crombie, Art Eggleton, Bernard Rudofsky, Raimundo Girjela, Bernard Gheurt, and Harry Weese. For information call (416) 253-5257
Canex’82
Oct 28-30 Symposia and seminars on the subject of “High Tech/High Touch” with leading designers, architects, and industrial designers. Oct 29 The top five designers named by Interior Design will speak on “Different Perspectives,” Kenneth E. Johnson, Kenneth H. Walker, M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., and Bruce Graham, with introduction by Sherman Emery and moderated by Walter Wagner. For information call (416) 789-6508

Exhibits

Atlanta
Rob Krier
Nov 12-30 Drawings from Urban Projects 1968-82. Rizzoli Gallery, 328 Omni International; (404) 688-9065

Boston/Cambridge
The Gropius Era and Current Methods
Oct 5-22 An exhibition of work by Harvard students 1940-65, current students, and recent graduates. Gund Hall, Harvard GSD, 48 Quincy Street; (617) 495-2578
Myron Goldsmith
Oct 26-Nov 12 Gund Hall, Harvard GSD, 48 Quincy Street; (617) 495-2578

Charlottesville
International Style in Perspective
Through Oct 8 The exhibition that originated at the International Style conference at Harvard travels to Virginia. Campbell Hall, University of Virginia School of Architecture; (804) 924-3715

Chicago
Mies van der Rohe: Interior Spaces
Through Oct 8 Includes original drawings, models. Art Club of Chicago, 109 East Ontario Street; (312) 787-9997
Rob Krier
Oct 12-Nov 7 Material from the recent book on Rob Krier, Urban Projects 1960-82. Rizzoli Gallery, Water Tower Place, 835 North Michigan Avenue; (312) 624-3500

La Jolla
Italian Re-Evolution
Through Oct 31 Exhibition of “Design in Italian Society in the Eighties.” Guest curator Piero Sartogo. La Jolla Museum of Contemporary Art, 790 Prospect Street; (714) 454-3341

Los Angeles
Daniel Solomon
Oct 19-Nov 5 U.C.L.A. Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning; (213) 205-3791

New Orleans
Bernard Tschumi
Oct 3-24 “Screenplays.” School of Architecture, Tulane University; (504) 865-5389

New York
Richard Neutra
Alvar Aalto
Through Oct 15 “The Mystery of Form.” 100 Level, Avery Hall, Columbia University; (212) 280-3414
Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown
Through Oct 16 “Buildings and Drawings.” The first exhibition of their work in New York. Modern Penthouse, 37 West 57th Street; (212) 838-7436
New Dimensions in Scandinavian Architecture
Through Oct 16 Nineteen of Scandinavia’s most promising architects. The American-Scandinavian Foundation, 127 East 73rd Street; (212) 879-9799

Melvin Charney
Through Oct 23 Drawings and documentation of projects from 1976-82 by this architect/artist. 49th Parallel/Center for Contemporary Canadian Art, 420 West Broadway; (212) 925-8499

The Sketchbooks of Le Corbusier
Through Nov 14 “Fragments of Invention”; 21 original sketchbooks, 110 photographs, original collages, drawings, sculpture, and paintings, from the Fondation Le Corbusier, Paris. The National Academy of Design, 1053 Fifth Avenue; (212) 369-4890

San Franciscio/Bay Area
Peter Wilson
Through Oct 9 The architect’s first one-man exhibition in the U.S. SFMOMA, 250 Mission Street; (415) 781-2372

Urban Obsessions
Oct 14 Drawings by Lars Leren, Stanley Saitowitz, Mark Mack, and Barbara Staufacher Solomon. SFMOMA, 250 Mission Street; (415) 781-2372

Washington, D.C.
Rhode Island Architecture

Glasgow, Scotland
Friedrich Weinbrenner
Oct 1-25 An exhibit of Weinbrenner’s work. Glasgow School of Art

London, England
RIBA Exhibitions

Paris, France
Biennale de Paris
Oct 2-Nov 20 The architecture of the Biennale will be focusing on “La Construction Moderne.” Institut Francais d’Architecture, 6 rue de Tourou, 639956

Rome, Italy
Mendini and Ostanti
Oct 18 “Duet,” an exhibition of work by Alessandro Mendini and Luigi Ostanti. Architettura Arte Moderna, 12 Via del Vantaggio; 6702549

Toronto, Canada
Californian Architects
Oct 4-Nov 10 Exhibit includes the work of Stanley Saitowitz, Charles Moore, Peter Eisenman, Steven Hall, Ballonoff Architectural Books, 98 Scotch Street; (416) 598-2000
Skyline Rises II

We are celebrating the beginning of our second year of publishing the new revised Skyline at the moment when the institution under whose auspices Skyline operates has undergone a major change in its leadership. The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies has reorganized and strengthened its internal structure with the appointment of new personnel. It also plans to expand its representation of the architectural community by the addition of new members to its board of trustees. These changes, we believe, will promote the effectiveness with which the IAU5 and its various enterprises —Skyline included—can inform and influence the decision-making of those concerned with crucial issues affecting architecture and urbanism today.

In the last year Skyline has been frankly experimental in its choice of subject matter, the nature of its coverage, and the style of its writing. While Skyline shares the general aims of the IAU5, it has tried to establish itself as a forum free from advocacy of any particular line of architectural thought.

Because of this, Skyline often appears to lack a position. It is true—we do lack a position, other than that of promoting architectural quality by fostering a climate of debate. To that end Skyline intends to develop a critical attitude and method of evaluation that can be applied to the range of architectural effort—and that will be understood by professionals and public alike.—Suzanne Stephens
We're Jumping

SHAW WALKER
Pratt in Manhattan

ARCHITECTURE & INTERIORS IN THE 80'S

A series of evening lectures in November with architects & designers of recognized achievement:

KENT BARWICK
WARD BENNETT
GIORGIO CAVAGLIERI
SAM DE SANTO
JACK DUNBAR
STEPHEN JACOBS
JACK LENOR LARSEN
THEO PRUDON
LOUIS TREGRE
BART VOORSANGER
KEVIN WALZ
JAMES WINES

Cost: $20 per lecture (10 lectures for $175)
Special student rate: $15 per lecture.
For registration & information call (212) 685-3754 or (212) 636-3453.

Oppositions Books

The Architecture of the City
by Aldo Rossi
Introduction by Peter Eisenman
208 pp. 109 illus. $30.00

Essays in Architectural Criticism: Modern Architecture and Historical Change
by Alan Colquhoun
Preface by Kenneth Frampton
224 pp. 174 illus. $30.00

A Scientific Autobiography
by Aldo Rossi
Afterword by Vincent Scully
128 pp. 35 illus. $20.00

Forthcoming this fall:

Spoken into the Void:
Collected Essays 1897-1900
by Adolf Loos
Introduction by Aldo Rossi
160 pp. 99 illus. $30.00

Style and Epoch
by Moishe Ginzburg
Preface by Kenneth Frampton
Introduction by Anatole Senkevitch, Jr.
160 pp. 80 illus. $30.00
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