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Letter from Paris

Barry Bergdoll

"An Unfinished Project," "The Spirit of the Times," "Construction": three slogans in search of a definition of modernism, three components of a major polemic enterprise that formed the architectural contribution to this autumn's Biennale de Paris/Festival d'Automne held concurrently at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and the Institut Français d'Architecture. The whole might as well have been labeled "The Past of the Present," so evident was the intent to respond in a grand and convincing way to the triumph of the 1980 Venice Biennale, seen last year in Paris and still making waves on its world tour.

Although "past" was the only modifier audaciously avoided in the cacophony of texts on modernism prepared by the same one hundred architects selected for the shows, the specter of that decidedly errante movement haunted the exhibitions at the Ecole. The catalogue essayists spare no vehemence the intent enterprise that "trrew the architectural Movement haunted by the specter of the "post" modernism of the 1980 Venice Biennale, several of whose component events have made post-modernism the touchstone of architectural design.

Both exhibitions reflect Chemetov's pragmatic attitude delivered at the Institut Français d'Architecture, La Construction Moderne. Both exhibitions reflect Chemetov's pragmatic assessment of the legacy of modernism and his conviction that architectural thought must be advanced in realized work. He has little patience for architecture as an abstract enterprise in which a beautiful site plan of a seductive paper design that has made post-modernism a phenomenon more of the art market and the architectural press than of the "true business" of the engagement of the architect with the exigencies of site and client. It is thus not the least bit ironic, as it may at first appear, that with the exception of Richard Meier's now rejected project for Renault at Boulogne-Billancourt, all the projects selected for "An Unfinished Project" are already built or near completion.

By contrast the work of the "under-40s" in the second show at the Ecole, given the forbidding title La Modernité en l'esprit du temps, was effectively arranged in a state of process and included as many designs as finished works. The darkened central court of the Palais des Etudes, the traditional heart of the Ecole's teaching — with lecture hall, loggias for the competition charrettes and (until 1960) the antique custs — was transformed into an immense architectural studio. Each project was tacked to an individually lit drafting board, while the dark void above was cross-crossed with the simultaneous projection of diverse work on thirteen slide screens. Here the moment of creation, the confusion and vitality of grappling with ideas, and the reevaluation of fundamental tenets of modernism were given a compelling sense of actuality and experimentation more reminiscent of the original spirit of the Modern Movement. Apart from an agreement to articulate the rule of the concept of modernity in the design process, there was clearly little rapport between the two shows.

Chemetov's hand-picked modernists in "Modernité: Un Project Inachevé," a full one-quarter of them French, are largely architects nurtured on the doctrines of CIAM or Team X. Many are Corbusier pupils or unabashed admirers. The work chosen continues the critique of modernism begun within its own camp and the commitment to social programs, seen particularly in frequent reworkings of modernist prototype housing solutions, be it the barre of Henry Ciriani's housing at the Marse-la-Vallée new town, the Zeitenhaus of Wilhelm Holzbauer's "Wohnen Morgen" housing in Vienna, or the modified Brutalist formulas of the British contributions, such as the Greater London Council's recently completed urban village in London's Covent Garden. Not only do these recent projects represent a continuation of the types and formal vocabulary of the 1950s and 1960s, but several of the architects are represented by buildings now two decades old and already textbook examples of the Team Ten critique, such as the Smithsons' Robin Hood Gardens Housing (1963). Tellingly, "Un Projet Inachevé" opens with an homage to Berthold Lubetkin, that icon of the unity of design and social purpose, whose attack on the contemporary "anything goes" attitude delivered at his RIBA Gold Medal acceptance speech in June is reprinted in the catalogue.
More puzzling is the prominence awarded Richard Meier, the only American represented in the show. Meier indeed might serve as a tenuous link between the two Ecole exhibitions. An avid student of modernism rather than of the many modernist pupils amongst which he incongruously finds himself at the Ecole, Meier's work, for all its manipulation of Corbusian imagery, is infused with a freedom from modern dogma.

"Unfinished" for him, as for the architects in "La Modernité ou l'esprit du temps" is not the burden of a mission, but the recognition that the formal issues of modernism contain an unheustated set of permutations applicable to contemporary programs.

It is indeed this recognition of the richness and diversity of the modern tradition that undermines any synthetic characterization of the architects included in the "under 40s" show ("La Modernité ou l'esprit du temps"). Nearly seventy-five architects are included in the catalogue, although only some thirty were actually presented in the exhibition. Particular preference seems to have been given to foreigners — not a single French architect even merited a slide show — and especially to the Japanese, who in both diversity and quality are the revelations of the exhibition. Modernism is merited in all its "alternative" manifestations, from the Expressionist-inspired organism of the Lille School to the many overt references to Russian Constructivism. These references are particularly unmistakable in the preference for exaggerated inorganic drawing techniques and the fascination with revealed construction, such as in British architect Ian Ritchie's Eagle Rock House (Sussex, England). Even the pop-collage (dare one say post-modern) manipulation of representational imagery of the so-called "Ecole de Philadelphia" — all members of Venturi's firm — nestles comfortably under this broad "modernist" umbrella. Venturi is perhaps the last architect to willingly and publicly discuss the "Zeitgeist" or "l'esprit du temps," a concept now more likely to instil squeamishness than inspire creativity. For all its incongruence and diversity, "La Modernité ou l'esprit du temps" is a fascinating testament to a renewed interest in a view of modernism that accommodates both Tecton and Archigram, Lubetkin and Venturi, the abstract and the referential, in an attempt to incorporate a view of the cultural dilemma in the making of architecture.

London is bracing itself for a public inquiry that would put the Modern Movement on trial, and architects are already lining up in respective camps. The cause célèbre is developer Peter Palumbo's plan to build an office block designed by Mies van der Rohe just before his death. The building would rise directly opposite the Mansion House designed by George Dance in 1759-52 in the City of London. The City Corporation turned down Palumbo's second planning application for the so-called Mansion House Square scheme in September, thus temporarily vindicating the vociferous conservationists who are campaigning against it.

The proposal, drawn up in the 1950s by Mies and Lord Holford of Holford Associates (planning consultants), is for a 294-ft.-high, 15-storey bronze-clad "Son of the Son of Seagram," with polished bronze-tinted glass, on the west side of a new 200-by-150 foot landscaped plaza. Existing shopping facilities would be relocated in a concourse underneath the square. The scheme is just as Mies designed it, bar a few modern modifications to bring it into line with revised building regulations and new technology. For example, the glass is being replaced with argon-filled double glazing for improved energy efficiency. Estimated in excess of £300 million at current construction prices, the project was approved in principle in 1969, subject to certain conditions, primarily that the developer secure enough of the site to ensure one-phase development.

Palumbo, who incidentally owns the Mies-designed Farnsworth House in Illinois, is undaunted by this latest setback, and has recently submitted an appeal to the Secretary of State for the Environment against the refusal of planning permission. (He hopes for a Public Inquiry next spring.) After all, he set out 23 years ago "to construct a modern building that will take its place as part of the nation's architectural heritage and rank alongside its distinguished neighbors." He has now acquired 12 of the site's 13 freeholds (limited-time ownerships) and 345 of its 346 leaseholds (rentals); the project could not get under way until 1986 at the earliest, by which time the remaining leases will have expired.

The battle is over the site's status as a conservation area and the nine buildings listed as being of architectural and historical significance — although even the preservationists have to admit they are not highly distinguished. Some supporters of the Palumbo scheme have suggested that a 23-year-old design by Mies deserves similar status, but the heritage activists will hear none of it. They are determined to preserve the motley collection of Victoriana that Palumbo would demolish, and prevent the consequent exposure of certain other facades that they argue were meant to be seen obliquely, from their present poky streets.

These latter buildings include Lutyens' Millbank of 1924-39 (literally a facade by Mies' near-contemporary, attached to a structure by Gotch and Saunders) to the north of the proposed plaza; to its south, a 1950s office block, Buckenham House; between this and Dance's Mansion House, Sir Christopher Wren's St. Stephen Wallbrook Church (1672-79), of which Palumbo is a warden. The current plan in fact revives Wren's own proposals for a public square in the area.

Palumbo, who inherited his father's property development company, has spent an estimated £10 million of his personal fortune on the scheme. He has strong support from leading architects: James Stirling, Norman Foster and Richard Rogers were joint signatories of a letter to The Financial Times in which they declared their "full confidence" in Palumbo's ability to realize Mies' "masterpiece," and rejected the conservationists' attitude: "in this situation their aim is misplaced as the architectural quality of the proposed building far outweighs the buildings it will replace."

The City Corporation rejected the plan second-time around on several grounds, particularly: that "the building itself would not be a direct descendant of (this nation's) architectural heritage, but could only be a part in the sense of being in company with other buildings that are themselves products of this nation's architectural heritage"; the loss of street pattern "at the hub of the City where the character is essentially one of concentration and density"; and the "incongruity" of the new open space. Opponents of the plan have repeatedly asserted that the Mies building is out of date, and would be even more anachronistic by the time it was built. Supporters meanwhile ask why neo-Venetian and Franco-Flemish style buildings on a medieval street pattern are any more appropriate to the city than a twentieth-century American idea designed by one of the acknowledged greats of modern architecture.
Deborah Tutelcser

"Gropius was a god and the god has fallen. We are looking at the remnants of a broken idol. We can say that it was deservedly broken or we can cry against the people who broke it," commented William J. Lonskii (M.Arch. '50, D.E.S. Arch. '53) during a break between sessions at the first reunion (October 14-15) of the classes who attended the Harvard Graduate School of Design during the "Hudnut-Gropius" years, 1936-53.

The 100 or so graduates, mostly men — women were first admitted to the GSD in January 1942 due to the "war emergency" — gathered to discuss the impact of the Hudnut-Gropius years on their own education and, in turn, the impact of the philosophy of the GSD taught from 1936 to 1953 on the three design professions — architecture, landscape architecture and regional planning. The reunion included Diamond as president of the Harvard Faculty of Design at Harvard in 1936. His formation of the GSD as "a professional school in which the three separate disciplines would enrich each other through proximity is an idea still central to the school's philosophy," Walter Gropius chaired the Department of Architecture from 1937 until his resignation in 1952.

The Hudnut-Gropius era at the GSD has had an incalculably far-reaching effect on both the profession and on architectural education due to the prominent positions achieved by many of the alumni. Among those who studied at the GSD during that time were Edward L. Barnes (B.S. '38, M.Arch. '42), Samuel Brody (M.Arch. '50), Ulrich Franzen (M.Arch. '40), Robert Geddes (M.Arch. '49), John C. Harkness (B.A. '38, M.Arch. '41), John Hedjuk (M.Arch. '53), John Johansen (B.S. '39, R.A. '50, M.Arch. '51), Ivan Hulot (B.S. '43, M.Arch. '47, Ph.D. '51), Ian McHarg (B.L.A. '49, M.I.A. '50, M.C.P. '51), I.M. Pei (M.Arch. '46), Paul Rudolph (M.Arch. '47), and Richard C. Stein (M.Arch. '50). Paul Rudolph set the tone for the reunion in his keynote address, "Towards a Sense of Place," delivered as the annual Walter Gropius lecture on Thursday night. His talk reflected an ambivalence toward the past shared by many of his fellow alumni. "We are here to pay tribute to Walter Gropius," stated Rudolph. "... We were privileged to be his students. What did we do with this opportunity? ... On an individual building basis there have been some very good, even brilliant insights constructed, but the great weakness of our efforts has been that urbanism escapes us. We don't know how to build cities or contribute to a sense of place."

Rudolph's talk encompassed what seemed to be the hidden agenda for the reunion: an attempt to bolster Gropius' reputation in the face of recent brutal criticism (epitomized by Tom Wolfe's book From Bauhaus to Our House, 1980) and a chance to speak out against the current reactionary dependency on historical models. Rudolph recalled, "... inherent in (Gropius') teaching were great concerns with the specific, the regional, and the 'sense of place,' contrary to current opinion." On the other hand, "... There are those today who would superimpose on one tiny building multiple historical styles, forming montages, making jokes, and crying for greater pluralism. The problem here is that the montages are in artificial ways but so far their composition has not illuminated the montage which our cities have become. Greater means of expression do not mean eclecticism.

Rudolph's lecture was both reassuring and disappointing. Although he noted new ideas, he reiterated some valid precepts. Through a profusion of familiar images, including a list of 28 building types that "traditionally contribute to a sense of place," Rudolph reminded the audience of two crucial aspects of urbanism — spatial definition and human scale.

The following day, what might have been a mere exercise in nostalgia evolved into a spirited discussion. The group mentioned many positive aspects of "Gropius' teaching. According to Richard Stein, Gropius believed in an architecture that comes "in an emerging rather than a changing art" in which "there is no fixed form, no set typology, no crystallized style." He taught a set of principles rather than a style. Rudolph quoted Gropius' 1937 statement, "It would be a horror to me if my appointment at Harvard would result in the multiplication of a fixed idea of Gropius' architecture."

Perhaps the most critical among them, John Heylck, reminded the group of the "brutality of gentle men." He suggested that "with the elimination of fables, myths, and storytelling, part of our lives had departed." On the whole, the group blamed themselves for not having been more critical as students. There was general disagreement on the benefits of Gropius' "collaborative ideal." They criticized Gropius for his analytical approach to architectural education while acknowledging its importance as a response to early twentieth-century eclecticism.

Ian McHarg recalled that Gropius' attitude toward history led to surreptitious slide shows of the great monuments of European architecture in students' rooms. "However," he stated, "the current resurrection of the Beaux-Arts is both horrifying and tragic." We should not condemn ourselves to the cyclical acceptance and rejection of history, said McHarg. "The problem with great men is that we expect too much of them." McHarg's remarks earned the most enthusiastic applause of the day.

Left to right, first row: Sam Brody, John Johansen, James Reston, Paul Rudolph, Edward L. Barnes, Corinna Hakon Hahlboe and King-Kai Wu. Second row: Richard Stein and (unidentified) photo: Clemens Kalischer

Gregotti at the League

Daralice Boles

The first step towards criticism of any kind is the adoption of a critical stance. The more evident the supporting philosophy, the better chance a reader has of understanding a critical piece and placing it in perspective. "But the pieces we are considering in this issue of Domus, the critical stance becomes evident the supporting philosophy. Geddes' thinking on the impact of the philosophy of the Bauhaus is epitomized in "The Vision of the Bauhaus." Our two Novecentismo articles, on the other hand, are not so easily categorized. They are examples of a more critical approach to architectural education while acknowledging its importance as a response to early twentieth-century eclecticism."

Vittorio Gregotti (photo: Dorothy Alexander)

A lecture by Fulvio Bianco marked the beginning of the exhibit. "La casa a casa: 1929-1930," at the Architectural League in the Urban Center (see Skyline, November 1982, pp. 16-23). The exhibition, curated by Lace, consists of 26 black-and-white photographs by Gabriele Basilico devoted to the work of "certain unknown architects," active in Milan after World War I. Lace, who is an editor of Domus and curator of the exhibit, traced the common themes uniting this seemingly diverse body of work. From Aldo Andreei's richly textured plasticity to Gropius Zanini's refined surfaces, the architects of the Novecento movement attempted to develop an evocative language rooted in the traditions of Lombard architecture. Lace discussed the affinities between Novecento architecture and metaphysical painting, and placed contemporary architectural practice in the broader context of the current disenchantment with the declarative language of modernism represented in Italy by the Rationalist movement. Lace's more elaborate discussion of this material will be presented in his article "Novecento in Milan: The Other Side of Modernism," to be published in a forthcoming issue of Oppositions.

— Dennis Doordan

Lectures and panel discussions continued to spark debate throughout November. Below are published a few highlights.
Bauhaus Dances Reconstructed

Form Dance (photo: Dorothy Alexander)

"Mechanistic cabaret, metaphysical eccentricity, spiritual tightrope walking, ironic variety? Is it perhaps all of these together, sometimes more of one, sometimes more of the other?" wrote Oskar Schlemmer of the Bauhaus theater. The possibilities were in evidence for several weekends last month when The Kitchen sponsored performances of Schlemmer's Bauhaus Dances, recreated by Debra McCall, a dancer, choreographer, and movement analyst who has spent three years reconstructing the dances from Schlemmer's notes and the Bauhaus Archives. She was aided by Andreas Weining, a student of Schlemmer and a performer in the original presentations. The dances were created by Schlemmer as lecture-demonstrations in the Stage Workshop during 1927. The new stage in Dessau allowed Schlemmer—famous for his Triadic Ballet first presented in Stuttgart in 1922 and performed at Weimar in 1923—to explore more fully the elemental connections between the human figure and abstract space.

McCall, who had studied the theories and systems of dance notation established by Rudolph Laban in 1900, became interested in the Bauhaus Dances because of their abstract qualities. Her interest led her to meticulously reconstruct not only Schlemmer's movements but also his stylistic intent. The first three of the six dances presented—"Space Dance," "Form Dance," and "Gesture Dance"—reflect increasingly complex relationships between three figures who move, not with mechanized, robot-like gestures, but with the dynamics of "softly animated marionettes" with distinct personalities. The dancers, in paddled costumes of primary colors and Braniff-like masks—casual and standardized—work first with simple rhythms, then with basic geometric props, and finally with more literal furniture that prompts momentary pauses. In the "Black Dance," cubist, first manipulated by three "builders" independently, are in the end combined into a single tower; the people who created it creep away defeated. The most abstract piece on the program was the "Pole Dance," in which a black-clothed figure is articulated by long white poles attached to limbs and torso. As the dancer moves, the poles become the focus of attention, representing the infinite lines of force emanating from the system of the body and engaging the cubical space of the stage.

In an intermission appearance, Weining, broadly grinning and pixie-like, reminisced about the energy of the Bauhaus in 1927—"our greatest year"—during which time the dancers spent many months "clarifying forms from emptiness." Elaborating on the playful and parodic themes underlying the dances, Weining added that the "Black Dance" was done "to make fun of the architects; they were always bothering us." —MG

The Architect as Auteur

Daralice Boles

Eighteen months ago, Robert Campbell, practicing architect and critic for the Boston Globe, mused "People are not aware of architects." Yet his reception as opening speaker on October 13 in the Metropolitan Museum of Art's series "Architecture: The State of the Art" surely soothed his concerns as both critic and architect by proving that there is indeed somebody out there. The lecture—and the series' other media speakers include Paul Goldberger, Brendan Gill, and Mohse Safdie among others—was and is a sell-out, a phenomenon attributed by Arthur Rosenthal to the frightful decline in New York City's infrastructure and simultaneous Midtown building boom, twin trends that have pushed architectural issues to a position front and center on the public stage.

Whatever the reasons, Campbell's approach was perfectly suited to his mixed audience. The lecture, presented as a stream of consciousness blend of aphorisms and anecdotes that appeared to come from the slides, was free-wheeling and far-reaching. Seemingly an eclectic introduction to architecture for those who knew little of the label past and present, the choice of slides alone gave the game away, and bit by bit a critical structure emerged. Campbell's own critique of current affairs came through in his "Auteur Theory of Architecture," a title borrowed from 1960s French film theory that stresses the individual curator/director over all other aspects of the creation. There followed a general debunking of unmourning and others that took Charles Jencks (gently) to task as the "leading impresario" of the current packaging craze and criticized the media as a whole for substituting images for architecture.

Finally this post-Venturiian offered his own standards of evaluation, advocating an architecture that is completely contextual, rooted to its region and above all articulate. We ask of architecture not that it place us in time and space, says Campbell—a fundamental message—refreshing in its simplicity and the entertaining delivery.

Philadelphia's Beaux Arts Ball

Six fantastic pavilions were the backdrops at the October 30 Beaux Arts Ball, held in Philadelphia's huge new Stock Exchange Atrium as a fund raiser for the Foundation for Architecture, the educational arm of Philadelphia's AIA. As fantastic—if not more so—was the design work of make-up artist "Peanut Butter," who lavished the faces of the black-tie guests far beyond the dreams of those costumed for the ball.

Eighty-one pavilions were entered in the Pennwall Competition, held especially for the ball, from which the five juries—James Wines of SITE; Robert Jensen, coauthor (with Patricia Conroy) of the new book Ornamentation; Lynne Nesmith, AIA Journal staff writer; Clark Dunham, Philadelphia theater designer; and John Nateau, architect with Ewing, Cole, Cherry, Perkins—who awarded three students and three professionals $1000 each to construct their pavilions. The work was chosen according to the stipulations of the competition, undersigned by a $15,000 grant from Penwall Corporation, that the pavilion be easy to build, but also wisely express the ball's theme of "ornament.

Student pavilions ranged from a joke on the curtain-wall structure by Fran Road, with one side of the shower curtain construction made of "shattered" reflective foil; to Meg Barclay's spoof of the egg-and-dart motif, complete with plastic eggs and feathered darts as the entablature above central-box dentile; to a sewer pipe arch by John Martin alluding to the role of plumbing in ornamentation.

The practicing architects' prize-winning schemes were more controversial among the jury, Janet Colsonberry's team from the Kring Organization both were named "ORNAMENTM ARCHITECTS" (The Architect as Ornament) with cardboard figures of Wright, Johnson, Le Corbusier and his Modular man as the entablature's four supporting columns.

Selected by the jury for its controversy was a classical subway station ornamented only with graffiti, by James Bradberry of Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown. Unfortunately, spray paint over a mock Vitruvian subway station did not stand out in the exhibition's overall sea of classicism.

But by far the most interesting pavilion was "Un Pavilion Decoupe," by Richard Votta of Zimmers Associates—a five-sided gazebo of dark interior mirrors, and one Palladian mullioned window—that created an active quality of transparency, especially for those going inside to play peek-a-boo during the ball. Each of the five corners was a frame for jewel cutouts of Ionic columns, further adding to the pavilion's airy quality, and marking it as the only pavilion without applied to ornamentation. —PR
Goodbye glassbox — ornament is it!
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H. H. Richardson
Complete Architectural Works
Jeffrey Karl Ochsner

Richly illustrated with photographs, formal drawings, and sketches, this book is the first complete catalog of Richardson's architectural designs. "As it stands it is perhaps the best illustrated monograph I know on the work of one American architect . . . a splendid book!" — John Coolidge, Harvard University
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Johann Friedrich Geist
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THE MIT PRESS
Creating an Architectural Discourse

Suzanne Stephens

It is instructive to explore the formative influences, enthusiasm, and convictions of Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Lewis Mumford, two of the most influential writers on architecture in the twentieth century. In each of the roles with which they became identified—Hitchcock as an architectural historian, Mumford as a social and cultural critic—their contribution to the development of architectural criticism and the formulation of an architectural discourse stands out. More than developing a critical position, they developed a critical mode for approaching new work.

In architecture, the critical act embraces non-verbal as well as verbal thought. Non-verbal criticism, for instance, involves the architect's espousal, rejection, or transformation of architectural approaches as applied to his or her own work. But because the design process benefits when certain non-verbal strategies are verbalized and therefore made conscious, writing and speaking about architecture should also assume a basic importance. This is as true for the architect as it is for the rest of us who must come to terms with our responses—however inchoate—to the built environment.

Those who write architectural criticism face the initial obstacle of formulating a criterion by which to evaluate a work. The critic must also come to terms with the chosen emphasis in his or her role—whether to "actively" attempt to shape the direction architecture takes, or "passively" react to specific work as it is completed. In espousing a particular direction, a critic risks closing his eyes to the drawbacks of the actual built work or the shortcomings inherent in the line of thought. On the other hand, by taking a purely reactive stance, the critic may fall into the trap of treating the work as a "one-off" product. This type of criticism lacks a basic frame of reference; too often specific sense data and fragmentary impressions, or absorption in purely technical matters, interfere with the overall evaluation.

In their writings, Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Lewis Mumford continually shifted their critical stances—from inside the discipline of architecture, promulgating a particular direction, to outside the discipline, responding with a certain detachment to the realized work. By doing so they were able to evaluate and write about the work at a level that extended beyond the subject at hand. Following the belief system of their nineteenth-century predecessors, who included Leopold Eidlitz, Henry von Brunt, P.B. Wright, and Montgomery Schuyler, Hitchcock and Mumford placed architectural response in a framework of effort that transcended the transitory moment.

Early in their careers both Hitchcock and Mumford argued for the adoption of modern architectural principles in this country. Hitchcock, through magazine articles and books, not to mention the landmark "Modern Architecture" (a.k.a. "International Style") show he undertook with Philip Johnson at the Museum of Modern Art in 1932, was explicated the formal and aesthetic tenets of the new architecture. Mumford, through books, articles, his work on the Regional Planning Association and in town-planning research, was bringing to the new architecture a socially-oriented emphasis. Their interests in architecture intersected early: An early Hitchcock essay was a review of one of Mumford's first books (The Brown Decades, 1931); Mumford was asked to organize the housing section for the landmark Hitchcock and Johnson show at the Modern.

Just as their interests had converged in the late 1920s, Hitchcock's and Mumford's probing of modernism intersected again in the late 1940s on the question of monumentality and meaning in architecture. The discussion centered around a series of articles appearing in The Architectural Review ("In Search of a New Monumentality," a roundtable discussion, September 1948, pp. 117-128; "Monumentalism, Symbolism and Style," Lewis Mumford, April 1949, pp. 173-180). This discussion anticipated some of the key debates of the 1960s and 1970s, in which a new generation of architects would begin systematically to address the question of meaning on a highly theoretical level. In 1948 Hitchcock's isolation of the architectonic characteristics of monumental buildings— their solidity, durability, slow rhythmic pattern, large size, and concentrated unity—would help focus discussion on the problems the new Modern architecture faced: its vocabulary of abstracted forms, lightweight structure, shifting planes, and flowing spaces did not match society's understanding of symbolic buildings. In his subsequent article, Mumford elucidated a powerful point about meaning and symbolic content: "It is not enough for a modern building to be something and do something; it must also say something." This new interest in expressive content Mumford thought healthy. Architects, he observed, had "mastered their grammar and vocabulary and are ready for speech." Furthermore, Mumford cited Hitchcock's first essay in Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration (1929) in which he said that the "New Pioneers" of modern architecture would not always be identified with starkness and nakedness of form; as in the maturation of architects working in other "primitive styles," they too would evolve a more "ornamental and symbolic approach."

Both Mumford and Hitchcock demonstrated in their writing a flexibility of approach in penetrating the problems of modernism, without losing the sense of optimism and unexplored potentialities they had been arguing for since the 1920s. Their critical modes, whether based on aesthetic or more general philosophical criteria, responded to the discipline of architecture as part of the larger and often analogous humanistic enterprise. This prevented either critic from being tied to specific categories, concrete artifacts, ideologies, or circumstances of period or place; it allowed a telescoping and shifting in time and space that gives reverberation and resonance to their criticism today.
Henry-Russell Hitchcock: Formative Years

Helen Searing

At the age of 29, Henry-Russell Hitchcock seized "the white stag, Fame." That was fifty years ago, when he co-authored with Philip Johnson the provocative book, The International Style.¹ He had already written a less acclaimed but more substantial volume, Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration,² and innumerable articles on literature and the fine arts. Several of these had been published in Hound & Horn, a Harvard-connected "little magazine" that took its title from a poem by Ezra Pound: "To the white stag, Fame, we're a hunting." But the world's bounds come to him.

Hitchcock's very first published piece, "The Decline of Architecture," appeared in the maiden issue in September, 1927, although it had been available some months earlier in an "advanced issue" of the first number. In this, in essays in The Arts, Architectural Record, International Studio, and The American Architect, and in monographs on Wright and Oed published in French by Cahiers d'Art, he evolved his methodology as historian and critic.

This year's semi-centennial of The International Style book and exhibition has brought it renewed scrutiny in articles, books, and symposia. Criticism has ranged from the antic ("dotty and influential"- Tom Wolfe) to the skeptical ("a neat piece of history-fiction"- Kurt Forster). Hitchcock himself was one of the first to point out its oversimplifications (in his article, "Twenty Years After The International Style," Architectural Record, August 1951) and to acknowledge that the book and accompanying exhibition at MoMA were "definite and controversial acts of participation in the dialectic of architectural development in this century."³ While subsequently Hitchcock took a more disinterested view of his professional obligations, in 1931, with Johnson and Alfred Barr, he set about to change as well as to record history. Though his art-historical expertise already spanned centuries, he was by temperament and training an avid adherent and promoter of the avant-garde in music, literature, and the visual and performing arts.

Hitchcock was graduated from Harvard in 1924 and he stayed on in Cambridge for his graduate education. The medievalist Arthur Kingsley Porter (1883-1955) was especially important among his mentors; at the Fogg also, Hitchcock, with Barr and A. Everett "Chick" Austin, studied with the legendary Paul Sachs (1878-1965), collector and Kunsthistoriker extraordinary. Virgil Thomson, Harvard, 1922, and a long-time friend of Hitchcock, has written of the part played by Sachs and Edward Waldo Forbes (1873-1969), director of the Fogg from 1909-1944, in encouraging a devotion to the arts and orienting their students, who included as well, Agnes Risjord, John MacAndrew, and Jere Abbott, "toward the modern."⁴ During the late 1920s and the 1930s, as professors (Barr at Wellesley, Risjord and MacAndrew at Vassar, Hitchcock first at Vassar and then Wellesley) and as museum directors (Austin at the Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford, Barr at MoMA, Abbott at Smith), they would further America's appreciation of art and modernism. One should also mention that the first American-born "New Pioneer,"⁵ Peter van der Meulen (1902-1928), received the A.B. from Harvard and studied at the architectural school there before going to Paris to work for Andre Lurcat.⁶

Besides an interest in the art of their own times, the Fogg-trained scholars of that period were noted for a commitment to connoisseurship, lovingly learning the identifying lineaments of an individual artist's production and basing any analysis first and foremost on a close study of the object itself. Thomson tells us how he walked Paris with Hitchcock, who "could read it like a history book,"⁷ precisely dating each building by its detailing. It seems to me that Hitchcock's approach to architectural history - his careful examination of the artifact, his concern for formulating precise descriptions of each architect's personal style - is rooted in connoisseurship, which has more customarily affected historians of painting, sculpture, and the graphic arts. His charming penchant for turning proper names into stylistic adjectives ("Lodovician," "Soomic," "Durandesque," "Puginian"), by rule known, apparently, only to himself, is surely related to the Fogg background. So is his assumption that criticism is inseparable from art history.

While all historians to a certain extent function as critics, if only during the selection process, Hitchcock has made the critical act an integral part of his method. Again, this seems to have been a characteristic Harvard attitude toward the humanities in general, an attitude prevailing, for example, the essay written by Norman Foerster, Harvard, 1910, for Hound & Horn, in which he dumas the Germanic tradition of scientific, value-free literary history as against the French practice of literary criticism.⁸ The values that Foerster and other Harvard men espoused were technical - based on the métier - and aesthetic, though as a devotee of the New Humanism, Foerster, unlike most contributors to Hound & Horn, believed in cultivating ethical values as well.⁹ An emphasis on aesthetic values, as well as on modernity, marks most of the contributions to Hound & Horn, which dedicated itself to upholding formal standards in the arts and letters. "Criticism has no meaning and no value until a work of art has first justified itself aesthetically, until it is accepted as a work of art... A picture, a poem, and a story have their intrinsic value quite apart from their association with theory."¹⁰

Hound & Horn originally appeared with the definite article and the subtitle "A Harvard Miscellany." Founded by two undergraduates, Lincoln Kirstein and Vanian Fye, almost all of its early contributors had studied at Harvard, including T.S. Eliot, Newton Arvin, Malcolm Cowley, 5.
Foster Damon, James Agee, J. Robert Oppenheimer, Roger Sessions, Fairfield Porter, and the architects: T. H. R. Hitchcock, Edward J. Wormley, Shadrack Hotz, and Austin. Several of them also were members of the Harvard Corporation, and Austin had been the President of Harvard, not political, according to Thomson: Kirstein, Hitchcock, the painter Maurice Grosser, and the filmmaker/photographer Henriett Radvansky. Although in its third year Hound & Horn dropped the subtitle and became more economical, Harvard men continued to make up a significant group among the editors and authors.12

In his useful book, The Hound & Horn: The History of a Literary Quarterly, Leonard Greenbaum has written that at its debut in 1929, the magazine concerned itself with three themes: "the individual as a person and an artist; the necessity of the artist choosing techniques that would enhance his work; and the need to find a point of reference from which to make value judgments."13 Greenbaum single out Hitchcock’s The ‘Decline of Architecture’ as "in the first and most precociously the expression of the role of the individual artist."14 In this article with its gloomy Spenglerian title, Hitchcock posed what he saw as the dilemma of architecture in his time — the search for mere technical perfection at the expense of individuality. Hitchcock’s periodical was close to the humanists. They had been echoing his teacher, Kingsley Porter, like Hitchcock's architectural contemporaries, which wrote in 1919 that: “Beauty in architecture [during the last half century] was conceived in the abstract, not the concrete. He believed that in Europe there were architects who knew how to build architecture, and he who knew how to conceive architecture with a "sound" (a favorite Hitchcock adjective) design, achieving "an aesthetically conscious formal expression of function and purpose." In a later letter, "Hound & Horn" commenting on criticism from a Boston architect, Charles Clare, which had been printed in the second number of Volume I, Hitchcock wrote: “A summer passed among the works of those European architects who find in the thesis of ‘The Decline of Architecture’ not a cause for depression but rather a tremendous incentive to make of the narrow path that lies ahead of us . . . a way as glorious as that of our past, has made me realize that if there were anything to withdraw in what I have written so far it would be the extreme pessimism that a winter spent surrounded by the works of Mr. Cribbome and his kind induced; the Weissenfelden of Stuttgart I found no unworthy successor of Motierian and the Capella Pazzi.”15

As this passage suggests, until the culmination of his first phase as historian-critic in 1932, Hitchcock championed European modernism against home-grown American contemporary architecture. In his 1932 essay in Hound & Horn, "Architecture Chronicle," he argued that "there is nothing for us now to do, if we would go on, but to accept and transpose the international modernism as it is lived in the seventh century, grateful that Hansa, Mangee, and Latrobe are still ready to come to our shores."16 Hitchcock considered the years after the deaths of Richardson in 1886 and Root in 1891 to have been decisive for the development of architecture. "With his production provided the exception, but he believed that period had come to an end in 1932, when examples of international modernism were arising on these shores. These observations were made in the context of praise for Lewis Mumford's The Brown Decade (New York, 1931), which, interestingly, after the publication of The International Style, Hitchcock himself would turn to that era, in the exhibition which he mounted for MoMA on Chicago architecture in 1933, and in his important study The Architecture of H.H. Richardson and His Times (first published in 1936).

Besides imparting a taste for aesthetic values and for modernism, a Harvard education imparted, if may borrow from Mark Twain, "the cool confidence of a Christian building four acres," when it came to having opinions about any and all of the humanistic disciplines. More than anyone else, Hitchcock made the essential preliminary moves that led to the first public performance of the Thomson-Getrud Stein opera, Four Saints in Three Acts. He had heard Thomson play it on the piano in Paris, and he persuaded Austin to give the opera its premiere in 1934, in the newly-completed Avery Wing of the Wadsworth Athenaeum, which contained a theater for the performing arts. Hitchcock had played an important role formulating the design criteria for this addition to the building, which gave Americans their first glimpse of a modern museum interior. He is also credited by Thomson with advancing the fortunes of a group of Neo-Romantic painters who made their headquarters in Paris — Paul Eliecheffe, Christian Berard, and Leonid and Eugene Berman: "in America, their work was bought only by the intellectuals, chiefly the friends of Hitchcock, who had been their earliest announce."17

The broadly based interest in the arts and his education were formidable. It should not, therefore, astound that Hitchcock, in a breathtaking display of linguistic erudition, should review in Hound & Horn the English and German translations of Proust’s great novel, as well as the current critical studies of the novelist’s work in French and English.18 Nor should it surprise that one so dedicated to a life in art should defend Proust against those whose "unfortunate lack of a hierarchy of values permits the treatment of the intellect on the plane of matters of fashion" and therefore consigned the later volumes of this novel to the rubbish heap of worn-out vogue. "In the middle of the Proust we find the offerings of other polyvalents — from Jere Abbott, photographs, a cubist drawing of "Americans Abroad," and, wit, and grandiloquence, from John Wheelwright, Harvard, 1921 (incidentally the great uncle of Harry Cobb), who studied architecture at M.I.T. and later was Boston’s city architect, outpourings of poetry, literary criticism, and impressionistic musings, as well as carpings comments on Mumford, Hitchcock, and "Hitchcock-Johnson", as architectural historians.19

Hitchcock’s credentials as intellectual and aesthetic did not suppress a lively interest in popular culture. In a 1920s review of movie magazines in Hound & Horn, he preferred periodicals like Photoplay to more pretentious purveyors of the cinematic art like the British Close-up, observing that: “Between H.D., [the poet Hilda Doolittle, who had written for Close-up an "overlong discussion of Dreyer’s (sic). Juvencé de [er]" and a Hollywood ghost writer there is a very long and obvious distance; but it is probable that the sort of ghostwriter has more that is essential to say about Greta Garbo — even what is conventionally called her art — than H.D. with the article on "Classics and the Cinema."

I shall close this account of Hitchcock’s writings for Hound & Horn with reference to one more article, his review of Virginia Woolf’s Orlando.20 To his favorable assessment, Hitchcock adds his concern with style and aesthetic values that informs all his critical writings, calling the book "pre-eminent in escapist brilliance of style," and comparing it with "the greatest works of belle-littres of the past" in "its effects of surface texture and its peculiar effect of concentration. While his method of discussing works in whatever medium is consistent, he always concentrates on the distinguishing features of the metier, and never confuses one expression with another. At a time when architectural history has grown increasingly inter, not to say extra-disciplinary, it is both refreshing and reassuring to return to Hitchcock’s admiring and knowledgeable review of buildings and the conviction that architecture is an art.

Notes
8. For Hitchcock’s critique of the New Humanism, see David Handlin’s fascinating paper delivered at the GSD symposium on the International Style, scheduled for publication later this year.
11. Philip Johnson’s “Architecture in the Third Reich” appeared in the last volume, VII, of the magazine, which ceased publication in 1934.

Orchestrated by the Architectural History Foundation, In Search of Modern Architecture: A Tribute to Henry-Russell Hitchcock pays homage to a scholar whose work has transformed the study of architecture. This festeshlitch was edited by Helen Searing—who acknowledges the influence of Hitchcock on her own historical studies — and includes 21 essays by contributors Vincent Scull, George Collins, Mark Girouard, David van Zanten, Henry Millon, Neil Levine, Lloyd Goodge, and Ann Jaffe, among others, all of whom have either collaborated with or studied under Hitchcock. The uniquely wide scope of Hitchcock’s interests is reflected in the range of topics covered in the essays, which are grouped in a chronological-topical framework that parallels Hitchcock’s own major concerns and preoccupations, including Romantic Classicism and nineteenth century architecture, and the essays re-examine architects figuring prominently in Hitchcock’s own investigations, such as H.H. Richardson and Frank Lloyd Wright. And the essays do not directly covered by Hitchcock, but who embody his historical assumptions, his methodology, and his breadth of vision. It is a fitting tribute to Henry-Russell Hitchcock that the essays, although covering a broad and varied subject matter, relate to only one area of Hitchcock’s expertise, the modern period. Published by The Architectural History Foundation and the MIT Press. (384 pages) and the companion’s love of illustrations, $45.00
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Creating an architectural discourse

"One can detect by the early 1920s the broad ideas that would shape Mumford's work. But ideas do not a life make, even

Lewis Mumford: Young Man and the City

Thomas Bender

Lewis Mumford has written on architecture and cities longer, more perspectively, more importantly, and with a more consistent and grounded point of view than any other American writer. His vast corpus of commentary and scholarship is, as the distinguished English social historian Ass Briggs once remarked, indisputably and distinctively American, an observation that recalls Mumford's early work. With his friend Van Wyck Brooks, Mumford led a movement during the 1920s to find and narrate a usable American past. In the process of this search Mumford seems to have absorbed the best and most characteristic of that rediscovered literary and artistic past, making his work resonate with a stream of American values associated with nineteenth-century figures such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Walt Whitman, Herman Melville, and Frederick Law Olmsted.

The quest for a usable past also motivated his architectural criticism. In his first book on architecture and cities, Sticks and Stones (1924), Mumford observed that "the future of our civilization depends upon our ability to select and control our heritage from the past, alter our present attitudes and habits, and to project fresh forms into which our energies may be freely poured." This statement describes well the task Mumford assumed as a historian and social philosopher over the course of the following half century.

The first volume of Sketches from Life: The Autobiography of Lewis Mumford takes us up to the period when he was ready to embark on his two great books, Technics and Civilization (1934) and The Culture of Cities (1938), and it thus provides the natural occasion for our reflections on the making of Lewis Mumford. The story he tells is that of the gradual definition of what he calls at one point an "unidentifiable and unnameable career."

If the autobiography concludes with Mumford having developed the capacities that enabled him to undertake his vast study of urban culture, it begins, fittingly, with New York, where he was born in 1895 and grew up. He insists that it was the city—not his family and especially not the prison-like schools of New York—that was formative in his development. The early part of the volume is a delightful recreation of a child's perception of New York in what was for the city the belle epoch. He tells of explorations, often with his grandfather, of ever widening expanses of the cityscape, and of the somewhat later joy of discovering the riches of the New York Public Library, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the American Museum of Natural History. There is also an unexpected but important description of his youthful fascination with the popular theater in New York. This intense involvement with theatrical culture and Mumford's resulting life-long interest in drama and playwriting helps us to understand his fine sense of the dramaticity of urban life.

Although Mumford mentions a few courses in the Evening Division at City College and at Columbia that stimulated him, his education was primarily outside the academy. He relied upon experience and contact with a few major thinkers, on occasion in person, but more often through their books. His most important mentor, of course, was the Scottish biologist and city planner Patrick Geddes, but we also learn of Mumford's debt to the brilliant and eccentric American economist Thorstein Veblen, who Mumford knew as a fellow writer on The Dial around the time of World War I.

While Mumford never accepted Geddes' rather elaborate sociological system, he did assimilate Geddes' essentially biological understanding of the city, and he admired and sought to emulate Geddes' synthetic reach. But it was as a personal force that Geddes most affected Mumford. He writes much more of the nature of the emotional bonds between the two of them than of the ideas he shared with Geddes. Yet Mumford did not find him personally attractive; on the contrary, Mumford was to be repeatedly disappointed in face-to-face contacts with him. Mumford did not like Geddes, but he admired him, perhaps more than the formal discipleship that he would not give to Geddes would have allowed.

No one, Mumford recognized, could get close to Veblen. But he was deeply affected by Veblen, and he appreciated him in just what "gave special excuse to more pedestrian scholars to ignore him." Veblen, in Mumford's memory, was not a social scientist so much as he was a man of letters and a sardonic critic of business culture. Mumford remembers Veblen for studying Nefitic culture to locate and understand the "instinct of workmanship" and then using this anthropological scholarship to criticize the distortion by modern business of man's best quality. Mumford, too, probed the prehistoric past to offer up a lesson to the present; it is precisely this sort of rhetorical strategy that he uses in the early chapters of The City in History (1961). While the two men used the age of savagery differently in their critical forays against modern America, Veblen found in the savagery of primitive cultures the antecedents of qualities he associated with modern engineers who, he hoped, would displace business leadership in America. Veblen thus became both the hard of savagery and the prophet of engineers and technocrats. Mumford, by contrast, was concerned with resisting domination by engineers as much as by businessmen. He was anxious to show how much that was at the core of primitive culture—sex, shelter, family ritual—remained basic. Mumford sought to protect these Neolithic fundamentals from the technique of the engineers. Characteristically drawn to polarities, Mumford in this instance advocated a dialectic of primitive and modern modes of experience.

One can detect by the early 1920s, at least in a general way, the broad ideas that would shape Mumford's work. But ideas do not a life make, even not a career. And this autobiography is about Mumford's personal as well as his specifically "intellectual" development. As such, it is illuminating and instructive. Some years ago Mumford published an "outline of autobiography"—he has since republished it as the first chapter of My Works and Days (1979)—in which he successfully connected himself with the larger cultural themes of the time of his birth. After the fashion of Henry Adams and other autobiographers in this mode, Mumford identified his life with (or in contradiction to) major movements in the general culture. But in Sketches from Life Mumford explores principally his immediate personal
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relationships—whether to people or places—and his inner life, and his search for a vocation (and a living). The late 1920s and early 1930s were years of making and definition for Mumford. It was here that he fortified that inner strength that enabled him, out ofstubbornness and courage, to hold to his position amid the swirl of movements and ideologies that buffeted so many American intellectuals in the twentieth century.

Mumford entered the 1920s with the ambition of carving out what was a novel sort of career. In this ambition he followed such near contemporaries as Randolph Bourne, Edmund Wilson, and Walter Lippmann, all of whom aspired to be men of ideas but sought roles outside the university. For the previous generation and for those who followed, intellectual ambition pointed to university careers. But in the second decade of the twentieth century some of the most talented men of intellectual ambition were put off by the departmental specialization, the positivism and narrow empiricism, and the freedom of the newly matured American university. At about the time when the brilliant, creative, and energetic Charles A. Beard left the constraints of the university, Lippmann, Bourne, Wilson, and Mumford declined to enter it. Instead they embraced the role of free intellectual, committing themselves to a new kind of journalism that united serious literary and cultural concerns with politics. If the academy was just then rejecting the generalist, Mumford embraced the title of generalist and rejected the academy. For Mumford the promise of cultural renewal was to be found neither in the university nor in the scientific discourses sustained there, but rather in the man of literary and artistic sensibility. The scientists he praised—William James and George Perkins Marsh, for instance—were precisely those equally at home with art, language, and science.

The problem for Mumford was that it was not clear whether there was a career for the kind of intellectual he sought to be. This was one of the crises he faced in the 1920s. The other was to resolve the terms of his rejection of the Victorian world into which he was born. This rebellion is apparent, as he notes, in his attitudes toward interior design and much else that shaped the substance of his architectural criticism. But the deepest problem of that legacy centered on the problem of finding sexual fulfillment within or outside of marriage.

Early in this crucial period, Mumford undertook his important study of Herman Melville, published in 1929. At several points in the autobiography Mumford notes, without elaboration, that writing this biography was important in his own development. The biography is indeed quite revealing in the context of Mumford’s autobiography. While Mumford deserves credit for being one of the first critics to recognize the importance and precise character of Melville’s literary achievement, Mumford’s most intense interest is with the life, not the writings. In particular, Mumford probed Melville’s failure to satisfy his obvious need for a career as a writer and his unmet sexual desires. Melville’s significance and lesson for Mumford, it seems, was that matters of career and sexuality were of fundamental importance to a creative artist and ultimately intertwined. Melville’s failure to solve these two problems caused him to stop writing, to stop being an artist. Mumford was determined not to fail: he would have a career and sexual satisfaction.

His well-known affair with Catherine Bauer is properly framed in this context. While he gives fewer details about the affair here than in My Works and Days (where he reprinted much of the correspondence between the two of them), he makes it far clearer here that it was in the course of this complicated period when he loved two women that he came to terms with his erotic desires in a positive and sustaining way that Melville did not. By the mid-1930s, after having thus explored his sexuality, Mumford achieved sexual maturity and satisfaction, and with Sophie Wittenberg, the woman he had married in 1921, constructed an enduring and supportive marriage.

By the middle or late 1930s he had found a career as well. The literary man became an urbanist. During the early 1920s Mumford was part of two distinct intellectual circles, one made up of literary figures, the other made up of architects and urban reformers. His Greenwich Village literary circle, which included Harold Sturms, Hendrik van Loos, Van Wyck Brooks, Paul Rosenfeld, J.E. Spingarn, and Elise Clews Parsons, was concerned with reinvigorating the art and cultural life of the United States. This group, Mumford claimed, produced “the best sustained conversation I can recall over any period in America.” It also inspired a book edited by Stearns with the title Civilization in the United States (1922), the main point being that there was very little worth of the title of the book. Mumford contributed a chapter on the history and failures of the American city. But bringing the city into the discourse of the literary circle was unusual for Mumford in the 1920s. In his history of American literature, The Golden Day (1926), it is remarkable, for example, how little attention is devoted to the urban context of the writers he discusses. Only in 1929, with the Melville biography, does Mumford’s interest in and knowledge of the culture of cities reveal itself in a literary study.

Mumford’s city interests were nourished by another circle of friends—most notably Charles Harris Whitaker, editor of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, Benton MacKaye, Henry Wright, and Clarence Stein. This group, which met either in Whitaker’s office or in Stein’s living room, furthered Mumford’s education in city planning and drew him into active involvement with the Regional Planning Association of America. With the financial support of Alexander Bing, this group planned and built Sunnyside Gardens in Queens—where Mumford lived for more than a decade—and planned and partially built Radburn, New Jersey.

The point to be made about these two networks of mutual education is that they rarely intersected. Mumford could not integrate the two sides of his intellectual and social experience in the 1920s, and even now, a half-century later, he deals with them in separate chapters.

By 1938, when he published The Culture of Cities, Mumford had overcome this bipolarity of interests. His career identity was established. Architecture, technology, and cities were to be the focus of his life work. But he
“Melville’s significance and lesson for Mumford, it seems, was that matters of career and sexuality were of fundamental importance to a creative artist and ultimately intertwined.”
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memory of the 1930s is restricted to unemployment, perhaps it is. But such a memory ignores the genuine excitement and social experiments of the New Deal era. While Mumford was writing, the Tennessee Valley Authority initiated federally sponsored regional planning and the Resetlement Administration under Reidsd Tugwell’s leadership was constructing Greenbelt communities on the outskirts of three major American cities. By 1941, however, America was a different place, and Mumford’s outlook had changed profoundly. The later volume concludes with haunting references to the constant threat of nuclear annihilation.

When someone has written so much and for so long, we must confront inevitable shifts in perspective. If, as some commentators say, each generation writes its own history, are we to accept Mumford as the writer of history for two generations — and take the second version as the history for the present generation? In an obvious sense the answer is yes. But Mumford is more complicated than that. Just as he has multiplied autobiographical materials — Green Memories (1947), Interpretations and Forecasts (1972), Findings and Keepings (1975), My Works and Days, Sketches from Life — he has surrounded us with commentary that is neither continuous nor contradictory. The legacy and the lessons of Mumford’s reflections on himself and on the culture of cities are to be found in the corpus as a whole.

He offers us a cumulative mode of understanding in which the individual elements find their informing context in the constantly evolving whole. As in our cities, the old is modified, but not superseded, by what is built later. The new, however, cannot stand independent of the old, which constantly affects and modifies its “pure” meaning. In a similar way, I think we must respond to the entirety of the vast outpouring from the pen of Lewis Mumford, if we are to profit from it as we should.

By the end of the 1930s the Lewis Mumford of popular historical memory was made. The major themes of his work on cities, technology, and architecture were fully developed. His subject, to state it so concisely as possible, was the history of technology and its relation to the physical forms and social relations of community life. Also evident were the major subthemes, including the rise and transformations of capitalism, the scientific world view, and the state and bureaucracy, especially and increasingly in relation to militarism.

Over the decades, Mumford’s evocations of the history and culture of cities have emphasized and favored much

In all of his writings on the city, Mumford refused to separate analysis from transcendent value, imagination, and emotion. This is the basis of his life-long discomfort with the pragmatic liberalism represented by American social science. This commitment provided him with a point of resistance, a fulcrum for criticism. And it protected him: While remaining committed to improvement, he was not seduced by the romance of power.
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Adolf Loos: My Appearance on Stage with Melba
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The following is an excerpt from Adolf Loos, Spoken Into the Void: Collected Essays 1897-1900. This recent Oppenheimer edition by Janet Newman and John H. Smith includes an introduction by Alfred R. Rockwell Jr. and an essay by the MIT Press for the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts and the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies (160 pages). The text here is from pg. 200.

The following is an excerpt from Adolf Loos, Spoken Into the Void: Collected Essays 1897-1900. This recent Oppenheimer edition by Janet Newman and John H. Smith includes an introduction by Alfred R. Rockwell Jr. and an essay by the MIT Press for the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts and the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies (160 pages). The text here is from pg. 200.
An area that until a few years ago was considered a backwater—the Fulton Ferry district in Brooklyn—has suddenly leaped to the forefront of a major development battle. David Walentas, who was selected by the city and state in "conditional developer" of a publicly owned waterfront site between the Brooklyn and Manhattan bridges, also wants to convert a group of adjacent industrial loft buildings he bought to residential or office space. These buildings still contain businesses providing 1,500 jobs, and a coalition of manufacturers, unions, residents and some legislators has organized to fight the developer—and the city, if it supports him. The outcome of the battle will determine not only the future of the historic Fulton Ferry district, but will provide an indication of whether manufacturing itself—and the jobs that go with it—is any future in New York.

Fulton Ferry has played an important role in New York's economy even since the seventeenth century, when its low-lying location across from Lower Manhattan made it a perfect ferry landing. The ferry terminal created a commercial and transportation hub, spawning an array of retail stores, warehouses, waterfront firms and restaurants. In the nineteenth century, a variety of architecturally distinguished buildings were built that reflected Fulton Ferry's diverse economy—so many of which still exist that the area has been designated an historic district. The district includes a Greek Revival office building, the Italianate-style Brooklyn City Railroad Building, a cast iron bank in Venetian palazzo style, the late Romanesque Revival Eagle Warehouse (now renovated for apartments) and a group of warehouses—the Empire Stores—that figure heavily in the current battle.

While the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge in 1883 led to the eventual demise of ferry service and turned Fulton Ferry into a tucked-away, largely forgotten area, in fact the district retained an economic vitality as garment, printing, warehousing and other firms continued to prosper in the large loft buildings. A survey conducted last year by the Brooklyn Historical Society found that the district's forty-five buildings employed as many as 10,150 people, most of them black and Hispanic. Speculators hoping to undertake residential conversions were holding between 10 and 15 percent of the industrial space off the market, but the real vacancy rate was only about three percent.

Nevertheless, Fulton Ferry underwent changes during the 1970s. The state built a small park at the East River's edge, the chic River Café opened and the Eagle Warehouse, along with several other buildings, was converted to residential units. Artists and others began moving into some of the vacant lots. And the city and state decided to redevelop a 15-acre site that includes the Empire Stores—seven landmark brick warehouses that were bulldozed with the public's approval as well as other city-owned properties. After a Request for Proposals was drawn up by the state Urban Development Corporation and the City Public Development Corporation, Walentas was chosen as "conditional developer." His development team, which included Boston-based Benjamin Thompson and Associates as planners and Reyer Blinder Belle as architects, proposed a mixture of stores, galleries and restaurants for the Empire Stores, construction of a marina, a sports and recreation center and a parking garage, extending the present state park and converting a city building into a farmers' market.

No one has voiced opposition to this proposal, which is still somewhat vague, does not have financing and has yet to go through the city's planning process. The major battle is over the 10-building Gaet and Sweney complex that surrounds the Empire Stores development site. Walentas bought the industrial buildings last year for a reported $10.2 million, and it was clear from the beginning that he did not intend to keep them for manufacturing. Refusing to renew leases in some buildings and to give long leases in others, Walentas has been emptying the four buildings near the Empire Stores site. Jobs have dropped from 2200 to under 1600; more than half the jobs lost went to New Jersey. Long island or were eliminated as firms went bankrupt. For the workers who lose their jobs, the result is often unemployment—and eventually welfare.

Despite City Hall's proclaimed intention of retaining jobs, the Koch Administration seems sympathetic to Walentas. City Planning Commission chairman Herbert Sturz, who does what the Mayor wants, has withheld release of a department study emphasizing the importance of keeping Fulton Ferry's manufacturing jobs. Brooklyn Borough President Howard Golden has said he could support a zoning change from manufacturing to residential in part of the Gaet complex. To garner political support, Walentas has hired lawyer John Zucotti, the former Deputy Mayor and Planning Commission chairman, and has retained Andrew Fisher, a lawyer and son of Brooklyn power broker Harold Fisher, as "community liaison." The prospect for defeating Walentas would not appear good—except that the manufacturers, the unions and the residents, all of whom fear "another Soho," are organizing. In October, some 1500 workers attended a Fulton Ferry rally at which Mario Cuomo, now Governor-elect, pledged to work to save their jobs.

Among developers and city officials, it has become a shibboleth that manufacturing is dead in New York City. Despite the naysayers, Fulton Ferry has thrived—but it is now in danger. The battle over Fulton Ferry affects the entire city, for if industry cannot survive there, it is endangered everywhere—and if these jobs are lost, the economic and social toll on the city will be enormous.

Concern has been expressed in recent months that even if Broadway theaters are preserved through landmark designation or other means, the incentives given theater owners will lead to high-rise construction—and the end of the district's unique ambience and charm (see Skylines, November 1982, p. 23). A new high-rise proposal vividly illustrates the reason for concern. Joes Carter and Associates, a development firm, is seeking to build a 53-story residential tower on the parking lot adjoining Mama Leone's restaurant on West 49th Street. The parking lot also adjoins the Ritz theater and, therein lies the story. Under the midtown zoning law approved this year, a developer can receive a bonus for restoring a theater. Carter bought the Ritz, which had been dark for years, sold proprietary rights to the Jujamcyn theater chain, which spent $1.5 million on rehabilitating it, and he is now seeking a 44 percent space bonus—most of it based on the restoration.

Carter's application is now being considered by the new Theater Advisory Group, which must make a recommendation to the City Planning Commission. The new bonus provision was designed to supplement the old zoning, which only encouraged construction of theaters in new buildings—not restoration of old ones. The Carter proposal, however, has given some theater preservationists pause: while they praise the restoration of the Ritz, there is concern that street life in the theater district will suffer from accelerated high-rise construction.

Leslie Loveman of the Committee to Save the Theaters says she has asked the Theater Advisory Council to hold off consideration of the West 49th Street proposal until an urban design study sponsored by the Committee is completed. That study, being undertaken by architect Lee Pomroy, and others, is supposed to make specific suggestions for preserving Broadway and its historic, cultural and architectural district. "I don't think that restoration bonus was thought through clearly," says Pomroy. "I'm not necessarily against it, I just think other criteria should be considered." Even the criteria for determining the size of the bonus are vague—which is one reason among many for giving the Carter proposal careful scrutiny.

Times Square

Last month, Skylines reported that the mammoth 42nd Street Redevelopment Project was having problems—and that the company scheduled to build a merchandise mart might pull out (Skylines, November 1982, p. 29). Now it's official: the Morse family, which operates the California Mart in Los Angeles, notified the state Urban Development Corporation that it could not secure the financing to build the mart planned for Eighth Avenue between 40th and 42nd Streets. Howard Brock, public relations spokesman for UDC, said the city and state are discussing what to do.

42nd Street between 7th and 8th Avenues looking south (photo: Marc Brody)
Ever since it opened in 1974, the W.R. Grace Building at Sixth Avenue and 43rd Street has had problems with its plaza. Norval White and Elliot Willensky, in their AIA Guide to New York City, called the plaza a "bore," and few would disagree. Its unusual northern exposure gives it less light than other plazas, and despite occasional concerts, the plaza has failed to attract many people to its large expanse. Among those it does draw are some criminals, and over the years the plaza has been the scene of a not insignificant number of robberies, narcotics deals, sexual assaults and other illegal activities. In an attempt to keep people out, the owner at one point put up a fence—"itself illegal—and had to be forced by the City Planning Commission to take it down. Now the owner is proposing to radically transform Grace Plaza—and the plan is generating controversy.

Raquel Ramati, who was retained as urban design consultant by the owner, Swig Weiler and Arrow Management Co., has come up with a plan to build a two-story glass-enclosed building covering the entire plaza. Two thirds of the building would be occupied by small stores, she says, and one third would be a sitting area large enough to accommodate 300 people. Under the plan, the owner would recoup the projected construction cost of $5.5 million, after which any profits would accrue to the city or a special community fund that would be established. Ramati says the plan would provide "a public amenity on what is now "a public liability and not an asset as a usable space." Community Board 5 endorsed the "concept" of Ramati's plan. But the idea of covering over open space has drawn criticism from some board members as well as the City Planning Commission. The commission's counsel, Norman Marcus, says that "turning a public area into a shopping mall" would set a precedent that other building owners might attempt to follow: it could, he says, set off a "plaza land rush." Even if the developer did not make a profit from the mall itself, Marcus says, the bonus given for building the plaza under the 1961 zoning law allowed additional floor space—from which the developer has already profited and will continue to profit. Marcus says the commission has suggested alternative ways of revitalizing the plaza—installing a cafe and hiring full-time security guards, for example.

Architect Lee Pomeroy, a member of Board 5, praises Ramati's effort but says, "I don't think they have to cover the . . . site." He proposes connecting Grace Plaza to the lobby of the adjoining Home Box Office building now being renovated, so that there would be a steady stream of pedestrians on the plaza. He suggests art or video exhibitions, but Ramati says small-scale efforts would not work. Things are at a standstill.

East Side Going Higher

Developer Paul Milstein is no stranger to planning disputes. Recently he was attacked for his sudden destruction of the Biltmore Hotel. Back in the 1970s, he made a name for himself by building the Lincoln Center area, he was defeated by a coalition of community and preservation groups. Now he is involved in another variance conflict—only this time it is on the East Side, and the community is divided.

Milstein and Robert Olnick (Milro Associates) are seeking to build a highrise residential tower (originally to be 53 stories, now reduced to 51) along the east side of Third Avenue between 68th and 69th Streets. With the mid-block portion of the site zoned R-8, the developers are asking that the entire site be zoned at the R-10 level allowed on the avenue—which would give them an estimated 95,000 additional square feet of floor space in a building designed by Davis Brody and Associates.

Raquel Ramati, Milstein and Olnick's consultant, says the zoning variance would make possible a much more architecturally attractive building than one put up as-of-right; it would also, she says, preserve the views of residents in the 20-story Manhattan House apartment building to the north. Without the variance, Ramati says, a 20-story wing would be built on land where the developers want to put a through-block "urban garden" open to the public—a space that would not block Manhattan House views. After months of negotiations, Community Board 8, which some critics call excessively pro-development, approved the variance request, although it recommended that the developers get only half the additional floor area they were seeking. Edith Fisher, who heads the board's development committee, says the board was especially pleased that the developers relocated tenants on the site to new buildings in a nearby building bought for that purpose by Milro.

But a coalition of blocks association and neighborhood residents, joined by Fred Papert of the Municipal Art Society (who led the fight against Milstein's Lincoln Center variance) are strongly opposing what they call the "additional bulk sought for this gargantuan development." They say their opposition is based on the precedent the variance would set for mid-block areas throughout the East and West Sides. When the board (as Milstein had suggested) went to the City Planning Commission seeking a zoning change, they were rejected, says Commission counsel Norman Marcus, on the grounds that rezoning the split lot to R-10 would destroy the "mountains and valleys" concept—high-rise avenue development and low-rise, mid-block.

Last year, developer Donald Trump was told he could not get a similar mid-block zoning change for a nearby East Side building. Now, say opponents, the Milro builders are trying to make an end run around the Planning Commission by seeking a variance from the Board of Standards and Appeals (RSA), which is supposed to make a determination of economic hardship, among other things. If mid-blocks can be rezoned through variances, say Milro opponents in a statement, "human sized mid-block structures—the brownstones and small apartment buildings—could become more valuable demolished than preserved, because their demolition would pave the way for enormous R-10 developments on the clearance.

Milro is now revising the application before making a formal submission to the RSA. The city and state will then undertake the Metropolitan State Environment Quality Review examining the impact of the additional density. Papert says the impact on the already overburdened East Side would be substantial and the variance will be rejected. "I think this is simply a question of his [Milstein's] wanting more money than anybody else."
The Times Square redevelopment scheme is being much publicized and closely watched. The following critique comes at a time when developers and architects are being lined up to carry out the large-scale project.

Susana Torre
Regardless of the fact that many places and structures of great public value have succumbed to real estate pressures, this proposal to redevelop 42nd Street and Times Square is clearly initiated with permanence in mind. A central concern is the preservation of the “pedestrian” oriented, low-rise quality of the street between Seventh and Eighth Avenues by concentrating huge densities on the south side of Times Square itself. This is one site with claims of its own to urban congregation. At the “crossroads of the world” — Times Square’s well-deserved nickname — all the major mass transit routes converge. Here the metropolis mirrors the quintessential American village, evolved from the crossing of two main thoroughfares. Times Square can be seen both as a town-within-the-town and as the major point of entry at the center of the island-city. Forty-second Street and Times Square also mark the first stretch of what J. B. Jackson called the “stranger’s path,” meaning a part of town that evokes to satisfy the outsider. Unlike other sections of the city that keep to themselves, this one is charged with extending a public welcome and catering to the needs and whims of those who come to town for business or for pleasure. In fact, in few metropolitan cities anywhere in the world is a reception axis marked so unequivocally: anchored at either end by a major transportation depot — the Port Authority Bus Terminal at 41st Street and Eighth Avenue and Grand Central Station at 42nd Street and Park Avenue — and released in every direction at the Crossroads.

At the crossroads of Seventh Avenue and Broadway is Times Square itself, bounded by 42nd Street — but often thought of as including Duffy Square, which extends to 46th Street — and the actual “district” addressed by the sponsors of the redevelopment project. Times Square is not only an urban canyon thronged day and night. It is also a metropolitan center of mass celebrations and an international symbol of collective striving and individual success. Its mythic quality has been reinforced and its message disseminated by productions from its own theaters and then from Hollywood in films such as 42nd Street and Lullaby of Broadway. Times Square is, above all, the necessary counterpart, the dark underside of those collective values and aspirations represented by Central Park (the one other space in the city that is a great social equalizer); the two are Day and Night, Nature and Artifice, Spirit and Flesh. Times Square is a darkness that needs to show itself without being ostensibly lit. Thus the glaring monumental signs that have populated the area since it became Manhattan’s nightly center of leisure call attention to themselves while diverting it from the street and its revelers.

The focus of this space is the former Times Tower (Edifitz & MacKenzie, 1903), a building designed to house the editorial offices and printing presses of The New York Times, and praised by Montgomery Schuyler in 1903 as a great “practical monument” and “artistic skyscraper.” Fashioned after Giotto’s campanile, the Times Tower became the totem pole of the twin rituals of the accumulation and dissemination of information. Around it gathered the multitudes to await news of elections and of the progress of two World Wars. This powerful symbol was eventually deprived of its social meaning by the relocation of the New York Times’ offices and the advent of television and stripped of its architectural meaning by the replacement of its former solidity, ornament, and public character with a “modern” corporate image in 1966. (Smith, Smith, Haines, Lundberg & Washburn.) Yet it continues to be a powerful visual magnet and, since 1905, the center of New York’s oldest tradition of urban festival: the celebration of each year’s end and beginning.

**Myth and Fact and the Guidelines.**

The design guidelines for the proposed redevelopment of 42nd Street and Times Square reflect an awareness of both myth and fact, but one that seems based on tantalizing fragments rather than a powerful symbolic synthesis. This approach mirrors, perhaps too closely, the fragmentation inherent in the twelve separate real estate holdings that make up the redevelopment area. There is, however, an attempt to make sense out of the pieces. First, the design guidelines function as a system of hierarchies to organize the fragments so that they
Times Square at the Crossroads

"Times Square is the dark underside of those collective values and aspirations represented by Central Park (the one other space in the

Broadway and 42nd Street looking south (c. 1894) (photo: The New-York Historical Society)

Times Tower (1905); Eidlitz & MacKenzie (photo: Allied Chemical)

correspond to three larger entities — Times Square, 42nd Street between Seventh and Eighth Avenues, and Eighth Avenue between 40th and 42nd Streets — each with its own set of existing or proposed characteristics. Second, they create a system of exchange whereby bulk is shifted to preserve 42nd Street as a low-rise corridor, and significant improvements in the quantity and quality of subway entrances on Eighth Avenue and Times Square are made a part of each development package. Third, they establish a system of visual coherence, based on a limited range of colors (light shades, "cool" tones) and materials (metal panels, reflective and transparent glass, decorative lighting, advertising signs) and dominated by certain planning and urban design concepts of widespread currency during the past decade.

Times Tower (1965); Smith, Smith, Huston, Landberg & Rankler (photo: Allied Chemical)

These concepts involve perception of place from several viewpoints. At ground floor, they call for a minimum separation between entrances to buildings in order to insure liveliness of movement and a sense of security on the sidewalks; selected retail uses and total visibility of store interiors to promote use by a targeted class of customers; rationalization of management by combining lobbies of theaters developed by a single concern; and planar definition of the street wall. From the point of view of the aggregate, the guidelines seek to integrate different scales (pedestrian and skyline, local and metropolitan, separated by a middle zone) by the use of regulating lines taken at the prevalent heights of local landmarks (theaters, signs, the Times Tower); use of setbacks to break down bulk, create "interesting" building tops, and emulate the shape and configuration, if not the style, of the more artistic among the generation of skyscrapers built after the 1916 zoning law — the Empire State, Chrysler, RCA, and Fuller Buildings.

In lieu of a vision, the guidelines provide a system of compromises. There is, for example, a significant difference between the ethical and economic aspirations embodied in the bulk distribution of the 1916 zoning law (maximum light and air on the street combined with a maximum of rentable property) and the formal concerns of the design guidelines, with their desire to emulate successful precedents. Hugh Ferriss’ chiaroscuro renderings of the outlines dictated by the 1916 law express a powerful idea, capable of being interpreted and transformed without loss of essence. The diagrams in the design guidelines lack that clarity regarding what is essential and what is not, and therefore, look as if they would stand little chance for survival during the long time involved from initial design to final realization. Also, time not only allows for circumstance to erode conceptual structures, but also changes values, priorities, and taste.

In some instances, the concepts outlined above seem to contradict one another, suggesting that different interpretations of what is requested may further erode the desired effect. For example, the continuity of the street wall on 42nd Street and the proposed tripartite organization of the new buildings (assuming a solid base, a shaft, and a top) will be compromised by the demand for a maximum of transparency in the storefronts at the ground and second-story levels. The marking of Times Square’s space in the skyline should not be accomplished by a grouping of buildings, as at Rockefeller Center, but by a single building calling attention to itself. The subtle and delicate setbacks and surface lines at different heights suggested in the guidelines to tie each building to the next for visual unity appear to be endangered by the huge bulk of many of the projected new buildings.

The guidelines’ contradictions are most evident in the reinterpretation of the Times Tower as a focus and symbol. The building is treated as a mausoleum in need of another change of clothing, made mostly of reflective glass, which is itself mirrored in the surrounding surfaces. A scaffold-like structure was proposed to artificially extend the height of the building, an allusion to the similar scaffolds behind the signs in Times Square. So, paradoxically, the focus is on a building that is not there and on a symbol whose very appearance is meant to convey the absence of an image. Tearing down the building and replacing it by a plaza is one option being explored by the developer George Klein and Philip.
city that is the great social equalizer); the two are Day and Night, Nature and Artifice, Spirit and Flesh.”

Patterns of Contradiction
Beneath the surface coherence of the development proposals lie three interpretations of the city, one for each of the three places identified as collections of fragmentary property holdings. The first place, at Eighth Avenue between 40th and 41st Street, rejects the city. The enormous Fashion Mart proposal for this site poses as a complete and self-sufficient world, the final destination for the pedestrian who crosses a bridge across Eighth Avenue directly from the bus terminal. The second, along 42nd Street between Seventh and Eighth Avenue, will grant the tourist who ventures outside the terminal a version of the idealized hometown Main Street, with its amalgamation of old-fashioned theater facades, low-rise scale, and rows of stores. The third, at Times Square, seems to strive towards the quality of mime, an illusory and seductive as Sidney Lumet’s Emerald City in The Wiz or the Grand Hyatt’s lobby, envisioned as a world of visual uncertainty where synchronized neon lights and monumental images will be broken up and multiplied of

infinitum in the building’s reflective surfaces, but where fear of disorientation may finally be conquered by submission to the persuasive messages of the advertisements.

Not since Rockefeller Center has there been an urban design proposal for Midtown of a scale and breadth to challenge the “20th solitudes” (in Rem Koolhaas’ words) created by Manhattan’s grid. Nor does this Times Square project, despite its attention to image, suggest a bold—urban and architectural conquest of a new public space. One hopes that this is not a signal of a reversal in the commitment towards the creation of public space in the city. This commitment, consistently pursued through FAR trade-offs since the late 1960s, represents the planners’ best intentions towards the creation of the modern American city. The two kinds of public space generated by these initiatives—the open plaza and the covered mall or atrium—have varied in quality and success.

Regardless of their quality, which is more often a function of who pays for them and who designs them, they all remain unrealized, ad hoc developments. Their agglomeration does not add up to a coherent public landscape, undermining the vulnerability inherent in the construction of public space out of a congeries of private holdings. A great city can, in fact should, sustain public spaces of different scale, including the incidental street as well as more ambitious spaces that link

42nd Street (Warner Bros., 1933) (photo: Warner Bros.)

42nd Street between 7th and 8th Avenues (photo: Marc Brody)

BROADWAY & 42ND STREET (photo: Vumer Bros.)

Points for Discussion
Instead of merely alluding to the pedestrian character of 42nd Street by low-rise development, why not create an actual pedestrian environment linking the Hudson waterfront with Times Square? This could be accomplished in a form similar to Barcelona’s famed Rambles—Narrow sidewalks and a broad promenade in the center of the street could be lined with trees, newspaper stands, florists, and food vendors. Why not place the discount TKTS booth presently located in Duffy Square on this promenade at 42nd Street and Eighth Avenue, to promote development of the currently isolated row of small theaters between Ninth and Tenth Avenues? Then redesign the in-fill retail spaces in the blocks between Seventh and Eighth Avenues as shopping arcades leading through the blocks to the other points in the district. Learn from the typological development of nineteenth-century shopping arcades in London, Paris, Milan, Cleveland, and other cities about how to turn an interior space into an extension of the urban character.
"In some instances the concepts outlined seemed to contradict one another, suggesting that different interpretations of what is requested may erode the desired effect."

Mark the space of Times Square with a group of buildings whose height and configuration in the skyline express their symbolic function as guardians of the space, embracing it rather than replacing it. If necessary, locate the additional density along 42nd Street in buildings with substantial setbacks to highlight theater facades. Design the base and shaft of buildings in stone in order to achieve a certain continuity with existing traditional architecture as well as a sense of permanence. Reserve reflective glass for building tops, so that they reflect moods of the sky rather than the refracted glitter of advertisements.

Finally, acknowledge that retaining the Times Tower as the rightful focus of Times Square may require a more substantial revision than the updating of its cladding. Thinking of it as a public building may be a step in the right direction. The building's original symbolic function as a source of information and center of communication could be restated by turning the building into an exhibition center devoted to communications at the international scale. Space could be rented on a short- or long-term basis for the display of varied means used to disseminate information. Freed from uses requiring windows of natural light, the building's exterior could be redesigned to take on meanings that will survive the changes in curtain-wall fashions.

Forty-second Street and Times Square can become an urban space where New Yorkers and visitors alike, regardless of their class, sex, race, or age, feel safe and welcomed by the city. It can be the symbol of the American metropolis grown mature enough to appreciate itself as an object of visual delight and aesthetic pleasure.
MOCA Update

September 1982 was a bad month for Cadillac.

Fairview's financial standing, what with a debt extension with Citibank and the passing of the first deadline for financing Bunker Hill's Museum of Contemporary Art (MCA) for Los Angeles (see Skyline, October 1982, p. 245), Cadillac Fairview defaulted on the record Citibank mortgage during October, raising further doubts for the entire Bunker Hill project, but a $270 million Canadian apartments sale brought in some cash in November. For its part, MOCA has now raised the $16 million in donations and grants contracted to leverage Cadillac's $20 million for the museum. With this new obligation due, Cadillac has arranged with Bunker Hill to begin construction of the underpinnings of just the museum and the garage to increase construction visibility and to placate the Community Redevelopment Agency. It will leave office buildings and condominiums for further financing and an improved seller's market. Meanwhile, the final scheme by Arata Isozaki goes before the MOCA Board November 16, as we go to press, for approval of interior and exterior adjustments. Financing arrangements under contract give Cadillac until September 1983 to provide for outstanding financing, and completion is still scheduled for 1983. Meanwhile, Frank Gehry's "Temporary Contemporary," MOCA's interim space, is now, before the City of Los Angeles for approval. The $500,000 foundation- and gift-backed scheme would remodel three offices (post office, phone, and police facilities) leased from the city at $815/year to create 30,000 square feet, with its first show planned for Fall 1983.

BBC Brougham

The British Broadcasting Corporation began interviewing members of eight world-class architecture firms—six British and two Canadian—during the first week of November, in the first stage of its limited competition for a new radio broadcasting center on its 6,500 square meter Langham Hotel island site in central London.

Richard Rogers was first to present ideas for the new building, estimated at between £15 million and £20 million, over 5,000 square meters. The plan was submitted with a 40,000 square meter hotel broadcasting building for an auditorium, studios, a library and cafe. In Los Angeles, the Galen Center will preview its new Pacific Design Office furniture showroom, highlighted by a series of roundabouts on the state of architecture in Los Angeles. In the meantime, a number of other finalists were Roger A.M. Stern, Architect (New York), Taft Architecture (Houston), and Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown (Philadelphia). The 2.5-acre site adjacent to the Institute's existing 14,000-square-foot facilities will be filled with a 40,000-square-meter broadcasting building for an auditorium, studios, a library and cafe.

In Los Angeles, the Galen Center will preview its new Pacific Design Office furniture showroom, highlighted by a series of roundabouts on the state of architecture in Los Angeles. In the meantime, a number of other finalists were Roger A.M. Stern, Architect (New York), Taft Architecture (Houston), and Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown (Philadelphia). The 2.5-acre site adjacent to the Institute's existing 14,000-square-foot facilities will be filled with a 40,000-square-meter broadcasting building for an auditorium, studios, a library and cafe.

Although the BBC has not officially released their names, the other British contenders are known to be Arup Associates, Foster Associates, Terry Farrell Partnership, Powell Moore Partnership and Seheen Alibas, with Arthur Erickson and Zedler Roberts from Canada. I.M. Pei and Partners and Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo & Associates were invited from the U.S.A., but declined to participate soon after the competition was announced in August.

George Howard, BBC Chairman, said at the time that "this is a competition to design an architecture building for a normal procedure in such circumstances. It is a competition for an architect." At first it was thought that the committee would choose one firm directly from this initial screening procedure, but now there is likely to be a scheme chosen and four others who will be asked to work up the detailed brief in collaboration with the BBC Radio Planning group and broadcast engineering experts by the middle of next year. This shortlist should be announced at the end of December. Whichever firm is selected, the BBC can incorporate the construction around 1990 for operation in the 1990s.

The Langham Hotel was the first purpose-built hotel in central London, and boasted the first elevators in the city. It was constructed on the site of the Portico, a grand terrace at the bend in John Nash's axis through Regent Street to Regents Park, opposite Nash's All Souls (1822-24) and the BBC's present administrative headquarters, Broadcasting House (H. Valmyrer, 1932). The latter was used as an auxiliary studio when the Portico was constructed. It is not yet known whether all of the firms are proposing demolition of the Langham, or some partial refurbishment.

-Janet Abrams

Skyline December 1982

People and Projects

In Peking, L.M. Pei and Partners' low-rise design for the four-story, 321-room Fragrant Hills Hotel, covering a third of the 30,000-square-meter site in the former Imperial Hunting Center, is in the midst of a construction effort causing the architect "a mixture of frustration and satisfaction." Pei, "being not accurate, but fast," Pei said of the scheme with a gray tee shirt that "this has to be the most meaningful thing I've ever done, because I have to deal with a farm first," but completion is slated for early this spring. Wellesley College in Massachusetts has appointed Hardy, Holzman, Pfeiffer Associates of New York as architects for a proposal to remodel the college's 9,000-square-foot sports center. In Chicago, SOM's River City's "One Magnificent Mile," an interconnected suite of buildings on the north end of Michigan Avenue encompassing a million square feet of space, one third for offices below and two thirds for condominiums above, will be partially opened in the fall. The Jackson Park North Western Terminal is to rise and its State of Illinois Center is under construction. Both and two dozen recently built or proposed designs were included in an eight-page Souvenir feature on the "unpreentented scale an unprecedented concept of construction taking place in 1982, completing the recent flurry of national weeklies' attention to skyscraper design. They include New York's "Tower of Power" on Philip Johnson and John Burgee's VIA 57 building (Nov. 15) and Time's "Three Towers" on Murphy/Jahn with Bion perhaps coming on the scene. The Winghaven Tower (Nov. 8) is also in Chicago, The Commercial-Union's reinterpretation of the new tallest high-rise accepting proposals through December for the seven stories blocks on massive North Loop Redevelopment..." In Atlantic City, Grossman/Rice has received city government approval for a $280,000 million, six-story building complex designed by Kevin Roche and John Dinkeloo & Associates. Hines agreed to a series of concessions for local residents, including giving four acres of the site to the city for a park. The construction cost is $1 million for traffic signal and interchange modifications. Hines plans to place a $1 million per year charge on the site. By the end of 1984, the 3,500-room hotel will be completed. The Neil Jackson Hotel in Oklahoma City will be designed by Bhattacharyya Vidyajy Harvan, a cultural organizer of the 16th annual American Indian National Convention, and the cultural center in Queens..." Charles Moore has been selected to design the San Antonio Art Institute's next building, a project estimated to cost $3 million. In the meantime, other finalists were Robert A.M. Stern, Architect (New York), Taft Architecture (Houston), and Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown (Philadelphia). The 2.5-acre site adjacent to the Institute's existing 14,000-square-foot facilities will be filled with a 40,000-square-meter broadcasting building for an auditorium, studios, a library and cafe.

In Los Angeles, the Galen Center will preview its new Pacific Design Office furniture showroom, highlighted by a series of roundabouts on the state of architecture in Los Angeles, featuring such panelists as Frank Gehry, David Hockney, Sheila de Bretteville, Joseph Giovannini, and Barbara Goldstein. Robert J. Fitzpatrick, president of California Institute of the Arts, will moderate the roundtables, and Stanfield Feldman, designer of the new PDC, will also speak. In New York Harbor, the National Parks Service has awarded proposals to consulting firms Beyer, Blinder and Belle (New York), and Anderson, N Getter, Finegold, Inc. (Washington, D.C.) to participate in the $280 million restoration of Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty in preparation for the United Nations' World Congress in 1986. James Marston Fitch will direct the historic preservation aspects and George Nooter will conduct feasibility and adaptive use studies for the Ellis Island restoration, with the aim of recreating the immigration center of 100 years ago, which ended in 1954. FACT-USA announced the opening of a competition called "ARCH-SPOT," a television spot/public service announcement competition for architectural and planning themes. The competition closes March 30, 1983, with a minimum of $5,000 in prizes, in part sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts. Winning spots and films are to be submitted for national selection for the fourth International Festival of Films on Architecture and Planning in New York City...
At least for the moment, modernism and preservationists can breathe a sigh of relief: Lever House has been declared a landmark. Designation last month by the Landmarks Preservation Commission of the SOM-designed glass and steel structure was spurred by spreading rumors that it would be demolished to make way for yet another looming midtown tower. Sure enough, last minute testimony opposing landmark status revealed that Fisher Brothers, owners of a contract to purchase the land, has commissioned Swanke Hayden Connell Architects to design an office building for the site.

Planned to take advantage of the new midtown zoning regulations, the proposed 40-story development would increase by almost three times the amount of rental property contained in the 24-story Lever House. In defense of their anti-preservation stance, the developers had the architects prepare a "white paper" for the Landmarks Commission. Predictably, they maintain that the existing International Style slab and tower under-utilizes allowable development rights, incorporating instead "a gloomy . . . plaza and arcade" that break the "integrated axis" of Park Avenue.

Meanwhile, under separate contract to buy a lease on Lever House and its land is developer George Klein, who, according to some sources, favors constructing a tower adjacent to and in some manner integrating the landmark into the new building.

Landmark designation can be overruled by the Board of Estimate or by proof from the owner of economic hardship, but both developers have refused comment on whether they will "fight" the battle before city officials for permission to alter or raz the existing building.

In fact, if they wait long enough, they may not have to, since the structure itself poses serious repair and maintenance problems. Over one-half of its glass spandrel panels and fifteen percent of its windows have been replaced and more are cracking due to the nascent curtain wall technology used in its construction, completed in 1952. As a landmark, any further alterations to its exterior must be carried out to preserve the character of one of the earliest "Modern Movement" high-rise buildings constructed by private owners in the country.

--- Deborah Dietsch

Lever House (1952): Skidmore Owings & Merrill (photo: Ezra Stoller)

Deborah Dietsch

Since the passage of Local Law 10, people have stopped walking around the city like fatted Chicken Little, fearful of a falling skyline. Enacted in 1980, after a Barnard student was killed by a piece of masonry that fell from a Columbia University-owned building, the statute requires inspection and repair of facades of more than six stories. To date, however, only 36 percent of such structures have been certified as safe. Not only is the city having a hard time enforcing the law, but in hasty efforts to comply with its regulations, property owners are stripping and dismantling facades from many older buildings.

The aim of the "façade law" is to establish a citywide, ongoing building maintenance program with the responsibility for inspection and upkeep placed on the owners. It requires that a conditions report be filed with the Department of Buildings every five years (the first deadline was last year). After reviewing the report, the architect or engineer, hired by the landlord, must immediately correct the structure given a second inspection. Failure to file certification or repair deteriorated components may result in criminal penalties which include fines of up to $1,000 and/or six months in jail and a civil penalty of $250 per month for negligence. Buildings with setbacks of 25 feet or more and those with ongoing maintenance programs are exempt.

For owners, the burden of compliance is costly, beginning with inspection of their property. The survey not only requires paying professional fees to architects and engineers, but many demand erection of external scaffolding or scagfolding for close scrutiny of metal anchors and supports. Even more expensive is the necessary repair or replacement of existing architectural features. Many owners have resorted to streamlining their building exteriors with an "architect of brick only."

Except in cases where a property is located within the confines of an historic district, subject to the rule of the Landmarks Preservation Commission, defendants of architectural integrity and demand erection of external scaffolding or scagfolding for close scrutiny of metal anchors and supports. Even more expensive is the necessary repair or replacement of existing architectural features. Many owners have resorted to streamlining their building exteriors with an "architect of brick only."

For owners, the burden of compliance is costly, beginning with inspection of their property. The survey not only requires paying professional fees to architects and engineers, but many demand erection of external scaffolding or scagfolding for close scrutiny of metal anchors and supports. Even more expensive is the necessary repair or replacement of existing architectural features. Many owners have resorted to streamlining their building exteriors with an "architect of brick only."

Besides, many corinices continue to be removed from Columbia and Barnard College's eleven apartment buildings on Broadway near the campus. The Mayflower Hotel at Central Park West and 61st Street has also been decased; the removal of its decorative terracotta window surrounds and moldings alone cost close to $1 million.

Arteneists aside, Local Law 10 also fails to specifically methods of inspection. It only stipulates that "a visual type of examination" be carried out and that "the architect or engineer may use methods of inspection as he deems appropriate." Since architects are not required to inspect structural deficiencies beneath the facade, assessments are not comprehensive. Moreover, architects and engineers are protesting that financial risk and liability are too high in relation to fees for certified inspection, and are refusing to undertake Local Law 10 inspections.

So far, of the 8,650 buildings within the boroughs that qualify under the law, only 5,719 owners have filed certification. Of those filed, 913 have reported unsafe conditions, including the Dakota, eleven apartment buildings on Park Avenue between 71st and 83rd Streets, the sweeping glass curve of 9 West 57th Street, the Gainsborough Studio on Central Park South, and 1 United Nations Plaza. Many of these buildings are holding out for careful building conservation.

As public policy, the intentions of the facade law are indisputable. But in practice, the lack of specificity within the regulation and its inadequate enforcement have created hardships for tenants, owners and architects alike. The sky may not be falling, but the question still remains of whether the public is being protected or pressured into accepting an insidious mandate.
TAMPERING WITH FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT

David Roessler

The installation of a Frank Lloyd Wright room opening on December 3 at the Metropolitan Museum of Art has been called by Charles Allan Alston "a notable contribution to historic detail. However, it has a poor relation in Allentown, Pennsylvania. The assembly of the Wright room, floating ceiling ten Art Metals Inc. says a lot about a current penchant for tampering with Wright's work and also the importance of the New York accomplishment.

In 1972 the Metropolitan purchased the Francis W. Little house, planning to remove it from its lakeside site at Wayzata, Minnesota, and install the very large room. A smaller expanded American Prairie House in the style of the skyscraper was included. The rest of the house was offered for sale and the Allentown museum purchased a small parlor area. This museum, proud of its enterprising acquisitions, explains in a handsome color brochure how the room was acquired. Edgar Tafel, New York City architect and Tafel Fellowship alumnus (1932-41), was involved in an expansion of the Allentown museum at the time the Little house was slated for demolition.

Allentown's room is quite small, 13 by 15 feet. Although labeled a "library" on plans, the room has very modest provisions for books and, as the museum brochure states, "was actually a small reception room." Its central attraction is two sets of four decorative glass windows, although the ceilings are not up to the standard of Wright's best work of the previous decade. Wright and Little disagreed about the window design and Wright at one point wrote that he had "decided to scrap" the idea. He was right: They do not compare with the glass in the Willits, Dana, Cooley, Irving, Martin (Buffalo), or Robie houses.

The museum's descriptive brochure is well-produced but contains a number of minor inaccuracies — Wright returned to this country not in 1911 but in 1910; in the 1914 Taliesin tragedy not 6 but 7 persons died. The last paragraph of the booklet contains two major sources of misinformation or distortion. First, it is claimed that "the historical value of the library is of the utmost significance," second, Ada Louise Huxtable is quoted as having written in The New Yorker, "The Little house is equal to the Cooley and Robie houses and perhaps a little superior to the Prairie houses. Neither claim is supportable. Furthermore, it is stated that the room was "ordinarily closed" and that the Metropolitan Museum, proud owner and vendor of the library. The alleged Huxtable quotation (which the Allentown library is proud to back up) was a by-lined news story of an announcement by the Metropolitan in the Times (May 15, 1972, p. 42). The Little house is not one of Wright's greatest works, on par with the Cooley, Robie, Willits, Dana, and Martin houses. The rooms were designed in his most intensive creative period of 1910-19 (1904-09); and they each contain architectural elements executed more effectively and more lavishly in any of the other Prairie houses.

Regarding the Tafel installation, there is a curious lack of respect for the architectural integrity of the room or any of the modernism that is included in its treatment today. The first surprise at Allentown is that the entry to the library space has been drastically altered. As the museum catalogue says, "the doorway approach to the room had to be eliminated and the transom closed. Both of these factors have altered Wright's concept of the flow of space but were inevitable changes with the demolition of the house." The "before" picture accompanying the text "is the change to be even worse than it sounds. Was such a radical change — indeed, was the room now an interior "hall"? The library was built into a corner of the new museum addition so that one of the four-part windows is still an exterior window and the other is a glass idem. There seems no possible excuse for cutting off the space's originality. Further, the transom, now closed, was originally a very important void connecting two spaces. Lost is the typical Wrightian sense of spatial continuity; instead of the parlor being perceived as an open space, the main entry hall — with which it shared some pitched ceiling planes — the original open plan has now been severed and the room served up as an entity called "the Little Library."

The second shock comes when one realizes that Tafel decided to "improve" upon Wright's brick pier flanking the transom. The Little house incorporates a certain amount of face brickwork inside. Visually, the brick rises from the floor until it reaches the broad timber fascia around the room at about 6', above which the brick is plastered. Wright was quite consistent in this treatment at the time. The fascia served several architectural purposes: it provided room continuous horizontal line both defining and tying together different elements and spaces. It also received the different wall surfaces, such as the occasional panels or pier of brick. The Little library originally featured this classic fascia, but now the space above the fascia has been filled in and the brickwork taken clear up beyond the fascia until it dies into the ceiling. Wright never treated brick this way in the Prairie house; only much later, in his Usonian houses of the late 1930s and thereafter, where details like the room-skirting transom-height fascia were no longer seen, was the brick typically taken all the way up to the ceiling. It is this later architecture that Tafel knows from experience and has chosen to insert into the Little room.

But the worst is still to come. The ceiling, now a contained sloping volume rather than an extension of a larger distant form, has also received an assist. The museum brochure states that Tafel, "who felt that the room had never been finished according to Wright's "intention," decided to include two strips of white oak molding around the double-sloping ceiling. He then inserted indirect lighting in the perimeter fascia."

It should be noted first that Wright could not have added oak molding to the ceiling because it was not originally a self-contained surface — any such stripping would have had to run out over the fascia, into the adjoining hall.

Wright's furniture plan provided in the booklet shows an asymmetrical layout with pieces arranged around two sides of the library. Allentown's arrangement features a large square coffee table, designed by Tafel, surrounded by four chairs (1904 Martin house reproductions) set right in the center. Not only is the table a design anachronism, but the layout is also incorrect in terms of social history: There were no such low tables or coffee groupings in the houses of the period. The furnishing further defines the space as a small self-contained unit. Rather than being a quiet side space, the library has had its "unassuming" falsely pronounced; it is no longer a low-key part of an open plan continuum. Allentown now has an interesting small room based rather freely on one by Frank Lloyd Wright and overflowing with assorted bric-a-brac: Chinese pattern rug and ceramics, Japanese prints, American brocades, and the Tafel table.

This leads one to ask why museums that would not dream of touching up a canvas will happily alter work of modern architecture. Alterations not intended by the architect are falsehoods and the viewer is deceived, invited to believe that additions and deletions are actually original. To explain them away in a museum publication is to excuse the irreconcilable, and few will even see such an apology. We expect more from museums; we must say neither more nor less than the truth about their changes, and that means refraining absolutely from "correcting" or "finishing" work that the author executed well enough to warrant its preservation in the first place. This argument is not intended to espouse a total hands-off attitude toward architecture preservation, just to encourage one true to the integrity of the work. Architecture needs use and people within it to stay alive, and life means change and adaptation. Problems can be corrected, jobs can be finished, even added to without being untrue to the original — Richard Meier's Aye Simon reading room at the Guggenheim is a fine example. It all seems to come down to the question of who the new work is serving and why the changes are being made. In the preservation or museum context surely the only acceptable answer is that the changes are serving to fulfill the original conception — perhaps expanded it necessary in a still-used building — but always in keeping with a conscientious reading of the architect's design.
The Winery:
Regional Effervescence

Andrew Batey

The wine business was established in antiquity, but its American history is fairly brief and its late flowering in California quite recent. Roman wineries were not unlike the house-type lean-tos often connected to the range of domestic buildings. These sheds were the precursors of the château—a rectangular barn with its only openings at the gable ends—which, by the eighteenth century, became the standard barrel storage building type. The buildings traditionally used to produce wine in Europe are simple vernacular, agricultural structures, and are linked to grand châteaux or schloss or villas. These buildings, situated in vineyards, are usually arranged causally in groups or compounds, sometimes determined by function. The ancient process of wine-making does not require a complicated program. The grapes are squeezed elsewhere or are crushed on site, usually outside the building. After the juice is put into tanks or barrels, the blending and aging process begins. The main function of most of the buildings is storage, allowing for observation, temperature control, and testing of the aging wine. Other activities, including bottling and expediting, are housed in the utilitarian structures.

The new winery, however, requires many more attendant activities having to do with "Hype." Tours, wine-tasting sales, and image-making are all integral parts of the new program. These extras have resulted in an architecturally stylistic riot of new construction—an unfortunate development for the Napa and Sonoma Valleys of Northern California. As these valleys, with their gentle, rolling landscapes of oak and grape vines, have become the premier wine-producing regions of America, they have fostered a vernacular architecture of stone and timber, unself-conscious and unpretentious. Large barns with tin roofs have long been adequate for the purpose of viticulture and appropriate to the specific place. The barns for wine processing were often sited on the small volcano-produced hills that dot the valleys and provide elevation—and thus gravity—to ease the flow of grape juice to barrel. A sort of European gentility characterizes the area, just right for the wine-making endeavor.

A few venerable California wineries maintain this tradition—Inglenook (the old building), Beamsville, and Buena Vista—but the explosion of development since the 1960s is sadly lacking in propriety and charm. The wineries of some of the great companies, such as Martini and Krug, are an embarrassment to architecture, and the plethora of "boutique" wineries are as corny and tacky as fast food dispensaries. Spring Mountain is a literal copy of Disneyland's Main Street R.R. Station; Chateau St. Jean, a Taco Bell Italianate villa; Stag's Leap, a mock mansard mix-up; and the new Disney Winery—well, one can imagine.

Fisher Winery (1982); MLTW/Turnbull Associates (photo: Rob Soper)

One architect who also makes wine has attempted to capture the essence of the Napa landscape, and the quality and character of the wine-making process. William Turnbull owns a small winery in Oakville that produces excellent wine. Called Johnson-Turnbull, it is a small cottage on the main road, where he has built a series of wooden sheds or barns at the rear containing large tanks and barrel storage. Turnbull has shown his wisdom about wine in his designs for two other lovely, simple wineries, Cakebread and Fisher. Cakebread is a redwood-clad timber frame structure, low-slung and rambling, not much more than a Northern California barn. Two big dormers loom out of the shingle roof to

Cakebread Cellars, Napa Valley (1982); MLTW/Turnbull Associates. Above: plan of barrel storage and fermentation room. Below: exterior (Photo: Rob Soper)
accommodate the largest stainless steel tanks, and a tower between them provides a shaft of skylight to flood the storage space beneath. Barn doors, industrial lamps, and lattice screens all lend an air of no-nonsense agri-business.

The Fisher winery in the Sonoma Valley is dug into a knoll on one side (the north), in the tradition of the hillside wineries of the nineteenth century. Because the earth temperature is 55°, ideal for wine-making, this design makes perfect sense. As in Cakedmead, a skylight tops the four-square structure with the fermentation tanks situated directly below. A simple timber vernacularly-inspired building, it is built of redwood and fir, left untreated to recall its agricultural purpose. The crispness of the detailing belies the self-effacing, "don't bother looking at me, I'm just a barn" character, but Turnbull often sets up this contradiction.

In contrast, Domaine Chandon by R.O.M.A. is a pastiche of recent architectural successes and clichés whereby these French makers of very good champagne (they call it "sparkling wine") in America have gone all out to be "American." Tucked behind some hilllocks and a pretty lake in Yountville, the retail portion of this enormous complex is composed of a series of barrel vaults of corten steel resting uneasily on concrete pillars and walls with some nasty detailing in between. The working winery is a tilt-up slab seeded with vineyard stone, a huge warehouse of stainless steel tanks. The interior of this tank farm is thrilling because of its scale and gentle curvature of plan and the cool depths of the darkened riddling room. The external clumsiness, however, of these giant storerooms, which recently have been allowed to multiply out of control, overshadows the landscape.

Jordan Winery overshadows too, but with bluff, not bulk. A mock-schloss that thinks it is a chateau is in fact a terra-cotta tile-roofed, yellow-plastered, arch-windowed, copper-guttered, shuttered, and manicured melange. It could have come only from northern Hungary. Backen, Arrigoni and Ross, the architects, have deftly surrounded an enormous tilt-up warehouse with this decorative object. The dining room, located amidst oak tanks, is lit by chandelier, and the guest bedrooms—yes, this winery is also a tiny inn for V.I.P.'s—are carefully decorated in "country French," as is the kitchenette. The chateau-schloss sits gracefully in an English-style park in the Alexander Valley north of Napa and Sonoma, and is the state-of-the-art in styled-up, lavish winery architecture.

The recent trend of gilded warehouses, of which Domaine Chandon and Jordan are examples, is the easy way out. A winery type that conforms to the French chai, or barrel storage shed, would seem to offer a perfect alternative—a building constructed of substantial material, self-insulating, of simple plan and elevation—the archetypal temple-shed. The masonry base could provide the chai or storerooms, and the temple-shed, the ancillary requirements. This much-sought-after "simple" solution to complicated programs is a natural here, but in our eclectically charged atmosphere, it eludes the makers of the modern winery. One looks forward to a time when a beautifully sublime wine is made in its architectural counterpart.

Northern California, booming in the production of wines, is also developing a vinicultural building type. Architects are getting involved, and one, William Turnbull, has even opened his own winery.
Alexander C. Gorlin

Dubbed the "Flash Gordon of Architecture" in a past Yavapais article, Helmut Jahn has recently broken with his staid Miesian background into the realm of an architect who embraces the aesthetics of science fiction fantasy. Already at the tender age (for an architect) of forty-three, he has won the competition for the Southwest Banchares Towers in Houston, Texas (see "Bank of the Southwest Tower," Skylark, November 1961, p. 10), which at 1400 feet will be the tallest building outside New York and Chicago.

Expectations ran high for the show of Jahn's work at the Yale and Architecture Building (November 1 to December 3) to clarify the shift in emphasis from a technically-based to historically-based forms. Since Jahn's recent work has transformed the traditional Miesian impression created by his firm with partner C.F. Murphy, this expectation, along with the desire to see a comprehensive presentation of the work, were realized. These expectations, however, remained unfilled. Few projects were displayed, few models at all, which is especially unfortunate since Jahn's projects are clearly conceived as three-dimensional objects.

The focus of the show is a series of enormous seven-foot airbrushed studies (watercolours ?) of the Southwest Banchares Towers. As with Jahn's "Late Entry" to the Chicago Tribune Competition, theatrical Hugh Ferriss-like sets and other effects in the drawings animate the Banchares Towers and give rise to wildly divergent imagery. The Banchares Towers, like the hyperdimensional skyscraper as the secularized Gothic Cathedral crowning the city (Stadtkrone), the rendering of the Tower is also influenced by the contrast of the Bausmann woodcut of a cathedral beaming with light. Jahn's obsessive image of the glass skyscraper as a Tower of Light is almost a parody of the New Jerusalem, a metaphor for "clear as glass." In the Banchares Towers, Hollywood klieg lights radiate diagonally into the sky, climaxing at the top in a single beam pointing vertically, balanced by a horizontal ray; this creates a cross at 1400 feet, the elevation of Houston as a center of economic and moral gravity. Not a little frightening in its similarity to a Darth Vader mask, or a laser weapon or scepter of unearthly power, John's Tower projects a rather humorous quality in its kitchy intensity of religious/theatrical/scientific imagery.

Formally, Jahn seeks to classically articulate the base, shaft, and top of the Tower. He does this to a certain extent, but without enough connection between the elements. The base, a square rotated at 45 degrees to Houston's planning grid, becomes isolated visually as a lone object. 100-foot high entrance gates in the form of gigantic gabled horns are located at each corner and connected by pedestrian arcades. Detailed entrance studies include glass used in a rusticated pattern, keystones and a bird's head jamb.

From this base the central shaft shoots abruptly up over 1000 feet straight to the triangular cap piece. As in the Chrysler Building, horizontal banding of dark and light reinforces the vertical rush. The bands are further articulated by slight setbacks, occurring at equal intervals, instead of in a hierarchical manner that would have acknowledged the change in solidity or weight from the pro富tion of form and color as in many Art Deco towers.

The tower is more like a mammoth rock, strangely reminiscent of Eero Saarinen's Great Arch of Christ spire at Columbus, Indiana (1940-42). It is clear from the sketches that Jahn wanted to generate the top form from a geometric manipulation of the plan as Wright did in his Price House in Bartlesville, Oklahoma (1954). It is a sort of "deus ex machina" concept, strong enough to challenge the imagination of the viewer. The Tower resembles a strait-jacketed Chrysler Building enlarged to enormous scale, it lacks the clever detailing of the original, such as its frieze of stainless steel automobiles.

Defining an opposite pole in Jahn's work—a technocentric rhetoric is his architectural emphasis— are his Deeve Harvester office (in progress in Moline, Illinois) and his Greyhound Terminal project, both "Crystal Palaces" of exposed steel and glass. Presented in highly detailed monochromatic section perspectives, they are relatively controlled in image and form. A color drawing of his entry in the Hunskar skyscraper competition (1962) for Louisville, Kentucky, shows Jahn's interest in the Russian Constructivist expression of structure with a spiralling octagonal tower. Finally, the Expo Center project in a virtual 1960s megastructure—like Stirling's residential project (1960), a series of cylindrical towers along a vast central spine. Unlike Stirling's work, however, Jahn's cylinders are chambered diagonally at the top, creating a futuristic and nautical image.

Jahn's exhibition at Yale demonstrates his prolific talent, although he seems not entirely directed or aware of the meanings he creates, and in need of a deeper focus on the cultural implications of his ideas.

Rockefeller Center at Urban Center

Rockefeller Center at Fifty— the first building was occupied in 1932— is "the heart of the city." One of the original fourteen structures was driven in 1939— although no longer dominating New York, remains an exemplar of urban design and planning. An exhibition organized by Rockefeller Center, Inc., hosted by the Municipal Art Society at The Urban Center during October, and now on permanent display at the RCA building, invites reflection on its persuasive qualities through a varied array of information. With photographs and other memorabilia the show illustrates the history of the site, the planning and design of the Art and Commerce Center, as well as Rockefeller Center today as a place of business and pleasure. Also featured are original renderings done between 1931 and 1936 and by Wrenn of several design variations, and an incredibly detailed seven-foot model of the core buildings made in the early thirties—the wood is stained to resemble the texture of the limestone cladding and each window is individually cut and painted. The show also includes a film showing construction footage, with commentary by Walter Kilman, Jr., who worked for Raymond Hood. Like its subject, the display, designed by Hovan and Genov, represents a complex balance between the sum and the parts.

It is unfortunate that the scope of the exhibit does not allow for a more elaborate comparison of the countless schemes for the project by many architects—Reinhard and Hofmeister; Corbett, Harrison and McMurray; Hood and Foxworth—and a presentation of these in the context of the separate visions of the future city that had been developed by Hood and Corbett.

Of course, as is made evident in the display of contemporary comments in the exhibit, perceptions of the Center varied. Gertrude Stein thought it was the most beautiful thing she had ever seen. Le Corbusier, when visiting New York in 1933, thought the buildings were too small. At the same time Lewis Mumford wrote that the Center was "much ado about nothing. It lacks distinction." On the other hand, Louis Sullivan wrote in 1940: "What makes the Center the most exciting mass of buildings in the city is the play of mass against mass, of low structures and high ones... Rockefellar Center has turned into an impressive collection."

A more recent analyst, Rem Koolhaas in Delirious New York (London, 1979), has termed it the "most mature demonstration of Manhatten's unspoken theory of the simultaneous existence of different programs on a single site—an archaeology of architectural philosophies." As he explains the concourse represents the grand plans of the Beaux-Arts, the entertainment facilities constitute a Dreamland, the ten-story base full of NRC studios foreground the electronic future, the roof gardens that form a new ground plane are the reconstructed past, and the tower/garden city above is a vision of the European future. Indeed, Rockefeller Center was, and is, the history of the city, written in stone—city. (MJE)

Stephen Fox

The exhibition "Dreams and Schemes, Visions and Revisions for the Contemporary Art Museum," which opened October 2 in Houston, represents an unusual foray by one of the city's art museums into the domain of architecture, and made in Houston architecture at that. Linda Cathcart, director of the CAM, and Marti Mays, curator, invited twenty Houston architects to submit proposals for the museum's present site on Montrose Boulevard. Eighteen of those invited responded with submissions. Of some, these were funded by a large developer and corporate client (Morris Asbury Architects, SOM Houston, 3D International); some have established reputations for design ability (Howard Barnstone, Charles Tapley Associates); and some are from Houston's new wave of young talent (Architectonica Texas, Lounecker & Papademetrius and Peter D. Waldman, Drexel Turner and Gregory Warwick, and Taft Architects).

The existing building, a stainless-steel-clad parallelogram designed by Gunnar Birkerts and Associates in 1972, was transformed in various ways by the participants. Common to many of the projects was the addition of a superstructure bridging the existing building, an expansion of the superstructure (also parallelogram-shaped), a squaring-out of the building's enclosure to encompass residual triangular lawns in front and back of theCAM, and the provision of a new, or at least more experimentally articulated, entrance. The principal gallery space, which occupies the entire main floor of the Birkerts building, was frequently subdivided into galleries of different sizes and less eccentric configurations.

About one-third of the entries relied upon witty comments rather than detailed architectural development to make a point about the museum, its environs (lately redeveloped with a crop of twenty- to thirty-story condominium towers), and current architectural trends. While several sections proposed revenue-producing towers set astride the Birkerts museum, one moved CAM to a downtown site and another suggested it might occupy an old tenement tower. With this exception, no entries suggested replacement of Birkerts' parallelogram, although most of the schemes projected alterations that would transform its appearance radically through polychrome and other tributes to the examples of Michael Graves and Rem Koolhaas.

One senses in the elaborate articulation of passage, the sensuous use of light, water, and planting, and the fascination with such elements as roof gardens and symbolic narratives, a desire for architectural experiences more intense than those that result from what another gallery director, Esther de Veaux has noted has Houston's most persistent architectural vice—facademy.
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The Wood Chair in America. Produced, designed, and edited by Donovan and Green; written with C. Ray Smith and Marian Page. Published by Estelle D. Brickel and Stephen D. Brickel, New York. 120 pages, 160 illustrations, 35 black-and-white photographs. $19.95, soft cover


Frank Lloyd Wright — Selected Drawings. Portfolio, Volume A. Edited by Yukio Futagawa and the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation. Introduction by Olga Winternitz. ADA Editory, Tokyo, 50 color plates. 400-copy limited edition, $500


Heavenly Ceilings: Reflections on the Garden Grotto. Naomi Miller, George Braziller, New York. 144 pages, 118 black-and-white illustrations. $22.50, hard cover; $10.95, soft cover


An Illustrated History of Interior Decoration: From Pompeii to Art Nouveau. Mario Prats. Thames and Hudson, New York. 401 illustrations, 65 in color. $75.00
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The representation of architecture in photographs and the written word elicit the following critiques.

**Killing Time.** Photographs by Joe Steinmetz. Text and editing by Barbara P. Norfleet. David R. Godine, Boston, 1982. 64 pages, 57 black-and-white photographs. $9.95, soft cover

**Photography and Architecture.** 1839-1939. Essay by Richard Pare. Introduction by Phyllis Lambert. Published by the Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal, in association with Callaway Editions, New York, 1982. 284 pages. 140 full-page tritone photographs, four 3-page foldouts. $55.00

---

**The Image Congealed**

Abigail Solomon-Godeau

The photographs that comprise Photography and Architecture are, like the Steinmetz sampler, a small selection of a much larger whole. 148 photographs from a collection of 25,000 images belonging to the Canadian Centre for Architecture are reproduced with the stated intent of representing the history of architecture through photography and the history of photography through杀

Killing Time is virtually inconceivable without the precedents established by institutions such as the photography department of the Museum of Modern Art, which under the directorship of John Szarkowski legitimized the "vernacular" photograph, and by the photographic practice exemplified by snapshot authors such as Garry Winogrand. Photography and Architecture represents the intersection of a recently heightened popular interest in architecture with a thoroughly aestheticized approach to photographic production in general. Thus, as the cover photograph of Killing Time has been artfully tilted at an angle to emphasize its Winograndian effect, so too has Walker Evans' FSA photograph of the sleeky desolation of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, received a false patina of age and aura by virtue of the tripplewise printing that makes all the photographs in Photography and Architecture appear equally old and pricey. In both cases, editing, design, packaging, and presentation function to enforce an aesthetic reading that dominates all other considerations.

Barbara Norfleet, Curator of Photography at Harvard's Carpenter Center for the Visual Arts and discoverer of Joe Steinmetz (see her 1979 book The Champion Pig), makes no direct claims for the "art" of Steinmetz. On the contrary, in her introduction she stresses the merit of such work as a valuable form of social documentary. In his photographs of Main Line/Bar Harbor/Princeton, Steinmetz, subtly disparaging themselves at coming out parties, teas, and rumble seats, and in his later work done in the playground of southern coastal Florida, Steinmetz has indeed created a visual archive of historical and social value. But the same claim could be made for any studio photographer, not to mention the contents of any family album. And no less as Norfleet, who also mounted a show of his work, edited from 140,000 of Steinmetz' negatives in order to call a comparative handful (37 in the book, 100 in the exhibition), obviously the editing process has shaped and determined our view of Steinmetz. While some of the pictures reveal a certain amount of irony towards their subject, others, such as the haunting group of women depicted at a Tupperware party in Sarasota, are largely indispensable from contemporary advertising images that appeared in picture magazines.

With all due respect to Norfleet's contention that the pictures demonstrate "Steinmetz' uncanny ability to portray the remoteness from ordinary life and the self confidence of the upper class" qualities certainly falling within the purview of social documentary, the impulse for such a project derives more from the theories of John Szarkowski than from those of Thorstein Veblen.

The representation of architecture in photographs and the written word elicit the following critiques.

**Photograph of Roman Forum and Church of St. Lucas e Martinae; August-Rosalie Blumental (c. 1864). Photograph Collection of the Centre Canadian d'Architecture.**

---

Pennsylvania (1957); Joe Steinmetz

Bev Tree, Florida (1971); Joe Steinmetz

Two recent photographic book offerings, one as casual and modest as the other is elaborate and grandiose, clearly indicate the ways in which our apprehension of photography has been determined by the terms of photographic discourse over the past fifteen years. Killing Time, a rigorously edited selection of photographs taken by a Florida-based studio photographer named Joe Steinmetz, and Photography and Architecture 1839-1939, a deluxe compendium of the finest fruits of an eight-year-old museum photography collection, are testimonials to how the work of the past is repositioned to accord with the sensibilities of the present.
The Canadians Unmounted

Trevor Boddy

Ob Canada, Great White North strong and free, we stand on guard, we stand on guard waiting for an architecture to come from these. Building With Words, a recent book on Canadian architecture, offers mumbled manifestos from the best practitioners active on the Sleeping Giant, new protestations of independence from little-brother architects across the 49th parallel. Or perhaps that should be little-sister architects, as Canadian novelist and critic Margaret Atwood likens the cultural condition of being Canadian to that of women in a male-dominated society, prompting bewilded men to ask us what is it that these newly awoken minorities really want.

Judging by the tenor of the statements gathered by Ruth Cawker and William Bernstein in Building With Words, what Canadian architects want is 1962 again: 1967, when Canada celebrated a century as a nation with Expo in Montreal; 1967, when the economy was booming and building; and most of all, 1967, when shingles were never cast on the burning power of modern architecture. This retro-regard prompts Toronto’s John Parkin to opine “Post-modernism — or as I prefer to call it, Neoconservatism — is not going anywhere, . . . the battle for contemporary architecture has yet to be won,” or Vancouver’s Arthur Erickson to suggest that historicism is “like dress fashions [which] fill the narcissism and ennui of the moment, the desire for something different.” More lucid than most of the architects, Erickson at least admits “that we’ve always tried to work through complexity to simplicity,” and that “I like the contrast of the weight and substance of concrete against the slickness, the sheen of glass.” Americans on both counts will soon be able to sample the weighty slickness of Erickson’s architecture in Vancouver’s Cawker and Bernstein’s recent Neoconservatism, as manifested in the visionary designs of two other leading practitioners who have organized them alphabetically. In Philadelphia, the critic of architectural culture. The authors both reject the regional that characterizes much of contemporary Canadian architecture, paired with overwrought regard for international currents, and it is derailed by the regional that characterizes much of contemporary Canadian architecture, paired with overwrought regard for international currents, and the varying literary quality of these quotations. In organizing the twenty-one architects’ statements, the authors both reject the regional approach basic to Canadian thinking and choose against grouping by theoretical position (the Contextualists versus the Expressionists versus the Mainstream Modernists).

Instead, Cawker and Bernstein have organized them alphabetically. In doing so, are they aspiring to neo-critical objectivity? Do they hanker after structuralist chic? Or is the meta-message of this book that there are no correspondences between these architects — “heck, here’s a bunch of guys who make buildings and just happen to have the same passport.”

Having edited the musings of architects myself, I know the difficulty of making sense of the prose of prominent architects who possess the verbal style and eloquence of Fred Flintstone. Worse are those who employ that great declaiming of structural thought, the aphorism and epigram. Etcetera, it would seem, is out to coin the new “less is more.” “Those profundities come from Building With Words: “In architecture, where society is encompassed both by space and time, the transformation is continuous” — Etienne Gaboury; “The meaning of architecture can only be found in the totality of life” — Elbert Hubbard. Nevertheless, the architects have done a superb editing job. The photographs chosen to illustrate each architect’s work are uniformly excellent, benefiting from button-down layout and seamless printing.

Word is out that Cawker and Bernstein have embarked on the more risky and important business of a critical work on contemporary Canadian architecture, a work that may make Building With Words invaluable as an annotated appendix.
In Retrospect

Kenneth Frampton

The following review is based on a speech presented at a symposium on "The Sketchbooks of Le Corbusier" held on November 3 at the National Academy of Design. At the symposium Stanford Anderson of MIT also spoke, tracing the influences of Pierre Berthas on Le Corbusier. Anderson discussed how the pure forms, hierarchic grids and regulating lines, systems of measures and proportion, and the unfolding and enfolding of architectual space found in this work were to emerge in the designs of Le Corbusier, who worked for Berthas in 1910.

Anderson also emphasized the influence of the Mediterraneans on both Berthas' and Le Corbusier's architecture, a point also made by Driant who reminds us that, while Corbusier's works are indubitably the influence of Berthas and Le Corbusier's work is not, the effect of the Mediterraneans on the two was greater than sometimes recognized.

The sketches and even more than the books, Le Corbusier's sketchbooks, were seen in the discussion in a fresh light and in a new context, particularly in light of the recent publication of the first volume, "Le Corbusier Sketchbooks, 1905-44." The sketchbooks, which were published by the Architectural History Foundation, had an immediate impact. They are a comprehensive collection of the works of a beloved and influential architect.

The first volume, "Le Corbusier Sketchbooks, 1905-44," is a comprehensive collection of the works of a beloved and influential architect. It contains over 500 pages of drawings and sketches, each carefully reproduced and accompanied by detailed notes and commentary. The book is divided into five parts, each covering a different period in Corbusier's career. The first part, "The Early Years," covers the period from 1905 to 1924, and includes sketches from his time in France and the United States. The second part, "The Modernist Years," covers the period from 1925 to 1930, and includes sketches from his time in Paris and Hollywood. The third part, "The International Years," covers the period from 1931 to 1944, and includes sketches from his time in New York and Brazil. The fourth part, "The Late Works," covers the period from 1945 to 1955, and includes sketches from his time in India and the Middle East. The fifth part, "The Final Years," covers the period from 1956 to 1966, and includes sketches from his time in India and the Middle East.

The sketchbooks are an invaluable resource for students and scholars of architecture, as well as for enthusiasts of the arts. They provide a window into the mind of one of the most influential architects of the 20th century, and offer a glimpse into the creative process that led to some of the most iconic buildings of our time. The sketches and notes in the sketchbooks are a testament to Corbusier's ingenuity and vision, and they continue to inspire architects and artists around the world.
The IAUS at 15

Margot Jacq and Kenneth Frampton

The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies was founded in 1967 in conjunction with the Museum of Modern Art and Cornell University. Its founding followed an exhibition of urban design proposals held at the Museum of Modern Art and titled "The New City: Architectural and Urban Renewal." It featured the work of a group of young architects and planners seeking creative alternatives to traditional forms of education and practice. A number of groups emerged out of the exhibition, one of which became the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, under the direction of Peter Eisenman.

From the outset it was intended that the Institute remain entirely independent of any existing school or university so that it could develop a unique form of educational structure in which students and teachers would work together in an effort to achieve a synthesis between the theoretical world of the university and the real problems confronting urban centers throughout the country. The Institute was thus initially structured as an "atelier," with teachers and students working on a number of projects that were successively commissioned by a number of government agencies, including HUD, UDC, and NMII.

In the first year many of the Institute students came from the Cornell University Urban Design Program headed by Colin Rowe. The Institute's first practical assignment—a design study of Kingsbridge Heights in the Jerome Avenue section of the Bronx—came from the New York City Planning Commission.

The intent to develop a theory of urban form—one that would be capable of influencing the actual planning process—culminated in 1973 with the design and exhibition of two "Low-Rise High-Density" housing prototypes and projects, one of which was for the construction of 650 dwelling units in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn. The realization of this scheme was nationally acknowledged as an important contribution to the investigation of such low-rise models.

The student-faculty dialogue established through these projects and the development of a new attitude towards architectural education was to be the basis for what has since become a number of different educational currents currently in progress at the Institute. These programs have been devised to serve a broad spectrum of students in an effort to fill a wide range of study between pre-architectural training and a consideration of architecture as a humanitarian discipline. In 1974 the Undergraduate Program was formed for college students, and in 1976 the Design and Study Options program, now known as the Advanced Design Workshop, was formally established for students enrolled in six-year professional programs elsewhere. Around the same time, the Internship Program was also started as a course of study for students of varying backgrounds who wish to enter the realm of architecture. Last but not least, mention should be made of the High School Program, which has been held regionally in the Hudson Valley during the annual summer course since 1975.

To further engage the public-at-large in the discussion of architecture, the Institute also established an Evening Program of lectures in 1974 as a natural extension of the "in-house" lectures that had been taking place since its foundation. At the same time, beginning with a Russian Constructivist exhibition in 1971, a series of exhibitions was organized to illustrate various aspects of the current state of architectural design and research. Since that time the Institute has mounted some 32 exhibitions, including seminal shows such as "Urb as Model," the Japanese and Austrian "New Wave," and the work of individual architects among them Peter Zumthor, Rossi, the Krier, Leondig, Ungers, and Heyduck. The evening lecture program became consolidated in 1977 under the title of Open Plan and, with strong input from the National Endowment for the Humanities, was developed into an integrated three-year, inter-disciplinary public education program.

To further disseminate its concerns among those outside the organization, the Institute has also undertaken a number of publications: Oppositions, an internationally respected journal of architectural theory, history, and criticism; October, a quarterly of theory and criticism on the arts within their social and political context; Skyline, a monthly review of news, books, events, and discussion in architecture; Exhibition Catalogues, which provide documentation and elaboration on work presented by the Institute; and the new series of Oppositions Books, which provide a critical coverage of theory and criticism of modern architecture.

In June of 1982, Peter Eisenman resigned as director of the Institute and will now serve as Vice Chairman of the Board. His successor is L. Saxe as President and Kenneth Frampton as Director of Programs, the Institute continuing forward to strengthening both its civic role and its reputation as a center for advanced research and a forum for architectural research. The development of public programs embracing a variety of disciplines. A renewed emphasis was placed on public and community programs in the field of urban studies in both Institute publications and educational programs. It will remain an organization whose influence is felt not only throughout the world of architecture but also in the lay community, supporting a unique variety of activities.

Notes from the Sidelines

As a member of the "trade" architectural press for the past fourteen of the fifteen years the Institute has been in business, I have been able to observe in an interested but reasonably detached manner the various transformations and developments occurring within the organization. But more importantly, during that time I have witnessed the impact of the Institute on the architectural community of professionals, journalists, academics, as well as lay people. For a small independent educational-, research-, and publications-oriented organization, the Institute's influence has been enormous: It has coalesced and consolidated a critical discourse in architecture. It gave substance to intellectual explorations occurring at the time, and directly or indirectly influenced actual design productions by one or more major architectural firms of the period.

When the IAUS was founded in 1967, its planning and urban design activities were most evident to outsiders. In the 1960s Jane Jacobs' pragmatic and empirically-based conclusions about street life, and the need for designing within existing urban patterns—for acknowledging the presence of the pedestrian and the importance of the public spaces between buildings—was being much touted. The Institute was soon submitting such values to intensive and systematic investigation, greatly influenced by the historically-based analyses of Colin Rowe and his contextualistically-oriented theories.

Planning projects undertaken by the Institute in its early years included research on various sections of the city for the City Planning Commission and an analysis of new town alternatives (the "New Urban Settlements" project) in 1970 with Emiliano Ambas and Peter Eisenman, co-directors, and Kenneth Frampton and Susana Torre, director and coordinator of the analytic phases. Probably the best known example of the Institute's planning and architectural research, however, was the "Low-Rise High-Density" housing prototypes Frampton and the IAUS developed with the Urban Development Corporation in 1973. The prototype, built in Brooklyn in 1979, recognized the value of low-rise living for low-income family dwellings. Incorporating "house-like" features missing in large-scale projects, such as double exposures, private gardens, and individual entrances to the units. The "case-study" street block for Binghamton published in Open Sttves (edited by Stanford Anderson for the IAUS and published in 1972 by Peter Eisenman, "The Low-Rise High-Density" housing addressed the problems of the pedestrian-oriented place where architectural elements of housing and urban design elements of the street would intersect to foster social interaction. While these and other Institute studies, reflecting the concerns of the day, advanced certain positions, at a given point in time, others were less conclusive. As far as the ultimate impact of the investigations at this point.

One can see, however, the effect of the Institute's other more publicly-directed activities. Through its symposia, exhibits, lectures, and publications, the Institute managed to foster a critical debate in the 1970s when there was virtually none. In its forums and "Open Plan" lectures, with its introduction of Oppositions and other publications, the IAUS was to spur renewed interest in architectural theory, history, and criticism. Many observers have complained that the language of the debate was sometimes hard to decipher, but nevertheless theoretical ideas of great importance and value were being heard or read by those of us in the "normal" architectural world. Soon ideas and arguments, such as Peter Zeidler's and Diana Agrest on meaning in architecture, or by Anthony Vidler and Didier OTB on the "built in thought," by Kenneth Frampton on social and political determination of architecture, were being brought about. Journalists and academics outside the Institute began organizing their own lectures, exhibits, and conferences. The mid-1970s appearance of the "L.A. Silvers" or the "Chicago Seven" and the recent revival of the Chicago Architectural Club are only some of the well-known manifestations of such debates emerging, and eventually communicating with the public. Even architects designing large-scale work were influenced by such discussions, if not by some of the buildings being produced within the Institute's walls. The fact that the Agrest/ Gandolinsons tower form of 1981, based on the research and investigation of the formal, symbolic and urbanistic analysis of 1920s skyscrapers, can now be spotted in designs coming out of the larger offices underscores the implications of that influence.

Besides generating debate on the domestic front, the Institute has also brought the news of other architectural developments to the world: in India, Spain, Japan, and elsewhere to the architectural community in New York. Its exhibits have antedated the publication of this work in the major professional press for several years: Architects such as Arata Isozaki and Aldo Rossi were showing their work at the Institute long before it began to appear in four-color spreads in the U.S. And now with these successes behind it, the Institute faces a new stage of development. At fifteen it has reached maturity, but hardly its full growth. It is important that the Institute maintain its past diversity of activity and the strength of its intellectual leadership, while influencing even a larger sector of the public. The path widens. ... 85

5th Anniversary party and exhibirt

The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies is located at 100 Yearning, 1000, New York, and is open to the public Tuesday through Sunday, 11 AM to 6 PM. Its exhibits, lectures, and publications have been acknowledged as an important contribution to the discussion of architecture and the urban environment.
Exhibitions

Chicago
Finnish Design
Through Jan 9 "Finland: Nature, Architecture and Design" Nathan S. Chanin School of Science and Industry, 57th Street and Lake Shore Drive; (312) 694-1414

A Century of Architectural Drawings
Through April 10 Chicago architects' drawings from the collection of the Art Institute, curated by Pauline Saliga. The Art Institute of Chicago, Michigan Avenue at Adams Street; (312) 443-3625

Fort Worth
Joseph Hoffmann
Through Jan 9 "Design Classics." Architectural renderings and drawings, furniture, decorative arts. Fort Worth Art Museum, 1309 Montgomery Street; (815) 738-9215

La Jolla
The California Condition
Through Jan 2 Exhibition by 12 contemporary California architects, curated by Stanley Tigerman and Susan Grant Lewin. La Jolla Museum of Contemporary Art, 700 Prospect Street; (714) 454-3541

Mies Van Der Rohe
Through Jan 2 Mies Barcelona Pavilion and furniture designs. Sponsored by Knoll, the exhibition includes a scale model of the Pavilion. La Jolla Museum of Contemporary Art, 700 Prospect Street; (714) 454-3541

Los Angeles
U.C.L.A. Exhibits

Arata Isozaki
Through Jan 12 Isozaki's proposals for the Museum of Contemporary Art. The Schindler House, 835 N. Kings Road, Los Angeles; (213) 601-1310

New York
Design Austria
Through Dec 10 Exhibition of architecture, art, decorative arts and crafts, industrial and graphic design. organized by various Austrian institutions. Main entrance, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 5th Avenue and 82nd Street; for details (212) 535-5165

Hassan Fathy
Through Dec 17 A selection of the architect's work. 100 Level, Avery Hall, Columbia University; (212) 854-3141

Precursors of Post-Modernism
Through Dec 18 Exhibit of Milanese architecture of the 1920s and 1930s, curated by Fulvioiana and sponsored by Alessi. The Architectural League, 457 Madison Avenue; (212) 753-1722

Scandinavian Modern 1880-1980
Through Jan 2 Retrospective of Scandinavian design. Cooper-Hewitt Museum, 2 East 91st Street; (212) 890-6960

Art Deco Buildings
Through Jan 8 Photographs by Randy Jaster of Art Deco buildings throughout the country. Zim-Lerner Gallery, 123 University Place; (212) 596-4440

American Picture Palaces
Through Feb 27 Arts and artifacts from movie palaces of the 1920s and 1930s, curated by David Naylor. Cooper-Hewitt Museum, 2 East 91st Street; (212) 890-6960

Frank Lloyd Wright
Dec 1-Mar 1 Sixty objects from the Metropolitan's collection of the architect's drawings, furniture, photos, engravings, ceramics, and graphics. Dee 3 Opening of the permanent exhibition of Wright's living room from the Francis Little House. The American Wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fifth Avenue at 82nd Street; (212) 879-5500

Irwin S. Chanin
Dec 8-Jan 28 Photos and historical documents illustrating the work of this architect/engineer. The Houghton Gallery, Cooper Union, Third Avenue and 7th Street; (212) 254-6300

Philadelphia
Quaint and Secret Places
Through Dec 31 Photographs of Philadelphia, 1892-1962, AIA Gallery, 117 South 17th Street; (215) 569-3186

San Francisco
Museum of Modern Art Exhibitions
Through Jan 2 Slides, models, and photos celebrating the centennial of the San Francisco AIA. Through Jan 16 "Italian Re-Evolution, Design of the Eighties," an exhibition curated by Piero Sartogo. San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, Van Ness Avenue at McClure Street; (415) 863-8800

Stamford
Furniture by American Architects
Through Jan 26 Designs by Richardson, Furness, Wright, Saarinen and Weir. Whitney Museum of American Art, Fairfield House, Main Street, Atlantic Street and Tressler Blvd.; (203) 358-7652

Washington, D.C.
American Architecture Exhibits
Through Dec 30 Documentation and photographs of 50 city halls spanning two centuries. Also a survey commemorating the 50th anniversary of the historic American building. AIA Building, 1735 New York Avenue, NW; (202) 626-7464

Through Jan 3 "Buildings on Pape: Rhode Island Architectural Drawings 1623-1945." AIA Foundation, The Octagon, 1799 New York Avenue, NW; (202) 636-3185

Rob Krier
Dec 9-Dec 31 Drawings and material from Urban Projects 1968-82. The Foundry, 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW; (202) 337-7300

London, England
RIBA Student Exhibition
Dec 1-15 1982 student prize winners. Royal Institute of British Architects, 66 Portland Place, London; (01) 589-5533

Rome, Italy
Architectural Photography

Toronto, Canada
Bernard Tschumi
Through Dec 31 Drawings. Ballenford Books, 98 Scollard Street; (416) 960-0655

Events

Boston/Cambridge
Eames Memorial Lecture
Dec 8 Emilie Ambrose, "Works." 6:00pm. Harvard Graduate School of Design, Piper Auditorium, Good Hall, 46 Quincy Street, Cambridge; (617) 495-4122

Charlottesville
University of Virginia Lecture
Dec 6 Joseph Connors, "Romanticism and Roman Urbanism." 8:00pm. University of Virginia School of Architecture, Room 153, Campbell Hall; (904) 924-2715

La Jolla
California Connections
Through Dec 12 Lectures by Frank Israel, Michael Ross, Anthony Lumsden, Moore Bubl and Yudell, Eric Moss, Morphosis, Frank Gehry, Robert Wellington Quigley, Ted Smith, Tom Sgardona, William Turnbull, Dan Solomon/Barbara Stauffer, Thomas Gordon Smith. La Jolla Museum of Contemporary Art, 700 Prospect Street; (714) 454-3541

The California Condition
Dec 1 Panel discussion moderated by Stanley Tigerman and Susan Grant Lewin, co-curators of exhibition, "The California Condition." Present will be the thirteen architects whose work is exhibited: S, sensors and students 7:30pm. Dec 2 Lectures on the exhibition by Stanley Tigerman and Susan Grant Lewin. 7:30pm. Dec 9 Robert A.M. Stern, Lecture on the relationship of contemporary architecture to work being done in California. 8:00pm. La Jolla Museum of Contemporary Art, 700 Prospect Street; (714) 454-3541

The Fountainhead
Dec 17 Showing of the 1949 film from Ayn Rand's novel. 8:30pm. La Jolla Museum of Contemporary Art, 700 Prospect Street; (714) 454-3541

Holmat Jahn
Dec 6 Lecture, "The Excitement is Architecture." 8:00pm. The College of Architecture and Planning Auditorium, Ball State University; (317) 285-4401

Miami
Palladio
Dec 3 Lecture by Carol Constant. 7:00pm. The Architectural Club of Miami, 3302 Southwest 27th Avenue; (305) 356-8001

New York
Metropolitan Museum of Art Lectures

Columbia University Lecture
Dec 1 Raimund Abraham, "Works." 6:00pm. Wood Auditorium, Avery Hall, Columbia University; (212) 308-3473

Forums on Form
Authors speak on their recent books. Dec 1 Calvin Coopr, The Politics of Park Design: A History of Urban Parks in America Dec 8 Robert A.M. Stert, East Hampton's Heritage: An Illustrated Architectural Record. 12:30pm. The Urban Center, 537 Madison Avenue; (212) 933-3395

Tekne Lectures, "Form in Furniture"
Dec 2 Forrest Myers, "Environmental" Dec 9 Howard Meister, "Meaning in Design." 8:50. 6:30pm. The Open Atelier of Design, 12 West 29th Street; for reservations, (212) 686-8696
Competition: Judith Selkowitz Fine Arts Third Annual Competition. $2,000 cash award to an American artist not affiliated with a commercial New York gallery for winning work of art in any medium that is priced at $1,000 or less. New entrants are encouraged to travel to cities within the U.S. Winner will be selected by an advisory board of six, consisting of members from the art architecture, and business communities, including Paul Goldberg and Michael Green. Deadline for submission is March 5, 1983. For details, contact Judith Selkowitz Fine Arts Award, P.O. Box 5266, New York, New York 10115.

Pratt Lecture
Dec 2 John Burge, "Exorcism or Confession: The State of the Arts." 6:00pm. Higgins Hall, S. James Place and Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn; (212) 636-3404

Art Deco Society
Dec 2 Richard Gay Wilson, "Machine Age America 1920-1941." 6:00pm. For location and details, (212) 669-5194

Conference on Art and Architecture
Dec 3-4 "Site: Place, Location and Meaning." Sponsored by the Minneapolis College of Art and Design and The Center for Art and the Environment at the University of Minnesota in cooperation with the Cooper Union. Speakers are Edward Levine, Michael Pittas, Raimund Abraham, Peter Eisenman, Dolores Hayden, Daniel Libeskind, Kurt Fortner, Rosemarie Haag Bliemer, Rosalind Krauss, $35, students $15. 9:30-5:00pm. The Great Hall, Cooper Union, 7 East 7th Street; for details, (212) 842-9056

Picture Palace Lecture
Dec 7 David Naylor, curator of the exhibition "American Picture Palace," 6:15pm. The Cooper-Hewitt Museum, 2 East 91st Street; (212) 999-6968

O'Neal Ford Lecture
Dec 8 Peter Papiademetrou, "O'Neal Ford and his Search for an Indigenous Architecture." Introduction by Bo Lacey; videotape of Ford. Members free, non-members $5. 6:30pm. The Architectural League, 457 Madison Avenue; (212) 753-1722

Royal Oak Foundation Lecture
Dec 9 Barbara Kriston, "Balz: 18th Century Center of Wit and Society." 8:30-9:00pm. The Mayer House, 41 East 72nd Street; for reservations, (212) 961-0329

Philadelphia
AIA Events
Dec 1 Tour by Leonard Davidson, "A Neon Adventure," highlighting the architectural use of neon signage in Philadelphia. 8:15am, 12pm, 1:00pm. Members $5, non-members $10. 1:00pm. Meet at City Hall courtyard. Dec 7 Tour by Jack Peterman, "What the Contractor Expects from the Architect," 5:30pm. Meet at Ballinger Company, 211 South Broad Street. Dec 11 Lecture and tour by Marshall D. Meyers, "Modern Architecture: Kahn's Richards Medical Research Building." Members $10, non-members $12. 1:00pm. AIA Gallery, 117 South 17th Street. Dec 15 Brown Bag Seminar, "Architects in Conversation" with Tony Giscler. 12:00 noon. AIA Gallery, 117 South 17th Street; for details, (212) 563-5186

London, England
RIBA Events
Dec 2 Conference on "Delays and Variations in the Construction Industry." Dec 2 Annual Discourse by Kenneth Frampton, 6:15pm. Dec 14 Christmas Cake Decorating Competition and RIBA Journal Tea Party. 4:30pm. Royal Institute of British Architects, 66 Portland Place; for details, (01) 590-5333

Judith Selkowitz Fine Arts Third Annual Competition. $2,000 cash award to an American artist not affiliated with a commercial New York gallery for winning work of art in any medium that is priced at $1,000 or less. New entrants are encouraged to travel to cities within the U.S. Winner will be selected by an advisory board of six, consisting of members from the art architecture, and business communities, including Paul Goldberg and Michael Green. Deadline for submission is March 5, 1983. For details, contact Judith Selkowitz Fine Arts Award, P.O. Box 5266, New York, New York 10115.

Designers the world over are currently in the creative throes of an international competition sponsored by the French Government for new office furniture—work surfaces, filing, storage, and seating units. The deadline for drawings and preliminary specifications is the end of December.

Unlike many competitions in which winners may receive prize money and limited renown, this one is dedicated, ultimately, to production and publication. Meeting in January 1983, the jury—which includes Mmes. Bombas, de Rouen, Marx, Bellini, Yorck Kuckuck, Hans Hollein, Kenji Ekuan, and George Nelson—will select about ten winners. These designers will then be matched with manufacturers in France to develop a prototype. In January 1984 four or five winners will be selected on the basis of these prototypes. Jean-Francois Graufrin, Commissioner General of the competition, hopes that the furniture will then be put into production; this, on the basis of $10 million in orders he claims to have already committed, should be one of this from the government. We shall see, but it sounds promising.

Meanwhile, the government is also sponsoring a number of international architectural competitions for sites in Paris. One already underway is that for the Parc de la Villette [Slyne, June 1982], recently announced again for the Tete-Defense and the Opera Bastille.

The Tete-Defense site is at the end of the monumental axis that starts at the Place de la Concorde, proceeds through the Arc de Triomphe, past the Palais des Congres, and off the back edge of the "platform" of La Defense. The goal of the competition is to be one part of an international information network and reference system as well as a new social center where the public will have access to the collected information and media from all over the world. Also included are facilities for two Ministries, other services and shops.

Although the registration deadline is past, the date for submission of projects is March 1983 and the jury—which includes Oriel Bohigas, Kisho Kurokawa, Richard Meier, Antoine Grumbach and Ada Louise Huxtable—will meet in April. The complex is due to open in 1988 and the government hopes it will be an important center of activity during the International Exposition of 1989.

The other competition, still open for registration, is for a new Paris Opera House on the Place de la Bastille. Again the site is an interesting one. The Place de la Bastille is an ill-defined space, the convergence of eleven streets and one canal, at a point where three districts of the city meet—the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, the arts-and-crafts Faubourg Saint Antoine, and the newer area of East Paris. The site for the Opera is essentially wedge-shaped with a short end on the "square" and a long edge on the rue de Lyon, facing the canal.

The present Paris Opera, designed by Charles Garnier and inaugurated in 1875, is not considered out of date and difficult to operate. The plans for the Opera Bastille include moving the Paris company to the new facility, which will feature not only a traditional auditorium, but also a more experimental space. The people developing the proposal for the Opera has devoted a year to compiling the technical information for competitors and outlining a program that also includes a school, a small cinema, a library, and exhibition spaces. The organizers say that competitors will be free, however, to modify the program. The details of the competition and requests for preliminary designs will be available after December 15.

For registration information contact: Mission Bastille, 38 rue de Laboarde, 75008 Paris.—MG

Hot Line

Psychologists and other professionals may sometime try to figure out why a conference on architecture is named "Post." It is to all except its architects/participants. Allegedly the leading designers of the day, their names have not been made public. There has been speculation that the name of the conference relates to its principal organizer, Peter Eisenman, and represents his "third try" to get architects to criticize each other's work. (Eisenman was behind the closed CASE meetings of the early 1960s, and of course the organization of the IAUS in 1965, both of which attempted to perform that critical function.)

It has further been reported that some 25 architects, including Europeans, flew to the University of Virginia for the "Post" conference on November 13-14, and that Rizzoli Communications will bring out a publication of the works under discussion, projects not permitted to have been seen in prior publication. It was also alleged that Skyline would be hosting a "post-mortem" on the conference on November 16, but here we can say that is not the case. We suspect there was tampering with the typography on that announcement (which appeared in the November issue) and we are told that Skyline would be hosting a "post-mortem" on the conference on November 16, but here we can say that is not the case.

We suspect there was tampering with the typography on that announcement (which appeared in the November issue) and we are told that Skyline would be hosting a "post-mortem" on the conference on November 16, but here we can say that is not the case.

Architects Invention:

Tadano Ando
Carlo Aymonino
John Bugbee
Harry Cobb
Peter Eisenman
Frank Gehry
Michel Graftes
Charles Gwathmey
Hans Hollein
Ara Iwasaki
Topo Ito
Philip Johnson
Rem Koolhaas
Lose Krue
Rob Krier
Richard Meier
Raphael Moneo
Lester Pelli
Jasper Robertson
Kevin Roche
Paul Rudolph
Nikos Salingar
Robert A. M. Stern
Hector Turgeman
O. M. Ungers

Corrections
November's account of the work at Gracie Mansion omitted mention of two prominent members of the Conservancy's Working Group: Philip Slowin, landscape architect on the project, and Massimo Vignelli, who is contributing his design services to the effort. Also, the photograph of the Main Hall e. 1890 should have been credited to the Fuch Brothers, courtesy The New-York Historical Society.

The photo of Ca'Brutta that appeared on the title page of the article "Milano 1920-1940" in the November issue was taken after December. Last month's credit for the design of Fort Lauderdale Riverfront Plaza Design was done by a fugitive will-wisher from "P2"—the rightist masonic cabal of architects, engineers, whose name came to light in Italy several years ago.
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Annette Michelson
Christopher Phillips
Linda Nochlin
Perry Miesel
Rosalind Krauss
Benjamin H.D. Buchloh
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The De-Politicization of Courbet
Fredric Jameson's Revisionary
Romances
When Words Fail
Documents 7: A Dictionary of
Received Ideas
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