Charles Sheeler, with the suburban expansion of Philadelphia, which creates a nonplace indistinguishable from any other such development.

The next topic is the uneasy relationship Americans have with their cities, alternating between repulsion and attraction. There are the expected essays by planner Charles Mulford Robinson (1899), but also a less familiar excerpt from DuBois's early study, *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899). An essay by Simone de Beauvoir (1954) considers the experience of immigrants in American cities. The chapter ends with a piece Page wrote for the *New York Times*, October 11, 2001, on the feelings of fear offset with resurgent confidence in New York City immediately following the events of September 11.

Chapter six takes a closer look at the phenomenon of the American suburb, which, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, became the dominant settlement type in the 1980s. More Americans now live in these “in between” places than in either urban or rural areas. Opening with magazine articles on the pioneering ideal suburb, Llewellyn Park, New Jersey (1857, 1871), it includes the perspectives of urban observers Frederick Lewis Allen and William H. Whyte, offers a passage from Betty Freidan's study of post-World War II suburbia (1963), and closes with an essay by James Howard Kunstler (1996), described as “the standard bearer of the New Urbanism movement as represented by Seaside, Florida, or Kentlands, Maryland.”

In the following chapter, the editors examine the shift from an essentialist and theological explanation for human failings to an environmentalist one. Bad buildings produced bad people, and building-design reform would result in improved human beings. Conn and Page assert that “we don’t believe that architecture can solve social problems without serious attention to the other causes of those problems,” but feel that good buildings are certainly part of the solution (6). Americans have demonstrated a particular fervor for creating buildings that would influence people’s morality, either subliminally or, it was hoped, directly. Such was the case of the Eastern State Penitentiary, Philadelphia, devised by its Quaker backers to reform its inmates through solitary confinement, which, it was presumed, would cause them to reflect and repent. The premises of this bold, internationally known experiment were contested by Charles Dickens in the assessment reproduced here, where he described the system of solitary confinement as, “in its effects [of driving inmates insane], cruel and wrong” (311). Other selections deal with Shaker architecture (1851), the model industrial community of Pullman, Illinois (1885), and Carnegie libraries (1905). But even the best intended endeavors sometimes failed, as demonstrated in James Bailey’s post-mortem on Pruitt-Igoe, St. Louis (1965).

Chapter eight covers Americans’ discovery of their own architectural past and the difficulty of preserving that history while promoting progress. This section opens with commentary on ancient Native American architecture (1822), in this instance a stone mound near Newark, Ohio, which the writer, Joseph Sanson, feared would be used as a source of road-building material. The editors do not provide any information as to its fate. Charles Eliot Norton’s topic is the lack of old homes in America (1889) while other texts elaborate on the re-creation of Williamsburg (1940) and loss of Pennsylvania Station (1958).

The purpose of this anthology is to encourage readers to support reform in order to stem the cancerous metastasizing of suburbs facilitated by private citizens, private developers, banks, and all-too-plaint politicians who believe they are simply making a “democratic” response to demand. “Our training as historians leads us to believe that a nuanced and deep understanding of how Americans have understood their pasts [sic] is crucial to building better places in a better future. We believe that the presence of the past in the landscape—not a mummified, Disney-fied past, but a living link to it—is crucial to the health of our society” (6).

While the broad range of the essays is commendable, and the design of the book is lean and efficient, some unfortunate compromises perhaps reflect the economic pressures now facing so many publishers. This is not what could be called a critical anthology, for the introductory comments for each excerpt are terse, and there are no editorial footnotes to elucidate now-obscure references. Among the more unfortunate omissions is that of a list of the illustrations with source information. More serious is the truncated thematic index, covering only nineteen of the topics. Far more troublesome, however—especially as this book is published by an academic press—is the absence of footnotes for the many references and quoted passages in the editorial introductions. One school of historical criticism today calls for the elimination of the footnote, as a “feudal” survival inhibiting creative scholarship. For the serious historian-reader, however, such economies are frustrating in the extreme.

LELAND M. ROTH
University of Oregon

Modernisms

Barry Bergdoll
European Architecture, 1750–1890
*Oxford History of Art*

Alan Colquhoun
*Modern Architecture*
*Oxford History of Art*

Dennis P. Doordan
Twentieth-Century Architecture
In an article published in the *JSAH* on the cusp of the new millennium, Christy Anderson anticipated an “explosion in architecture series and surveys” responding to a growing interest in the history of architecture among students, architects, preservationists, and the general public. The fascination with historic buildings, neighborhoods, and environments has only grown since 2000, if the proliferation of television programs, magazines, and lavishly illustrated books on the topics is a reliable gauge. Numerous titles in the series Anderson discussed have appeared. Yet, as the books under review here demonstrate, while providing valuable choices for anyone teaching the history of architecture, these volumes do not live up to the public’s expectations for a growing interest in the history of architecture-among historians, architects, preservationists, and the general public.

The fascination with historic buildings, neighborhoods, and environments has only grown since 2000, if the proliferation of television programs, magazines, and lavishly illustrated books on the topics is a reliable gauge. Numerous titles in the series Anderson discussed have appeared. Yet, as the books under review here demonstrate, while providing valuable choices for anyone teaching the history of architecture, these volumes do not live up to the public’s expectations for a growing interest in the history of architecture-among historians, architects, preservationists, and the general public.

Covering some of the same material as Lewis’s *The Gothic Revival* and Bergdoll’s *European Architecture, 1750–1890*, a volume in the Oxford History of Art series. As a pedagogical tool, the study is a clear, well-illustrated, affordable, and welcome addition to surveys of nineteenth-century architecture. In the introduction, Bergdoll positions the book as a successor, in some respects, to earlier surveys such as Henry-Russell Hitchcock’s *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, which was part of the Pelican History of Art and issued in its final revised form in 1977, and Robin Middleton and David Watkin’s *Neo-classical and Nineteenth Century Architecture* (New York, 1977). Although the latter volume is, as Bergdoll suggests, a “lively” read, its organization is too convoluted to make it an effective survey, and while Hitchcock’s book is extremely comprehensive and erudite, it is too detailed to succeed as an introductory text. Thus Bergdoll’s publication fills a significant gap in the literature on European architecture during the nineteenth century.

Like Lewis, Bergdoll lays out the material more or less chronologically, but organizes the chapters thematically, allowing the narrative to double back on itself historically to take in various issues that emerged at the same point in time. For example, in part three, “Nationalism, Historicism, Technology,” chapter seven (“New Technology and Architectural Form, 1851–90”), chapter eight (“The City Transformed, 1848–90”), and chapter nine (“The Crisis of Historicism, 1870–93”) all deal primarily with the second half of the nineteenth century. The first two parts of the book—“Progress, Enlightenment, Expres-
imement” and “Revolutions,” respectively—encompass the late eighteenth century through the middle of the following one.

Bergdoll’s introduction establishes the thematic directions of his text: “The fundamental hypothesis might be summarized thus: ushered in by the great period of intellectual questioning, which historians have called the Enlightenment, and fueled by the social, political, and economic upheavals and challenges of a century and a half continually made aware, anxious even, of the changes that separated it from the past, architecture after 1750 became self-consciously experimental as never before” (2). Bergdoll shows how that experimental attitude informed new approaches to historical styles, recently perfected materials like iron, and modern typological developments, among other factors. He demonstrates how European architects who worked for and in government institutions satisfied state imperatives such as the representations of national identity and history in built form.

*European Architecture, 1750–1890* is evidence of its author’s comprehensive knowledge of designers and theoretical debates, as well as of recent literature on the period, much of which is cited in the useful bibliography. In addition to the examples one might expect to find discussed, a few lesser known figures and projects are introduced as well. For instance, the chapter on the nineteenth-century city covers the familiar and indispensable examples of Paris’s reworking by Napoléon III and Prefect of the Seine Baron Haussmann and the rebuilding of the Vienna Ringstrasse, yet it also considers the relatively unexamined replanning of Barcelona that Ildefonso Cerda commenced in the late 1850s. Such additions provoke a rethinking of the selections every teacher must make in presenting European architecture of this period.

Considering new and forthcoming texts, like Bergdoll’s, Anderson wrote that “a series such as the Oxford History of Art has grand ambitions as a new standard in the revisionist survey,” and went on to suggest that the individual titles might be so experimental (if not idiosyncratic) in their approaches as to have limited useful lives: “The best of the new series have a built-in obsolescence that will require scholars continually to revisit the buildings and rethink their interpretations in order to ask what meaning those buildings have for a new audience.” So unassailable is Bergdoll’s research and interpretation, however, that it is hard to imagine that his book will soon be unseated as the outstanding overview of the period.

With respect to anticipated lifespan, *European Architecture, 1750–1890* might be compared with Dell Upton’s contribution to the same series, *Architecture in the United States* (Oxford, 1998). While Bergdoll stays close to the theoretical debates and intellectual contexts of architecture, of which he is a preeminent historian, he stays away from the revisionist approaches that drive Upton’s account. To some extent, the authors’ terrains are incomparable, since nineteenth-century architectural culture in Europe and the United States differed so much in the organization of the profession and the character of its institutions. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that Upton’s concern with the issues raised in vernacular architecture studies—in which he has been a leader—particularly the importance of buildings not designed by professionals, had little impact on Bergdoll’s treatment of the material. For instance, “the rise of the suburbs” in the second half of the nineteenth century and “the domestic realm and the refuge of the psyche” at century’s end are accorded only a few pages each in Bergdoll’s survey. The conceptualization of the home in the nineteenth century as a theater for the staging of gender roles, for the affirmation of the patriarchal family, and for the display of bourgeois individualism are all themes that historians of European culture have explored in detail in recent literature. Yet in Bergdoll’s account such issues remain relatively secondary to public buildings and the discourses that surrounded them.

Alan Colquhoun’s *Modern Architecture, also part of the Oxford History of Art, begins where Bergdoll ends: with the Art Nouveau movement. Colquhoun’s twelve chapters deal variously with architects, movements, time periods, or some combination of the three. Thus Art Nouveau is followed in chapter two by “Organicism versus Classicism: Chicago 1890–1910,” in chapter seven by “Return to Order: Le Corbusier and Modern Architecture in France 1920–35,” and in the final chapter by “Pax Americana: Architecture in America 1945–65.” Like the rest of the series, Colquhoun’s survey is an affordable and visually appealing alternative to other books covering the same period, in this case William Curtis’s *Modern Architecture Since 1900*, which has been widely used as a survey text.*

The differences between these two treatments of twentieth-century architecture are implicit in their titles. Where Curtis deals broadly with building during the period, giving, for example, a good deal of attention to historicist design, Colquhoun’s concern is predominaently with “modern” architecture. He is righty self-conscious about his title, writing at the very outset that “the term ‘modern architecture’ . . . can be understood to refer to all buildings of the modern period regardless of their ideological basis, or it can be understood more specifically as an architecture conscious of its own modernity and striving for change. It is in the latter sense that it has generally been defined in histories of contemporary architecture, and the present book follows this tradition” (9). Despite being rooted in the modern movement, Colquhoun distances himself from some of its prejudices. While unfolding his story chronologically, he maintains that it is “less certain in its outcome and less triumphalist than . . . most previous histories of modernism” (9). Such a disavowal of the teleological modernist “master narrative” is virtually indispensable at a moment when poststructuralism has made survey writers aware of the intellectual and political ramifications of every choice they make regarding how history is narrated.

In part, the distance Colquhoun perceives between his history of the
movement and previous treatments can be attributed to the fact that modernism itself has become historical and thus susceptible to being analyzed like any other architecture of the past. Furthermore, the modernist project has been abandoned, repudiated by some, as a consequence of postmodernism, and its totalizing ambitions can no longer be sustained” (11). Colquhoun’s implication is that writing from outside and beyond the modern movement will yield different conclusions than those made by the first historians, who wrote essentially as advocates for modernist architecture.

Yet, in the end, many of the same figures dominate this account as in its predecessors, particularly the triumvirate of Frank Lloyd Wright, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, and Le Corbusier. In Colquhoun’s story, however, the intellectual climates and historical situations in which these men worked are given relatively greater emphasis than in previous studies. For instance, Colquhoun organizes his Chicago chapter to start with a section titled “Social Reform and the Home” followed by “Frank Lloyd Wright and the Prairie School,” thereby emphasizing the importance of understanding the historical context in which the architect worked rather than the exceptional achievement of an isolated genius. Furthermore, like other authors in the Oxford History of Art series, Colquhoun attempts to engage the most recent, revisionist literature when dealing with canonical architects. Thus he writes, in connection with a discussion of the spatial qualities of Adolf Loos’s houses, that “Beatrix Colomina has wittily noted that in a Loos interior someone always seems about to make an entrance” (82).

If Colquhoun’s account of modernism is not, strictly speaking, as triumphalist as those he intends to revise, it does conform to a familiar narrative arc. Modern Architecture (the book and the movement) begins with Art Nouveau and ends with Louis Kahn, who was critical to the position that the “utopian promise of a new, unified, and universal architecture was becoming increasingly implausible” by the 1960s (254). By ending the story with Kahn, Colquhoun endorses the same modernist history of which he claims to be skeptical: the book concludes when the movement collapsed, at least according to standard accounts, reiterating the mythic narrative of development, fulfillment in “high” modernism, and ultimate disintegration. To thoroughly dispel modernism’s self-mythologizing, while still recognizing its important contributions, the author might have embedded the movement within a longer history filled with a greater variety of alternative directions in which architecture moved during the twentieth century. If the programmatic ambitions of Colquhoun’s text are not entirely realized, he has nonetheless provided a readable and rich history of the modern movement that will be useful to teachers, students, and the general public.

Covering some of the same material is Dennis Doordan’s Twentieth-Century Architecture, published in a slightly larger format than the other books reviewed here and with about twice the number of illustrations. It is also significantly more expensive. Doordan attempts to respond to some of the disciplinary changes that Anderson discussed as having shaped the conception of new surveys (particularly the wariness of canon formation that became widespread by the 1980s) by including third world, roadside, and vernacular architecture alongside high-style examples by modernist designers working in western Europe and North America.

In expanding the scope of the twentieth-century survey, Doordan necessarily has to abbreviate his commentary about individual architects and buildings. For example, whereas Colquhoun provides an entire chapter on Loos, Doordan gives us one short paragraph on Loos’s Goldman & Salatsch Building in Vienna (1911) and a fleeting reference to his essay “Ornament and Crime” (1908). Perhaps similar comparisons could not be made for every subject treated in the two books, but it is the case that Doordan’s comprehensiveness comes at the price of depth. Furthermore, some of the material included to satisfy recent historiographical developments seems only partially integrated into the overall narrative. For instance, chapter one, “The Modern City,” has one subsection on women in architecture. While it is gratifying to see Vivi Lön, Jane Drew, and Julia Morgan included here, might they have been integrated into other thematic discussions rather than being ghettoized on the basis of gender?

The perplexing organization of the book is one of its principal drawbacks. Its three parts essentially retrace modernist development, from “Confronting Modernity, 1900–1940,” to “Modernist Hegemony, 1940–1965,” to “An Era of Pluralism, 1965–2000.” Within each section are chapters and subheadings whose titles appear in boldface type in the book’s table of contents; within the subheadings are more specific topic headings set in regular type. The chapter titles are broadly thematic: “The Modern City,” “The House,” and so on. The subheadings, however, range in theme from historical developments like the emergence of the modern movement to specific buildings, such as Rockefeller Center and the General Motors Futurama, to typologies, including skyscrapers and office buildings. A more consistent treatment of the subheadings would have made the structure of the book more apparent and helped give coherence to its very wide ranging subject matter. This reservation notwithstanding, it is gratifying to find the classicizing architecture of Charles Platt on the page facing Le Corbusier’s nearly contemporary Domino House, and to see two and a half pages devoted to automobile service stations.

Among the most important differences between Colquhoun’s and Doordan’s surveys is their chronological scope. Fully three chapters take Doordan’s account from the endpoint of Colquhoun’s volume, the mid-1960s, through the end of the millennium, surveying the diversity of architectural production worldwide in the postwar period.
under such rubrics as postmodernism, deconstructivism, traditionalism, new urbanism, and green architecture.

Perhaps Doordan's survey of twentieth-century architecture is the clearest example, among the books reviewed here, of the consequences of poststructuralist doubt for the authors of survey and series volumes. No historian today could seriously claim comprehensiveness for his or her overview of a movement or period, nor could he or she legitimately argue for making an "objective" presentation of the subject. Instead, writers are burdened with an obligation here, of the consequences of poststructuralist doubt for the authors of survey methods. Only the reader of such publications will be able to assess whether narratives built on these shifting foundations will satisfy their needs for histories that somehow weave together varieties of architects, buildings, cities, and nations.

KEVIN D. MURPHY
Graduate Center,
City University of New York,
and Brooklyn College
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Harvey H. Kaiser
An Architectural Guidebook to the National Parks: Arizona, New Mexico, Texas
Layton, Utah: Gibbs Smith, 2003, 240 pp., 118 b/w illus. $16.95 (paper), ISBN 1-56868-068-7

A series of guidebooks on the architecture of the national parks offers an opportunity to explore a wide range of architecture that is little known. The national parks include buildings that are significant either because of their design or through association with significant people or events; buildings that served the tourist industry, luring people to places of great natural beauty; and buildings constructed by the National Park Service (NPS), both for its own use and for visitors. Sorting through these motifs and their products provides ample justification for a guidebook.

Harvey H. Kaiser's first two volumes of a projected series covering the United States are thus important attempts at highlighting architecture that is usually overlooked in favor of historical associations or natural wonders. His books provide numerous views of American architecture, some of which are enticing enough to get the reader out of her armchair. An architectural guidebook has, ideally, three functions: to tell the reader if she wants to go to the site under discussion, to tell her what to look at when she is there, and to help her make sense of what she sees. Kaiser's books are strong on the first, adequate on the second, and very mixed on the third.

As far as alerting the armchair traveler to the possibilities of travel, these studies highlight the range of architecture available for viewing in the national parks. Kaiser is selective in his approach, including sites in only twenty-one of forty possible parks in the western volume, and twenty-one out of forty-eight in the southwestern volume, yet he manages to consider resort lodges, Anasazi ruins, Spanish churches, lighthouses, forts, bridges, homesteaders' cabins, and a full range of NPS operations buildings. Kaiser's greatest enthusiasm is for the rustic architecture of the 1920s and 1930s, and in discussing some of these examples he is at his most thorough, analytical, and poetic. The glaring omission is post-World War II architecture, in particular the NPS's vast Mission 66, a ten-year effort beginning in 1956 to upgrade park facilities nationwide. Kaiser addresses the modern architecture of Mission 66 in only the most reluctant and negative way, failing to help the reader understand architecture with connections to nature that are more allusive and less literal than his beloved rustic designs.

The two publications under review here only partly succeed in directing the reader to buildings she should see once she has arrived at her destination. There are no site plans in the western volume, which forces the reader to orient herself. The site plans that are included in the southwestern volume, such as the South Rim of the Grand Canyon, are extremely valuable. The books would also have profited from headings that called out the names of buildings, construction dates, and architects—a standard guidebook tool. Instead, the reader is forced to plow through several paragraphs to answer some of these basic questions. Generally, however, Kaiser highlights the most important buildings in a park, and the accompanying photographs—printed large enough to do them justice—help identify the various sites.

Beyond mere description and the history available in the relevant NPS brochure, an architectural guidebook should help us understand what a particular structure is, or was; who built it, for whom; and why it looks the way it does,