

This PDF includes a chapter from the following book:

# **Frank Lloyd Wright versus America**

## **The 1930s**

© 1990 MIT

### **License Terms:**

Made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International Public License

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

### **OA Funding Provided By:**

National Endowment for the Humanities/Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Humanities Open Book Program.

The title-level DOI for this work is:

[doi:10.7551/mitpress/3039.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/3039.001.0001)

---

## Notes

---

### THEME / **Precedents**

#### **1 Olga Milan Lazovich**

1. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 509.
2. Ingraham (1980), p. 10; Twombly (1979), p. 186. It is assumed that Olgivanna would have proofread her own marriage announcement even if she did not correct later books by Wright or herself:

**Married**

**August 25**

**Rancho Santa**

**Fe California**

**Olga Ivanovna**

**Daughter of**

**ivan Lazovich and**

**Militze Milan of**

**Cettinje Montenegro**

**To Frank Lloyd Wright**

**Son of Anna Lloyd-Jones**

**and William Cary Wright**

**Taliesin Wisconsin. 1928**

The closed spacing of “Milanof” caused some historians to believe that her maiden name was Milanof or Milanov. Note that Wright’s mother is named first whereas Olgivanna’s father precedes her mother, the more common form. Hand-lettered announcement, W. R. Heath papers, Library of Congress, as reproduced in Fishman (1977).

3. As quoted in Pfeiffer (1987), plate 1 description.
4. This marriage (and its issue, Svetlana) was ignored by compiler Ingraham (1980), p. 10. There are other problems with the compilation. For an outline of the often-forgotten side of Frank Lloyd Wright’s family—the Wrights—see Johnson (1980), which is being updated.
5. Nott (1961), p. 84.
6. Olgivanna’s life prior to joining Wright in February 1925 is reconstructed from conflicting evidence found in O. L. Wright (1959), pp. 31–36, 274–275; Nott (1961), pp. 32–41, 62, 84–85; Twombly (1979), pp. 186–187 (which is more or less the traditional view of biographers and historians); *Who’s Who in America*, 1980–81; Gurdjieff (1969), pp. 252–253, 284–287; Gill (1987), pp. 290–291, 326–327; Hartmann (1983), pp. xix, 98, 106–130; P. D. Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous* (London, 1950), chapters 1 and 2; *Current Biography 1952*, p. 654;

Barbara Jelavich, *History of the Balkans* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 34–37, 108–121; F. L. Wright (1932a), pp. 274–275; F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 508–514; and Pfeiffer (1985a), pp. viii–ix. There are few publications about only Montenegro but see the illustrated article by Bryan Hodgson, “Montenegro: Yugoslavia’s ‘Black Mountain,’” *National Geographic*, November 1977, pp. 663–682. On Miriam Noel see J. L. Wright (1946), chapter 14.

**7.** F. L. Wright (1943), p. 303; not in the 1932 edition of the autobiography. Biographers differ on the number and names of incorporators.

**8.** Twombly (1979), pp. 189–192; see also Einbinder (1986), pp. 222–248.

**9.** List dated 12 December 1932, sent to A. Kroch, Chicago, copy in FLW Archives.

**10.** FLW to C. Morgan, 12 December 1929, in F. L. Wright (1984), pp. 79–80.

**11.** FLW to Raymond Hood, 2 June 1930, in *ibid.*, pp. 80–81.

## **2 Ocotillo Camp**

**1.** Green (1983), p. 5.

**2.** F. L. Wright (1932a), pp. 302–303.

**3.** Wright spelled it Ocatilla, Ocatillo, and seldom Ocotillo. Since he specifically mentioned that the name was taken from the plant, all spellings herein are Ocotillo.

**4.** F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 303.

**5.** *Ibid.*, p. 305; further described in de Fries (1930), pp. 342–343, with excellent illustrations on pp. 344–347.

**6.** Mentioned to de Fries; noted in *ibid.*, p. 342.

**7.** FLW to R. L. Jones, 10 October 1929, in F. L. Wright (1986b), p. 48; Hanks (1979), p. 223; de Fries (1930), p. 342; and Twombly (1979), p. 238. Hitchcock (1940), p. 13, stated that de Fries’s writings on Wright, especially de Fries (1926), could be “largely ignored”; obviously they can not.

**8.** F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 306.

**9.** *Ibid.*, p. 307.

**10.** Green (1983), p. 7.

**11.** F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 308.

**12.** This discussion is based on Johnson (1987b).

**13.** Cf. George M. White, *Living in Montana* (Ronan, Montana, 1982), p. 97.

**14.** Clay Lancaster, *The American Bungalow 1880–1930* (New York, 1985), pp. 181–184.

**15.** Pfeiffer (1985a), plate 71. Previously Wright had done a preliminary design for a “desert dwelling” (1921?) of uncertain construction. See Neil Levine, “FLW’s Own Houses . . .,” in Bolon et al. (1988).

**16.** I discuss this more fully in “Frank Lloyd Wright versus the City: Architectural and City Planning Theory” (manuscript in preparation).

**17.** Cf. Banham (1969), p. 516, who described Ocotillo as one of the great statements of twentieth-century architecture.

**18.** Green (1983), p. 11.

- 19.** Izzo and Gubitosi (1981), items 78–85; and Pfeiffer (1985a), photos 90–120. Strangely, in Hitchcock (1942) Ocotillo was dismissed (p. 78 and plate 277).
- 20.** FLW to R. L. Jones, 10 October 1929, in F. L. Wright (1986b), p. 47, and Green (1983), p. 15.
- 21.** F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 306; see de Fries (1930); and cf. K. Loenberg-Holm, “The Week-end House,” *Architectural Record*, 68 (August 1930), pp. 188–191, and the incomplete views of Ciucci (1978). Wright acknowledged and presumably favored de Fries’s publication (Wright 1932a, p. 306). It was in a letter to a former employee, Werner Moser, that Wright first coined the name “Taliesin in the great Desert” (FLW to Moser, 25 July 1929, in F. L. Wright 1984, p. 75).
- 22.** F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 308.
- 23.** De Fries (1930), p. 344. The last line provided the title for daughter Iovanna Lloyd Wright’s *Man in Possession of His Earth* (New York, 1962; London, 1963), a biography of Wright of sorts with some personal ideas of influences on design.
- 24.** F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 306. There are seven draftsmen in a photograph held by the FLW Archives.
- 25.** Twombly (1979), p. 220.

### **3 Trilogy: Wright, Gutheim, Hitchcock**

- 1.** Dust jacket of the 1957 printing of the second (1943) edition.
- 2.** FLW to F. L. Jones, 16 December 1929, in F. L. Wright (1986b), p. 59.
- 3.** FLW to Cheney, 26 December 1930, FLW Archives.
- 4.** Letter of 21 June 1979 from Dr. J. A. Edwards, Archivist, University of Reading (where the Longmans papers are held) to Mr. David Lea, Longmans Group, in response to a request of the author.
- 5.** FLW to N. Guthrie, 9 February 1931, in F. L. Wright (1986b), p. 290.
- 6.** Edwards to Lea, 21 June 1979.
- 7.** “Copyright Window Displays,” *Publishers Weekly*, no. 1212 (2 April 1932), p. 1563.
- 8.** Duell to FLW, 28 September 1939, FLW Archives.
- 9.** Duell to FLW, 10 November 1939, FLW Archives.
- 10.** FLW to Duell, 27 January 1940, FLW Archives.
- 11.** Gutheim to FLW, 7 March 1940, FLW Archives.
- 12.** FLW to Gutheim, 15 March 1940, FLW Archives.
- 13.** FLW to Duell, 2 April 1940, FLW Archives.
- 14.** Gutheim to FLW, 16 July 1940 and 8 August 1940, FLW Archives.
- 15.** Telegram, FLW to Duell, 11 February 1941, FLW Archives.
- 16.** Letter, FLW to Duell, 11 February 1941, FLW Archives.
- 17.** Kimball (1928), pp. 192 and 200.
- 18.** FLW to Mumford, 30 April 1928, in F. L. Wright (1984).
- 19.** Hitchcock (1928b), p. 341, which precedes Wright’s “In the Cause of Architecture. II. The Meaning of Materials—Stone,” in the same issue.

20. Barr et al. (1932), p. 37.
21. See Holger Cahill and Alfred H. Barr, Jr., *Art in America* (New York, 1934), p. 72.
22. Mumford (1931), p. 167. There were other observers who followed Mumford's lead. For instance Ralph T. Walker perceptively remarked in 1930 that "the European architect took over the American factory and the ideas of Frank Lloyd Wright" (address of Ralph T. Walker, in the AIA pamphlet "A Symposium on Contemporary Architecture" [Washington, D.C., 1931], p. 21).
23. FLW to Hitchcock, 15 September 1937, p. 2, FLW Archives, also in F. L. Wright (1984).
24. FLW to Hitchcock, 15 June 1938, FLW Archives.
25. FLW to Hitchcock, 12 July 1938, in F. L. Wright (1984). In all, seven letters from Wright to Hitchcock, from 1928 to 1958, are published in *Letters to Architects*, pp. 133–140.
26. FLW to Duell, 1 June 1941, FLW Archives.
27. FLW to Hitchcock, 1 April 1941, FLW Archives.
28. Tafel (1979), pp. 144–145.
29. FLW to Duell, 7 June 1941, FLW Archives.
30. FLW to Hitchcock, 13 June 1941, FLW Archives.
31. FLW to Duell, 22 December 1941, FLW Archives.
32. H.-R. Hitchcock, "Frank Lloyd Wright at the Museum of Modern Art," *Art Bulletin*, 23 (March 1941), pp. 72–76. Compare Bruce Blevin, Jr., "Frank Lloyd Wright," *New Republic*, 103 (9 December 1940), pp. 790–791; and Talbot Hamlin, "Frank Lloyd Wright," *Nation*, 51 (30 November 1940), pp. 541–542, where Hamlin attempted an academic put-down and stated that the show contained "strange lacunae," that it lacked coherence and a "progress or subject pattern," and that the "decorative side" seemed "overweighted." A more balanced view if not praiseworthy or wholly correct was in T. Hamlin, "A Pot Pourri for an Architect," *Pencil Points*, 22 (January 1941), pp. 55–56. But then Hamlin was writing for a very different audience. The exhibition was called "Two Great Americans" and the other artist was filmmaker David W. Griffith.
33. *Saturday Review of Literature*, 8 (23 April 1932), pp. 677–678.
34. Information on Faber imprint is in a letter of C. M. Whittaker (Faber and Faber) to the author, 7 September 1981. A third edition of the autobiography was first planned in 1951, at which time Wright edited some text. He thought Duell, Sloan and Pearce were to publish it (see letter, FLW to Bruno Zevi, 19 September 1951, in F. L. Wright 1984, p. 189), and similarly a second edition of *In the Nature of Materials* (see letter, Hitchcock to FLW, 19 September 1952, in *ibid.*
35. FLW to B. Zevi, 19 September 1951, and FLW to Hitchcock, 19 September 1952, in F. L. Wright (1984).

#### 4 Fellowship

1. FLW to P. M. Cochius, 5 December 1928, and P. M. Cochius to FLW, 4 February 1929, in Johan Ambaum, "Outwerpen van Frank Lloyd Wright voor de glasfabriek Leerdam," *Jong Holland*, no. 1 (1987), pp. 45–46.
2. See the letters of FLW to Jens Jensen, 8 December 1929, FLW to Moser, 25 July 1929, and FLW to Lewis Mumford, 7 January 1929, in F. L. Wright (1984), pp. 71–72, 76.

3. FLW to Wijdeveld, 6 August 1930, as outlined in Meehan (1983), pp. 233–234, and information kindly supplied by Dr. Donald Langmead; and cf. R. Neutra to FLW, 6 July 1929, FLW Archives. The “students” were described as Okami from Tokyo and Laubi from Zurich.
4. FLW to Wijdeveld, n.d. [c. October 1930], Wijdeveld Papers.
5. Wijdeveld to FLW, 3 January 1931, FLW Archives.
6. FLW to Wijdeveld, 6 April 1931, Wijdeveld Papers.
7. Cable, FLW to Wijdeveld, 17 April 1931, FLW Archives.
8. Cable, Wijdeveld to FLW, 16 April 1931; and cable, Wijdeveld to FLW, 18 April 1931, FLW Archives.
9. Wijdeveld to FLW, 11 April 1931, copy in Wijdeveld Papers.
10. Wijdeveld to FLW, 10 June 1931, FLW Archives.
11. Jensen to Wijdeveld, 15 June 1931, FLW Archives.
12. FLW to Wijdeveld, 13 August 1931, Wijdeveld Papers.
13. Contract draft, date added, November 1931, FLW Archives.
14. Wijdeveld to FLW, 1 January 1932, FLW Archives.
15. FLW to Wijdeveld, 13 February 1932, Wijdeveld Papers. The copy in the FLW Archives is not that of the letter received by Wijdeveld. On the Académie Européenne Méditerranée, see H. Th. Wijdeveld, *Naar een internationale werkgemeenschap* (Santpoort, 1931).
16. Wijdeveld to FLW, 13 October 1947, Wijdeveld Papers, and discussions with Dr. Langmead.
17. Drafts, FLW to Wijdeveld, 21 October 1947, FLW Archives, and in F. L. Wright (1984), pp. 106–108, which is *not* the letter received by Wijdeveld. Wijdeveld did visit in 1947 and obtained a visiting professorship at the University of Southern California. See various letters in the Wijdeveld Papers and FLW Archives, 1947–49, for Wright’s role.
18. Wijdeveld to FLW, 1 January 1932, copy in Wijdeveld Papers.

## 5 Apprenticeship

1. F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 236. Oddly, these and other observations on education of c. 1931 were not significantly altered in the 1943 edition of the autobiography, although Taliesin was then ten years old. Wright seemed intrigued by the idea of education rather than the actual process of educating, a thought strengthened by his confession “I am no teacher.”
2. Smith (1979), p. 136.
3. Tafel (1979), p. 137.
4. J. L. Wright (1946), pp. 32–33.
5. Shay (1926), pp. 129, 425; and Champney (1983), p. 189. On Hubbard see also the entry in *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1932); William Alfred Hines, *American Communities and Co-operative Colonies* (Philadelphia, 1908; reprint 1975), pp. 513–521; and Charles F. Hamilton, *Roycroft Collectables* (San Diego, 1980).
6. William Marion Reedy, *A Little Journey to East Aurora* (East Aurora, N.Y., 1912), p. 33. See also Champney (1983), p. 190, and Smith (1979), p. 136.

7. Andrews (1955), p. 248.

8. On Ashbee see Crawford (1985).

9. Cf. Hanks (1979).

10. Borsodi (1972), pp. xxvii–xxviii.

11. The discussion of *paideia* is in O. L. Wright (1963), pp. 204–206. It is not clear if Olgivanna obtained the book independently of Gurdjieff; it was first published in Germany in 1933 and two volumes followed. It was published in English in three volumes in 1939–46 after expatriate Jaeger had been established at Harvard University. Jaeger states that *paideia*

**like other broad comprehensive concepts (*Philosophy*, for instance, or *culture*) refuses to be confined within an abstract formula. . . . It is impossible to avoid bringing in modern expressions like *civilization*, *culture*, *tradition*, *literature*, or *education*. But none of them really covers what the Greeks meant by *paideia*. . . . The ancients were persuaded that education and culture are not a formal art or an abstract theory, distinct from the objective historical structure of a nation's spiritual life.** (Jaeger 1965, p. v; his emphases)

The description of *paideia* as education through the development of mind and body may appear a trite simplification, yet the concept was popularly described as such. Jaeger's notion that only the nobility had access to *areté* is patent and distinct—"ordinary men have no *areté* . . . it was impossible to dissociate leadership and *areté*" (p. 5).

12. Smith (1979), p. 140.

13. Cf. the "Work Song" in F. L. Wright (1943), before p. 379; also Ulrich Conrads, ed., *Programmes and Manifestoes on 20th-century Architecture* (London, 1970), frontispiece.

14. F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 236, and F. L. Wright (1943), p. 236. Wright saw all employees as potentially traitorous; see, e.g., Johnson (1977), pp. 22ff. Loyalty by the fellows took many forms; among other duties Tafel acted as chauffeur for most of his nine years at Taliesin. Or there was this publicized incident in 1932:

**On a street in Madison, Wis., Architect Frank Lloyd Wright met one C. R. Sechrest, one time farm laborer at Taliesin, [who] . . . demanded \$282 which he said was owing his wife for cooking at Taliesin. They scuffled, fell in the gutter, Sechrest's knee broke Wright's nose. Two nights later five of Wright's students called on Sechrest with a blacksnake whip shouting "Kill the s-o-b!" Sechrest drove them out with a butcher knife, had them arrested. The judge thought \$100 fine and 60 days in jail "inadequate." (*Time*, 20 November 1932, p. 52)**

Tafel (1981), p. 62, denies the episode took place.

15. F. L. Wright (1936a), p. 210.

16. O. L. Wright (1963), pp. 206–207.

17. Smith (1979), p. 135.

18. F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 238, abridged in the 1943 autobiography and slightly altered in the 1977 edition.

19. In 1932 Wright said the charge was \$675 per annum; Pfeiffer (interview 1982) said it was \$650 and then became \$1100 per annum in 1933, \$1500 in 1945, and was raised again in 1959. See also FLW to E. Bauer, 4 June 1932, and comment on p. 58, in F. L. Wright (1982).

**20.** J. L. Wright (1946), p. 33; and Kassler (1975), p. 11.

**21.** Olgivanna L. Wright (given as “Mrs. Frank Lloyd Wright” in the author line), “The Last Days of Katherine Mansfield,” *The Bookman*, 23 (March 1931), pp. 6, 12. Perhaps thinking about Gurdjieff’s Institute and its relation to the proposed Fellowship revived her memories of Mansfield’s death. It is one of Olgivanna’s best pieces of writing.

When Mansfield entered the Institute in October 1922, it had begun operations at Fontainebleau; forty “mostly Russian” people were still cleaning and clearing and constructing (see John Middleton Murry, *Katherine Mansfield’s Letters to John Middleton Murry 1913–1922* [London, 1951], p. 676.). Mansfield has described her first meeting with Olgivanna: “Presently steps came up and a woman appeared, very simply dressed, with her head bound in a white handkerchief. She had her arms full of logs. I spoke in French, but she didn’t understand. English—no good. But her glance was so lovely—laughing and gentle, absolutely unlike people as I have known people” (Murry, p. 678). By November Mansfield and Olgivanna were “old friends.” Mansfield died of tuberculosis in January 1923.

**22.** A remarkability not agreed to by Mrs. Wright (see the letter of FLW to Gutheim, 14 February 1941, FLW Archives).

**23.** As quoted in Twombly (1979), p. 147. Over the years words have been written in praise of or damning institutes like Gurdjieff’s. His was known falsely, for instance, as the place that killed Mansfield. There are two carefully considered views that are less journalistic than Lewis’s. The latest is by a long-alert biographer of Mansfield, Anthony Alpers, whose recent book *The Life of Katherine Mansfield* (London, 1980) held that Gurdjieff’s teachings were

**either too naive or too well worn, and were mainly suitable for persons not well read. Of moral content they had none. His “know thyself” was hardly modern Greek; his notion of “balancing the centres” came from the sort of man who could make a good firm milking stool, but would hardly depose the Trinity. Yet he comes out of all the literature as a kindly decent friend to Katherine Mansfield in her last and most desperate endeavour to locate her “self.” . . .**

**He was not a fraud. A man who lays bricks and planes wood, cuts out dress materials and printing stencils, designs all the decorations of a “holy place,” mends Oriental carpets, and picks up a little shredded cabbage in the kitchen, is something else.** (Pp. 378–379)

A view that might have been shared by the apprentices at Taliesin and perhaps by Wright. Another view is that of Olgivanna, that “one of the most humane acts Gurdjieff ever did was to accept her [Mansfield] into the Institute” (“Last Days,” p. 6). The opinion of everyone including her doctors was that Mansfield was dying when she entered the Institute. John Middleton Murry, Mansfield’s husband, referred to the Institute as “a kind of spiritual brotherhood . . . to help its members to achieve a spiritual regeneration” (*Journal of Katherine Mansfield* [New York, 1946], p. 255).

**24.** Twombly (1979), p. 147.

**25.** FLW to Kenneth Bayes, London, 17 July 1939, copy in FLW Archives; and F. L. Wright (1943), p. 510. For the



character and kind of restrictions imposed by the Wrights see Tafel (1979), pp. 128ff.; Twombly (1979), pp. 173ff.; and compare Alpers, *Life of Katherine Mansfield*, pp. 367–369. Also see Sidney K. Robinson, “Composed Places: Taliesin and Alden Dow’s Studio,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1974, esp. chapters 7–9, and S. K. Robinson, *The Architecture of Alden B. Dow* (Detroit, 1983). On Gale and Gurdjieff, see Derleth (1940), pp. 176–193.

**26.** Tafel (1979), p. 138.

**27.** *Ibid.*, p. 139. The Wrights’ daughter Lovanna studied with Gurdjieff (*ibid.*, p. 135). The regimen at Taliesin can be found also in these letters and notes, all in F. L. Wright (1982): a list of rules of 4 January 1934 (pp. 63–64); FLW to W.B. Fyfe, 21 October 1933 (pp. 82–83); FLW to E. Bauer, 4 June 1932 (pp. 14–16); and a statement of December 1933 (pp. 205–207). See also the reflections of Dankmar Adler’s daughter in Saltzstein (1969); and comments here and there in Meehan (1984).

**28.** Tafel (1979), p. 139; see also Saltzstein (1969), and Meyer Levin, “Master-Builder,” *Coronet*, 3 (December 1937), pp. 171–184.

**29.** Tafel (1981), p. 62.

**30.** FLW to Willcox, 7 February 1934, Willcox Papers; Albert Kahn to FLW, 9 September 1932, FLW Archives; and letters to/from E. Kahn, 21 April 1932 to 30 August 1932, FLW Archives.

**31.** FLW to E. J. Kahn, 21 April 1932, FLW Archives.

**32.** Kassler (1975), p. 8. Cf. F. L. Wright (1936b) and Kassler (1981).

**33.** Klumb to Wijdeveld, 11 April 1933, Wijdeveld Papers.

**34.** Kaufmann (1986), pp. 36–39.

**35.** See various testimonials in F. L. Wright (1982), pp. 193–205; and also Bernard M. Boyle, “Taliesin, Then and Now,” *Architecture*, 73 (March 1988), pp. 129–132.

**36.** Branden (1986), pp. 190–191. I also discuss Rand’s reactions to Taliesin in “Frank Lloyd Wright versus Hollywood” (manuscript in preparation).

**37.** Branden (1986), p. 191.

**38.** Quotations selected from Nott (1969), pp. 146–155.

**39.** Anne Baxter (daughter of Wright’s daughter Catherine), *Intermission: A True Tale* (London, 1977), p. 19. See also the short remembrances of 12 former apprentices in Mervyn Kaufmann, “Frank Lloyd Wright Remembered,” *House Beautiful*, 126 (August 1984), pp. 30, 111.

**40.** F. L. Wright (1943), p. 291, slightly altered in F. L. Wright (1977), p. 419.

---

THEME / **Architectural Issues: National versus International**

**6 Architecture**

**1.** Cf. Johnson (1977).

**2.** Johnson (1987c), pp. 105–106.

3. Mumford (1952), p. 398.
4. Behrendt (1952), pp. 398–399.
5. I discuss comparable uses of steel in “Frank Lloyd Wright versus Hollywood” (manuscript in preparation); and see Hines (1982), pp. 120–127.
6. E. Masselink to G. Nelson, 14 April 1938 and 25 April 1938, copies in FLW Archives.
7. Behrendt (1952), p. 399.
8. Andrews (1955), p. 172; and cf. Hines (1982) and David Gebhard, *The Architecture of Gregory Ain* (Santa Barbara, 1980). The unbuilt Sussman house (1955) was used for the 1988–1990 “In the Realm of Ideas” exhibition. It has a Davidson plan.
9. See also Pommer (1983), pp. 158–169.
10. Donald Langmead and I present this research and discuss the relevant issues in our “Frank Lloyd Wright: The View From Holland” (manuscript in preparation).
11. FLW to E. Noble (daughter), 11 March 1930, copy in FLW Archives.
12. E. Noble (mother) to FLW, c. May 1930, FLW Archives.
13. Frank Lloyd Wright, “Principles of Design,” *Annual of American Design*, 1931, pp. 101–104.
14. FLW to Hitchcock, 8 March 1958, in F. L. Wright (1984); and cf. Muschamp (1983) here and there (no index was provided, a worrisome discourtesy).
15. See Schulze, (1985), pp. 237ff; and cf. Pfeiffer (1985a).
16. Frank Lloyd Wright, “Living in the Desert,” *Arizona Highways*, 25 (October 1949), p. 2.
17. Banham (1969), p. 516.
18. FLW to Alden Dow, 11 September 1934, F. L. Wright (1982), p. 26.
19. Tafel (1979), pp. 194–200.
20. This is discussed in my “Frank Lloyd Wright versus Holywood” (manuscript in preparation).
21. If as generally agreed *Taliesin* no. 1, in which the zoned houses appeared, was published in 1934 then the date of 1935 in Pfeiffer (1985a) is in error. The “suburban” zoned house was also illustrated in that publication. Wright stated that his zoned designs were a direct response to a suggestion contained in a letter (published in *Taliesin*) from Dorothy Johnson Field. Her ideas about the zoned house were eventually published as *The Human House* (New York, 1939) where Wright’s zoned house project and Willey house were illustrated. That book in turn influenced Robert Woods Kennedy’s very fine study, *The House and the Art of Its Design* (New York, 1953), where Field and Wright are quoted (pp. 127–130) and H. H. Harris and Wright are illustrated.

## 7 Prejudices Old and New

Epigraph, Matthew Nowicki, “Function and Form,” in Mumford (1952), p. 417.

1. Dwight Janes Baum, “This Modernism,” *Pencil Points*, 13 (September 1932), p. 600. See also the AIA pamphlet “A symposium on contemporary architects” (Washington, D.C., 1931).
2. John F. Harbeson, “Design in Modern Architecture, 3—The City of Tomorrow,” *Pencil Points*, 9 (March 1930), pp. 165–172. Cf. “Frank Lloyd Wright and Hugh Ferriss Discuss This Modern Architecture,” *Architectural Forum*,

- 63 (November 1930), pp. 535–538 (taken from the text of a radio broadcast).
3. See, for instance, Dora Landau, “An American Architect Exhibits in Berlin,” *The American Magazine of Art*, 23 (July 1931), p. 165; W. L[eotze], “Unter der Lupe, Frank Lloyd Wright und die Kritik,” *Die Form*, 6 (September 1931), pp. 356–358; Bull (1931), p. 54; and “Wright in Berlin,” *The Art Digest*, 5 (July 1931), p. 12.
  4. From my review of the evidence; see also Sweeney (1978).
  5. Cf. Leonard K. Eaton, *American Architecture Comes of Age: European Reaction to H. H. Richardson and Louis Sullivan* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972).
  6. Tselos (1931), p. 42. In Tselos’s view the Bauhaus exhibit was also wanting.
  7. Klumb to Hoffman, 5 September 1980, in Donald Hoffman, *Frank Lloyd Wright’s Robie House* (New York, 1984), p. 27.
  8. Announced in, e.g., “Exhibition of Modern Architecture,” *Architectural Record*, 71 (January 1932), p. 29. Of the better-known German architects, only Mies van der Rohe and Mendelsohn drew Wright praise. When Gropius and Le Corbusier visited the University of Wisconsin in the 1930s (at different times) they asked to visit Taliesin; Wright refused (see Tafel 1979). On Mendelsohn, see, e.g., “Frank Lloyd Wright and Hugh Ferriss Discuss This Modern Architecture,” p. 536, and “Wright in Berlin,” p. 12, where Mandelsohn described Wright as “a great artist whom we love as the father of new times.” See also Mandelsohn, “Frank Lloyd Wright,” *Wasmuth’s Monatshefte für Baukunst*, 10 (1926), pp. 244–246; Mendelsohn, “Frank Lloyd Wright und seine historische Belentung,” *Das neue Berlin* (September 1929), pp. 180–181; and Tafel (1979), p. 151. On Mies see, e.g., Tafel (1979), pp. 69ff, and Schulze (1985), esp. pp. 178–183.
  9. New York, 1932; reprint edition 1966.
  10. F. L. Wright (1932c), p. 10.
  11. *Ibid.*, p. 11. On Le Corbusier’s 1925 letter see Turner (1983), pp. 351–352; Donald Langmead and I discuss it in our “Frank Lloyd Wright: The View from Holland” (manuscript in preparation).
  12. FLW to P. Johnson, 11 February 1932, in F. L. Wright (1984), pp. 90–91.
  13. FLW to J. Nesbitt, 4 October 1954, FLW Archives.
  14. Vincent Scully, “Frank Lloyd Wright and Philip Johnson at Yale,” *Architectural Digest*, 43 (March 1986), p. 91.
  15. Stanley Tigerman, “Mies van der Rohe: A Moral Modernist Model,” *Perspecta* 22 (New York, 1986), p. 115.
  16. Statement in F. L. Wright (1982), p. 205.
  17. Reyner Banham, “A Set of Actual Monuments,” *Architectural Review*, 175 (April 1989), p. 90.
  18. Frank Lloyd Wright, “To the students of the Beaux-Arts Institute of Design, all departments,” *Architecture*, 66 (October 1932), p. 230.
  19. E. J. Kahn to FLW, 1 September 1932, FLW Archives.
  20. F. L. Wright (1934b), pp. 55–60.
  21. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 560. In the 1977 autobiography the words, “in our own country,” were added (p. 589).
  22. Alexander (1935), p. 28; letter of reply, *New Masses*, 23 July 1935, pp. 23–24.
  23. Wright’s attitude toward the skyscraper shifted over the years. Before c. 1932 he saw the tall building as an

architectural problem to be solved. He said of Louis Sullivan's Wainwright Building, "The skyscraper is a new thing beneath the sun, an entity imperfect, but with virtue, individuality, beauty all of its own—was born. Until Louis Sullivan showed the way tall buildings never had unity, the tall building's its height triumphant" (F. L. Wright 1932a, p. 267, slightly altered in F. L. Wright 1943, p. 270). After c. 1932 his view of the skyscraper was aimed not at the architectural problem, like the Soviets, but at its social and economic implications. (Other passages in the 1932 autobiography mark the turning point; some of these correspond with parts of his 1930 lectures at Princeton University and with parts of his antiurbanism arguments in regard to Broadacre City. In any event the Princeton lectures are the predecessor of most of his writings 1931–c. 1945.) Of course Wright proposed many skyscrapers before and after 1932.

**24.** I am presently completing a study of Wright's architectural and city planning theories to c. 1913 for the University of Washington Press.

## **8 Broadacre City**

**1.** Curtis (1982), p. 210. Johnson (1988) contains an outline of the essay herein.

**2.** The varieties of analysis of Broadacres are rather extensive. Some of the more cogent are by Lionel March, who gave three broadcasts about Wright on BBC radio; two were published and the relevant one is March (1981); see also relevant sections of Goodman and Goodman (1960); Grabow (1977); Reiner (1963); Sergeant (1976); Fishman (1977); Reissman (1964); Scully (1969); Schapiro (1938); Alofsin (1989); Lewis Mumford, *The Urban Prospect* (New York, 1956); Smith (1979); Creese (1985); and Collins (1963). Of less value are Ciucci (1978); Twombly (1979); and Speck (1989).

**3.** F. L. Wright (1958a), p. 60. *The Disappearing City* was reprinted in F. L. Wright (1969).

**4.** F. L. Wright (1932d). For the sources of some comments between 1931 and 1935 see entries in Alofsin (1989), pp. 41–43, and Sweeney (1978), pp. 51–56.

**5.** *New York Times*, 20 March 1932, pp. 8–9. See also "Frank Lloyd Wright Tells of the Broadacre City," City Club of Chicago *Bulletin*, 25 (15 February 1932), pp. 27, 29, which reports that an amazing 300 people attended the lecture, an event unparalleled since the Club's progressive days prior to U.S. entry into World War I.

**6.** FLW to E. Tafel, 12 November 1934, F. L. Wright (1982), p. 88; and Sergeant (1976), p. 123.

**7.** These were first published in O. L. Wright (1970), p. 111.

**8.** Curtis (1982), p. 210.

**9.** There are a few examples of buildings that evolve from or were incorporated into the plan, including the Automobile Inn. The Ras-el-Bar beach cabins, for instance, were modified to become the San Marcos Water Gardens project and with further revisions became a "tent-town for weekends" project of 1931. Later, the same design was used as the Automobile Inn in the 1935 Broadacres plan and remained there through 1958 (see quadrant G of Figure 3). This is best illustrated in Wright's article "Die Machanisierung und die Materialien," *Die Form*, 6 (September 1931), pp. 346–347, and Pfeiffer (1985a), various plates.

**10.** The plan and model were published to coincide with the exhibit (see F. L. Wright 1935b, 1935c; Sergeant 1976, p. 123). Changes after 1935 can be seen in F. L. Wright (1945), called a "second edition" (presumably to

*The Disappearing City*; see esp. p. 52); and in F. L. Wright (1958b), a large color liftout.

**11.** Based on Gallion (1950), p. 392. The Frank Lloyd Wright Archives does not possess the original drawings but does possess those used for *The Living City* (F. L. Wright 1958b).

**12.** Alofsin (1989), pp. 10, 22. Alofsin neatly brings together the 1934–35 published visual presentations on pp. 19–27.

**13.** Edgar Tafel and Frank Lloyd Wright, “The architect’s many enemies: A Taliesin script, 1934,” *Architectural Association Quarterly*, 13 (December 1982), pp. 65–67. Cf. Kopp (1970), pp. 164–186.

**14.** Wright suggested 5.0 people per family (F. L. Wright 1935b), but in 1935 the average was closer to 3.5.

**15.** Few authors have presented visual information for their speculations of a regional plan for Broadacres, but see Sergeant (1976), p. 169.

**16.** As identified in the FLW Archives.

**17.** F. L. Wright (1943), p. 349. Ludwig Hilberseimer’s ascetic decentralized and regional pattern is very similar to Wright’s; see esp. Hilberseimer, *The Nature of Cities* (Chicago, 1955), pp. 225ff.

**18.** Fein (1968), introduction.

**19.** McKelvey (1973), p. 143.

**20.** Fein (1968), introduction. On Olmsted’s development of Riverside, Illinois, see Creese (1985), pp. 219–239.

**21.** Material in FLW Archives. On the Larkin Company see Quinan (1987). Walter V. Davidson should not be confused with Alexander Davidson, for whom Wright designed a house in Buffalo in 1908.

**22.** Tafel (1979), pp. 83–84; the model is illustrated in Hitchcock (1942), plate 312.

**23.** The entire plan is on a 5 × 9 inch sheet, in the FLW Archives; and see Creese (1985), p. 273.

**24.** As quoted in Pfeiffer (1985a), plate 158. Coincidentally in 1931 Los Angeles architect J. R. Davidson proposed a “Driv-in Curb Market” that was to be located on a city street corner with curbside and on-site parking; see Wilson et al. (1986), p. 165.

**25.** Illustrated in Pfeiffer (1985a), plates 188–189. The caption says construction was to be “pre-fabricated sheet steel,” but the drawings say reinforced concrete. Pfeiffer (1985a) refers to “Exhibition Markets” for Davidson in 1928, but the FLW Archives, reexamining the drawings (November 1987), deemed a 1932 date correct.

**26.** Brooks (1972), p. 150. Marion Mahony married Walter Burley Griffin in 1911 and in 1912 she, no doubt with Walter, designed a house for Ford. Foundations were laid when Ford, the contractor, and perhaps the architect quarreled. Ford switched to architect W. H. Van Tine, who prepared plans for a new house that was built more or less on the foundations of Marion Griffin’s design. Ford called the manor Fair Lane and it was complete in December 1915 as a rather Gothic “plain, oblong structure, broken by a few abortive irregularities.” (See David T. Van Zanten, “The Early Work of Marion Mahony Griffin,” *Prairie School Review*, 3, no. 2 [1966], pp. 18–22; Brooks [1972], p. 163; and Nevins and Hill [1957], p. 21.)

Ford reiterated his thesis of decentralization in Anne O’Hare McCormick, “Ford Seeks a New Balance for Industry,” *The New York Times Magazine*, 29 May 1932, pp. 4–5. It followed Wright’s article in the same magazine by only five weeks. Wright’s secretary Karl Jensen wrote to Ford noting the similarity of theses and suggested the two men meet. There was no reply. Jensen to Henry Ford, 10 June 1932, copy in FLW Archives.)

27. Nevins and Hill (1957), pp. 36ff.
28. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 501.
29. Quoted in Nevins and Hill (1957), p. 226; Henry Ford, *Ford Ideals* (Dearborn, 1922), as quoted in Gallion (1950).
30. Quoted in Nevins and Hill (1957), p. 227.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 229.
32. Quoted in *ibid.*
33. See Wik (1972), chapters 6 and 7.
34. Wik (1972), pp. 106–108; Nevins and Hill (1957), chapter 12; Ciucci et al. (1978), pp. 333ff.; Sergeant (1976), pp. 133–134; Scott (1964), pp. 301ff.; Henry Ford, *My Life and Work* (London, 1922), chapter 13.
35. Gutheim (1941), p. 144.
36. F. L. Wright (1931), pp. 108–109. See also Ciucci (1978).
37. Henry Ford, *Moving Forward* (New York, 1931).
38. Nevins and Hill (1957), p. 317. See also *ibid.*, chapter 12, and Wik (1972), chapter 7.
39. Stein (1956), p. 19.
40. See esp. Michael Simpson, *Thomas Adams and the Modern Planning Movement* (London, 1985).
41. Cf. Anne Whiston Spirn, *The Granite Garden* (New York, 1984). See also Creese (1985), pp. 241–278.
42. Lipman (1986), pp. 9, 13.
43. Barney (1965), p. 155.
44. Lipman (1986), p. 15.

## 9 Bitter Root

1. Information about the Montana projects is taken from Johnson (1987b), which was based on research in the FLW Archives, University of Montana Archives, and Bitter Root Valley Archives, Hamilton, and site visits in 1985.
2. I discuss this in “Frank Lloyd Wright versus the City: Architectural and City Planning Theory to 1913” (manuscript in preparation).

## 10 And Le Corbusier?

1. William H. Jordy, “‘I Am Alone’: Le Corbusier, Bathrooms, and Airplanes,” in Hilton Kramer, ed., *The New Criterion Reader* (New York, 1988), p. 176.
2. Cf., e.g., Lampugnani (1982), pp. 66ff.
3. Barnett (1986), p. 115.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 115ff.
5. Pfeiffer (1985b), plate 64b.
6. Collins (1963), p. 74.
7. Sargent (1979), p. xvi.
8. J. L. Wright (1946), pp. 33–34; freely selected from section 5, lines 109–134. Parenthetically the comments of

Harold W. Blodgett and Scully Bradley are relevant. To Whitman “the broad-axe is an emblem of a ‘long varied train’ which is the poem itself, powerfully setting forth the attributes and shapes which the great instrument, both builder and destroyer, symbolizes—the creative strength of man deriving from the confident, independent masculinity and femininity which the poem celebrates” (Walt Whitman, *Leaves of Grass*, ed. Blodgett and Bradley (New York, 1965), pp. 184–185.

In eight locations of the January 1938 *Architectural Forum* Wright placed extracts of Whitman’s poetry, again freely selected and joined, including the following:

***Beware what precedes the decay of the ruggedness of states and men.***

***Beware of civilization.***

Charles Ashbee wrote a book he entitled *Where the Great City Stands*.

9. F. L. Wright (1933), p. 4.

10. [Statement], December 1933, in F. L. Wright (1982), pp. 206–207.

## 11 Lectures and Exhibitions: Willcox

1. Smith (1971), p. 5. The following discussion is based on Johnson (1987c).

2. Telegram, Willcox to White, 5[?] April 1929, and reply telegram from White, 6 April 1929, copies in Willcox Papers. Apparently Bock stayed with Willcox for only three years; in 1932 he returned to Illinois and then retired to California. (See Donald P. Hallmark, “Richard W. Bock, Sculptor. Part II: The Mature Collaborations,” *Prairie School Review*, 8, no. 2. [1971], p. 29. See also Hanks 1979, pp. 77, 88, 122–123, 170.) Many of the White-Willcox letters are retained in the Willcox Papers (see Smith 1971), and four were republished in part in Brooks (1981), pp. 83–92, where Willcox is not even identified.

3. Willcox to FLW, 18 October 1930, copy in Willcox Papers. See also Don Genasci and David Shelman, “W. R. B. Willcox (1869–1947): His Architecture and Educational Theory,” pamphlet, Department of Architecture, University of Oregon, 1980, in University of Oregon, Special Collections.

4. FLW to Willcox, 17 [or 27?] October 1930, Willcox Papers.

5. FLW to Willcox, 12 November 1930, Willcox Papers.

6. Weatherhead to Willcox, 16 January 1931, Willcox Papers.

7. Marginal notes in ink by FLW on a letter from the Western Association of Art Museum Directors to FLW, 12 June 1930, FLW Archives. See also the letter of FLW to Pauline Schindler, n.d. [1931], in F. L. Wright (1984).

8. Hitchcock (1942), p. 85; see also Barr et al. (1932); Hines (1982), pp. 100–105; and David Gebhard, *Schindler* (London, 1971), pp. 114–116.

9. FLW to Willcox, 21 January 1931, Willcox Papers, much of it handwritten afterthoughts (“Audac” refers to AUDAC, the American Union of Decorative Artists and Craftsmen); and FLW to R. L. Jones, 4 March 1931, in F. L. Wright (1986b), p. 65. Lloyd Wright’s contact in Seattle is unknown.

10. FLW to Willcox, 21 January 1931.

11. David Shelman, “Freedom and Responsibility . . .,” in Genasci and Shelman, “W. R. B. Willcox,” p. 26.

12. Clifford to FLW, 10 January 1932, FLW Archives.

13. Clifford to FLW, 8 March 1931, copy in Willcox Papers, and “Foremost U.S. Architect to Speak Here,” *The Oregon Statesman*, 8 March 1931, pp. 1, 2.
14. FLW to Willcox, 2 April 1931, Willcox Papers, a portion in FLW Archives.
15. Ibid.
16. “Seattle-Made Daylight Lamp Excites Visitor,” *The Seattle Times*, 15 March 1931, p. 1.
17. Robert E. Burton, *Democrats of Oregon: The Pattern of Minority Politics, 1900–1956* (Eugene, 1970), p. 74; and Arthur H. Bone, ed., *Oregon Cattleman/Governor Congressman: Memoirs and Times of Walter M. Peirce* (Portland, 1981), p. 337. See also Gordon B. Dodds, *The American Northwest* (Arlington Heights, 1986), pp. 228–232.
18. Clifford to FLW, 10 January 1932, FLW Archives.
19. FLW to Clifford, 15 February 1932, FLW Archives.
20. Putnam to FLW, 24 March 1932, FLW Archives.
21. Lipman (1986), pp. 176, 178.
22. See Johnson (1987b).
23. Donald Leslie Johnson, “Frank Lloyd Wright’s Contribution to Wenatchee’s Riverfront Park,” *Confluence* (North Central Washington Museum), 3 (Summer 1986), pp. 92–94.
24. Belluschi to FLW, 2 July 1931, quoted in Gideon Bosker and Lena Lencek, *Frozen Music: A History of Portland Architecture* (Portland, 1983), pp. 105–107, where a drawing is illustrated.
25. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 364. Sequences of events in the section of the autobiography on the years 1930–32 are often wrong. The March trip is not in F. L. Wright (1932a) and appears slightly altered in F. L. Wright (1977), p. 390.
26. FLW to A. Barnsdall, 28 September 1934, in F. L. Wright (1982), p. 84.
27. FLW to N. Guthrie, 9 February 1931, in F. L. Wright (1986b), p. 190.
28. The show’s European itinerary is discussed in Donald Langmead and my “Frank Lloyd Wright: The View from Holland” (manuscript in preparation).
29. Surely he meant “wolken kratzer”—skyscraper. FLW to Willcox, 31 July 1931, Willcox Papers. Little is known of the trip to Rio; it is not mentioned in Twombly (1979) or Hitchcock (1942), briefly and impressionistically in F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 515–519, and not in F. L. Wright (1932a), perhaps because the book was then in production. Wright was informed of his selection to the jury on 24 July 1931 (K. Jensen to FLW, 24 July 1931, FLW Archives).
30. FLW to N. Guthrie, 20 November 1928, in F. L. Wright (1986b), p. 282.
31. Based on my records, which are more complete than Sweeney (1978).

## 12 Lectures and Exhibitions: Brownell

1. FLW to Brownell, 2 May 1933, 1 December 1933, 6 December 1933, as described in Meehan (1983), pp. 271, 275, 276.
2. Gutheim (1941), pp. 3–4, 23–24.
3. FLW to Brownell, 5 February 1934, as described in Meehan (1983), p. 278.



4. Brownell class lecture program for May 1935, FLW Archives.
5. Brownell to FLW, 10 February 1937, FLW Archives.
6. Brownell to FLW, 11 February 1935, FLW Archives.
7. Ibid.
8. FLW to Brownell, 10 October 1936, as described in Meehan (1983), p. 310.
9. Brownell to FLW, 1 February 1937, FLW Archives.
10. FLW to Brownell, 22 May 1937, as described in Meehan (1983), p. 329.
11. Telegram, FLW to Brownell, 11 August 1937 (?), FLW Archives.
12. Brownell to FLW, 10 February 1937, FLW Archives.
13. Ibid., p. 2.
14. *Twentieth Century Authors* (New York, 1955), p. 134.
15. B. Brownell, *Art Is Action: A Discussion of Nine Arts in the Modern World* (New York, 1939; rpt. 1972), pp. 56–57.
16. Schapiro (1938), p. 42. Also compare Smith (1979), p. 171.
17. Brownell and Wright (1937), p. 87.
18. Ibid., p. 167.
19. Ibid., p. 243.
20. There are many studies of Fabianism but one of balanced and detailed value remains Margaret Cole, *The Story of Fabian Socialism* (London, 1961).
21. A personal conversation with Schulze, paraphrased in Schulze (1985), p. 211.
22. Schulze (1985), p. 211; on Mies and Wright see Tafel (1979), pp. 69–80, and Schulze (1985), pp. 209–211; Mies’s relation to Wright while still in Europe is discussed in Donald Langmead and my “Frank Lloyd Wright: The View from Holland (manuscript in preparation).

---

THEME / **Moscow**

1. The Congress has usually been called something similar to an international or world conference, which of course it was not; see, e.g., F. L. Wright (1943), p. 541; O. L. Wright (1959), p. 37; Twombly (1979), p. 292; and Ciucci (1976). “All-Union” congresses were common in the USSR in the 1930s.
2. For example, Gill (1987) makes no mention of Moscow, Russia, or the USSR and Einbinder (1986) mentions the subject in passing.
3. See Johnson (1987a).

**13 The 1920s**

1. Cooke (1983), p. 356.
2. Lubetkin (1956), p. 262.
3. Taylor (1961), p. 9.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 122. Cf. Lance Marinetti Barbi, “Marinetti and Futurism,” *The Structurist*, 12 (1972–73), pp. 51–55.
5. Hahl-Koch (1980), pp. 87–88; see illustrations in Lissitzky (1970).
6. Zygas (1980), esp. pp. 112–114; Gray (1962); Starr (1978), pp. 21–22; see also Kopp (1985).
7. Zygas (1980), p. 117.
8. *Encyclopédie des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes au XXème siècle* (Paris, 1925; rpt., New York, 1977), No. 2, p. 77 and plate XLIV.
9. *L'Architecture vivante* (Paris: Morance, 1925), [part 2], plate 47; plan, section, elevation in 1927 [part 1], plate 21. For discussion of the building see Starr (1978), chapter 5; and of the Russian context see Kopp (1985), pp. 132ff.
10. Cooke (1983), p. 36; and see Szymon Bojko, “Vkhutemas,” in Barron and Tuchman (1980), pp. 78–80, and Khan-Magomedov (1981), pp. 66–150.
11. Cf. Zevi (1949), chapter 2.
12. *Architectural Design* (1970), pp. 71ff.
13. Lubetkin (1956), pp. 262–263; quotation cited by Frampton (1980), p. 167.

#### **14 Prelude to the 1937 Congress**

1. Shatz (1980), p. 84; cf. Tolstoy (1981).
2. Cf. Carmichael (1976); Conquest (1968), pp. 26–32ff.; and Tolstoy (1981).
3. Fainsod (1964), pp. 195–196.
4. Deutscher (1949), p. 425.
5. Barron and Tuchman (1980), p. 13.
6. Among the Australians was Henry Pynor; see Johnson (1980a), pp. 111–112.
7. Starr (1978), p. 220; and Conquest (1968), p. 443.
8. F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 541ff.
9. O. L. Wright (1959), p. 41.
10. *Architecture of the USSR*, July–August 1937, p. 5.
11. *Pravda*, 19 June 1937, p. 4.
12. Starr (1978), p. 221.
13. Cf., e.g., Cooke (1983); Kopp (1970); Shvidkovsky (1971); Barron and Tuchman (1980); Kopp (1985); Lubetkin (1956); the 1925 *Encyclopédie des arts décoratifs*; Voyce (1948); Berton (1977); Bliznakov (1971); and “Constructivist Architecture in the U.S.S.R.,” *Architectural Design*, 2 (February 1970) the issue under the guest editorship of O. A. Shvidkovsky. Its successor was Shvidkovsky (1971).
14. Shvidkovsky (1971), p. 18; on the April 1932 decree see Bowlt (1976), esp. pp. 288ff.
15. Bliznakov (1971), pp. 3, 209.
16. As spoken to Clara Zetkin, published in *The Studio* (London), Autumn 1935, p. 8.
17. Starr (1978), p. 221.
18. As outlined in Zevi (1949); and see Arkin (1935), p. 17.

19. As reported in *Moscow Daily News*, 27 May 1937, p. 2.
20. Voyce (1948), p. 149.
21. Willen (1953), p. 30.
22. Bliznakov (1971), pp. 203–204.
23. “Soviet Congress of Architecture,” *Pravda*, 15 June 1937, p. 1. The Congress was also announced in *Architectural Review*, May 1937, pp. 2–6.
24. Berton (1977), p. 222; and see also “Molotov Points Out Tasks of Architecture,” *Moscow News*, 30 June 1937, p. 8.
25. *Moscow Daily News*, 23 April 1937, p. 4; and A. Shchusev, “Soviet Architecture Offers Wide Scope to Creative Talents,” *Moscow Daily News*, 12 June 1937, p. 3.

### **15 Wright, Architecture, and the Soviets prior to 1937**

1. See the George Howe and William Lescaze project for the Museum of Modern Art of 1930 in Alison Slay and Michelle Stone, *Unbuilt America* (New York, 1976), plates 195–197. Lescaze was Swiss and studied in Zurich under Karl Moser, whose son was later employed by Wright.
2. Lucio Costa was associated and Le Corbusier was a consultant; see Hitchcock (1969), pp. 519–521.
3. Starr (1978), p. 242. Cf. F. L. Wright (1910, 1911); Bliznakov (1971), pp. 142–143, 212–213; and Moisei Ginzburg, *Style and Epoch*, intro. and trans. A. Senkevitch (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).
4. Cooke (1983), p. 37, with illustration of blocks.
5. Hines (1982), p. 64; Starr (1978), p. 23.
6. MS copy, FLW Archives, original in Library of Congress, Manuscript Division. The letter promoting FLW’s response is not extant.
7. MS copy, FLW Archives. The 1932 response to *Pravda* should be dated about October. The second manuscript is a letter, FLW to M. Olgin (*Pravda*, New York office), dated October 1933. FLW and Gutheim misunderstood the manuscripts when they combined and only partially quoted them in Gutheim (1941), p. 171, where the correct dates should be, as noted above, 1932 and 1933.
8. Letter, D. Arkin to FLW, no date (but referring to events that date it sometime in 1933), FLW Archives.
9. *Ibid.*; and Starr (1978), p. 242.
10. Typescript dated December 1933, FLW Archives. Incorrectly dated 1937 in Gutheim (1941), pp. 216–218, which differs slightly from the typescript.
11. Starr (1978), pp. 242–243, emphasis Starr’s and probably Melnikov’s.
12. See F. L. Wright (1934a), pp. 70–71, the date of which helps confirm the date of Arkin’s letter cited in note 8; and D. Arkin, “Notes on American Architecture,” *Architecture of the USSR*, March 1934, pp. 47, 48, 51.
13. Cable, FLW to CULTSWIAZ, no date but text suggests late 1935. The head of the requesting letter is cut off, so the sender is assumed to be the Society; copy in FLW Archives.
14. The paucity of information is revealed by Parkins (1953) and Senkevitch (1974).
15. Galantay (1975), pp. 42–45; Parkins (1953), pp. 16–29; Noble (1938), p. 29.

- 16.** Berton (1977), pp. 220–221; Tafuri and Dal Co (1979), chapter 12.
- 17.** French (1984), pp. 365–368.
- 18.** Hall (1984), p. 53; Simon et al. (1937), p. 201; Berton (1977), p. 232.
- 19.** Berton (1977), p. 220. See Ernst May, “Moscow: City Building in the U.S.S.R.,” in Lissitzky (1970), pp. 188–203.
- 20.** Parkins (1953), p. 33; Simon et al. (1937), p. 201. Simon’s book was adequately reviewed in *Architectural Record*, 67 (August 1937), p. 28.
- 21.** As quoted in Parkins (1953), p. 36. Cf. Kopp (1985), chapter 7.
- 22.** French (1984); Berton (1977), pp. 232–234.
- 23.** Both are displayed in Evenson (1984).
- 24.** Starr (1978), p. 10.
- 25.** Turner (1983); and Doremus (1985), but Doremus should be read cautiously.
- 26.** Sweeney (1978), entries for 1911 and 1915.
- 27.** *American Architect*, 138 (December 1930), pp. 48ff.
- 28.** *The Studio* (London), Autumn 1935, p. 17. The relationship between theater set design and architecture is made explicit.
- 29.** *Decorative Art: The Studio Year Book* (London, 1933), p. 29, fully illustrated.
- 30.** FLW to Michael A. Kostanecki in Krakow, Poland, copy in FLW Archives, dated 2 Jan. without year. Wright asked Kostanecki to “oversee the setting up” of Wright’s proposed exhibits at the Milan Triennale of August–September 1933; therefore a date for the letter of 1933 seems reasonable. (In the end Wright did not exhibit.) Further, Wright stated that “the translated piece from the Soviet you have probably seen in Shelter. I think Lescaze sent it to them.” See S. T. Woznicki, “USSR—On the Problems of Architecture,” *Shelter*, 2, no. 5 (1932), p. 82. Also cf., e.g., “Milan 1933,” *Architectural Review*, 74 (September 1933), pp. 111–114.
- 31.** See various articles in *Shelter*, 2, no. 5 (1932), pp. 80–93.
- 32.** Bliznakov (1971), p. 194.
- 33.** *Ibid.*, pp. 195–196.
- 34.** Noble (1938), p. 30.
- 35.** Peter Davey, “Arts and Crafts Gardens,” *Architectural Review*, 176 (September 1985), p. 35.
- 36.** Williams-Ellis (1960), p. 266.
- 37.** “Architects in the U.S.S.R. Meet to Consider Architecture,” *Architectural Record*, 83 (October 1937), p. 59.

## **16 Why Attend?**

- 1.** Wright’s health during 1936–37 was interpolated from the following information: letters from E. Masselink to Carl Sandburg, 21 October 1936 and 17 December 1936, Sandburg Archives; Hanna and Hanna (1981), esp. chapter 3; letter, Brownell to FLW, 10 February 1937, FLW Archives; telegram, FLW to Paul Hanna, 26 January 1937, in Hanna and Hanna (1981), p. 48; letter, FLW to Hanna, 27 January 1937, in *ibid.*, pp. 50–51 (and in F. L. Wright [1986b], p. 126).

2. As observed by Twombly (1979), pp. 216–217.
3. FLW to D. Arkin (Moscow), 20 January 1943, copy in FLW Archives, also published in F. L. Wright (1984), p. 103, where it was also addressed to Alabian.
4. Cf. letter, Amkino to FLW, 4 September 1935, FLW Archives.
5. F. L. Wright (1937a), p. 50.
6. F. L. Wright (1937b), p. 15.
7. Letter, FLW to U.S.S.R. Consul General, New York, 22 May 1937, copy in FLW Archives.
8. A comprehensive illustrated list and map is contained in Catherine Cooke, “Moscow Map Guide 1900–1930,” *Architectural Design*, 53, nos. 5/6 (1983), pp. 81–96.

### 17 To Moscow and the Congress

1. FLW to M. A. Kostanecki, 2 Jan [1933], p. 1, copy in FLW Archives. Kostanecki’s letter to Wright is not available but see Kostanecki, “Tworczość arch. Frank Lloyd Wright A,” *Architektura i Budownictwo*, 9, no. 6 (1933), pp. 179–187.
2. FLW to M. J. Olgin, 17 March 1934, copy in FLW Archives.
3. FLW to Alden Dow, 11 September 1934, in F. L. Wright (1982), p. 26; and FLW to B. A. Verdernikov, 10 May 1935, copy in FLW Archives. Verdernikov’s letter to FLW is not available.
4. Telegram, FLW to Soviet Consul General (Boroway?), 21 May 1937, copy FLW Archives; and “City Architects Prepare for Congress,” *Moscow Daily News*, 1 June 1937, p. 3.
5. Chaitkin (1973), p. 55.
6. F. L. Wright (1937b), p. 18.
7. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 541.
8. Williams-Ellis (1960), p. 266. Apparently Williams-Ellis did not give a paper, but see his views outlined in “Eminent Foreign Architects . . .,” *Moscow Daily News*, 30 June 1937, p. 3; and “Architects Vote Congress High Success,” *Moscow News*, 7 July 1937, p. 10. English architect W. Townsend may have attended the Congress; see “British Architects Call Moscow’s Development a Dream Come True,” *Moscow News*, 7 July 1937, p. 10.
9. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 541; O. L. Wright (1959), pp. 37–38.
10. O. L. Wright (1959), pp. 39, 41 (her emphasis).
11. Berton (1977), p. 222. Berton’s quotations of Wright’s speech are not taken from *Pravda*, as implied, but from Wright’s 1943 autobiography.
12. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 542, an interesting slip for FLW’s father attended Madison University before it was renamed Colgate University. The slip was corrected in the 1977 edition to University of Wisconsin “boy” (F. L. Wright 1977, p. 568). See Johnson (1980b). Davies’s “Mission to Moscow” and his role as an apologist are well known.
13. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 542.
14. F. L. Wright (1937b), p. 18.

- 15.** “Soviet Art Notes,” *Moscow News*, 23 June 1937, p. 7; *Moscow Daily News*, 16 May 1937, p. 3, 1 June 1937, p. 3, and 17 June 1937, p. 1.
- 16.** F. L. Wright (1943), p. 543. It is not certain what “similar architects” meant, and it was not clarified in the 1977 edition of the autobiography.
- 17.** F. L. Wright (1943), p. 543.
- 18.** *Architecture of the USSR*, May 1937, p. 2.
- 19.** Tafuri and Dal Co (1979), p. 174. Lurçat arrived in Russia in 1934.
- 20.** Breines (1937), p. 63; and “Architects Begin Union Congress Today,” *Moscow Daily News*, 16 June 1937, p. 1. See also *Architectural Design*, 1970, p. 107; “Foreign Guests . . .,” *Moscow News*, 16 June 1937, p. 5; and “A noted guest to architects’ congress,” *Moscow Daily News*, 14 June 1937, p. 4.
- Breines said Heiberg was from Denmark but he was a Norwegian who taught at the Dessau Bauhaus up to 1930 and then worked in Copenhagen. Enticed by the second Five-Year Plan, Heiberg traveled with Hannes Meyer to Russia in the mid-1930s. Meyer became director of the Bauhaus on the resignation of Walter Gropius in 1928 but his outspoken support of the extreme political left forced his replacement in 1930.
- 21.** S. Breines, “Paper Architecture,” *American Architect*, 139 (March 1931), pp. 24–25, 82, 86. See also “Frank Lloyd Wright and Hugh Ferriss Discuss This Modern Architecture,” *Architectural Record*, 43 (November 1930), pp. 535–538.
- 22.** S. Breines, “The Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians,” *Architectural Record*, July 1934, pp. 59–60, and October 1934, p. 18.
- 23.** Breines (1937); and see, e.g., “Swimming Pool on Estate in Cos Cob, Conn.,” *Architectural Forum*, January 1938, pp. 493–496 (a piece of Germanic modernism); and articles in *Architectural Record*, 82 (October 1937), p. 5; *Architectural Forum*, 70 (June 1939), p. 459; and *Architectural Review*, 86 (August 1939), pp. 64, 70.
- 24.** *Architecture of the USSR*, May 1937, p. 2.
- 25.** Senkevitch (1974), p. xxi.
- 26.** “Serving the People Is Guiding Principle of Soviet Architecture,” *Moscow Daily News*, 17 June 1937, p. 5; and Breines (1937), p. 64.
- 27.** Breines (1937), p. 64.
- 28.** *Pravda*, 18 June 1937, p. 4. See also “First Congress of Architects Opens,” *Moscow News*, 23 June 1937, p. 3.
- 29.** *Pravda*, 18 June 1937, p. 4. See also S. O. Khan-Mahomedov, “M. Ya. Ginsburg 1892–1946,” in Shvidkovsky (1971), pp. 90–96.
- 30.** See relevant sections of *Pravda* from 15 to 27 June 1937, *Moscow Daily News* from 17 to 26 June, and *Architecture of the USSR*, July–August 1937, double issue devoted to the Congress.
- 31.** Breines (1937), p. 65. Viktor Vesnin attempted a difficult path between classical eclecticism and some form of modernism; see, e.g., V. A. Vesnin, “Working Out Style Worthy of Socialist Epoch . . .,” *Moscow Daily News*, 16 June 1937, p. 5.

**32.** *Pravda*, 26 June 1937, p. 51. There were three brothers, all architects; see *Who Was Who in the U.S.S.R.*, ed. Heinrich E. Schulz and Paul K. Urban (Metuchen, N.J., 1972), pp. 569–580.

**33.** Some confessions were painful. The composer Dmitrii Shostakovich went through a kind of hell in 1936 and finally subtitled his 1938 Fifth Symphony, “A Soviet Artist Replies to Just Criticism” (Starr 1978, p. 227). After the censure of constructivism, Aleksandr Vesnin severely restricted his architectural and artistic activity.

**34.** See “Architects End First All-Union Congress,” *Moscow Daily News*, 27 June 1937, p. 1; and “All-Union Congress of Architects,” *Moscow Daily News*, 28 June 1937, p. 2.

### 18 Wright’s Paper

**1.** *Pravda*, 26 June 1937, p. 4. Translation by Donald Leslie Johnson and Sonya Hasselberg-Johnson.

**2.** Speech by architect Karo Alabian, *Pravda*, 20 June 1937, p. 4.

**3.** F. L. Wright (1943), p. 544. Perhaps architect David E. Arkin did the translation. Wright believed Arkin was the “editor of *Pravda*,” but he was in fact an academic and architectural critic who may have written for *Pravda* but was founding editor of *Architecture of the USSR*.

**4.** See, e.g., F. L. Wright (1943), p. 437.

**5.** Wright’s closest friend in Moscow according to Starr (1978), p. 223, and his personal interpreter according to F. L. Wright (1943), p. 544.

**6.** *Ibid.*, last paragraph. The number of errors in just part of the paragraph about his speech is amazing; for a sample see Johnson (1987a), p. 70.

**7.** F. L. Wright (1937a); translation by Donald Leslie Johnson and Sonya Hasselberg-Johnson. There is a typescript in the Library of Congress as well as some edited typescripts in the FLW Archives. Wright’s prose is difficult at best, with vague allusions and esoteric terminology as well as imprecise grammar. Russian prose is active yet repetitive and, in the 1930s, replete with pet Soviet terms like “social order.” Translation from Wright to Soviet Russian then back to English is dicey business. H. de Fries published a similar apology when he translated Wright’s words into German for his 1926 book.

**8.** F. L. Wright (1943), p. 544.

**9.** “Manuel Sanches-Arcas (Spain),” *Architecture of the USSR*, July–August 1937, pp. 45–56. Wright was not mentioned in the brief preliminary program contained in the May issue of this journal (pp. 2–4), probably because he first refused to travel and then accepted in late May.

**10.** For a literal comparison of the two texts see Johnson (1987a), p. 71.

---

### THEME / London

**1.** Mabel Moran (secretary at Taliesin) to G. Nelson, 8 July 1937, and E. Masselink to Nelson, 12 July 1937, copies in FLW Archives.

**2.** Discussed in my “Frank Lloyd Wright versus Hollywood” (manuscript in preparation).

3. H. Myers to FLW, 27 November 1936, in F. L. Wright (1984); Nelson to FLW, 17 February 1937, and Nelson to Masselink, 26 April 1937, FLW Archives.
4. Nelson to Masselink, 11 May 1937, FLW Archives.
5. Myers to FLW, 28 July 1937, and FLW to Myers, 31 July 1937, both in F. L. Wright (1984).
6. The issue was ready to distribute on about 10 January 1938: Myers to FLW, 11 January 1938, in F. L. Wright (1984); FLW to Nelson, 7 June 1937; and correspondence of April 1937 through March 1938 passim, FLW Archives.
7. Myers to FLW, 23 January 1940, in F. L. Wright (1984).

### 19 Interest and Preparation

1. Angela Mace, Archivist, RIBA Archives, to Donald Leslie Johnson, 22 April 1982.
2. R. C. Lindsay, British Embassy, Washington, D.C., to FLW, 19 March 1938; Wright accepted by return mail on 29 March (FLW Archives). Wright stated incorrectly that the invitation came “by way of the British Ambassador to the United States” in April 1939 (F. L. Wright 1943, p. 534; repeated in F. L. Wright 1977, p. 561).
3. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 534. This part of his autobiography about relations with the Sulgrave Manor is probably correct.
4. Wright confirmed the fee of \$US 2500 (F. L. Wright 1943, p. 353).
5. Letter, “Spencer” (whoever that may have been at Sulgrave) to FLW, 10 June 1938, FLW Archives; and F. L. Wright (1943), p. 535. See also Margaret Richardson, “The RIBA Building,” *Architectural Design*, 49, nos. 10–11 (1979), pp. 60–69.
6. Seckel (1938), pp. 61–63, written for a general audience.
7. Elizabeth Kassler (who had been researching Fellowship membership) to Donald Leslie Johnson, 29 October 1980; and Sergeant (1976), Appendix E. Marya Lilien was sponsored by Wright when she needed to leave Poland in front of the Nazi armies; see note preceeding the letter from FLW to the Consul General, Warsaw, 11 October 1938, in F. L. Wright (1982), p. 40.
8. See, e.g., Bruce Brooks Pfeiffer, “Frank Lloyd Wright: His Life, His Work, His Words,” in Izzo and Gubitosi (1981); Storrer (1978); and Zevi (1980).
9. Gloag (1935a), p. 16.
10. As recalled in a letter, Gloag to FLW, 18 April 1956 (FLW Archives), at a time when Gloag’s son lived in Prairie View, Illinois.
11. The essay was first published as an article in *The New Yorker*, 6 (29 July 1930), pp. 22–25.
12. Gloag (1935b), p. 1.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
14. Gloag (1935c), p. 202.
15. Hastings (1929), p. v.
16. Williams-Ellis (1934), p. 179. Williams-Ellis’s unhappiness also reflected his concern for the English environment, first raised in a book of 1927, *England and the Octopus*, which helped inspire a renewed conservation movement.



- 17.** Gloag (1934), p. 187.
- 18.** Gropius to Tomás Maldonado as quoted in Naylor (1986), p. 174; Loos as translated in “Basic Principles,” *Architectural Review*, 76 (October 1934), p. 151. See also Jackson (1970), pp. 54–56. For a sampling of what was actually built, see “Britain in the Thirties,” *Architectural Design*, 49, nos. 10–11 (1979), pp. 296ff.
- 19.** *The Studio* (London), 105 (April 1933), pp. 249–256.
- 20.** Hitchcock (1928a), introduction; and see Lewis Mumford’s review of the pamphlet (reprinted here as Appendix A).
- 21.** P. Morton Shand, “Scenario for a Human Drama. VI. La Machine-a-Habiter to the House of Character,” *Architectural Review*, 77 (February 1935), p. 62. For Oud’s views see J. J. P. Oud, “Der einfluss von Frank Lloyd Wright auf die architektur Europas,” *Bauhausbücher*, 10 (1926), pp. 77–83; and cf. J. J. P. Oud, “Wp-yw Franka Wright’s na architektura Europejska,” (FLW’s Influence on European Architecture), *Architektura i Budownictwo* (Warsaw), 9, no. 6 (1933), pp. 188–189. On Shand see Jackson (1970), pp. 29ff; and John Betjemen, “P. Morton Shand,” *Architectural Review*, 128 (November 1968), pp. 325–328. Some of Shand’s articles from the series were reprinted with slight alterations in *Architectural Association Journal*, 75 (January 1959), pp. 158–183. See also John R. H. McDonald, *Modern Housing* (London 1931).
- 22.** Willett (1978), p. 127.
- 23.** Graeff (1975). Nineteen architects were invited by Mies, who was chosen to lead the Werkbund in 1926; the exhibition had been proposed in 1925. See Campbell (1978), esp. chapter 7; Schulze (1985), pp. 131–134; and the contemporary observation of Kurt Schwitters, “Stuttgart, ‘The Dwelling, Werkbund,’” as translated by S. Frank, *Oppositions*, Winter 1976, pp. 80–83. On Graeff see Schulze (1985), pp. 106ff; and Wingler (1968), pp. 284, 375.
- 24.** Graeff (1975), p. 153.
- 25.** Willett (1978), p. 124.
- 26.** Frampton (1980), p. 169; see also Searing (1983) pp. 170–177; and cf. Donald Langmead, “English Language Sources on Dutch Modern Architecture 1900–1940: Monographs Not by Dutch Authors,” *Vance Bibliographies, Architecture Series EA1671* (Monticello, Ill., 1986), introduction.
- 27.** Graeff (1975), p. 153.
- 28.** Herbert (1969), p. 14, quoted with his kind permission.
- 29.** Fishman (1977), p. 160. For later conscriptive schemes see Mary McLeod, “Le Corbusier and Algiers,” *Oppositions*, 19–20 (Winter 1980), pp. 54–85. McLeod points to the “naive deception” that aesthetic good equals social good, naively assuming, one supposes, that the reverse is correct. Cf. Reiner (1963), pp. 71ff.
- 30.** Fishman (1977), p. 160. See also Brian Hoonigan’s review of Fishman in the *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 37 (December 1978), pp. 299–300.
- 31.** F. L. Wright (1932e), pp. 348–349.
- 32.** F. L. Wright (1935a), p. 116; and letter, Masselink to Hastings, 10 January 1935, FLW Archives.
- 33.** *Architectural Review*, 81 (March 1937), pp. 99–100, written before Wright left for Moscow.

- 34.** Cf. F. L. Wright (1932a), pp. 334–344; altered in F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 353–357. In F. L. Wright (1977), the AIA is implicated against Wright (pp. 377–379).
- 35.** Frank Lloyd Wright, “The Chicago World Fair,” *Architect’s Journal*, 81 (13 July 1933), pp. 45–47.
- 36.** Robertson (1931), p. 62. See also Robertson’s book *Modern Architectural Design* (London, 1931); one “W. G.” (perhaps) said that Robertson “does not dart off into rhapsody, epigrams, or daring theories as so many continental architects are apt to do, but sticks calmly to the practical facts of the present day and recalls or suggests the principles by which the material difficulties of our period may be overcome. He finds the essence of modern architecture in a revived sense of orderliness, and as one of the first pronouncements of a practising English architect on new development, his book has a special interest” (*Studio*, 105 [January 1933], p. 59). The book and review are indicative of the response by a majority of British architects (and their clients) to the vigor of European proselytizing.
- 37.** Bull (1931), p. 540; and F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 357, 363.
- 38.** Hitchcock (1937), p. 2.
- 39.** *Architectural Review*, 87 (September 1937), p. 144.
- 40.** Ibid, p. 222. See also “Correspondence,” *Architectural Review*, 87 (November 1937), p. 221.
- 41.** Robertson (1931), p. 63.
- 42.** Cf. Hastings (1929); he was the newly appointed editor of *The Architectural Review*.
- 43.** Johnson (1980b).
- 44.** O. L. Wright (1966), p. 16; and cf. Barney (1965).
- 45.** “A Summer School of Town Planning,” *Architects’ Journal*, 78 (13 July 1933), p. 36.
- 46.** Harrison (1981), p. 252.
- 47.** Stuart Samuels, “The Left Book Club,” in Walter Laqueur and George L. Mosse, ed., *The Left-Wing Intellectuals Between the Wars 1919–1939* (New York, 1966).

## **20 To London**

- 1.** *RIBA Journal* (1938), p. 1.
- 2.** Cable, FLW to Sulgrave, 16 October 1938, FLW Archives, where FLW states that “unexpected delays on three buildings” forced him to cancel or postpone his engagement. On 17 October 1938 FLW agreed by cable (FLW Archives) to early May 1939. Cf. cable, Sulgrave to FLW, 20 July 1938 and subsequent letters, FLW Archives.
- 3.** FLW to L. Spivey, 18 April 1939; Eugene Masselink to Sulgrave, 1 May 1939; FLW Archives.
- 4.** Gloag to FLW, 10 March 1939, FLW Archives. Various letters of invitation and response are in FLW Archives along with an annotated proposed schedule.
- 5.** “Mr. Frank Lloyd Wright at the A.A.,” *Architectural Association Journal*, 54 (May 1939), pp. 268–269.
- 6.** “Frank Lloyd Wright,” *The Builder*, 156 (28 April 1939), p. 789.
- 7.** F. L. Wright (1943), p. 537; F. L. Wright (1977), p. 564.
- 8.** F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 536–537, his emphasis; altered in F. L. Wright (1977), pp. 563–564.

9. *The Times*, 8 May 1939, p. 20. It should be mentioned that the TECTON architecture group had just published their *Planned, A.R.P.* (London 1939), i.e., air raid precaution.

10. *Spectator*, May 1939, p. 738.

11. “American Architect Looks at England,” *The Observer*, 7 May 1939, p. 11.

12. Pevsner (1939); Fry (1939).

13. *Architectural Association Journal*, 54 (May 1939), p. 269.

14. “Exhibition at Building Centre,” *The Builder*, 156 (8 May 1939), p. 858; and “Mr. Frank Lloyd Wright’s Drawings at the A.A.,” *The Builder*, 156 (26 May 1939), p. 953; and exhibit catalogue in FLW Archives.

15. E.g., George Herrick, “A Functional Office Building, U.S.A.,” *The Builder*, 156 (8 May 1939), pp. 857–858; and the proposal of Johnson Wax Building was contained in “Office Building in Wisconsin,” *Architects’ Journal*, 85 (18 February 1937), p. 289; and “Administration Building. . .,” *Architectural Design and Construction*, 9 (June 1939), pp. 232–233; and many of the articles noted here for 1937–39, all in England.

The best contemporary publication was a small pamphlet, “A new house on Bear Run, Pennsylvania,” prepared by John McAndrew for his exhibition of the Fallingwater House at the Museum of Modern Art in 1938. Some of its illustrations are reprinted together with many other contemporary and new photographs and drawings in Hoffman (1978); and see also Zevi and Kaufmann (1962).

16. “Frank Lloyd Wright Architecture Club dinner,” *The Builder*, 156 (5 May 1939), p. 855; and cf. *Builder* (1939).

17. “Frank Lloyd Wright,” *Architects’ Journal*, 84 (11 May 1939), p. 757 (their emphasis).

18. “Murus,” “Frank and Free,” *The Builder*, 156 (12 May 1939), p. 890.

19. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 352.

20. Discussed in my “Frank Lloyd Wright versus Hollywood” (manuscript in preparation); see also F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 260ff.; Twombly (1979), pp. 191–192; Gill (1987), p. 131; Sergeant (1976), Appendixes E and F; and Ben Hecht, *Charlie* (New York, 1957).

21. “Frank Lloyd Wright,” *RIBA Journal*, 46 (22 May 1939), p. 700.

22. “Frank Lloyd Wright,” *Architects’ Journal*, 84 (11 May 1939), p. 757.

23. Edward J. Carter, foreword to F. L. Wright (1939b).

24. “Tributes to Bobby Carter from his friends,” *Architectural Association Quarterly*, 4 (1982), pp. 68–69.

25. Reginald Isaacs, “Gropius at/in Harvard,” *bauhaus archive* (Berlin, 1983), p. 12.

26. *Architects’ Journal*, 84 (11 May 1939), p. 757.

27. Nott (1969), p. 138.

28. Lionel Brett, “Influence in This Country,” *The Listener*, 36 (12 December 1946), p. 838, part 2 of “Work and Theories of Frank Lloyd Wright” in the same issue.

## 21 Reaction

1. *The Builder*, v. 156. “Organic Architecture. Mr. Lloyd Wright’s First Watson Lecture. 1.—The Philosophy of That Architecture” (5 May 1939, p. 586); “. . . 2.—Organic Architecture—The Movement” (12 May 1939, pp. 907–909); “. . . 3.—The Practical Applications To-Date” (19 May 1939, pp. 951–954); and “. . . 4.—Exemplars and

Technique” (19 May 1939, p. 954). Not all questions at the lectures and their answers were published. See also F. L. Wright (1939b), where the illustrations are probably those from the U.I.A./London Building Centre exhibition; they are Taliesin, the Kaufman house, the Ardmore four-family house (1939), the Jacobs house (1937), the Johnson building, and Taliesin West. For an example of autobiographical license about the book and events in London see (and compare) F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 535–537, with alterations in F. L. Wright (1977), pp. 561–564.

2. “Frank Lloyd Wright,” *Focus*, Summer 1939, p. 49; my emphasis.
3. *RIBA Journal*, 47 (20 November 1939), p. 17.
4. *RIBA Journal*, 47 (11 December 1939), p. 44.
5. *RIBA Journal*, 47 (15 January 1940), p. 65.
6. *RIBA Journal*, 46 (16 October 1939), p. 1005; *Architectural Review*, 86 (November 1939), pp. 228–229.
7. F. L. Wright (1939b), p. vii.
8. Gutheim (1941), p. 265. It is difficult to know for certain if this was a prewritten lecture or a text prepared from notes taken at a lecture. It does wander to many subjects. In October 1939 Wright accepted the chairmanship of the Advisory Committee to the Art Department of Hull House; see letter from Hull House to FLW, 24 October 1939, FLW archives.
9. See the excellent book by Coe and Reading (1981).
10. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 364.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 414.
12. *Time*, 32 (November 1938), p. 37.
13. FLW to Spivey, 16 June 1939, FLW Archives.
14. Gutheim (1941), p. 265.
15. See “Frank . . .,” *Architectural Forum*, 67 (August 1937), p. 10, probably extracted from the same Taliesin press release published in *Architectural Record* and *Soviet Russia Today* of the same year.
16. Nott (1969), p. 139.
17. Pevsner (1939), p. 731.
18. Cf. letters between FLW and Gloag, 1940–41, FLW Archives.
19. FLW to Ashbee, 11 May 1939, in Alan Crawford, “Ten Letters from Frank Lloyd Wright to Charles Robert Ashbee,” *Architectural History*, 13 (1970), p. 71.
20. Giedion to FLW, 23 September 1938, FLW Archives.
21. Giedion (1956), p. 421.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 424, 492.

---

THEME / **Gold**

1. R. C. Lindsay (probably associated with Sulgrave Manor) to FLW, 4 April 1938, FLW Archives.
2. R. C. Lindsay to FLW, 17 May 1938, FLW Archives.

**22 Royal Gold**

1. Information in the form of a contemporary note, no date, supplied by RIBA Archive for this and the previous paragraph.
2. Minute, RIBA Royal Gold Medal Committee, 17 October 1940, RIBA Archive.
3. "The RIBA Council 1940–41," *RIBA Journal*, 47 (15 July 1940), p. 222.
4. Lionel Esher, *A Broken Wave* (London, 1981), pp. 20–21.
5. Minute, RIBA Royal Gold Medal Committee, 17 October 1940, RIBA Archive.
6. *The Observer*, 7 May 1939, pp. 15ff for route and expectations as relayed to the British public.
7. Cf. "Architecture in the U.S.S.R.," *RIBA Journal*, 48 (September 1941), pp. 150, 155–158.
8. As quoted in Jackson (1970), p. 54.
9. Coe and Reading (1981), p. 12.
10. Dannatt (1959), p. 17.
11. Esher, *A Broken Wave*, pp. 16–25.
12. Howard Robertson, "Domestic Architecture and the Second Great War," *Decorative Art*, 1940, p. 17.
13. Minute, RIBA Royal Gold Medal Committee, 17 October 1940, RIBA Archive.
14. Letter, Secretary of RIBA to The Keeper, 19 December 1940, copy in RIBA Archive.
15. Edward R. Murrow, "Introducing America," *The Listener*, 25 (16 January 1941), pp. 71ff.
16. Charles H. Reilly, "Modern Movements in Architecture," *The Listener*, 25 (20 March 1941), pp. 399–401.
17. His autobiographical account of the 1939 London trip and later RIBA award is riddled with confusion and error (F. L. Wright 1943, pp. 534–538). Some of the errors are noted elsewhere; others are: the book of the Watson lectures was not titled *Frank Lloyd Wright*; a copy of his book did not take more than a year to reach him after its release; "Carter" was not secretary of the RIBA; Wright did not become an "honorary member" of the RIBA, nor was his honorary corresponding membership conferred before he went to London in 1939. Gill (1987), p. 405, uses the autobiography in his few notes.
18. Ian MacAlister (Secretary, RIBA) to FLW, 4 November 1940, copy in RIBA Archive. A copy in the FLW Archives is not original but a typed transcription.
19. Cablegram, FLW to MacAlister, RIBA, 17 December 1940, RIBA Archive. Mysteriously that sentence is not reproduced in the version in F. L. Wright (1943), p. 536, or in F. L. Wright (1977), p. 563. The FLW Archives copy is a typescript and the last sentence reads differently: ". . . such a culture can never lose."
20. "Elections: February 1941," *RIBA Journal*, 48 (18 November 1940), p. 17; and "Membership Lists," *RIBA Journal*, 48 (10 February 1941), p. 71.
21. His election was confirmed in a letter, RIBA to FLW, 6 February 1941, FLW Archives.
22. Secretary, RIBA, to FLW, 31 December 1940, copy in RIBA Archive.
23. Secretary, RIBA, to Minister of Information, 31 December 1940, copy in RIBA Archive. Wright may have been advised to listen to the traditional New Year broadcast of honors, or Royal favors. On learning of the award, John Gloag sat down that evening and wrote a note of congratulations (1 January 1941, in F. L. Wright 1984, p. 208).

- 24.** The reply is extant: H. V. Johnson (American Embassy) to MacAlister, RIBA, 2 January 1941, RIBA Archive.
- 25.** Letter, Windsor Castle (sic) to FLW, 20 December 1940, as reported in F. L. Wright (1984), p. 204.
- 26.** MacAlister, RIBA, to FLW, 17 June 1941, copy in RIBA Archive, original in FLW Archives.
- 27.** D. Colles (Secretary of the Privy Purse) to Secretary, RIBA, 21 July 1941, RIBA Archive.
- 28.** As reported in a RIBA Executive Committee minute, 30 December 1946, RIBA Archive.
- 29.** “The Royal Gold Medal,” *RIBA Journal*, 54 (February 1947), p. 217.
- 30.** “The Royal Gold Medal 1945,” *RIBA Journal*, 52 (January 1945), p. 81; see also “Academician Victor Vesnin,” *ibid.*, 51 (December 1944), p. 29.
- 31.** “Royal Gold Medal,” *RIBA Journal*, 52 (July 1945), p. 277.
- 32.** “Building Problems in the U.S.S.R.,” *RIBA Journal*, 52 (June 1945), p. 24.
- 33.** “Presentation of Royal Gold Medals,” *RIBA Journal*, 54 (March 1947), p. 245.
- 34.** FLW to C. D. Sprigg (at RIBA), 21 July 1947, in F. L. Wright (1984), p. 209.
- 35.** J. L. Wright (1960), p. 4. See Twombly (1979) for other awards that Wright began to receive in the 1930s.
- 36.** “Mr FLW,” *RIBA Journal*, 57 (August 1950), p. 373.

### **23 A Touching Affair**

- 1.** F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 537–538.
- 2.** FLW to Gloag, 1 October 1938, copy in FLW Archives.
- 3.** “From Frank Lloyd Wright,” *Christian Century*, 13 November 1940, p. 1420.
- 4.** See Twombly (1979), pp. 218–221.
- 5.** Telegram, Robert Waithman (New York correspondent, *News-Chronicle*), to FLW, 21 January 1941, and telegram collect, FLW to Robert Waithman, 22 January 1941; FLW Archives. Both F. L. Wright (1943), p. 538, and F. L. Wright (1977), p. 565, erroneously state that he was asked in 1942.
- 6.** Letter, E. Masselink to Waithman, 25 January 1941, copy in FLW Archives. On the same day Wright sent copies of the cable (slightly altered) and his article to Gutheim asking him to include it in the new book, but entries in the book ended with 1939. Letter, FLW to Gutheim, 25 January 1941, copy in FLW Archives.
- 7.** F. L. Wright (1941a); F. L. Wright (1941b); F. L. Wright (1943), pp. 538–539; F. L. Wright (1977), pp. 565–567. The *Square-Paper* version mentions a cable from London reporting on the article’s reception, implying that the first *Square-Paper* was not published until early March.
- 8.** F. L. Wright (1941b), p. 4.
- 9.** F. L. Wright (1941a), p. 4.
- 10.** MS copy prepared by the Tax Relief Association of California, Willcox Papers.
- 11.** E.g. especially March (1981) and Sergeant (1976).
- 12.** As reported in “Wright over London,” *Architectural Forum*, 75 (August 1941), suppl. p. 68. *Architectural Forum* also reported that Wright’s article was received with “waspish criticism,” its information presumably coming from Wright.
- 13.** F. L. Wright (1941b).

14. Waithman to FLW, 31 March 1941, FLW Archives.
15. *News-Chronicle*, 25 February 1941, p. 4.
16. Ibid. (letter from B. A. Gross).
17. Letter to Editor, copy in FLW Archives.
18. “Architects’ Chief Wants Colourful New London,” *News-Chronicle*, 31 March 1941, p. 5.
19. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 539. Altered in F. L. Wright (1977), p. 567, to read as a question: “a touching affair—that check?”; and a new sentence immediately followed: “And how involved and far beyond in its significance anything I had to offer.” Again, anyone’s guess for a meaning.

#### **24 AIA Gold**

1. FLW to T. A. Hughes, 22 January 1945, in F. L. Wright (1984), pp. 208–209.
2. This and the previous paragraph paraphrased and quoted from Wilson (1984), pp. 28–29.
3. FLW to D. W. Orr, 15 January 1949, in F. L. Wright (1984), p. 217.
4. Wilson (1984), p. 29; see also Henry H. Saylor, *The A.I.A.’s First Hundred Years* (Washington, D.C., 1957), p. 155; and Meehan (1987), pp. 219–229.

---

#### THEME / **The Closing**

1. Saylor (1930), introduction.
2. Ibid., pp. 327–329.

#### **25 Talent and Work**

1. As paraphrased in Wilson (1971), p. 403.
2. The outline of Gurdjieff’s philosophy and methodology was kindly prepared by Alan Flashtig.
3. Nott (1961), p. 84.
4. This paragraph paraphrased and quoted from Wilson (1971), pp. 393–394; see also Gurdjieff (1969).
5. F. L. Wright (1932e), p. 349.
6. F. L. Wright (1932a), p. 366; F. L. Wright (1943), p. 370.
7. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 510.
8. G. Loeb to FLW, 3 May 1949, FLW Archives.
9. Meehan (1987), pp. 17–19.
10. The “red menace” in relation to Wright is outlined in my “Frank Lloyd Wright versus Hollywood” (manuscript in preparation).
11. Pfeiffer (1988), p. 45, part of a story of how Gurdjieff cured Wright’s gall bladder trouble.
12. Pfeiffer and Nordland (1988), p. 175; cf. p. 171 re Cornelia Schneider.

**26 The Soviets**

1. Whittick (1956), pp. 71–72; and Saint (1983), pp. 132–136.
2. Nevins and Hill (1957), p. 673.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, p. 683.
5. Hildebrand (1974), p. 129.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 128ff; Nelson (1939); Handlin (1985), pp. 207–211; and *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects* (New York, 1982), pp. 535–537.
7. Hildebrand (1974), p. 128.
8. Wegg (1970), p. 50.
9. Gutheim (1941), p. 143.
10. “Wright, American Architect, Gives His Impressions . . .,” *Moscow Daily News*, 28 June 1937, p. 4; and “An American Architect’s Impression of USSR,” *Moscow News*, 7 July 1937, p. 10. On 29 June 1937 Wright attended a final reception; see “Visiting Architects Given Reception,” *Moscow Daily News*, 20 June 1937, p. 1.
11. F. L. Wright (1937c), p. 59.
12. F. L. Wright (1937b), p. 15; and compare F. L. Wright (1939b), pp. 29–31 and FLW to Thomas Creighton, 10 January 1953. Also see FLW to Hitchcock, 18 February 1953, in F. L. Wright (1984).
13. F. L. Wright (1937b), p. 18.
14. F. L. Wright (1939a), p. 21. The question and answer part of the article is also in “Frank Lloyd Wright Again,” *Architect and Engineer*, March 1939, p. 4. See also F. L. Wright (1939b), pp. 29–31.
15. F. L. Wright (1939a), p. 23. For other views from 1937–39, always in the same vein, see Twombly (1979), pp. 293–296.
16. As quoted in Twombly (1979), pp. 216–220.
17. August Derleth, *The Wisconsin* (New York, 1942), pp. 208–209, and Derleth (1940), pp. 221–222.
18. FLW to G. Loeb, 22 December 1943, FLW Archives. See also Twombly (1979), pp. 294–298.
19. FLW to Hilla Rebay, 28 February 1949, in F. L. Wright (1986a), p. 120.
20. Telegram, Verlinsky (also head of Amkino Corp.) to FLW, 12 October 1937, and related correspondence, FLW Archives.
21. Sillen to FLW, 9 March 1938, FLW Archives.
22. *New Masses*, 26 (15 March 1938), pp. 28–31.
23. This outline of post-Moscow events is based on a study of pertinent documents in FLW Archives; see also Twombly (1979), pp. 292–293.
24. Kazin (1943), p. 173.
25. In Wright’s London lectures and reprinted in part in “Excerpt from London Lectures,” *New Directions in Prose and Poetry* (New York, 1940), p. 266, one editor of which was Edgar Kaufmann, Jr.
26. F. L. Wright (1914), p. 408.



**27 The U.S. Government**

1. FLW To Mrs. Roosevelt, 12 July 1935, copy in FLW Archives.
2. As quoted in Myhra (1974), p. 177.
3. All statements taken from *ibid.*, pp. 177–187.
4. Cady (1970), p. 313 and chapter 11. See also Christensen (1977), chapter 6; Grabow (1977), p. 118; Sergeant (1976), p. 136.
5. F. L. Wright (1948), p. 80.
6. Perhaps October 1941 rather than August. Wright's long response to Foreman's invitation is dated 17 October 1941 (copy in FLW Archives).
7. Letter, FLW to Wegg, 8 November 1941, copy in FLW Archives.
8. The story is digested from Wegg (1970), with many thanks to the AIA and BPI Communications Inc., for permission to quote. Wright's brief recollection is quoted in Pfeiffer (1985b), plate 28a.
9. Pfeiffer (1988), p. 22.
10. Cf. F. L. Wright (1948), pp. 80–81; and cf. description plate 28a in Pfeiffer (1985b). On Ardmore problems see the letter to the editor from J. V. Esposito (Chair, Neighbor's Committee), *Architectural Forum*, 71 (December 1939), p. 26; and from Vernon Harrison, *ibid.*, 71 (November 1939), p. 82.
11. Wegg (1970), p. 52. See also Pfeiffer (1986), plates 128–134, which are dated 1938 or 1939 or 1940.
12. The history of Wright's Quadruple Homes and Quadruple Block Plan is complex, covering sixty years; I am studying it for a book manuscript in preparation. See "Usonia comes to Ardmore," *Architectural Forum*, 71 (August 1939), pp. 36, 142–143; and Sergeant (1976), pp. 72–75.
13. "USHA's Research Produces . . .," *Architectural Forum*, 72 (May 1940), pp. 372–373. Cf. Harwell Hamilton Harris, "The Highway Hotel," *ibid.*, 72 (October 1940), p. 248.
14. As recorded in Gill (1987), pp. 416–417, based on unpublished memoirs of Carleton Smith.
15. See Sergeant (1976), p. 201, for petition and signatories.
16. Einstein to E. Mendelsohn, March 1943, as translated by Mendelsohn, FLW Archives.
17. FLW to Gropius, 6 February 1943, copy in FLW Archives.
18. F. L. Wright (1948), pp. 79–84; Sergeant (1976), pp. 72–81; Priscilla J. Henken, "A 'Broad-acre' Project," *Town and County Planning* (London), June 1954, pp. 294–300; and David and Priscilla Henken, *Realizations of Usonia* (Westchester, 1985).
19. Gill (1987), pp. 413–414. See also David Guise, "Preservation: Price Tower Vacant," *Progressive Architecture*, April 1989, pp. 21, 26. To Gill's charge that Wright was numerically incompetent (p. 414), 2,100 cars end to end equals a length of eight miles, and of course it would take only twenty minutes to inject or eject those cars from a properly designed garage. Gill's credentials for competency in architectural matters remain unspecified.

**28 Rededication**

1. "Vincent Scully," interview, *Domus*, 665 (October 1985), p. 22.
2. As quoted in Art Peterson, "Architecture and the Tradition of Symbolism in Northwest Art: The View from

Cold Mountain," *Column*, 5 (1988), p. 16.

3. These last three paragraphs are based on Pérez-Gómez (1983), especially pp. 5–7, 263, but the entire book is commended.
4. F. L. Wright (1943), p. 260.
5. Blodgett (1985), esp. pp. 626–629.

## 29 A Sad Ending

1. Letter, FLW to Lindbergh, 24 May 1940, copy in FLW Archives; and see Gill (1987), pp. 402–405.
2. Nott (1969), p. 155; and cf. Sweeney (1978), pp. 248–249.
3. F. L. Wright (1941c), p. 4.
4. I explore Wright's use of the square in "Frank Lloyd Wright versus the City: Architectural and City Planning Theory to 1913" (manuscript in preparation).
5. Letter, Mumford to FLW, 30 May 1941, copy in FLW Archives along with a copy of Mumford's newspaper article (penciled date of "6.14.41").
6. Letter, FLW to Mumford, 3 June 1941, FLW Archives, draft copy only; a copy is reprinted in F. L. Wright (1984), pp. 146–148.

The parting of ways for Mumford and Wright was a sad turn indeed. It is not known if Wright's response to the open letter of 1941 reached Mumford, but one must assume so. Publicly Wright got a parthian shot. In a review of Mumford's Dancy Lectures for Alabama College published as *The South in Architecture* (New York, 1941), Wright found Mumford wrong on most counts and ended on a most inappropriate note: "With Lewis we are indeed back to . . . the imperative need of throwing the lives of American boys at Hitler—at once. Blood, sweat, and tears have been promised to the British lads by Churchill. He is keeping his promise. Lewis Mumford now promises all these to us" (Wright, "Mumford Lectures," *The Saturday Review*, 24 [23 August 1941], p. 16). Mumford's son Geddes died during the course of the war. There was an awkward reconciliation after the war, as revealed in letters of 1951–58 (see FLW Archives and F. L. Wright 1984, pp. 148–152).

