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Danilo Udovički-Selb reshapes long-held interpretations in *Between Modernism and Socialist Realism: Soviet Architectural Culture under Stalin’s Revolution from Above, 1928–1938*. He shows that the contested terrain of modernity was claimed by both Stalin and the avant-garde and that the impact of the Soviet architectural revolution of the 1920s endured in the most unexpected places. The bombastic Palace of the Soviets contains references to the work of Kazimir Malevich; Viktor Vesnin was elected to the Supreme Soviet in 1936; support for Constructivism was voiced publicly as late as 1937; and Moisej Ginzburg played a hide-and-seek game with the censor on the secluded parts of his 1938 Caucasus sanatorium, where clear allusions to modernist works of the previous decade are visible.

Kimberley Skelton argues that English patrons and architects radically rethought practices of hospitality and the architecture of the country house in response to the unprecedented political, social, and religious conditions that followed the Civil War of the 1640s. In *Redefining Hospitality: The Leisured World of the 1650s English Country House*, she shows that as those of high rank became less concerned with demonstrating their public responsibility, they turned from the display of hospitality for all guests to showcasing the entertainment of their elite friends. The architect John Webb pioneered a house plan type that embodied this shift: in place of interiors firmly divided into rooms designed for multiclass social gatherings, he opened vistas that evoked and served the recreational activities of the elite. These enfilades would remain important through the 1930s.

The Universities’ Mission to Central Africa (UMCA) was among the most progressive and highly motivated of Britain’s nineteenth-century religious organizations. Formed in 1861, it was led by Tractarian clergymen who considered correct and dignified architecture to be essential to missionary work. G. Alex Bremner considers the UMCA’s extraordinary architectural output for the first time in *The Architecture of the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa: Developing a Vernacular Tradition in the Anglican Mission Field, 1861–1909*. The mission’s ingenious if uneasy balance between established church custom and radical cultural assimilation, combining High Anglican theology and a vernacular approach in church design, are examined in particular. The article enlarges our understanding of the relationship between social policy and architectural form during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In *Patriotism and Protest: Union Square as Public Space, 1832–1932*, Joanna Merwood-Salisbury argues that although New York City’s Union Square was originally modeled after the secluded residential squares of London, it came to symbolize the political ideals of American democracy just as strongly as the very different landscape of Central Park. During the Civil War the square—named for its location at the “union” of several irregular streets—acquired civic and national prominence as a site for mass political rallies in support of the national Union. The square was remade in 1872 by Frederick Law Olmsted, one of the designers of Central Park, as a place to accommodate demonstration and public gathering. Union Square was the site of the first Labor Day parade in 1882, and large anarchist, socialist, and communist demonstrations were held there in the early twentieth century. The meaning of the square was defined by these manifestations of the democratic process.