Falls; his aim was to preserve it from development. Calling it The Shire, Yeon spent the rest of his life reshaping this landscape into a series of winding paths, open grassy prairies, and natural glens.

After 1960 Yeon also produced a succession of carefully crafted gallery spaces for the M. H. de Young Memorial Museum and the Legion of Honor museum in San Francisco, the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, and—later and on a smaller scale—the Portland Art Museum. As Treib emphasizes, Yeon, with rarely more than one employee in his office, was as passionately and personally involved in each of these projects as he was in everything else he touched.

While Yeon seems to have taken “only a skeptical view of the idea” of regionalism (171), Treib usefully situates his architectural production within this context in a chapter titled “Regionalism and Regional Modernism.” As Treib notes, during the 1910s a shift toward a regionally inflected modern architecture began to temper the more severe abstraction that Philip Johnson and Henry-Russell Hitchcock called the International Style. In Scandinavia, designers such as Gunnar Asplund and Alvar Aalto began to introduce native building materials and pitched roofs into their work. At the same time, Frank Lloyd Wright’s output and reputation resurfaced. Yeon was undoubtedly influenced by Wright’s use of low, horizontal forms and extended eaves, and by his integration of building and landscape. Likewise, he would have been familiar with the Bay Area houses of William Wurster, which merged modernist and rustic elements borrowed from rural California vernacular traditions with contemporary regionalist features comparable to those used by Belluschi.

If the taut, wood-sheathed volumes of Yeon’s work were interpreted as regionalist modernism, his interiors were more conventional. They lacked the interpenetration and unification of space that characterized houses by Wright or others holding to a purer modernist aesthetic. Yeon’s rooms were typically self-contained and eclectically varied in color and finish. His interiors, in fact, seem indebted to the earlier Arts and Crafts movement, particularly as it appeared on the West Coast. The extravagance, richness, and warmth of Yeon’s precisely crafted wood interiors, while often abstract and geometric in their forms—especially at the Watezk House—exude a passion parallel to that found in works by Charles and Henry Greene, such as in their Thorsen House in Berkeley (1909).

As is all too often the case these days, given production costs and other factors in the publishing world, illustrations of Yeon’s built work are somewhat limited here; had they been included, it might have meant the loss of some of the many plans the book contains. Treib masterfully analyzes these, yet it is sometimes difficult to comprehend what they might have been had they been realized. “In this regard,” Yeon himself lamented in 1968, “architecture is the most unsatisfactory of all the arts because it doesn’t really exist until it is built.” The design of “an original house, tailored to the needs of clients, expressing, let us hope, something of their personality, and fitting to the land and its environment, is a total waste of talents and energies if it is never constructed” (127). In this respect, Yeon experienced more than his share of disappointment.

Nonetheless, Treib’s gracefully written and thoroughly researched account of Yeon’s many achievements is a long overdue and welcome addition to the field of architectural studies. Two and a half decades after his death, this passionate defender of the landscape and culture of the Pacific Northwest is finally being celebrated for his contributions to the place that he himself embraced and celebrated throughout his life.

KEN BREISCH
University of Southern California
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With Reyner Banham’s death in 1988 at age sixty-six, an iconic and complex career in twentieth-century architectural history, theory, and criticism came to an untimely end. Banham’s twelve published books and more than seven hundred articles engage a wide array of fields, including pop art, automotive design, and cultural geography. His career-long emphasis on the relationship of engineering to modern architecture and his professional emergence among postwar London’s artistic avant-garde made him a unique chronicler of the British high-tech movement, and of such related trends and groups as the New Brutalism and Archigram. His much-anticipated monograph on high-tech architecture, however, remained incomplete and unpublished at his death.

In Reyner Banham and the Paradoxes of High Tech, Todd Gannon takes this lacuna as a point of departure. Gannon’s inclusion of Banham’s previously unpublished introduction is a welcome addition to the book, as are his explorations of archival material from the Getty Foundation. The gist, however, is his broader reassessment of Banham’s long-term engagement with postwar British architecture, of which high tech was a peak, and its relationship to mainstream modernism and postmodernism internationally.

Banham seems to be undergoing a slow transformation from major figure within and contributor to a broader field into full-fledged topic of scholarly research. Entries in the literature are numerous, while thorough treatments are few. Nigel Whiteley’s 2002 biography Reyner Banham: Historian of the Immediate Future is an intellectual history that engages and analyzes a range of issues from Banham’s career with erudition, but that format does not allow the focus that Gannon aims for here. Similarly, while A Critic Writes is a valued anthology of Banham’s wit and reportage, Gannon’s research, to say nothing of his analysis or contextualization, underscores the fact that full engagement of Banham’s published texts—let alone his unpublished archival material—is still an ongoing excavation.

Banham’s prominent career and influential writing often create a sense that his position at the intersection of engineering and architecture is a known quantity. An engineer by training, he switched to art history and earned a PhD in the 1950s from London’s Courtauld Institute, working under Nikolaus Pevsner. His dissertation, later revised and published in 1960 as Theory and Design in the First Machine Age, boldly upended the history of modern architecture, asserting that the movement’s claims to functionalism were largely visual conceits, not technical realities. As Gannon’s evaluation of Banham’s
final manuscript emphasizes, the early work established an unwavering premise for Banham’s understanding and advocacy of high-tech architecture and related movements, from the beginning of his career until the very end.

Banham wanted to hold modernism to higher standards of engineering and functionalism than the idea of the International Style—with its aesthetic prejudices, technological ignorance, and latent classicism—would allow. And he especially wanted to rebuke the representational qualities and conventionalism of postmodern architecture, the kind advocated by his own student Charles Jencks in a kind of academic patricide that paralleled that which Banham had once levied against Pevsner.

Thus, Banham championed Alison and Peter Smithson’s Hunstanton School as an exemplar of the New Brutalism. He praised the wild-eyed, iconoclastic, and contingent explorations of Archigram for their serious engagement with issues of infrastructure and adaptability. And he eagerly engaged James Stirling’s work at the Olivetti Headquarters in suburban London, work that he felt manifested illustrative formal elements of the related transitional movement of clip-on architecture. Banham’s Architecture of the Well-Tempered Environment, published in 1969, was not simply a history of building HVAC but also a renewed critique of modernism and its persistent reliance on conventional forms (111, n. 76).

As Norman Foster and Richard Rogers rose to prominence, Banham praised their Reliance Controls Building (with Su Brumwell and Wendy Chessman, operating as Team 4), built in Swindon in 1967 and often called the first high-tech building, and Foster’s Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts in Norwich (1974–78). He touted the Parisian Centre Pompidou (1971–77) by Rogers and Renzo Piano when it debuted and became “the monument of reference by which High Tech Architecture is usually defined” (242). Subsequently, as the preeminent architects associated with high tech matured to produce works such as Foster’s HSBC Building in Hong Kong (1983–85) and Rogers’s Lloyd’s of London Building (1978–86), Banham lauded their completed works with renewed enthusiasm.

Yet a finer-grained analysis of Banham’s writing reveals more mercurial posturing on his part. The paradox of architecture for him was not simply that modernism had failed to illustrate true functionalism. It was that illustrating functionalism at all involved negating it altogether. What Whiteley states in his monograph, Gannon acknowledges and amplifies: form and function were not a synthesis waiting to happen, but one of numerous irresolvable antinomies that Banham was more apt to investigate dialectically than actually resolve.

Banham lamented the New Brutalism’s decay from a rigorous ethical stance to a conventional palette of aesthetic practices, yet he himself was never able to completely abandon the idea that image, not just pure function, defined the New Brutalism, or, for that matter, its successor styles. Nor was he able to stick definitively with a set of defining principles for the movement. The early Banham of the clip-on era might have felt that the Pompidou was only an illustration of functionalism, not its real embodiment. Yet he praised it effusively as “the only monumental building of consequence to go up in Europe in the 1970s” (136, n. 62), and he later cast it as the definitive exemplar of the style’s characteristics and principles. The Banham who had once debated whether the New Brutalism was an ethic or an aesthetic had, for the moment, chosen to accept the latter, at least with regard to the Pompidou. He expressed similar enthusiasm upon the completion of Piano’s IBM Traveling Pavilion (1982; installed in Amsterdam, 1983–86), where the detail involved in connecting structure and skin was “a work of architectural art in its own right . . . an architectural composition richer than many complete buildings” (161). Gannon does not claim to have discovered the reasons for Banham’s changes of view. Rather, he elaborates Banham’s shifts in focus and method as these pertained to key buildings and designs, seeing these as a demonstration of his intellectual complexity. In this context, the freshly uncovered final manuscript demonstrates a surprisingly conventional return to visual and art historical methods, rather than ideologically driven ones, thereby revealing another Banham paradox.

As numerous authors have suggested, Banham’s essays, with all their wit and erudition, are best read in original form rather than through the analysis of others. Yet, because of Banham’s shifting viewpoints and unexpected responses to culture and context, Gannon’s text is instructive, giving us cause to read Banham again with fresh eyes and clearer context when we do.

CHARLES L. ROSENBLUM
Carnegie Mellon University

Notes
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Over the past two decades, the stadium as a building type has undergone a profound transformation. For most of the twentieth century, it was the preserve of builders and engineers far more than of architects. Indeed, the most prolific designer of stadia, not just in those years but perhaps ever, Archibald Leitch, was trained, depending on your historical research, as either a mechanical engineer or a “factory architect.”

In the past century, the stadium generally was regarded as a project of modest architectural but specific commercial ambitions (with some rare, but notable, exceptions). Much has changed recently, owing to circumstances largely exogenous to design per se but central to the powerhouse role that sports play in the economies of cities around the world. In our present moment, a stadium is likely the single largest, most technologically complex, and, perhaps most important, expensive building in
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