The book is rather narrowly focused on a “German intellectual-theological tradition” that produced settlements with a “formal geometric unity” (16). The Ephrata Cloister and the Shakers, for example, are excluded because their settlements lack this geometric unity. Also excluded are utopian communities such as the Oneida Perfectionists and the North American Phalanx, which Lewis apparently considers to be in the mainstream of utopian rather than separatist thought. Within the narrow tradition he defines, Lewis finds rich ground. The book is well written and well researched, providing extensive detail as well as revealing illustrations.

Lewis begins with the ideal city of the Bible, the “central fact” of which, he says, is “its squareness” (19). Quoting at length from the Christian scriptures, he cites several examples that establish this theme of sacred squareness” (23). Moving next to the Renaissance, he discusses Thomas More’s Utopia and Filarete’s Sforzinda. More important for his argument, however, is Albrecht Dürer’s Comprehensive Treatise on the Fortification of Cities, Castles and Towns. This work details an ideal square city and was “the first to render the sacred square city of scripture in terms of real architecture” (55). With this city, Lewis argues, “Protestant city planning may be said to have begun” (54).

The core of Lewis’s book is a series of chapters describing settlements in Germany and the New World that meet his definition of a “city of refuge.” Some are the ideal cities of treatises, others are actual communities. We first visit Freudenstadt in Swabia, “the first formally planned city of refuge” (57), founded in 1598 to attract Protestants from Austria, victims of the Counter-Reformation. Lewis argues that in designing Freudenstadt, Heinrich Schickhardt took his “entire conception” from Dürer (59), creating a square plan with four central gates and an open central square. Along the way we also encounter Johann Valentin Andreae’s Christianopolis, Tommaso Campanella’s City of the Sun, New Haven—according to Lewis, the “first religious sanctuary in the Americas to express its social order through ideal geometry” (78)—Philadelphia, German Huguenot settlements, and Moravian settlements in Germany and America.

The book ends with George Rapp’s first and third towns, Harmony and Economy, each of which gets a lavishly illustrated chapter of its own. Lewis deems them “the most important and influential of all cities of refuge” (131), and he devotes about a third of the book to them. The arc of the Harmony Society is laid out in detail, from its origins in Germany in the 1780s to its dissolution in 1905. The Harmonists’ second town, New Harmony, does not get its own chapter but is discussed in these two, which include a brief digression into Robert Owen and his purchase of the New Harmony site. The architecture and landscape architecture of the towns is covered in detail, making it clear that both participated in “giving architectural expression to his [Rapp’s] theological doctrines” (143). All of these examples, according to Lewis, are sanctuary cities, “orderly, with repeated house types and a regular street plan” (11), and most are square in plan like their biblical forerunners. As example follows example, we see the justice of Lewis’s argument that these constitute a “tradition.”

Among the pleasures of the book are the many colored illustrations, which include plans of ideal and actual cities, plans of communal buildings, and views of built settlements in Europe and America. The richness of illustration greatly enhances the volume.

The one disappointing part of the book is the short final chapter. Although titled “Conclusion,” it is mostly about Robert Owen’s New Harmony and James Silk Buckingham’s plan for a model town. The small part of the chapter actually dedicated to conclusions focuses on the place of these cities of refuge in mainstream socialist thought and how Friedrich Engels used them as examples of the successes of communal living. Lewis claims them as “one of the historical sources for international socialism, surely the single most influential force in the past two centuries” (217). This is a major claim, but surely more could have been said about these complex and fascinating societies. In a book subtitled Separatists and Utopian Town Planning we might well expect the conclusion to say more about town planning and built form. This curious omission leaves the reader vaguely unsatisfied and wondering what to make of all the plans so lovingly described in the preceding chapters. Nonetheless,

Clifton Ellis and Rebecca Ginsburg, eds. Slavery in the City: Architecture and Landscapes of Urban Slavery in North America Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2017, 200 pp., 30 illus. $32.50 (cloth), ISBN 9780813940052

Slavery was a violent, pervasive, and pernicious institution that left a terrible stain on the moral character of the United States, one that has persisted to this day. Many well-intentioned people still believe that slavery’s physical environments were limited to southern rural plantations, but Clifton Ellis and Rebecca Ginsburg’s edited volume Slavery in the City makes clear that slavery was also embedded within urban settings throughout the South and North, in a surprising variety of iterations. Other scholars have addressed urban slavery (myself included, as Ellis and Ginsburg note in their introduction), but our knowledge of its built environments is advanced significantly by this collection of essays, which offers new information from a variety of methodological perspectives. This slim volume provides a much-needed corrective to our limited understanding of the physical and psychological conditions of slavery in the United States. It also informs us that a number of factors, including demographics, directly influenced the shape of urban slavery. Its publication will be of value not only to architectural historians but also to scholars of history, anthropology, and African American studies.

Edward A. Chappell’s chapter constitutes the most ambitious contribution to the book. Retired director of architectural and archaeological research at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Chappell is a preeminent expert on the built environments of Williamsburg and Jamestown. In his chapter, he maps slave spaces in Williamsburg, Annapolis, Baltimore, Charleston, and other southern U.S. cities.
He also compares those communities to Falmouth, Jamaica. Chappell examines what Elizabeth Collins Cromley has called the “food axis”—the pathway of food from the place where it is cooked to the space where it is consumed. In this context, he also interrogates the critical issue of visibility. Did slave owners deliberately minimize the visual presence of slaves, or was the timely presentation of hot victuals via convenient routes more important? Chappell investigates food axes in great detail, but, unfortunately, the book’s illustrations do not always equal the quality of the text. For example, Figure 1 in Chappell’s essay provides twenty-eight building plans on one page measuring only 6 by 9 inches. Although the author’s descriptions are thorough, even architectural historian readers may find it difficult to match his words to such small plans; scholars from other disciplines may find the task even more daunting. A more generous budget for images from the University of Virginia Press would have made this volume more useful.

John Michael Vlach, another well-established scholar, focuses in his chapter on environments of bondage in the North, reminding us that slavery was present in the United States beyond the South. As he points out, the state of New York did not abolish slavery until 1827. Because of the smaller numbers of slaves in the North and because urban sites there have been built over, it is challenging to discern the architectural details of slaves’ accommodations. Consequently, Vlach addresses more rural sites and investigates the psychology of northern slave owners. Did they regard the presence of human chattel and its accompanying housing as a mark of superior social status?

At the beginning of his chapter, volume coeditor Clifton Ellis explains why the records of Maryland’s 1798 Federal Direct Tax, having fortuitously survived, provide a crucial resource. He generously acknowledges other scholars who have guided his interpretation of those records. A demographic analysis of Annapolis is key to Ellis’s essay, but he admits that tax records largely fail to itemize slave dwellings in the city, even though they provide this information for surrounding regions. While the presence of slaves in Annapolis is made apparent by archaeological evidence such as beads and small bells, the related architecture is not indicated in documentary records. Ellis proposes that, unlike the slaves in Charleston, Annapolis’s slaves were housed in low-status spaces such as cellars and garrets; consequently, they were not enumerated in tax records. They were, as others have pointed out, hidden in plain sight.

Gina Haney’s chapter is the volume’s most compelling. Haney utilizes a phenomenological approach—what she calls a “sensorial landscape”—to examine how enslaved people might have experienced daily life in Charleston’s built environments. Bells and drums meant to regulate their movements could terrorize them, but, ironically, also incited feelings of dread among white people, particularly women living alone. Haney investigates how people of color navigated the complex interstices of urban life at night. She argues convincingly that the large number of slaves in the city induced fear among whites, and she notes that this fact is fundamental to an understanding of architectural spaces in Charleston.

In his chapter, Kenneth Hafertepe describes how, unlike Charleston, where much of the urban fabric is preserved, Texas cities have largely erased earlier architectural evidence of slavery. Further, slaves in urban Texas constituted a much smaller portion of the population than did slaves in cities of the Southeast. Hafertepe draws from documentary evidence such as fire insurance maps created by the Sanborn Map Company, bird’s-eye views, photographs, and letters from both white and black inhabitants to study eight Texas sites. He finds that in addition to agricultural work and domestic tasks such as cooking, cleaning, and childcare, many slaves acquired skills in manufacturing and construction. Often, they were hired out by their owners and needed to find their own accommodations, most of which are now gone. The task of investigating urban slavery in Texas is daunting, but Hafertepe ably draws a number of conclusions. Some slave owners, having moved to Texas from other parts of the country, adopted local vernacular house types to shelter their slaves, while others employed building traditions brought from Charleston or New England. The segregation of black slaves from white owners was important, but so too were issues of convenience. As with Chappell’s chapter, more illustrations in Hafertepe’s essay would have enabled a greater understanding of Texas urban slave environments.

Like other contributors to this volume, Charles H. Faulkner employs demographic data, in his case to assess the architecture of urban slavery in Knoxville, Tennessee. He contests a thesis of the 1950s that slaves’ living conditions were more humane in parts of Tennessee than elsewhere. As Faulkner shows, Knoxville created laws regarding slaves and free blacks that were every bit as onerous as those in other states, including the prohibition of unsupervised assembly on Sundays. Because of the erasure of physical evidence, Faulkner’s investigation is limited to only the Blount Mansion and the Perez Dickinson slave quarters. From these sites, he concludes much about the lives of Knoxville’s slaves and free black inhabitants. Archaeological remains such as bones from food sources and buttons and beads from clothing suggest exchanges between Caucasian and African ethnic groups even in West Tennessee.

Lisa Tolbert’s essay, the volume’s last, focuses on temporal and urbanistic information concerning slavery in small towns such as Franklin, Tennessee—less studied than larger cities like Knoxville. Tolbert mines data from an 1850 transcript of the murder trial of a black man named Henry, who in 1850 was charged with the nighttime killing of two white citizens in Franklin. She asserts that court testimony significantly informs our understanding of Upper South slavery and its physical environments. Restrictions on the movements of slaves at night were not always strictly enforced, yet African Americans risked their lives when violations were occasionally punished. As other authors in this volume demonstrate, the proportion of blacks to whites was critical to the uses of urban space. Demographics also limited the ability of slaves and free blacks to create communities in the face of temporal and spatial restrictions. The calculus of profit determined whether African Americans had a greater or lesser degree of freedom of movement. Profit was key to racial control.
Considering how little physical evidence of the presence of slavery remains in most North American cities, *Slavery in the City* makes a significant contribution to our understanding of human bondage in the United States. The small number of illustrations is a troublesome defect, especially for readers not familiar with the conventions of architectural history. However, the range of methodological approaches used by the contributors to this collection opens up opportunities for future scholars at other urban slave sites.

BARBARA BURLISON MOONEY

University of Iowa

**Note**


Fabiola López-Durán

**Eugenics in the Garden: Transatlantic Architecture and the Crafting of Modernity**

Austin: University of Texas Press, 2018, 312 pp., 132 b/w illus. $90 (cloth), ISBN 9781477314951; $29.95 (paper), ISBN 9781477314968

Scholarship on twentieth-century architecture beyond Europe and North America has been adjectivizing modernization for the past several decades. Authors write about incomplete modernization, conservative modernization, and unequal modernization to speak of processes that varied.1 Authors have been adjectivizing modernization for the past several decades. Authors write about incomplete modernization, conservative modernization, and unequal modernization to speak of processes that varied.1 Inequality and exclusion are not side effects of modernization but inherent conditions of its processes. Architectural historians, however, have not been at the forefront of this way of thinking. Much to the contrary, when compared to sociologists, anthropologists, and even art historians, we arrived late to the understanding that gender, race, and ethnicity are fundamental facets of how we narrate (or do not narrate) our histories of modernization.

*Eugenics in the Garden,* by Fabiola López-Durán, marks a significant step toward rectifying this situation. The book traces Le Corbusier’s connection with eugenic concepts developed around the end of the nineteenth century, showing how racist ideas played a role in the transatlantic materialization of Corbusian spatial proposals in Brazil and Argentina. The author gets right to the point: modern architecture as we know it is much closer to white supremacist ideas than we would like to admit.

The book starts and ends in Paris, taking us on a wild ride of more than half a century, from the 1880s to the Vichy Republic of occupied France during World War II. In her introduction, López-Durán reminds us that “race is a social construction that dangerously legitimizes the conviction that inequality is inevitable. This conviction has justified slavery, apartheid, genocide, and its current politically charged forms of segregation and racism” (17). In her next sentence she zeroes in on Le Corbusier, “the genius of modernism,” who, she asserts, “was clearly influenced by theories of evolution and driven by an allegiance to the white race as a superior normative model that crafted not only his doctrine but also the global doctrine and global forms of high modernism” (17). These are strong words that will have a lasting impact in our discipline. But how does López-Durán craft this argument, and what evidence and documentation does she provide to support it? In fact, she provides ample support from primary sources.

In the book’s first chapter, “Practicing Utopia,” López-Durán addresses what she labels the “medicalization of the built environment.” Much has been written about the relationship between medicine and the newborn science of urbanism during the nineteenth century. But what López-Durán examines here is not so much architects writing about medicine as physicians writing about the built environment. The chapter presents a rigorous review of the work of Francis Galton, the creator of the term *eugenics,* which he derived from the Greek word meaning “wellborn.”

In the second chapter, “Paris Goes West,” López-Durán analyzes how Galton’s eugenics went mainstream in France after the foundation, in 1885, of the Musée Social, an institution dedicated to the study of contemporary societal issues. At the turn of the century the Musée Social brought together a prominent group of professionals, including the physicians Adolphe P inard and Louis Landouzy and urbanist Alfred Agache. Architect members of the Musée Social designed urban projects for several Latin American cities, including master plans for Guayaquil, Ecuador (André Bérard, 1913), Buenos Aires and Havana (Jean-Claude Nicolas Forestier, 1924 and 1925, respectively), Rio de Janeiro (Agache, 1929), and Caracas (Maurice Rival, 1935). Latin American scholars have known for a while that the region became a laboratory for ideas still seen as unsuitable for Europe and North America. López-Durán offers abundant documentation to support this claim.

“In Machines for Modern Life,” her third chapter, shows how entrenched and institutionalized eugenics became in Argentina. The creation in 1911 of the Museo Social Argentino was rooted in Galton’s idea of fighting crime with physiognomy, the practice of measuring facial features to predict criminal instincts. López-Durán saves her strongest punch for the fourth and final chapter, “Picturing Evolution.” She begins the chapter by noting that Le Corbusier has been discussed from almost every conceivable angle save that of his professed allegiance to eugenics. Reading her book and seeing the wealth of evidence she presents, one cannot avoid the realization that the architect’s racial beliefs have been overlooked or neglected by many of our most celebrated colleagues. As a discipline we must ask why this has been the case.

It is well known that Le Corbusier used Latin America to test his architectural and ideological beliefs. According to López-Durán, between his “first trip to Latin America in 1929 and his second in 1936, his discourses were centered on the racial and sexual other, the primitive, nature, and death” that he found across the Atlantic (154). Many documents included here shed new light on Le Corbusier’s belief in eugenics as a solution for Latin America. A page from one of his famous sketchbooks contains a drawing of a humble Afro-Brazilian man beside the words “Acheter livre Carrel” (Purchase Carrel’s book)—a reference to the 1935 book *Man, the Unknown* by Alexis Carrel, recipient of the
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