

Books

Lisa Reilly

The Invention of Norman Visual Culture: Art, Politics, and Dynastic Ambition

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, 214 pp., 13 color and 47 b/w illus. \$99.99 (cloth), ISBN 9781108738484

The Treaty of Saint-Clair-sur-Epte of 911 settled large territory on the Normans in return for peace and conversion. But Normans roamed elsewhere, including, in particular, to South Italy around the year 1000, where they were mercenaries for the patchwork of warring local rulers. They married local princesses, built fortifications, founded churches, and gradually took over. In 1130 the youngest of the scions of the Hauteville family, Roger II, created the Norman kingdom based in Palermo. In 1066, another Norman, William, conquered England, transforming the course of English history. In *The Invention of Norman Visual Culture*, Lisa Reilly interrogates what these two “Norman” cultures had in common, not in shared visual values as much as in shared approaches to their affirmation of legitimacy and authority through architecture and the visual arts. For William this entailed demonstrating that the throne of England was his rightful inheritance; for Roger II, it meant the “invention” of a new kingdom.

The book is divided into four chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter, an

elegant and sophisticated introduction, establishes the conceptual frame for the author’s engaging in these “two roads” in one book. This is followed by a chapter on the creation of the duchy of Normandy and its primary monuments, the great churches in Caen and the Abbey of Jumièges. Chapter 3 covers the conquest of England, a discussion based on written sources and the narrative account of the Bayeux Tapestry, as well as a review of the new powerful monumentality of several early Norman religious foundations, including Winchester and Durham. Chapter 4 turns to Norman Sicily and focuses on Roger II’s Cappella Palatina in Palermo and the Cathedral of Cefalù, as well as his coronation mantle, now in the Imperial Treasury in Vienna. In her conclusion, Reilly summarizes the primary theme of the volume: the use of art to affirm the right to rule through highly visible monumental structures and textiles made by indigenous laborers (Anglo-Saxons for the tapestry, and Muslim weavers and embroiderers for the mantle). As she states, “In stressing the diversity of each kingdom’s heritage, [these structures and textiles] also place each kingship within the framework of its history, as part of a sequence with parallels to Rome and the Holy Roman Empire as well as other contemporary rulers” (194). Status and authority were expressed through the construction of monumental buildings to vie with those of the Holy Roman Empire or Byzantium. In both England and Sicily, the conceptual significance of the objects was an expression of the importance of the arts as symbols of authority.

Reilly’s combination of textiles with architecture as vehicles for political ideology is an important contribution. These remarkable objects are the centerpieces of her argument for parallel approaches in the two kingdoms, a proposition “pinned in

place” by a consideration of similar themes of hybridity and heterogeneity in a few significant buildings, especially Durham Cathedral and the Cappella Palatina.

This is an idea book, an essay on power and the roles of art and architecture in sustaining and affirming authority. It is ambitious in its scope, and an easy, stimulating read. It also touches a chord today given the keen relevance of multiculturalism, and few historical moments stimulate the imagination as much as the Norman conquests of England and South Italy.

There is much that is rich and fascinating here. There are also areas that might have inflected the author’s interpretation in subtler ways, however, and for this reader these lie mostly with the Italian material. Normans had been in South Italy for well over a century prior to Roger II’s coronation. Beginning early in the eleventh century, Norman control of South Italy entailed the conquest and conversion of Greeks and Muslims and the latinization of their strongholds in Apulia, Basilicata, Campania, and Calabria. By the time of Roger II’s coronation in 1130, the Normans had been building in Sicily for almost fifty years (Troina, Agrigento, Mazara del Vallo, Syracuse, and Catania).

Count Roger I, father of Roger II, is particularly significant. In 1058 this youngest son of the Hauteville family established a court in Mileto, Calabria, on the Via Popilia, the main artery between Reggio Calabria and Capua.¹ He founded numerous abbeys, including Sant’Eufemia, Serra di San Bruno, Bagnara, and SS. Trinità in Mileto, as well as the cathedrals of Mileto and Reggio. By the time of Roger II’s creation of the kingdom in 1130, there was already a long tradition of monumental Hauteville patronage, not only in Calabria but also as an integral part of the conquest of Sicily (Troina, ca. 1080; Lipari, ca. 1085; Mazara del Vallo,

Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 80, no. 2 (June 2021), 219–242, ISSN 0037-9808, electronic ISSN 2150-5926. © 2020 by the Society of Architectural Historians. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press’s Reprints and Permissions web page, <https://www.ucpress.edu/journals/reprints-permissions>, or via email: jpermissions@ucpress.edu. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/jsah.2021.80.2.219>.

1086–88; Catania, 1091; Syracuse, consecrated 1093; and Agrigento, consecrated 1099). Some monasteries doubled as cathedrals (Lipari, Catania), guided by brilliant Norman or Breton monks, including Bishop-Abbot Ansgar, who erected the massive monastery-cathedral of Catania as a bulwark of Christianity in the Muslim caliphate of southeastern Sicily. These strategically placed institutions formed part of a concerted strategy for control and conversion of Muslims and Greeks; the role of this monastic elite was noted by Heinrich Schwarz in 1946 and again by Corrado Bozzoni in 1974, work expanded in the essays of Giuseppe Occhiato in the 1970s and 1980s.² A more recent and important contribution by Francesco Gandolfo on Sicilian monuments has stimulated a group of new and emerging young scholars, including Tancredi Bella, Margherita Tabanelli, and Fabio Linguanti.³ Although the Calabrian monuments have been mostly destroyed by earthquakes (especially that of 1783), they attest to the importance of Benedictines in maintaining connections between monasteries in South Italy and Normandy, even though unfortunately some key Norman abbeys, such as Saint-Évroult, have also been destroyed. As a result of the scarcity of evidence, much of the scholarly discourse has focused on similarities of ground plans and the adoption of the Cluniac apse-echelon plan in South Italy, but there is clear evidence of other important affinities, such as massive masonry walls and columns integrated into piers.

It is this denser fabric that Reilly's book might have explored as a Sicilian counterpart to the visual culture of William the Conqueror. By the time Roger II was born in 1095, Normans had long intermingled with local families. Roger II himself was the son of the remarkable Adelaide del Vasto, and he had Greek and Muslim tutors; he was as much a polyglot and cosmopolitan product of South Italy as he was a Norman. At the death of his father in 1001, when he was six years old, the family necropolis—with Roger I's ancient sarcophagus underneath a porphyry canopy—was installed in the Hauteville abbey of SS. Trinità in Mileto, founded close to the comital palace sometime before 1080. The abbey and cathedral in Mileto were enriched with lavish marble decoration and (presumably ancient) columns.

The mid- to late eleventh-century Norman foundations of Calabria and Sicily form a strong foil to William's conquest of 1066, and it seems more compelling to draw analogies with Count Roger I's conquest of new territories starting in the 1050s than with the actions of a son who inherited the Sicilian conquest. To be sure, Roger I became a count (in 1071), not a king, but for the youngest Hauteville son this was still a significant promotion. His establishment of his court and mint in Mileto, along with the 1059 papal recognition of Norman authority in Calabria authorizing the reorganization of dioceses *ad fidelitatem Romanae Ecclesiae*, can be seen as analogous with William's accomplishments in England: regime change stabilized by new dioceses and affirmed by strategically placed and massive new buildings. This process formed a central piece in the latinization of South Italy, an emphatic shift away from Byzantium and toward Rome. The newly founded episcopal sees and monasteries were the linchpins of Roger I's political and religious revolution: in parallel with the substitution of Anglo-Saxon buildings in England with Norman monuments, the structures erected after 1060 in Calabria and Sicily represented a profound refutation of the predominantly Greek building practices of small-scale and central-plan structures.

But following repeated earthquakes and the ongoing spoliation of building materials, little remains of the Norman foundations of Calabria, nor do luxurious historiated textiles survive. However, coins produced in Roger I's mint might be considered as important evidence of visual images of power. The ground plans of many Norman foundations based on Norman-Cluniac models reflect an entirely new latinized approach to construction in South Italy: these were also massively scaled buildings with wall buttresses, transepts, and long naves on a Benedictine model. In addition to the building remains, there are fragments of opulent pavements and stained glass. Views of the ruins provided by the sketches of travelers suggest the lavish reuse of ancient materials and attest to some of the buildings' former glory.

In spite of Greek administrators in Calabria and Muslim advisers in Sicily, powerful threads connected the south to the north, often through monastic networks

that linked South Italy to Normandy and Normandy to England. We can imagine that the abbots on whom the Hauteville depended to provide spiritual and political counsel also aided in the development of a visual culture that articulated "art, politics, and dynastic ambition" in South Italy. This was thus already a sophisticated and cosmopolitan undertaking long before the birth of Roger II in 1095, and it is this thick, dense, and fascinating background that is somehow missing from Reilly's narrative.

CAROLINE BRUZELIUS
Duke University

Notes

1. Vera von Falkenhausen, "Mileto tra Greci e Normanni," in *Chiese e società nel Mezzogiorno: Studi in onore di Maria Mariotti*, ed. M. Mariotti and P. Borzomati (Soveria Mannelli: Rubbetino, 1998), 1:109–33.
2. Heinrich Schwarz, "Die Baukunst Kalabriens und Siziliens im Zeitalter der Normannen, I: Die lateinischen Kirchengründungen des 11. Jahrhunderts und der Dom von Cefalù," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 6 (1946), 1–110; Corrado Bozzoni, *Calabria normanna: Ricerche sull'architettura dei secoli undicesimo e dodicesimo* (Rome: Officina, 1974); Giuseppe Occhiato, "La chiesa abbaziale della SS. Trinità di Mileto nell'architettura normanna meridionale," *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Storia dell'Arte Medioevale e Moderna* (Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Messina) 2 (1976), 7–20; Giuseppe Occhiato, "L'abbazia détruite de la Sainte Trinité de Mileto (Calabre)," *Cahiers de Civilization Médiévale*, no. 201 (1978), 213–45; Giuseppe Occhiato, "Robert de Grandmesnil, un abate 'architetto' operante in Calabria," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 28 (1987), 609–66.
3. Francesco Gandolfo, "Le cattedrali siciliane," *L'Europa delle cattedrali: Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Parma, 19–23 Settembre 2006)*, ed. A. C. Quintavalle (Milan: Electa, 2007), 191–207; Tancredi Bella, "Ansgarius quod ego . . . Ecclesiae primus fundamina ieci: La cattedrale normanna di Catania: Materiali per un riesame," *Arte Cristiana: Commitenza e committenti*, no. 909 (2018), 404–21; Margherita Tabanelli, "Templum tota Sicilia maximum ab Angerio conditum: La cattedrale di Catania tra XI e XII secolo," in *La lezione gentile: Scritti di storia in onore di Maria Segagni Malacart*, ed. L. C. Schiavi, S. Caldano, and F. Gemelli (Milan: Angeli, 2017), 477–88; Margherita Tabanelli, "Il chiostro di San Bartolomeo a Lipari: Sperimentazioni progettuali e decorative nella prima comunità benedettina della Sicilia normanna," *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 23 (2016), 579–88; Fabio Linguanti, "La Cattedrale di Troina: Prima sperimentazione architettonica normanna in Sicilia," *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 25 (2018), 440–51.

Phillip John Usher

Exterranean: Extraction in the Humanist Anthropocene

New York: Fordham University Press, 2019, 240 pp., 34 b/w illus. \$32 (paper), ISBN 9780823284214

Discussion of the Anthropocene, a designation invented in 2000 for the geological epoch following the Holocene to reflect the increasing human impact on the ecology of the earth, has taken many forms in the last decades. Arguments over the potential dating of this period—whether it began with the first traces of human industry, the Industrial Revolution, or the first atomic explosion—have preoccupied scientists and cultural critics. Questions persist regarding whether the period represents the initiation of a new “posthuman” epoch, one that would encourage the understanding of humankind as having reached its limits and as being embodied in the world, as opposed to separate from it. Discussion continues regarding the role and nature of architecture and urbanization in the process of transforming the earth’s surface.¹

The impact of these debates on the study of architectural history, however, has been less noticeable. At the 2015 meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians in Chicago, a panel titled “Architectural History in the Anthropocene” provided a useful introduction to the questions arising from chronological, evidential, and methodological shifts.² As Esther da Costa Meyer has written: “Architectural history has been slower to respond: engaging with this scale-defying paradigmatic shift requires us to question the autonomy of architecture, the social costs of its reliance on fossil fuels, issues of materiality and scale, the relation to other species, the urban consequences of climate change (sinking cities, citywide slums, and a rapidly escalating number of camps for climate refugees). To produce a truly global, self-reflexive, and non-Eurocentric theory demands as well, a transnational collaboration with other fields.”³

One of the significant problems encountered in attempting to revise architectural history in this way is the inference that Anthropocenic disturbance is only a recent occurrence and that it demands scrutiny through a posthumanist lens. Accordingly, the Renaissance, the traditional birthplace

of the very humanism that has been displaced, has received little revised attention. In *Exterranean: Extraction in the Humanist Anthropocene*, Phillip John Usher bravely enters the fray with a refreshing reading of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century French and German texts on mining. He coins the neologism *exterranean* to indicate his concern with the technical processes, environmental effects, and culture of extraction, not only in the Renaissance but also in our own era. As he notes in his introduction, he is interested in shifting the balance from a contemporary concentration on emissions to a focus on extraction—the effects of which have been widely analyzed today, but not extensively in the cultural history of the Renaissance, and even less so in architectural history.

Usher’s introduction clearly establishes his approach: he aims to provoke “collisions between the reality and theory of our present moment and texts and images from early modern Europe”; it is this “laboratory,” as he calls it, echoing Bruno Latour, that he calls the “Humanist Anthropocene” (4). Without entering into the debates over the dating of the Anthropocene, Usher holds that the writings under consideration, dating from 1500 to 1600, fundamentally transformed “the status of mining as a profession and collectively brought mining within the bounds of humanist culture and practice” (11). Indeed, these texts offer a parallel discourse to that of the emerging professionalization of architecture from Leon Battista Alberti onward. In this sense, Usher’s analysis of Georgius Agricola’s *De re metallica* (1556), which deals extensively with the machines, techniques, and culture of mining metals, and which finds its authority in the text of Vitruvius, might very well be seen as the extractive antecedent to the constructive text of Alberti.

Usher begins his readings of extractive texts, which include poems, manuals, guidebooks, religious tracts, and the literary essays of Michel de Montaigne, with a dramatic staging of a “trial” described in a work titled *Judicium Jovis*, or *Judgment of Jupiter*. Here, “Terra,” pointing to the holes in her dress, accuses a miner of having caused her great suffering; the miner, she claims, has in effect committed matricide by digging deeply into her organs. The miner objects, accusing Terra in turn of hiding her wealth, thereby impeding trade and the building of wealth.⁴ Agricola

would repeat these arguments, as he too tried to defend the act of extraction as non-harmful to the earth. And this despite the visual evidence, as Usher demonstrates, of the engravings illustrating *De re metallica*, which show an earth deforested to clear the way for mines, constrictive mine shafts, and unhappy miners at work.

The second primary mode of extraction that Usher addresses is more directly architectural—that of quarrying stone. And in his highly evocative case study of the limestone quarries of Caen and the lithic city they built, he finds continuities that thrust up from the quarry to the castle, the city maps, and the histories that might well provide analogous chains of relationships in our own study of stone romancing, from John Ruskin to Adrian Stokes, for example, in Venice.

Finally, in a study that especially resonates with my own work, Usher turns to the extraction of salt—both through the evaporation of seawater, whose salinity had already been prepared by geological processes, and through evaporation by fire, as in the saltworks of Lorraine and Franche-Comté. In a telling restaging of a fictional moment in history, he imagines a dinner between the French king Francis I and the ambassador of the Holy Roman Empire, and calls up the saltcellar designed by Benvenuto Cellini, itself staged as a contest between Neptune and Ceres, the sea and the earth.

In each of his chapters, Usher presents careful readings and explications of poems and texts—some forgotten, some famous but now read in another vein—gradually building up a tissue of connections across a veritable culture of extraction, yes, but more, a material culture that stands at the beginning of a teasing out of the values, difficulties, and ecological consequences of the processes that in turn came to form our own Anthropocene. In doing so, he also charges us to return to those texts of the well-worn Renaissance, to the quarrying and mining of that era’s building materials, to the labors and desolation incurred, and to the mythical and real powers that extraction invoked.

ANTHONY VIDLER
The Cooper Union

Notes

1. For a comprehensive summary of this topic, see Renata Tyszczyk, “Architecture of the Anthropocene: The Crisis of Agency,” *Scroope: The Cambridge Architectural Journal* 23 (2014), 67–73.

2. Selected articles from the panel, edited and with an introduction by Daniel Barber, were published in the *Journal of Architecture* 21, no. 8 (2016).
3. Esther da Costa Meyer, graduate course outline, 2020, quoted with permission of the author.
4. Paulus Nivahs, *Judicium Jovis* (Leipzig, 1495).

William E. Wallace

**Michelangelo, God's Architect:
The Story of His Final Years and
Greatest Masterpiece**

Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press,
2019, 328 pp., 62 color and 33 b/w illus.
\$29.95 (cloth), ISBN 9780691195490

In recent years, many of the great stories of Renaissance art have been told not by art historians but by popular writers such as Ross King and Walter Isaacson. William E. Wallace is in a small class of scholars who has sought to remain active in two realms, maintaining his fundamental commitment to scholarship while also developing a series of publications that address a broader public. His most recent contribution, *Michelangelo, God's Architect: The Story of His Final Years and Greatest Masterpiece*, represents the culmination of a career dedicated almost entirely to this single, engrossing figure. Thanks to this ongoing work, Wallace has earned the ability to wear his knowledge lightly: he may sprinkle the text with learned, archival references, but the reader has only the impression of a rollicking good story.

As stories go, the one of Michelangelo's work at the Basilica of St. Peter's is a good one indeed. Architect after architect and pope after pope failed to get the job done. Boundless egos collided with each other and ran up against constraints imposed by materials, budgets, time, and the laws of physics. Even Michelangelo failed to finish the job, despite devoting the last decades of his life to a project he knew he would never see completed, although he did realize the drum and prepared the way for the construction of the cupola. While Wallace discusses many of Michelangelo's works, his story centers on the magnificent dome.

Balancing biography, art criticism, and history, Wallace's book is organized into eight chapters, each concerning a different piece of the story. The chronological span of the book corresponds to the last two decades of Michelangelo's life, leading up to his death at age eighty-nine in 1564.

It might seem an odd choice to begin any kind of biography with the subject at age seventy, but Wallace makes the case that Michelangelo worked at full mental if not physical strength until the very end, and these decades were among his most ambitious. To demonstrate the point, he provides many vivid accounts of Michelangelo's immense energy in his final years. For example, he quotes an observer's description of Michelangelo at work on the Florentine *Pietà*: "Although more than sixty years old and no longer among the most robust, [Michelangelo] knock[ed] off more chips of a very hard marble in a quarter of an hour than three young stone carvers could have done in three or four . . . and I thought the whole work would fall to pieces because he moved with such impetuosity and fury" (133).

The first three chapters of Wallace's book concern an array of projects from Michelangelo's late years, including the messy details surrounding the completion of the tomb of Julius II, his work on the Palazzo Farnese, and his poems and drawings for Vittoria Colonna. In a number of instances, Wallace offers new interpretations of familiar projects. For example, while many scholars have emphasized Michelangelo's radical breaking of classical rules, in his discussion of the Palazzo Farnese, Wallace suggests that Michelangelo did not know Vitruvius well enough to defy him. He reports that the artist was rumored not to know Latin, and a reliable Italian translation of Vitruvius was not widely available until the Barbaro edition of 1556 (Cesare Cesariano's 1521 edition had very limited circulation at the time). Although this might seem only a minor inflection with respect to existing scholarly analysis, it has significant implications, given that so many scholars have wanted to see in Michelangelo a determined iconoclast.

The last five chapters center on the construction of St. Peter's. Wallace's chief argument, that the dome represents Michelangelo's crowning achievement, is hardly uncontested. Compared to the *David*, the *Pietà*, the Sistine Chapel, and the *Last Judgment*, the cupola barely figures in the public imagination. Even among specialists and architectural historians, Michelangelo's work on the Medici Chapel, the Laurentian Library, and the Capitoline all receive more attention. With relatively

little of his text devoted to architectural analysis per se, Wallace may or may not convince readers of the importance of Michelangelo's work at St. Peter's relative to other projects. However, no one is likely to finish the book without becoming fascinated by the circumstances surrounding this tremendous commission.

The first problem Michelangelo faced was getting around the *setta sangallescica*, the group of loyalists to Antonio da Sangallo the Younger who were regulars at the Fabbrica of St. Peter's even after the architect's death. Sangallo attempted to ensure the adoption of his design through the construction of a massive model. But as recorded in an acerbic letter, one of the first truly biting examples of architectural criticism in early modern history, Michelangelo judged Sangallo's design a disaster. Among other jabs, he claimed that its dark, warren-like spaces would provide places for thieves to hide and nuns to be impregnated. In his view, the design needed to be returned to the "true" design of Donato Bramante, and his initial proposals reflected exactly this impulse.

Beyond his heightened attention to St. Peter's, Wallace introduces several revisionist themes to the Michelangelo scholarship. Throughout the text, he emphasizes Michelangelo's close ties to his assistants, countering beliefs about his seeming reluctance or inability, or both, to train a generation of artists to follow in his footsteps. While Raphael created a workshop and a style that extended beyond himself and recruited extremely talented assistants, such as Giulio Romano, who went on to have their own extraordinary careers, none of Michelangelo's associates are as distinguished. Yet Wallace offers multiple examples of Michelangelo encouraging, supporting, and working closely with other artists, culminating in a description in chapter 7 of Michelangelo's reliance on a close set of associates who could help to satisfy the demand for "anything from his hand" (197). The ability of this select group of artists to produce finished works based on Michelangelo's inventions broadened his artistic legacy.

Another widely held conception of Michelangelo, probably rooted in Giorgio Vasari's account but challenged by Wallace, is that he was a misanthrope and prone to conflict with his patrons. On the contrary,

Wallace argues, Michelangelo placed great importance on developing close personal connections with his patrons. Wallace's new framing of the topic offers a constructive recalibration, emphasizing the mutually reinforcing and reciprocal aspects of the artist's relations with both friends and patrons. Steeped in knowledge of Michelangelo's prodigious letters, Wallace offers characterizations of the artist's friendships that carry a sense of the personalities involved, conveyed vividly across the hundreds of years since the letters were written. Wallace's focus on friends over patrons is particularly fitting for a consideration of this period of Michelangelo's life, when the artist wanted neither fame nor money and turned away prominent people who sought his work. The only reason for him to take on a project was his desire to do so.

Wallace is in his element when discussing not just the friends but also the workmen surrounding Michelangelo, thus bringing the archival documents to life. This is the same territory that Wallace explored in his first book on San Lorenzo, but he now writes as a mature scholar who commands the whole field.¹ While it is easy to get lost in the details in his earlier treatment, here the members of the Fabbrica di St. Peter's appear in all of their pathos and drama, reading more as characters in a novel than as figures in a ledger. The image Wallace wants to present is not that of an airy genius leaving the details to be worked out by others; instead, he argues that "Michelangelo was a hands-on architect who concerned himself with every detail of design and construction. Today we would consider him a micromanaging, type-A personality" (194). As Wallace elaborates: "He selected and inspected all his materials; arranged for rope, tackle, and boats; haggled with carters and shippers about fees; and made drawings for even the tiniest, seemingly most insignificant detail, before turning the paper over to make calculations, count bushels of grain, draft a letter, and compose poetry. Michelangelo was not only a creative genius but a savvy businessman, skilled engineer, versatile building contractor, and successful entrepreneur—a person who shuttled constantly between the mundane and the sublime" (194–95).

While it is thrilling to explore the work of Renaissance construction rendered in

such fine texture, Wallace might have taken a step further by letting go of the idea of genius altogether. As a scholar with intimate knowledge of all aspects of Michelangelo's working life, he does not need to rely on this tired concept. To understand the day-to-day work that went into Michelangelo's creations is not to diminish the imagination and invention that he achieved through them. The word *genius* is too often used as a crutch by scholars who are unwilling or unable to describe how or why artists manage to achieve their goals. Unlike such scholars, Wallace is both willing and able to do this demanding work in painstaking detail. To bring home the practical concerns that plagued Michelangelo, he devotes two full pages to a list of the artist's preoccupations, all drawn from the letters (192–94). Wallace concludes: "These prolonged sentences are longer than the rhetorical opening of Vasari's life of Michelangelo. Vasari was celebrating a genius; I am suggesting the day-to-day concerns of a fallible mortal in charge of St. Peter's: God's architect" (194). Despite this small quibble, Wallace's book is a model of deep scholarship brought to life with lively prose through the integration of sixteenth-century documents on almost every page.

CAMMY BROTHERS
Northeastern University

Note

1. William E. Wallace, *Michelangelo at San Lorenzo: The Genius as Entrepreneur* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Stephen H. Whiteman

Where Dragon Veins Meet: The Kangxi Emperor and His Estate at Rehe

Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2020, 292 pp., 21 maps, 113 color illus. \$70 (cloth), ISBN 9780295745800

During his long reign, the Kangxi emperor (r. 1661–1722) established many of the spaces and practices that defined the Manchu-led Qing dynasty (1644–1911) as both a continuation of the Chinese imperium and a new multiethnic and multicultural empire. The main site where the emperor himself carried out this endeavor was his summer palace: the Mountain Estate to Escape the Heat (Bishu Shanzhuang 避暑山莊), in the city of Rehe (today known as

Chengde), in Hebei province approximately 150 miles northeast of the Forbidden City. Built in the early eighteenth century, the estate was rebuilt by Kangxi's grandson, the Qianlong emperor (r. 1736–95), whose later imprint has dominated both the site and studies of it. As the jacket description rightly notes, Stephen H. Whiteman's *Where Dragon Veins Meet* is the "first monograph in any language to focus solely on the art and architecture of the Kangxi court," and thus it is also inherently the first to focus exclusively on the Mountain Estate during the Kangxi period. This book therefore fills a monumental gap in the art, architectural, and landscape histories of the early modern world, providing a long-overdue interdisciplinary discussion of the Qing emperor whose reign and works overlapped with those of better-studied contemporaries such as the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb (r. 1658–1707), the Russian czar Peter the Great (r. 1682–1725), and the French king Louis XIV (r. 1643–1715).

Established in 1702 and constructed over several years, the Mountain Estate was strategically located at a node through which, Kangxi argued, the empire's geomantic energy flowed down along the empire's "dragon veins" (*longmai* 龍脈). These eponymous veins of the book's title refer to traditional Chinese beliefs about the geomantic topography of the empire. To reduce an extremely complex topic to a brief explanation: these veins of geomantic power originate in certain mountains and ranges, and their auspicious energy flows down to and is dispersed across the empire by its waterways. However, the Manchu homeland of the Qing emperors lay well north of the Great Wall; although that region had been periodically incorporated into empires led by nomadic conquest dynasties (most famously the Mongols), both conceptually and geographically it lay well outside the traditional historical borders of the Han Chinese empire. Through paintings, prints, maps, poetry, prose, architecture, and the landscape itself, Kangxi worked to integrate the Mountain Estate into the empire and to craft a new site through which to negotiate and represent Qing imperial ideology.

Whiteman's introduction, "Historicizing the Early Qing Landscape," and conclusion, "The Landscape of the Emperor," together best demonstrate the integration

of interdisciplinary methodologies in the book. The linked histories of gardens, landscapes, art, architecture, poetry, and prose are viewed through the lens of early modern global history and historical geography, with digital spatial humanities used to filter out the diachronic identity of the site. The tools and methods of digital and spatial humanities support the author's argument, and the twenty-one original maps created with geographic information systems (GIS) technology are unquestionably this publication's most compelling illustrations. These maps are a major contribution to the topic and to the field, and their clean, straightforward presentation elegantly highlights the combined historical and technical work involved in their creation.

The introduction and conclusion bracket the book's unusual quadripartite division of six chapters. Part I, "Recovering the Kangxi Landscape," begins with a translated excerpt of a key primary source, a court official's "Record of Traveling at the Invitation of the Emperor," which literally lays the groundwork for chapter 1, "Reconstructing Kangxi." Part II, titled "Allegories of Empire," includes chapters 2 and 3, respectively titled "Mountain Veins" and "Only Here in Rehe," which are also punctuated by a translated excerpt of the primary source "Record of the Mountain Estate to Escape the Heat," written by Kangxi himself. In these first two parts and three chapters, Whiteman focuses on reclaiming the Kangxi landscape of the Mountain Estate and uncovering its ideological foundations that were later buried by Qianlong's additions.

Parts III and IV focus on pictorial works that represent the garden. Titled "Space and Pictoriality," part III includes chapter 4, "Painting and the Surveyed Site," and chapter 5, "Paper Gardens." Part IV, "The Metonymic Landscape" consists of one chapter, chapter 6, "Touring the Rear Park." In the second half of the book, therefore, Whiteman analyzes extant painted and printed works depicting the site that were commissioned by Kangxi, and demonstrates how they promoted his vision of the site as well as broader Qing imperial ideology. A number of digital visualizations illustrate the various Chinese modes of looking at and representing the landscape, which offered clear alternatives to European linear perspective as equally powerful ideological tools for representing early modern empires.

The multiplicity of media involved in both Kangxi's endeavor and this book itself is remarkable. A significant scholarly challenge is inherent in the material, linguistic, temporal, and representational diversity of Whiteman's resources. These include the physical landscape itself, printed and painted pictorial representations of the historical landscape, both historical and modern bespoke cartographic representations of the historical landscape, multiple cartographic and representational techniques that are often at odds with each other (bird's-eye views with linear perspective, for example), and poetry and prose descriptions. The range of skills that the author needed to develop, first to conduct the research for this project and then to present it in a single volume, is extremely impressive.

By including the extended excerpts of translated prose essays together with Kangxi's poetry about the site, Whiteman draws us into the narrative and stimulates our curiosity about the original Chinese texts. Contrary to standard practice, however, these original texts are not available to consult in the book itself, either in the print edition or in the electronic version. Thus, readers are unable to compare the original and translated texts quickly and easily. Instead, the "Note to Readers" states that the Chinese texts are available online, yet at the time of this writing (May 2021), those texts were still not available for consultation. The URL given for the Chinese texts connects readers of the book to the website of the Art History Publication Initiative (AHPI), which works with the University of Washington Press and three other publishers to provide the online content for books supported under the AHPI program. As of this writing, the website states only that "supplementary materials including maps and original Chinese texts will soon be available on this site."¹ The site features some of the volume's images and one very useful map collating the Kangxi- and Qianlong-era structures that is not included in the published book. For these primary Chinese sources to remain unavailable so long after the book's publication is entirely mystifying, especially given their essential importance for the author's argument and the significant space devoted to their translations in the book. At a time of global pandemic, when library access is restricted and budgets (both personal and

institutional) are tighter than ever, the continued absence of these primary sources contradicts the author's and publisher's generous intentions of making them freely available online.

Ultimately, *Where Dragon Veins Meet* is a complex book distinguished by clear writing, innovative maps, and subtle argumentation, all of which interact in the same multimedia manner as the Kangxi emperor's own products. The book is a major contribution to multiple fields and convincingly demonstrates "the potential of a connected history of Qing art in the early modern world" (10). In addition to expanding the histories of Chinese art, architecture, and designed landscapes, Whiteman contributes to the diversification of the spatial humanities with his focus on late imperial China. This book accomplishes a great deal, but, more important, it lays a firm foundation for future scholarship on Kangxi and the global early modern landscape.

KRISTINA KLEUTGHEN
Washington University in St. Louis

Note

1. "Where Dragon Veins Meet: The Kangxi Emperor and His Estate at Rehe, Stephen Whiteman," Art History Publication Initiative, <https://arthistorypi.org/books/where-dragon-veins-meet> (accessed 16 Feb. 2021). The URL given for the texts in the book is <https://doi.org/10.6069/9780295745817.S01>.

Joseph Manca

Shaker Vision: Seeing Beauty in Early America

Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2019, 408 pp., 60 color and 30 b/w illus. \$39.95 (paper), ISBN 9781625344687

In *Shaker Vision*, Joseph Manca imagines the aesthetic world of the Shakers by listening to what the Shakers had to say about what they did, investigating what they saw, and compiling what outsiders had to say when they visited Shaker sites. He illuminates a world of contradictions through a variety of sources, including primary literature such as Shaker daybooks and journals, letters, narratives, and reports. The unique lens Manca recommends to the reader is the way the Shakers saw beauty.

This book is also about dichotomies. Shakers danced sensuously during their worship rituals, expressing emotional energy long contained. They also embedded

their rituals with a profound, even irresistible sense of orthogonality and order. The tension between order and restraint and the appreciation of beauty, nature, and sensuality—seemingly irreconcilable opposites—reveals a unique and distinct way of being in the world that was embodied by both the Shaker individual and the larger community. As Manca explains, Shakers “liked orderly and uniform bodily movement, just as they liked well-maintained, clean villages and tidy gardens, and enforced various rules in this regard” (43). They believed that “comeliness would result from that restrained and uniform action” (43). “Shakers found a quiet and beautiful poetry and godliness in the silent, orderly, and symmetrical movement of groups of people through space” as they walked down a divided stairway or along a path across a field running parallel to a building (44). They sought symmetry and order as they marched up the Holy Hill for ritual in a largely imagined but ordered outdoor field space. At the same time, Shaker Sabbath meetings included ecstatic dancing or shaking; as in other nineteenth-century religions, speaking in tongues and falling to the ground, both indoors and outdoors, were not unusual.

Manca helps us to understand this tension by quoting early Shaker leader Frederick W. Evans, who said in December 1874, “The beautiful, as you call it, is absurd and abnormal. It has no business with us.” But as Manca goes on to explain, the Shakers “often wrote of objects and persons as being beautiful, handsome, pretty, romantic, picturesque. . . . They found beauty in the neat and plain as well as in order, which they felt reflected heavenly order. They could find beauty in a person, as long as the feelings were not of desire. . . . And landscape, both natural and shaped by man, was open ground for visual pleasure, and there were no apparent limits on the colors, forms, and movement that nature could take that were not permitted for Shakers” (12).

Shaker Vision is a smart book, offering a literate, original, illuminating framework for thinking differently about what the Shakers were doing when they constructed buildings and laid out settlements, when they visited the world outside, and when they practiced their religion through sacred dance and worship. It suggests that delight in beauty is a basic human characteristic,

and this in turn makes the Shakers appear more similar to the believers of other religious traditions. As Manca writes, “The records indicate a conclusion new and unexpected: that Shakers were in many ways not so different from other people” (15). If their distinctive material culture reflected their effort to be different, to create a unique identity made tangible with buildings and landscapes, their love of beauty rendered them human.

Manca’s discussion of the Holy Hill and Shaker architecture is particularly noteworthy, based as it is on numerous firsthand accounts of how the Shakers viewed this unique religious ritual, what it looked like, and how it felt. Manca quotes Shaker elder Rufus Bishop: “It was indeed a beautiful sight to see so many virgin followers of the Lamb[,] say about 400 of both sexes, beating the heavenly marches up and down the mountain, 4 a breast a distance of nearly 2 miles; 2 males on the right and 2 females on the left hand” (53). Bishop found the suspension of reality and the willingness to explore the potential of religious ritual a beautiful, even transcendent, experience. This propensity for order played out in the Shakers’ worship rituals both in buildings and in nearby outdoor areas designated as Holy Hills. The same order that characterized Shaker society determined the layout of Shaker settlements as well.

Although this book is beautifully illustrated, it is built primarily from written texts and transcriptions of spoken words. Meticulously researched and interpreted, the narrative opens a window onto the Shaker world through the accounts of the Shakers themselves. And, unlike many scholars who have examined Shaker buildings, Manca is unusual in devoting special attention to the Shaker gaze—the particular Shaker way of looking at and noticing beauty. In chapter 5, “Visions, Voices, and Art: Imagining Heaven and Earth,” Manca analyzes spirit drawings, the visual images that Shakers created as “instruments and mediums of their world, carried out in two-dimensional art” (239). These intriguing and sometimes symbolic images communicate aesthetic representations of the Shakers’ ordered world at a time of spiritual awakening and intense spiritual manifestation. They reflect a vision of heaven that is ordered but also beautiful and good.

The Shakers ordered their spatial practice in part to conform with the regulations laid out in the Millennial Laws, which interpreted Shaker theology, providing guidelines for how individuals might “live” religious ideals and concepts. The laws were first distributed in 1821 by the Central Ministry and elders of New Lebanon, the followers of Ann Lee, who died in 1784; they were reissued in 1845 and 1860. Broad and sweeping in their scope, the Millennial Laws prescribed a “pattern of good order & economy in all things” (159). They included instruction on how to lie down in bed, how to walk through common residences, and how to order relationships. The Shakers’ group homes, meetinghouses, farm fields, furniture, and clothing “corresponded to their ideas of uniformity, simplicity, and beauty in restraint” (45). According to Manca, their descriptions of their buildings suggested “moral goodness and the fitness of the structures for their place at the Shakers’ Zion” (139).

Manca also explores how Shakers viewed their bodies, noting that they “saw beauty and visual interest in the external personhoods of each other” (27). “Believers,” he writes, “equated Shaker villages with ‘Zion,’ their holy place on earth, the heavenly mount of the Old Testament, and the place where the saved would be gathering” (101). *Shaker Vision* invites us to see the world the Shakers saw, one that was abundant, ordered, and inhabited by a community that appreciated beauty in all of its forms, both natural and built.

MARTHA BRADLEY EVANS
University of Utah

Francesco Dal Co

The Guggenheim: Frank Lloyd Wright’s Iconoclastic Masterpiece

Translated by Sarah Melker

New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press,
2017, 184 pp., 63 color and 104 b/w illus.
\$30 (cloth), ISBN 9780300226058

Completed in 1959, the Guggenheim Museum in New York is young for a building with the status of a UNESCO World Heritage Site. A monument of such importance generates many histories, from its commission to its evolving role in culture and society. Lest we think the museum’s history is complete, its curatorial department issued a provocative public letter in June 2020

demanding that the Guggenheim address those of its practices that enable racism and other forms of discrimination, placing that call within a national movement for systemic change.¹ In light of the museum's role as a cultural power broker, it is increasingly important that we understand the multiple meanings of its building. While issues of race and discrimination unfold and demand redress, critics and historians can turn to Francesco Dal Co's synthetic monograph for an insightful interpretation of the Guggenheim in the context of New York City and in the evolving histories of modern art.

Revised from the Italian edition, *Il tempo e l'architetto* (Mondadori, 2004), updated through 2016, and translated by Sarah Melker, the book consists of eight chapters, an extensive portfolio of photographs and drawings, and a bibliographic essay in lieu of endnotes. Unfortunately, it lacks an index, which hinders scholarly reference. It is a concise 35,000 words, handsomely designed and of a comfortable format. The text follows a chronological development with interwoven interpretive passages. The author brings decades of experience as a critic, editor, and theorist to bear in not only distilling an extensive body of literature but also analyzing with acute perception the building's design history and its multivalent meanings. The subtitle is significant: the anticipated adjective *Iconic* is replaced with *Iconoclastic*, a hint that the author returns often to the root meanings of words and thereby repositions our understandings of the building as a breaker of idols, not an object of worship.

Dal Co sets the book's tone with an epigraph quoting the comments of sculptor Richard Serra, who asserts that there is no "possibility for architecture to be a work of art. . . . Architecture as a work of art is a contradiction in terms." In chapter 1 the author sets out to refute this claim by proposing that, rather than make a binary choice, we examine the Guggenheim building through the agency of time. Only by looking at the duration of sixteen years of debate, design, and construction filled with tension and conflict can we comprehend its multiple meanings. In his second chapter Dal Co introduces Solomon R. Guggenheim and describes how Hildegard (Hilla) Rebay von Ehrenwiesen, his artistic adviser, chose Wright in 1943, from among

other contenders, for the commission to house Guggenheim's collection of nonobjective art. Dal Co could have added that Rebay had seen Wright's architectural exhibition organized by Erich Mendelsohn in Berlin in 1931, had read his books, and had met his sister, Maginel Barney, who lived in Greenwich Village.² In chapter 3 the author puts the building's design process into the context of tensions with the Museum of Modern Art as it pursued its agenda to define modern art. While MoMA focused on objects' aesthetics, Guggenheim and Rebay intended, according to Dal Co, to create not a museum but "a place suitable to welcome an artistic community and to educate the public, sharing the conviction that non-objective art could only be appreciated in unusual spaces, an environment that enhances spiritually" (20).

The future of the modern city backgrounded the question of what and where the Guggenheim museum would be. Wright's contract initially charged him with finding the building site, and in 1943 he suggested an 8-acre plot at Henry Hudson Memorial Park in Riverdale in the Bronx. It would allow for gardens and courts immersed in nature and freed from what he called the "tyranny of the skyscraper." Dal Co asserts that Wright's idealized locale was the equivalent of his conception for Broadacre City, a place where "mechanization takes command" (24). Dal Co cites Lewis Mumford as the source of this phrase, but it was Sigfried Giedion who coined it later for his book *Mechanization Takes Command* (1948). Mumford had begun writing on the subject in 1930, and he published his critique as *Technics and Civilization* in 1934.³ A lot at Fifth Avenue and the south corner of Eighty-Ninth Street was chosen for the museum in 1944, but it was not until 1951 that the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation assembled the full, final site between Eighty-Eighth and Eighty-Ninth Streets, opposite Central Park (22).

In chapter 4 Dal Co discusses precedents for Wright's spiraling design. He points to Wright's overlooked research tower for the S. C. Johnson & Son Administration Building in Racine, Wisconsin, designed and built 1943–50. That building's construction coincided with the design development of the Guggenheim, and Wright transferred its dome over a reception area—a series of concentric circles

with decreasing diameters—to the oculus of the Guggenheim. The theme of the spiral also articulated the interior of the V. C. Morris Gift Shop in San Francisco (1948–49). Wright's first use of a spiral floor plan occurred in his design for the Automobile Objective for Gordon Strong in 1924, a project for motoring tourists that was canceled by the client. Dal Co also mentions Wright's awareness of Le Corbusier's 1929 Mundaneum project, with its spiraling global museum. However, he dismisses the claim that Wright was thinking then of the spiral for a museum, citing at most a "conceptual affinity" between the Guggenheim and the Musée Mondiale (75).⁴ Wright apparently had no museum in mind when he designed the Automobile Objective for Strong, but he did include in its interior a cutting-edge planetarium. All it would have taken to start transforming the failed project into a museum was an invitation. That invitation came fourteen years later from Hilla Rebay.

In chapter 5 Dal Co elaborates on the design phases beginning in 1943, even before the museum site was chosen. Although six reworkings would follow, Wright defined his basic strategy in two perspective drawings shown to Guggenheim by 1944. The variations he tested confirm that a specific urban site was almost irrelevant, as Wright intended the building to defy every building convention and context that defined New York's architecture. According to Wright's own theory, an organic building must grow out of its site, yet this building grew before its site was selected. Dal Co resolves this paradox by returning to the original meaning of *genius loci*. As articulated by George Dumézil in *Archaic Roman Religion*, the phrase meant a condition of "scarcity, or language's incapacity to name the supernatural being appearing in a specific place" (60). The marvel of the museum on its site is precisely its refusal to limit the language of any spiritual resonance it generates. That the building still enhances a spiritually powerful art has been proved over time by many exhibitions, including the 2018–19 show of Hilma af Klint's paintings.⁵

Dal Co treats briefly in chapter 6 the transition from the death of Solomon Guggenheim to the appointment of James Johnson Sweeney as the replacement for the ousted Hilla Rebay. A series of challenges

simultaneously arose, including budgetary pressure and a name change, from the Museum of Non-Objective Painting to the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum. After Guggenheim's death, the museum's board and new director changed course to expand the institution's collecting policy in emulation of MoMA, its major rival. Meanwhile, Wright adhered to the original programmatic conception of the museum, as Sweeney, who had been a curator at MoMA from 1935 to 1947, relentlessly opposed Wright's every move.⁶ Wright saw Sweeney as establishing an "orthodox order" (108), a phrase indicating Wright's prescient perception of a codification of modern art whose authority would produce a canon and ultimately a calcification of art.

In chapter 7 the discussion of technical issues of construction may challenge readers unfamiliar with the basic principles of statics, but it returns historical inquiry to the fact that architecture is a built phenomenon manifesting, overtly or not, load and support. Drawing on the structural analysis of the engineer Tomaso Trombetti, the research of Joseph Siry, and the observations of George Segal, the builder, Dal Co addresses a basic question: What supports the spiral ramp as it rises and has no connections along its interior edges? Using a series of diagrams showing intersecting lines of force, Dal Co explains that instead of the ramp being a single curving flat beam, it is U-shaped and has two components, a lower portion of three sections supported by a collar extending to ground and an upper range of nine sections tied to giant hairpin-shaped beams in the dome. In a sleight of hand, the ramp appears to be a continuous ribbon wrapping around the central space.

In his final chapter Dal Co concludes where he began with the dichotomy of art versus architecture. He argues that the Guggenheim museum manifests more than this banal binary to demonstrate an attack on iconoclasm "not aimed at the images but at the forms of worship that made art its object" (109). That worship Wright saw as an orthodoxy embodied by the Museum of Modern Art and its minions. It is a conflict not merely between art and architecture but also between orthodoxy's valorization of images and the rejection of their power over the viewer. The building is thus a protest operating at multiple levels: a resistance to the hegemony of the modernist canon as

it was evolving, a defiance of authority with its demands to conform, a gnomic expression of archaic spiritual force, and, as Dal Co suggests, a metaphor for Wright's long life. The curators of the Guggenheim's future might keep these perspectives in mind as they address the museum's supremacist orientation.

ANTHONY ALOFSIN
University of Texas at Austin

Notes

1. Robin Pogrebin, "Curators Urge Guggenheim to Fix Culture That 'Enables Racism,'" *New York Times*, 22 June 2020, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/22/arts/design/guggenheim-curators-racism-sexism.html> (accessed 15 July 2020). See also Zachary Small, "Guggenheim Opens Investigation into Basquiat Show after Racism Complaints," *New York Times*, 2 July 2020, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/02/arts/design/guggenheim-investigation-racism.html> (accessed 3 Aug. 2020).
2. Anthony Alofsin, *Wright and New York: The Making of America's Architect* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2019), 238.
3. Sigfried Giedion, *Mechanization Takes Command: A Contribution to Anonymous History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948); Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Civilization* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1934).
4. Wright requested that Strong send back his drawings for the Automobile Objective because "something of the kind is contemplated on the other side in France, only in that case, it is a museum. Some interest has arisen in this idea as I have worked it out for you and I have been asked many times to see it." Frank Lloyd Wright to Gordon Strong, 30 Sept. 1929, quoted in Bruce Brooks Pfeiffer, *Frank Lloyd Wright: The Heroic Years: 1920–1932* (New York: Rizzoli, 2009), 196.
5. See Roberta Smith, "Hilma Who? No More," review of the exhibition *Hilma af Klint: Paintings for the Future*, *New York Times*, 11 Oct. 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/11/arts/design/hilma-af-klint-review-guggenheim.html> (accessed 7 Sept. 2020).
6. For information on James Johnson Sweeney's tenure at MoMA, see "James Johnson Sweeney," MoMA Exhibition Spelunker, Museum of Modern Art, New York, <https://www.moma.org/interactives/exhibitions/2016/spelunker/constituents/807> (accessed 8 Sept. 2020).

Nancy S. Seasholes, ed.

The Atlas of Boston History

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019, 209 pp., 248 color and 139 b/w illus. \$40 (cloth), ISBN 9780226631158

Where's Boston? was the title of an innovative multimedia installation produced for

the Bicentennial of the American Revolution in 1976. Intended to celebrate the role of Boston and its people from its earliest history to the present, the installation raised key questions that students of the city have continued to explore. Their work has led to the emergence of a robust publishing industry devoted to histories, guidebooks, and atlases that have made their exploration both easier and more complex. For scholars of cartography, William Wilkie's *Historical Atlas of Massachusetts* (1991) marked a watershed in the study of cartographic representations of the commonwealth. Other valuable additions to the literature include *Mapping Boston* (2001), edited by Alex Krieger and David Cobb with an introduction by Norman B. Leventhal, whose important map collection became the foundation of the Leventhal Map Room at the Boston Public Library. Shortly after that volume's publication, Nancy S. Seasholes's *Gaining Ground: A History of Landmaking in Boston* (2003) further enhanced our understanding of this place over time.¹ Now, *The Atlas of Boston History*, edited by Seasholes and published by the University of Chicago Press, joins the bookshelf with its 191 large-format, lavishly illustrated pages. To paraphrase Tip O'Neill, long-term Boston politician and Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives who famously stated that "all politics is local," all architectural history is local, so it is important to have good maps.

Seasholes and her thirty-five contributors have produced a wonderfully useful document that all students of Boston will want to acquire. The vertically oriented, large-format atlas (11¼ by 14¼ inches) is organized chronologically around eleven historical periods, from the retreat of the last Ice Age until 2010. Each of the eleven sections begins with a brief introduction, followed by subsections developed by Seasholes's team; a total of fifty-seven subsections cover specific historical categories. Each of these includes its own introduction and double-page spreads of multiple modern and historical maps and attendant graphs and charts, annotated to support the historical issues defined in the subsection. Architecture plays a supportive role through sidebars featuring selected photographs and line drawings based on historic images that transform buildings into social and cultural markers. As Seasholes explains in her preface, the team of

scholars “decided that the emphasis of the atlas should be on the physical development of Boston and its infrastructure, economic changes, the various demographic groups that have populated the city, and social and cultural developments more than on political events” (ix).

As with any project involving so many contributors, it must have proved a challenge for Seasholes to maintain a consistent balance between the section and subsection introductions and the more detailed discussions that follow. Often the inclusion of many distinct voices can be enlightening for readers, as different authors shift the discussion in new directions. Here the narrative introductions for the sections and the text for the plates provide extensive and valuable information in a focused and concise manner. Seasholes plays an important part in this work, contributing to nineteen of the seventy introductions and plate descriptions. Her contributions on landmaking, water and sewage systems, and transportation networks serve as the essential backbone for the overall text. The book also reflects the editor’s sustained effort to show in its many modern maps the correct relationship of land to water throughout the centuries, an important issue in a city where so much was built on landfill. Seasholes’s descriptions of methods of landfill are essential reading for any student of Boston history, archaeology, or architecture.

The other contributors represent a broad spectrum in terms of ages, disciplines, and professions, from very senior academics to independent scholars and graduate students, and they offer a broad diversity of perspectives on the city. For example, Mark Peterson’s sections on the colonial era in Boston, and especially the period 1740–60, display a wide-ranging understanding of the economics and politics of the area where Boston merchants operated and flourished. Jim Vrabel, author of *A People’s History of the New Boston* (2014), should be commended for foregrounding the names of many grassroots community organizers who fought for better lives and better neighborhoods in the second half of the twentieth century.² Reading through the titles of the book’s subsections—“First Inhabitants,” “Boston and the Slave Trade,” “Railroad Development,” “Abolitionist Movement,” “Relocation to the Suburbs,” and more—gives a quick sense of the riches found therein.

What joys specific plates can provide, prompting new understandings of moments in time and places in the metropolis. Plate 10 is a fine example of such an eye-opener, juxtaposing two images from 1743: a map of Boston by William Price (an updated version of the John Bonner map of 1722, not illustrated) and a panoramic view of the Boston skyline by William Burgis. Scholars have carefully located the buildings that can be identified in the panorama on the accompanying map. One might wish for a more complete listing of these buildings, identifying them and their sites with their full names rather than just color codes for building types and church denominations, but here perhaps I am being greedy, since this volume is not an atlas of architectural history. The back pages of the atlas include suggested sources related to each plate, sources for illustrations, and occasionally quite detailed biographical and other information, such as on the figures included in the women’s history tour of Boston. Within this mix, Seasholes includes chronologies for the water, sewage, and transportation sections that are her specialty.

Sprinkled throughout the “Additional Information” section at the back of the atlas are chronologies of Boston population growth and decline over time. Although the editor and her team decided to de-emphasize “political history,” I would argue that it would have been helpful also to include lists of names and dates for the leaders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the colonial governors under its reformed charter, the leaders of the town meeting period of governance, and the mayors of Boston from the early nineteenth century forward.

Given Boston’s identity as the “city on a hill” originally founded by immigrants determined to achieve religious freedom, it is curious that religion itself is rarely mentioned in this volume. The early impact of the Puritan theocracy, the later dominance of Unitarianism, and the powerful role of Catholicism in the city for many decades are noted in passing, but their influence on the landscape could be recorded in greater detail. Further, while urban renewal receives substantial attention, the text makes no mention of the role of the historic preservation movement in creating the multiple historic districts that came to define the city from the 1950s onward. As Boston is now a minority-majority city, a more

prominent discussion of the emergence, locations, and migrations of African-American, Latinx, and Asian American populations should be foregrounded in any future revisions.

Despite these few shortcomings, this volume is enormously useful and will become a standard text for anyone writing about the city and its metropolitan surrounds. *The Atlas of Boston History* provides valuable answers to so many questions that all scholarship is lifted by its existence, and the fact that it was awarded the 2020 Historic New England Book Prize should surprise no one. This work crowns many years of effort by a devoted team of scholars.

KEITH N. MORGAN
Boston University

Notes

1. William Wilkie, *Historical Atlas of Massachusetts* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1991); Alex Krieger and David Cobb, eds., *Mapping Boston* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2001); Nancy S. Seasholes, *Gaining Ground: A History of Landmaking in Boston* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2003).
2. Jim Vrabel, *A People’s History of the New Boston* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2014).

James A. Jacobs

Detached America: Building Houses in Postwar Suburbia

Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press,
2015, 272 pp., 61 b/w illus. \$45 (cloth),
ISBN 9780813937618

If you search the Internet for an image of “the suburbs,” inevitably a certain kind of view will flood your screen: dozens of aerial photographs that position the viewer far above curvilinear streets with regularly spaced houses set on postage-stamp lots. These familiar images suggest that suburbs are places best understood as large-scale planned units to be examined from afar. In *Detached America*, James A. Jacobs rightly and productively brings us back down to earth with his probe into the design and marketing of postwar suburban tract houses.

In the literature addressing the impact of suburbanization on the American domestic landscape, few studies have singled out the tract house itself as an object worthy of study. Fewer still have seriously considered the design and spatial evolution of

houses as a form of evidence of cultural or social change. Jacobs takes up these important avenues of inquiry, tracking shifts in nationally popular housing designs from 1945 to 1970 by examining mid-twentieth-century popular shelter media and home-building trade publications, and by conducting spatial analyses of the changes revealed in housing plans and amenities featured in marketing materials. In looking at these patterns, Jacobs identifies and contextualizes critical shifts in how North Americans envision home and home life, many aspects of which remain familiar today. Equally important, he considers how the broader political economy of the housing industry converged with consumer culture and identity in the postwar period to generate—arguably for the first time—a national housing culture in the United States.

Jacobs begins by introducing the key players and dynamics of the mid-twentieth-century housing market as shaped by home builders, the Federal Housing Administration, and the housing consumer. He describes how the federal government and the building industry transformed home building and home buying in the postwar period, working together to address a national housing shortage and make the housing market more accessible to white, middle-income Americans. According to Jacobs's analysis, this new political economy of housing had two significant outcomes. First, the federal government, via FHA minimum housing standards, instituted a national basis for new housing form and character for the first time in U.S. history, and most builders observed the new standards. Second, and more broadly, consumers' perceptions of housing shifted so that the home began to be considered as a consumer good. In this new housing market place, producers and consumers engaged in what Jacobs calls a "sustained process of mutual education and interaction" that shaped middle-class aspirations and patterns of family life (2–3). Builders designed and aggressively marketed houses to "imagined consumers"—largely white, upwardly mobile nuclear family groupings either aspiring to or having already achieved some version of middle-class identity. Over the course of the 1950s and 1960s, builders and consumers capitalized on economic expansion, rising wages, equity growth in existing homes, and

growing families to sustain a period of serial home purchasing. The result was an increasing differentiation in housing models, accompanied by, ultimately, distinctions in class lines across suburban areas.

The greater part of *Detached America* focuses on this progressive differentiation of nationally popular suburban housing forms in response to consumers' revised expectations of home life. Jacobs periodizes house forms appearing consistently across the United States from the 1940s to 1970 into three major categories: the minimum house of the late 1940s, the split-level and bi-level forms of the 1950s, and the "zoned house" of the 1960s. He characterizes this progression, as well as the speed at which these changes were implemented, as "one of the great milestones in the history of domestic architecture in the United States" (7).

As a "universal starting point" for homes in a variety of price ranges and forms, Jacobs asserts, the FHA's standards for the minimum house unified the form and qualities of middle-class housing more in the mid-twentieth century than at any other time in the nation's history. Builders, seeking to capitalize on postwar housing demand and federal incentives readily adopted these standards in the immediate postwar era. Minimum homes were inexpensive, efficient, and small (typically five to six rooms), but they offered home buyers "modern" and technologically up-to-date dwellings that featured not only the latest in mechanical systems and standard three-fixture bathrooms but also kitchens with cabinets and continuous countertops, all designed to meet specified construction standards. The small size of these houses required multifunctional common spaces and sacrifices in social buffer spaces and privacy. In Jacobs's analysis, minimum houses aimed to achieve two major goals: first, to solve the postwar housing shortage as quickly as possible through affordable homeownership, and second, to reform living standards for the working and middle classes.

As the postwar housing shortage abated and middle-class white Americans' incomes and prospects improved, desires for more space and better design, as well as the concept of "casual living," drove changes in the shape and form of suburban houses. New plans like the split-level and split-foyer or bi-level (commonly known as the "raised ranch") broke down barriers

between spaces of domestic work and leisure. These houses added slightly larger multipurpose areas that were designed to foster family "togetherness," such as the "living-kitchen," featuring an informal dining space, and the "kitchen-family room," which opened onto casual seating areas. More formalized basement recreation rooms also became more common. Arranging these spaces within the envelopes of popular forms like the ranch resulted in the horizontal stretching or vertical lifting of these plans to respond to consumer demands at affordable price points.

In the 1960s, spatial patterns in period housing plans shifted again as consumers began looking for more privacy, space, and separation of uses in the home, and as builders sought to entice consumers to "trade up" to newer housing models. The zoned house of the 1960s introduced more stratified divisions of public and private space than were seen in the previous two decades. The zoned house was not defined by any particular form, but rather by the designation of certain spaces as quiet and formal or active and casual. In these houses, living rooms transitioned to quieter, more sedate, adult spaces, while family rooms provided more finished and integrated casual, active spaces than basement recreation rooms. Large kitchens with eat-in spaces remained, but formal dining areas for special occasions also made a comeback. Entry foyers returned as important circulation spaces and social buffers, and two-story houses reemerged as a strategy for introducing greater separation between public and private zones. Jacobs calls this reversal of decades of spatial simplification in American domestic design "the most consequential and far-reaching rethinking of domestic planning since before World War II" (187). These changes signaled a new national standard for the normative function of the private house.

The familiarity and persistence of many of the design and planning ideas Jacobs discusses in *Detached America* underscores the book's significant contribution. The mid-twentieth-century suburban tract home remains among the most common dwelling forms in the United States, and vast portions of the nation's population live much of their lives in these spaces. Jacobs offers a much-needed, socially informed examination of the design history and interior

cultural landscape of these spaces. His research and periodization offer students and instructors in cultural landscape studies, architecture and architectural history, and historic preservation a serious and useful framework for engaging with these buildings that has previously been largely absent from the literature.

Jacobs's research also highlights an unresolved tension in studies of suburban domestic design, where on the one hand we see increasing uniformity in popular suburban housing, while on the other we see indications of creative variation and regional difference. Jacobs acknowledges this tension, stating that for every trend he identifies, there will inevitably be numerous variations and exceptions (8). These differences and variations, however, find little treatment or attention here. The effect of the national viewpoint that Jacobs presents is much like that of the suburban aerial photo: from far enough away, everything begins to look the same. While this perspective is not without its merits, the literature on domestic suburban design has long suffered from an overemphasis on prescriptive norms and national scales, a focus that overshadows or ignores the messy, and often more interesting, realities of suburban spaces. Jacobs gives glimpses of this underlying creative messiness, such as when he describes how builders and consumers actively made and remade domestic space. Builders' marketing tactics, market research, and market testing of houses at the local and regional levels, as Jacobs reveals, raise questions about how national trends intersect with regional and local specificities, and which has greater influence. The rigorous energy and attention that builders and their professional associations paid to design matters during the postwar period, as well as builders' communication with their local markets, signal a design community deeply engaged at both scales.

Beyond our understanding of suburban homes as objects, the argument in *Detached America* that interaction between builders and consumers shaped the American suburban domestic landscape is important and deserves more attention. While Jacobs leaves largely unexamined the impact of the consumer-producer dialogue at local and regional levels, his research effectively demonstrates that when we get closer to

ground level, there is still much to learn about the suburbs, their makers, and the people who call them home.

ELAINE BROWN STILES
Roger Williams University

Avigail Sachs

Environmental Design: Architecture, Politics, and Science in Postwar America

Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2018, 231 pp., 45 b/w illus. \$39.50 (cloth), ISBN 9780813941271

How is a discipline born, or, alternatively, how is an existing discipline reimagined? These are the questions Avigail Sachs ponders and, to a large degree, answers in her thoughtful, meticulously researched study of postwar architectural education, *Environmental Design: Architecture, Politics, and Science in Postwar America*. The backdrop is the rise of the science-based research enterprise within American higher education as it was supported by such federal agencies as the National Science Foundation. Departments and schools of architecture, many of them still adjusting to the Bauhaus-inspired reforms that had only recently upended traditional, Beaux-Arts educational practices, sought renewed relevance within this context. As developed during the 1950s and 1960s, environmental design offered a new, more comprehensive way of thinking about architectural pedagogy and practice that continues to inform the discipline today.

Sachs's discussion ranges across familiar academic territory, much of it bounded by the Ivy League, including Harvard's Graduate School of Design, the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Fine Arts, Yale's School of Art and Architecture, and Princeton's School of Architecture and Urban Planning, but it focuses particularly on the University of California, Berkeley's College of Environmental Design (CED), which was formed in 1959 when the departments of architecture, landscape architecture, and city and regional planning were all brought together under a common banner. Led by William Wurster, who first rose to prominence as a practitioner of Bay Region modernism, the CED became a national locus for intellectual inquiry regarding architectural "research" as a necessary counterpart to architectural practice.

Earlier, it should be noted, Wurster had served as dean of MIT's School of Architecture, overseeing its transformation into the more broadly focused and research-oriented School of Architecture and Urban Planning. Environmental design as a defined area of study eventually became codified in the monikers of research centers and professional societies, most notably the Environmental Design Research Association.

Exactly just what constituted environmental research and design—and how to get there from the standpoint of architectural education—was the subject of serious and protracted debate among both academics and professionals during these formative years. Methodologies employed in the social and behavioral sciences, especially psychology, offered one potential pathway, leading to the establishment of subspecialties such as environment-behavior studies and man-environment relations. Cybernetics and its close cousins, operations research and systems analysis, offered another, more rational approach, even as they inevitably collided with the less rational aspects of the creative process. Participatory design was yet a third route. Sachs traces its origins in part to "squatting," a technique developed by William W. Caudill of the Texas firm Caudill Rowlett Scott, in which designers immersed themselves fully in a community setting to gather feedback carefully from various stakeholders before proposing a design. User participation, moreover, would assume increasing urgency as social unrest began to rock American inner cities in the mid- to late 1960s. As a field, architecture had an identity problem that extended directly to its membership: the elitism of the Beaux-Arts aesthetes merely had been replaced by the elitism of the "scientific" professionals, and neither was particularly welcoming to women or underrepresented minorities.

There was an inevitable reaction to environmental design as a field even before it reached maturity. From the rear guard, some professionals complained that when students were burdened with the demands of nonstudio coursework, they became less proficient in drawing. From the vanguard, those academics under the influence of post-modern literary theory would, by the early 1980s, sideline environmental discourse as antithetical to what they perceived as architecture's eternal values. In this larger,

discordant context, Sachs's analysis of Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown's Studio LLV, the architecture seminar that lay behind their seminal 1972 text (with Steven Izenour) *Learning from Las Vegas*, is particularly insightful. In attempting to combine the formal and the social, but lacking the time to do justice to the latter, students inevitably became mired in their own aesthetic biases—a situation that raised the question of what was truly “learned.”

In researching *Environmental Design*, Sachs combed through more than a dozen archives, unearthing reports, program manuals, conference proceedings, and curricula, in addition to examining better-known published studies by Christopher Alexander, Rachel Carson, James Marston Fitch, Jane Jacobs, Kevin Lynch, and William Whyte, among others. Interspersed throughout her text are photographs as well as diagrams drawn from these sources, some remarkably prescient, others quaintly outmoded, and all fascinating. Key intellectual forebears pop up from time to time, including John Dewey, Patrick Geddes—whose role in this narrative could have been expanded significantly—and Lewis Mumford. In fact, Sachs identifies Mumford's “Housing” essay for the Museum of Modern Art's 1932 *Modern Architecture: International Exhibition* as the catalyst for the entire movement. Nevertheless, environmental design's truest and most sustained champion turns out to have been Catherine Bauer, Mumford's onetime collaborator who rose to prominence as a housing reformer and subsequently became Wurster's marital, academic, and intellectual partner. Bauer's relentless advocacy for a more inclusive, participatory approach informed the best ideas that emerged from the CED and the environmental design movement writ large. In a long-overdue acknowledgment of her outsize role, Wurster Hall on the Berkeley campus was renamed Bauer Wurster Hall in late 2020.

Ever since Giorgio Vasari elevated architecture from manual to intellectual status, self-scrutiny among its practitioners has been a constant. Sachs shines an important spotlight on how this introspective process accelerated in the postwar years. In the end, a new discipline was not born, and an existing discipline was only partially reimagined. “Ultimately, architecture as environmental design was a theory of the *profession*

and its role in democratic social action, or a theory of *practice*, and not a theory of *architecture*,” she writes in the book's conclusion. “As such it offered a vision of what *architects* should be, but it did not, and could not, provide overarching characterizations of *architecture*. Indeed, it was often the conflation of these realms—the attempt to explain the art of architecture through its practice—that led to divisive results” (164). Such ongoing divisions notwithstanding, that contemporary architects remain engaged in environmental discourse would seem essential, given the potentially dire outcomes facing the planet in the twenty-first century.

ROBERT WOJTOWICZ
Old Dominion University

Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz

Traces of J. B. Jackson: The Man Who Taught Us to See Everyday America

Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press,
2020, 328 pp., 16 color and 35 b/w illus.
\$39.50 (cloth), ISBN 9780813943343

As a junior at the University of California, Berkeley, in the 1990s, I enrolled in Paul Groth's class Cultural Landscapes. On the first day, I listened to Groth talk about highways, barns, and commercial storefronts as the “ordinary built environment,” a subject that I had not known existed, and that has guided my work ever since. At the time, I did not realize that my academic journey was directly influenced by J. B. Jackson; Groth was a long-time teaching assistant for Jackson's course History of the Man-Made Environment, and he had built his class on Jackson's slides, research, and findings.

It is hard to measure the full extent of J. B. Jackson's influence on the disciplines of architectural history, American studies, and geography. On the one hand, Jackson was the founder, main publisher, and editor of *Landscape* magazine from 1951 to 1968, the writer of several collections of essays, a distinguished faculty member at Harvard and Berkeley for almost two decades, and the recipient of numerous accolades, including the 1995 PEN Award for the Art of the Essay. On the other hand, he did not follow the conventions of scholarly writing (his work did not include scholarly monographs) or academic employment (he did not work full-time as a professor at one institution, where he could have further

shaped programs and areas of scholarship). In *Traces of J. B. Jackson*, Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz quotes a 1973 letter in which Jackson's brother told him, “You have single-handedly created a field of study” that “will soon become an established discipline” (201). As a historian of the built environment (or cultural landscape scholar) myself, I have often felt that the study of ordinary landscape histories and social histories of built environments has been marginal to the fields of geography and architectural history. In recent years, however, architectural historians and theorists have begun to reinvigorate socially oriented research and the study of the everyday built environment; given these developments, revisiting Jackson's work now is not only instructive but also timely.

Horowitz's intimate and thorough biography reflects on Jackson's work as well as on his legacy. Starting out chronologically and emphasizing the more thematic aspects of Jackson's life, Horowitz reconstructs “traces” of his upbringing, early education, relationships, and wartime service, contextualizing both his interest in ordinary landscapes and his changing personal orientation toward issues of race, class, religion, and sexuality. She shows how Jackson's wartime service shaped both his interest in sketching and his close attention to maps, geography, and built landscapes. These interests in turn inspired Jackson's sensitive and insightful approach toward landscapes later in life. Horowitz also deftly explores her own evolving personal relationship with Jackson, leveraging their interactions to gain insight into Jackson's character and ideas. The heart of the book lies in its most engrossing chapters, which address his ideas and writings as well as his public speaking and teaching.

Filled with salient quotations from Jackson's published work and field journals, correspondence, and interviews, Horowitz's book shows how Jackson continually redefined the terms *vernacular* and *landscape* as the field of landscape studies took shape. For Jackson, landscape “encompassed the full imprint of human societies on the land” (1). Landscape could be viewed as an “expression of a culture, of a way of life,” and “as a complex and moving work of art, the transcript of a significant collective experience” (99). In many ways, it is that collective experience that Jackson doggedly pursued

in his research on the vernacular, which he regarded as the “form of a building that is temporary, utilitarian, unorthodox in terms of style, and often unorthodox in construction. . . . It is contingent; it responds to environmental influences—social as well as natural—and alters as those influences alter” (244). Jackson’s concern for the social content of the material world—use—motivated his orientation and led him to emphasize certain key questions. “The vernacular point of view is: how do we use a thing? The establishment point of view is: how is it made?” (272). He believed that all scales and units of the built environment are deserving of study and analysis, from signs to bus stops, houses, roads, fields, and towns.

For scholars and teachers of built environment histories and landscape studies, Horowitz’s analysis of Jackson’s field journals, painstakingly culled for striking details and spatial arguments, illustrates his methods. One of Jackson’s singular talents was the ability to describe places and their uses in close detail; as Horowitz notes, he “commented on the weather, the signs of spring, the colors, the light. He described the road, mentioning its quality, the traffic, delays, the workmen making repairs” (146). Driving alone on a BMW motorcycle as he traveled from Berkeley to Cambridge, as well as around his home in La Cienega, New Mexico, Jackson documented small towns, rural fields, and midsize cities across the United States; he visited Mexico and Cuba and traveled extensively in Europe. Horowitz transcribes some of his field questions: “Where is town growing?” “Where is idle time spent—in town & for longer periods?” “Where is vice?” (162).

Jackson not only observed and documented but also talked with strangers, and his “interview with filling station” (123) allowed him to take the pulse of a place and to initiate the formulation of an argument about how its spaces functioned and for whom. After an attentive reading of all of Jackson’s available field notes and decades of correspondence, Horowitz summarizes his process as follows: “He sets off in a general direction, but on an unknown path. His quarry—truth—is elusive and ever-moving. He searches without knowing the outcome. He hunts alone, hoping for a sudden flash of insight. He cannot direct others but only suggest that in their own

searches, they remain open to inspiration and guesses. . . . Jackson tells me that his great gift had two elements—willingness to go on an unpredictable search and trust in his powers of insight” (206). Jackson’s willingness to pursue research without a predetermined goal and to take risks resulted in colorful arguments about the characters of places that were sometimes polemical and always instructive.

Jackson’s great gift cannot be isolated from his complicated personal transformations. In her own relationship with Jackson, Horowitz encountered a knowledgeable and skillful orator, essayist, and teacher. His writings, however, reveal his complex relationship with his upper-class upbringing, early expressions of bigotry, and a repressed and desperate angst regarding his sexuality. Later in life, he turned away from his elite origins, embracing “Pueblo Indians, Hispanics, small farmers, and blue-collar workers,” who “preserve the basic elements of an authentic regional culture: the small community, the practice of religion, the family, and the freedom to exploit natural resources on a day-by-day domestic scale.” Lauding the common person, he concluded: “What gives our landscape much of its impressiveness is the evidence of that struggle” (249).

Jackson’s work, expansive and transformative as it is, has also been met with critique, including his own. Horowitz calls out a moment in Jackson’s field journal where he critiqued a behavior to which he had adhered for weeks in his own journal writing. As he wrote: “Tourists can never see & realize the injustices done by dividing fields in highway construction, or destruction of houses & villages.” Jackson argued this approach was similar to judging “the injustices of city & its makeup by looking at it” (165). Looking is a critical skill, but here Jackson discovered that when “looking” is not triangulated with other methods, it can result in baseless assumptions. Geographer Richard Walker and others have repeatedly demanded that scholars of the built environment incorporate the political economy in their assessments of places. Also, beyond the “interview with filling station,” more in-depth ethnographies often complicate findings about what places mean for particular groups and their histories.

As Horowitz makes clear, readers of Jackson’s work are always left with the

feeling that they too are experts on their own ordinary built environments. In his teaching, Jackson wanted “to remind [students] that each of them had his or her own landscape, which was part of the way they related to the wider world” (81). His way of viewing the world and his call to encourage others to view it for themselves are still relevant today. Horowitz’s biography is an excellent point of entry for those who are unfamiliar with Jackson’s methods and arguments, as well as for those who are interested in nurturing their ability to see ordinary landscapes anew.

SARAH L. LOPEZ
University of Texas at Austin

Daniel A. Barber

**Modern Architecture and Climate:
Design before Air Conditioning**

Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press,
2020, 328 pp., 76 color and 196 b/w illus.
\$60 (cloth), ISBN 9780691170039

Climate is one of the few aspects of modern architecture’s history that until now has not been subject to comparative case study research. In the wake of recent interest in embodiment and identity, scholars have revisited individual projects, including Hannes Meyer and Hans Wittwer’s ADGB Trade Union School (1928–30) and Arie Sharon’s campus for the University of Ife (now Obafemi Awolowo University) in Ile-Ife, Nigeria (1962–72), complementing Jiat-Hwee Chang’s wide-ranging conceptual genealogy approach to climatic architecture.¹ In the richly illustrated *Modern Architecture and Climate*, Daniel A. Barber takes on the challenge of putting these approaches into dialogue, examining some canonical projects and texts on climate control while threading conceptual concerns throughout. Framed by a 1931 Barcelona housing project by Le Corbusier and the Olgyay brothers’ 1957 survey *Solar Control and Shading Devices*, the book presents a convincing argument for the need to revisit the rich and transformational body of practical knowledge about climatic modernism over the quarter century before air-conditioning became widespread.²

At the core of this project is a transnational history of architectural responses to issues of climate control, including Le Corbusier’s interest in sun shading, which was informed by the work of Brazilian

architects, who were early adopters of the *brise-soleil*; the work of émigrés Victor and Aladar Olgyay, who effectively established the field of bioclimatic architecture; and the work of Richard Neutra, also a Euro-American, who demonstrated practical responses to climate needs while working on development projects in Puerto Rico. Almost everyone, apparently, got together to design, or to criticize, the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris (1958). Knowledge about climate control, embedded in formats of diagrammed analyses and distributed images, largely traveled from European origins, driven by concerns about providing more sunlight in buildings, to the design of buildings for warmer or tropical climates, where it was reconceived as techniques for controlling and limiting solar ingress.

However, Barber's analysis goes beyond observing the dynamics of knowledge transmission. He proposes some meta-themes into which he endeavors to sort the myriad side stories, minor cases, and nuanced conceptual shifts in the growth of the field of climatic modernism. Some of these themes critique the hegemonic power that climate control enacts over vulnerable bodies, particularly those living as the subjects of colonization and capitalism at the sites of extraction in the world economy. Climatic difference, Barber claims, was eradicated in favor of universal standards that came with racist histories, such as the climate determinism popularized by Ellsworth Huntington in *Civilization and Climate* (1915).³ As climatic modernism adopted these norms for air-conditioning, the standards were extended at a scale that had disastrous consequences for the planet. This process was masked by an emphasis on façade design and, more convincingly, involved the proliferation of "environmental media" (13), including ever more complex "technical images" that were "projective" as they built toward computational data processing (16).

The concern for climate change runs throughout this historically grounded work, specifically climate change caused by the exponential growth in carbon emissions generated by the construction of, access to, and cooling of buildings. Barber's preoccupation with the catastrophic consequences associated with such emissions supports his claim that this is a "history focused on the future,"

intended to encourage the reclamation of the passive solar control methods that characterized modern architecture prior to air-conditioning, as well as to enable a better understanding of some of the other architectural approaches to climate issues that have been erased in favor of global comfort standards (13).

The book is divided into two sections, "The Globalization of the International Style" and "The American Acceleration," suggesting a somewhat artificial division of the globe, given the vital importance of transnational exchanges in the flow of knowledge. A short terminal text titled "The Planetary Interior" notes a return to shading devices, increased concern for indigeneity, and the embedding of climate-building analysis within contemporary design software. Barber proposes this relatively hopeful conclusion as an opening for architects to reclaim agency in relation to climate change. Leading up to it, however, are several cautionary tales. Le Corbusier's early claim to innovation in the use of horizontal sun-shading louvers followed the disastrously ineffectual *mur neutralisant* that he coengineered for the Cité-Refuge de l'Armée du Salut in 1928. In this vein, Neutra's detailed work on the design of passively cooled social architecture for Puerto Rico that remained largely unbuilt, the dense graphs of the Olgyays that were illegible to professional architects and thus compromised the brothers' research goals, and the unfortunate choice to use glass curtain walls for United Nations buildings in both New York City and Paris are all examples of the difficulties that climatic modernism faced in aligning research, media, data, and supportive patronage.

The second section of the book begins with a discussion of populist media projects that supported new forms of architectural expertise and patronage during the postwar American real estate boom. With a rich sample of new genres of illustrations that emerged from unprecedented allegiances among meteorologists, editors, architects, and historians as they collectively explored the diverse climatic forces converging on the suburban home, it is an entertaining and convincing narrative of the development of comfort as a middle-class desire and object of consumption. Although Barber misses a possible prehistory in Frank Lloyd Wright's organic architecture

and an afterlife in the widespread installation of Nest thermostats, in this highly accessible section he offers material on American climatic cultures that will appeal to a wide readership.

The ambition of the project as a whole, however, seems to go beyond this form of transdisciplinary history of domestic design. Barber's sometimes dense and often generalizing commentary surrounding these case studies attests to his familiarity with the environmental humanities and their methodological intent to politicize "events," a term he borrows from Isabelle Stengers, as he seeks to retell the past as a more complex set of relations than these appealing images might first suggest (12). Despite this ambition, the political narrative is sometimes watered down by the breadth of the project, which encompasses many stories generated by a dense period of research and innovation. In Barber's attempt to advocate on behalf of climate emergency while simultaneously illustrating its cases in an engaging manner, something had to give. In relation to the latter, the book skims over the postcolonial context of Maxwell Fry and Jane Drew's climatic media and omits the Cold War dynamics of Soviet climatic research, including Hannes Meyer's important contributions. Despite calling for diverse agency in relation to climate, Barber also misses the influence of the lived Japanese house in Antonin Raymond's work. But he unearths many lesser-known figures who in some way have tried to shift human relations with the elements of climate through design. Such stories are redemptive, as they illustrate how the progression of climate change can be countered with the weapon of the graph, or with the trial-and-error shaping of a façade.

For the academic and the architect, this valuable volume encourages more careful consideration of climatic modernism as both history and limit. It is thought-provoking, giving us pause to consider the passionate attempts that architects have made to mediate their environment. The tales gathered here trace a lineage that situates design within the planetary. While the evolving form of control between humans and their environment may be seen in positive terms, it is also prone to failure when its science is faulty, or when its benefits are restricted to the few at the expense of the globe. Barber's

constant and learned skepticism warns us to maintain an informed but critical distance from the pursuit of immediate comfort.

HANNAH LE ROUX
University of the Witwatersrand

Notes

1. Jiat-Hwee Chang, *A Genealogy of Tropical Architecture: Colonial Networks, Nature and Technoscience* (London: Routledge, 2016); Jiat-Hwee Chang, "Thermal Comfort and Climatic Design in the Tropics: An Historical Critique," *Journal of Architecture* 21, no. 8 (2016), 1171–202.
2. Aladar Olgyay and Victor Olgyay, *Solar Control and Shading Devices* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957).
3. Ellsworth Huntington, *Civilization and Climate* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1915).

Lukasz Stanek

Architecture in Global Socialism: Eastern Europe, West Africa, and the Middle East in the Cold War

Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press,
2020, 368 pp., 150 color and 127 b/w illus.
\$60 (cloth), ISBN 9780691168708

Lukasz Stanek's *Architecture in Global Socialism* is an indispensable contribution to our understanding of the multifaceted process of globalization. Too often, globalization is associated with Americanization, a viewpoint that eliminates from globalization's history the multitude of actors that take part in its process, the various geopolitical positionings that shape international alliances, and the social, economic, and political agendas that these alliances stake. This process can be traced to the era of development following World War II, with the opening of decolonizing states in Asia and Africa to new actors and markets that challenged lingering colonial ties. By focusing on the work of architects from the socialist bloc in these emerging markets of the global South, Stanek's book breaks with the predominant monolithic view on the hegemony of Western capitalism and its unidirectional vectors of influence.

Building on growing scholarship regarding the production of knowledge in Eastern European countries and its impact on the discourse of development, *Architecture in Global Socialism* is the first study of its kind in architectural history. Ambitious in scope and breadth, it compellingly

conveys the sheer scale and magnitude of the presence and work of architects from the socialist bloc in West Africa and the Middle East from 1957 (the year of Ghana's independence) to the end of the Cold War. Stanek redirects the conversation regarding the globalization of architecture by underscoring the fundamental contribution of architects from the socialist bloc in shaping the postwar world—occasionally operating in direct competition with their counterparts in the Western bloc, but most of the time functioning as complementary to them.

The book is organized chronologically around five chapters, each anchored in a different locale, taking the reader from Ghana in the 1960s and Nigeria in the 1970s to Iraq, the United Arab Emirates, and Kuwait in the 1980s. As this range suggests, not all these countries shared the same socialist agenda. The pervasive presence of architects from socialist countries outside the Eastern bloc indicates that Cold War ideology at times had very little to do with the contents of the work itself. As Stanek emphatically demonstrates, many of these architects did not consider themselves to be apostles of socialism; rather, they viewed themselves as part of an international culture of modern architecture. Many were motivated by the personal and professional benefits of working abroad. The book is replete with the names of architects involved, anchoring Stanek's critique of the Cold War global division of labor and serving as a historical corrective to the reductive Cold War Western narrative that insisted on the architectural anonymity and lack of design agency in socialist countries. These figures further come to life through occasional firsthand accounts, drawn from the numerous interviews conducted by the author and woven seamlessly into the narrative.

In a similar vein, when discussing state design institutions and contractors, Stanek takes great care to articulate their respective roles in the political economy of the socialist bloc's Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon). He thereby successfully disentangles them from a reductive (and imaginary) architectural uniformity controlled by Moscow. In fact, very little of Stanek's discussion focuses on projects developed by architects in the Soviet Union. This reflects the important role

played by satellite countries in augmenting and diversifying the Eastern bloc's methods of international association and in delivering technical aid. When "seen from the South," Stanek asserts, the countries constituting the Eastern bloc presented a heterogeneous array of "distinct political ambitions and constraints, economic interests, technological profiles, industrial capacities, and architectural traditions" (4). This array changed over time and reflected shifts in foreign policy, moving from Nikita Khrushchev's "gift diplomacy" to Leonid Brezhnev's more straightforward economic agenda (1964–82). Stanek's work thus reaffirms recent trends in the study of the history of development suggesting that the development discourse was far less homogeneous than previous critiques have indicated.¹

Bearing in mind the diversity in practices and agendas documented in this book, the question arises as to what the "socialism" of "global socialism" stands for. For the most part it refers to the socialist bloc's structure of assistance and its political economy—the very conditions that allowed architecture from socialist countries to circulate globally. This structure is articulated best in chapter 4's discussion of the context of the "world socialist system"—the political economy defined by the Comecon under Brezhnev. In this chapter, which focuses on the legal forms of contracts, currency exchange rates, and the barter system, Stanek argues that "the political economy of the world socialist system was not only a principle of distribution of architecture but also the principle of architectural production. In other words, it not only defined where architects and planners from socialist countries worked but also how they worked and what they produced" (172). The most gratifying part of the book for readers interested in political economy is Stanek's discussion of the coordination of the work of East Germans and Romanians involved in construction export with respect to their uneven economic positions within the bloc. Stanek shows how type design, standardization, and "technological adaptation" served as tools for collaboration as well as competition (228). More broadly, this chapter also highlights the significance of structures of finance and trade, the institutional or contractual

relationship between design and construction, and the roles assumed by architects and the building industry in all of the above.

The interdependence between the how and the what, however, is more tenuous in other parts of the book. Global socialism is not defined here exclusively in terms of its political economy but also through auxiliary concepts such as “socialist cosmopolitanism” and “socialist solidarities.” One of the strategies Stanek employs in confronting the cultural complexity of interactions between various locales involves examining these interactions in terms of “worlding from below” (101). Stanek borrows this concept from AbdouMaliq Simone’s investigations into the ways in which southern subjects construct meaning in their urban settings and employ the resources they find there to operate at scales beyond their immediate localities.² In contrast to the precariousness associated with these urban experiences, Stanek applies the concept of worlding from below in chapter 3 to an itinerant class of professionals who tried to make sense of their involvement in southern locales. To do so, they capitalized on their countries’ peripheral position and recent development as well as their historical experiences of colonization, however ambiguous, as a shared ground for solidarity and the transference of expertise. As fascinating as this discussion is, these shared experiences belonged to a broader cadre of professionals than the ones from the socialist bloc, and it remains unclear how the experience of socialism or the work it produced played out in this particular “worlding.” Ghana’s National Physical Development Plan (1965), for example, is discussed in relation to regional planning techniques developed in Poland since the 1930s, but it is not clear how the reworking of regional planning under socialism affected the design. On the other hand, one can infer how the socialist experience affected planning practices in Stanek’s chapter 4 discussion of the Baghdad master plan, but this analysis is not tied back to the shared experiences of peripherality or colonialism discussed in the preceding chapter. Dissociating worlding from the socialist experience—whether it be professional or personal—weakens the force of Stanek’s argument in chapter 1 that links worlding with the radical possibilities of socialist world making.

It is also disappointing that despite Stanek’s detailed attention to architecture’s transfers, translations, and adaptations, he does not challenge modern architecture’s technoscientific normative validity and assumed objectivity. He examines heritage considerations, for instance, within the parameters of Western epistemology without problematizing them. An example is the case of Zbigniew R. Dmochowski’s influential documentation of vernacular traditions in Nigeria, where a focus on space and structure effaces the rich and culturally significant techniques of surface treatment and ornament in Nigerian building traditions (chapter 3). More conspicuous, however, is the almost complete absence of issues of race throughout the book, although this was in fact a thorny subject in Cold War propaganda. On the one hand, the Soviets used acrimonious American race relations to their advantage, while on the other, Western-affiliated media outlets based in Africa reported consistently on the racism experienced by African students in the Soviet Union. Given the centrality of the Central Asian and Caucasian republics as experimental grounds for socialist architectural knowledge production in non-Western societies, one cannot help but wonder how assumptions about race in these experiments undergirded ostensibly purely technical matters like climate and the planning concept of the *mikrorayon* when these were deployed globally. In other words, if architectural export can be considered in terms of “deterritorialization and reterritorialization of expert systems across diverse social and cultural situations” (297), then what is missing are the disciplinary stakes in architecture’s deterritorialization from Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Caucasus and its reterritorialization in the global South.

Notwithstanding these weaknesses, the importance of *Architecture in Global Socialism* cannot be overestimated. Stanek has undertaken an unprecedented challenge to map the export of architecture from the socialist bloc with historical erudition that does not shy away from complexity. Whatever his book’s blind spots, they should be considered an invitation to further research made possible by Stanek’s monumental endeavor.

AYALA LEVIN
University of California, Los Angeles

Notes

1. Frederick Cooper, “Writing the History of Development,” *Journal of Modern European History* 8, no. 1 (2010), 16.
2. AbdouMaliq Simone, “On the Worlding of African Cities,” *African Studies Review* 44, no. 2 (2001), 15–41.

David Morton

Age of Concrete: Housing and the Shape of Aspiration in the Capital of Mozambique

Athens: Ohio University Press, 2019, 310 pp., 72 b/w illus. \$90 (cloth), ISBN 9780821423677

David Morton’s *Age of Concrete* is an amazing book recounting the story of the city of Maputo, Mozambique’s capital, focusing on the development of its *subúrbios*—the spaces in which the city’s inhabitants challenged colonial-era building rules and confronted the postcolonial circumstances surrounding the construction of an independent Mozambique. Morton’s refreshing narrative reveals an inspired storyteller who delves deeply into facts regarding the people whose daily lives and environments shaped the country’s history.

Under colonialism, many African cities were divided into central urban cores and large, informal peripheries deprived of basic urban infrastructure. While city centers were often designed with Western settlers in mind, the peripheries became large slums for the native working classes. This stark spatial division has left permanent marks on contemporary African metropolises across the continent. Morton’s work builds on this history in tracing Maputo’s development from the 1940s under Portuguese colonial domination, through moments of revolution and the independence movement, to the present. The city was originally named Lourenço Marques, for its colonial founder; it was renamed Maputo in 1976, soon after Mozambique gained independence from Portugal. During that same time, the city’s architecture underwent a physical and symbolic transformation. Mozambique’s first president, Samora Machel (1933–86), declared to all Mozambicans that Maputo was “our city.” The capital’s colonial-era modern architecture, once a tool of domination, was reoccupied after the exodus of the colonial population as a key expression of Mozambique’s new postindependence condition.

Modern architecture and urbanism, having come into a world framed by colonialism, where visions for improvement and innovation overlapped with brutal destruction, required reinvention.¹ Today, the modern buildings of Maputo constitute one of the continent's great ensembles of modern architectural heritage.²

Architectural heritage is not the subject of the *Age of Concrete*, however. Rather, the book frames concrete as a material, process, and metaphor through which to analyze the changes that have taken place over time within the city's periurban margins.³ Morton's scholarship is rooted in "the low-lying neighborhoods where most residents of Maputo live a life shaped by a lack of basic urban infrastructure, and punctuated by the ills caused by frequent flooding" (3). He documents the "making of houses" in these *subúrbios* (5–7), a process in which residents have historically used reeds as a building material, replacing them with more permanent materials such as concrete blocks over time. Morton also offers insight into the ways this process of construction has come to embody the lives and aspirations of the houses' inhabitants, highlighting the advantages of living in the *subúrbios* rather than in what might be considered the artificial, mechanical environments of the city's modern architecture. Those buildings tend to deny the significance of traditional African culture in favor of a Western-derived concept of architectural development that seeks to eliminate differences such as class, ethnicity, and gender, and thereby to unite all humanity under the banner of a shared belief in progress and emancipation. Of course, it is clear that differences among people and places are profound and persistent.⁴ Morton's book itself is testament to this fact. The relationship it explores between Maputo as a city of reed houses and Maputo as a city of concrete thus highlights not only the dynamic between the city's urban center and its physical margins but also the gradual process through which the residents of the margins have materially transformed these environments over time. Morton thus provides a stimulating reflection on the act of construction and the nature of dwelling itself, as well as on racial and social injustice and the lives of the natives and poor whites who live in these settings.

In this respect, Morton's work does not follow typical analytical models for colonial urbanism, which often split the city in two, examining the permanent architectural evidence of colonizers' structures on the one hand and the precarious dwellings of colonized subjects on the other. Morton, by contrast, takes the unique approach of illuminating the building methods of what may be understood as Maputo's popular urbanism to argue that the struggles faced by the house builders and home dwellers who constructed the city's *subúrbios* in turn helped to give substance to Maputo's urban governance, in terms of both what it has been and what it should be. According to José Forjaz, the fragile balance at work in this system depends on the organizational capacity of the Mozambicans who occupy these spaces to maintain and support a system of regulation that is midway between traditional common law and institutional law, with practices imported and adapted from their places of origin.⁵ In revealing "how people tried to dismantle structures of inequality, both before and after independence," through these practices (17), Morton builds on this existing scholarship while challenging how we understand acts of physical intervention within the built environment.

Shaped by themes of conflict, segregation, and domination, this book offers a complex and difficult history informed by research methods that are both ethnographic and sociological in their disciplinary orientation. Morton leads the reader through the daily practices and multiple ways of living that exist in Maputo, describing the day-to-day struggles and aspirations of the city's population. He integrates multiple accounts of the particular and the nonheroic into a refreshing, innovative, and distinctly postcolonial study of the city. To these ends Morton has compiled an exhaustive bibliography that attests to his profound mastery of these issues, which he deconstructs through a kind of loving humanity. Morton establishes a well-paced flow between the general and the particular, between the collective and the personal, that holds the reader's uninterrupted attention. The book's chapters are thematically varied, a result of the author's effort to avoid imposing a singular master narrative on life in Mozambique's capital; instead, he deploys

many smaller narratives to reinforce his arguments.

Morton's use of oral histories, which he collected, synthesized, and expertly narrated following his immersion in the daily life of the city and its inhabitants, is also noteworthy. That Morton lived with the book's subjects, shared experiences with them, and created bonds of complicity and friendship is one of the keys to this work's effectiveness as a narrative. At the same time, Morton engaged in intensive archival work, including the study of collections of period songs, poems, and novels. Collectively, these materials generate an immersive environment in and of themselves. The combination of archival and field-based work offers a new approach to framing questions and stories surrounding the history of Africa's built environment. First-hand narratives help to enliven the archival material and transcend its historical limitations, resulting in rich interpretations of architecture, urbanism, and natural landscapes rooted in textual and oral evidence. Without whitewashing the horrors of apartheid, these living oral accounts offer dispassionate and factual views of human relations as informed both by a colonial urban context designed to dominate and persecute and by the establishment of a hierarchical postcolonial governing apparatus following the independence of Mozambique.

Morton offers an intimate, scholarly, and instructive journey through the urban history of Maputo and the culture of the city's suburban inhabitants in relation to the materiality of the city of concrete. In this regard, I also want to acknowledge the book title's clever use of the word *concrete*, which alludes to the progressive transformation of Maputo's precarious reed houses into today's more substantial concrete dwellings as well as to the construction of the consolidated city center that began decades ago. The book's cover image, which shows a group of six women admiring Maputo's progressive high-rise housing blocks—the concrete city center—at the very moment of independence in 1975, also gestures toward these multiple iterations and meanings of concrete. Superimposed on this eloquent image are colored bars that recall the Mozambican flag, printed like a keyword diagram with the title and subtitle.

As a different story of decolonization, this book foregrounds what historians tend to render as background: those neighborhoods often generalized as undifferentiated, unhistorical slums. Following the work of John Turner in Peru and Hassan Fathy in Egypt, at a time when sustainability is an urgent global concern and postcolonial theory has become especially important in foregrounding global–local relations, Morton’s reflections contribute to the ways architectural and urban historians can address topics related to equity, access, and environmental resources. *Age of Concrete* is a splendid and much-needed book that illuminates the circumstances of time, conditions of space, and subjectivities at work in cultural heritage through its assembling of invisible players and marginalized events and sites.

ANA TOSTÕES
Tecnico, University of Lisbon

Notes

1. Gwendolyn Wright, “Building Global Modernisms,” *Grey Room*, no. 7 (Spring 2002), 124–27; Ana Tostões, “How to Love Modern [Post-]Colonial Architecture: Rethinking Memory in Angola and Mozambique Cities,” *Architectural Theory Review* 20, no. 3 (2017), 122–32.
2. The city of Asmara, Eritrea, which was declared a World Heritage Site by UNESCO in 2017, is also notable in this respect. See Sean Anderson, *Modern Architecture and Its Representation in Colonial Eritrea: An In-visible Colony, 1890–1941* (London: Ashgate, 2015).
3. Sílvia Jorge, “Lugares interditos: Os bairros pericentrais autoproduzidos de Maputo” (PhD thesis, Faculty of Architecture, University of Lisbon, 2017).
4. Hilde Heynen, “The Intertwinement of Modernism and Colonialism: A Theoretical Perspective,” in “Modern Africa, Tropical Architecture,” ed. Ana Tostões, special issue, *docomomo Journal* 48 (2013), 10–19.
5. Architect José Forjaz has been responsible for the coordination of several restructuring plans of the Maputo *subúrbios*, namely, the Maputo Structuring Plan (Plano de Estrutura de Maputo) in 1985 and 2008, the Improvement of Informal Settlements Plan (Plano de Melhoramento dos Assentamentos Informais) in 2006, and the Partial Urbanization Plans of the neighborhoods Mafalala (2004–5), Chamanculo C (2005–9), Maxaquene A (2010–12), and Polana Caniço A and B (2013–15). See Jorge, “Lugares interditos.” See also Fabio Vanin, *Maputo, Open City: Investigations on an African Capital* (Lisbon: Fundação Serra Henriques, 2013); Ana Tostões, ed., *Modern Architecture in Africa: Angola and Mozambique* (Lisbon: Caleidoscópio, 2013).

Michael Falser

Angkor Wat: A Transcultural History of Heritage

Volume 1, **Angkor in France: From Plaster Casts to Exhibition Pavilions**

Volume 2, **Angkor in Cambodia: From Jungle Find to Global Icon**

Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2020, 508 and 642 pp., 1,400+ illus. \$198.99/€172.95 (cloth), ISBN 9783110335729

It is not easy to do justice in a necessarily concise review to a tour de force of a book such as Michael Falser’s *Angkor Wat*, with its two large-format volumes totaling 1,150 pages (printed in small typeface) and containing more than 1,400 illustrations, mostly black-and-white but also with color plates at the end of each volume. Falser examines the material and discursive configuration of the religious monument of Angkor Wat in Cambodia by means of archaeological, curatorial, and representational strategies as a world-renowned architectural masterpiece and key symbol of Khmer identity since the late nineteenth century. To investigate these strategies, Falser employs the analytical lenses of critical theory, postcolonial studies, and heritage studies (or, better, “critical” heritage studies, as per the recently adopted qualification).

Built in the second quarter of the twelfth century as a cosmic temple dedicated to Shiva and subsequently turned into a Buddhist monastery at the century’s end, Angkor Wat (*angkor* is the transcription of the Sanskrit term *nagara*, “royal capital”; *wat* is vernacular for “monastery”) has fascinated Westerners since they first became aware of it in the early 1860s, around the time France annexed the kingdom of Cambodia as a protectorate within the Indochinese Union (a composite colonial state also comprising Vietnam and Laos). By the 1930s, Angkor Wat was canonized by scholars affiliated with the *École Française d’Extrême-Orient* as the epitome of classical Khmer architecture (the Western art historical notion of “classical” denoting a stage of perfection bound to degenerate into allegedly inflated styles). Since 1954, Angkor Wat’s silhouette has featured on the flags adopted by succeeding incarnations of the postcolonial Cambodian state, even as French conservators retained authority over the site until the early 1970s. Angkor Wat’s grandeur was

well suited to the high imperial age, at a time when Europeans undertook the study and conservation of the major historical monuments located in colonized territories. Indeed, the French restoration of Angkor Wat and Angkor’s other monuments, such as the Bayon and the Baphuon, was anticipated by British interventions on the Mahabodhi Temple in Bodhgaya and those by the Dutch at Borobudur in Java. After the devastation suffered by Cambodia in the 1970s, which witnessed American carpet bombing, civil war, and the Khmer Rouge’s reign of terror (1975–79), followed by arduous recovery in the 1980s under a Vietnam-backed regime, since the 1990s Angkor Wat has regained global visibility as a tourist destination, with the typical mix of beneficial and detrimental results (unlike many iconic monuments, Angkor Wat is not located in or close to the national capital, but in Cambodia’s western region).

As the book’s bibliography shows, there is a considerable Western literature (mostly, though not only, in French) on Angkor Wat and Khmer art generally, which includes scholarly and popular books, articles in academic journals and illustrated magazines, and museum guidebooks and exhibition catalogues, in addition to the surveys and reports produced by colonial, national, and international conservation agencies, as well as by individual experts. Falser’s careful consideration of a large number of written and visual documents, along with secondary works, gives his analysis exceptional depth; the book’s vast iconographic apparatus in particular is an integral aspect of the author’s archival research and his methodology as an architectural historian. Falser premises the goal of tracing “Angkor Wat’s ‘trans-cultural’ trajectory” over the time span 1860–2010 on the reconsideration of “our explanatory terms to describe the involved *transfer-translation operations*” (1:42), which produced “two twinned archaeological versions of Angkor (Wat) in the sense of Foucault’s ‘enacted utopias,’ in our case of cultural heritage” (2:8). The study is informed conceptually by the notion, adapted from literary theory, of translation as a practice generative of new versions of a text—or, in this case, artifact—that in turn modify the original text (1:39–43). But aside from this conceptual framework, it is analytically productive to consider the sculptural and

architectural replicas of Khmer monuments exhibited in France (both permanent and ephemeral, faithful and pastiche) and the on-site conservative and reconstructive interventions as two parallel vectors of the same project of heritage making, or “patrimonialization” (a French lexical loan employed by Falser). At the same time, distinct albeit interfacing disciplinary concerns dominate the two volumes: those of museology and of art and architectural history and criticism in volume 1; and those of architectural conservation and heritage studies in volume 2.

Volume 1, *Angkor in France*, opens with a long introduction that establishes the study’s conceptual framework and introduces the contents of both volumes. The following eight chapters examine the representational history of Angkor’s monuments through architectural drawings, artists’ sketches, and, above all, plaster casts and architectural replicas made for museums and colonial and international exhibitions, moving chronologically from the Mekong Mission of 1866 (the first French exploration of western Cambodia after naturalist Henri Mouhot’s sighting of Angkor Wat in 1860) to the 1937 Paris Exposition Universelle (where the Soviet and German pavilions stood ominously one against the other ahead of World War II). The epilogue considers the additional inheritance claims by India, whose Hindu architecture represents the prototype of, and model for, Angkor Wat, as well as by Thailand, whose centuries-long suzerainty over western Cambodia ceased only in 1907 as a result of an unequal treaty with France. In volume 2, *Angkor in Cambodia*, Falser’s focus shifts to the actual monumental site. Chapters 9 to 12 (numeration carries on from volume 1) discuss, respectively, the creation and management of the Angkor Archaeological Park during the temporal arc 1907–70, the postcolonial reclaiming of Angkor Wat and of the legacy of the Angkorian empire under King Norodom Sihanouk’s leadership (1953–70), the temple’s spoliation during the domestic strife of the 1970s and 1980s, and its rise to conservation cause célèbre in the early 1990s, when Angkor Wat garnered international support and inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List. An extended epilogue amounting to an additional chapter examines the management

of Angkor Wat as a World Heritage Site since 1992.

Even though exhibits centering on French Indochina have been studied previously, Falser marshals an unprecedented amount of written and visual sources in volume 1. The aesthetic, material, technical, and spatial aspects of even minor museological collections and colonial exhibitions, along with the main exhibition venues in Paris and Marseille, are examined in minute, even overwhelming detail from a theoretically informed perspective that delineates an escalation in dimensions, from single architectural elements to the integral full-scale replica of Angkor Wat built in 1931. Intriguing is the—alas, too brief—discussion of the condemnation of Cambodian displays by French leftist intellectuals and anticolonial activists (1:332–34). But Falser’s most valuable contribution, dealing with the actual monumental site, is found in volume 2. This includes his exemplary discussion of anastylosis in chapter 9. First tested by the Dutch at Borobudur in the early 1900s, this technique was used extensively by French conservators to shape their “utopia of cultural heritage” at the Angkor Archaeological Park. Of great value to readers is also the detailed analysis Falser provides in chapters 10 and 11 concerning the ideological mobilization of Angkor by the succeeding state entities that held power from 1953 to 1993, and the way shifting foreign relations informed heritage diplomacy. Falser shows that the rhetoric of Angkor as heritage of humanity championed by UNESCO actually originated at the time of the U.S.-installed Khmer Republic (1970–75) that forced Sihanouk into exile. Moreover, the limited diplomatic relations of the People’s Republic of Kampuchea, which replaced the Khmer Rouge’s Democratic Kampuchea, opened the way for Asian states such as India and Japan, as well as socialist Poland, to provide technical and financial support for conservation in the 1980s, when the ousted Khmer Rouge exploited their ability to jeopardize access to Angkor from their remaining strongholds along the border with Thailand.

In addition to praise for his painstaking research, Falser deserves recognition for

considering comparatively analogous colonial cases of architectural conservation and representation, and for contextualizing historically the various stages in the patrimonialization of Angkor. One can also sympathize with his polemic against the “neo-colonial dispossession strategy against Cambodia’s own claim to manage Angkor Park independently” (2:401)—a strategy deployed since the 1990s through a plethora of international cooperation projects in which France is, once again, a key national player, along with Japan. In stigmatizing the reproduction of the colonial rhetoric of tutelage in the “Salvaging Angkor” campaigns of the past thirty years, the author could have drawn a parallel with the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia, a hybrid body comprising foreign and Cambodian lawyers and prosecutors that was set up in the early 2000s on the recommendation of the United Nations to put the Khmer Rouge leaders on trial in accordance with international legal standards of independence and impartiality. Following the school of thought inaugurated by Robert Hewison’s *The Heritage Industry* (1987), Falser’s indictment of the Angkor World Heritage Site as a “cultural heritage theme park . . . where over-restored temple sites were now presented, like picture-perfect pavilions in universal and colonial exhibitions, by various national (but not Cambodian) teams” (2:403) may well be justified from the standpoint of current architectural conservation, and even of the political economy of international cooperation, but may overlook the economic importance of the combined enhancement and exploitation (or *mise en valeur*) of Angkor for postconflict Cambodia.¹

I come thus to the critical remarks. Mirroring the scale of its subject, Falser’s monumental study embodies a totalizing, encyclopedic idea of knowledge that is at odds with the author’s own deconstructionist position—a position based on close observance of Foucauldian dogmas and postcolonial pieties that occasionally stiffens into an intellectual cliché. Falser, who seems to share an obsession with Angkor Wat with the colonial scholars he condemns, paradoxically magnifies French agency in his attempt to expose its epistemological and ideological biases while conversely undervaluing local knowledge and cultural imagination. The intentionally

ephemeral nature of most of the colonial artifacts examined in volume 1—inherently different in this from the actual Khmer monuments—cannot be forgotten in the evaluation of their cultural, artistic, and ideological significance. The nationalist iconization of Angkor Wat by Sihanouk and the Khmer Rouge is scrupulously examined in volume 2, even though Falser’s analysis is based on French-language documents that catered mainly to an international audience rather than a domestic one. The issue of the social memory of Angkor Wat possessed by Cambodian refugees in the 1990s is briefly addressed in a largely visual section (2:299–304). Overall, however, little is said about the social perception of Angkor Wat as an identitarian symbol in both colonial and postcolonial Cambodia among local intellectuals who expressed their views in the vernacular (the bibliography contains no sources in Khmer).

The very scale of the book also poses a problem, given that reading it from start to end is no mean task. Further, its superior production unfortunately omitted much-needed copyediting. The laborious prose, replete with jargon and repetitions as well as lexical blunders and syntactical aberrations (not to mention the abuse of French terms for which direct English equivalents exist), does not help the reader negotiate the book’s exceptional length. Even the chapter-by-chapter summaries in the “Findings and Conclusions” sections at the ends of both volumes are longwinded. Editing oversights include some glaring typos (e.g., “Camodia” in the title line of volume 2’s table of contents), inconsistent and often incorrect (according to predominant Anglo-American editorial styles) italicization of the names of French organizations, and, conversely, a perplexing avoidance of italics in the titles of books and journals listed in the bibliography.

To sum up, Falser’s *Angkor Wat* is unquestionably the fruit of much dedication and thorough field and archival research in Cambodia, Thailand, France, and Germany. Despite its flaws and intimidating length, it is a remarkable work of scholarship. Scholars interested in the politics of heritage, museology, and the global history of architecture, as well as the cultural history of Cambodia, will find much valuable information in this book, presuming they

can afford a copy (the dimensions and copious illustrations justify the hefty list price, which is the same for the hardcover and electronic editions) and are determined enough to read it through.

MAURIZIO PELEGGI
National University of Singapore

Note

1. Robert Hewison, *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline* (London: Methuen, 1987).

Mary Corbin Sies, Isabelle Gournay, and Robert Freestone, eds.

Iconic Planned Communities and the Challenge of Change

Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019, 544 pp., 22 color and 133 b/w illus. \$49.95 (cloth), ISBN 9780812251142

Recent scholarship has significantly enriched our understanding of the transnational dissemination of the garden city idea in the twentieth century. Although Ebenezer Howard’s utopian vision of a self-governed egalitarian society based on a cooperative commonwealth never materialized, his conception of the garden city provided a useful blueprint for planning experiments by social reformers aiming to create ideal settlements where residents would enjoy good health, emotional well-being, and strong communal ties. Many of these early planned environments have since become classic studies in the planning literature, where stories of visionary schemes have been retold repeatedly and the achievements of particular communities reappraised. As research has continued to expand, lesser-known variants of the garden city in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East have begun to come to light. These examples offer new comparative perspectives on the adaptation and appropriation of modern planning in different geopolitical contexts, where it has been employed to achieve social goals and to serve specific political agendas.¹

Although these studies have shed new light on the global histories of planning, less attention has been paid to the ongoing changes that threaten the legacies of planned communities in the present day. *Iconic Planned Communities and the Challenge*

of Change is an important book that fills this gap. As editors Mary Corbin Sies, Isabelle Gournay, and Robert Freestone explain, their purpose is to explore the fortunes of iconic planned communities in the twenty-first century, as these communities have become increasingly vulnerable to pressures of growth, change, and decline. Another of their stated objectives is to stimulate debate on how best to preserve the spirit and practical value of the innovative planning that underlies these communities while also meeting the needs of new generations of inhabitants. The “iconic” communities referred to in the title are places whose physical environments are broadly recognized as a result of the widespread circulation of visual images encapsulating their design and social tenets. Although such images may be exaggerated for propaganda purposes, the editors argue that they may also play a central role in heritage protection and thereby enable these communities to extend their environmental, artistic, and social legacies.

All contributors to this well-researched book are established scholars in the field. Using interdisciplinary perspectives, they present twenty-three planned communities of a variety of types across six continents, ranging from company towns to garden suburbs to mixed-use developments to new towns. Well-known cases include Letchworth, Welwyn, and Hampstead in Britain; Römerstadt in Germany; Tapiola in Finland; Colonel Light Gardens in Australia; and Riverside, Radburn, Greenbelt, and Sunnyside Gardens in the United States. Less widely known places include Menteng in Indonesia, Soweto in South Africa, Jardim América and Pacaembu in Brazil, Batovany-Partizánske in Slovakia, and Sabaudia and Garbatella in Italy. To facilitate discussion of common issues, the editors asked all of the contributors to address the strengths and weaknesses of their study sites, as well as the opportunities and threats the sites are currently experiencing in regard to conservation and continued viability.

Notwithstanding their keen interest in preserving the planning legacies of the presented communities, the editors acknowledge the impossibility of formulating “one size fits all” principles to guide the preservation of these communities, given the significant differences among them in cultural traditions, regulatory frameworks, and

historical trajectories. Nevertheless, based on their examination of the cases, they conclude that the quality of the original planning is the most important factor in a community's ability to retain its distinctive features and livability and achieve long-term viability. To support this point, the editors invoke the concept of "critical resilience," which involves community stakeholders assuming an active role in decision-making processes. They posit that such grassroots planning efforts are crucial not only for preserving the distinctive heritage of the past but also for ensuring equity, cultural diversity, and affordability of housing, as well as other amenities essential to social sustainability. Referring to Greenbelt as an example, the editors highlight how this New Deal-era community's tradition of civic activism and volunteerism has contributed to its sustained success, preserving the town's original planning rationale despite the legislative inadequacies that have accompanied its continued growth.

While Greenbelt's success story attests to the town's resilience through its connection with a diverse activist culture, such a framework is harder to apply to discussions of the fortunes of other planned communities that emerged under very different historical circumstances. Indeed, the use of the term *resilience*, like the term *community*, may illuminate but at the same time also prevent a more critical reflection on some of the tensions inherent in these developments. As critics of New Urbanism have pointed out, despite the emphasis of New Urbanist communities on the importance of promoting diversity and community bonds, in reality many of these communities tend to be exclusive, marginalizing groups with cultural beliefs, values, and norms that differ from those of the majority.² This is not to say that the contributors to this book are unaware of these dynamics. In fact, several chapters connect community histories to issues of social injustice, such as Angel David Nieves's account of Soweto as a "black garden city" (291) in the apartheid era and Sandra Annunziata's critique of the gentrification of Garbatella. But the discussion of resilience and sustainability would have been more robust and meaningful if the editors had introduced a framing question explicitly addressing the entwined

relationships among race, class, and the making of communities across the cases presented, particularly those of elite enclaves such as Uplands, Seaside, Menteng, Jardim América, and Pacaembu—just to name a few. Likewise, such considerations are critical for meeting the challenges of heritage preservation, one of which involves thinking about who ultimately benefits.

While iconicity is a key thread of the book, the contributors could have done more to address the shaping of collective memories and how the sense of historicity has shifted over time in different planned communities. Isabelle Gournay's chapter on visual representations at the end of the volume elucidates how planners, authorities, and community members have long harnessed the symbolic power of iconic images to promote their causes. But given the rich histories that the chapters evoke, it would be interesting to inquire further about how the ongoing presence of iconic markers has (re)constructed relations with the past, and to explore how such processes unfold in places with different social and political histories. Intriguing examples include Sabaudia, where recent efforts to uncouple the community's rural origins from its past under Italy's Fascist regime led to new interpretations highlighting the artistic and cultural contexts of the site as a version of modernism that resonates with contemporary urban values. Attempts to reconcile complex and difficult histories can also be seen in Menteng, where hybrid "Indisch architecture" represents the advent of a modernizing colonial society uncomfortable with typical colonizing practices. Indeed, such reinterpretations are much more than intellectual exercises—they are part and parcel of heritage preservation practices that can potentially enable better comprehension of the contested ideals and identities ascribed to iconic built environments.

Taken in its entirety, this book is undoubtedly an important contribution to the field. The diversity of its case studies, all excellently written, makes it a valuable resource for scholars studying planned communities and historic preservation, as well as for anyone interested in the history of architecture and planning, preservation, community development, and heritage studies.

CECILIA L. CHU
University of Hong Kong

Notes

1. For example, see Liora Bigon and Yossi Katz, eds., *Garden Cities and Colonial Planning: Transnationality and Urban Ideas in Africa and Palestine* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014); Robert Home, "Town Planning and Garden Cities in the British Colonial Empire 1910–1940," *Planning Perspectives* 5, no. 1 (1990), 23–37; Stephen V. Ward, ed., *The Garden City: Past, Present and Future* (London: Spon Press, 1992).
2. For example, see Denise D. Hall, "Community in the New Urbanism," *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review* 9, no. 2 (1998), 23–36.

Daniel P. Gregory

The New Farm: Contemporary Rural Architecture

New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2020,
192 pp., 150 color illus. \$45 (cloth),
ISBN 9781616898144

Although Daniel P. Gregory's *The New Farm* was slated for publication long before the COVID-19 pandemic struck, I have encountered no book that better evokes the longings so many of us have felt under lockdown: for fresh air, real solitude, and uncluttered and intentional spaces to inhabit. Enjoyed in the crowded confines of a suburban home office amid interruptions from family and pets, the book presents a seductive vision of modern farm life, of agrarian simplicity sheltered and structured by buildings whose modern lines are tempered with reassuring vernacular precedents. In the course of a thematic introduction and sixteen lushly illustrated case studies, Gregory presents an argument for a new organic style that architecturally materializes the literal translation of *agriculture* as "care of the soil" (14).

Gregory's prose, honed to a rhythm of cozy familiarity at *Sunset* magazine, is approachable and amiable, inviting the reader to ride shotgun on a rambling road trip across rural North America, Europe, and Australia. Among the people whose stories animate these places are a nurse anesthetist turned poultry farmer, a "tech-preneur" whose lavender fields are harvested by university student "ambassadors," a third-generation Utah farmer with a penchant for hydroponics, and heiress/feminist/philanthropist Abby Rockefeller (who also contributes the foreword).

The introduction establishes Gregory's curatorial intentions as both aesthetic and

ethical, namely, to define an approach to cultivation and the architectural forms that best embody that approach: “The term *architecturally modern working farm* might make you think that we are talking about a sort of agricultural International Style or the farm as factory. . . . Instead, though the farms in this book certainly have International Style DNA, we are defining *modern* more broadly, to encompass a wide range of architectural idioms as well as practice of organic farming and sustainability” (22). To provide context and precedent for that “wide range,” the introduction conjures a coastal and predominantly postwar architectural genealogy. Rooting this lineage in his own family history, Gregory commences with a Bay Region style farmhouse in the Santa Cruz Mountains that once belonged to his grandparents, designed by William Wurster ca. 1927. Other California points of inspiration, such as Sea Ranch and Cakebread Cellars, are linked to East Coast brethren such as the gastronomic paradise of Stone Barns Center in New York. Interwoven with these canonical sites are some less familiar examples—for instance, the seaside structures of McLeod Kredell Architects’ Island Design Assembly workshop in Maine, which hover between ephemerality and permanence. Within these opening pages, Gregory establishes motifs that recur throughout the volume: abstracted gables, weathered wood, and local vernaculars elongated, deconstructed, and recombined.

A short companion essay anchors each of the image-driven case studies that follow. Architectural drawings mingle with rich color photography, sourced largely from the architects and owners themselves. Despite the variety of different photographers represented, the book retains a surprising visual cohesion. Geography largely dictates the volume’s organization: the first eight farms are situated within the United States and the next seven are international, including sites in Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Canada, and Australia. The series begins and ends on the West Coast of the United States, with the final case study returning the reader to California for a concluding stroll through an olive orchard on the site of a former dairy ranch.

The book’s greatest strength is its ability to invite the reader into a place, quickly sketch the landscape and buildings, and

anchor people, animals, and agricultural processes within that topography. In its most effective case studies, the relationship between architecture and activity comes to life through designer Benjamin English’s deft layout. For example, in the chapter on Abby Rockefeller’s Churchtown Dairy in Hudson River Valley, New York, the panoramic interior of the wooden round barn becomes a cathedralesque centerfold between pages that zoom out to provide a sweeping aerial view of the full dairy complex and then back in to depict the intimate labor of dairy farming. Here, as throughout the book, the reproduced architectural drawings of the site provide subtle insight into the viewpoint of the designers. At Churchtown, the site plan is appropriately quaint and pictographic—a contrast to the photorealistic renderings provided by other firms.

The book’s organization necessarily invites a formalist comparison between the U.S. examples and their international counterparts. Many of the U.S. case studies derive from a precisionist variant of rural modernism à la Charles Sheeler’s Bucks County barns—gables and flat, textured surfaces machined in lines that blur the distinction between agrarian and industrial.¹ The international examples, particularly the European ones, are more materially daring—as in the woven lattice of hazel trees lining a wall of Georg Schmid’s cow barn near Basel (123) and the striking two-tone Douglas fir of the Oosterhout Farm at Rijswijk, south of Amsterdam (128).

For the architectural historian, Gregory’s short essays are poetic vignettes whose subtext is left to the reader to decode. The aim is not historical comprehensiveness, though history percolates through the text and images. Take Prugger Farm, a combination house and barn in northern Italy, sited near “a Mussolini-era bunker, where the children like to play” (114). Against this backdrop, Gregory compares the building’s processional ramps and cube-like structure to the Villa Savoye. There is much for the historian to unpack in this description, from the European tradition of people and animals living together under one roof to the multiple valences of modernism in Italy during World War II. Of note, most of the historical references in the case studies draw on the history of

modern architecture generally rather than on the specific intersection of modernism and farming—I kept waiting in vain for a reference to Hugo Häring’s iconic Gut Garkau (1922–26), near Lübeck, Germany.

But beneath these layers of formal allusion, there is a deeper argument at play about what the contemporary farm could and should be, one that remains largely implicit in this text. First, *The New Farm* reifies the small family farm as the container of key cultural values. This insistent notion snakes through much of modern U.S. history, from the eighteenth-century Jeffersonian yeoman to nineteenth-century transcendentalism to 1930s New Deal policies meant to battle sweeping farm consolidation and industrialization to our contemporary imaginary. Now, as always, that vision of the small family farm comes embedded with racial and socioeconomic implications. Indeed, despite all of the admirably green agriculture presented in this book’s pages, the occupants are overwhelmingly white and not infrequently upper- or upper-middle-class. Farmers who can afford to hire (or are themselves) architects are a rather select group.

Connected to this bourgeois slant is the related trope of “getting back to the land.” In describing a time-lapse animation of a seaside sheep ranch under construction in Tasmania, Gregory asserts that the filmmakers capture “the modern farm as dreamscape, the ultimate balm for busy urbanites” (167). This description is not too far from *The New Farm* taken as a whole, which translates the atmosphere of aspirational modernism—familiar to consumers of *Dwell* magazine or the long-running BBC series *Grand Designs*—to an agrarian context. It is a vision that today is realizable for the privileged few, but that a century ago was merely the architectural face of a technological fantasy.

In the early twentieth century, “getting back to the land” was synonymous with hardship, with giving up urban amenities in favor of Thoreauvian simplicity. Frank Lloyd Wright, Albert Frey, Wallace K. Harrison, and others who count a “modernist farm” within their canons, envisioned farms that came equipped with the luxuries of urban life—offering both the chance to reconnect with the soil and the ability to enjoy leisure time through the

use of modern and electrified conveniences.² Even in these earlier visions, sleek, abstracted architecture was the material expression of that elevated, comfortable “back to the land” lifestyle: the symbol of farming for pleasure rather than for subsistence.

In some ways, then, the eponymous “new farm” does not feel so new at all. Many of the same cultural anxieties and yearnings that stimulated the architectural discourse around modern farms a century ago are still present today, amplified by a polarized climate in the United States in which “organic” and “smallholder” farming takes on dimensions of class and identity politics. In this bifurcated, post-Trump nation, *The New Farm: Contemporary Rural Architecture* almost seems to demand a follow-up volume of nearly the same title: *The New Farm: Contemporary*

Urban Architecture. Indeed, in recent years, talented designers and architects have nurtured revolutionary urban and community farming efforts, such as Sweet Water Foundation in Chicago and Detroit Cultivator on the site of the Oakland Avenue Urban Farm.³ Rooted in many of the same agricultural values and practices as their rural “new farm” cousins, these models add “care of the people” to “care of the soil,” manifesting equity in an explicit pursuit of universal food security and racial justice.

SARAH ROVANG
Thoma Foundation

Notes

1. American artist Charles Sheeler depicted the barns of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, many times in photographs and paintings over several decades (ca. 1915–40). Sheeler was also an accomplished

artist of hard-edge industrial landscapes, and he brought that same clarity of line to the historic farm structures of Bucks County.

2. Frank Lloyd Wright’s plan for Broadacre City included a farm featuring an integrated farmhouse and barn. Albert Frey designed a streamlined flat-roofed farmhouse for the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1934. Wallace K. Harrison, along with J. André Fouilhoux, designed a modern “electrified farm” for the 1939 New York World’s Fair. See Frank Lloyd Wright, *The Disappearing City* (New York: W. F. Payson, 1932); Wallace Ashby, *Farmhouse Plans* (Farmers’ Bulletin no. 1738) (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1934); Sarah Rovang, “Envisioning the Future of Modern Farming: The Electrified Farm at the 1939 New York World’s Fair,” *JSAH* 74, no. 2 (June 2015), 201–22.

3. Urban designer Emmanuel Pratt heads Sweet Water Foundation, and Detroit Cultivator is a collaboration between Oakland Avenue Urban Farm and the Detroit firm Akoaki, led by architects Anya Sirota and Jean Louis Farges.