



Newsletter

of the Society of Architectural Historians

October 2001 Vol. XLV No. 5



Messages from the SAH President

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Brief hours turned September 11 from a peaceful morning in late summer into a day of horror at the World Trade Center in New York City, at the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., and in a pasture near Shanksville in western Pennsylvania. The news crashed in on us with insistent rapidity, and with it came the mounting realization that family, friends, lives were being lost. Grasping for historical perspective, and the promise that we might find a way beyond the loss, some have compared this day to the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, when a nation's view of itself was changed forever by an unexpected instant of tragedy. The subjectivity of such comparisons makes them mutable (my own association is with the assassination of President Kennedy on November 22, 1963) but the fundamental claim remains valid: somewhere in our passage from shock to anger and sorrow, the relentless events of September 11 had stretched in time from ticking minutes to the immeasurable distance between a world we knew then and the world we know now.

In search of meaning, I seize at random on a few facts. The twin buildings of the World Trade Center on the tip of Manhattan, each 110 stories and with a combined mass of 1,000,000 tons of steel and concrete, took nearly seven years to build, from their groundbreaking on August 5, 1966, to the ribbon cutting on April 4, 1973. To see their profile on the Manhattan skyline, to stand at their base gazing up, even to ascend to their swaying summits, was to be convinced of their permanence: they were so stubbornly *there* in the city, that over the years we even became

fond of their blocky aesthetic. And yet, between 8:48 a.m., when the first jet hit the north tower, and 10:29 a.m., when the south tower collapsed, both were destroyed, in an interval of 101 minutes whose brevity was made all the more abrupt by the suddenness with which these towers came down in seconds. Faced at once with the ephemerality and destructiveness of our human work, apocalyptic references to Hiroshima or Nagasaki seem more appropriate than the mundane knowledge that buildings are imploded with dynamite every day.

What happened in Washington and western Pennsylvania is perhaps less extreme, though each in its own way has proven just as devastating. We are reminded of struggles whose origins return to the first glimmers of human history, and we are reminded how those struggles have again and again hinged on the architecture of our world. Beyond their obvious differences, the architecture of a jet plane, of the World Trade Center, of the Pentagon, and of a patch of rural farmland share the kinship of being spaces that we have made and in which we carry out our lives. With varying degrees of purpose, each became a target because what we make inevitably acquires meanings, some of which we intend and control, others of which we do not. We live in this interval between experience and significance, between ourselves and others. This is the lot of our humanity, and it is here that we build our moments of joy and our expressions of grief.

Christopher Mead
President

Cover: *The World Trade Center Towers nearing completion, circa 1973. Photo courtesy of The Skyscraper Museum, New York.*

PUBLISHING PLENARY TALKS

The publication in our *Newsletter* of John Pinto's plenary talk, delivered in June 2000 at the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Society in Miami, inaugurates what I hope will be a regular tradition of recording such talks for future readers. The idea of a plenary speaker dates to the Fall 1998 SAH Board Meeting, when several Directors argued that our annual meetings needed an event that transcended the topicality of individual sessions, to address issues affecting the discipline of architectural history as a whole. Every year, it seemed, we defined our common purpose indirectly, by attending the annual meeting and witnessing the accomplishments of our colleagues, without ever finding an occasion to consider the larger intellectual interests that brought us together. The criticism was at once apt and useful, and the Officers worked with the Directors of the Society to solve this problem by planning a plenary talk for all subsequent annual meetings. Charged with commenting on the study of the built environment to a general assembly of the Society of Architectural Historians, the Plenary Speaker is selected from the recipients in the previous five years of one of the following SAH awards: the Alice Davis Hitchcock Award, the Spiro Kostof Award, the Antoinette Forrester Downing Award, the Philip Johnson Award, and the Founders' Award.

The first Plenary Speaker was Robert Brueggemann, who spoke in April 1999 at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Society in Houston. His talk, "From Harvard Yard to the Houston Galleria: The SAH and the Built Environment," was (alas) never transcribed, though its pertinent comparisons of the scholarship of John Coolidge, Reyner Banham, and Spiro Kostof made it stick in the minds of many. John Pinto is our second Plenary

Speaker, and this time we are fortunate to have his talk recorded in written as well as spoken form. In 1996, he received the Alice Davis Hitchcock Award for the book he coauthored with William MacDonald on Hadrian's Villa and its Legacy. An historian of Renaissance and Baroque architecture, initially at Smith College and since 1988 at Princeton University, Professor Pinto received his B.A. and Ph.D. from Harvard University, and was from 1973 to 1975 a Fellow of the American Academy in Rome.

Among his many publications, Professor Pinto's work on Hadrian's Villa articulates an historical practice of relevance to everyone in our discipline. First there is the fact, dramatized by his coauthorship of the book with MacDonald, that the writing of history (like its making) is a collaborative process of heeding and then translating the ideas of other into the terms of our own perceptions and preoccupations. Then there is the collaboration that occurs between an architectural object and its historical interpretation, as meaning continues to evolve and mutate over time. Brought yet again to life by MacDonald and Pinto, Hadrian's Villa endlessly prompts our imagination because its ruined fragments are so susceptible to admitting our reconstructions of what might have been. While history may be made in the past, it is written in the present, where we shape and reshape past possibilities to present circumstances.

Christopher Mead
President

Architectural History as a Humanistic Discipline

Introduction

Our field is positioned — advantageously, in my opinion — between the architectural profession and the humanistic disciplines. We do what we do at the nexus of bricks and mortar and art, history, and aesthetics. It's a wonderful combination, one that allows me to teach students who come from a broad range of fields, including classics, literature, engineering, art history, and architecture. I myself came to the field from graduate work in art history and teach in a department of Art and Archaeology, which, it's worth noting, until 1964 also embraced Princeton's School of Architecture.

I'm acutely aware that situating the history of architecture within a department of Art History represents only one of many structural solutions. My purpose this evening is not to debate where those of us who teach the history of architecture should stand in the constantly shifting and often irrational hierarchies of academic departments. Rather, it is to examine the relevance of architectural history at the millennium for the study of the humanities, and in the process, perhaps, to shed some light on the goals we set for ourselves as teachers and scholars.

To talk about architectural history as a humanistic discipline naturally forced me to think about the purpose of humanistic scholarship, today and in the past. Surely we pursue our work in order to organize and interpret our cultural inheritance in its vast complexity, to make the past available to the present. In this context, historic architecture assumes particular relevance as the concrete embodiment of cultural "deep structure" which effectively molds society and shapes human behavior.

The humanist's task extends further to function as a critic, judging the actions of the present by the experience of the past. In this regard, the humanist's analytical responsibilities expand to encompass the interpretative, the creative, and the poetic. From this imperative comes one of the tensions that continuously shapes our view of architectural history: the dynamic balance between analysis and interpretation. This determines the relative values we place on documentary evidence and critical theory, and the degree to which our view of the past is informed by the circumstances of the present.

Critical to the early development of art and architectural history was the notion of *Kunstwissenschaft*, or the "science of art," premised on a flawed belief in the existence of historical objectivity. But architectural history is not an objective science so much as an interpretive art that is constantly engaged in reassessing and translating the past into a modern idiom. By the same token, responsible historical interpretation must always bear some objective relation to the verifiable facts as our cumulative discipline has assembled them: the realities of dimensions, documents, and drawings.

Preparing these remarks has heightened my awareness of my own limited view of the field. I take some comfort, however, from the observation that most architectural historians feel a responsibility to be actively engaged across the broad chronological, geographical, and thematic spectra of our field, often both as teachers and as scholars. By way of contrast, this is a responsibility felt by relatively few of my art historical colleagues, who, to my eye, have collectively erected far more rigid boundaries between periods and specializations.

My own effort to assume a bird's-eye view of our field was greatly aided by the essays gathered in last September's issue of this Society's *Journal*, which I found immensely stimulating — my heartfelt thanks to all of the authors and editors. The range and variety of viewpoints expressed by the contributors — many of them contradictory — speak well for the vigor and health of our field. At the same time, there's ample evidence in these essays — and elsewhere — that architectural history, if not in crisis or at a metaphorical crossroads, is increasingly perceived as a marginal field of study. But I take the view of my colleague, Wen Fong, who taught me that the Chinese ideogram for crisis is a combination of two characters, one denoting danger and the other opportunity. How can we turn the challenges facing the history of architecture as an academic discipline to our advantage?

In what follows, I've tried to suggest several ways in which we might work together to redefine our field as one that is central — rather than peripheral — to the core fields of humanistic knowledge. I've outlined three broad areas offering both challenges and opportunities, each of which I'll consider in turn:

- 1) Integrating architectural history and humanistic studies
- 2) Forging a consensus that respects ideological, methodological, and professional diversity
- 3) Embracing digital technologies as a means of broadening our academic base.

1) *Integration*

The history of the built environment has the potential to provide multiple points of engagement with the humanities. Consider three examples, chosen almost at random: the intersection of the oratory as a musical form and its concrete embodiment as an architectural type, the layered sub-strata of Rome as Freud's analogy for recovering the human subconscious, and the literary theme of the pastoral as it is expressed in landscape and villa design. Instead of drawing lines that insulate the study of architectural history from other areas of the humanities, we need to strive more vigorously to connect with them. Stated differently, we need to recognize the permeability of the boundaries surrounding our discipline as a strength, and not a weakness. This will allow us to open up and enrich our own academic discourse through engagement with intellectual models from other disciplines. To be sure, this is already happening, but we need to be more concerned with making connections than with defining differences and more confident of the value of what we do and its relevance to the interests of others.

I would argue that an essential part of a strategy to give architectural history a more central position necessarily involves reaching out from narrowly defined studies. Over the past quarter century art and architectural history, following in the wake of cultural and social history, have set aside grand narratives in favor of more focused studies and close readings. A synchronic view of history, focusing on narrowly defined research topics, has tended to dominate, with diachronic studies that cut across and through history representing the exception. To the extent that synchronic studies have provided richly nuanced interpretations, there is little need for concern. However, to the extent that many specialized studies result in little more than an arid accumulation of learning, accessible and of interest to only a handful of other specialists, we would do well to ponder the alternatives.

I believe that narrative history, even the over-arching narrative of the *longue durée*, can contribute to invigorating our field and assist in attracting a

wider audience for our scholarly enterprise. In my view, the construction of narratives — the telling of stories — presents history in terms that engage directly with the all-important personal dimension of architecture. Personal in two senses. In the first place, narrative architectural history — the study of human agents and their aspirations translated into concrete form — embraces the distinctive nature of architecture as a social art. It naturally brings to the fore architecture as a collaborative enterprise, involving the interaction of clients and designers, contractors and masons, critics and theoreticians. Narrative history also breathes life into the abstract calculus of design. At the same time, a narrative approach acknowledges the writer's own unique personality, inviting him or her to construct a clear and consistent voice that serves to identify his or her critical and evaluative role.

As historians of architecture, we must remain alert to the capacity of architecture to awaken in us complex responses that are at once intellectual, emotional, and physical. These responses may have little to do with the original intentions of a patron or designer, but each constitutes one of the myriad lenses through which we view the past. We need to acknowledge the dual existence of buildings both as documents of the past and as objects in the present. At the same time, we need to examine architecture within its total context: cultural, historical, physical, psychological, formal, and symbolic. If we're to meet this challenge with any measure of success, we must become more self-aware, more confident, and more open to extra-disciplinary forces.

2) *Forging Consensus*

Although the field of architectural history is nowhere near so ideologically and methodologically polarized as some others in the humanities — here I think again of art history — there are a number of fault lines that we would do well to map and to monitor. In most cases they're evidence of the dynamic nature of our discipline, of intellectual plate tectonics, in which the relationships between traditional methods and new approaches are constantly being redefined. In some cases, however, the divisions they represent do not serve our collective interests. Three, in particular, we would do well to temper, if not outright eliminate, the artificial and unnecessary separation of history from theory and criticism, the disjuncture between scholarship and professional training, and the gap — often reinforced by departmental divisions — dividing archi-

tectural historians from archaeologists and historians of art. The compelling reasons for minimizing these disciplinary divides are both pure and pragmatic. Not only do they inhibit collegiality and intellectual discourse, but in a time of diminishing resources within the humanities they perpetuate unnecessary competition for faculty positions and make it more difficult to take unified action on matters of mutual interest.

The advantages of viewing history, theory, and criticism as complementary and coextensive, rather than incompatible approaches to the evaluation of architecture, are manifest. Only by insisting on the recovery of the context within which buildings were created can we identify the forces that shaped architecture in the past. At the same time, however, only by embracing criticism can the historian assume a creative and evaluative role that consciously expresses his or her point of view, which is itself a function of particular circumstances of time and place. It's possible to consider problems of value without abandoning historical rigor indeed, in the absence of such critical engagement, the historian's assumptions remain masked by a veneer of empiricism and are effectively diminished. There really is no viable alternative to viewing the past through the lens of the present, and to pretend otherwise is to renounce one of our most powerful instruments.

My views on this question are indebted to the criticism of James Ackerman, particularly his 1984 essay "Toward a Theory of Art Criticism," in which he argues for an equilibrium of interpretation and response. [1] In Ackerman's formulation, interpretation focuses critical attention on the intended import and function of a work of art — or, for our purposes — a building, while response focuses on the historian/critic's experience of the building. Interpretation needs to be built on documentation, while response necessarily draws on the psychology of perception and philosophical commitment. Engagement with philosophy — one of the cornerstones of humanistic studies — is essential if the historian is to operate within a credible structure of values.

Closely related to the critical response of the present is the historical phenomenon of reception. The study of how the form and meaning of certain buildings produce a resonance transcending the culture and age that conceived them is often neglected. This concern has been central to my

own teaching and scholarship. The creative responses of successive generations of architects, artists, and writers to enduring monuments such as the Campidoglio and the Trevi Fountain, or to more complex sites such as Rome and Hadrian's Villa are worthy of consideration in their own right. They also serve to underscore the fact that critical engagement is not rooted exclusively in the present but is itself an ongoing historical process.

The disjuncture between historical scholarship and professional training also calls for attention. One of architectural history's great strengths is its connection to the profession and through this its direct relevance to the present. My own impression, confirmed and amplified by Mark Jarzombek's recent essays on the subject, is that we are moving closer to a disconnect in professional training between design work and history. In Jarzombek's view, "the familiar multidisciplinary of architectural education is fast becoming a residual part of architecture's humanistic mission." [2] What can be done to bring studio instruction and the history of architecture into a closer and more stimulating relationship?

Any eventual solution cannot result from unilateral action on the part of historians, but I would suggest that there are several steps we can take to help bridge the gap. One of the most obvious is to enrich our teaching and scholarship in ways that speak more directly to an audience that includes professional architects and students. There are a number of ways in which this can be done. Many of the technical and technological changes that are transforming the profession have historical counterparts. An example of one such parallel would be the Renaissance formulation of new graphic standards for representing three-dimensional architectural form. This exerted a profound effect on how buildings were conceptualized and built, similar to the effect that digital technologies are exerting today. Making greater use of a problem-solving approach to the analysis of historical design often yields insights that are more stimulating to design students than the abstractions of theory and the taxonomy of styles. At the same time, we would do well to avoid the pitfalls of destiny-fulfilling models, in which the past is continually used as a confirmation of the present, and as a pointer to future developments.

My training as an art historian and lodgement within a department of art and archaeology naturally makes me wish to address what Alina Payne

has aptly described as the “suspended dialogue” between historians of art and historians of architecture.[3] No doubt my vested interest colors my view that both parties have much to gain — and virtually nothing to lose — from forging closer intellectual ties and strategic academic alliances. A rapprochement needn’t involve sacrificing the advantages architectural historians currently enjoy from their close association with the profession. However we choose to define architecture — as a profession, a system of representations, or a spatial art possessing distinctive physical, technical, and social dimensions — the evolving methodologies of art history, focusing as they do on the nature of the creative process and its products, have much to offer us. The value of an open exchange is most evident to me in my own teaching, and particularly in graduate seminars enrolling students from a range of academic backgrounds, including architects, and art historians. Discussion and debate are invariably more lively and probing when approached from a variety of critical and historical perspectives.

There remains the strategic level of the relationship. So long as programs of art history and architecture compete for precious resources, both will be at a disadvantage. This is not all; whenever we make distinctions by medium and period — art versus architecture, modern versus pre-modern — we contribute to the increasing fragmentation of our disciplines. It troubles me that many of my art historical colleagues find it convenient to omit architecture from their syllabi. It worries me equally that the relevance of history in many professional schools of architecture is thought to extend back at most to the late eighteenth century. My own scholarship focuses on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a time in which the theory and practice of the *bel composto* fusing architecture, sculpture, and painting was dominant. Perhaps for this reason I naturally see particular advantages in considering art and architecture as coextensive.

3) *Embracing Technology*

If we’re to arrest the progressive marginalization of the history of architecture, we need to position our discipline closer to the center of the core fields of knowledge in the humanities. It may appear ironic, but to do so we need to become more engaged with revolutionary developments in digital technologies. The digital revolution is transforming the way in which information is structured and conveyed, and we need to take advantage of those

changes. To date we have been more passive than pro-active, but why shouldn’t we lead the way?

Contemporary society takes it for granted that our children need training in order to become critical readers, and we devote many years of instruction to this end. In contrast, we presume that our children are brought into the world able to see critically and require no training in visual literacy. This is absurd. Every day we are confronted with an increasing number of more sophisticated images, each of them challenging our critical faculties with conflicting claims for truth, accuracy, even moral authority. But we’ve done appallingly little to ensure that our students process this onslaught of images with intelligence and discrimination.

This was brought forcefully home to me last fall when, together with my colleague Kirk Alexander, I offered a Freshman seminar on the topic of Art History and Technology. The nine freshmen who enrolled in the seminar were confident, experienced surfers of the Net, but surprisingly unable in the early stages to view the material they found on-line critically, to look beneath the surface so as to identify the structural logic and decisions that yielded one category of information but not another, that in many cases fragmented knowledge rather than integrating it. Technology and its products require critical judgments that are essentially aesthetic and belong to the domain of the Humanities.

At the core of the discipline of architectural history is our critical engagement with and sensitivity to the built environment, the expression in three-dimensional visual constructs of our cultural values. Representation, context, the complex interrelationships of form and meaning: all these are familiar issues with which architectural historians deal on a daily basis and with which we are eminently qualified to deal. The application of digital technologies to the exploration of the visual and spatial dimension of architecture, as well as the integrative potential of databases frees us as teachers and scholars to approach our collective historical project in exciting new ways. For a discipline such as ours that emphasizes the value of context, inter-relational databases of texts and images offer new opportunities for enriching our understanding: they can reveal systematic structures linking architecture with political theory and practice, institutions’ social and economic organization, as well as scientific and literary achievement.

Over the past five years I've become increasingly engaged in developing applications of digital technology to my teaching and research, and have found the experience to be both intellectually stimulating and liberating. I should stress that this work has been undertaken in close collaboration with a remarkable team of programmers, computer graphics specialists, and database designers, whose probing questions about my methods and assumptions have sharpened my own critical awareness. Today, all of my teaching — and an increasing proportion of my research — draws on a database linking bibliographic, textual, and visual materials relating to Rome as a center of artistic production through the ages. The database is designed to be highly flexible, capable of communicating with other related projects at the university and elsewhere, and responsive to different needs. Among the teaching initiatives it has supported to date are the Freshman seminar mentioned above, a lecture course, graduate seminars, and an on-line course restricted to Princeton alumni, with a current enrollment of over 1,000.

Let me take a moment to summarize the organization and salient features of the Nolli project. Giambattista Nolli's magisterial 1748 plan of Rome functions as the front end of the database, ensuring that every byte of data, no matter how small or detailed, is situated within a clear contextual hierarchy. Click on a site and a range of information will be displayed, beginning with a short building history with multiple hypertext links connecting the monument to others with which it may share an architect, patron, style, or function. Each monument record also includes literary descriptions or responses to the building in question, which are also linked so that by searching by author it is possible to view Rome through a particular period lens. The records are complemented by a range of visual images, including modern photographs as well as period prints and drawings that illustrate the appearance of each monument at different points in time and — in the case of architectural drawings — allow insights into the creative process of design.

Working with this database, I find that I'm able to ask more challenging questions of my students and expect better answers. With all of the information stored in the database at our fingertips, we're able to spend more time focusing on questions of interpretation and making connections between monuments in different topographical relationships, ranging from vertically-stratified sites like San

Clemente to buildings experienced sequentially along processional routes, such as the Via Papale. It's important to emphasize that with students and instructor having equal access to the same data, I can stimulate — and expect — more debate, often presenting one interpretation and then asking for a contradictory reading based on the same facts.

It's of course dangerous to generalize too broadly on the basis of one's own experience, but I have growing evidence from my own students, in the form of their written work and course evaluations, that they find learning through the approach I've just described to be more accessible and more intellectually stimulating than traditional modes of instruction. I also find that students from a broader range of backgrounds and interests are attracted to the field, which in turn has the effect of elevating the level of discussion and enlivening debate.

Given time and resources, it's easy to imagine many different applications of technology by architectural historians. The use of computer-aided-design programs to test hypothetical reconstructions of ruined structures or buildings that no longer survive has already produced excellent results, and much has been learned from virtual-reality models of urban centers such as Jerusalem and Rome. To the extent that historians come to study the past through the techniques of digitalization their methods will intersect with those of the profession, which, as Anthony Vidler observes, increasingly views the components of design, representation, and material production as extensions of the same technological system.[4]

The future is not without its challenges, two of which deserve particular mention. Writing almost forty years ago, James Ackerman remarked on the absence of efficient organizations for the procurement and distribution of the essential tools of education and scholarship, with particular emphasis on visual materials: photographs and slides. He went on, observing that "Thousands of institutions in America annually duplicate effort and expenditure to acquire and to reproduce material, much of which is of a quality substantially inferior to what could be obtained by collaborative effort...Furthermore, photographic repositories [at major universities and research centers] are composed almost entirely of prints purchased from commercial distributors and bound by copyright, so that they cannot be reproduced for the use of scholars elsewhere in the country." [5]

It's striking how little has changed. There are some encouraging signs, among which is the collaborative "Image Exchange" project undertaken by this Society and the College Art Association to compile a database of visual images, but, until recently, progress has been slow, not to say glacial. The availability of digital scanning technologies puts the means into our hands to address this problem once and for all in a systematic way. The private collections of our own members, if shared and made generally available on a website for purposes of teaching, research, and scholarly publication, would constitute a resource of the first order. On the institutional level, why should Princeton build up its slide collection on Islamic architecture from scratch when comprehensive collections already exist at Harvard and MIT? Here again there are encouraging signs — such as the cooperation of Yale, Princeton, and Stanford on distance learning — but these are early, tentative steps. Even within the same institution, there is still far too much duplication of resources and far too many departmental barriers. It is ironic — and not a little frustrating — that I can download an image from a museum website in Europe, but not from my own university museum. We need to make a concerted effort to remove these barriers and to expand the notion of fair use of copyrighted images to encompass teaching and scholarship. It is also important for us to actively participate in setting standards for database design and scholarly applications, because if we fail to do so they will be set for us by the commercial sector.

At the same time, we need to take advantage of new digital forms of publication to foster exchange and reach a broader audience. As this happens, the standards and procedures of academic tenure review need to be restructured. The collective authorship of most networked and digital texts is in fundamental tension with the economic and status structure of the academy. It comes as no surprise, then, that at present there exist few incentives for a junior faculty member in the humanities to invest significant time and energy in any project that does not lead to a print publication. This essentially ensures that those who are most familiar with digital technologies and most capable of realizing creative projects are discouraged from doing so.

Conclusion

By way of conclusion, but also looking ahead, I want to say how pleased I am that one of the sessions announced for the Society's meetings next year in Toronto is devoted to teaching the history of architecture using digital technologies. In their call for papers, Stephen Murray and Maurice Luker invoke Victor Hugo's warning that the book, the embodiment of the new technology of printing, would replace the older technology of the cathedral as a means of shaping collective consciousness. In spite of dire predictions of its demise, I have every expectation that the book will continue to flourish well into the new millennium, in large measure because its design, production, and distribution have adapted so well to new technologies. In much the same way, I believe that architectural history will remain a vital intellectual and academic enterprise, but only if those of us gathered in this room work together to position it firmly at the center of the humanities.

John Pinto
Princeton University

Notes

1. J.S. Ackerman, "Interpretation, Response: Toward a Theory of Art Criticism," in *Distance Points Essays in Theory and Renaissance Art and Architecture*, Cambridge (Ma.), 1991, 37-56.
2. M. Jarzombek, "The Disciplinary Dislocations of (Architectural) History," *JSAH*, 58, 1999, 488.
3. A.A. Payne, "Architectural History and the History of Art: A Suspended Dialogue," *JSAH*, 58, 1999, 292-299.
4. A. Vidler, "Technologies of Space/Spaces of Technology," *JSAH*, 58, 1999, 482-486.
5. J.S. Ackerman, in *Art and Archaeology* (with R. Carpenter), Englewood Cliffs N.J., 1963, 227-228.

SAH Foreign Study Tour to Cuba

The first Cuba study tour is sold out
Spaces are still available on the Society's
second tour to Cuba:

February 28-March 12, 2002
cost: \$3,818.00 double occupancy
single supplement: \$750.00

For additional information
call Angela FitzSimmons at the
SAH office in Chicago (312) 573-1365.

Anatomy of an SAH Study Tour: Dutch Modernism in July 2001

The Society's 14-day Foreign Study Tour of Dutch Modernism in July 2001 vividly demonstrated why so many of our members, notoriously independent travellers by nature, repeatedly make an exception for SAH's annual domestic and foreign study tours. We travelled the length and breadth of this small country and saw most of the icons of the early modern movement in Holland as well as amazing examples of contemporary commercial and domestic architecture and much, much more. Readers who want to know, in detail, what we saw and where we saw it, are referred to the thorough introduction to the then forthcoming tour written by its leader (SAH *Newsletter*, October 2000) and the detailed itinerary of the tour which each member of the Society received in March 2001. The focus of this article will be on aspects of this tour, and others like it, which make the Society's study tours such unique and valuable experiences.

The participants – Our group consisted of 29 participants and our American tour leader, together with a Dutch guide and a representative of the travel company which assisted with local arrangements. It included six couples, several persons traveling without their spouses, and a number of single individuals (14 of us were males and 15 were females). We ranged in age from the mid-30s to the mid-80s. By this writer's count, there were five academic architectural historians, five architects, six persons working in the field of historic preservation, 10 interested lay persons and three tolerant spouses. We came from 11 states and the District of Columbia. Nine of us were on our first SAH tour. We were honored to number the current and immediate past presidents of the Society among the participants. It was a remarkably diverse, interesting and congenial group, bound together by a common appreciation of the built environment. In all, a rather typical SAH study tour group.

The tour leader – The selection by the Society's Executive Committee of a leader is perhaps the most important element in organizing each SAH study tour. The typical SAH study tour leader is an architectural historian, a recognized expert in the architecture which is the focus of the tour, and a member of the Society (in some cases there are co-leaders). We were extraordinarily fortunate to be led on this tour by Helen Searing, the Alice Pratt Brown Professor Emeritus of Art, Smith College. Helen proved an inspired choice. She has been a student of modern Dutch architecture, with an emphasis on housing, since completing her dissertation on the subject at Yale in 1972. She prepared the tour itinerary with great care, drawing upon her specialized knowledge gained in 30 years of work-

ing in the field and making two "pre-tours" of the Netherlands on her own in order to meticulously plan and map each day's route and visit each site in advance of our tour. In addition to being erudite, articulate, gracious and accessible, Helen was indefatigable. She took full advantage of the long hours of July daylight, sending most of us to our rooms at the end of each day tired but exhilarated. Our experience was enhanced by the informal comments made by Helen as we walked and at each site.

Written materials – Each member of the Dutch Modernism tour received, well in advance, two groups of materials, each prepared specifically for the tour by Helen Searing. The first to arrive, two months prior to departure, were a series of background documents, consisting of a selective bibliography and five separate but related papers which collectively provided in 25 pages a clear and comprehensive introduction to twentieth century architecture in the Netherlands – a far richer and more complicated building vocabulary than might be realized. These materials were followed several weeks later by a detailed 42-page set of tour notes (the term "notes," though commonly used at SAH, fails to do justice to what in this case is, in itself, a significant piece of scholarship). The tour notes, organized chronologically for each day of the tour, identify the buildings and sites to be visited that day and provide essential information about them in elegant, clear and jargon-free language. These tour notes and related background materials, equally suitable for the lay person and the scholar, are a unique and valuable hallmark of every SAH study tour. Most of us retain them, share them with friends, and use them as handy references for years. Reading them *after* a tour, following the day-to-day visual immersion in the buildings themselves, is for this writer at least as valuable as their use before and during the tour.

Access to local experts – While the details vary, SAH study tour participants typically have the benefit of guidance by or contact with a variety of local experts. A few examples from the Dutch tour will be mentioned. At the Hague, we were joined for the day by the Dutch architectural historian Ernie Mellegers, a friend of Helen's (one of several colleagues of Helen whom we met during the tour). Ernie teamed with Helen in providing lucid commentary on the day's sites, including a fascinating visit to his own home at the Nirwana Flats (1927-29), a seven-story luxury apartment building of the *Nieuwe Bouwen* or movement by Johannes Duiker and J.G. Wiebenga, two of the many outstanding Dutch architects whose work we were introduced to during the tour. At Willem Dudok's lyrical Town



Main hall, Amsterdam Bourse. H.P. Berlage, architect, 1898-1903. Photo by Cynthia Field.

Hall (1924) in Hilversum, we were guided by a knowledgeable and kindly architect who had worked closely with Dudok in his later years and whose love for the building was evident in his every word. Nick Fritz, an American by birth and a naturalized Dutch citizen, was with us for the entire trip; in addition to providing directions and other logistical support, Nick talked to us as we travelled through the beautiful Dutch countryside about the history, economy, typography and hydrology of Holland.

In Rotterdam, a veritable laboratory of contemporary architecture, we were greeted at the Netherlands Architecture Institute by its new and dynamic director, Aaron Betsky, an American who came to NAI from the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art; Mr. Betsky spoke to us about the architecture of Rotterdam and the nature and role of the NAI (which itself is housed in a striking and complex building (1988-93) by the contemporary Dutch architect J.M. Coenen). Incidentally, we enjoyed two special treats at the NAI. We toured a comprehensive exhibit there on the work of the great early modern Dutch architect J.J.P. Oud (several of whose housing blocks and other buildings we visited during the tour). In what for the writer was one of the highlights of the trip, we also visited the just-opened (following extensive restoration) Sonneveld House (1931-33), a stunning "international style" residence (now managed as a museum by and located across the street from the NAI); the Sonneveld House was done for a senior executive of the Van Nelle firm by the same Dutch architects (L.C. Van der Vlugt and J.A. Brinkman) who had just completed the magnificent Van Nelle Factory (1925-31), an icon of *Nieuwe Bouwen*, in Rotterdam. It is a pleasure to report that the Van Nelle Factory is currently being carefully recycled into offices. Rather than tear down buildings of architectural significance which have outlived their original purpose, we repeatedly saw examples of how the Dutch adapt them to other uses.

Special access to key buildings – Another unique aspect of SAH study tours is the special access which they typically afford to important buildings and sites (often with permission to photograph their interiors). There were a number of instances of this on the Dutch study tour. At the Scheepvaarthuis (Shipping Offices Headquarters) in Amsterdam (1913-16, by J.M. van der Mey), a key work of the Amsterdam School, we had a private 90 minute guided tour which allowed us to savor in detail the complex and beautiful iconography and dynamic spatial features of this exquisite building. We toured the Zonnestraal [Sunshine] TB sanatorium (1925-28) at Hilversum by Duiker, Wiebenga and Bernard Bijvoet, a key Nieuwe Bouwen landmark, in the company of the resident preservation officer, whose father had been a patient there; even though the central pavilion of this complex is currently an unused ruin, the clarity and ingenuity of its design, a multi-level symphony of concrete and glass curves and rectangles, was clearly evident. It was heartening that as we toured the Zonnestraal facility, we made our way around a large crew of workers intensively engaged in its restoration for reuse as part of a larger sanatorium complex. A final example was our one hour guided tour of the Centraal Beheer (a major Dutch insurance company) office building complex (1967-72, 1990) at Apeldoorn by Herman Hertzberger, a key example of the Dutch Structuralism movement. We had the virtual run of this fascinating building, which is closed to the public. And there were many others.

New discoveries – One of the genuine treats of virtually every SAH tour is the special pleasure of discovering the unexpected – the unheard of architect whose work you find wonderful or the little known building which knocks your socks off. There were more than a few such experiences for the writer on the Dutch tour. One of them was seeing six grammar schools and several other works in Groningen, a major city in northern Holland, all designed by Siebe Bouwma (1899-1959). Bouwma was an obscure but obviously talented architect who worked from the mid-1920s for the Public Works Department of Groningen and virtually all of whose oeuvre is located



Detail of vaulted skylight, Amsterdam Bourse. H.P. Berlage, architect, 1898-1903. Photo by Cynthia Field.



Exterior view, Van Nelle Factory, Rotterdam. J.A. Brickmann & I.C. Van der Vlugte, architects, 1925-31. Photo by Richard Longstreth.

ed there and consists of municipal commissions. His schools, designed and built between 1925 and 1932, were in the style of the Amsterdam School but at the same time, in the words of Helen Searing, were "more extravagant in [their] shapes and materials" (and perhaps their use of color as well). It was such a treat, during the course of a single day, to visit all of these schools, each a unique composition though clearly from the same hand. Without the knowledge

and guidance of our tour leader, these wonderful buildings would certainly have been overlooked by this writer and perhaps by other participants as well.

Planning and organization – The Society's study tour program has been a key feature of the organization's services to members since its inception 61 years ago. Over that span SAH tours have been made throughout the United States and to over 30 foreign countries. Some tours focus on a particular city (e.g., the Detroit tour in 1994 and the Chicago tour in 2000), a particular architect (e.g., the Goff and Wright tour to Oklahoma in 1998), a particular architectural period (e.g., the 20th-Century German tour in 1997 and the Dutch Modernism tour in 2001 – a wonderful pairing for those SAH members fortunate enough to participate in both tours), a particular building type (e.g., the tour of Adirondack "camps" in 1996 and the Four Corners tour of ancient pueblo sites in 1999) or a particular region (e.g., the Southern Illinois tour in 1991 and the Eastern Virginia tour in 1997). On the Brazil study tour in 2000, our co-leaders specialized in modern and baroque Latin American architecture, respectively, literally giving us the best of both worlds in that fascinating country. The richness and variety of these offerings are remarkable. The one consistent thread which has run through the eight SAH study tours in which this writer has participated in recent years is the high quality of their substantive content and their excellent organization.

Planning and organizing an SAH study tour is typically a collaborative process involving the tour leader and the Society's headquarters staff in

Chicago (especially Angela FitzSimmons, its Director of Programs). For most foreign tours in recent years, the Society has engaged a professional travel services company to assist with local planning and arrangements. Making the many ingredients of a successful tour come together is a daunting logistical and human relations challenge which often stretches over a period measured in years before the tour takes place.

It has been the Society's longstanding practice each year to offer one domestic study tour (typically lasting for a week or less) and one foreign study tour (typically lasting for approximately two weeks). As a result of the success and popularity of these tours, and in an effort to better serve our members, the Society – with the impetus and considerable assistance of its Study Tour Coordinator, Stephen Harby, a California architect, inveterate traveller and extraordinarily generous volunteer known to many of us – is cautiously expanding the number and types of study tours which it will offer. You have undoubtedly seen evidence of this already and you will be receiving more information regarding it in the future.

Conclusion – No summary of the Dutch tour would be complete without mention of H.P. Berlage, the founder of the modern movement in Dutch architecture, with whose seminal Exchange building in Amsterdam we began our tour and whose name, works and shadow were with us throughout. The Society's esteemed past president, Richard Longstreth, a wordsmith of the highest order, captured the effect of this omnipresent (and great) Dutch architect in a



Detail of façade. Amsterdam Bourse. H.P. Berlage, architect, 1898-1903. Photo by Cynthia Field.

poem of his own composition about the tour which, after much arm-twisting, he recited at our farewell dinner (held in the magical art nouveau dining room of the American Hotel in Amsterdam, a gem by Willem Kromhout, 1898-1900). In a rhetorical flourish seldom matched even by Richard, he pictured our group "slogging through Berlage..." The poem and the evening were all downhill from there.

John C. Blew
Chicago

BUS and the Pevsner Legacy— An Ongoing Inspiration

BUS Editor in Chief Damie Stillman participated in a two-day conference at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, July 13-14, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the publication of the first volume of Nikolaus Pevsner's *Buildings of England*. The conference, which attracted 150-200 people, including representatives of the German architectural guidebook series, Georg Dehio's *Handbuch der Deutschen Kunstmalerie*, focused on Pevsner's German background, his art history, English taste and English guidebooks before the *Buildings of England*, Pevsner and modern architecture, Pevsner as a conservationist, and the relationship between the *Buildings of England* and (1) the *Buildings of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales* and (2) *Buildings of the United States*.

Damie Stillman's presentation, "Learning from Pevsner: *Buildings of England* and *Buildings of the United States*," began with a few of his personal experiences with Pevsner, then turned to Pevsner's challenge to SAH to do for this country what Pevsner had done for his. Stillman and then discussed in some detail the similarities and differences between the two series.

It was indeed Pevsner who, in 1976, issued a direct challenge to SAH that ultimately brought forth the idea for BUS. At the SAH Annual Meeting in Philadelphia that year, the University of Pennsylvania awarded three honorary degrees to distinguished architectural historians, a process that the university also repeated for other scholarly societies meeting in Philadelphia in the year of the Bicentennial. They had asked that one of the three honorees be British, and the SAH Board had nominated Pevsner for this. So, it was especially fitting that he used the occasion to inspire the Society to create a coordinated series of architectural guidebooks to the whole country, something, that had been in the minds of the founders of the Society in 1940.

The result, as they say, is history, but it still took a long time for the pro-

ject to get started, and for the founders to find initial funding, and publish the first volumes. Nevertheless, that the series has indeed grown and matured can be seen in the six published volumes; the seventh (*Buildings of Virginia: Tidewater and Piedmont*), which will be out in time for the 2002 Annual meeting in Richmond; the six more that will go to the BUS publisher, Oxford University Press, within the next two years; and the twenty others in active preparation.

After his return from the conference, we asked Damie Stillman a few questions about Pevsner, his influence on BUS, and the conference:

BUS: How do you see Pevsner's work continuing to inspire scholars and the general public?

DS: The large number of people at the conference, both scholars and members of the general public, testified to how potent a force he still is. I suppose his most important legacy is his inspiration to everyone to look at build-



Cliff Palace, Mesa Verde National Park, CO (Anasazi builders, c. 1209-1270s). Photo: Denver Public Library, from Buildings of Colorado.

ings. And the other aspect is his combining of a scholarly Germanic approach to architectural history with a concern for the buildings of England and, by extension, buildings elsewhere – from the rest of the United Kingdom to the United States. Thus, he built on the formula adopted by Georg Dehio in the early 20th century and adapted it to England and English buildings.

BUS: What expectations do you think he had for an American version of his work, and how do you think that BUS has responded to his challenge?

DS: I am not sure that he envisaged our series as a clone of the British one, but he knew how important such an inventory and evaluation was. Having championed this idea for England, he certainly wanted to see it developed all over.

On the other hand, he would probably be surprised at how different BUS is from Buildings of England. For one thing, our format is more user-friendly, with many more maps and with the illustrations right in the text. But, the fact that we would be concentrating on different types of buildings would not, I think, surprise him. He certainly realized that, given the different composition of American society, as well as the breadth of the American landscape, the books would be different. Cathedrals and churches, for example, do not loom nearly so large in our story as in his, but the diverse ethnic backgrounds of Americans would insure far more varied examples. The reaction of the audience at the conference to my slides, for example, of Mesa Verde in Colorado or the Nanny Ooyah-tona whalebone house in Alaska confirmed this, for they seemed especially to enjoy these. (See accompanying photographs.)

BUS: Were there any particular highlights or revelations to come out of the conference?

DS: Yes, I think there were. First, it was extremely valuable to see how Pevsner's German background had its effects on his later work. Then, it was revealing to see what ideas on architectural literature and guidebooks were floating around in England before he began to work on Buildings of England. And third, of course, it



Nanny Ooyah-tona House, Tigara Village (near Point Hope), AK (Native Alaskan builders, c. 1900). Photo: HABS, Library of Congress, from Buildings of Alaska.

was fascinating to learn more about his habits; the controversies with other writers, such as John Betjeman, which seems to have been primarily on the latter's part; and his idiosyncracies. One of these, it seems, was his tendency to create lists of everything he saw or worked on, and when this was discussed, I realized that he had instilled this in me when he had advised me at the beginning of my career.

BUS is pleased to announce that the paperback edition of Tom Noel's *Buildings of Colorado* is currently in production and will be released by the 2002 Annual Meeting in Richmond, where—as previously noted—Richard Guy Wilson's *Buildings of Virginia: Tidewater and Piedmont* will make its debut.

Also, we are pleased to note that the paperback editions of Antoinette Lee and Pamela Scott's *Buildings of the District of Columbia* and Kathryn Eckert's *Buildings of Michigan* are currently being reprinted and will be available this fall.

Call for Session Proposals
Society of Architectural Historians
56th Annual Meeting
Denver, Colorado
April 23-27, 2003

Members of the Society and representatives of affiliated societies who wish to chair a session at the 2003 Annual Meeting in Denver, Colorado are invited to submit proposals by January 4, 2003 to Dr. Therese O'Malley, General Chair of the SAH 56th Annual Meeting, CASVA, National Gallery of Art, 6th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington D.C., 20565, tomalley@nga.gov, 202-842-6481.

Since the principal purpose of the annual meeting remains that of informing the Society's members of the general state of research in their discipline, session proposals covering every period in the history of architecture and all aspects of the built environment are encouraged. Sessions may be theoretical, methodological, thematic, interdisciplinary, pedagogical revisionist, or documentary in premise, and have broadly conceived or more narrowly focused subjects. In every case, the subject should be clearly defined in critical and historiographic terms, and should be substantiated by a distinct body of either established or emerging scholarship.

Proposals of not more than 600 words including a session title should summarize the subject and the premise. Include name, professional affiliation, address, telephone and fax numbers, email and a current cv. For examples of content, consult the Call for Papers for the 2002 Annual Meeting in Richmond published in the April 2001 issue of the SAH *Newsletter* or available at the SAH website <http://www.sah.org>,

Proposals will be selected on the basis of merit and the need to organize a well-balanced program. Since late proposals cannot be considered, it is recommended that proposals be submitted and their receipt be confirmed well before the deadline. The General Chair cannot be responsible for last minute submissions, electronic or otherwise, that fail to reach their destination. Authors of accepted proposals will be asked to draft a Call for Papers of not more than 350 words.

MEMBER NEWS

R. Stephen Sennott, author for the BUS volume, *Buildings of Illinois*, has been appointed Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs in the College of Architecture at the Illinois Institute of Technology. In addition to his new duties as an administrator, he also teaches the history of architecture in IIT's three-year Master of Architecture graduate program. **Elizabeth Walton Potter** received the University of Oregon's Ellis F. Lawrence Medal at a ceremony in Eugene on June 15, 2001. According to **Leonard Eaton**, the medal is given to an alumna or alumnus "whose professional and personal achievements embody the integrity, educational philosophy and commitment to his or her chosen field exemplified by Lawrence," an architect, teacher and leader who taught at Oregon from 1914 until his death in 1946. Potter is a graduate of the University of Oregon (BA. 1960) and the Winterthur Program at the University of Delaware (MA. 1964). Her career has included service as Oregon's state historic preservation officer, longstanding membership in the Marion Dean Ross Chapter of the SAH, and many publications on the architecture of the Pacific Northwest.

The Graham Foundation is pleased to announce the recipients of its 2001 awards for dissertation research. **Stacey E. Holden** of the Department of Art History at Boston University received the \$15,000 Carter Manny Award for completion of her dissertation, "Modern Medieval: Porters, Millers, and Butchers in Colonial Fez, 1912-1937." Trustees Merit Citations of \$10,000 went to **Meredith Cohen** of Columbia University for her thesis, "The Sainte-Chapelle and the Politics of Pre-Eminence;" and to **Micheline Nilsen** of the University of Delaware for her dissertation, "The Implementation of Railroads in Western European Cities," as well as to Harvard's Charissa N. Terranova. SAH members receiving Honorable Mentions were: **Jeanne-Marie Musto** of Bryn Mawr College and **Ken Tadashi Oshima** of Columbia University.

The Hagley Museum & Library recently awarded a Hagley-Winterthur Fellowship to **Kim Burdick** for her research on "Louise Crowninshield - Preservationist." In addition, research grants went to: **Hilary Ballon** of Columbia University for "Gateway to Metropolis: New York's Pennsylvania Stations," and **Christine O'Malley** of the University of Virginia for "The Design Decade and Beyond: American Industrial Designers and the Challenge of Architecture, 1925-55."

Maristella Casciato, an architectural historian from the University of Rome Tor Vergata who is currently member of the Executive Committee of DOCOMOMO International, and chair of the International Specialist Committee on Registers, will become the new chair of that organization. In addition, the DOCOMOMO headquarters will be relocated in Paris, at the Cité de l'Architecture et du Patrimoine, the institution directed by Jean-Louis Cohen. In close collaboration with Fabienne Chevallier and Jean-Louis Cohen, Maristella Casciato has proposed new programs for this important international preservation organization, especially in the fields of education, world heritage, and research. Casciato will assume her duties at the Seventh DOCOMOMO International Conference, to be held in Paris from the 16th to the 21st of September 2002, during which time the headquarters will also be relocated.

Richard L. Hayes has recently been promoted Director of the Center for Design and Construction at the American Institute of Architects in Washington, D.C. As director, Dr. Hayes develops, manages and directs programs, products and services to provide support for practice and careers in architecture, as well as identifying new and emerging topics of interest to the profession.

OBITUARIES

Former SAH president **Alan Gowans**, one of the most distinguished Americanists of his generation, died on August 19, 2001 at the age of 77. A native of Toronto, Gowans was retired from a 22-year professorship in the art history department at the University of Victoria, and was living in Washington, D.C. at his death.

Alan Gowans was educated at the University of Toronto, where he received an undergraduate degree as well as a master's degree in art history. He went on to study at Princeton University in the early 1950s, earning a second master's degree in fine arts and later a doctorate in art history there. He settled in New Jersey and became a U.S. citizen in 1957. One of his first books, *The Architecture of New Jersey* (published in 1964 and still the standard in its subject), was researched while teaching at Rutgers University. He later taught at Vermont's Middlebury College and at the University of Delaware, where he was chair of the Art History Department from 1959 until 1966. His 1964 cultur-

al history survey, *Images of American Living*, was one of the first American texts to treat high art objects and the artifacts of everyday life as part of the same fabric of material culture.

As his career progressed, Gowans's field of view expanded to include vernacular architecture, especially the North America's critically neglected domestic architecture. *The Comfortable House: North American Suburban Architecture 1890-1930* (MIT Press, 1986) provided the first broad taxonomy of familiar house types, including the "foursquare" so common in America's smaller towns and cities. Known for his clear prose, Gowans sought a broad audience for his work and often championed popular art forms, such as cartoons and gas station signs; as he said: "The question is not what is art, but what is it that arts do, in and for society." His publications included more than twenty books and scores of scholarly articles, all of which showed both a critical intellect and a catholic, populist sensibility in the subjects he loved.

August also saw the untimely death of another enthusiastic champion of the "pop architecture" of the commercial strip. Architect and teacher **Steven Izenour**, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates, died of a heart attack while vacationing in Newbury, Vermont on August 21. He was just 61 and had recently overseen the installation of a major retrospective of his firm's work at the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

The son of the distinguished Yale theatre historian and designer, George Izenour, Steve received his B.A. from Swarthmore College (1962) before attending architecture school at the University of Pennsylvania (B.Arch. 1965). He then went on to receive a Master of Environmental Design from Yale (1969), where he reconnected with Penn professors Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown and co-taught their ground breaking studio on the urbanism of Las Vegas. His contribution was recognized via co-authorship of the book, *Learning From Las Vegas*, published in 1972 by MIT Press. He joined the Venturi office and immediately began to exert a major influence on projects throughout the 1970s, including the famous "decorated sheds" that placed the firm at the center of the critical maelstrom surrounding postmodernism.

Never comfortable in a conventional professional role, Izenour contributed to many aspects of the Venturi/Scott Brown office, including theoretical writings, unique graphic presentations, photogra-

phy, theatre design, planning and preservation projects, and even the lighting designs used in the Sainsbury Wing of the National Gallery in London. He won awards for, among other projects, his house for his parents at Stony Creek, Connecticut (1979-83) and his imaginative lighting scheme for Philadelphia's Benjamin Franklin Bridge (1987). He taught for many years in the architecture program at the University of Pennsylvania, where students delighted in his humor, zest for life, and often controversial positions on contemporary design issues. He also found time to write, co-authoring the book, *White Towers* (1979), with his friend and colleague Paul Hirschorn. He was a strong supporter of not only the SAH (presenting his final paper at the 1994 annual meeting in Philadelphia) but also of the Society for Commercial Archaeology. A recent Izenour studio with students from Yale and Kent State ventured to the neglected boardwalks of Wildwood, New Jersey, proposing unique solutions for the preservation of "doo wop" architecture in the seaside town.

A memorial service at the University of Pennsylvania on September 6 drew a large number of Philadelphia architects to hear tributes from, among others, Denise Scott Brown. Described by one colleague as "the heart and soul" of the Venturi/Scott Brown office, Izenour's death will be mourned by the entire international architecture community.

Editor

AWARDS AND FELLOWSHIPS

The **International Center for Advanced Studies at NYU** is accepting applications for 2002-2003 fellowships in the **Project on the Cold War as Global Conflict**. These awards are for scholars with PhDs at all career stages in humanities and social sciences. Non-U.S. applicants are encouraged. Fellows will be awarded a \$35,000 stipend for 9 months and are eligible for low cost NYU housing. Deadline: January 15, 2002. The Project examines conventional wisdoms about the Cold War and post-Cold War worlds. The 2002-2003 theme is "Everyday Life, Knowledge, Culture." Studies of Americanization and Sovietization and resistance to them are welcomed. Topics could include effects of the Cold War on public health, education, welfare state; trade unions; development and direction of academic disciplines and area studies programs, gender and race relations; class dynamics within and between nations; religion; mass and high cul-

ture including art, architecture, film and other media; rise of "Big Science" and the national security state; changes in transportation, information and communication systems. Work can be within a specific country, but regional and comparative studies for Latin America, Africa, Middle East and states within the Soviet Union are also encouraged. See <http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/icas> for more information and application forms, or write to icas@nyu.edu, fax: 212-995-4546.

EXHIBITIONS AND CONFERENCES

The **Art Institute of Chicago** will present an innovative exhibition entitled **Modern Trains and Splendid Stations: Architecture and Design for the 21st Century** in its Kisho Kurokawa gallery from December 8, 2001 through July 28, 2002. Designed by noted architect David Childs, FAIA, and curated by Martha Thorne of the Department of Architecture, the exhibition will present plans, drawings, models, photographs and computer renderings of "interesting examples" of both station and train designs from around the world executed during the past thirty years or proposed for future construction. A 160-page illustrated catalogue, co-published by the Art Institute and Merrell Publishers of London, will feature in-depth articles by train designer Claudia Wessner, journalist Don Phillips, and architectural historian Martha Thorne and a section documenting each of the stations shown in the exhibition.

The **McFaddin-Ward House Museum** in Beaumont, Texas will hold its annual conference from November 8-10, 2001. This year's title is **Telling the Story: Best Practices for House Museum Interpretation**. Papers by museum curators and professionals from throughout the U.S. will address the challenges facing these important historic sites. For information on the conference, contact: Conference Coordinator, 409-832-1906; or info@mcfaddin-ward.org.

CALLS FOR PAPERS

The **Nationalmuseum in Stockholm** and **Swedish Museum of Architecture** invite scholars to submit proposals for an upcoming symposium on the work of Nicodemus Tessin the Younger (1654-1728) to be held in Stockholm from September 19 through 22,

2002. The theme of the conference is "Sources, Works, Collections," and it will be divided into three one-day sessions: "Tessin and Europe," "Tessin and Sweden," and "Tessin: Rooms and Ceremonies." The organizers, who include **Patricia Waddy** of Syracuse University and **Guy Walton** of New York University, encourage paper proposals on the following topics: Tessin's activities in architecture, garden design, decorative arts; history of collections, art theory in the seventeenth century, Tessin's writings and sources thereof, history of state ceremonies and theatre, Tessin as courtier and politician, and any other topics pertinent to the overall theme. It is suggested that papers be submitted and delivered in English, but exceptions may be made. Future publication of the papers may be possible. Submit proposals before NOVEMBER 1, 2001 to: Louise Hadorph, Research Department, Nationalmuseum, Box 16176, SE-103 24, Stockholm, Sweden. FAX: +46 8 5195 4456, TEL +46 8 5195 4302. E-mail: lhh@nationalmuseum.se.

The Hagley Museum & Library invites scholars to submit proposals for papers for its April 19-22, 2002 Annual Meeting of the Business History Conference, entitled "Corporate Governance." Submit a one-page abstract and a one-page curriculum vitae before the deadline of OCTOBER 15, 2001 to: Roger Horowitz, Secretary-Treasurer, Business History Conference, PO Box 3630, Wilmington, DE 19807. For further information or answers to questions, contact David Sicilia, Department of History, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742; e-mail: ds190@umail.umd.edu.

The Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts in Winston-Salem, North Carolina announces its third biennial **Gordon Conference**, to be held on October 12, 2002, and invites scholars to submit papers dealing with the decorative arts and material culture of the early South from 1600 to 1850 to be presented there. Disciplines will include architecture, historic preservation, American studies, art history, folklore, and archaeology as well as the decorative arts. A cover letter, curriculum vitae, two-page abstract and bibliography are required for consideration. The deadline for proposals is MARCH 1, 2002, and participants will be notified of acceptance by March 31, 2002. Send proposals to: Gordon Conference, Attn: Sally Gant, Director of Education, MESDA, PO Box 10310, Winston-Salem, NC 27108-0310. FAX: 336-721-7367; e-mail at: sgant@oldsalem.org.

ELECTRONIC NEWS

Allan Ceen, Michelle LaFoe, and Richard Betts are pleased to announce the new website and virtual studio/archive component of the Studium Urbis Organization: <http://www.studiumurbis.org>, which is headquartered in Rome, Italy.

The Studium Urbis encourages and facilitates original research and design in architecture, urban and landscape planning, and visual and topographical studies in Rome, Italy and beyond. The center also strives to disseminate results, study and workshop opportunities, and other information in the area of architecture and urban studies to faculty, students, practicing professionals, the media, leaders, policy-makers, and the general public.

The Studium Urbis Rome will also be hosting an International Conference on Giambattista Nolli and Rome in 2002 <http://www.studiumurbis.org/studiumurbis/calendar.html>. All information will be posted on the website, and we will send a general email announcement regarding the details and the submittal deadline for abstracts in design and history. Presentations in Italian and English will be accepted. For more information, contact Michelle LaFoe (mలాfoe@mindspring.com), conference coordinator.

CLASSIFIED

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY FACULTY POSITION AVAILABLE

The Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation is seeking candidates for a fulltime position in its Historic Preservation program (rank open). Responsibilities will include teaching, scholarship, and administration. Professional and/or teaching experience is required. The emphasis will be both on architectural history and on the understanding and protection of, and appropriate design with, historic architecture. Candidates must hold at least a Master of Architecture or its equivalent, or a Master of Science in Historic Preservation, or a Master of Art, and have a background in architectural

Continued on back page

THE CAMARGO FOUNDATION FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The Foundation maintains in Cassis, France, a center for the benefit of scholars who wish to pursue studies in the humanities and social sciences related to French and francophone cultures. The Foundation also supports creative projects by composers, writers, visual artists, photographers, filmmakers, and video artists. The Foundation offers, at no cost, eleven furnished apartments, a reference library, a darkroom, an artist's studio, and a music composition studio. The residential fellowship is accompanied by a stipend, awarded automatically to each recipient of the grant. The normal term of residence is one semester (early September to mid-December or mid-January to May 31st), precise dates being announced each year. Applicants may include university and college faculty, including professors emeriti, who intend to pursue special studies while on leave from their institutions; independent scholars working on specific projects; secondary school teachers benefiting from a leave of absence in order to work on some pedagogical or scholarly project; graduate students whose academic residence and general examination requirements have been met and for whom a stay in France would be beneficial in completing the dissertation; composers, writers, visual artists, photographers, filmmakers, and video artists with specific projects to complete. Because of the limited number of studios, only one composer and one visual artist or photographer can be accepted each semester. Applicants from all countries are welcome. Application deadline is February 1 for the following academic year.

For additional information and application forms, please consult the Foundation's Web site: www.camargofoundation.org or write to:

**The Camargo Foundation
Mr. William Reichard
125 Park Square Court
400 Sibley Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101-1928 USA**

history, preferably American. Applicants should respond with a letter of interest, curriculum vitae, examples of work, and names and addresses of three references. Review of applications will take place upon receipt and will continue until a candidate is chosen. Material should be sent to:

Bernard Tschumi, Dean Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation Columbia University 402 Avery Hall 1172 Amsterdam Avenue New York, NY 10027.

Columbia University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

The University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

School of Architecture and Department of
Landscape Architecture

offers the **Doctor of Philosophy** degree in
Architecture and Landscape Architecture

with concentrations in either

**History & Theory or Cultural &
Behavioral Factors in Design**

Robert B. Riley, Coordinator
Architecture/Landscape Architecture
Ph.D. Degree Program
101 Temple Buell Hall
611 E. Lorado Taft Drive
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820
r-riley@uiuc.edu

Society of Architectural Historians
1365 North Astor Street
Chicago, IL 60610-2144

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. Postage
PAID
Kansas City, Mo.
Permit No. 4085

October 2001

Vol. XLV No. 5



The *Newsletter* is published every even month by the Society of Architectural Historians (phone: 312-573-1365). Deadline for submission of material is eight weeks prior to publication.

Send editorial correspondence and submissions for publication to Mark Alan Hewitt, AIA, 104 Mine Brook Road, P. O. Box 289, Bernardsville, NJ 07924; tel. 908.630.9416; fax: 908.630.9417; email: mahe-witt@mindspring.com. Material on disk or email is preferable; all formats acceptable.

Editor: Mark Alan Hewitt, AIA

SAH Officers

President: Christopher Mead, 505-277-2767
1st V.P.: Diane Favro, 310-825-5374
2nd V.P.: Therese O'Malley, 202-842-6480
Secretary: Robert Craig, 404-894-3395
Treasurer: John K. Notz, Jr., 312-245-8410

Executive Director: Pauline Saliga, 312-573-1365

SAH email: info@sah.org and membership@sah.org.
SAH Website <http://www.sah.org>

Copyright © 2001, The Society of Architectural Historians. All rights reserved.