MODERN ARCHITECTURE

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION

NEW YORK FEB. 10 TO MARCH 23, 1932

MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

INSTITUTIONS SUBSCRIBING TO THE EXHIBITION

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART, NEW YORK

PENNSYLVANIA MUSEUM OF ART, PHILADELPHIA

WADSWORTH ATHENEUM, HARTFORD

BULLOCK'S-WILSHIRE, LOS ANGELES

BUFFALO FINE ARTS ACADEMY AND ALBRIGHT ART GALLERY

CLEVELAND MUSEUM OF ART

MILWAUKEE ART INSTITUTE

CINCINNATI ART MUSEUM

MEMORIAL ART GALLERY, ROCHESTER

TOLEDO MUSEUM OF ART

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND FOGG ART MUSEUM, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

WORCESTER ART MUSEUM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
PATRONS OF THE EXHIBITION		7
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		11
PART I. INTRODUCTION		
FOREWORD	ALFRED H. BARR, JR.	12
HISTORICAL NOTE	PHILIP JOHNSON	18
EXTENT OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE	P. J. AND H.-R. H., JR.	21
EXTENT: PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE EXHIBITION		25
GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY		28
PART II. THE EXHIBITING ARCHITECTS.		
FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT	HENRY-RUSSELL HITCHCOCK, JR.	29
MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION		38
BIBLIOGRAPHY, CHRONOLOGIES OF LIFE AND WORK		39
ILLUSTRATIONS		48
WALTER GROPIUS	HENRY-RUSSELL HITCHCOCK, JR.	57
MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION		60
BIBLIOGRAPHY, CHRONOLOGIES OF LIFE AND WORK		61
ILLUSTRATIONS		65
LE CORBUSIER	HENRY-RUSSELL HITCHCOCK, JR.	71
MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION		76
BIBLIOGRAPHY, CHRONOLOGIES OF LIFE AND WORK		77
ILLUSTRATIONS		82
J. J. P. OUD	HENRY-RUSSELL HITCHCOCK, JR.	91
MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION		97
BIBLIOGRAPHY, CHRONOLOGIES OF LIFE AND WORK		98
ILLUSTRATIONS		103
MIËS VAN DER ROHE	PHILIP JOHNSON	111
MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION		117
CHRONOLOGIES OF LIFE AND WORK		118
ILLUSTRATIONS		121

PAGE

RAYMOND M. HOOD — HENRY-RUSSELL HITCHCOCK, JR. — 129
MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION — 132
BIBLIOGRAPHY, CHRONOLOGIES OF LIFE AND WORK — 134
ILLUSTRATIONS — 137

HOWE & LESCAZE — HENRY-RUSSELL HITCHCOCK, JR. — 143
MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION — 145
CHRONOLOGIES OF LIVES AND LISTS OF WORK — 147
ILLUSTRATIONS — 149

RICHARD J. NEUTRA — HENRY-RUSSELL HITCHCOCK, JR. — 157
MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION — 159
BIBLIOGRAPHY, CHRONOLOGIES OF LIFE AND WORK — 160
ILLUSTRATIONS — 163

BOWMAN BROTHERS — HENRY-RUSSELL HITCHCOCK, JR. — 171
MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION — 172
CHRONOLOGIES OF LIVES AND WORK — 173
ILLUSTRATIONS — 175

PART III. HOUSING

HOUSING — LEWIS MUMFORD — 179
I. THE NEED FOR A NEW DOMESTIC ENVIRONMENT — 179
II. THE PRESENT IMPASSE: HIGHER STANDARDS AND POORER HOUSING — 180
III. THE BIOLOGY AND ECONOMY OF THE MODERN HOUSE — 183
IV. THE STRATEGY OF A COLLECTIVE ATTACK — 185
V. THE PROMISE OF MODERN HOUSING AND COMMUNITY PLANNING — 187

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON HOUSING — 190

OTTO HAESLER — PHILIP JOHNSON — 192
THE MODEL IN THE EXHIBITION — 193

LIST OF HOUSING PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE EXHIBITION — 194

ILLUSTRATIONS — 195

PATRONS OF THE EXHIBITION

THE DUKE OF ALVA
Patron and amateur; instrumental in introducing modern architecture into Spain.

M. CHARLES DE BEISTEGUI
Penthouse by Le Corbusier, Paris.

DR. ALEXANDER J. CHANDLER
Desert camp by Frank Lloyd Wright, Chandler, Arizona.

MR. WILLIAM BURNLEE CURRY
Headmaster of Dartington Hall, England; house by Howe & Lescaze. Formerly Headmaster of the Oak Lane Country Day School, near Philadelphia; nursery building by Howe & Lescaze.

BURGOMASTER P. DROOGLEEVER FORTUIJN OF ROTTERDAM, HOLLAND
Under his administration J. J. P. Oud continues his work as City Architect.

DR. EDUARD FUCHS
House by Miës van der Rohe, Berlin.

BURGOMASTER HESSE OF DESSAU, GERMANY
Instrumental in providing land and municipal endowment for the Bauhaus School, 1925; buildings by Walter Gropius.

MR. RICHARD LLOYD JONES
House by Frank Lloyd Wright, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

HERR HERMANN LANGE
House by Miës van der Rohe, Krefeld, Germany.

MR. AND MRS. CHARLES J. LIEBMAN
House planned by Raymond Hood and Harry Allen Jacobs, Mt. Kisco, N. Y.

DR. AND MRS. PHILIP M. LOVELL
House by Richard J. Neutra, Los Angeles, California.

MME. HELENE DE MANDROT
Founder of the *Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne;* house by Le Corbusier, Le Pradet near Hyères.

MRS. ALICE MILLARD
House by Frank Lloyd Wright, Pasadena, California.

FOREWORD

EXHIBITIONS AND ARCHITECTURE

EXPOSITIONS and exhibitions have perhaps changed the character of American architecture of the last forty years more than any other factor. The Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893 established that refined archaeological taste for antique colonnades which almost immediately became the official style for American public buildings. This Classical Revival was later accompanied by the revival of "good taste" in Colonial houses, Gothic college dormitories, Spanish country clubs and a dozen other varieties of evidence that our architects knew their history. Unfortunately this flood of revivalism not only brought to an end the robust bad taste of our late nineteenth century building but very nearly stifled the one genuinely important tradition in modern American architecture, the thread which passed from Richardson to Sullivan, from Sullivan to Frank Lloyd Wright. By 1922, thirty years after the Chicago Exposition, the American public was entirely persuaded that, however secondary to the European arts American painting or sculpture or music might be, in architecture we led the world. This feeling seems to have been based partially upon the ability of our architects to imitate past European styles more tastefully even than the Europeans themselves, and partially upon our technical proficiency whether in central heating, bathroom furniture or the rapid erection of skyscrapers. It was the skyscraper especially that confirmed our pride, for we had not yet come to realize that it was the engineer, perhaps more than the architect, who made our skyscrapers imposing.

COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION 1893

Chicago Tribune COMPETITION 1922

Strangely enough it was in the field of skyscraper design that our complacency was to receive a severe jolt. In 1922 the competition for the Chicago Tribune Tower brought forth scores of projects from all over the world. Almost without exception the American designs were Renaissance or Roman or Gothic; most of the European projects proved equally derivative though several were genuinely modern and several others transitional or half-modern. A Gothic design by the New York architect Raymond Hood was given first prize by the *Tribune*. Saarinen, a Finnish architect, won the second prize. His project which was enthusiastically acclaimed by American architects was an agreeable eclectic compromise achieved by applying novel ornament upon an emphatically vertical façade which rose from a Neo-Classic ground story. By common consent a foreign architect had surpassed Americans in solving a peculiarly American problem. Saarinen's triumph might have been all the more embarassing had it been gener-

ally realized that his principles of design derived primarily from the neglected Sullivan, and that his new ornament was less original than that of Frank Lloyd Wright, since 1910 one of the chief inspirations of modern European architecture.

The exhibition which included Saarinen's project traveled throughout the country and did much to shake the confidence of American architects in the sufficiency of historical styles for modern purposes. The Paris Exposition of Decorative Arts in 1925 was even more disturbing. The United States was not represented in the Exposition because its exhibits were not sufficiently modern. We are still suffering from this backwardness—both commercially and architecturally. Only recently has the deluge of "modernistic" decoration from Vienna, Paris, Stockholm and Amsterdam begun to diminish, but not before our more advanced architects, already stimulated by Saarinen's success, had accepted the modernistic mode with enthusiasm and ornamented their buildings with zigzags and chevrons instead of Gothic crockets and Classical modelings. The modernistic style has become merely another way of decorating surfaces.

EXPOSITION OF DECORATIVE ARTS 1925

"MODERNISTIC"

As a result of these forty years of successive and simultaneous architectural fashions the avenues of our greatest cities, our architectural magazines and annual exhibitions are monuments to the capriciousness and uncertainty of our architecture.

CONFUSION

The present exhibition is an assertion that the confusion of the past forty years, or rather of the past century, may shortly come to an end. Ten years ago the Chicago Tribune competition brought forth almost as many different styles as there were projects. Since then the ideas of a number of progressive architects have converged to form a genuinely new style which is rapidly spreading throughout the world. Both in appearance and structure this style is peculiar to the twentieth century and is as fundamentally original as the Greek or Byzantine or Gothic. In the following pages Mr. Hitchcock and Mr. Johnson have outlined its history[1] and its extent. Because of its simultaneous development in several different countries and because of its world-wide distribution it has been called the International Style.

EXHIBITION OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE 1932

INTERNATIONAL STYLE

The aesthetic principles[2] of the International Style are based primarily upon

[1] See also *Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration* by Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Jr. New York: 1929.

[2] *The International Style: Architecture Since 1922* by Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Jr., and Philip Johnson. New York: 1932.

STRUCTURE

MATERIALS

PLANNING

the nature of modern materials and structure and upon modern requirements in planning. Slender steel posts and beams, and concrete reinforced by steel have made possible structures of skeleton-like strength and lightness. The external surfacing materials are of painted stucco or tile, or, in more expensive buildings, of aluminum or thin slabs of marble or granite and of glass both opaque and transparent. Planning, liberated from the necessity for symmetry so frequently required by tradition is, in the new style, flexibly dependent upon convenience.

These *technical* and *utilitarian* factors in the hands of designers who understand inherent aesthetic possibilities have resulted in an architecture comparable in integrity and even in beauty to the styles of the past. But just as the modern architect has had to adjust himself to modern problems of design and structure so the modern public in order to appreciate his achievements must make parallel adjustments to what seems new and strange.

PRINCIPLES:

VOLUME

First of all, the modern architect working in the new style conceives of his building not as a structure of brick or masonry with thick columns and supporting walls resting heavily upon the earth but rather as a skeleton enclosed by a thin light shell. He thinks in terms of *volume*—of space enclosed by planes or surfaces—as opposed to *mass* and solidity. This principle of volume leads him to make his walls seem thin flat surfaces by eliminating moldings and by making his windows and doors flush with the surface.

REGULARITY

FLEXIBILITY

Two other principles which are both utilitarian and aesthetic may be called *regularity* and *flexibility*. The architects of the Classical and Renaissance, and often of the Medieval periods, designed their façades and plans in terms of bilateral symmetry, that is of balanced masses on either side of a central axis. They also usually divided their façades horizontally in three parts: the bottom or base, the wall or middle section and the top or cornice. In the International Style these arbitrary conventions of symmetry and triple division are abandoned for a method of design which accepts, first, both vertical and horizontal repetition and, second, flexible asymmetry, for both are natural concomitants of modern building. The modern architect feels it unnecessary to add an elaborate ground floor and an elaborate crowning decoration to his skyscraper, or a gabled porch in the center and at either end of his school or library. He permits the horizontal floors of his skyscraper and the rows of windows in his school to repeat themselves boldly without artificial accents or terminations. And the resulting *regularity*, which may in itself be very handsome, is given accent by a door or ventilator, electric sign, stair tower, chimney, or fire escape, placed

asymmetrically as utility often demands, and the principle of *flexibility* permits. The Bauhaus at Dessau (p. 67) in the present exhibition is a clear illustration of these principles of design.

TECHNICAL PERFECTION

A fourth comprehensive principle is both positive and negative: positive quality or beauty in the International Style depends upon technically perfect use of materials whether metal, wood, glass or concrete; upon the fineness of proportions in units such as doors and windows and in the relationships between these units and the whole design. The negative or obverse aspect of this principle is the elimination of any kind of ornament or artificial pattern. This lack of ornament is one of the most difficult elements of the style for the layman to accept. Intrinsically there is no reason why ornament should not be used, but modern ornament, usually crass in design and machine-manufactured, would seem to mar rather than adorn the clean perfection of surface and proportion.

PROPORTIONS

COMPOSITION

LACK OF ORNAMENT

These principles are not as dogmatic as they must necessarily seem in so brief a discussion: on the contrary they have been derived from the evolution and intrinsic character of the architecture itself. A study of these principles in relation to most of the models and photographs in the present exhibition will enable the visitor to understand what is meant by the International Style and how it differs from the modernistic or half-modern decorative style, which with the persistence of the revived styles of the past, has added so much to the confusion of contemporary architecture.

ARCHITECTS:

In this exhibition the International Style is illustrated by the work of its leading exponents in Europe and in America. One very great architect, however, is included who is not intimately related to the Style although his early work was one of the Style's most important sources. Mr. Hitchcock explains how fundamental was Frank Lloyd Wright's influence upon the important Dutch architect J. J. P. Oud. The Germans, Gropius and Miës van der Rohe, also seem to have studied his work at some time in their careers. But Wright while he does not precisely disown these architectural nephews remains, what he has always been, a passionately independent genius whose career is a history of original discovery and contradiction. While he is much older than the other architects in the exhibition his role is not merely that of "pioneer ancestor." As the embodiment of the romantic principle of individualism, his work, complex and abundant, remains a challenge to the classical austerity of the style of his best younger contemporaries.

WRIGHT

HOOD

Another exception, Raymond Hood, is included because, of all the megalopoli-

tan architects, he seems the most straightforward as well as the most open to new ideas. It is true that his work in retrospect appears somewhat inconsistent, but he must be credited with having designed the finest skyscraper in the vertical style and, a year later, the finest New York skyscraper with a horizontal emphasis (which suggests the definite influence of the International Style). Time will shortly reveal whether his inclusion in the exhibition is a prophecy that a brilliant future awaits our commercial architecture or whether as in the past fifty years our best building will be designed by non-conformists and rebels.

GROPIUS
LE CORBUSIER
OUD
MIËS VAN DER ROHE

The four founders of the International Style are Gropius, Le Corbusier, Oud and Miës van der Rohe. It happens that one is a Parisian of Swiss birth, another a Dutchman, the other two Germans; but it would be very difficult to find in their work any national characteristics. For Le Corbusier is perhaps the greatest theorist, the most erudite and the boldest experimenter, Gropius the most sociologically minded, Miës van der Rohe the most luxurious and elegant, while Oud of Rotterdam possesses the most sensitive and disciplined taste. These four masters prove not only the internationalism of the Style but also, as Mr. Hitchcock makes clear, the wide personal variations possible within what may seem at first glance a restricted range of possibilities.

HOWE & LESCAZE

Among American architects are five others whose work is given special emphasis in the exhibition. The new skyscraper by Howe & Lescaze in Philadelphia is a monument to the persistence and artistic integrity of a firm which has only recently, after years of discouragement, persuaded clients, real estate brokers, and renting agents that the International Style may not be a commercial liability. Whether conservative New York will take Howe & Lescaze's housing project as seriously as it deserves remains to be seen.

NEUTRA

Principally because of his writing the Austrian-born Neutra is, among American architects, second only to Wright in his international reputation. His executed buildings permit him to rank as the leading modern architect of the West Coast.

BOWMAN BROTHERS

The Bowman Brothers of Chicago have as yet built very little but their thorough study of steel construction in relation to architecture, both technically and legally, may revolutionize certain phases of American architecture within the next few years. Their concern with structural probity and frankness has led them very naturally to work in the International Style.

HOUSING

Many difficult architectural problems are touched upon in the exhibition—the private house, the school, apartment houses, both urban and suburban, the church, the factory, the department store, the club and (alumni please note) the

college dormitory. But more urgently than any of these is the problem of low-rent housing. Lewis Mumford's article is an admirable and challenging exposition of this subject, more vital in these days of superfluous population than ever before. The aerial photographs of "slums and super-slums" are instructive criticisms of contemporary city planning—or lack of planning. But of even more positive value is the model of a housing development (p. 199), by the German Haesler, one of the foremost European experts. In this project the economy, adaptability and beauty of the International Style are as clearly demonstrated as in the more costly kinds of building shown elsewhere in the exhibition.

MUMFORD'S ARTICLE

HAESLER

A. H. B., Jr.

HISTORICAL NOTE

NINETEENTH CENTURY ENGINEERING

In the 19th century, behind the obvious story of conflicting revivals, there are two histories of architecture. One is concerned with the developments in pure engineering which remained until after the Great War outside the field of architecture. Buildings like the Crystal Palace in London were seldom considered as having architectural significance any more than the metal and glass arcades of the period. Architecture and engineering were divorced.

NINETEENTH CENTURY FREE DESIGN

The other history beneath the general revivalism is that of conscious independent design. Experiment was continuous from the early century but the experimenters remained individualists. Each generation went its own way, breaking each time in a unique fashion with the current revivalism. There was little consecutive development.

AMERICA TO 1914

Henry Hobson Richardson, though he is often considered merely a reviver of the Romanesque, was one of the greatest of these individual experimenters of the second half century. His later buildings, almost entirely freed from archaeology, show a great originality of composition and an extraordinary freedom of fenestration particularly considering the continued use of traditional building methods. In John Wellborn Root and Louis Sullivan this tradition of freedom was continued. And in Sullivan's disciple, Frank Lloyd Wright, all ties with the past were finally broken. As early as the turn of the century Wright made his amazing innovations in the plan of the house, cutting out interior divisions, and extending the rooms into separate wings with many windows on each side. His fenestration was in bands, his composition frequently asymmetrical, foreshadowing much work of the next quarter century in Europe.

EUROPE TO 1900

At the same time Cuijpers in Holland, of Richardson's generation, was also experimenting along Medieval lines. Otto Wagner, a younger contemporary in Vienna, trained under Gottfried Semper in the Classical tradition, started a new sort of rationalism without Medieval ties. The Belgian Van de Velde, inspired by the English Arts and Crafts movement of Ruskin and Morris, was advancing along a line which emphasized at first honesty of structure and later a free linear ornament which came to be called *Art Nouveau*. Around 1900 this movement had spread throughout Europe. At the same time the remarkable steel and glass department stores, such as the Samaritaine in Paris by Frantz Jourdain and the Tietz store in Berlin brought tentatively and temporarily the achievements of engineering into close touch with architecture.

But it was a brief modernism. As the 20th century wore on the new phase had to come to terms with the better traditional architecture of the time, which had already been simplified and freed from crass imitation. So the successful modern architecture of 1910, represented by the Jugendstil in Germany, the Wiener Werkstätte group in Vienna, and Voysey and McIntosh in England, was less advanced than the outstanding work of 1900.

1910

HALF-MODERN ARCHITECTURE

The dominant current in architecture just before the War was in the hands of various national half-modern architects who perfected, much as had Schinkel in the early 19th century and Richardson in the later, a personal simplification of the Medieval or Classical traditions. Behrens and Bonatz in Germany, Berlage in Holland, Østberg and Tengbom in Sweden, are still practicing; but their best work falls in the years immediately before the War.

RADICAL TENDENCIES BEFORE THE WAR

In this period, however, when the half-modern architects were at the helm, there were isolated and sporadic examples of more radical tendencies which are realized as particularly significant in retrospect. The industrial architecture of Peter Behrens, for instance, was remarkably free from the compromise with tradition which characterized his houses. Adolf Loos in Vienna, the opponent of the dominant leader Josef Hoffmann and his decorative architecture, was stripping his houses of all ornament and foreshadowing in his writings the functionalist attitude of twenty years later. In France the brothers Perret developed further the possibilities of ferroconcrete construction. But there was only one building which actually foreshadowed the line of advance architecture was to take after the War, a factory at Alfeld built in 1911–1914 by Walter Gropius, a student of Behrens.

THE NEW STYLE

Before the War modern architecture was the creation of great individualists. Since the War an international style has grown up throughout Europe, not the invention of one genius but the coordinated result of many parallel experiments. Engineering was at last not only joined closely with architecture but made its basis. The Crystal Palace was, indeed, more of a direct ancestor of the new style than any one building of its time.

NEOPLASTICISM

The development of a conscious style was involved at first with two movements in painting: Neoplasticism in Holland and Expressionism in Germany. Neoplasticism was an international movement founded in Holland and derived from Cubism. The painter, Mondriaan and the theorist, Theo van Doesburg, reduced composition to related rectangles and blocks, and color harmony to the three primary colors in relation to black and white. The most important architect

Historical Note

connected with Neoplasticism was Oud, though at first Rietveld appeared at least his equal. Theo van Doesburg's sojourn at the Bauhaus in 1922 brought Neoplasticism to young German architects in general and to Gropius in particular. Walter Gropius, previous to this, had been strongly influenced by the post-War wave of Expressionism. In painting Expressionism had represented the revolt from Impressionism. In architecture it led to an exuberant reaction from the relative restraint of the work of 1910. Architects indulged in arbitrary curves, zig-zags and fantastic decoration, breaking down all formal discipline, traditional or structural. The phase is best exemplified in the work of Hans Poelzig, Otto Bartning and Erich Mendelsohn executed between the end of the War and 1924.

EXPRESSIONISM

There was no movement in France comparable to Neoplasticism or Expressionism in its influence on architecture, although Le Corbusier was for a time himself a painter associated with Ozenfant in the movement called Purism.

TOWARDS A NEW ARCHITECTURE

It was in Le Corbusier's *Vers une Architecture* that the advent of a new style was signalized in 1923. During the War years he had developed on the basis of Perret's use of ferroconcrete a new technic and a new aesthetic. More of an innovator than Oud, more consistent than Gropius, he displayed in his *Citrohan* model of 1919–22 the startling possibilities of an art of building as little related to the modern architecture before the War as to the styles of the further past. Miës van der Rohe was developing at the same time a parallel aesthetic less dependent on a particular system of construction.

DIE NEUE SACHLICHKEIT

Since 1922 the new style has not changed in its fundamentals. Based as it is on modern engineering and on modern provision for function, it went through stages where both these basic conditions were over-emphasized. This was especially true in Germany during the years which followed Expressionism when *Die Neue Sachlichkeit*, the new realism or new objectivity, encouraged a denial of the aesthetic elements in all the arts. The best work of the functionalists is, however, distinguished more in theory than in practice from the work of those who accept the new aesthetic possibilities of the art of architecture. The new style has spread to all parts of the world. Whether it will develop local substyles or change rapidly as the years go by, only the future can tell. In 1932 Miës, Le Corbusier, Oud, and Gropius who were the chief pioneers are still the leading modern architects.

P. J.

THE EXTENT OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE

THE architecture of the twentieth century to the superficial observer is no more consistent than that of the nineteenth. Yet in the most advanced work of the last decade there is a decided convergence. This converging tendency which contrasts so strongly with the chaos of the nineteenth century and the individualism of the last generation suggests the existence of an international style. Though many architects and critics question the desirability or even the possibility of style fixation, it is true that consciously or unconsciously a considerable number of architects throughout the world accept parallel technical and aesthetic disciplines.

GERMANY

Of the countries in which modern architecture was first developed, Germany has today the greatest amount of consciously advanced building. The leaders of pre-War architecture such as Peter Behrens, Hans Poelzig, and Bruno Paul are now working in the style initiated by their juniors, Walter Gropius and Miës van der Rohe. Erich Mendelsohn, Otto Bartning and the other Expressionists, whose extravagant fantasies dominated the scene just after the War, are restraining their work in conformity with the new way of building. The extreme functionalists, like Hannes Meyer, Hans Witwer and Arthur Korn, who form a distinct group, are divergent in theory but differ little in practice. In all parts of Germany there are working good architects who have never been either Expressionists, or extreme functionalists. Among the soundest are Schneider in Hamburg, Scharoun in Breslau, Vorhölzer in Munich, Luckhardt & Anker in Berlin, and the prolific housing expert, Otto Haesler, in Celle near Hanover.

HOLLAND

In Holland the half-modern school of Amsterdam with its fantastic and elaborate brickwork is still dominant. Among those of the group who are freeing their work from these mannerisms are Wijdeveld and Dudok, the city architect of Hilversum. But the best post-War architecture is in Rotterdam where Oud is city architect. Although the work of Rietveld in Utrecht ranks second only to Oud, Brinkman & Van der Vlugt, Ravesteijn and Van Eesteren further established Rotterdam as the center of the modern movement. Duiker in Amsterdam is also a technical innovator of importance.

FRANCE

The importance of Le Corbusier's work alone gives France a place with Holland and Germany in the leadership of modern architecture. André Lurçat is, after Le Corbusier, the most significant modern architect. Of the architects who are gradually freeing themselves from the tradition of the Ecole des Beaux Arts,

Roux Spitz is the best. Badovici, the editor of *L'Architecture Vivante*, has built one interesting house and Moreux several. Men primarily decorators, such as Djo Bourgeois and Chareau, who works in collaboration with Bijvoet of Amsterdam, have tried their hand at modern building.

As is to be expected in so cosmopolitan a city as Paris, most of the modern architects, including Le Corbusier, are not French born. The Belgian Mallet-Stevens, the best known and the poorest, the American Paul Nelson, the Armenian Guevrekian and the Pole Elkouken are among this group. French engineers, particularly Freyssinet of Limousin & Cie., have done industrial work with ferroconcrete that may be ranked as architecture.

AMERICA

In America there is Frank Lloyd Wright who stands alone. Those men such as Barry Byrne, Chase McArthur and Wright's son Lloyd Wright, who follow most directly in his footsteps are no more worthy exemplars of modernism than the metropolitan architects of the East. The latter have borrowed the tricks of design and ornament of the Paris Exposition of 1925 without any real conception of what modern architecture may be. Except for Raymond Hood and George Howe, few established architects have attempted modern design with any real understanding and sympathy. The magnificent factories of Albert Kahn in Detroit, like the Starrett-Lehigh Building in New York, are an exception. William Lescaze, Frederic Kiesler and Richard J. Neutra are the best among the foreign born, foreign trained modern architects now practicing in America. R. M. Schindler in California, although trained in Europe, belongs rather with the group of Wright's followers.

Of the younger men just beginning to build whose training and background are exclusively American there are, in addition to the Bowman Brothers, George Daub, Norman Rice, Richard Wood, John Moore, Percival Goodman, Lyman Paine and Stott & Holden in New York; Howard Fisher, George Keck and Harry Dubin in Chicago. Those who have received their training chiefly in the offices of the leading modern architects of Europe include Alfred Clauss, Oscar Stonorov, Albert Frey, Walter Baermann, Alfred Kastner, Lönberg-Holm and William Muschenheim. Hamilton Beatty in Madison, Wisconsin, a pupil of Le Corbusier, has built several houses. From the designs of Clauss & Daub the Standard Oil Company of Ohio are building forty stations. Thompson and Churchill deserve mention for their technical ingenuity. A. Lawrence Kocher, editor of the *Architectural Record*, has built with Frey an experimental aluminum house. Buckminster Fuller, the inventor of the Dymaxion House, has interested

the general public with his radical approach to the problem of the house. Other young men throughout the country, whose potentialities cannot yet be estimated, are doing fresh and interesting work in interiors and remodelling.

SWITZERLAND

Modern architecture since the War has not been limited to these four countries. Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and Belgium have fewer original architects but considerable work of interest. In Switzerland the Zürich functionalists are the leaders. Steiger, Werner Moser and Max Ernst Haefeli of Zürich, together with Hans Schmidt of Basle, form a definite group with which the critic Giedion is closely affiliated. Outside the group there are Steger & Egender, and Kellermüller and Hofmann, both of Zürich, and Carl Weidemeyer of Ascona. Of the older generation Professor Karl Moser has, like Peter Behrens, been ready to follow the younger radicals.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In Czechoslovakia, Brno is as much a center for post-War modern architecture as Rotterdam in Holland or Zürich in Switzerland. Financial prosperity since the War has provided the newer architects with unusual opportunity to build, and the reaction to the decorative Austrian style dominant before the War has given impetus to the introduction of a more modern style. The general standard of the work is relatively low but that of Otto Eisler, Bohuslav Fuchs, Josef Kranz and Jan Visek may be compared with the best Swiss work.

BELGIUM

In Belgium the leading modern architects are Victor Bourgeois, H. L. De Koninck, Eggerickx and Francken. Henry van de Velde of the older generation as head of the Ecole Superieur des Arts Décoratifs at Brussels is developing a group of promising younger men. Even the best Belgian work is, however, inferior to that of Switzerland and Czechoslovakia.

SCANDINAVIA

In Scandinavian countries the best work is done in Stockholm in Sweden, and Åbo in Finland. The younger group in Sweden includes Gunnar Asplund, Sven Markelius, Eskil Sundahl and Uno Åhren, all of Stockholm, and Friberger of Göteberg. The best younger Finnish architects are Alvar Aalto and Erik Bryggman. In Norway and Denmark the half-modern architecture of before the War retains more force than in Sweden and Finland.

RUSSIA

The opportunities in Russia are enormous and have drawn thither many of the young architects of Germany. As yet the modern buildings built in Russia are inferior technically. Of the impressive industrial work, the most successful is the Technical Institute of thirty-three units at Lefortovo near Moscow. Barkhin, Ginsburg, the brothers Vyesnine and Velikovski may be mentioned as of particular consequence.

ITALY
SPAIN
ENGLAND
JAPAN

In Italy, Spain, England and Japan really modern architecture has only begun to appear. Sartoris, Terragni, Figini and Pollini in Italy have built but little. Mercadal, Sert, Labayen & Aizpurua in Spain have had more considerable opportunities. Emberton, Etchells, Connell and Tait have done the most thoroughgoing modern work in England. In Japan the publication of books and magazines has propagandized modern architecture. Yamada and Ueno are the best known younger architects.

P. J. AND H.-R. H., JR.

PHOTOGRAPHS IN THE EXHIBITION ILLUSTRATING THE EXTENT OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE

AUSTRIA

Lois Welzenbacher: Apartment House, Innsbruck. 1930.

BELGIUM

H. L. de Koninck: Lenglet House, Uccle, near Brussels. 1926.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Otto Eisler: House for Two Brothers, Brno. 1931.

Bohuslav Fuchs: Students' Clubhouse, Brno. 1931.

Ludvik Kysela: Bata Store, Prague. 1929.

ENGLAND

Amyas Connell: House in Amersham, Buckinghamshire. 1931.

Joseph Emberton: Royal Corinthian Yacht Club, Burnham-on-Crouch. 1931.

FINLAND

Alvar Aalto: Turun Sanomat Building, Åbo. 1930.

FRANCE

Gabriel Guevrekian: Villa Heim, Neuilly-sur-Seine. 1928.

André Lurçat: Froriep de Salis House, Boulogne-sur-Seine. 1927.

André Lurçat: Hotel Nord-Sud, Calvi, Corsica. 1931.

FRANCE (continued)

Rob Mallet-Stevens: de Noailles Villa, Hyères. 1925.

Paul Nelson: Pharmacy, Paris. 1931.

GERMANY

Otto Haesler: Old People's Home, Kassel. 1931.

Luckhardt & Anker: Row of Houses, Berlin. 1929.

Ernst May & Associates: Friedrich Ebert School, Frankfort-on-Main. 1931.

Erich Mendelsohn: Schocken Department Store, Chemnitz. 1928–30.

Erich Mendelsohn: House of the Architect, Berlin. 1930.

Hans Scharoun: "Wohnheim," Breslau. 1930.

Karl Schneider: Kunstverein, Hamburg. 1930.

HOLLAND

Brinkman & Van der Vlugt: Van Nelle Factory, Rotterdam. 1928–30.

W. J. Duiker: Open Air School, Amsterdam. 1931.

G. Rietveld: House at Utrecht. 1924.

ITALY

L. Figini & G. Pollini: Electrical House at the Monza Exposition. 1930.

JAPAN

Isaburo Ueno: Star Bar, Kioto. 1931.

Mamoru Yamada: Electrical Laboratory, Tokio. 1930.

SPAIN

Labayen & Aizpurua: Club House, San Sebastian. 1930.

SWEDEN

Sven Markelius & Uno Åhren: Students' Clubhouse, Stockholm. 1930.

Eskil Sundahl: Workers' Houses, near Stockholm. 1930.

SWITZERLAND

Artaria & Schmidt: Residence for Professional Women, Basle. 1930.

Max Ernst Haefeli: Apartment House, Zürich. 1929.

Carl Weidemeyer: House on Lago Maggiore. 1929.

U. S. S. R.

Nicolaiev & Fissenko: Electro-Physical Laboratory, Lefortovo, Moscow. 1927.

Nicolaiev & Fissenko: Electro-Technical Institute, Lefortovo, Moscow. 1927.

U. S. A.

Clauss & Daub: Filling Station for the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, Cleveland, Ohio. 1931.

R. G. & W. M. Cory: Starrett Lehigh Building, 11th Avenue at 26th Street, New York. 1931.

Frederic Kiesler: Film Guild Cinema, 8th Street, New York.

Kocher & Frey: Harrison House, Syosset, Long Island. 1931.

Thompson & Churchill: Office Building at Lexington Avenue and 57th Street, New York. 1931.

Tucker & Howell, Oscar Stonorov, Associate: Biological Laboratory of the Highland Museum, Highlands, N. C. 1931.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY*

The International Style: Architecture Since 1922. Hitchcock and Johnson. New York: 1932.

Die Baukunst der Neuesten Zeit. Gustav Adolf Platz. 2nd Edition. Berlin: 1931.

Neues Bauen in der Welt. I. *Russland.* El Lissitzky. II. *America.* R. J. Neutra. III. *Frankreich.* Roger Ginsburger. Vienna: 1930.

Die Neue Raumkunst. Herbert Hoffmann. Stuttgart: 1930.

Modern Architecture. Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Jr. New York: 1929.

Die Neue Baukunst. Bruno Taut. Stuttgart: 1929.

Architecture. André Lurçat. Paris: 1929.

Bauen in Frankreich, Eisen und Eisenbeton. Siegfried Giedion. Leipzig: 1928.

Internationale Architektur. Walter Gropius. 2nd Edition. Munich: 1927.

Groszstadt Architektur. Ludwig Hilberseimer. Stuttgart: 1927.

Internationale Neue Baukunst. Ludwig Hilberseimer: Stuttgart: 1926.

Vers une Architecture. Le Corbusier. Paris: 1923.

Towards a New Architecture. (English Translation of the above.) London & New York: 1928.

L'Art International d'Aujourdhui. (Several of the volumes of this series deal with different types and features of modern architecture.) Paris: 1929–

*Individual bibliographies are included in the sections devoted to the separate architects.