City University of New York (CUNY)
CUNY Academic Works

Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects | CUNY Graduate Center

2007

Edward Durell Stone: Perception and Criticism

Mary Anne Hunting
The Graduate Center, City University of New York

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/3660
Discover additional works at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

EDWARD DURELL STONE: PERCEPTION AND CRITICISM

by

MARY ANNE HUNTING

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York
2007

UMI Number: 3249917

Copyright 2007 by
Hunting, Mary Anne

All rights reserved.

UMI®

UMI Microform 3249917
Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2007

MARY ANNE HUNTING

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Kevin Murphy

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

Kevin Murphy

Date

Executive Officer

Rosemarie Haag Bletter

Sally Webster

Richard Guy Wilson

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

EDWARD DURELL STONE: PERCEPTION AND CRITICISM

by

Mary Anne Hunting

Adviser: Professor Kevin Murphy

The work of the New York City-based architect Edward Durell Stone (1902-1978) has been subject to ongoing critical controversy. Stone achieved phenomenal success, beginning in the 1950s as an architect in the period of the Cold War, with buildings on four continents, in thirteen foreign countries, and in thirty-two states. But an examination of his stylistic progression reveals that Stone increasingly fell out of critical favor as he shifted modernism from the International Style to a more "romantic" modern aesthetic that incorporated decoration along with aspects of monumentality, regionalism, historicism, and fantasy—a progression that can be traced in six of his high profile projects: the Richard H. Mandel house in Bedford Hills, New York (1933-1935); a model house for *Collier's* magazine (1936); the Museum of Modern Art in New York City (1935-1939); the United States Pavilion at the Exposition Universelle et Internationale Bruxelles (1956-1958); the American Embassy complex in New Delhi, India (1953-1965); and the Gallery of Modern Art in New York City (1956-1964). And yet, middle-class consumers responded positively to Stone's architecture, reflecting the larger problematic of a crisis of taste in America, exemplified by the extended arguments between the popular writer Tom Wolfe, who praised Stone as an apostate for daring to break free from the constraints of doctrinaire modernism, and Stone's most outspoken adversary, Ada Louise Huxtable of the *New York Times*, who panned his

work as “kitsch,” a criticism that still endures but not necessarily with a full understanding of its connotations. Through kitsch, it can be argued, Stone was able to democratize taste by cracking the barrier between the high art of the avant-garde and the emerging middle-class culture. Much of Stone’s legacy as a celebrity architect is due to the influence of his second wife, Maria, who helped to shape his public image as she managed his publicity at the apex of his career in the late 1950s and early 1960s. During this period—when mass communication systems were growing at an unprecedented rate—Stone especially used to his advantage print and television to achieve worldwide fame, which lasted as long as his aesthetic was contemporary with the mass culture it represented.

Acknowledgements

To Thomas Henry Remien, without whom I would never have attempted those things now most important in my life; to Henry David Hunting Remien and Mary Ives Hunting Remien, my motivation to finish; and to my mother and father who always encourage me.

With much gratitude to Professor Kevin Murphy, adviser and mentor; to Jill Lord, dissertation colleague; to Eleanor Gustafson, gifted editor and friend; and to the family of Edward Durell Stone, especially Hicks and Emily.

Appreciation is also extended to the dissertation readers: Professors Rosemarie Haag Bletter, Sara Webster, and Richard Guy Wilson.

I would also like to thank all those who supported my research, including (but not limited to) Andrea Cantrell and the staff of Special Collections at the University of Arkansas, Kate Wood of Landmarks West!, Maria Stone, Ernest Jacks, Christian Bjone, Robert Skolmen, Pamela Wilson, Erica Stoller, Kevin Lee Sarring, Robert J. Roche, Sherry Neely, Jane C. Loeffler, Roderick K. Johnson, Jerry Kieffer, Raymond Gomez, Jeff Cronin, Denise and Vincent Degenhart, Paige Donhauser, Wayne Checkman, Louis Walker, Juliet Hartford, Helen Keier, John Baldi, Gregory Luhan, Charles Cash, Bernard Rooney, Kate Wood, Mrs. Julian Salley, Frederick E. Nelson, and Edward Jones III.

And finally, with thanks to Allison Ledes, editor of *The Magazine Antiques*, for introducing me to the subject of this dissertation.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements vi
List of Illustrations viii
Introduction 1
Chapter One: An Artistic Path 40
Chapter Two: Transition in Modernism 60
Chapter Three: New Romanticism: A Provocative Aesthetic 133
Chapter Four: Architecture for the Average Man 215
Chapter Five: Quest for Celebrity 270
Conclusion 325
Bibliography 331
Illustrations 379

List of Illustrations

Fig. 1. Gallery of Modern Art, Two Columbus Circle, New York City: 1964; 2005.....379

Fig. 2. Huntington Hartford with a model of the Gallery of Modern Art.....380

Fig. 3. Carlson Terrace, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; 2005 demolition.....381

Fig. 4. Edward Durell Stone townhouse, 130 East 64th Street, New York City.....382

Fig. 5. Redevelopment of the Stuart Pharmaceutical Company building, Pasadena, CA.....383

Fig. 6. General Motors building, New York City.....384

Fig. 7. A. Conger Goodyear house, Old Westbury, Long Island, New York.....385

Fig. 8. Cover of Edward Durell Stone, *Evolution of an Architect* (1962).....386

Fig. 9. Edward Durell Stone on the cover of *Time* (March 31, 1958).....387

Fig. 10. National Cultural Center; Kennedy Center for Performing Arts, Washington, D.C.....388

Fig. 11. Hallmark Gallery, 720 Fifth Avenue, New York City.....389

Fig. 12. Photograph of Maria Elana Torch Stone.....390

Fig. 13. Cartoon by Alan Cantwell Duncan.....391

Fig. 14. The Edward Durell Stones, chancery atrium, American Embassy, New Delhi, India.....392

Fig. 15. Living room, Edward Durell Stone townhouse, New York City.....393

Fig. 16. Rotch Travelling Scholarship drawings.....394

Fig. 17. "The Colosseum," Rome, Italy.....395
Fig. 18. Busch Memorial Stadium, St. Louis, MO.....395

Fig. 19. United States Pavilion, Exposition Universelle et Internationale Bruxelles, 1958.....395

Fig. 20. Doge's Palace, Venice, Italy.....396
Fig. 21. Gallery of Modern Art, New York City.....396

Fig. 22. Parthenon, The Acropolis, Athens, Greece.....397
Fig. 23. Chancery, American Embassy, New Delhi, India.....397

Fig. 24. Roof garden and ballroom, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City.....398

Fig. 25. Music hall and lobby, Radio City Music Hall, Rockefeller Center, New York City.....399

Fig. 26. Richard H. Mandel house, New Bedford, New York.....400
Fig. 27. *Collier's* house model.....400
Fig. 28. Museum of Modern Art, 11 West 53rd Street, New York City.....400

Fig. 29. William Thurnauer house, Teaneck, NJ.....401

Fig. 30. Gulf Gas Station, Idlewild Airport, New York.....402

Fig. 31. Stuart Pharmaceutical Company, Pasadena, CA.....403

Fig. 32. Grillework, American Embassy, New Delhi, India.....404

Fig. 33. Roosevelt House, American Embassy, New Delhi, India.....405

Fig. 34. Museo de Arte de Ponce, Ponce, Puerto Rico.....406

Fig. 35. "Tech Student Wins Rotch Scholarship," *Boston Herald* (May 4, 1927).....407

Fig. 36. "Plan and Elevation of Prize Winning Design for 'An Architect's Office'".....408

Fig. 37. Envoi of the Loggia die Leone, Villa Borghese, Rome, Italy.....409

Fig. 38. Envoi of the Cathedral of Sainte Cécile at Albi sur le Tarne, France.....410

Fig. 39. Page from sketchbook.....411

Fig. 40. Drawing of the Radio City Music Hall, in *Fortune* (January 1933).....412

Fig. 41. Aerial view Richard H. Mandel house, New Bedford, New York.....413

Fig. 42. Floor plans, Richard H. Mandel house.....414

Fig. 43. Northern terrace, Richard H. Mandel house.....415
Fig. 44. Open plan (living room, hall, and library), Richard H. Mandel house.....415

Fig. 45. Staircase and first-floor hallway, Richard H. Mandel house.....416

Fig. 46. "House of Richard H. Mandel," *Architectural Forum* (August 1935).....417

Fig. 47. Plate glass windows, Richard H. Mandel house, in *Inside 100 Homes* (1935)..... 418

Fig. 48. "Washable Dinner Dresses," *Vogue* (June 15, 1935).....419

Fig. 49. Living room, Richard H. Mandel house, in *Fortune* (October 12, 1935).....420

Fig. 50. Bar room, Richard H. Mandel house.....421

Fig. 51. Dining room, Richard H. Mandel house.....422
Fig. 52. Dining room, Samuel Lionel Rothafel apartment, Radio City Music Hall.....422

Fig. 53. Staircase between the ground and first floors, Richard H. Mandel house.....423

Fig. 54. Ulrich and Elizabeth Kowalski house, Mount Kisco, New York.....424

Fig. 55. *Collier's* house model (1936).....425

Fig. 56. *Collier's* house floor plans.....426

Fig. 57. *Collier's* house advertisement.....427
Fig. 58. *Collier's* house model by Theodore E. Conrad.....427

Fig. 59. *Collier's* house for Edward Clifford Jones Jr., Fairmont, WV.....428

Fig. 60. *Collier's* house for Doris Dockstader Rooney, Dodge City, KA.....429

Fig. 61. *Collier's* house for Charles Augustus Wallace, Columbia, SC.....430

Fig. 62. *Collier's* house for William C. Ilfeld, Las Vegas, NM.....431
Fig. 63. *Collier's* house for Maurice L. Miller, Louisville, KY.....431

Fig. 64. *Collier's* house for Stuart Randall Carswell, Newark, DE.....432

Fig. 65. Simon & Schuster office, Center Theater roof, Rockefeller Center, New York City.....433

Fig. 66. Museum of Science and Industry, RCA Building, Rockefeller Center.....434

Fig. 67. Museum of Modern Art, 11 West 53rd Street, New York City.....435

Fig. 68. Museum of Modern Art.....436

Fig. 69. "Brick House" by Philip Goodwin, Hartford, CT.....437

Fig. 70. Sketches of the Museum of Modern Art building.....438

Fig. 71. Rendering of the Museum of Modern Art by Hugh Ferriss.....439

Fig. 72. Model of the Museum of Modern Art (1937).....440

Fig. 73. Model of the Museum of Modern Art (1938).....441

Fig. 74. Final model of the Museum of Modern Art (1938).....442

Fig. 75. Sketch of the 1964 addition to the Museum of Modern Art by Philip Johnson.....443
Fig. 76. Museum of Modern Art (2004).....443

Fig. 77. Floor plans, Museum of Modern Art.....444

Fig. 78. Views of the terrace, staircase, and gallery, Museum of Modern Art.....445

Fig. 79. Cover of the *Art In Our Time* exhibition catalogue (1939).....446

Fig. 80. Bruno Graf house, Dallas, Texas.....447

Fig. 81. One of six dormitories, University of South Carolina, Camden.....448

Fig. 82. Stone in the audience of the *Ed Sullivan Show* (February 2, 1958).....449
Fig. 83. The Edward Durell Stones on *Person to Person* (February 14, 1958).....449

Fig. 84. Stone as a guest on *What's My Line?* (August 10, 1958).....450

Fig. 85. U.S. postage stamp of the United States Pavilion, Brussels Exposition.....451

Fig. 86. United States Pavilion, Brussels Exposition.....452

Fig. 87. Models of the United States and Russian pavilions, Brussels Exposition.....453
Fig. 88. Map of the Exposition Universelle et Internationale Bruxelles, 1958.....453

Fig. 89. "Site Plan, Roof Construction, and Prototype," United States Pavilion.....454
Fig. 90. United States Pavilion under construction, Brussels Exposition.....454

Fig. 91. Philips Company Pavilion and the French Pavilion, Brussels Exposition.....455

Fig. 92. Interior of the United States Pavilion, Brussels Exposition.....456

Fig. 93. Sketchbook page.....457

Fig. 94. Interior of the United States Pavilion, Brussels Exposition.....458

Fig. 95. Evening view of the American Pavilion, Brussels Exposition.....459

Fig. 96. Taj Mahal, Agra, India.....460
Fig. 97. Chancery, American Embassy, New Delhi, India.....460

Fig. 98. Model of the chancery, American Embassy (1955).....461

Fig. 99. Site plans, American Embassy.....462

Fig. 100. Staff housing, American Embassy.....463

Fig. 101. *Estufa Fria*, Parque Eduardo VII, Lisbon, Portugal.....464

Fig. 102. Sketchbook page.....465

Fig. 103. Chancery atrium, American Embassy.....466

Fig. 104. Chancery atrium plan, American Embassy.....467

Fig. 105. Chancery grille mock-up, American Embassy (1956).....468

Fig. 106. Model of the chancery, American Embassy (1955).....469

Fig. 107. Serpentine wall, A Conger Goodyear house, Old Westbury, New York.....470
Fig. 108. Serpentine wall, Mepkin Plantation, Moncks Corner, SC.....470

Fig. 109. Elevation of Superintendent's Group, Mepkin Plantation.....471

Fig. 110. Roosevelt House, American Embassy, New Delhi, India.....472

Fig. 111. "An artist's conception" of Roosevelt House, American Embassy.....473

Fig. 112. Reception hall, Roosevelt House, American Embassy.....474
Fig. 113. Spiral staircase, Reception hall, Roosevelt House, American Embassy.....474

Fig. 114. International Cooperative Administration Building, American Embassy.....475
Fig. 115. Interior atrium, International Cooperative Administration Building.....475

Fig. 116. American Embassy grille and ceiling mock-ups at the Museum of Modern Art.....476

Fig. 117. Gallery of Modern Art, Two Columbus Circle, New York City.....477

Fig. 118. View of Columbus Circle (1963).....478

Fig. 119. Pre-existing building on site of Gallery of Modern Art (1959).....479
Fig. 120. Site plan of Gallery of Modern Art.....479

Fig. 121. Initial plan and interior concepts, Gallery of Modern Art (1957).....480
Fig. 122. Stanford University Medical Center, Palo Alto, CA.....480

Fig. 123. Initial façade concept, Gallery of Modern art (1957).....481

Fig. 124. Proposed design of the Gallery of Modern Art by Hanford Yang.....482

Fig. 125. Proposed site plan of the Gallery of Modern Art by Hanford Yang.....483

Fig. 126. Stone at the Villa Foscari by Andrea Palladio, Malcontenta, Italy.....484

Fig. 127. Sketch for façade, Gallery of Modern Art.....485

Fig. 128. Designs for façade, Gallery of Modern Art.....486

Fig. 129. "Artist's conception of projected Gallery of Modern Art" (1956).....487

Fig. 130. The Edward Durell Stones in front of the Ca'd'Oro, Venice, Italy.....488

Fig. 131. Drawing of Doge's Palace, Venice Italy.....489

Fig. 132. Section and plans, Gallery of Modern Art.....490

Fig. 133. Corner "vision panels," Gallery of Modern Art.....491

Fig. 134. Second-floor, Gallery of Modern Art.....492

Fig. 135. Second- and third-floor landing, Gallery of Modern Art.....493

Fig. 136. Third- and fourth-floor landing, Gallery of Modern Art.....494

Fig. 137. Auditorium, Gallery of Modern Art.....495

Fig. 138. Victoria Theater, New York City.....496
Fig. 139. Theater at the Fine Arts Center, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.....496

Fig. 140. Gauguin Room and *Tahitian Landscape* by Paul Gauguin, Gallery of Modern Art.....497

Fig. 141. Gauguin Room, Gallery of Modern Art.....498

Fig. 142. Library study, Sam Spiegel apartment, New York City.....499

Fig. 143. The Huntington Hartfords and Edward Durell Stones, Gallery of Modern Art opening...500

Fig. 144. Advertisement for the sale of the former Gallery of Modern Art building.....501

Fig. 145. "The Hartford," *National Geographic* (July 1964).....502

Fig. 146. *Collier's* House of Ideas, International Building, Rockefeller Center, New York City.....503

Fig. 147. Fine Arts Center, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.....504

Fig. 148. International College model, Beirut, Lebanon.....506

Fig. 149. "House for Moderns," *Good Housekeeping* (August 1946).....507

Fig. 150. "Futuramic" Oldsmobile advertisement.....508

Fig. 151. Ingersoll "southern modern house," Kalamazoo, MI.....509

Fig. 152. Durisol Inc. houses, Garrison, NY.....510

Fig. 153. Libby-Owens Ford Glass solar house.....511

Fig. 154. Tile Council of America modern bathroom model.....512

Fig. 155. Celanese House, New Caanan, CT.....513

Fig. 156. Celanese House model and cut-away.....514

Fig. 157. Plan and sketch, Celanese House.....515

Fig. 158. Carlo Paterno house and site plan, North Salem, CT.....516

Fig. 159. Art in Interiors patio setting, Midtown Galleries, New York City.....517

Fig. 160. Proposed designs for Festival Theater and Fine Arts Center, Williamsburg, VA.....518

Fig. 161. Proposed elevation and section for Smithsonian Gallery, Washington, D.C.....519

Fig. 162. Proposed design for Brooklyn Battery Tunnel, New York City and sketch.....520

Fig. 163. Proposed models for Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, St. Louis, MO.....521

Fig. 164. Proposed perspective and plan, American Embassy, London.....522

Fig. 165. Proposed designs, John M. Olin Library, Washington University, St. Louis, MO.....523

Fig. 166. Albert C. Koch house by Stone and Carl Koch Jr., Cambridge, MO.....524

Fig. 167. Dining alcove, Contemporary American Industrial Art exhibition (1940).....525

Fig. 168. David Stech house, Armonk Village, New York.....526

Fig. 169. Walter Janney house, Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, New York.....527

Fig. 170. W. T. Grant house, Greenwich, CT.....528

Fig. 171. Dormitory, University of South Carolina, Camden.....529

Fig. 172. Beckman Auditorium, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA.....530

Fig. 173. Model of the Ideal Theater by Stone and Eldon Elder.....531
Fig. 174. El Panama Hotel, Panama City, Panama.....531

Fig. 175. Plot plan and guesthouse, Mepkin Plantation, Moncks Corner, SC.....532

Fig. 176. Model of Our Lady of Mepkin Abbey, Moncks Corner, SC.....533

Fig. 177. Proposal for the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C.....534

Fig. 178. Edward Durell Stone with the American presidents and first ladies.....535

Fig. 179. Perpetual Savings and Loan Association, Beverly Hills, CA.....536

Fig. 180. Edward Durell Stone dressed in a fur-collar coat and Homburg.....537
Fig. 181. "Architect and Bride," in *Architectural Forum* (September 1954).....537

Fig. 182. Display ad, *Evolution of an Architect*.....538

Fig. 183. Sketch of the chancery, American Embassy, New Delhi, India.....539

Fig. 184. Edward Durell Stone and Frank Lloyd Wright.....540

Fig. 185. Tom Wolfe standing in front of the former Gallery of Modern Art building.....541

Fig. 186. *Time* magazine spread of buildings with Stone's grillework (March 31, 1958).....542

Fig. 187. Drawing of Edward Durell Stone in the living room of his New York City townhouse...543

Introduction

By the age of sixty-three, the New York City-based architect Edward Durell Stone (1902-1978) had achieved "phenomenal success on very ambitious projects," as he himself informed a colleague, with modern buildings on four continents, in thirteen foreign countries, and in thirty-two states.[1] The diversity and scope of his architecture knew no bounds—from master plans for entire university campuses, revitalized urban plans for whole cities, and foreign government complexes to hospitals, cultural centers, museums, airports, and banks, as well as extensive residential work. "One is amazed at the amount and the variety of Stone's work," the architectural historian Esther McCoy (1910-1989) enthusiastically commented in 1963.[2] At his peak, Stone was acknowledged as one of "the busiest, most distinguished and progressive architects in America," with a huge and prestigious workload that brought prosperity on a scale rare in architecture.[3]

Framed between the Great Depression and the Vietnam War, Stone's forty-year architecture career not only spanned unprecedented economic swings and international confrontations stemming from dangerously conflicting political ideologies but also an American cultural Renaissance and remarkable technological advancements. He was fond

---

[1] Edward Durell Stone to Kenneth J. Conant, May 3, 1965, Edward Durell Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 3, file 5, Special Collections, University of Arkansas Libraries (hereafter cited as Stone Papers).

[2] Esther McCoy, "The Screen of Stone," Bookshelf, *Los Angeles Times*, January 13, 1963.

[3] Nan Robertson, "Leading Architect Warns of Dangers in Progress," *New York Times*, April 3, 1959. The October 8, 1966 issue of *Business Week* was headlined, "Man with a Billion on the Drawing Board," (which is equal to about $5.57 billion today) and in the March 20, 1967 issue of *Newsweek* the article "Spotlight on Business: The Architects Come Into Their Own" estimated that Stone's commission fees were five million dollars (which is equal to about $28. 5 million today). The most comprehensive published list of Stone's work, by no means complete, is in Edward Durell Stone, *Recent & Future Architecture* (New York: Horizon Press, 1967), 134-136.

of saying, nostalgically, "I have now been through the horse and buggy, the automobile, the air, the atomic, the jet and the space ages."[4]

Stone's first phase of work began in the mid-1930s when he experimented with the International Style after it had been presented in 1932 at the Museum of Modern Art (founded in 1929) in New York City. But realizing that the general public found the strict modern vocabulary "too sparse, too arid, too cold,"[5] he consciously shifted to an American vernacular expression following Frank Lloyd Wright (1867-1959), who later became not only an inspiration but a confidant. During his second phase, which commenced during the period of the Cold War, Stone created a more decorative modern aesthetic that some referred to as "the new romanticism."[6] Based on its great success, in his third phase of work, beginning in the mid-1960's, Stone commodified this aesthetic for big business—primarily for corporate and institutional clients. His on-going "unabashed search for beauty," which he believed modern thinking "did not find acceptable," was not just stimulated by client demand and thus his own financial considerations but also was part of a larger, post-modern reaction to the early modernist "collective-industrial scheme of life," as Joseph Hudnut (1886-1968), dean of Harvard's

---

[4] Edward Durell Stone, "The Name of the Game Is Beauty," September 1967, Edward Durell Stone Papers, 2nd acc.

[5] Edward Durell Stone, *Evolution of an Architect* (New York: Horizon Press, 1962), 89. Although in his book Stone proclaimed his repudiation of the International Style, and hence some such as Cranston Jones and Paul Goldberger commented on his "dramatic reversal of direction," or "revolt," against the International Style, in actuality Stone never fully renounced those elements seen in his earliest work.

[6] See Winthrop Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches: Edward Durell Stone," Profiles, *New Yorker*, January 3, 1959.

Graduate School of Design, described it in 1945, which for Stone was incompatible with American individualism.[7]

Stone excelled at financial efficiency and client satisfaction, two important criteria for an architect's success, but critical evaluations of his oeuvre for the most part have focused only on aesthetic considerations.[8] Some argue about whether his architecture is an exemplar of pop art or a forerunner to postmodernism while others still struggle to fit Stone's architecture into the age-old interpretive model of a competition between modern and traditional aesthetics. A more productive approach to his work is taken in this dissertation, which constitutes an examination of his work's critical reception. This analysis reveals that Stone's architecture has repeatedly provoked discussion of complex, often contentious relationships between modernism and monumentality, regionalism, historicism, fantasy, feminism, or especially ornamentation. Thus, although once considered by some as "one of the three or four outstanding creative influences in contemporary architecture," as Stone increasingly dismantled established modernist dogma with his own innovative romantic variation, he fell out of critical favor and was ultimately dismissed in the histories of modernism for transgressing certain basic principles in the interest of personal success.[9]

---

[7] Edward Durell Stone, draft of an article about architecture in the 1950s, November 24, 1959, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 90, file 7 and Joseph Hudnut, "The Post-Modern House," in *Architecture Culture, 1943-1968: A Documentary Anthology*, by Joan Ockman, 76 (New York: Rizzoli).

[8] See Judith Blau, "A Framework of Meaning in Architecture," in Geoffrey Broadbent, Richard Bunt, and Charles Jencks, eds., *Signs, Symbols and Architecture* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980), 336.

[9] Editor's note, *Saturday Review*, November 7, 1959.

Although Stone himself proclaimed that "a great building should be universal, not controversial,"[10] ironically, he is still remembered, as noted by William Dudley Hunt Jr. in his *Encyclopedia of American Architecture* (1980) for being "a controversial architect about whose work architects and other people seem to have widely divergent views."[11] Indeed, as early as 1959, in a thorough profile of Stone in the *New Yorker*, the journalist Winthrop Sargeant described the conflict between those who said Stone was "merely a rather engaging contemporary romantic—a latter-day exponent of the Beaux-Arts tradition"—and those who considered him a follower of a native tradition fathered by Louis Sullivan (1856-1924) and Wright. "Historians of contemporary architecture will doubtless settle this issue at some point or other," he concluded.[12]

But surprisingly, there has never been a thorough examination of Stone's life and work, our general understanding being based on three informative but insufficient sources. The first is Stone's autobiography, *The Evolution of an Architect* of 1962 (fig. 8), a personal retrospection created for self-promotion and therefore lacking in objectivity and a historical point of view—as well as a thorough fact-check.[13] The other two are a cover story about Stone by Cranston Jones (1918-1991) published in *Time* magazine on

---

[12] Ibid., 157.

[11] William Dudley Hunt Jr., *Encyclopedia of American Architecture* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1980), 506.

[12] Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches."

[13] For example, on page 32 of *Evolution of an Architect* Stone proclaimed that the Richard H. Mandel house (1933-1935) was "the first modern house in the East." But by then modernism had already infiltrated the East Coast, as documented by the eleven modern houses dating between 1924 and 1930 in John McAndrew, *Guide to Modern Architecture: Northeast States* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1940) and the six eastern houses of the same dates in James Ford and Katherine Morrow Ford, *The Modern House in America* (New York: Architectural Book Publishing, 1940). On page 174 of *Architects on Architecture: New Directions in America* (New York: Walker, 1966), Paul Heyer was one of the many to make the fundamental error of taking Stone at his word, which historian James Marston Fitch (1909-2000) recognized in "They Saw That It Was Good; They Saw That It Was Good," *New York Times*, December 25, 1966.

March 31, 1958 (fig. 9) and Stone's obituary by Paul Goldberger in the *New York Times*, for which Goldberger was the architecture critic from 1973 to 1997.[14] However, none of the publications benefited from the exceptionally comprehensive materials in the Edward Durell Stone Papers, donated in 1975 and 1979 to the Special Collections of the library at the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville, nor the historical perspectives on modernism embodied in the scholarly literature of the past several decades.

Nonetheless, for more than half a century such early impressions have fueled the controversy surrounding Stone's architecture, periodically sparked by sharp-tongued, glib essays by historians, preservationists, curators, and even casual observers, in addition to architecture critics, including four of the six who received Pulitzer Prizes between 1970 and 1990: Allan Temko (1924-2006) of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Paul Gapp (1928-1992) of the *Chicago Tribune*, Paul Goldberger, and Ada Louise Huxtable, also of the *New York Times*.[15] The most consistently outspoken has been Huxtable, "perhaps the most powerful individual on the *Times*' roster of critics," as the *Wall Street Journal* retrospectively reported of her tenure at the newspaper between 1963 and 1982.[16] Huxtable's ability to sway public opinion is remarkable, as exemplified by the still-reverberating comment she made in 1964 about Stone's former Gallery of Modern Art building (1956-1964) in New York City, which she likened to "a die-cut Venetian

---

[14] "More Than Modern," Art, *Time*, March 31, 1958 and Paul Goldberger, "Edward Durell Stone, Dead at 76; Designed Major Works Worldwide," *New York Times,* August 7, 1978.

[15] The specific criticism of Paul Gapp will not be discussed in detail because his objection to Stone primarily pertained to his Standard Oil Building in Chicago (1968-1973; now called Avon Center), a building not discussed in this dissertation.

[16] Stephen Grover, "Heeded Words: Ada Louise Huxtable Has Formidable Power As Architecture Critic," *Wall Street Journal*, November 7, 1972. According to Grover, Scully said her work cannot be valued for its "critical acumen or command of history" and that at best it has "a kind of hectic candor."

palazzo on lollypops" (fig. 1).[17] It continues to be a catchphrase for the building, as the social critic Tom Wolfe observed just three years ago on one of his two *New York Times* Op Ed pages: With this "never-to-this-day-forgotten comment," he declared, she "inflicted the cut that keeps on bleeding."[18]

Wolfe's recollection of the critical assessment by Huxtable reflects a renewed interest in Stone, stemming in part from recent publicity concerning a number of his buildings. In 2005 some of Stone's Carlson Terrace married students' housing units (1957-1961; fig. 3) at the University of Arkansas were demolished and Stone's own house (1956-1958; fig. 4) at 130 East Sixty-fourth Street in New York City was remodeled. In 2004 the city of Pasadena, California, approved an adaptive reuse of Stone's former Stuart Pharmaceutical Company building (1956-1958; fig. 5). In 2003 his General Motors Building (1964-1966; fig. 6) in New York City sold for $1.4 billion, a record at the time for a skyscraper in the United States. And in 2002 the World Monuments Fund rescued a house (1938-1939; fig. 7) built in Old Westbury on Long Island for A. Conger Goodyear (1877-1964), the first president of the Museum of Modern Art.[19]

---

[17] Ada Louise Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum," Architecture, *New York Times*, February 25, 1964.

[18] Tom Wolfe, "The Building That Isn't There, Cont'd," Op-Ed, *New York Times*, October 13, 2003. Also see Tom Wolfe, "The Building That Isn't There," Op-Ed, *New York Times*, October 12, 2003. Ironically, according to Lawrence Wodehouse on page 265 of *Ada Louise Huxtable: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1981), Stone had recommended Huxtable for her *New York Times* job.

[19] See Stephanie Rosenbloom, "Architectural Landmark," On the Market, *New York Times*, June 4, 2006; Elizabeth Blish Hughes, "Second Generation," *House & Garden*, February 2006; Rainer Sabin, "Weathered Stone," *Little Rock Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, September 15, 2005; "Adaptive Reuse," *Builder and Developer* 13 (October 2003): 160-162; Charles V. Bali, "G.M. Building Sells for $1.4 Billion, A Record," *New York Times*, August 30, 2003; and John Rather, "Consortium to Preserve Threatened Landmark," *New York Times*, December 30, 2001.

But the building that has most reignited the polemics surrounding Stone's architecture is his idiosyncratic Gallery of Modern Art, which he built at Two Columbus Circle for George Huntington Hartford II (b. 1911). In 2005, at the apex of the nine-year battle to preserve the ten-story building as originally designed, Vincent Scully, professor emeritus of the History of Art at Yale University, appealed to the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission to reconsider its decision to refuse a public hearing on the building's proposed redevelopment, which the city favored (fig. 2). When Scully joined in the controversy he wrote, "As more and more people have been led to look at Stone's building again and to consider it afresh in relation to its surroundings and to what is proposed for it, something rather wonderful has occurred, by which the building, rarely anyone's favorite in the past, is looking better every day." Recognizing that the building's value extended beyond formalistic considerations, he continued:

> Its own integrity, its uniqueness, the indomitable determination to make a point that produced it, are coming to the fore and are powerfully affecting the way we see it. It is in fact becoming the icon it never was, one about which the city now cares a great deal. It is that very awareness of the life in forms which has united the critics, and all that, too, is too important to throw away.[20]

As one of a number of scholars now willing to reconsider the work of Stone, Scully was conspicuously more tolerant than in 1969 when he assessed the building in *American Architect and Urbanism*, proclaiming that it "most repellently, perhaps" exemplified a decorated container of superficial classicism, with the functions fitted into its volume and the surface "as crumpled and laced up as the trade can afford."[21] In spite of the failed

---

[20] Vincent Scully to Robert B. Tierney, August 14, 2005, Two Columbus Circle Records, Landmark West! (hereafter cited as Landmark West!). The letter was also quoted in David W. Dunlap, "For 2 Columbus Circle, A Growing Fan Club," Blocks, *New York Times*, August 18, 2005.

[21] Vincent Scully, *American Architecture and Urbanism* (1969; repr., New York: Praeger Press, 1971), 191.

effort to thwart the redevelopment of the building by Allied Works Architecture of Portland, Oregon, for its new owner, the Museum of Arts & Design, Scully's decision to depart from his earlier Puritanical formalism and join the insurgency demanding a comprehensive re-evaluation of the Columbus Circle building demonstrates greater appreciation for mid-twentieth-century American architecture, and, moreover, makes clear that traditional criteria are too narrow to encompass Stone's effort to enrich modern architecture (which he "facetiously called 'moxie.'"[22]). Instead, a broader, more complex perspective is required to illuminate Stone's critique of the International Style, necessitating an examination of the shifting cultural attitudes towards modernism; the taste-making power of the American mass media; and the pertinent social, political, and economic circumstances.

For example, one of the central issues about the architecture of Stone, which has been largely overlooked in the critical arena, is that Stone's aesthetic was a vital link between avant-garde "high" art and the emerging consumer culture of the postwar period. As Stone transgressed modernism, middle-class consumers had come to appreciate, and to a certain extent depend on, his architecture of luxury and leisure: He was the architect "to whom people come running when they want a building that is reasonably sure to attract attention and applause," it was reported.[23]

When Stone came into his professional maturity in the 1950s, extraordinary increases in wealth, education, and leisure were igniting a cultural explosion in the United States. As the middle class prospered—economically socially, and politically—an

---

[22] Edward D. Stone, "Modern Architecture on the Campus," *Stanford Review* (November 1960): 12-14.

[23] Eleanor Early, "Consulting Architect for National Cultural Center is Man of Monumental Achievement," *Diplomat* 10 (August 1959): 42.

intense cultural conflict, or "crisis," developed, in the opinion of journalist Dwight Macdonald (1906-1982).[24] As explained in *The Culture Consumer: Art and Affluence in America* (1965) by Alvin Toffler, the avant-garde had always considered the art world its special domain and therefore perceived the emerging middle class as dooming art and design to mediocrity.[25] Stone confronted the very core of this mindset by bringing high culture to the middle class through his architecture. No longer focused on appeasing just "the minuscule minority of precious initiates," he declared that he would rather exhilarate "the man in the street, the uneducated man, the uninformed man"—in essence the mass consumer.[26] He successfully met this challenge; as a populist he earned the reputation of "a grand old man of architecture who aimed to please, and did."[27]

Consequently, in 1958 *Architectural Forum* recognized that perhaps more than any other architect Stone had cracked the so-called "ignorance barrier" between the great mass of Americans and the architectural profession and by 1966 Stone had cemented his position as "architecture's leading oracle in the eyes of the public," according to Walter McQuade (1922-1994), architecture editor of *Fortune.*[28] Stone had become the rare individual who could win the respect of hospital board members and housewives alike,

---

[24] Dwight Macdonald, "Masscult & Midcult," in *Against the American Grain* (New York: Random House, 1962), 11 and 58.

[25] Alvin Toffler, *The Culture Consumers: Art and Affluence in America* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965), 12-13.

[26] Quoted in John Peter, *The Oral History of Modern Architecture: Interviews With the Greatest Architects of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Abrams, 1994), 68.

[27] Amei Wallach, "From Austerity to Opulence," *New York Newsday*, August 8. 1978.

[28] "Architect Stone in the Public Limelight: Limelight and Filigree," *Architectural Forum* 108 (April 1958): 77 and Walter McQuade, "The Architects: A Chance for Greatness," *Fortune*, January 1966. Stone too liked this quote for it was included in the promotional booklet for Edward Durell Stone & Associates of about 1971.

stated the *Architectural Record.*[29] He not only knew what consumers wanted but was also able to provide it clearly and convincingly: His simple yet emotionally charged messages to the public, such as "going to bat for beauty," could be instantly understood and were quoted by scholars, critics, and laymen.

Much of Stone's appeal can be attributed to his "expansive personality," intelligence, and talent.[30] Tall and dignified with a strong, "kind face," "genial basset-hound features," and "a very blue-eyed gaze," his charm was complemented by conviviality and personal magnetism (see fig. 9).[31] His relaxed style stemmed from his upbringing in Arkansas, described by Stone as being similar to that of Booth Tarkington's Penrod or Mark Twain's Tom Sawyer. The appeal of his soft, slow Southern speech was lost on few: according to the University of Arkansas *Razorback* yearbook of 1921, Stone was "slow and drawl, but at that he is a good guy."[32] It was said that Stone gave the impression of "an easy-going, somewhat disorganized embodiment of the old saw that you can take the boy out of the country, but you can't take the country out of the boy."[33] His sense of humor, infectious chuckle, and sharp wit ingratiated him to many. "He loved a laugh and never missed an opportunity to generate one," Ernest E.

---

[29] "An Architecture of Space and Grace," *Architectural Record* 122 (July 1957): 154.

[30] Ernest E. Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian: Tales of Architect Edward Durell Stone" 2000, private collection, 334.

[31] Betty Beale, "Edward D. Stone Discusses His Views On National Cultural Center in Capital," Exclusively Yours, *Washington Star*, July 17, 1959; "More Than Modern;" and Jessica Dover, "Introduction of Edward Durell Stone at the Cosmopolitan Club" (December 9, 1959), Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 1, file 1.

[32] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 15; Early, "Consulting Architect for National Cultural Center," 11; and *The Razorback* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1921), 130.

[33] George McCue, "The Evolution of an Architect: Edward Durell Stone's Homely Account of His Life and Designs," *St. Louis Sunday Post-Dispatch*, November 18, 1962.

Jacks, probably his most loyal employee, recalled in his thoughtful recollection, "The Elegant Bohemian: Tales of Architect Edward Durell Stone" (2000).[34] "Ever ready for a party," he was also a "terror" of Greenwich Village in New York City, recalled the architectural historian Reyner Banham (1922-1988).[35]

Nonetheless, Stone was among "the best-liked members of the profession" and the favorite boss that some ever had.[36] Gordon Bunshaft admired his sincerity and thoughtfulness, Harry Anderson his humanity, Philip Johnson his integrity, Max Abramovitz his genius, Morris Ketchum Jr. his rich imagination, and Frank Lloyd Wright his honesty.[37] Even though Stone admitted to being an inattentive and poor student, colleagues thought him exceedingly intelligent, noting a remarkable visual memory, a great knowledge of history, admirable interpersonal skills, and, of course, enviable talent.[38] "The people who knew him intimately," it was reported in the *New Yorker*, "considered him an authentic but eccentric genius, who could draw."[39]

---

[34] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 50. I would like to thank Mr. Jacks for sharing his manuscript with me.

[35] Walter H. Kilham Jr., "Journeys in Two Worlds," (Cornwall, CT: privately published, 1992) and Reyner Banham, *Guide to Modern Architecture* (Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1962), 18. Banham may have been indirectly referencing Stone's reputation for drinking, for which he has always been remembered (for example, it was said in "More Than Modern," that Stone could "draw anything except a sober breath").

[36] Wayne Andrews, "Three Who Made the Monuments of Our Time," *New York Herald Tribune*, November 25, 1962 and Richard W. Snibbe, "Search for a Personal Style," *Progressive Architecture* 44 (July 1963): 168.

[37] Gordon Bunshaft to Jury of Fellows, December 5, 1957, American Institute of Architects Archives (hereafter cited as AIA Archives); Harry V. Anderson, "Edward Durell Stone: Architect," *Interior Design* 30 (May 1959): 79; Philip Johnson to Edward Durell Stone, May 6, 1964, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 2, file 5; Max Abramovitz to Jury of Fellows, November 29, 1957 and Morris Ketchum Jr. to Jury of Fellows, December 2, 1957, AIA Archives; and Olgivanna Lloyd Wright, *The Shining Brow: Frank Lloyd Wright* (New York: Horizon Press, 1960), 242.

[38] "Innovating Architect: Edward D. Stone," *New York Times*, April 18, 1958.

[39] Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches."

In 1957, in support of his nomination to become a fellow of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), Stone's peers waxed lyrical about his capabilities as an architect: "One of the most gifted architects of his generation," his first mentor, Henry Richardson Shepley (1887-1962) said of Stone; "Brilliant and capable," said Morris Ketchum Jr. (1904-1984), who had worked with Stone and Philip Goodwin on the Food Building for the 1939 World's Fair in Queens, New York; "The most imaginative designer of his generation," said Pietro Belluschi (1899-1994), dean of the School of Architecture and Planning at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.) between 1951 and 1965; and "His design ability far exceeds that of any man I have known in recent years," said Earl T. Heitschmidt (1984-1972), who supervised Stone's design for the United States Pavilion at the Exposition Universelle et Internationale Bruxelles, 1958 (fig.19).[40] In a profession in which competition is fierce, no one ever denied that Stone was gifted.

While not always apparent, Stone was also capable of doggedly pursuing ambitious projects, the quintessential example being the National Cultural Center (later the John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts; fig.10) in Washington, D.C., which he designed between 1959 and 1971. Extant correspondence chronicles his thirteen-month courtship of the key decision makers for the project, whom he won over to his way of thinking behind the scenes so that there was no debate at the executive and trustee board

[40] Henry R. Shepley to Jury of Fellows, November 29, 1957; Wallace K. Harrison to Jury of Fellows, December 3, 1957; Morris Ketchum Jr. to New York Chapter of the AIA, July 23, 1957; Pietro Belluschi to Jury of Fellows, November 27, 1957; and Earl Heitschmidt to Jury of Fellows, December 10, 1957, all in the AIA Archives.

meetings in 1959 when he was selected as the "architect-advisor."[41] His strength of will is apparent in his comment to his childhood friend, J. William Fulbright (1905-1995), the Democratic senator from Arkansas who co-sponsored the legislation authorizing the building: "It is understood that I will not necessarily be the architect. However, I guarantee that I will make the choice inevitable for them," which he did indeed do.[42]

Even though Stone had "an iron will within that very velvet way," as one person noted, he was also "a chance taker—a true buccaneer."[43] Marguerite Cullman, the wife of the United States commissioner general of the Brussels Exposition succinctly described him as a "gambler," as well as "a creative dreamer, a shrewd businessman and a Southern charmer, neatly synthesized."[44] Time and again, Stone's charismatic manner enabled him to win the trust of his clients. Not only could he effectively persuade but he could compromise and accommodate, so that they came to respect and rely on him. The Kennedy Center leaders, for example, were sure that without his "persuasive presence" the whole project would have been in danger of being permanently crippled at one critical point in its development: "Ed is all the ammunition we've got," one of them exclaimed.[45]

---

[41] Jarold A. Kieffer, *From National Cultural Center to John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: At the Front End of the Beginning* (Fairfax VA: privately printed, 2004), 15-17. The decision makers included Mrs. Jouette Shouse, Robert W. Dowling, David E. Finley, and Corrin Strong. Much of the correspondence is in the John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts Archives as well as in the private collection of Mr. Kieffer, whom I would like to thank for his support.

[42] Edward D. Stone to J. William Fulbright, June 3, 1959, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 70, file 20.

[43] Jarold A. Kieffer, interview with the author, July 2004 and Dover, "Introduction to Edward Durell Stone."

[44] Marguerite Cullman, *Ninety Dozen Glasses* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1960), 14.

[45] Ralph Becker, quoted in Hank Brennan, memorandum to Edward Durell Stone, November 23, 1964, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 71, file 13.

Equally important, Stone recognized early on that tremendous opportunities for promotion and professional growth could be had through the emerging communication systems. In *Mass, Class, and Bureaucracy* (1963), Joseph Bensman and Bernard Rosenberg observed that never before had the individual been so subsumed by mass communication: "What he sees, hears, learns and knows—as well as many of his attitudes and values—is presented to him by mass media," they wrote.[46] Not only was Stone's reputation continuously reinforced by radio and television but also by the print media—trade journals as well as daily, weekly, and monthly publications. Because their focuses ranged from news, business, and entertainment to literature, fashion, and society, Stone became known as an arbiter of taste in all levels of society, which was often reinforced through even more publicity: A brochure that introduced Stone's Hallmark Gallery (1963-1964; fig. 11) on Fifth Avenue in New York City noted that architecture magazines regularly admired his hundreds of romantically beautiful structures.[47]

The following examination of Stone's use of the media to become a popular architect utilizes the persuasive arguments of the architectural historian Beatriz Colomina, who in *Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media* (2000) traced strategic relationships between modern architecture and the media through the work of Adolf Loos (1870-1933) and Le Corbusier (1887-1965), the latter of whom she considered "perhaps the first architect to fully engage the modern condition of the

---

[46] Joseph Bensman and Bernard Rosenberg, *Mass, Class, and Bureaucracy: The Evolution of Contemporary Society* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963), 334.

[47] *Introducing the Hallmark Gallery, 720 Fifth Avenue at 56 Street, New York City* (1964), private collection.

media."[48] Contending that the communication systems are truly the place where architecture is produced, she notoriously declared: "Modern architecture only becomes modern with its engagement with the media."[49] Colomina considered architecture a commodity that is more often consumed by the masses not firsthand but through photographs and drawings in publications, films, exhibitions, and advertisements. Even though such media are considered ephemeral, they are the places where Stone's architecture also became known to the public at large and, consequently, through which he obtained his historical standing.

The frequency with which Stone's work has been published is documented in two published surveys. In *American Architects and the Mechanics of Fame* (1991) Roxanne Kuter Williamson reviewed twenty histories and four encyclopedias to determine those architects "deemed important enough to be included in the history textbooks;" and she named Stone to her "Index of Fame."[50] Subsequently, in a computer-aided analysis of 380 architecture texts dating between 1815 and 1996, Juan Pablo Bonta established that Stone ranked forty-third of the one hundred most famous architects in America.[51] A further examination of general reference works reveals that Stone's name first appeared in *Who's Who in America* in 1941, followed by *Current Biography* in 1958, and *The Dictionary of American Biography* in 1976. He is still listed in surveys of notable

---

[48] Beatriz Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000), 220.

[49] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 14.

[50] Roxanne Kuter Williamson, *American Architects and the Mechanics of Fame* (Austin: University of Texas, 1991), 13. Stone was in ten of the twenty-four books.

[51] Juan Pablo Bonta, *American Architects and Texts: A Computer-Aided Analysis of the Literature* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996), fig. 3.4, 30-31.

architecture, ranging from Talbot Hamlin's *Architecture Through the Ages* (1953) and Ian McCallum's *Architecture USA* (1959) to G. E. Kidder Smith's *Architecture in the United States* (1981) and *The Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects* (1982). Stone was also consistently mentioned in trade publications—in more than one hundred issues of *Architectural Forum* and at least fifty of both *Progressive Architecture* and *Architectural Record.*[52] However, since architectural journals typically provided a platform for current ideas rather than passing judgment, it is more meaningful that the trade publications produced extensive articles and sometimes entire issues devoted to Stone's work and that they competed for first-publication privileges.[53] For example, in March 1957 John Knox Shear (1917-1958), the editor-in-chief of *Architectural Record*, made a deal with Stone to produce a book on his work using a series of four installments published in his journal, each twenty pages long.[54] But when Douglas Putnam Haskell (1889-1979), the editor of *Architectural Forum* between 1949 and 1964, learned of the arrangement, he rescinded his previous offer to Stone for a sixteen- to twenty-page spread on his "new direction in design," which would have been "the biggest wad of pages on a single architect since

---

[52] *Architectural Forum* (1892-1974) was the largest of the three architecture journals with a circulation of 64,000; *Progressive Architecture* (1920-1995), which merged in 1943 with *Pencil Points* (1920-1945) had 42,296; and *Architectural Record* (founded 1891) had 37,511. In 1964 *Architectural Forum* was incorporated into *Fortune,* which added a new editorial department for architecture. Its companion magazine, *House and Home* (1952-1977) was sold to McGraw-Hill. See Ada Louise Huxtable, "Architectural Forum Dropped; House and Home Magazine Sold," *New York Times*, May 28, 1964.

[53] Even foreign publications devoted extensive pages to Stone; for example, see"Le Néo-Classicisme Américain," *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui* 29 (April 1958): 46-52.

[54] John Knox Shear to Edward Durell Stone, March 25, 1957, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 92, file 11. While the first three were published between July 1957 and February 1958, which included "An Architecture of Space and Grace;" "Two Approaches to Hospital Design" 122 (October 1957): 217-236; and "Educational Work of Edward Durell Stone" 123 (February 1958): 177-196, the fourth, an historical perspective, was not. Although the book was also not published, *Architectural Record* continued to produce comprehensive articles about Stone's recent work such as "The Work of Edward Durell Stone" 125 (March 1959): 157-172.

1938" (when an entire issue had been devoted to Frank Lloyd Wright).[55] Haskell lamented to Stone, "Even though you selected another magazine as an official medium for the bulk of your recent labors, so that *Forum* won't be doing nearly as much with Ed Stone as we might have wished, we still hope you will keep us informed."[56] The print media editors, including those of the popular magazines, ambitiously pursued Stone and thus played a crucial role in modeling Stone's reputation.

As a result of his publicity, by 1958 Stone was an architectural star, competing for attention with other celebrities in the larger arenas of sports and light entertainment. According to Daniel J. Boorstin in *The Image; or What Happened to the American Dream* (1963), a book indicative of prevailing notions of what celebrity was in the period, as a consumable commodity, a celebrity is required to continually produce new and interesting materials in order to stimulate public enthusiasm, opinion, and even gossip.[57] Stone "worked hard on being a celebrity," Wolf Von Eckardt, (1918-1995), architecture critic of the *Washington Post* between 1963 and 1981, remembered in his Stone obituary, and he was instrumental in shifting the image of the modern architect from what Mary McLeod called a "social crusader and aesthetic puritan" to a "trendsetter

---

[55] Douglas Haskell to Edward Durell Stone, March 12, 1957, Douglas Putnam Haskell Papers, box 21, files 2 and 3, Avery Drawings and Archives Collection, Columbia University (hereafter cited as Haskell Papers). *Architecture Forum* devoted 102 pages to Frank Lloyd Wright in volume 68 (January 1938).

[56] Douglas Haskell to Edward Durell Stone, May 31, 1957, Haskell Papers.

[57] Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Image; or What Happened to the American Dream* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books, 1963), 57 and 70-72. See also Stuart Ewen, *All Consuming Images: The Politics of Style in Contemporary Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), 68-72.

and media star."[58] To this end, Stone may well have picked up the mantle that his close friend Wright (fig. 185) had carried until he died in April 1959.

Nonetheless, it has recently been claimed that Philip Johnson (1906-2005) was "the first architect of the twentieth century to understand how much a successful architectural career depends on a mastery of the techniques of publicity."[59] In fact, part of Johnson's legacy, according to Goldberger, was his ability to play the celebrity culture "as successfully as a rock star."[60] But Stone arguably was a much earlier contender for such recognition, especially in light of the accolades he received: In addition to being named a colossus, visionary, giant, and an apostate, Stone has been described as legendary, prominent, the busiest, world's best known, greatest living, world famous, most celebrated, most gifted, and most talked about architect of his time.[61] However, unlike Johnson, Stone did not achieve his celebrity entirely on his own. His image was cultivated by the second of his three wives,[62] Maria Elana Torch (b. 1924; figs. 12, 14,

---

[58] Mary McLeod, "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernism to Deconstructivism," *Assemblage* 8 (February 1989): 38.

[59] Deyan Sudjic, *The Edifice Complex: How the Rich and Powerful Shape the World* (New York: Penguin Press, 2005), 108.

[60] Paul Goldberger, "Philip Johnson Is Dead at 98; Architecture's Restless Intellect," *New York Times*, January 27, 2005.

[61] "Squires at Large," *Esquire*, June 1964; Jules Loh, "Edward Durell Stone: At 71, he has the Vigor of an Idealist Beginner," *Little Rock Arkansas Gazette*, October 28, 1973; Tom Wolfe, *From Bauhaus to Our House* (New York: Farrar, Straus Giroux, 1981), 85; James B. Manning, "Edward Durell Stone: Legendary Architect," *Jacksonville (FL) Times-Union*, May 6, 1973; *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Architects*, s.v. "Stone, Edward Durell;" Nan Robertson, "Leading Architect Warns of Dangers in Progress, *New York Times*, April 3, 1959; Martin Weil, "Architect Edward Durell Stone, 76 Dies," *Washington Post*, August 7, 1978; "Architect Stone a Self-Styled 'Migrant Worker'," *Los Angeles Times*, July 21, 1968; Albert Morch, "Celebrated Architect's New Hope," *San Francisco Examiner*, November 28, 1971; Suzy Knickerbocker, Society, *New York Journal American*, November 10, 1964; Winzola McLendon, "Cultural Center Is 'Righteous Cause'," *Washington Post*, November 24, 1959; *Introducing the Hallmark Gallery*; and "Blueprint in Fame," *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, January 14, 1962.

[62] Stone's first wife was Sarah Orlean Vandiver (1908-1988), whom he married in 1930 and by whom he had two children Edward Durell Stone Jr. (b. 1932) and Robert Vandiver Stone. Their divorce was finalized

130, 143, 181), the youngest of six children of Daisy L. Torch (later Carfagna; 1900-1989) and Carl Frank Torch (1890-1969), respectively of Catalonian and Florentine descent, who was raised in Painesville, Ohio.[63] Stone met the petite young woman (who some thought looked like Elizabeth Taylor[64]) in 1953 on an airplane headed for Paris, where she was researching an article on European fountains for a short-lived, start-up magazine called *Fashion and Travel*. They were soon joyfully ensconced in a passionate romance and a quick marriage following Stone's divorce from his first wife, Orlean.[65] Olgivanna Lloyd Wright (1898-1985), who also knew Maria well, observed, "Ed Stone takes her as a God-given gift—he worships everything about her," and Maria, was "devoted," loyally protecting him "like a young tigress."[66] Stone attributed to this "happy marriage" his most significant architecture, which suggests that to a certain extent, his work is autobiographical.[67] The architect Gordon Bunshaft (1909-1990), one of Stone's

---

in June 1954, the same month Stone married Maria Elena Torch, with whom he had two more children, Benjamin Hicks (b. 1955) and Maria Francesca (b. 1962). Their marriage also ended in divorce, and in 1972 Stone married Violet Campbell Moffat by whom he had one more child, Fiona Campbell (b. 1976).

[63] Maria Stone's father operated the Torch Nursery in Perry, Ohio. Allegedly, Maria won beauty contests when she was seventeen and did some modeling in New York City before becoming a fashion buyer and writer in Baltimore and between 1949 and 1950 attended Northwestern University's School of Journalism in Evanston, Illinois. See Douglas Haskell, memorandum to staff, August 26, 1954, Haskell Papers and People, *Architectural Forum* 101 (September 1954): 41.

[63] People, *Architectural Forum* (September 1954), 41.

[64] Knickerbocker, Society, *New York Journal American*.

[65] The story of their meeting was widely published. See, for example, Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches."

[66] Wright, *Shining Brow*, 242.

[67] "More Than Modern."

first employees in 1937, agreed, "Ed's architecture, in many ways, reflects Ed as a person."[68]

As director of his public relations between 1957 and 1962, Maria helped Stone leverage the media and claim the mass audience in unprecedented numbers. She not only understood the power of the image and had an uncanny knack for publicity, but she knew that in the world of celebrity their private life was "consumable merchandise."[69] She used it to Stone's advantage—and to her own, especially during their cyclonic separation (ending in divorce in 1966). When Wright dubbed Stone's masterpiece, the American Embassy chancery (1953-1959; fig. 23) in New Delhi, India, the "Taj Maria," the phrase quickly caught on—largely thanks to Maria's own efforts—and was broadly circulated to a world fascinated by the consumption of other people's personalities.[70] It was even used by Alan Cantwell Dunn (1900-1974) in one of his architectural cartoons for *Architectural Record* (fig. 13).[71] This "personality advertising," as it has been called by Roland Marchand in *Advertising the American Dream* (1985), was so successful that it is still closely tied to the embassy's official history.[72] The 2004 listing of the building on the

---

[68] Bunshaft to Jury of Fellows, December 5, 1957. Conversely, if Stone was involved in the conceptual phase of his buildings until he retired in 1974, as has been reported, it is quite possible that his own declining health and poor state of professional and personal affairs are reflected in the lack of creative energy expressed in his buildings towards the end of his career.

[69] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 8. See also Milestones, *Time*, May 20, 1966.

[70] See Maria Stone to Douglas Haskell, August 1, 1955, Haskell Papers. Maria said in a cablegram to Stone on September 23, 1958 (Stone Papers), "Hope Taj Maria is as beautiful as inspiration."

[71] The cartoon, *Meetings and Miscellany*, is in *Architectural Record* 44 (March 1959): 25. Another cartoon about Stone by Alan Dunn, *"Now, This Is Where Ed Stone and me Go Our Separate Ways*!" is in *Architectural Record* 136 (October 1964): 23.

[72] Roland Marchand, *Advertising the American Dream: Making Way for Modernity, 1920-1940* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 357.

Secretary of State's Register of Culturally Significant Property states that the embassy has been called the "'Taj Maria' to give credit to Stone's wife and muse" (see fig. 14).[73]

It has been continuously asked how much direct influence the "Tidy Siren," as Stone lovingly called his wife, actually had on his architecture.[74] Perhaps the 1959 article in the *Washington Post* describing their newly renovated townhouse in New York City responds best:

> He wanted the whole house modern, but after they had argued for two weeks, she saved the beautiful, wood paneled Victorian drawing room. Now, he admits, she was right…."Maria is Italian and likes marble," explains Stone. "She also likes vivid colors....We have white marble floors, red velvet and crystal chandeliers.[75]

Encouraged by Maria, this romantic (and sometimes florid) aspect of Stone's aesthetic (fig. 15), which was not only apparent in his own house but also in his large public projects, became widely known. In fact, Stone quickly became recognized for the romantic inclination in his aesthetic: Howard Stix Cullman (1891-1972), the commissioner general of the Brussels Exposition announced when he introduced Stone at the opening ceremonies in April 1958:

> Mr. Stone has recently been honored for his introduction of a new romanticism into American architecture. This innovation has been welcomed by all who felt that functionalism, having served its purpose of getting rid of unnecessary ornamentation, was becoming cold and sterile. Mr. Stone has not been ashamed to seek beauty.[76]

---

[73] Bureau of Overseas Building Operations, Department of State, *Secretary of State's Register of Culturally Significant Property*, Publication 11192 (June 2005), Property No. X1001 (www.state.gov/documents/organization66242.pdf).

[74] "More Than Modern."

[75] Winzola McLendon, "Jet-Age Architect Stone: Cupid's Arrow Outflew His Plane," *Washington Post*, November 29, 1959.

[76] Howard S. Cullman, "Opening of the United States Pavilion at the Brussels Universal & International Exhibition," *News From the Office of the US Commissioner General,* April 17, 1958, Records of International Conferences, Commissions, and Expositions, Record Group 43, box 22, National Archives and Records Administration (hereafter cited as Exposition Records).

Stone liked to be described as a "rational romantic," as he was in *Gentlemen's Quarterly* in April 1959.[77] But while some assume that the word *romantic* simply referred to his "improvisations on the principles of the International Style," it also recalls the initial Romantic movement of between 1790 and 1850.[78] As the historian Jacques Barzun explained in his article "Romanticism: Definition of A Period" (1949), romanticism was part of a great revolution that pulled the intellect of Europe from a monarchical into a popular state, or, as the art critic Clement Greenberg (1909-1994) explained in "Towards a Newer Laocoon" (1940), romanticism flowered directly from bourgeois society.[79] Like the romantics who revolted against the monotonous academicism of classicism by bringing dramatic, radical diversities into tense equilibrium, Stone democratized taste as he broke away from the confines of orthodox modernism and applied exoticism, historicism, and decoration, all informed by sentiment and passion.[80] In fact, his belief that one's work should "fulfill the fundamental need within the heart of man," epitomizes the 1846 definition of Charles Baudelaire, "Romanticism is precisely situated neither in choice of subject nor in exact truth, but in a way of feeling."[81]

---

[77] Emma Gene Hall, "Directions in Modern Architecture: A Conversation with Edward Durell Stone," *Gentlemen's Quarterly*, April 1959.

[78] Mary Ellen Hayward and Frank R. Shivers Jr., eds. *The Architecture of Baltimore: An Illustrated History* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 2004), 289.

[79] Jacques Barzun, "Romanticism: Definition of A Period," *Magazine of Art*, 42 (November 1949): 243 and Clement Greenberg, "Towards a Newer Laocoon," *Partisan Review* 7 (1940): 299.

[80] Barzun, "Romanticism: Definition of A Period," 244.

[81] Stone, "Modern Architecture On the Campus," 12-14 and Charles Baudelaire, quoted in Hugh Honour and John Fleming, *The Visual Arts: A History*, 5th ed. (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1999), 646.

But rather than being viewed as romantic, as Stone would have preferred, some of his work has more recently been referred to as kitsch, a modern aesthetic phenomenon defined in the dictionary as "art or artifacts perceived as being of poor quality, esp. when garish or sentimental" or "garish, sentimental, tasteless."[82] Ironically, according to Matei Calinescu in his discussion "Kitsch and Romanticism" in *Five Faces of Modernity* (1987), as the first important popular movement to have evolved from modern democracy, romanticism was "the mother of kitsch and...there are moments when the child becomes so like its mother that one cannot differentiate between them."[83] Thus, the romantic aesthetic that Maria moved her husband to create, which captured widespread attention, had the unforeseen consequence of marking him with the taint of kitsch among some critics.

Even though critics of Stone's mid-career work, above all the Gallery of Modern Art (fig. 1), recognized its kitsch qualities, they did not use the word itself (nor the word *camp*[84]), undoubtedly because a contemporary critical apparatus for thinking about it, especially Susan Sontag's essay, "Notes on 'Camp,'" had not yet been sufficiently assimilated into the culture.[85] However, by 1971 when Stone completed the Kennedy Center (which some thought mimicked the New Delhi embassy on a much larger scale;

---

[82] *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, rev. ed. (1993), s.v. "kitsch."

[83] Herman Broch, "Notes on the Problem of Kitsch," quoted in Matei Calinescu, *Five Face of Modernity: Modernism Avant-Garde Decadence Kitsch Postmodernism*, rev. ed. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987), 237. The discussion on "Kitsch and Romanticism" is on pages 237-240.

[84] "Camp" is defined in the *New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* as "ostentatious, exaggerated, affected, theatrical." While some make a distinction between the words *camp* and *kitsch*, and in fact even consider camp "a rival to kitsch" (see Eliot Fremont-Smith, "After the Ticker-Tape Parade," Books of the Times, *New York Times*, January 31, 1966), in this study they are used interchangeably.

[85] See Susan Sontag, "Notes On 'Camp'," *Partisan Review* 31 (Fall 1964): 515-530.

fig. 10), the concept of kitsch had been firmly established: Robert Hughes stated in *Time* magazine that Stone's attempted monumentality was "undone—even on its own terms—by a sense of 'kitsch'" and Huxtable famously concluded in her review that the building's "final proof of failure is the safe and sanitary kitsch."[86] As a result, Kennedy Center was the watershed for thinking about Stone as "the greatest architectural kitsch-monger of them all" or as representing "the kitsch school of architecture."[87]

By the early 1970s, then, Stone's appeal on the basis of the formal qualities of his architecture was turned against him due in part to the association of his work with kitsch. Subsequently, in the 1990s, as part of a renewed awareness of mid-century modernism in which the Greenbergian antagonism between avant-garde and kitsch had been rethought and the cultural Cold War reconsidered with regard to modernism, a revived interest in Stone began to emerge along with an opportunity for reassessment.[88] But those intent on recapturing the moment of Kennedy's *Camelot* only applied the by-then historical criteria of kitsch when evaluating the Gallery of Modern Art while turning their backs for the most part on other important factors. Few recognized that Stone was an effective Cold

---

[86] Robert Hughes, "The New Monuments," Art, *Time*, September 13, 1971 and Ada Louise Huxtable, "Some Sour Notes Sound at the Kennedy Center," *New York Times*, September 19, 1971.

[87] Wolf Von Eckardt, *A Place to Live: The Crisis of the Cities* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1967), 215 and Paul Gapp, "Ambiguous Statement Snarls Center Debate," Architecture, *Chicago Tribune*, June 30, 1974. According to Stone's first wife, Orlean, the criticism of his buildings greatly bothered him. Even though they had been divorced for seventeen years, she wrote to him after the opening of Kennedy Center: "I am prompted to write you this note...knowing how much you take criticism to heart, I am sure you are unhappy—I wish to say, I do not believe you could design a bad building. It is good they talk, you would feel much worse if it passed without remarks, however time, I am sure will prove you out, so be patient, my dear, and learn and be strengthened by your fortitude (Orlean Halstead to Edward Durell Stone, September 16, 1971, Stone Papers, box 4, folder 1).

[88] See Max Kozloff, "American Painting During the Cold War," 107-123; Eva Cockcroft, "Abstract Expressionism, Weapon of the Cold War," 125-133; and Thomas Crow, "Modernism and Mass Culture in the Visual Arts," 233-266, in Francis Frascina, *Pollock and After: The Critical Debate* (New York: Harper & Row, 1985).

War architect whose buildings resourcefully communicated the political *Zeitgeist* of global American power in the face of the threat of Communism.[89] As a result, these revivalist evaluations still tend to circulate today, but not necessarily with a full understanding of the implications of kitsch.

In addition to revealing how Stone's particular brand of mid-century modernism was collapsed into stereotypes of "sixties kitsch," this study chronicles the emergence of Stone's popularity as he transcended modernism. After a discussion of Stone's formative years and their impact on his architecture in Chapter One, six specific high-profile projects are discussed in detail. For each, the critical reception is considered in relation to their inspirations and characteristics, pertinent cultural and political currents, client demands, and Stone's own biographical circumstances. The gap between the popular perception and critical dismissal of his work is then evaluated relative to his efforts at self-promotion and publicity. Although Stone skillfully used the media to construct his identity as an architect and to popularize his aesthetic, in so doing he virtually ensured his own fall from popularity once the moment of his great creativity passed and his so called "style" of architecture was no longer embedded in the culture of the time.

As is revealed in Chapter One, "An Artistic Path," Stone's artistic ability sustained him throughout his entire career, beginning as a student in architecture school at Harvard University and then at M.I.T. Required to follow Beaux-arts methodologies, he learned to employ the plan as the generator of a design and then, as a former employer paraphrased him, to "smaltz" [*sic*] it up.[90] No doubt Stone's innate talent at drawing

---

[89] Laurie Kerr, "How 2 Columbus Circle Saved the World," *Wall Street Journal*, December 2, 2003.

[90] Lloyd Flood to Edward Durell Stone, March 12, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, folder 14..

contributed to his persistent fondness for decorative ornament (in spite of the untold numbers of disapproving reviews he received later as an architect). His interest or aptitude for technical matters was less evolved—Stone himself later admitted, "I am not an Eiffel or a Buckminster Fuller. I am not an inventive engineer."[91] Nor was he a cultural power broker as his peer Johnson once was, or a theorist like Robert Venturi (b. 1925), whose *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (1966) influenced generations of architects to come. He was not interested in intellectual gatherings or institutional activities because they were too limited in their objectives. Not only did they not focus on more important pragmatic matters but they also failed to provide a platform for individuality.[92]

As a Rotch Travelling Scholar between 1927 and 1929 Stone determined that a historical knowledge of architecture is essential not just to the understanding but also to the creation of architecture.[93] His beautifully rendered drawings (figs. 16, 37-39, 93, 102, 131, and 162b), exemplify the importance he placed on careful examinations of the past as well as his facility to record them. Even though during his travels Stone saw the new modern architecture in Europe, his journals primarily document historical buildings and

---

[91] Richard Atcheson, "Edward Durell Stone: Maker of Monuments," *Show*, March 1964.

[92] Nonetheless, Stone did accept Johnson's invitation to partake in the symposium entitled "What is Happening to Modern Architecture?" at the Museum of Modern Art, organized in response to the Sky Line column, "Status Quo," in the *New Yorker*, October 11, 1947, in which Lewis Mumford discussed the Bay Region Style (see Philip Johnson to Edward D. Stone, December 10, 1947, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 73, file 34). In a lecture of June 14, 1951 (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 2, file 22) Stone recollected, rather cynically: The object of this debate was to decide on the style and direction of modern architecture. I like style too, and I thank God for Lily Daché and John Fredericks, but in a larger sense maybe these differences in individual approach are not too important."

[93] When asked to name the fine arts books he had read on his 1925 application for the Graduate School of Design at Harvard, Stone listed William J. Anderson, *Architecture of the Renaissance in Italy: A General View for the Use of Students and Others* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1901). See Stone's student file, Office of Student Services, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University (hereafter cited as Harvard Services).

details, perhaps because of the requisite Beaux-arts format of his scholarship as well as his innate artistic ability. While impressed with both the size and scale of the historical buildings he saw, it was their sense of permanence—expressed in solid, natural materials; monumental presentations; and articulations of past traditions—that most impressed him and informed his later buildings: the Coliseum in Rome for the Busch Memorial Stadium (1962-1966) in St. Louis, Missouri, and for the United States Pavilion at the Brussels Exposition (figs. 17-19); the Doge's Palace in Venice for the Gallery of Modern Art (figs. 20-21); and the Parthenon in Athens for the American Embassy in New Delhi (figs. 22-23).

Upon his return to New York City at the beginning of the Great Depression, Stone was fortunate to find work as an architect at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel (1929-1931; fig. 24) and then at Rockefeller Center (1929-1933; fig. 25). While luck was certainly on his side, the fact that as a neophyte he was hired to work on these two extraordinary projects during this gloomy economic period is a testament to his talent. Although Stone did not retain the art deco expression of these buildings in his own work, he was impressed with their use of rich, luxurious materials and geometrically patterned details as well as the collaboration among artists that took place. More importantly, Stone clearly absorbed the idea of melding two stylistic impulses together, in the case of Radio City Music Hall, "of the International Style eroding the Beaux-arts aesthetic," as the architectural historian William H. Jordy (1918-1997) once described it.[94]

---

[94] William H. Jordy, "The International Style in the 1930s," in Mardges Bacon, ed., *"Symbolic Essence" and Other Writings on Modern Architecture and American Culture* (New Haven, CT: Buell Center/Columbia Book of Architecture and Yale University Press, 2005), 156.

During the early phase of his own production of work between 1933 and about 1950, discussed in Chapter Two, "Transition of Modernism," Stone experimented with new forms, materials, and spatial arrangements as he progressed from first-generation modernism, which he had observed firsthand in Europe and then as it was distilled in the Modern Architecture: International Exhibition held at the Museum of Modern Art in 1932. The Richard H. Mandel house (1933-1935), in what is now Bedford Hills, New York (fig. 27), illustrates Stone's earliest interpretation of the International Style for which he followed the Beaux-arts format by collaging modern details that had been acceptable in Europe without regard for the theories or social impetus behind them. While somewhat innocent, the house received extensive attention in the media because it was an early example of American modernism. Already in this initial phase of his career, Stone was aware of the potential of the mass media, and after this public acclaim, in 1936 he created plans for a smaller version of the Mandel house for the literary magazine *Collier's, The National Weekly* (1888-1957; fig. 27), which inspired at least six houses built in small cities across America for middle-class clients who otherwise did not have access to modern design.

While Stone's early modernist work was critically well received, it connected him with only one major job—the Museum of Modern Art building (1935-1939) on West Fifty-third Street in New York City (fig. 28). Designed in collaboration with the New York architect Philip Lippincott Goodwin (1885-1958), Stone's most thoughtful individual contribution was the front façade, which still survives in spite of alterations and additions to the museum campus. Considered the only "strictly modern building of prominence" in the city for a number of years, Stone's reputation remained connected

with the museum, even though shortly after it was built he shifted his interest to a distinctly American vernacular aesthetic.[95] Motivated by a cross-country trip in 1940, Stone said he had been awakened to indigenous talent and materials in this country, not just in the work of Wright, but also of Greene and Greene (1894-1922), Bernard Maybeck (1862-1906), and even his friend Gardner Dailey (1897-1967).[96]

After being interrupted by World War Two when he was a major in the Army Air Force for three-and-a-half years,[97] Stone returned to private practice, experimenting with indigenous wooden modular houses such as the one for William Thurnauer (1949-1950) in Teaneck, New Jersey, in which he developed various ideas that became part of his modern aesthetic: central atriums, or garden courts, in place of corridors; tiled pools of water; hanging planters below skylights; cantilevered roofs; and a profusion of geometric patterning both externally and internally (fig. 29).[98] While the houses he designed in the 1940s (see fig. 168-169) responded to a strong demand for postwar residential construction (Stone was "deluged with commissions" in the twenty-five to fifty thousand dollar range[99]), overall they did not attract critical attention. Nor did Stone feel he had

---

[95] Neil Levine, *The Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 300.

[96] Stone described his journey in *Evolution of an Architect*, 89-92.

[97] Stone entered the army in September 1942 and was released in October 1945. He was chief of the planning and design section in the Engineering and Development Branch of the Air Installations Division involved with airfield design and layout and master planning. See Col. G. M. Goodman, recommendation of Stone, August 17, 1945, Stone Papers, 1st acc.); Edward D. Stone to Henderson E. McGee, December 27, 1945 and to Richard Morse, January 29, 1947, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 83, file 11; and Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 95-96.

[98] In a letter of March 15, 1965, the architect Ely Jacques Kahn (1916-1994) wrote to Stone about the house, "This is a remarkably fine example of what a domestic setting should be and permit me to congratulate you, at this late date, for a fine job" (Stone Papers, 2nd acc.).

"any great success" with them, writing, "I went through the hairshirt period, when everything was solid lumber and rough brick work and stone. I got that out of my system."[100]

Although Stone's practice began to take hold during this postwar period, it was during the Cold War that Stone completed his most original work.[101] As discussed in Chapter Three, "New Romanticism: A Provocative Aesthetic," he nearly abandoned his residential architecture for larger, and far grander, international projects. His imaginative new aesthetic, first conceived for the chancery of the American Embassy in New Delhi (fig. 23), combined aspects of International Style modernism with culturally familiar concepts and forms complemented by a rich variety of decorative details. However, the first phase of his embassy work was not finished until nearly nine months after Stone's highly acclaimed United States Pavilion opened at the Brussels Exposition (fig.19). Created in a vocabulary similar to the New Delhi embassy, the pavilion was favorably received by even the most dedicated modernists possibly because it was perceived as a temporary, fantasy structure.

The worldwide recognition that these two government commissions generated (the pavilion won an Award of Merit and the chancery a first Honor Award from the AIA) motivated Stone to refine his new aesthetic further. In contrast to what Stone considered the straight-jacket urban environment of "glassy office buildings" of

---

[99] Edward D. Stone to McGee and to Victorine duPont Homsey, December 29, 1945, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 82, file 7. In a letter to Jack Briggs of January 11, 1957, Stone said that during this period he was "sweating out houses for miscellaneous women" (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 83, file 11). In "Elegant Bohemian," 29-33, Jacks more thoroughly examines the Stone houses.

[100] Atcheson, "Stone: Maker of Monuments"and Hall, "Directions in Modern Architecture."

[101] Thomas Hine, *Populuxe* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987), 6-10.

speculative construction, his buildings sought eminent drama.[102] Often sheathed in white marble, they were embellished with intricately patterned details (often created by filtered light) and with what he considered "old symbols of luxury"—glistening crystal chandeliers, expansive mirrors, rich gilding, dark mahoganies, and royal red velvets and carpets—all of which he found "exhilarating to the spirit" (see fig. 187).[103]

As Stone attempted to synthesize modernism with some of the very elements the movement had rejected, his aesthetic came to be considered defiantly decorative. Huxtable called it his "seraglio period," and John Pastier, the first architecture critic of the *Los Angeles Times*, declared his embassy project the beginning of a "delectable succession of architectural confections"—its slick, although "original," neoclassical style resembling the work of a talented pastry chef more than an architect.[104] However, for others the Stone aesthetic offered freedom from the strictures of doctrinaire modernism, exemplified by a proclamation made in 1959 by the president of Colby College in Waterville, Maine. As he was conferring an honorary doctor of fine arts degree to the fifty-seven-year-old architect, he said:

> You are now a leader in the effort to restore to modern architecture some of the manifestations of elegance and individuality that the machine age prepared to sweep away. In a time of conflicting claims and loyalties, you have shown that architecture can be unmistakably modern without sacrificing beauty and spiritual enrichment.[105]

---

[102] Edward Durell Stone, draft of "The Case Against the Tailfin Age," July 15, 1959, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 90, file 3.

[103] Edward Durell Stone, "The Case Against the Tailfin Age," *New York Times*, October 18, 1959 and *Introducing the Hallmark Gallery.*

[104] Ada Louise Huxtable, "The Lollypop Building: The Best Way To Preserve 2 Columbus Circle? A Makeover," *New York Times*, January 7, 2004 and John Pastier, "Architects: Their Works and Worth," *Los Angeles Times*, January 17, 1971.

[105] J. Seelye Bixler, citation, June 8, 1959, Time Inc. Archives (hereafter cited as Time Archives). Stone also received honorary doctor of fine arts degrees in 1951 from the University of Arkansas; in 1962 from

As was later explained by Von Eckardt, Stone's deviation from the International Style was welcomed by many who had become "disenchanted with pure functionalism and were ready for the romantic touch."[106] A memorandum Haskell sent to the *Architecture Forum* staff in 1956 confirmed this sentiment: "I want all to know that Ed Stone wants us to do a comprehensive story on his new work, of which he has quite a lot. 'The new Ed Stone' really means some new architecture, softer and some of it very beautiful….Stone wants a lot of pages and it might just happen to be the right thing to do."[107] Two months later Peter Blake, then architecture editor of *House and Home* wrote to him, "I think your Brussels Pavilion looks gorgeous…and a whole lot of other things I keep seeing in project form."[108] The response was extraordinary.

While his aesthetic was not initially created for consumerism, after its ardent reception, Stone soon after refashioned it for other projects, ranging from a gas station to a pill factory (figs. 30-31), and its primary feature, the perforated grille (fig. 32), became recognized as "high architectural fashion."[109] Even though it was conceived as a functional device, providing environmental controls that the partnering glass wall lacked, it was not exempt from the rules established in this age of the tailfin, as this period has sometimes been called. In fact, although Stone made a public case against what he called

---

Hamilton College in Clinton, New York; and in 1963 from Windham College in Putney, Vermont, as well as a master of fine arts degree in 1961 from the Otis Art Institute in Los Angeles and a doctor of humane letters degree in 1964 from the University of South Carolina in Camden.

[106] Von Eckardt, *A Place to Live*, 216.

[107] Douglas Haskell, memorandum to staff, December 21, 1956, Haskell Papers.

[108] Peter Blake to Edward Durell Stone, February 8, 1957, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 18, file 10.

[109] "New Face For America Abroad," *Time*, July 11, 1960.

"the epidemic of tailfins," he followed the hugely influential precedent of Harley Earl (1893-1969), who in 1948 had designed the first tailfin for Cadillac. As a symbol of prestige, this purely decorative feature was further commodified for mass consumption, appearing on virtually every make of American car by 1964.[110] Stone similarly stylized the grille for his own use, as exemplified at Roosevelt House, the ambassador's residence in the New Delhi embassy complex (1957-1963; fig. 33), where it was treated as a purely decorative detail. Moreover, by 1960, according to John M. Jacobus, it had become a vernacular, "employed as a badge of up-to-the-minute fashion by architects from every strata of the profession."[111] For example, when the Jewett Arts Center (1958) at Wellesley College in Massachusetts, was in its conceptual stage, arts committee members John McAndrew (1904-1978) and Agnes Abbot (1897-1992) suggested that the building's architect, Paul Rudolph (1918-1997), use similar decorative grillework. In fact, Abbot clipped a photograph of Stone's house from *Time* magazine and sent it to Rudolph to illustrate her point.[112] Although by 1967 Stone had "dropped" the grille, because it had been recognized as his "trademark," could inexpensively be imitated by others, and was considered part of his architectural vocabulary, he is still remembered as the "American

---

[110] Stone, "The Case Against the Tailfin Age" and Hine, *Populuxe*, 83-84 and 102-103. A condensed version of the "Tailfin" article, "One Man's Revolt Against the Tailfin Age," appeared in *Readers Digest* in February 1960. See also Ada Louise Huxtable, "Idlewild: Distressing Monument to Air Age," *New York Times*, November 25, 1962.

[111] John M. Jacobus, *Twentieth-Century Architecture: The Middle Years, 1940-65* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), 152-153.

[112] Timothy M. Rohan, "Rendering the Surface: Paul Rudolph's Art and Architecture Building at Yale," *Gray Room* 1 (Fall 2000), 209-210.

architect who liked to clothe his facades with an ornamental veil," or, as Johnson once declared, as a "screen decorator."[113]

While the grille was not incorporated in his design of the Gallery of Modern Art (fig. 1), the final project analyzed, in Chapter Four, "Architecture for the Average Man," the building does represent Stone's most daring effort to unite modernism with its antecedents and thus has provoked considerable backlash. Completed on the cusp of Stone's third period of work between about 1963 and 1974, during which time he was almost exclusively involved in business for corporations, governments, and other institutions, the Gallery of Modern Art evolved from an exceptional collaboration with Huntington Hartford. While critics have recognized Hartford's intention to dislocate modernism and Stone's ability to perfectly articulate his mission, they have failed to observe that it was Hartford, not Stone, who had a strong anti-modern agenda. At the same time that Stone was working on Hartford's museum, he was also designing the Museo de Arte de Ponce (1961-1965; fig. 34) in Puerto Rico for the industrialist Luis A. Ferré (1904-2003), which opened just ten months after the Gallery of Modern Art and won an Honor Award from the AIA in 1967. This two-story rectangular museum clad in white marble aggregate and defined internally by seven hexagonally-shaped sky-lit galleries was, in the words of McQuade "as lean and clean as Stone's early works, with strong horizontal lines."[114] Thus, whether motivated by objective rationalism as was the

---

[113] George H. Favre, "Simplicity, Order, and Permanence," *Christian Science Monitor*, May 15, 1967; Goldberger, "Edward Durell Stone, Dead;" Hall, "Directions in Modern Architecture;" John Fleming, Hugh Honour and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture*," 4th ed. (London: Penguin Books, 1991), s.v. "Stone, Edward Durell;" and Philip Johnson, "Retreat From the International Style to the Present Scene," (lecture, Yale University, New Haven, CT, May 9, 1958), in *Writings Philip Johnson* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 85. Stone later said about the grille that perhaps he "let this enthusiasm get out of hand" in Heyer, *Architects on Architecture*, 175-176.

[114] Walter McQuade, Structure & Design, *Fortune*, April 1966 and Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 303.

Puerto Rican museum or by sensitive hedonism like Hartford's museum, Stone was adept at manipulating his aesthetic in order to satisfy his clients (and thus maintain a consistent stream of work) while at the same time sustaining the design principles for which he was best known.[115]

His popularity was strengthened by the solid public image he had created for himself, discussed in Chapter Five "Quest for Celebrity." He expended much energy on his publicity, with his efforts ranging from developing long-lasting relationships with influential public figures, such as J. William Fulbright and Henry and Clare Booth Luce, to manipulating all forms of the mass media. He worked the many opportunities with which he was presented to attract public attention. His formats included competitions, demonstration rooms/houses, and exhibitions—especially at the Museum of Modern Art. As long as his architecture satisfied the museum's criteria for modernism and corresponded with its own cultural and political motives, the museum was keen on exhibiting Stone's International Style and Cold War architecture.[116]

Stone also partook in the developing cult of Wright, whom he called a "hero, prophet, adventurer."[117] His effort to be identified with Wright (see fig. 184) was so successful that in 1964 the *New York Post* reported that after Wright's death "Stone more or less inherited the title of America's leading architect."[118] Although Stone had much in common with Wright and was similarly skillful at obtaining publicity, in the end he did

---

[115] Goldberger, "Philip Johnson Is Dead at 98."

[116] See Carol Duncan and Alan Wallach, "The Museum of Modern Art As Late Capitalist Ritual: An Iconographic Analysis," *Marxist Perspectives*, 1 (Winter 1978): 28-51.

[117] Stone, "Hero Prophet Adventurer."

[118] Gerald Nachman, "Dean of Architects," Closeup, *New York Post*, September 21, 1964.

not inherit the critical acclaim of Wright, who has continuously held an important position in the history of modernism. Not only did Stone transgress many modernist precepts but he also departed from Wright in successfully playing to the mass market. As his commissions grew in size and number, Stone transformed his office into a large, full-service firm that responded to the growing demands of American capitalism in a way that Wright did not.

But in spite of being "far ahead of his time" in his awareness and sensitivity to the environment, city planning, and historic preservation, as Stone became more prolific in his work, his critical acclaim faded.[119] A 1968 review in the *New Yorker* described the prevailing attitude toward his architecture:

> It is the bane of the architectural profession that the moment one becomes successful, one becomes too successful; no sooner does an architect get as much work to do as he needs than he gets more work to do than he should. Mr. Stone's pierced screens, delicate arches, and sky-lit interior courts, complete with jungle greenery and babbling pools, have lost much of their freshness for us through repetition.[120]

In this final decade of his production, the romantic touch of Maria (see figs.14-15) is glaringly absent in all forms of output, as was clear in Stone's second retrospective, *Recent & Future Architecture*, published by Horizon in 1967. According to the reviews, the book was a "great big pretty new cocktail table book…an expensive puff-book…[that] may represent the last nail in the coffin of the old-time, unconnected architect."[121] Its enormous size—13 ¾ by 14 ½ inches—indicates that it was intended as

---

[119] Christopher Gray, "Edward Durell Stone and the Gallery of Modern Art; An Architect Who Looked Both Forward and Back," Streetscapes, *New York Times*, October 27, 2002.

[120] Briefly Noted, *New Yorker*, January 6, 1968.

[121] James T. Burns, "Edward Durell Stone? Who Ever Heard of a Book Called Edward Durell Stone?" Review of *Recent & Future Architecture* by Edward Durell Stone, *Progressive Architecture* 49 (April 1968): 222.

a presentation book for corporate offices or large institutions (it is too big to house on the average bookshelf).[122] Calculated and impersonal, the four-page introduction describes Stone's convictions about architecture and the urban environment, his approach to architecture as a business, and his institutional or corporate aesthetic. Far removed from his earlier autobiography, *Evolution of an Architect* (fig. 8), his later book is without narrative and therefore lacks the entertaining anecdotes, colorful descriptions of family and friends, and delightful sketches. Rather, it is a metaphor for Stone's late architecture designed for business clients who required predictability (and thus security), perceived status, and budget consciousness.

This dichotomy between his earlier and later work is evident in the architectural surveys written between 1952 and 2002. When his name first appeared in *Current Biography* in 1958, Stone was noted for his universal appeal because his buildings provided "a happy meeting ground of a number of polarities: the conservative and the experimental; the classic and the romantic; the austere and the highly decorated." By 1966 Jacobus stated in *Twentieth-Century Architecture: The Middle Years, 1940-65* that while Stone had provided relief from the "pervasive, brittle uniformity" of the International Style, in his search for form not governed purely by function he had "failed to respond with dignity and discrimination," instead relying on nineteenth-century academicism and thereby reducing architecture to trivia.[123] Posthumous criticism has also been unkind: in 1985 the architectural historian Spiro Kostof (1936-1991) asserted in his

---

[122] Stone was not bashful; he even sent a copy to President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson as "a testimonial" to their efforts "to make beauty an integral part of the total environment" (Edward Durell Stone to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, December 22, 1967, Stone Papers, 2nd acc.).

[123] *Current Biography* (1958), s.v. "Stone, Edward Durell" (the statement was taken from "An Architecture of Space and Grace," 154) and Jacobus, *Twentieth-Century Architecture*, 150 and 152.

History of Architecture that "for the most part, the integrity of Stone's work was diluted, if not altogether mocked."[124] Correspondingly, in the 1980 survey of 420 architects working for more than 150 Manhattan firms, Stone's work was known by 98 percent, but liked by only 19 percent.[125]

While Norval White sympathetically concluded in his *Architecture Book* (1976) that although "like many good men" Stone "fell from the grace of his profession," he "left an early mark of greatness that cannot be erased," others were clearly less certain.[126] Even Arthur Drexler (1925-1987), curator and director of the department of architecture and design at the Museum of Modern Art, who had exhibited Stone's work in three exhibitions, stated when Stone died in 1978: "I'm afraid he's an architect who's not much appreciated by his peers today, perhaps a little unjustly."[127] It is time that this ambiguous reputation be clarified by probing what Stone meant to the development of modernism in mid-twentieth-century America. Stone was considered one of the great architects in his own time and created some buildings that occasioned extensive critical debate over the nature of modernism. Thus, an analysis of Stone's work and its critical fortunes provides

---

[124] Spiro Kostof, *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 729.

[125] Blau, "A Framework of Meaning in Architecture," 339. This was also discussed in Niels L. Prak, *Architects: The Noted and the Ignored* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984), 89.

[126] Norval White, *The Architecture Book* (New York: Knopf, 1976), 293.

[127] Arthur Drexler, quoted in Wallach, "From Austerity to Opulence." Joseph Giovannini, "Arthur Drexler, 61, Authority on Architecture," *New York Times*, January 17, 1987. Drexler had been architecture editor of *Interiors* between 1948 and 1951 when he became curator of the Department of Architecture and Design at the Museum of Modern Art; in 1954 he became the department director when Johnson resigned.

an opportunity to understand his changing reputation as well as a consideration of the changing nature of modernism more generally.

Chapter One: An Artistic Path

The development of Stone's architectural aesthetic began in his youth, when his artistic talent appeared to be the only personal asset that could motivate or encourage him. The experiences in his early years help to explain why as an architect Stone always considered himself first a "creative artist" and second a practical builder and businessman.[128] However, Stone came to understand that an artistic sensibility was not a requirement for modern architecture, writing in 1958, "Nowadays an architect is a bit embarrassed to think of himself as an artist." And yet, he continued, "it seems to me that an architect should again think of himself as an artist and confess to himself and to his client and to the world that his objective is to do a beautiful building, in fact, a work of art."[129] It is not surprising, therefore, that among the personal items in the Stone Papers is an article Stone retained entitled "Architects Can Draw Again." Written in 1961 by Ilse Meisner Reese, a contributing editor of *Progressive Architecture*, it validated Stone's point of view: "Generally speaking, the talent of the architect as an artist with a pen and pencil has lain dormant during the past two or three decades. There has been little need for an elaborate, detailed rendering to delineate the typical curtain-wall building." But, as Reese went on, "What we observe in architecture and rendering today is, in a curious way, a happy marriage between the Beaux Arts school and its successor, the International School of modern architecture." The author's enthusiasm for the renewed interest in surface texture, ornament, and plastic shapes combined with modern simplicity and new

---

[128] Stone, *Recent & Future Architecture,* 8.

[129] Edward Durell Stone in *The New Age of Architecture*, transcript of film produced by *Architectural Forum*, 1958, American Federation of Arts Records, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian (hereafter cited as AFA Records).

building concepts complemented Stone's own predilection for a modern architecture that utilized his Beaux-arts training and artistic gifts.[130] For, as Henry Shepley had recognized, "Stone from his earliest days had an extraordinary talent for turning a very commonplace design into a thing of beauty."[131] He drew effortlessly, was proficient at the drafting board, and was adept at simplifying and ordering ideas in two-dimensional form.[132]

As a boy, Stone's talent had been readily apparent to his mother, Ruth Johnson Stone (1862-1919), perhaps because she too was artistically gifted. She gave him a large room in the house for his own carpentry shop to build furniture and boats, miniature towns and roadways, as well as a playhouse, which the neighborhood boys visited in morning and afternoon shifts.[133] When only fourteen, Stone entered a birdhouse-building contest sponsored by one of the Fulbright family concerns, the Northwest Arkansas Lumber Company. His bluebird house—shaped with sassafras branches in the manner of a log cabin—won him first place, three dollars, and mention in the Fulbright family newspaper, the *Fayetteville Democrat*, for which he was also the newsboy.[134] He was smitten not only with the prize but also with the attention he received in the region that had been settled by his grandfather, Stephen Keplinger Stone (1878-1975).

---

[130] Ilse Meisner Reese, "Architects Can Draw Again," *Progressive Architecture* 42 (March 1961): 134-143.

[131] Henry R. Shepley to Jury of Fellows, November 29, 1957, AIA Archives.

[132] John G. Williams, *The Curious and the Beautiful: A Memoir History of the Architecture Program At The University of Arkansas* (Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 1984), 14 and Cranston Jones, Form Givers exhibition confidential report to James Linen and Harris K. Prior, June 28, 1958, AFA Records.

[133] Blake Clark, "America's Unconventional Master Builder," *Reader's Digest*, February 1965.

[134] "N.A.L. Co. Bird House Contest," *Fayetteville Democrat*, April 1, 1916.

Although talented artistically, Stone was not a good student academically. When Stone took classes at the "training high school" at the University of Arkansas between the fall of 1918 and the spring of 1920, he received an A, a B-, and a C in Mechanical Drawing even though his academic performance was otherwise poor.[135] Similarly, when he attended the College of Arts and Sciences at the university for six terms between the fall of 1920 and the spring of 1922, his grades hovered in the C and D range, and he was placed on academic probation in 1921, explaining in his autobiography that most teachers "deplored the possibility of any future for me."[136] But in the winter term of 1921–1922 Stone received a B in Applied Design in lettering and an A in Elementary Freehand Drawing from still life, casts, and flowers. No doubt it was in this class that he drew the Parthenon frieze about which his teacher, a Miss Galbraith, was "elated" and gave him his first bit of academic encouragement.[137] As an old friend of his late mother, Miss Galbraith reportedly took it upon herself to write his much older brother James Hicks Stone (1886-1928), a practicing architect in Boston, "This boy has divine talent. If you don't take him away from here and put him in another school, it's a crime, and you're a wicked man."[138]

According to Stone, he spent the summer of his eighteenth year in Boston working in an electrical appliance store while being introduced to architecture by Hicks, as his brother was known, who took him blindfolded to the Brooklyn Bridge where he

---

[135] Edward Durell Stone Record Sheet, College of Arts and Sciences, Office of the Registrar, University of Arkansas. I would like to thank Hicks Stone for providing me with this information.

[136] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 20.

[137] Ibid.

[138] Quoted in "More Than Modern."

had his first glimpse of the skyline of New York City, which he said marked him for life.[139] The same summer Stone saw the white marble Pan American Building (1907-1910) in Washington, D.C., a stripped classical design by the Beaux-arts-trained architect Paul Philippe Cret (1876-1945) in association with Albert Kelsey (1870-1950). Clearly moved by this remarkable Beaux-arts building, including its central interior court that was paved in brightly colored tile with a pink marble fountain and with lush tropical vegetation and birds enclosed by a sliding glass roof, Stone later recalled in his autobiography, "This was the moment of truth for me. I decided finally that I wanted to be an architect."[140]

While Stone remembered that he returned to Fayetteville inspired to study subjects most pertinent to architecture—French, freehand drawing, and mechanical drawing—in truth, his grades continued to slip, and even in his final term, spring 1922, he received a F in Lettering, C in Elementary Freehand Drawing, and C in Advanced Freehand Drawing in addition to the E's and F's in his other courses.[141] At the end of the

---

[139] Upon graduating from the University of Arkansas in 1906 with a B.S. in Civil Engineering, James Hicks Stone (called Hicks) worked in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, after which he moved to St. Louis, Missouri, attending the St. Louis Architecture Club and working for Mariner and La Beaume between 1908 and 1909 and Hellmuth and Hellmuth between 1909 and 1910 and again between 1911 and 1912. (Stone stated on page 20 *of Evolution of an Architect* that Hicks attended Washington University in St. Louis, but there is no record there of his attendance.) Similar to his younger brother, Hicks worked in Boston for Shepley, Rutan and Coolidge between 1910 and 1911 and again between 1912 and 1913 and took classes at the Boston Architectural Club. Between 1913 and 1915 he attended the Graduate School of Design at Harvard University in Cambridge. While at first a Special Student, in 1914 he advanced to degree candidacy and received the Joseph Eveleth Scholarship of two hundred dollars. In 1916 he applied for the Robinson Travelling Fellowship, but lost to Jean Vernon Wilson. He then worked for the Boston firms of Strickland & Law (1886-1920); Charles Greeley Loring (1913-1965) and Joseph D. Leland (1886-1968); and then for Leland alone. See *Catalogues of the University of Arkansas, 1900-1901;1901-1902; 1902-1903; 1903-1904; 1904-1905; 1905-1906* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas); *Boston City Directories*; the student file of James Hicks Stone, Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, MA (hereafter cited as Harvard Archives) and *Harvard University Catalogues 1912-1913, 1913-1914,* and *1914-1915* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University).

[140] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 21.

[141] Ibid. and Stone Record Sheet.

year Stone moved to Boston, where during the winters between 1922 and 1924 he studied in the evenings at the Boston Architectural Club, founded in 1889 to provide lectures, exhibitions, classes (set up on an atelier system), and studio space for people pursuing architecture.[142] He fondly remembered learning the classical orders by making analytiques drawn in ink and then rendered in Chinese ink washes—technical skills that he considered essential in developing creative ideas. Stone immodestly recalled, "I must say that when they were done you could hardly believe that the hand of man could do such beautiful things."[143]

As president of the Boston Architectural Club between 1922 and 1926, Henry Shepley was so impressed with the youth's talent that he invited him to join his firm, Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch and Abbott (1924-1952) in January 1924, as a draftsman—instead of as an office boy, the position he had held since June 1923 at Strickland, Blodgett & Law (1920-1932).[144] Stone was no doubt impressed by Shepley, who had taken after his renowned grandfather, Henry Hobson Richardson (1874-1886), and father, George Foster Shepley (1860-1903), by studying at the Ecole des Beaux-arts in Paris before joining the firm in 1914, then called Shepley, Rutan and Coolidge (1886-1915). The firm's tradition of enriching the surfaces of its structures with ornamentation considered "intrinsic to the various historical styles" guided Stone in the traditional

---

[142] Margaret Henderson Floyd, *Architectural Education and Boston: Centennial Publication of the Boston Architectural Center, 1889-1989* (Boston: Boston Architectural Center, 1989), 40-41 and Rotch Committee, "Life Records & Envois," Rotch Travelling Scholarship Records, MC520, box 27 (O), folder 2, Manuscript Collection, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Archives and Special Collections (hereafter cited as Rotch Records).

[143] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 21.

[144] Henry R. Shepley to George H. Edgell, April 25, 1925, Harvard Services. I would like to thank Hicks Stone for sharing this information with me.

projects on which he worked: he measured the sway-backed roof of Massachusetts Hall (1790) at Harvard, which Shepley reconstructed during the building's restoration, and he drew details of the arches, sills, brickwork, limestone sections, and sashes for the George Alexander McKinlock Dormitory (1925) at Harvard; of the flagstaff on top of the Washington Building (1927) in Washington, D.C.; and of the windows, spandrels, cornices, ironwork, and stone facing of the Fabyan Building (1927) in Boston.[145]

In many respects, Hicks paved the way for his younger brother and remained a life-long inspiration even though he died of cancer well before Stone set up his own practice.[146] Both attended the University of Arkansas and both were members of the Gamma Upsilon chapter of Sigma Nu, for whom Stone later built the chapter house (1951-1953).[147] Still following in the footsteps of Hicks, Stone was accepted to the Graduate School of Design at Harvard in May 1925, with letters of recommendation written by Shepley, Sidney T. Strickland (b.1880), and probably Clarence Henry Blackall (1857-1941).[148] He won Special Student status, which meant he was not a candidate for a

---

[145] "Shepley Bulfinch, Richardson & Abbott," *Architectural Record* 125 (February 1959): 157. According to a 1947 resume (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 2, file 16) Stone also worked on buildings at the Cornell Medical Center and New York Hospital in New York City, Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee, and Elmira College in Elmira, New York, but there is no record of his participation in the Shepley Archives. I would like to thank the firm's archivist, Robert J. Roche for his assistance.

[146] In a letter of March 28, 1958 Barney Gruzen wrote to Stone, "I remember how much your brother Hicks was responsible for your beginning in this grand profession (Stone Papers, 1st acc. Box 69, file 14), and in a letter of January 1, 1964 to Stone, Kenneth J. Conant wrote that Hicks was "very much beloved and respected" at Harvard and was remembered "with abiding warm regard" (Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 2, file 1).

[147] See Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 126-127 and "Homelike for a Residential Area," *Architectural Forum* 99 (August 1953): 114-116.

[148] In his acceptance letter to Stone, George Harold Edgell wrote on May 11, 1925, "I am sure that Mr. Shepley and Mr. Blackall will be pleased when they hear." This letter, along with two letters of recommendation by Henry R. Shepley and Sidney T. Strickland, are in Stone's student file, Harvard Services.

degree but rather for a certificate of accomplishment, and received one of the three scholarships of $250 (the full tuition fee) by placing highest in the requisite design competition based on Beaux-arts methodology: after preparing a preliminary sketch within twelve consecutive hours, he successfully completed a more detailed drawing during the following week.[149]

Although at Harvard Stone only received a B- in both Modelling Architecture Ornament in Clay and in the second Freehand Drawing courses, according to his schoolmate, Walter Harrington Kilham Jr. (1904-1997), he was "easily the most talented" among his peers.[150] Under Jean Jacques "Jake" Haffner (b. 1885), the Nelson Robinson, Jr. Professor of Architecture, Stone also completed an intermediate design course—the Study of Elementary Composition. Kilham claimed that Stone chose Harvard only for the design course under Haffner, who along with his equivalent Jacques Carlu (1890-1976) at M.I.T. had given critiques on Monday evenings at the Boston Architectural Club after arriving at Harvard in 1922.[151] Haffner also studied at the Ecole des Beaux-arts between 1907 and 1912 while working for M. Victor Alexandre Frédéric Laloux (1850-1937), architect of the Gare d'Orsay (1898-1900) in Paris, who was known for establishing "the organization of a plan, with an intuitive balancing and proportioning of each part so as to

---

[149] Faculty of Architecture, *School of Architecture, 1927-28* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1927). On page 17 a Special Student is described as someone admitted by the vote of the Council who was not a degree candidate but rather was granted a certificate of accomplishment upon completion. The student had to be a least twenty-one and have high-school training or its equivalent and three years of preparation either in an office experience or satisfactory work in a college or scientific school. Stone qualified for having worked in the office of Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch, & Abbott in Boston.

[150] In addition, Stone received an incomplete in the first Freehand Drawing and Water Colour course as well as in the two Sketches courses according to a letter that documents his record, May 25, 1934 and a Report on Standing, Harvard Services.

[151] Kilham, "Journeys in Two Worlds" and Floyd, *Architectural Education and Boston*, 87.

contribute to the whole."[152] Stone's temperament was suited to Haffner's teaching method, which emphasized individual progress rather than a regimented program.[153] As a result, Stone professed to be "devoted" to him.[154] Since Haffner was a noted watercolorist in classical architecture, he must have immediately spotted Stone's ability to draw, even if one peer described his compositions as "slick Beaux-arts jobs…in the Paris Exposition 1925 style."[155]

Although Stone was "an architectural history buff" who liked "to travel with Bannister Fletcher under his arm," he only took two architectural history classes in his life—both at Harvard, where the connection between architecture and fine art was consistently emphasized.[156] He received a B in the History of Ancient Architecture taught by George Harold Edgell (1887-1954), dean of the architecture school between 1922 and 1935, who in 1918 had published with S. Fiske Kimball *A History of Architecture*, the first survey of its kind in America.[157] Stone also received a B in the History of Roman,

---

[152] Arthur Drexler, ed., *The Architecture of the École des Beaux-Arts* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1977), 96. According to H. Bartle Cox, "M. Victor Laloux: The Man and His Work," in *Architects' Journal* (May 19, 1920): 640, the atelier of Laloux, one of the largest and most successful, obtained more Premier Grand Prix de Rome prizes than any other (at least up to 1914), with Haffner winning his in 1919. See also William G. Perry, "French Comrades in America, II: Jean Jacques Haffner," *Pencil Points* 8 (February 1927): 67-84; and Anthony Alofsin, *The Struggle for Modernism: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and City Planning at Harvard* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2002), 55.

[153] Alofsin, *Struggle for Modernism*, 55.

[154] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 23.

[155] See Alofsin, *Struggle for Modernism*, 276 and McAndrew, interview by Lynes, Russell Lynes Papers, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian (hereafter cited as Lynes Papers).

[156] Edward Durell Stone to Kenneth J. Conant, July 6, 1964, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 2, file 7. Stone was referring to Sir Banister Fletcher, *A History of Architecture for the Student, Craftsman, and Amateur, Being a Comparative View of the Historical Styles from the Earliest Period* (London: Batsford, 1896).

[157] Alofsin, *Struggle for Modernism*, 54-55. Even though Edgell had focused in the Italian Renaissance in his fine arts graduate studies, it was under his deanship that Harvard began to de-emphasize history courses

Early Christian, and Byzantine Architecture course, taught by Kenneth John Conant (1894-1984), an assistant professor of architecture, in which Stone was required to refine his visual skills and drawing abilities by making sketches from projected lantern slides and executing complete renderings of reconstructed buildings.[158] While Stone had a cordial relationship with both professors, it was Conant (who later became a leading medieval archaeologist in North America) with whom he kept in touch and later relayed that his course had had a "profound influence" on him.[159] Conant's approach to studying architecture was analytical: he used objective systems of classification to analyze historical structures and objects. His popularity among students stemmed in part from his "love of buildings, their physical presences and characters, no matter the period."[160] Both Conant and Edgell had studied under Herbert Lanford Warren (1857-1917), a leading architectural historian in the United States who in 1895 had established the architecture program at Harvard, which originally included in the curriculum three years of history courses—covering ancient, medieval, and Renaissance and modern.[161] Even though these courses had been shortened by Stone's time, Warren had passed down to his successors

---

in favor of a more rigorous education in construction technology, and in 1922 this course was shortened from a full to half year.

[158] Ibid., 57. Conant also taught the History of Medieval, Renaissance and Modern Architecture, which Stone did not take.

[159] See Stone to Conant, May 3, 1965. For more about Kenneth Conant see Peter Fergusson, "Medieval Architectural Scholarship in America, 1900-1940: Ralph Adams Cram and Kenneth John Conant," in *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians* 35 (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990): 127-142. Conant was the catalyst for and the first honorary president of the Society of Architectural Historians when it was founded in 1940.

[160] Fergusson, "Medieval Architectural Scholarship in America," 138.

[161] Alofsin, *Struggle for Modernism*, 19.

his belief that architecture is essentially a fine art, the practice of which must be based on a thorough knowledge of construction.[162] Stone took away from Harvard an enthusiasm for architectural history, and throughout his life remained "steadfast to his image of architecture as fine art."[163]

While the fine arts appealed to Stone's artistic predisposition, the technical aspects of construction did not. Even though he received a C+ in the Construction Problem that was given two weeks a year under the direction of the "terrible"[164] Charles Wilson Killam (1871-1961), a brilliant engineer who was involved with Harvard from 1908 until his death, Stone failed Killam's Theory of Building Construction—Statics, Resistance of Materials, and Elementary Structural Design, which John McAndrew, who attended the school of architecture from 1924 to 1928, recalled was a very "tough and rough" course, the only one in which anyone learned anything at all.[165] In *Journeys in Two Worlds*, Stone's classmate Walter Kilham dramatically recounted that one afternoon Stone "appeared in the drafting room obviously quite upset. He said that he couldn't take it any longer and had decided to quit the school and go over to the rival M.I.T. With that

---

[162] "Official Register of the Department of Architecture" (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1902), quoted in Anthony Alofsin, "Toward A History of Teaching Architectural History: An Introduction to Herbert Langford Warren," *Journal of Architectural Education* 37 (Fall 1983): 4.

[163] Marketing Book created by Edward Durell Stone & Associates, 1968, Stone Papers.

[164] McAndrew, interview by Lynes.

[165] Alofsin, *Struggle for Modernism*, 32 and ibid. After graduating from Harvard, McAndrew worked for Aymar Embury II in New York. He was also an architectural consultant at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, New York, and an assistant professor beginning in 1932, before becoming curator at the Museum of Modern Art in 1940. See Russell Lynes Jr., *Good Old Modern: An Intimate Portrait of the Museum of Modern Art* (New York: Athenaeum, 1973), 177-178 and a press release announcing his appointment, Museum of Modern Art Archives (hereafter cited as MoMA Archives).

he left the room; his parting gesture the throwing on the floor that symbol of the engineer, his slide rule."[166]

Extant correspondence with Dean Edgell indicates that Stone asked to be exempted from repeating Killam's course, but, although he was "very well-liked by everybody both faculty and staff," Edgell reported that the school's council "felt that it could not invite precedent of allowing a Special Student to fail Construction one year and continue without taking it the next."[167] Attributing Stone's failure to a "bad start," he was confident that Stone could obtain the requisite B or better.[168] Moreover, recognizing that Stone did "brilliantly" in design (he had won a second Special Student competition for the year 1926), Edgell said, "Let us assume that you will be with us next year and that I shall not have the distress of seeing work as fine as yours in design labelled 'M.I.T.' or 'Yale' 'Columbia' or 'Penn' for the matter of that!"[169] Nonetheless, in the fall of 1926 Stone did transfer to M.I.T. as a Special Student in Architecture—Course IV because there he was not required to study engineering.[170] Besides two semesters of Elementary French, required for first-year architecture and engineering students, Stone took the third-year Freehand Drawing courses and the fifth-year Design courses, presumably under Carlu, who had also studied at the Ecole des Beaux-arts and in 1913 had won the Grand

---

[166] Kilham, "Journeys in Two Worlds." This story was also quoted in "More Than Modern."

[167] George Harold Edgell to M. A. Smith, January 3, 1930 and to Edward D. Stone, September 30, 1926, Harvard Services.

[168] George Harold Edgell to Board of Registration of Architecture, Department of Education, May 28, 1934; Edgell to Edward D. Stone, September 20, 1926; and Action of Council Report, 1925-1926, Harvard Services.

[169] Edgell to Board of Registration and to Edward D. Stone, July 3, 1926, Harvard Services.

[170] On page 23 of *Evolution of an Architect,* Stone said he switched to M.I.T because Jacques Carlu was "beginning to experiment with modern design." M.I.T offered a separate, four-year Bachelor of Science

Prix de Rome.[171] Carlu's architecture philosophy was similar to Stone's: In a 1926 article in *Pencil Points*, Carlu stated, "The contemporary artist is he who is a bond between yesterday and tomorrow,—who connects the memory of the past with the expectation of the future."[172]

As part of the Beaux-art method of teaching at M.I.T., which was "founded upon personal criticism," Stone was encouraged to enter competitive "opportunities" that would enable him to make the equivalent of a grand tour in Europe to study architecture firsthand.[173] He may have been disappointed when he only received "first alternate" in late 1926 or early 1927 in a competition for students with "conspicuous ability" to receive a scholarship for the Fontainebleau School of Fine Arts, a summer school for Americans conducted by the French government and directed by Carlu.[174] However, he would not have been discouraged for long, because in May 1927 it was announced in the *Boston Herald* that Stone was "delighted but surprised" to be awarded the coveted Rotch Travelling Scholarship (fig. 35).[175]

---

degree in Architectural Engineering (Course IV-a). See *Catalogue for 1926-1927* (Cambridge, MA: M.I.T., 1926), 77-79.

[171] *Catalogue for 1926-1927* (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1926), 77-79 and *Catalogue for 1927-1928*, (Cambridge, MA: M.I.T.), 73-76 and 245. Edward Durell Stone student file, Office of the Registrar, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

[172] Edmund S. Campbell, "French Comrades in America: Jacques Carlu," *Pencil Points* 7 (May 1926): 283.

[173] *Catalogue for 1926-1927,* 73-74.

[174]*Catalogue for 1927-1928,* 74*;* Rotch Committee, "Life Records & Envois," and Campbell, "French Comrades in America," 270.

[175] "Tech Student Wins Rotch Scholarship," *Boston Herald*, May 4, 1927 and Travelling Scholarship Committee, "Life Records & Envois, 1906-1935," s.v. "Forty-Second Holder Rotch Trav. Scholarship: Stone, Edward Durell," Rotch Records.

Founded in 1883, and based on the Prix de Rome model, which was established under the reign of Louis XIV, the Rotch Travelling Scholarship was only eligible to young men with Massachusetts training.[176] To win it, Stone initially had to pass a preliminary examination that showed his familiarity with Greek, Roman, medieval, and Renaissance architecture in A.D.F. Hamlin's *Text-Book of the History of Architecture* (1895); to produce in three hours a freehand pencil or charcoal drawing of an architectural fragment or vase; to complete a three-hour test on construction, incorporating the Boston Building Laws and Frank E. Kidder's *Architect's and Builder's Pocket-Book: A Handbook for Architects*, *Structural Engineers, Builders, and Draughtsmen* (1904); and to complete a translation of Julien Gaudet's *Elements et théorie de l'architecture* (c. 1901). As one of sixteen invited to advance to the second stage of the competition, Stone was then required to complete on consecutive days two "en loge" sketches, the topic prepared by Haffner and then judged by him and Carlu. The first was a nine-hour sketch of an architectural motif—a monumental straight staircase in a museum; and the second a nine-hour sketch of an architectural plan—a naval officers' club. Stone was then invited to the final competition, along with Barnett Sumner Gruzen, Hugh Perrin, and Marjorie Pierce. Upon the completion of a nine-hour preparatory sketch for a "studio and business establishment of a firm of architects requiring the aid of 250 draughtsmen," he was given two weeks to complete the required drawings, which were then judged by Shepley and William G. Perry of Boston along with Henry O. Milliken

[176] The scholarship endowment was founded in memory of Benjamin Smith Rotch of Milton, Massachusetts, whose children joined in an Indenture of Trust, executed on December 29th, 1883, that provided $50,000 for "the advancement of education in architecture," sufficient to assure income each ensuing year for students and architects to study abroad. See www.rotchscholarship.org (accessed January 16, 2007).

and Ralph Walker of New York City. His winning scheme was published in *Pencil Points* (fig. 36), and he received three thousand dollars for two years of travel.[177]

Between September 1927 and October 1929 Stone traveled throughout Europe—England, France, Spain, Italy, Greece, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden—as well as North Africa, tucking away thousands of years of architecture in his photographic memory and creating exquisitely rendered sketches and watercolors (fig. 16), thirteen of which are illustrated in his autobiography.[178] Every four months, Stone was required to send to the scholarship committee sketches and watercolors as well as carefully studied drawings, or envois, as evidence of his study and travel. Although he received permission from the committee to create an envoi for a restored Pompeian house in April 1927 and one for James Wyatt's Radcliffe Observatory (1770-1801) at Oxford University in October 1927, there is no record that he executed either of these.[179] But he did produce an envoi of the Loggia dei Leone at the Villa Borghese in Rome (fig. 37), for which he received permission to study in January 1928

---

[177] "Plan and Elevation of Prize Winning Design for 'An Architect's Office', by Edward D. Stone," *Pencil Points*, 8 (July 1927): 440. See also Clarence Henry Blackall, *A History of the Rotch Travelling Scholarship, 1883-1938* (Boston: privately printed, 1938) and Rotch Travelling Scholarship Committee Minutes, April 1923, Rotch Records, box 1, folder 4. Stone said on page 24 of *Evolution of an Architect* that he designed an "idyllic situation" that no architect could ever afford, which included conference rooms and drafting rooms surrounded by gardens.

[178] The sketches in *Evolution of an Architect* include the Arch of Titus (p. 12), Piazza San Pietro (p. 13), and Loggia of the Lions (p. 23) in Rome; the cathedral (p. 14) and a street (p. 26) in Sienna; a Roman aqueduct (p. 24) and view of Segovia (p. 29); city hall in Stockholm (p. 25); and in France a chateau (p. 25), the Tour de Beurre in Rouen (p. 27), Notre Dame (p. 28), the Arc de Triomphe (p. 24), and the Arc de Carousel (p. 29).

[179] C. H. Blackall to Edward Stone, October 25, 1927, Rotch Records, box 3, folder 15. Wyatt completed the building after its original architect, Henry Keene, died in 1770. According to Anthony Dale, *James Wyatt, Architect, 1746-1813* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936), 36, it is almost certain that Wyatt completed the upper story, decorated with Coadeware stone plaques modeled by John Bacon.

and submitted the envoi in July of that year.[180] Another envoi—the Cathedral of Saint Cécile at Albi sur le Tarne in France (fig. 38)—was received sometime after that.[181] All the drawings were exquisitely rendered, despite the fact that C. H. Blackall, the secretary of the scholarship, had advised Stone not to "dress up" his drawings, or make pictures, but rather to record his architectural impressions. "The real thought and study is represented more by the notes and the measured work rather than by the carefully finished water colors or drawings," he explained.[182] The scholarship committee was clearly pleased with Stone's initial enthusiastic performance (Stone later became more slack in responding to the deadlines): William Emerson (1873-1957), dean of the Department of Architecture at M.I.T., informed him in March 1928 that his letters "have been of such great interest and have given me so much pleasure that I want to write you this little word of appreciation, and to tell you what a satisfaction it is to me to know that you are having such a valued opportunity and are making such an intelligent and appreciative use of it."[183]

The study tour abroad developed Stone's passion for travel and history. He later explained, "The obsession with monuments of the past may seem sentimental and pedantic, but I believe the inspiration for a building should be in accumulation of history."[184] More significantly, it reinforced his knowledge of the classical principles

---

[180] Illustrated on page 23 of Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*. Rotch Committee Minutes, April 1923. These drawings and many others are still retained by family members.

[181] "Life Records & Envois."

[182] C. H. Blackall to Edward Stone, September 20, 1927, Rotch Records, box 3, folder 15.

[183] William Emerson to Edward Stone, March 19, 1928, Rotch Records, box 3, folder 15.

[184] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 143.

used in his lifelong work since his interest was in formal composition rather than the more natural picturesque. "At his heart, he retained a strong element of Beaux-Arts classicism," Jacks surmised, as he further explained that Stone's ability to pictorially envision architecture, his reliance on the primacy of the plan, his simple, geometric organizations, and the fondness for historical reference were informed by his training and constant wanderings.[185]

Since the scholarship requirements were based on Beaux-arts conventions, Stone was bound to a traditional system of production. Even so, he claimed in his autobiography that he was also impressed with the European modernist architecture he saw, the most notable works being in the Netherlands—schools, city halls and public baths by William Dudok in Hilversum; the Van Nelle Tobacco Factory (1926-1929) by Johannes A. Brinkman, Leendert Cornelis van der Vlught and Mart Stam in Rotterdam; and the Zonnestraal Sanatorium (1926-1928) by Johannes Duiker and Bernard Bijvoet in Hilversum. In France he saw Parisian cubist houses by Robert Mallet Stevens, projects by Tony Garnier in Lyons, and churches and concrete hangers at Orly by Auguste Perret. In Germany he admired the Berlin theaters and other buildings by Eric Mendelsohn and Peter Behrens and in Barcelona, Spain, the German Pavilion (1929) by Mies van der Rohe. Although Stone did not specifically name buildings by the other modernist pioneers—Jacobus Johannes Pieter Oud (1890-1963), Walter Gropius (1883-1969), and Le Corbusier (1887-1965)—he did write, "Le Corbusier's first books were being published and in nearby Dessau [sic Weimar] where the Bauhaus was founded, all heralding the arrival of the new machine age. Those ideas were contagious and we

[185] Jacks, "The Elegant Bohemian," 334.

students spent our time redesigning the United States on marble-topped café tables."[186] While it is conceivable that this recollection, written more than thirty years after his tour, may have been an afterthought, it is significant that his sketchbook contains some fifteen pages of twentieth-century structures or details (fig. 39). Although none of the drawings illustrates the iconic structures shown in the International Style exhibition of 1932, his subsequent modern buildings do show an awareness of those works.

Stone returned to New York City on the *S.S. Berengaria* on October 25, 1929, known as Black Friday because it was the day the stock market crashed.[187] As a testament to his talent, among the many unemployed he was able to find work. He had met Leonard Schultze (1878-1951) a year earlier in Stockholm and was hired by the firm of Schulze and Weaver (1921-1940) to handle the design of more than six public rooms in the art deco interior of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel (1929-1931) in New York City, including the famous trellised roof garden, called the Starlight Roof, which left a lasting impression on him, as well as the ball room (fig. 24). He wrote to his fiancé Orlean Vandiver (1907-1985) that he was "hard at it getting the ball room under way" and felt that the chance for his scheme (for which he made a color study) being accepted was looking "pretty darn good" since Schulze was "all hot and bothered over it."[188] He confided, "I'm not altogether pleased with it myself but have had to sort of hit a compromise between the conservatism of the office and really going wild." He added that he then reported directly

---

[186] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 25. Stone said he spent most of his time at the Café des Deux Magots, "headquarters for architects, existentialists and Dadaists."

[187] I would like to thank Robert Skolmen for this information.

[188] In "An American In Brussels," *Christian Science Monitor*, June 23, 1958, Carlyle Morgan stated that the Starlight Roof gave Stone "a chance at trellis work and other ornamentation for its ceilings." See also Leonard Schultz, "The Waldorf-Astoria Hotel," *Architecture* 64 (November 1931): 294 and 279.

to Schultz instead of to the head designer, which, he exclaimed, "tickles me a plenty and gives me a chance for my own decisions."[189] Thus, the twenty-eight-year-old architect had been able to maneuver his situation so that he could work independently right under the eye of the boss while "designing the most stupendous architecture this side of Rome," as Herbert Muschamp, the architecture critic at the *New York Times* between 1992 and 2004, characterized it much later.[190]

Between 1930 and 1932 Stone found another exceptional opportunity at Rockefeller Center (1929-1933) through his former Harvard colleague Walter Kilham.[191] Under the direction of Raymond Hood (1881-1934) and Wallace Kirkman Harrison (1895-1981), the latter of whom "expected much" of the young draftsman as he worked over the boards in his office, Stone was the "director of the draughting room" and "chief of design" for the two theaters—the Center Theater (now demolished) and Radio City Music Hall (fig. 25).[192] In addition, he worked alongside Donald Deskey (1894-1989), who was responsible for the lush art deco interiors of the music hall, and he was inspired by his use of luxuriant materials, vivid color combinations, opulent metallic surfaces, and the collaboration by artists, including Gwen Lux (1908-2001) and Witold Gordon (1885-1965), both of whom later collaborated with Stone.[193]

---

[189] Edward Stone to Orlean Vandiver, 1929, private collection.

[190] Herbert Muschamp, "Art Deco Authenticity," *New York Times*, October 4, 1999.

[191] In *Journeys in Two Worlds*, Kilham stated, "It was my privilege to find a place for him in the budding office of Wallace K. Harrison."

[192] Harrison, December 3, 1957 and Stone's resume, January 11, 1942 (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 2, file 16).

[193] A wall mural by Witold Gordon is in the bar of Stone's Mandel house and is illustrated on page 74 of Mary Anne Hunting, "The Richard H. Mandel House in Bedford Hills, New York," Living With Antiques, *The Magazine Antiques*, July 2001.

Although Stone's drawing for the music hall proscenium was pictured in *Fortune* in January 1933 (fig. 40), he himself did not attend the opening night on December 27, 1932, for he had been discharged for accepting a commission while on vacation in Bermuda to design a house for William Vincent Astor (1891-1959) in St. Georges Parish.[194] Nonetheless, his talent did not go unnoticed: architecture critic Brendan Gill (1914-1997) recalled Harrison once saying, "Ed, the big bear! The lobby of the Music Hall, that was Ed for you—on his scale. What a talent he had!"[195]

But in spite of strong mentorships, extensive training, international exposure, and exceptional work experiences, when Stone's work ended at Rockefeller Center in the midst of the Great Depression, his "architectural future looked fairly gloomy," as he later reflected.[196] However, Stone now was fully prepared, as he explained, to become an architect in his own right. For these formative years provided him with the means to create his own architectural principles, which included a rational planning process rooted in Beaux-arts methodology; simple, straightforward solutions to complex design

---

[194] See "Debut of a City," *Fortune*, January 1933 and page 30 of *Evolution of an Architect* as well as Daniel Okrent, *Great Fortune: The Epic of Rockefeller Center* (New York: Viking Press, 2003), 239 and "Innovating Architect: Edward D. Stone." The information in Okrent's book is based on an interview in 1958 with Orlean Vandiver Stone in the Time Archives. Completed by January 1934, Ferry Reach, as it is still called, was built in a traditional Bermuda style in collaboration with N. W. Hutchings & Sons. On January 12, 1932, Henry Shepley wrote to Stone, "I am enclosing two photographs of my favorite Bermuda house. You can use this for Vincent Astor's back door if you want" (Henry R. Shepley Papers, Shepley Bulfinch Richardson and Abbott Archives, Boston, hereafter cited as Shepley Papers). When discussing the possibility of building a house for the Luces in 1961, Stone wrote to Clare Boothe Luce on September 26, "I worked with him [Nat Hutchings] some thirty years ago on a house for Vincent Astor," and he wrote to Nat Hutchings on September 16, "It is now thirty years since we worked on the Astor House together" (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 78, file 41). See also "Life Calls on Vincent Astor at 'Ferry Reach' in Bermuda," *Life*, January 29, 1940; "Vincent Astor Buys Estate In Bermuda for Winter Home," *New York Times*, December 15, 1932; and "Vincent Astor in Bermuda," *New York Times*, January 27, 1934.

[195] Brendan Gill, "Wallace K. Harrison," in *A New York Life of Friends and Others* (New York: Poseidon Press, 1990), 157. Between 1934 and 1935 Stone again worked for Harrison on the final drawings for the highly acclaimed Rockefeller Apartments (1934-1936) on 54th Street in New York City. See Victoria Newhouse, *Wallace K. Harrison, Architect*, (New York: Rizzoli, 1989), 70.

[196] Edward D. Stone to George H. Edgell, May 23, 1934, Harvard Services.

problems; uniting various elements of the plan in clean geometric shapes; and utilizing ideas absorbed from traditional or cultural surroundings, all of which he would shortly utilize.[197]

[197] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 32.

Chapter Two: Transition in Modernism

Although during his formative years Stone had been one of the few American architects fortunate enough to see firsthand the modern architecture in Europe, when back in America he recognized that there was limited exposure to this new idiom. He was therefore evidently pleased when in 1932 the Museum of Modern Art in New York City mounted the Modern Architecture: International Exhibition, curated by Henry-Russell Hitchcock (1903-1987) and Philip Johnson. Stone famously declared in his autobiography, *Evolution of an Architect*, that the "exhibition did for architecture what the famous Armory Show had done for painting: it introduced the modern masters to the public for the first time."[1] He then went on, "I know of no single event which so profoundly influenced the architecture of the Twentieth Century."[2] Indeed, this exhibition did change the course of architecture in America, not only for the public, as Stone recollected, but also for the young architect himself. Its influence on his style is apparent as Stone progresses from his first attempt at the International Style in the Richard H. Mandel house, then in its smaller variation for the *Collier's* magazine, and finally in the Museum of Modern Art, considered the first public building in America to embody the utilitarian principles of the International Style (figs. 26-28).[3] The pattern of publicity that Stone would have observed with these projects, one in which the critics were attracted to

---

[1] In 1913 the International Exhibition of Art at the Seventh Regiment Armory in New York City was the first large exhibition of its kind in America to challenge academic definitions of art.

[2] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 30-31. Stone's comment about the International Style exhibition contrasts with the observation of Robert A. M. Stern, who said that the International Style exhibition "appears in retrospect to have had virtually no direct impact on the course of architectural practice in the U.S." ("International Style: Immediate Effects," The International Style at 50 *Progressive Architecture* 63 [February 1982], 105).

[3] Museum of Modern Art, "Nelson A. Rockefeller Becomes New President of Museum of Modern Art," press release no. 39508-17, MoMA Archives.

new and exciting innovations rather than to middle-class residences for publication, made a great impression on him, determining the course of his future career.

Even though Hitchcock declared in "The Brown Decades and the Brown Year" that by 1932 there already existed a group of culturally significant buildings in America that represented a "wide practice of fully developed modern style of architecture,"[4] before the International Style exhibition, modernism was not widely understood, much less accepted in America.[5] Under the editorship of Ethel Brown Power (1881-1969), *House Beautiful* reported in November 1932 that "the discussion over Modernism still waxes; even the meaning of the word is not as yet defined, for the term is used loosely up and down the land."[6]

With the exception of the Bayard Building (1897-1898) on Bleeker Street by Louis Sullivan (1856-1924), a building Stone no doubt appreciated because decoration was ostentatiously applied to the exterior, Stone felt that there were no examples of modern architecture in New York City, and he would have readily agreed with the *New York Sun* headline of January 29, 1932, that there was "Not One Modern Building in the City."[7] He was likewise convinced that the work of the Bauhaus School (founded 1919), which had been responsible for uniting the various abstract currents in Europe and Russia, was "little known" in America.[8]

---

[4] Henry-Russell Hitchcock Jr., "The Brown Decades and the Brown Year," *Hound and Horn* 2 (January–March, 1932): 275 and 277.

[5] See for example the Museum of Modern Art's press release announcing the International Style exhibition, February 7, 1932, MoMA Archives.

[6] Next Month, *House Beautiful*, November 1932.

[7] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 30.

[8] Ibid.

Stone's impression was not completely accurate because Bauhaus concepts had been introduced to this country earlier: According to Margret Kentgens-Craig in *The Bauhaus and America: First Contact, 1919-1936* (1999), fourteen books produced by the school between 1924 and 1928 had circulated here and in 1930 a Bauhaus exhibition had been organized in Cambridge by the Harvard Society for Contemporary Art.[9] There had also been an exhibition about the Bauhaus in 1931 at the John Becker Gallery in New York City.[10] Further aspects of first-generation modernism could have been observed in the entry by Walter Gropius (1883-1969) and Adolf Meyer (1881-1929) in the highly publicized Chicago Tribune building competition in 1922, as well as in such critical books as *Vers une architecture* (1923; revised 1924) by Le Corbusier, which had been published in English in 1927. In 1929 Hitchcock devoted a third of *Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration* to what he called "The New Pioneers,"[11] and the European émigrés Rudolf M. Schindler (1887-1953), Richard Neutra (1892-1970), Albert Frey (1903-1998), and William Lescaze (1896-1969) had already started building modern houses in America beginning in the late 1920s.[12] Further, consumer magazines had experimented with hybrid forms of modernism—as early as December 1928 the *House Beautiful* Home Builders' Service Bureau had published plans for "Our Modern House,"

---

[9] Margret Kentgens-Craig, *The Bauhaus and America: First Contact, 1919-1936* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999), 39, 72-73 and 142.

[10] "Adventures of Pioneering Bauhaus," *New York Times*, January 25, 1931.

[11] Henry-Russell Hitchcock Jr., *Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration* (New York: Payson & Clark, 1929), 153-222.

[12] Examples of their work before 1932 include the Frederick Field House (1931) by George Howe and William Lescaze in New Hartford, CT; the Aluminaire House (1931) by Kocher and Frey shown at the Architectural League of New York; the Jardinette Apartments (1927) and Lovell Health House (1929) by Richard Neutra in Los Angeles, and the R. M. Schindler house (1922) in Hollywood, California.

followed by another in January 1930, and in April 1931 *Ladies Home Journal* pictured a model modern house designed by Norman Bel Geddes (1893-1958).[13]

These examples, however, do not add up to a "fully established mode of architectural expression in the U.S., with relatively rich concentrations of practitioners and realized monuments in New York," as the architect Robert A. M. Stern has claimed about modernism.[14] Rather, as the architectural historian Neil Levine more perceptively observed, modernism in America was "an experimental, exurban, and elitist proposition" that did not become "the norm" until after World War II.[15] Stone was able to be a key figure in the process of modifying and distributing the International Style to the American public largely because the Museum of Modern Art had made its introduction. After its initial showing in New York City (albeit with mixed critical response and modest attendance), the International Style exhibition traveled to more than thirty American cities during a six-year period. Accompanied by two propagandistic tools—a catalogue, *Modern Architecture: International Exhibition*, and a book, *The International Style: Architecture Since 1922*—it introduced Americans to modern buildings in Europe as well as to some in America, designed between 1922 and 1932.[16] The curators chose the term *International Style* to describe these buildings because of their world-wide

---

[13] "Our Modern House," *House Beautiful*, December 1928 and "A Modern House," *House Beautiful* January 1930. This information was included in my paper, "Through the Eye of the Editor: Ethel Brown Power (1881-1969)," written for the Domesticity and Architecture course, CUNY Graduate Center, Spring 2000. The Norman Bel Geddes house is illustrated in Richard Guy Wilson, "Architecture in the Machine Age," in *The Machine Age in America, 1918-1941* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1986), 174.

[14] Stern, "International Style: Immediate Effects," 105.

[15] Levine, *Architecture of Wright*, 300-301.

[16] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 206; *Modern Architecture: International Exhibition* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1932) and Henry-Russell Hitchcock Jr. and Philip Johnson, *The International Style: Architecture Since 1922* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1932).

distribution and because of their simultaneous development in several different countries.[17] Alfred Hamilton Barr Jr. (1902-1981), the founding director of the museum, said in the preface to the book, "It should be made clear that the aesthetic qualities of the style are the principal concern of the authors," not the ideological, political, and sociological implications of the European approach, which had no meaning in America. [18] Hitchcock and Johnson agreed: they did not comment on the original utopian inspiration, nor did they stress the technological aspects of the movement, such as the advances in plate glass, which made it possible to span larger areas. Rather, as they identified the canonical works they stressed three simple, yet exclusive, principles—volume (rather than mass), regularity (rather than axial symmetry), and the avoidance of applied ornament—which could be easily grasped and remembered by a diverse audience so that modern architecture could be brought "home to the general public" and practically expressed in every line of building.[19] In essence, Hitchcock and Johnson took an aesthetic that was formulated in one set of circumstances at a specific moment and applied it to a different time and place. The difference was described in *Fortune* at the time: "In Europe, as a result of the prevalent postwar socialism, the crisis was met on social terms whereas in this country as a result of the traditional individualism of the people it was met in individualistic terms."[20]

---

[17] Museum of Modern Art, press release, February 7, 1932, MoMA Archives.

[18] Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson, *The International Style* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1995), 29.

[19] "Museum of Modern Art, New York City, Announces Exhibition of Modern Architecture," press release, n.d.; and press release, January 24, 1932, MoMA Archives.

[20] "The House That Works: I," *Fortune*, October 1935.

Although the stated goal of the exhibition was to provide a modern model for expansion and growth in America, it was actually quite narrow in scope because the International Style was introduced as a fully evolved, almost prepackaged, aesthetic. Touted by the museum as "the first fundamentally original and widely distributed style since the Gothic," it was meant to replace the "successive and simultaneous architectural fashions" founded on historicism (even though consumer publications did not fully adopt this approach and instead considered modernism as just one of many styles from which to choose).[21] While the catalogue presented a straightforward survey of nine architects and their work and included a section on housing by the critic Lewis Mumford (1895-1990), the book vacillated between providing a formalistic evaluation of European architecture after 1922 and giving instructions for future building, the latter making it reminiscent of nineteenth-century pattern books. As a result, it promoted a specific set of rules, advising that those who conformed to the principles could produce aesthetically sound buildings. Hitchcock later confessed that this approach "became a kind of awkward Bible, which it was not intended to be, of [a] cold style."[22]

To be sure, like many others, Stone used the exhibition as an "academic rule-book" since his ensuing projects display direct quotations from the European models.[23] He was also aware of the various roles that the museum, and its curators, took on as it made its first presentation of modern architecture to the American public. The museum

---

[21] Hitchcock and Johnson, *International Style*, 15 and Museum of Modern Art, press release, February 7, 1932, MoMA Archives.

[22] Henry-Russell Hitchcock, interview by Russell Lynes, January 6, 1971, Lynes Papers.

[23] Museum of Modern Art, "A Modern Museum: The 1939 Goodwin/Stone Building," press release, April 1989, MoMA Archives.

played "super-critic" by determining what was acceptable to be shown; "tastemaker" by seeking to "accelerate revolutionary changes in American architecture;" and "victorious fame maker" by doggedly pursuing various forms of media to publicize architecture as a new museum discipline and, more significantly, as a fashionable commodity for consumption.[24] Stone was greatly affected by this new approach to architecture in which the design was derived from high art, commodified for American popular culture, and promoted and disseminated by means of mass communication.

While there were those such as Stone intrigued with the International Style, others rejected it because the aesthetic derived from construction techniques, materials, and functional plans.[25] In his article "The International Style Lacks the Essence of Great Architecture," Columbia University's professor of architecture Talbot Faulkner Hamlin (1889-1956), well-known for his book *Greek Revival Architecture in America* (1944), accused the new aesthetic of completely surrendering to the industrial machine in its insistence on "economy, efficiency, and bareness" as opposed to the spontaneity and delight of great architecture. "Can it be that the International Style has never learned how to play?" he asked.[26] Royal Cortissoz (1869-1948), an art critic for the *New York Herald Tribune* who was trained in the classically inspired firm of McKim, Mead & White, further proclaimed: "This modern architecture marks the abdication of the architect as

---

[24] Alfred Barr, "'Tastemaking:' Mr. Barr of the Museum of Modern Art Files a General Demurrer," *New York Times,* September 25, 1960; Ada Louise Huxtable, "Trend-Setting Departures and Pinnacles of Excellence in U.S.," Architecture, *New York Times*, May 18, 1965; Williamson, *American Architects and the Mechanics of Fame*, 203; and Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 211-212. Also see Aline B. Saarinen, "Our Cultural Pattern: 1929—and Today," *New York Times*, October 17, 1954.

[25] H. I. Brock, "Architecture Styled 'International;' Its Principles Set Forth in Models Displayed in a New York Exhibition," *New York Times*, February 7, 1932.

[26] Talbot Hamlin, "The International Style Lacks the Essence of Great Architecture," *American Architect*, 143 (January 1933): 12-16.

artist and his subjection to a mode of international standardization. He accepts a common denominator of expression...eschews decorative detail as though there were something evil about it." He predicted that with such "bleak looking buildings...we do not envision 'modern' architecture as getting a very lasting foothold in the United States."[27]

It was in the midst of this deliberation and uncertainty that Stone landed a new client, Richard H. Mandel (1906-1967; fig. 41), who wanted to build a thirty-room house in New York's Westchester County.[28] Admittedly "enamored of the sleek mechanics of the International Style," Stone began to experiment as he set out to design the house on sixty acres overlooking the Croton Reservoir.[29] Stone had been led to the commission by Donald Deskey, with whom he had collaborated at Radio City Music Hall (figs. 25 and 40), and together they worked with Mandel, heir to the fortune of the Chicago-based Mandel Brothers department store (1855-c.1960), who was then one of Deskey's associates.[30] Stone recollected in his autobiography that Mandel "was interested in a good

---

[27] Royal Cortissoz, quoted in Lynes, *Good Old Modern*, 209-210.

[28] The Mandel house sold in June 2006 to owners intent on preserving it.

[29] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 89. Stone was assisted by an architect named Thomas Williams (1902-1967), who signed a number of the plans, details, elevations, and sketches, including some with furniture layouts, which are in the 2nd accession of the Stone Papers. According to a letter Stone wrote to Williams on March 4, 1958 (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, files 13), he and Williams had met in Europe when Stone was traveling as a Rotch scholar. Listed in the Manhattan telephone directory beginning in 1933, Williams had had a similar career path to Stone's: he graduated from the architecture school at Harvard in 1927 and was a "draftsman-designer" for Shepley, Bulfinch & Abbott in 1929 before working in New York City. See American Institute of Architects, *American Architects Directory*, 1st ed., s.v. "Williams, Thomas."

[30] In an interview with the author, Stephen Mandel said his father studied design in Paris before returning to the United States to become an associate of Deskey's, for whom he not only provided furniture designs but probably financial backing as well. The earliest documentation of their professional association is in Off the Record, *Fortune,* October 1935, where it is stated that Mandel had also been an apprentice at Bon Marché in Paris. According to Manhattan telephone directories Mandel worked at Deskey's Rockefeller Center office at 630 Fifth Avenue from 1936 to 1942.

business arrangement and I was interested in undertaking my first modern house, so I worked for forty dollars a week."[31]

As his earliest attempt at International Style architecture, the design for the two-story house utilized the formalistic vocabulary and methods for arranging plans and façades codified in the exhibition. At least initially, then, Stone viewed modernism as a closed stylistic system—an aggregation of fixed forms—rather than as an attitude, an idea, or a cultural expression. His effort epitomized the early American interpretation of the International Style, which gave primacy to what was visually obvious. Stone's pictorial approach of cutting and pasting previously conceived images by others utilized his Beaux-arts training and showed his awareness of the aesthetic clichés distributed by Hitchcock and Johnson.

Beginning with the floor plan, Stone drew inspiration directly from the pinwheel configurations of the 1926 Bauhaus building by Gropius in Dessau, Germany. The zigzag-shaped plan of the house is essentially divided into three rectangular areas (fig. 42): the first, containing the living room, library, and terrace below the master bedroom, dressing room and bath; the second, containing the ground-floor entrance, the rest of the first-floor public rooms, two guest rooms, and family bedrooms; and the third, the servants' rooms, squash court, and garage.

The house was also "under the influence" (as Johnson said) of "the great innovator" Le Corbusier, whose Five Points for a New Architecture were frankly

---

[31] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 32. Forty dollars is equal to about $542 today (Inflation Calculator, www.westegg.com/inflation).

utilized.[32] The white stuccoed steel and concrete block structure was supported on load-bearing columns (Le Corbusier's *plan libre*) making it possible for the façade, a non-load-bearing membrane (*façade libre*), to contain long horizontal strip windows of flush plate glass (*fenêtres en longueur*), which provided a mechanism for maximum viewing of the outside world.[33] The thin Lally columns (*pilotis*) on the western side elevate the house so that the ground underneath is available for a terrace overlooking the reservoir (fig. 43). They support one of the three flat roofs containing sun-deck or roof gardens (*toît-jardin*), which Hitchcock subsequently observed were "almost the sign-manual of the International Style in the early days."[34] There were other references to Le Corbusier as well: The open plan that combined the living room, stair hall, and library into one spacious unit that could be divided with curtains (fig. 44) was a feature Le Corbusier used in a number of his houses, beginning in 1923 with his maisons La Roche; and the streamlined aluminum railings of the staircase (fig. 45), evoking the image of a ship, a quintessential machine-age symbol, recall those in Corbusier's monumental Villa Savoye (1928-1929) in Poissy-sur-Seine, France, which had been illustrated in Hitchcock and Johnson's *International Style* book.[35] Moreover, both the Mandel house and the Villa Savoye sit starkly alone as machinelike images on manicured green lawns (as opposed to

---

[32] Philip Johnson to Ernestine M. Fantl, August 15, 1935, MoMA Archives, The Recent Work of Le Corbusier, Exhibition File, no. 43, October 24, 1935–January 2, 1936. Johnson was impressed with the Mandel house since he also suggested in the letter that "the Deskey House Mandel" be included in the traveling exhibition on Le Corbusier.

[33] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 7.

[34] Henry-Russell Hitchcock, "International Style Twenty Years After," in Hitchcock and Johnson, *International Style* (1965), 96.

[35] Mies van der Rohe also used curtains to separate the dining room and library in his Tugendhat house (1930) in Brno, Czechoslovakia. See Terence Riley and Barry Bergdoll, *Mies in Berlin* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2001), 245.

the houses of Frank Lloyd Wright, which more naturally merge into the landscape). *Architectural Forum* fittingly described the image: "Like a giant airplane the [Mandel] house seems to partake of the openness of the landscape and the sky. Harmony is successfully accomplished with nature's setting by means of contrast rather than a blending with the soil."[36] The machine symbolism is further expressed in the prominently positioned garage to house the ennobled automobile, as opposed to the subordinate entrance to the left of the house at the end of the winding half-mile-long driveway.[37]

Other references to early European modernism include the dramatically curved dining room, which is repeated in the surrounding exterior wall and sharply contrasts with the otherwise rectilinear shapes of the house, a feature not utilized just by Le Corbusier, but also by Oud, and even Mies van der Rohe in his semicircular dining room in Tugendhat house (1930) in Brno, Czechoslovakia. But the curve was most strongly articulated in the work of Erich Mendelsohn (1887-1953), who, in his drawings for the Schocken Department Store (1926-1928) in Stuttgart, Germany, layered the curve to create a streamlined effect. Further, the parapet walls that frame the front façade were originally planted with evergreens (fig. 46), reminiscent of one that Mendelsohn designed for his Nimmo House (1934) in Shrub's Wood, Buckinghamshire, England.

In spite of the modern impulse behind the Mandel house, there were certain aspects of the plan that Stone could not work out using a formalistic application of the International Style. Even though the grand public rooms—living room, library, and hall—signaled the new open plan (fig. 44), many of the more utilitarian rooms,

---

[36] "House of Richard H. Mandel," *Architectural Forum* 63 (August 1935): 79.

[37] See "Automobiles," in Le Corbusier, *Towards A New Architecture* (New York: Dover Publications, 1986), 129-148.

particularly on the ground floor, are broken down into smaller, distinctly enclosed spaces following traditional American houses whose room shapes and sizes were derived from the plan rather from function. Thus, the house demonstrates Stone's earliest progression from traditional to modern design.

Because there were still few examples of International Style houses in America, the Mandel house attracted a lot of publicity: by 1940 it had been featured in more than fifteen publications of various kinds, from newspapers and trade journals to mass-market magazines. Even before it was completed, the house had been praised in a *New York Times* article entitled "A $60,000 Dwelling Being Erected at Mount Kisco," in which a model was pictured. Not only was the expense (equal to about $812,800 today[38]) noteworthy, but so was the design—described as "a radical departure from the conventional house in plan, construction and use of materials." Intrigued with the modern features that Stone exploited or modified in order to meet the needs of his American client, the article proclaimed the house's modernity in its horizontal lines diversified with a single curved surface, the derivation of the exterior façade from the plan, the contrasting surfaces of white stucco and flush plate glass, and the absence of ornamentation, all elements Stone had observed in the International Style exhibition.[39] Subsequent articles also focused on the flexible plan that responded to family needs and on the integration of the interior and exterior—not only through the use of terraces and sun-decks but also by the use of glass bricks that allowed for sunny rooms but avoided the "goldfish bowl" effect (i.e. people could not see in; fig. 50). The flush plate-glass

---

[38] "A $60,000 Dwelling Is Being Erected at Mount Kisco," *New York Times*, December 31, 1933 and the Inflation Calculator.

[39] "A $60,000 Dwelling Being Erected."

windows running the full length of the living room were "the most dramatic point in the entire modern house," at least to Mary Fanton Roberts who included it in her 1936 book *Inside 100 Homes* (fig. 47). [40] The reviews also noted the use of other modern materials—stucco, Formica, Bakelite, monel metal, linoleum, and cork—as well as cutting-edge technologies—air conditioning, fire-proofing, and a new type of plaster with insulating properties.

As opposed to the International Style exhibition, which sparked a debate about modernism, the overall tone of the reviews about the Mandel house was favorable, indicating that in just three years the polemic about modernism had become less so—at least with the critics. Still, the emphasis was on identifying the aspects that made the house modern—particularly the honest, straightforward, and unadorned qualities—in an effort to educate, if not convince, the public: It is "the expression of modernism at its best" said one critic, while another exclaimed that it was "one of the latest and most outstanding examples of the International Style in America."[41] Significantly, however, modern design was not offered as a replacement for other styles, as the museum had hoped, but rather as just one of many, as exemplified by Harry V. Anderson (d. 1983), then editor-in-chief and publisher of *Decorators Digest*, who informed his readers that for a house as large as the Mandel house, "modern was the natural choice for style

---

[40] Mary Fanton Roberts, *Inside 100 Homes* (New York: Robert M. McBride, 1936), 90.

[41] Harry V. Anderson, "For Modern Living," *Decorators Digest* 5 (August 1935): 29 and 100 and "The Mandel House: A Home Resulting From Close Cooperation Between Architect, Decorator and Owner," *Interior Decorator* 95 (August 1935): 34.

because it has those desirable qualities, even in mass production, which other styles lack."[42]

Excitement about the Mandel house was not limited to "architectural circles," as Stone later recalled. The American photographer Edward Steichen (1897-1997) staged a *Vogue* fashion shoot at the house in 1935 (fig. 48), and the editors at *Fortune*, after seeing an article about the house in the August 1935 issue of *Decorators Digest*, asked for permission to publish the photographs in "The House That Works I" in its October issue (fig. 49).[43] Stone was reportedly pleased, no doubt because of the increased exposure: the circulation of *Fortune* was nearly ninety-four thousand as opposed to the forty-four hundred at *Decorators Digest*.[44]

Equally significant, the Mandel house was praised for what was seen as its original, distinctly American expression, as exemplified in 1935 by *Architectural Forum*, which stated, "There is no blind following of the European so-called International Style, no smugness, no dependence for elegance upon the dead glamour of the past." Instead, Stone boldly "translated a theory and scheme of living into the physical form in which to live."[45] It contained many amenities associated with the leisure activities of other spacious American country houses, including a billiard room, squash court, and swimming pool. While modern in the sense of simple and clean design, there was also a

---

[42] Anderson, "For Modern Living," 100.

[43] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 32 and 42; "Washable Dinner Dresses" and "Summer Cycle," *Vogue*, June 15, 1935; and Harry V. Anderson, "Edward Durell Stone: Architect," *Interior Design* 30 (May 1959): 79. Also see David A. Hanks, "The Eric Brill Collection and The Richard H. Mandel House," *Sotheby's Important 20th Century Design*, December 9, 2005, 206-207.

[44] *Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals* (Philadelphia: N. W. & Son's Ayer, 1935), 626 and (Philadelphia: N. W. & Son's Ayer, 1936), 619.

[45] "House of Richard H. Mandel," *Architectural Forum* 63 (August 1935): 79.

consistent, but subtle, indication of glamour and luxury articulated in the dramatic lighting, materials, and even the stylized bar room, containing the mural by Witold Gordon (fig. 50; who had also designed some of the lounge murals at Radio City Music Hall). As a result, it reflected the individuals who lived there—their life style and interests: "One feels that this is a house designed for a person who knows what he wants to do with his time," observed *Architectural Forum*.[46]

Surprisingly, however, no correlations have been made between the interiors of the Mandel house and the highly acclaimed American art deco interiors of Radio City Music Hall, completed just two years earlier under the direction of Deskey. The Mandel house dining room echoes the circular dining room in the private apartment of Samuel Lionel "Roxy" Rothafel (1882-1936) in the music hall, which also contained a Deskey-designed dining table with center lights (figs. 51-52). Also similar to the music hall, the Mandel house is a rare example of a modern American *Gesamtkunstwerk*, where every detail contributed to the whole; the house contained some sixty-five pieces of furniture and lighting devices by Deskey (probably with the aid of Mandel).[47] Although Anderson noted in *Decorators Digest* that "the house has the innate integrity as a true work of art," neither he nor anyone else extended the discussion on the modern *Gesamtkunstwerk* and its relationship to the antecedents, no doubt because such settings were still unique in modern America.[48] As Kristina Wilson discussed in *Livable Modernism: Interior*

---

[46] Ibid., 80.

[47] For a more detailed discussion about the furnishings, see Mary Anne Hunting, The Richard H. Mandel House in Bedford Hills, New York," Living With Antiques, *The Magazine Antiques*, July 2001 and David A. Hanks, "Brill Collection and Mandel House."

[48] Anderson, "For Modern Living," 29.

Decorating and Design during the Great Depression (2004) even though the "ensemble strategy" was especially suitable to modern design, at the time it was more of a marketing tool for the homefurnishings industries than a reality in the home.[49]

Nonetheless, Deskey did stress that the cooperation between Stone, Mandel, and himself was key to the success of the house. He wrote, "Modern architecture, perhaps more than other styles demands...collaboration."[50] In their 1936 publication, *Art and the Machine: An Account of Industrial Design in 20th-Century America*, Sheldon (1886-1980) and Martha Candler (1889-1973) Cheney, considered the Mandel house "one of the most pleasing monuments of the new building in America," especially because of the collaborative effort, which they felt was usually not the case in industrially designed architecture.[51] Collaborations between architect, designer, and patron were not a new concept, but there had been little opportunity to apply the concept to International Style houses in America.[52]

The collaboration on the Mandel house may have been especially successful because of the experience Deskey brought to the project. Although listed as an "interior decorator" in the New York City directory of 1934 and 1935, he had been deeply involved in the conceptualization of the design, judging by three contemporary records that note, respectively, that Deskey "cooperated in the plans for the architecture;" was

---

[49] Kristina Wilson, *Livable Modernism: Interior Decorating and Design During the Great Depression* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 17.

[50] "Mandel House: A Home Resulting From Close Cooperation," 8.

[51] Sheldon and Martha Candler Cheney, *Art and the Machine: An Account of Industrial Design in 20th-Century America* (1936; New York: Acanthus Press, 1992), 164.

[52] For example see Mary Anne Hunting, "The Reform Club in London: A Nineteenth-Century Collaboration," *The Magazine Antiques*, June 1994.

"co-designer and decorator;" and was "interior architect."[53] As for Mandel, Stone was pleased that his "venturesome client" was "willing to go the limit with modern ideas" to bring about a "very profitable and interesting study" instead of the "little whimsical colonial bungalows" that everyone was building at the time.[54] Although Mandel's specific contributions are not known, a contemporary account confirms that "the owner of the house…labored continually with the other two in arriving at the total architectural solution."[55]

The Mandel house has continually been viewed as "typically the machine house," as the Cheneys described it in 1938, harking back to the famous epithet by Le Corbusier in 1923—"The house is a machine for living in."[56] More recently, in the catalogue to the groundbreaking exhibition *Machine Age in America, 1918-1941* (1986), the architectural historian Richard Guy Wilson impressed upon the reader that the rounded dining room extrusion and extended second-floor deck of the Mandel house represent the "sleek streamlined body, the machine in motion."[57] However, some, perhaps even Stone, were conflicted about whether to glorify the mechanical aspects of the house and therefore the impersonal and functional, or to champion its decorative aspect with an accent on living. The Cheneys tried to see it as both: they said the machine served "as purveyor" in bringing about comfort, convenience, and even luxury (although "the erring if any is on

---

[53] "The Mandel House: A Home Resulting from Close Cooperation," 81; Anderson, "For Modern Living," 29; and Cheney, *Art and the Machine*, 164.

[54] Stone to Edgell, May 23, 1934 and transcript for the *Merv Griffin Show*, May 28, 1965, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 72, file 5.

[55] Cheney, *Art and the Machine*, 164.

[56] Ibid. and Le Corbusier, *Towards A New Architecture*, 4.

[57] Wilson, "Architecture in the Machine Age," 174.

the side of unadornment"), but fortunately the Mandel house did not lose its modern integrity because its austerity, usually associated with modernism, was so successfully modified.[58]

While the initial criticism of the Mandel house did not pay attention to Stone's classical sentiments (which later became the cornerstone of his work), in his compendium *Forms and Functions of Twentieth Century Architecture* (1952) Talbot Hamlin discussed the "true visual axis" of the main stair hall, the center of circulation and communication between the three main floors of the house: "The approach from the main entrance through the hall up the entrance stairs and into the living room is a sequence experience as visually exciting as the plan is natural and efficient," (fig. 53) he wrote.[59] This procession of rooms reflects Stone's consciousness of the dramatic classical axes he would have seen in Europe, such as the reconstructed Ecole nationale des Beaux-arts (c.1832) by Félix Duban or the Paris Opera House (1857-1874) by Charles Garnier.[60] But short of this one observation about the classical approach, the house has never been considered in relation to the architect's Beaux-arts predisposition.

Generally speaking, the response to the house underscores the American public's limited exposure to, or apprehension of, modernism. For example, *Fortune*'s Off the Record column commented that the "natives" were "puzzled but respectful" of "the Glass

---

[58] Cheney, *Art and the Machine*, 162-164.

[59] Talbot Hamlin, *Forms and Functions of Twentieth-Century Architecture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), 208. He also admired the subsidiary sequence from the living room through the library to the dining room.

[60] See David Van Zanten, "Felix Duban and the Buildings of the Ecole Des Beaux-Arts, 1832-1840," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 37 (October 1978): 161-174.

House."[61] At the time, many were still wondering if the International Style was "a fad or fancy—or at best an 'international' makeshift, like pigeon English" or whether it possessed "permanent value," enabling it to transcend "ephemeral fashion."[62] On the other hand, the more well-informed, such as Anderson, who steadfast in his belief that the Mandel house was "the answer to all of us who have been skeptical of the International or Modern style," was convinced that Stone's building would be "the yardstick by which the true modern conception of Architecture and Decoration will be measured in the future."[63] But by 1945 the house had already become an historical archetype of the International Style of the 1930s, as George Nelson (1908-1986) and Henry Wright (1910-1986) observed in *Tomorrow's House: How to Plan Your Postwar Home Now*, based on such signature characteristics as the white stucco walls and the corner windows. They concluded that "the modern approach has become considerably more catholic since the days of its early importation from Europe—and incidentally, more to the liking of most people."[64] By 1967 the house was deemed an icon of the "Bauhaus tradition" in America and was accorded the prestige of being "one of the finest houses in the United States" in the *Christian Science Monitor*.[65] But Stone was no longer associated with the International Style, having noted the broad apprehension by the public early on. In fact, according to Stone, the modern house (fig. 54) he completed for Ulrich and Elizabeth

---

[61] Off the Record, 34.

[62] Brock, "Architecture Styled 'International'" and Anderson, "For Modern Living," 100.

[63] Harry V. Anderson, "*Modernity*," *Decorators Digest* 5 (August 1935): 25.

[64] George Nelson and Henry Wright, *Tomorrow's House: How to Plan Your Post-War Home Now* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945), fig. 195.

[65] Favre, "Simplicity, Order, and Permanence."

Kowalski between 1934 and 1936 sparked such a strong reaction in the community that zoning ordinances were changed "to prevent further shocks to their sensibilities."[66]

In recent years, there has been considerable publicity about the Mandel house partly because there is a renewed interest in the International Style but also because the house has been painstakingly preserved and offered for sale. On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the International Style exhibition, Stern deemed the house "the most important example of the superficial application of the International Style" following the 1932 exhibition; although "elaborate," he said, it is not the "purest" example. But what post-exhibition International Style house in America is pure? For as the Mandel house reviews of the 1930s had revealed, it was more desirable to have a hybrid American form than the European original. As opposed to Stern's ambiguous conclusion—that the house "seems to make no real point"—it can be more convincingly argued that as a prototype, the Mandel house is a notable statement about the divergent responses to the International Style: apprehension and misunderstanding versus intrigue and optimism.[67]

Subsequent to the Mandel house, in 1936 Stone worked on a fascinating, yet little known, project in the International Style—the "ideal modern house for a man of moderate means" for *Collier's*—a literary magazine with a circulation of more than 2.5 million under the direction of William Ludlow Chenery (1894-1974), editor-in-chief between 1925 and 1943, and owned by Crowell Publishing Company in Springfield,

---

[66] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 32. For more about the Kowalski house see "Recent Work by Edward D. Stone," *Architectural Forum* 75 (July 1941): 22-23.

[67] Stern, "International Style: Immediate Effects," 107.

Ohio.[68] While it is not known how the project came about, a series of six articles promoting the house design was published over two months between March 28 and May 30, 1936, containing not only floor plans but also picturing a model by Theodore E. Conrad (1910-1994) of Jersey City, New Jersey, the maker of most of the Stone models, as well as working drawings and specifications, which could be bought for three dollars (figs. 55-58).[69] Although this was the first of a number of house plans that Stone created for magazine publications between the 1930s and early 1950s, modern plans had already started appearing in such magazines as *House Beautiful* and *House & Garden.*[70] While the precedent was undoubtedly nineteenth-century pattern books, these plans were a modern form of communication targeted at the mass public.

Although not promoted as such in the magazine, those close to Stone knew that the eight-room house was actually "a smaller Mandel house."[71] A comparison of the plans of the two designs (figs. 42 and 56) reveals that for the *Collier's* house Stone simply eliminated the more traditional rear rectangular volume of the Mandel house with the servants' rooms, squash court, guest rooms, garage, and two bedrooms. By turning

---

[68] John T. Flynn, "A Good Place to Live," *Collier's*, March 28, 1936 and "Crowell's Have Largest Magazine Audience," *Springfield (OH) News-Sun*, November ?, 1937.

[69] For more about Theodore Conrad see Carter B. Horsley, "Modelmakers' Work Gaining New Recognition," *New York Times*, July 28, 1974; David W. Dunlap, "Theodore Conrad, 84, Modeler And Architecture Preservationist," *New York Times*, August 20, 1994; and "In Scale," The Talk of the Town, *New Yorker*, July 7, 1956. For the advertisement see Ruth Carson, "Lights On!" *Collier's*, September 14, 1940. Plans and elevations for the *Collier's* house are in the Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 95, file 15 and K-19.

[70] This information is based on research for my paper entitled "Through the Eye of the Editor: Ethel Brown Power (1881-1969)." As the editor of *House Beautiful* between 1923 and 1933, Power was instrumental in introducing the American public to modernism as well as adapting its concepts for middle-class consumption.

[71] Meeting with Martial & Co. and Ben Raeburn, Horizon Press, October 31, 1962, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 5, file 16.

the house around and placing the façade with the semicircular dining room at the back (fig. 55), Stone disregarded the traditional American model in which the most dramatic image is projected on the front and the function is at the back of the house.[72] The entrance—here centered on the simpler front façade as opposed to the side of the Mandel house (46)—is screened by a perforated wall that also created a private interior courtyard, a feature Stone favored in subsequent designs. The pattern of the wall echoes that of the glass bricks used elsewhere, most notably in the curved dining room wall, as well as in the second-floor stairwell and two bathrooms (fig. 55). (In subsequent projects the perforated wall would evolve into Stone's signature grille.) On the sides of the *Collier's* house, the horizontal strip windows recall those on the Mandel house, but the rest of the windows are made of larger pieces of plate glass, and the parapet wall with plantings that stood in front of the Mandel house has been moved up to the second floor to surround the sun-deck.

The Stone "masterpiece," as it was called, was first introduced in the magazine's Next Week column in the March 21, 1936 issue:

> For years we have been hearing about the modern house, with its marvels of comfort and convenience; its amazing economy and attractiveness. Recently Collier's retained one of the foremost modern architects to design the perfect house for a man of moderate means. There followed a series of conferences with experts in all lines, to determine the best arrangement, materials and form. An exact model was built and specifications were drawn. The resultant masterpiece is described next week.[73]

Subsequently, in the first and most important article, "A Good Place to Live," John T. Flynn described the house as a "healthful, pleasant, private, serviced modern home"

---

[72] See Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour, *Learning from Las Vegas: The Forgotten Symbolism of Architectural Form* (1977; repr., Cambridge: MA: MIT Press, 2001), 105 and 114.

[73] Next Week, *Collier's*, March 31, 1936.

designed for a 100- by 150-foot lot and priced between twelve and sixteen thousand dollars (about $170,000 today).[74] Even though a quarter of the price of the Mandel house, it was designed to give "practically every useful aid to good living according to 1936 standards that can be found in the dwellings of men of wealth." No reference was made to the more specific term *International Style.* Instead this "modern" example was offered as just one among many stylistic alternatives, including the "Colonial, or Spanish or Old English or what-not," which was still typical during this period.[75]

Cognizant of the potential resistance to the modern aesthetic, Flynn cautioned the reader, "You may not like the modern house." Recalling earlier descriptions of the Mandel house, he explained: "But it has an idea behind it of which the exterior design is a mere incident. It has been called a 'machine for living.' That is the revolutionary idea which is hidden away in this new architecture." He highlighted the fact that until recently, small house design had received little attention, with builders clinging to traditional methods of planning and to orthodox materials. However, the *Collier's* house, he proudly announced, "breaks away from a number of chains which have bound the small house slavishly to the past." By emphasizing the advantages of modern planning—particularly the idea of designing from the inside out for health, comfort, and convenience for the entire family—he proclaimed, "The time when you had to arrange your life to suit your house is past. Now you can begin with your requirements for living and building your house to fit them. That's what 'modern architecture' means." The modern American

---

[74] The Inflation Calculator. Flynn had previously been managing editor of the *New York Globe* according to Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1885-1905* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957), 470.

[75] Flynn, "A Good Place to Live" and Wilson, *Livable Modernism*, 16.

features of the *Collier's* house were cleverly contrasted with traditional features in an effort to educate the average consumer: a heated two-car garage attached to the house as opposed to the traditional converted stable at the back; a garden courtyard serving as an "outdoor living room" in the front as well as a garden in the rear, both of which are private, instead of yards that are "disclosed to the world;" flexible room arrangements instead of the established arrangement of a porch and living room on the front with the kitchen in the rear; and laundry and maid's quarters near the kitchen instead of the laundry in the cellar and maid's quarters in the attic. State-of-art utilities and technologies (heating and air conditioning systems, fire- and soundproofing, insulation, and mechanical equipment), modern materials (linoleum, glass brick, cork, terrazzo, Formica, and rubber tile), a judicious use of space (closets and storage), and an emphasis on the out-of-doors (terraces, roof decks, and plate-glass windows) were among the many amenities.[76]

The subsequent four articles included, "What's a Garden for?" which presented the concept of a garden as an outdoor extension of the house (fig. 58): "The modern house is making demands on the garden that have never been made before," its author Ruth Carson explained. Unlike traditional houses, all the primary living spaces in the *Collier's* house were designed to face the rear garden, enclosed by a surrounding five-foot wall so that it too could become a private living room.[77] The third article, "Night Life at Home," explained that the enormous developments in lighting during the past few years had affected not just the functional and scientific but also the architectural and

---

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ruth Carson, "What's a Garden For?" *Collier's*, April 11, 1936.

decorative aspects, with coves, cornices, louvers, and flush panels of glass now available.[78] The fourth article "Money To Build Your Home" described how an insured loan could be obtained under the National Housing Act. Interestingly, it stated that the Federal Housing Authority, an organization that historically did not endorse modern design, had enthusiastically approved the house plans.[79] The fifth article, "Home is Like This," explored interior decoration alternatives, with emphasis given to the idea that there is no fixed modern style but rather a consistent approach utilizing new and interesting spaces.[80] The sixth article, "The Cook Gets the Last Word," illustrated two different kitchen plans.[81]

While the Mandel house had obviously played a part in transforming the social and moral progressiveness underlying the European International Style into a capitalistic aesthetic appealing primarily to well-heeled Americans by virtue of having been widely published, the *Collier's* house design, and other subsequent paper projects created by Stone during the Great Depression, forced him to modify his vision for the more pragmatic middle-class consumer in America. Moreover, instead of collaging formal devices onto the surface as he had done with the Mandel house, for this design Stone was

---

[78] Marie Beynon Ray, "Night Life at Home," *Collier's*, April 25, 1936.

[79] George Creel, "Money to Build Your Home," *Collier's*, May 2, 1936. In *No Place Like Utopia*: *Modern Architecture and the Company We Kept* (New York: Knopf, 1993), 139, Peter Blake wrote about "the horrendous obstacles constructed by public and private agencies" towards modern architecture: "It is difficult to remember today that mortgage banks, building code enforcers, and others in charge of determining architectural taste in the United States were generally opposed to anything 'modern.'"

[80] Helen G. Thompson, "Home Is Like This," *Collier's*, May 16, 1936.

[81] Betty Thornley Stuart, "The Cook Gets the Last Word," *Collier's*, May 30, 1936.

required to consider the needs of the average American family in terms of domestic comfort and function.[82]

When the editors of *Architectural Forum* wrote about the Mandel house in 1935, "The Jones will take it or leave it: most likely, when they understand it better, they will want one like it," little did they realize just how popular the prototype would become in a reduced version with the general public.[83] Some twelve hundred people reportedly bought the *Collier's* house plan during the first three months it was available for sale by the magazine: "That's enough to house a community of six thousand and make a completely modern town," a *Collier's* advertisement informed its readers in May 1936. In addition, the house model was shown in 1938 in an Exhibition of Models of Houses by Contemporary American Architects at W & J Sloane (1852-1987) in New York City. The home furnishings store had organized the exhibition in collaboration with *Architectural Record*, which also illustrated the photographs of the front and back of the model taken for the exhibition in June 1938 by the respected photographer Mattie Edward Hewitt (d.1956).[84]

Although six houses built according to the *Collier's* plan have been located, Stone was aware of only one, built in 1937 by Edward Clifford Jones Jr. (1899-1982) on a large piece of wooded property in Fairmont, West Virginia (fig. 59). Even though a conservative man, according to Jones's son, as the owner of a successful women's retail store founded by the family in 1900, Jones was abreast of current fashions and trends and

---

[82] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 203.

[83] "House of Richard H. Mandel," 79-80.

[84] "Co-Operative Exhibitions Attract Prospective Clients," *Architectural Record* 83 (June 1938): 84.

was therefore interested in owning a house considered "far ahead of its time."[85] Indeed, the photographs highlight the sharp contrast between his modern house and the traditional agrarian landscape that surrounded it. Jones modified the Stone plan in a number of ways, including the addition of a wall with plantings around the rear façade (as at the Mandel house); a raised rear terrace; a solid, instead of perforated, front wall; different window arrangements; and a small curvilinear planter on the front.[86] The second-floor interior was also reworked so that instead of all three bedrooms running along the rear sun-deck, there is only one bedroom—with a covered terrace to the east—while the other two bedrooms without sun-decks were positioned on the front.

When the Jones house was awarded honorable mention in the *House Beautiful* twelfth annual small house competition in 1940, such International Style features as its square volume, flat roofs, smooth walls, flush glass panels, and glass blocks were mentioned in addition to Stone's successful integration of the exterior and interior in the design.[87] However, its conservative, American edge was also noted: it was admired for being "far from the boxy building many people visualize when you mention Modern" with its "definite charm" resulting from its success at adapting to the sloping site and blending in with the wooded landscape, which was markedly different from the stark presentation of the Mandel house. Moreover, the white-painted brick walls, considered an

---

[85] Edward C. Jones III, interview by the author, May 14, 2005. In a letter of September 6, 1962, Edward C. Jones wrote to A. C. McNeill that they kept the house "modern" by adding a swimming pool, a "fin" over the rear terrace (visible in the *House Beautiful* photograph) and full length sliding glass doors in the living, dining, and recreation rooms as well as in the basement (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, 13).

[86] I would like to thank Mr. and Mrs. Edward Jones III for providing this information as well as photographs.

[87] "12th Annual Small House Competition," *House Beautiful*, March 1940.

uncharacteristically modern feature in the strictest sense, was admired because the bricks were "just rough enough in texture to reflect light vibrantly."[88]

Four others built soon after the *Collier's* articles include the Doris Dockstader Rooney (b. 1909) house in Dodge City, Kansas, and the Charles Augustus Wallace (1903-1944) house in Columbia, South Carolina, both of which were completed in 1937 (figs. 60-61); and the William C. Ilfeld (1905-1979) house in Las Vegas, New Mexico, and the Maurice L. Miller house in Louisville, Kentucky, both completed in 1938 (figs. 62-63).[89] The owners were from varying professional backgrounds: Mrs. Rooney was a homemaker whose husband, George Bernard Rooney Jr. (1908-1971) was a grain farmer and banker; Wallace owned a concrete pipe company; Miller was a sanitation engineer for the county health department; and Ilfeld, about whom the most is known, worked for the successful mercantile company founded by his grandfather Charles Ilfeld (1847-1929) after emigrating from Hamburg in 1867.[90] Clearly, the plans attracted successful people in small towns or cities who did not have ready access to an architect well versed in modernism.

All the houses were modified to meet individual needs or tastes, such as repositioning the garage or eliminating the perforation in the front wall. In at least two of

---

[88] Ibid.

[89] See Sam C. Molloy's obituary in the *Eddyville (KY) Herald Ledger*, August 7, 1974.

[90] Perhaps William Ilfeld used his inheritance to build his house since his father, Herman, who was treasurer of the company, died in 1935. See William J. Parish, *The Charles Ilfeld Company: A Study of the Rise and Decline of Mercantile Capitalism in New Mexico* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961), 346-347. According to the author's interview with his sister, Charlotte I. Rubin on July 6, 2005, Ilfeld was "a very original man." He lived in the house only until he joined the army during World War II, after which he studied geology and then gemology. He subsequently made his own line of jewelry that was sold under his own signature to such retail stores as Lord & Taylor, Marshall Field, and Bonwit Teller. His work is illustrated in Nancy N. Schiffer, *Silver Jewelry Treasures* (Atglen, PA: Schiffer Publishing, 1993), 100.

the houses, regional architects adapted the plans: William Gordon Lyles (1913-1981), a draftsman and designer for the firm Wessinger & Stork in Columbia and Samuel Calvin Molloy (d.1974), who headed his own firm in Louisville between 1935 and 1952. Nonetheless certain features remained consistent: The houses were all of concrete block covered with stucco; had white-painted rectangular façades juxtaposed with curvilinear dining rooms; had ribbon windows and flat roofs; retained the first- and second-story sun-decks and terraces; and had primary rooms opening to the outdoors. All were modern prototypes in their respective cities, in some cases reportedly set the standard by which others followed. Kathryn Wallace Salley (fig. 61b) recalled about the Columbia house in which she grew up, "People came from all over and asked to see it because they thought it was a very strange house. But I was very proud to live there; I loved my house."[91]

Two of the houses were written up in the local newspapers before they were completed: "The home carries the modernistic theme with many features of ultra-modernism without forsaking comfort and livableness," the *Hutchinson (KS) News* said about the Rooney house; and an article entitled "But People Do Live in Glass Houses" in the *Louisville Courier-Journal* claimed that the Miller house, which was erected in an area that had been devastated by floods in 1937, "will be one of the most modernistic in this section of the country."[92] Interestingly, while the *House Beautiful* article about the Jones house clearly stated at the top "Architect Edward D. Stone New York," the

---

[91] Kathryn Wallace Salley, interview by the author, November 9, 2004. See also Robert P. Stockton, "Carolina Landmark," *Columbia (SC) State Newspaper*, August 27, 1978 and Danny C. Flanders, "International Flair 'Modern' Architecture Lends Unusual Touch to the City Neighborhoods," *State Newspaper*, February 6, 1994.

[92] "Charm in New Home; The Rooney House Is Modernistic in Design and Fittings But It Possesses Comfort and Character—Furnishings in Many Tones of Green," *Hutchinson (KS) News*, May 10, 1937 and "But People Do Live In Glass Houses," *Louisville Courier-Journal*, November 20, 1938. The Molloy house was the second modern house in the area; the other one is more Miesian.

Courier-Journal article did not mention Stone and instead pictured a drawing by "Sam C. Molloy, Architect" (fig. 63).[93] Twice removed from the Mandel house, the authorship of the design was no longer meaningful, or necessary, for it to be favorably received.

Just recently, a sixth house was discovered in Newark, Delaware, which was built in 1948 by a retired army colonel Stuart Randall Carswell (d. 1949) and his wife, Priscilla (fig. 64). They had spotted the house in *Collier's* in 1936 and decided to build it upon retirement. When Stone's office did not respond quickly to his letter of inquiry in January 1948, Carswell had a local architect design it based on the Stone plan and photographs. Constructed of solid brick, this later variation is even further distanced from the original, with such distinctive features as the curved dining room, terraces and roof decks, glass block windows, and the interior and exterior integration no longer present. The essence of the prototype was clearly lost, indicating that the desire to stay within the doctrines of the International Style was no longer the requisite consideration.[94]

In his essay "Modernism and Mass Culture in the Visual Arts," in which the art historian Thomas Crow contends that there is a positive interdependence between high art and mass culture, he addressed this process of transforming an American avant-garde aesthetic into a popular commodity for the geographically, economically, and culturally diverse middle-class. In this cycle of exchange, he explained, the artistic avant-garde is uniquely positioned to serve as a broker by providing the desires and sensibilities that the

---

[93] In fact Gregory A. Luhan, Dennis Domer, and David Mohney, authors of the *Louisville Guide* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2004), as well as the current owner, were unaware of the *Collier's* connection until I brought to their attention, after which they revised their entry for the house on pp. 286-287.

[94] Stuart R. Carswell to Edward D. Stone, January 15, 1948; Roy S. Johnson to Carswell, April 5, 1948; and Carswell to Stone, April 11, 1948, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 82, file 2.

mass culture cannot produce (since its focus is profit maximization).[95] European modernism had been the first and necessary step in the design process while its subsequent form, the Mandel house, contained only components of the original selected or adapted out, after which the *Collier's* plan was further removed but sold, and appreciated, as new. Even though the *Collier's* houses do not contain the initial creative impetus, a sufficient residue remains so that they cannot be written off as inconsequential or regrettable because in the long run the repackaged design served the interest of a wider circle of people. So, in effect, the Mandel house, which evolved from a product of legitimate modernism of the avant-garde, served as a research and development arm for the *Collier's* house, which was better suited to middle-class consumption.[96]

As a reproducible cultural commodity, the *Collier's* house appealed to an audience removed from large urban centers, who instead of deferring to their own regional vernacular traditions, wanted a design that they perceived to be more universal and would thus enable them to aspire to a different or more versatile culture. Their attraction—to what some would consider architectural kitsch—was stimulated by the increasingly powerful communications systems that exposed them to an aesthetic outside their own and fueled a desire for something perceived as more worldly. As a result, they tolerated commodified products circulated by mass-marketing efforts and were indifferent to its transition from the avant-garde. Stone benefited from this process, as the *Collier's* house design was the first of many such projects in which he was involved throughout his career. In fact, so pleased was *Collier's* (the distaff Aimee Larkin sent a

---

[95] Crow, "Modernism and Mass Culture in the Visual Arts," 238 and 256.

[96] Ibid, 256-258.

telegram to Stone expressing her "delight" with the house and congratulated him on a "swell job"[97]) that Stone produced in April 1938 a weekend house design for the magazine; and in November 1948 an expandable wood and glass house for *Woman's Home Companion* (1873-1957), a magazine also owned by the Crowell-Collier Publishing Company.[98] However, none of these houses that Stone produced for publication brought additional publicity in other types of media from which Stone could have benefited.

While most of Stone's International Style commissions were private residences, for which he was increasingly required to privilege human needs and desires over the International Style image, Stone did complete a few commercial projects in New York City, including a glass pavilion with terraces and the interiors for the Simon and Schuster Company (founded 1924) on top of the Center Theater at Rockefeller Center (fig. 65). Completed in 1941, the offices were described as "not only the handsomest but probably the most compact and efficient publishing offices in the country."[99] (Although not widely publicized, they were featured in the film *Gentlemen's Agreement* in 1947). While working for the architect Wallace Harrison, Stone also completed a forty thousand dollar

---

[97] Aimee Larkin to Edward D. Stone, February 19, 1936, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library, Crowell-Collier Collection, Box 87.

[98] See Ruth Carson, "Collier's Week-End House," *Collier's*, April 23, 1938; Carson, "Living at Ease," *Collier's*, July 20, 1940; Carson, "We Furnish the House," *Collier's*, August 10, 1940; and Carson, "Lights On!" as well as Wallace W. Heath, "Big As You Like It," *Woman's Home Companion*, November 1948. Although Stone claimed on page 33 of *Evolution of an Architect* that his design for *Collier's* was "one of the first times that a general mass-market magazine endorsed modern architecture," he was incorrect. For example, *House Beautiful* had published "Six Modern European Houses: That Represent Current Tendencies in France and Germany" by Henry-Russell Hitchcock in September 1928. Further, between 1928 and 1934 *House Beautiful* had published more than twenty articles on modern architecture under the editorship of Ethel Power. During the same period the *House Beautiful* Home Builders' Service Bureau published and offered for sale standardized plans, elevations, working drawings, and specifications for two modern houses.

[99] Quoted in *Current Biography* (1941), s.v. "Simon, Richard and Schuster, M. Lincoln."

project for the Museum of Science and Industry (1935-1949; fig. 66), located in the lobby of the RCA Building at Rockefeller Center, which was considered "distinctly modern in its architecture and exhibit assembly. [100] Thanks to these projects, for Stone's next and most acclaimed commission in the International Style—the Museum of Modern Art (figs. 67-68), which opened in May 1939—he was able to meet successfully the immense challenge of creating a unique design by using the principles and not just the images of the style, as he had done with the Mandel house, earning him the epithet of the "spearhead of modernism."[101]

For years it has been repeatedly written that Stone was chosen to assist Philip Goodwin in designing the Museum of Modern Art building by Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller (1908-1979), who was both a trustee of the Museum of Science and Industry and of the Museum of Modern Art beginning in 1932.[102] But other accounts suggest that the choice of Stone as the associate architect was not determined solely by this one, albeit

---

[100] New York Museum of Science and Industry, *Science in Action* (New York, 1937), Rockefeller Archive Center, Nelson A. Rockefeller Personal Projects, box 168, folder 1701 (hereafter cited as NAR Personal Projects).

[101] Mary Anne Staniszewski, *The Power of Display: A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001), 10 and Jones, confidential report to Linen and Prior.

[102] Most recently, for example, Suzanne Stephens said, "Edward Durell Stone, then working for Wallace Harrison…was hired by Nelson Rockefeller" in "Criticism With Yoshio Taniguchi's Design: New York's Museum of Modern Art Finally Becomes What It Wanted to Be All Along," *Architectural Record* 193 (January 2005): 104. The source of this information could have been *Good Old Modern*, which Lynes described on p. vii as an "unofficial, unsubsidized, and unauthorized" account of the museum. Lynes said on page 191, "It was Nelson Rockefeller who proposed that young Edward Durell Stone, then thirty-four, be associated with him and who, according to John McAndrew, 'arranged this shotgun marriage.'" But in the interview with Lynes McAndrew actually said, "Ed Stone was I should think proposed by Nelson Rockefeller [but] I'm not sure." Stone too thought Rockefeller was his patron according to Lynes who quoted him on page 192 of *Good Old Modern*, "'One day,' Stone recalls, 'I overheard Wally [Harrison] say to Nelson, 'What about Ed?' I didn't know what the hell was going on.'" Richard Marsh Bennett, who had worked in the Stone office, said the museum "should have gone to Wallace Harrison because Harrison is related to the Rockefeller family but it looked like it was too close so Harrison had Stone do it (Richard Bennett, oral history by Betty J. Blum, 1965, 1975, and 1983, www.artic.edu/aic/libraries/caohp/bennett). In 1926 Harrison had married Ellen Milton, whose older brother David had married in 1925 Abby ("Babs") Rockefeller (1903-1976), the sister of Nelson Rockefeller.

powerful, man. In his 1943 memoir of the museum, A. Conger Goodyear, a "solid, sensitive industrialist (lumber)" who had been a trustee of Buffalo's Albright Art Gallery before becoming the founding president of the Museum of Modern Art until 1939, recalled, "Rockefeller and I had decided that to introduce an European collaborator would be a mistake, and had quite independently each come to the conclusion that the best associate for Philip Goodwin would be Edward Durell Stone, who was then gaining recognition as a designer of the modern school."[103] Goodwin's own influence—as architect, trustee, collector, and benefactor—must also be considered, for as Hitchcock pointed out in his interview with Russell Lynes in 1971, "The real backer of the architecture project was certainly Philip Goodwin, but how much he put up financially, I don't know."[104] In any case, as the son of James Junius Goodwin (1835-1915), a cousin and partner of J. Pierpont Morgan, the trustees had "hoped that Goodwin would make a substantial contribution to the cost of the building."[105]

As an impressive collector of modern paintings and sculptures,[106] Goodwin had been made a trustee of the museum in April 1934, and since he was the only architect on

---

[103] "Nelson Rockefeller...From a Center to a Citadel," *Time*, May 22, 1939 and A. Conger Goodyear, *The Museum of Modern Art: The First Ten Years* (New York: Vrest Orton, 1943), 126.

[104] Hitchcock, interview by Lynes.

[105] A. Conger Goodyear to Nelson Rockefeller, March 17, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233 and "James J. Goodwin Dead: Retired Financier, a Cousin of the Late J. P. Morgan, Expires at 79," *New York Time*, June 24, 1915. According to another article "Goodwin Left $30,000,000: Estate of Morgan's Cousin Divided Among Widow and Sons," *New York Times*, July 4, 1915, James Junius Goodwin left a fortune of thirty million dollars to his family. In 1939 Philip Goodwin wrote to Rockefeller that he wanted to make a contribution to the Building Fund, "and will do so as soon as we are through with these last hectic days finishing up the building" (Goodwin to Rockefeller, April 10, 1939, NAR Personal Projects, box 130, folder 1277).

[106] For more about the Goodwin collection, which was given to the museum, see Alfred H. Barr Jr., "The Philip L. Goodwin Collection," *The Bulletin of the Museum of Modern Art* 6 (Fall 1958): 4-11. Some of the collection is also visible in photographs of Goodwin's New York apartment in Augusta Owen Patterson, "An Architect On the Skyline," *Town & Country*, December 1941.

its board was asked in January 1935 to replace Philip Johnson, who had recently resigned as chair of the architecture committee (founded 1933; Hitchcock, Howe, and Hudnut were also members).[107] A product of the Groton School in Massachusetts and Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut, Goodwin graduated from architecture school at Columbia University in New York City in 1912, after which he studied at the Ecole des Beaux-arts in Paris until 1914 (at the same time as Shepley, Stone's first mentor and patron).[108] Subsequently, between 1916 and 1921 Goodwin was a draftsman in the conservative New York City firm of Delano and Aldrich (1903-1935) and was a partner of Goodwin, Bullard, and Woolsey between 1917 and 1921, after which he set up his own practice.[109] He was described by his peers, Lynes said, as "a man of 'exquisite taste,' 'so much loved,' 'a very generous and thoughtful man who was always doing things for people,' 'one of the most loved of the Museum's close friends.'" As "an old time New Yorker," he was known for his traditional houses for ladies and gentlemen of wealth attracted to his conservative revivalist inclinations (fig. 69).[110] His roots were firmly

---

[107] In a letter of July 25, 1944 to A. Everett "Chick" Austin Jr. (1900-1957), director of the Wadsworth Athenaeum in Hartford, Connecticut, Goodwin remembered, "I do not forget that I think it was you who involved me with the M[useum] of M[odern] A[rt] about 1935,—or you were one of those who did,—and I have never regretted it and got much benefit and enjoyment out of it. Even if Miss Edith [*sic*] Genauer in the July *Harper's* misquotes even my own words, to Conger Goodyear, and the Kortzes and the Sweenys rave,— the place does a fine job" (A. Everett Austin Jr. Papers, Wadsworth Athenaeum Museum of Art, hereafter cited as Austin Papers). Goodwin was upset about the comment made by the art critic Emily Genauer on page 136 of her article "The Fur-Lined Museum" in the July 1947 issue of *Harper's* in which she said that Stone brought to the job such ability and imagination that Goodyear still jokingly speaks of the building as "the Education of Philip Goodwin."

[108] Noffsinger, *The Influence of the École Des Beaux-Art*, 109.

[109] "P. L. Goodwin Dies; Noted Architect," *New York Herald Tribune*, February 14, 1958 and "Philip Goodwin, Architect, 72, Dies," *New York Times*, February 14, 1958.

[110] Lynes, *Good Old Modern*, 190. For Goodwin's house designs see "'Brick House,' Woodside Circle, Hartford, Conn.: Philip L. Goodwin, Architect," *American Architect* 127 (May 20, 1925): pl. 126 and "House of Ralph D. Cutler, West Hartford, Connecticut," *Architectural Record* 75 (February 1934): 158-160. Goodwin did not have a large or successful practice: He wrote to Chick Austin on October 25, 1935

planted in Beaux-arts classicism, so much so that the museum's press release announcing his appointment as the architect of its building said he was "a member and trustee of the Beaux Arts."[111]

Although an unlikely match—Goodwin an Ivy League aristocrat and Stone a rural Ozarkian—the two men worked well together, but in recent years scholars have had conflicting opinions about the individual contributions of each to the museum design. On one hand Hitchcock has said, "The most relevant figure was Philip Goodwin...far more than Ed Stone was I think the architect of the building."[112] On the other hand, based on an impressive formalistic survey of the extant drawings of the museum, the historian Dominic Ricciotti concluded, "If one were to assign ultimate responsibility to either Goodwin or Stone for the success of the Museum's original building, the evidence would point to Stone…his role was decisive."[113] Likewise, Matilda McQuaid, curator of the retrospective exhibition of the building on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary in 1989, stated, "There is no doubt...that Stone was most influential in the overall design of the Museum."[114] Her assessment, as well as Ricciotti's, stemmed from a comparison between the end result and Goodwin's early schemes before Stone had joined him, which exhibit classically inspired masonry construction, symmetrical organization, and even

---

that he had "little" work in his office and on October 28, 1941 that he had a "depleted office" (Austin Papers).

[111] Museum of Modern Art, press release no. 111236-33, MoMA Archives. This would have either been the Beaux-arts Society of Architects or the Beaux-arts Institute of Design.

[112] Hitchcock, interview by Lynes.

[113] Dominic Ricciotti, "The 1939 Building of the Museum of Modern Art: The Goodwin-Stone Collaboration," *American Art Journal* 17 (Summer 1985): 73.

[114] Draft for a text panel, MoMA Archives, A Modern Museum: The 1939 Goodwin/Stone Building, Exhibition File, no. 1518, May 10–August 22, 1989 (hereafter cited as A Modern Museum).

ornamental medallions (fig. 70a). But the road to Stone's participation on any level was anything but smooth, as is confirmed by documents in the Rockefeller Archive Center in Sleepy Hollow, New York, in addition to the well-known correspondence in the Alfred H. Barr, Jr. Papers. Viewed together, these resources present a comprehensive picture of the selection of the Goodwin/Stone team over the candidates preferred by Barr in this order: Oud, Mies van der Rohe, and Gropius.

In November 1935, Rockefeller invited Goodwin to lunch to discuss "several ideas" concerning the museum's immediate need for more space, its "major problem at the present."[115] The following month the board of trustees minutes recorded that Rockefeller had suggested they consider independent plans for a new building, especially because the loan exhibitions made it impossible to have the permanent collection on view except intermittently.[116] In early January 1936 Goodwin responded to Rockefeller's request for some exploratory "diagrammatic plans and figures" for a new museum with forty thousand square feet of space, and they corresponded about building plans through February.[117] Because of the "urgent necessity for additional space," on January 23 the board instructed Rockefeller to acquire the property and dwellings at 6, 8, and 10 West

---

[115] Nelson A. Rockefeller to Philip Goodwin, November 8, 1935, NAR Personal Projects, box 130, folder 1277.

[116] Minutes of the 54th Meeting of the Board of Trustees (December 19, 1953), 3, quoted in Rona Roob, "1936: The Museum Selects an Architect, Excerpts From the Barr Papers of The Museum of Modern Art," *American Art Journal* 23 (1983): 22. Rona Roob was the museum's former archivist.[116]

[117] Philip Goodwin to Nelson Rockefeller, January 3, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233. Goodwin provided schematic plans on at least two occasions: See Nelson Rockefeller to Philip Goodwin, January 20, 1936 and Goodwin to Rockefeller, February 14, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

53rd Street, which was announced in the *New York Times* on May 8, 1936.[118] On February 14, 1936, Goodwin provided two drawings for the approval of the residents on 53rd Street (see fig. 70b) and in the accompanying letter was already addressing such ideas as a theater in the basement and a large, open staircase leading to the galleries.[119] That month Goodwin also produced an outline for a competition for the new building, although, significantly, Stone's name was not on the proposed list of twelve architects to be invited—Frank Lloyd Wright, Holabird & Root, Harrison & Fouilhoux, William Lescaze,[120] Richard Neutra, and Eero Saarinen in America as well as Gropius, Le Corbusier, Mies, Oud, Gunnar Asplund, and Tekton in Europe. However, Goodwin was not really in favor of the competition, remarking in his report, "I do not think the results of competitions have ever been very successful, notably the Chicago Tribune Building [1922]." He instead advised, "To get the most practical and even the best-looking results, it would be better to pick out the person the executive committee or trustees think best fitted to handle the project and hand it over directly to him." [121]

Although Goodwin did not convince Rockefeller that the proposed building should be kept "on the simplest and cheapest possible footing" and not be used "as a

---

[118] Quoted in Betty Chamberlain, "History of the Museum of Modern Art," (1954), 61, MoMA Archives; minutes of the 55th Meeting of the Board of Trustees, 4, in Roob, "1936: The Museum Selects an architect," 30; and "Art Museum Buys A Site for $215,250," *New York Times*, May 8, 1936.

[119] Philip L. Goodwin to Rockefeller, January 21, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

[120] Howe and Lescaze had been commissioned by the museum trustees in June 1930 to submit skyscraper schemes for a new building for an unspecified site, which were never used. See Howe and Lescaze, "A Modern Museum," ? (Springdale, CT: Summer 1930), MoMA Archives and "Plans for A Contemporary Museum, New York City: Howe and Lescaze, Architects," *Architectural Record* 80 (July 1936): 43-50. Goodwin did not add Howe's name to the list because at the time he was still on the museum's architecture committee.

[121] Philip Goodwin, Suggested Outline for Competition for New Building for the Museum of Modern Art, February 21, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, file 1233.

stepping stone for publicity or experiment in architectural design," Rockefeller did listen to him in part, for he announced to Goodwin on March 6, 1936 that instead of a competition he would like him to be the architect of the new building.[122] The appointment was approved by the trustees a week later when it was further agreed that in addition to Rockefeller, Goodyear and Barr would serve on the building committee.[123] Goodwin found the appointment to be "quite a shock" but confided privately to Rockefeller that it was the sort of thing he had longed to do for years but never had been presented with the opportunity.[124]

Because Goodwin had no experience in modern design, it was decided that he should collaborate with a young architect better versed in the modern aesthetic, although Goodyear had his doubts, writing to Rockefeller on March 17, "I have suggested to Barr that perhaps it will not be necessary to have any younger architect associated with Goodwin, on the theory that this association would probably indirectly result in increased cost to us."[125] Nonetheless, the hunt for an associate architect began: in March 1936 Ernestine Mary Fantl (later Carter; 1907-1983), recently named curator of the department of architecture and industrial art, contacted Alfred Charles Claus (also Clas or Clauss; 1860-1942), a German-born architect best known for his work in Milwaukee, Wisconsin,

---

[122] Ibid and Philip Goodwin to Nelson Rockefeller, March 10, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

[123] Sixtieth Meeting of the Board of Trustees, in Roob, "1936: The Museum Selects an Architect," 30. Stephen C. Clark, who had been a trustee since 1929, was appointed to the building committee on November 12, 1936.

[124] Goodwin to Rockefeller, March 10, 1936.

[125] A. Conger Goodyear to Nelson Rockefeller, March 17, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233. While it is not known how much Goodwin gave to the building campaign, when he died in 1958 he left $300,000, which is equal to nearly $2,000,000 today (Inflation Calculator). See Last Will and Testament of Philip L. Goodwin (Cornwall, NY: May 29, 1956).

but who had worked on the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society Building (1929-1932) under Howe and Lescaze and for the Tennessee Valley Authority in Knoxville designing houses, and she asked him if he would like to come to the museum for an interview.[126]

Barr, who had famously claimed that the museum was "a laboratory in whose experiments the public is invited to participate," was unwilling to consider anyone unproven, a departure from his own art acquisition program.[127] But his preference for an eminent foreign architect over a young American (whom he felt could only be valuable in connection with the interior[128]) corresponded with the perception of his own collecting objectives: According to Hilton Kramer, chief editor of the *New Criterion*, with rare exception Barr ignored and disparaged the American avant-garde and largely obliterated the history of modern art in America prior to 1948 when New York City took over as the leader of the art world with the advent of abstract expressionism.[129]

Thus, in a letter of May 12, 1936, the day he left for a three-month trip to Europe,[130] Barr wrote to Rockefeller: "Russell Hitchcock and I both hope to see Oud during the summer to get a line on the possibility of his working on our building, perhaps

---

[126] Ernestine M. Fantl, telegram to Alfred Clauss, March 26, 1936 and Clauss, telegram to Fantl, March 27, 1936, MoMA Archives, Early Museum History Files. Also see "4 Join Modern Museum Staff," *New York Times*, January 20, 1936 and "John Carter Dies; Bibliographer, 69," *New York Times*, March 28, 1975.

[127] Rene D'Harnoncourt, "Foreword: The Museum of the Future," *Art in America* 54 (February 1964): 25.

[128] Goodyear to Rockefeller, March 17, 1936.

[129] Hilton Kramer, "MOMA Reopened: The Museum of Modern Art in the Postmodern Era," *New Criterion*, Special Issue (Summer 1984): 30-31.

[130] Barr had three purposes in Europe: to plan the exhibition Fantastic Art, Dada, Surrealism, which opened at the museum in December 1936; to study "the problem of having a giant European architect—Oud, Mies van der Rohe, Gropius—help with the new museum;" and to sound out the possibility for Joseph Hudnut of hiring Walter Gropius or Mies van der Rohe to be professor of design at the Graduate School of Design at Harvard University. See Alfred Barr to Mrs. Barr, June 1, 1936, Barr Papers and Roob, "1936: The Museum Selects an Architect," 23.

as a consultant…it might be advisable for me to go to Berlin too to see Mies....although of the two men Oud is preferable." He continued:

> I leave at this time with considerable hesitation for I must have two months of almost unbroken study in order to prepare myself for the building. Unfortunately there are no dependable experts upon many of the problems that we shall have to face. Of course Philip Goodwin will be very helpful, and I think extremely conscientious, but a museum is such a special affair that no architect can really be expected to take the time to discover exactly what we need unless we take the time to find out ourselves…The building must not be done in a hurry.

He added a handwritten postscript, "Please don't decide not to have a really great architect until we talk with Oud."[131]

On the same day, he wrote to Goodyear that both he and Goodwin were "much puzzled about how to find the right man as collaborator," concluding it would be useful to conduct an informal, private competition among the six or eight American possibilities, which would help them get a "useful line upon them" and enable Goodwin to become personally acquainted with them.[132] He sent a copy of this letter to Rockefeller with a note saying that the proposed competition would be a "valuable and common sense solution to our otherwise insoluble problem of finding an American collaborator." His additional comment—"Of course, we would put Stone on this list"—is the first mention of Stone in relation to the project and indicates Barr's awareness of Rockefeller's interest in Stone's candidacy. But Barr offered no support for Stone, or any other American for that matter, "I really could not with any faith in my own judgment,

---

[131] Alfred Barr to Nelson Rockefeller, May 12, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233. According to Philip Johnson, because Henry-Russell Hitchcock was the "great conscience for Barr," Barr may have been influenced by Hitchcock, who personally knew J.J.P. Oud (Johnson, interview by Matilda McQuaid, in "Notes on 1989 Exhibition of the Museum of Modern Art," MoMA Archives, A Modern Museum.

[132] Alfred Barr to A. Conger Goodyear, May 12, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

give you a list of three younger men in an order of preference, as you asked the other day, but remember, we must first study the possibility [of] a great modern architect such as Oud working as a consultant," he wrote.[133]

The issue regarding the selection of the architect peaked when Barr received a letter of June 18, 1936, from Thomas Dabney Mabry Jr. (d. 1968), who had become executive secretary of the museum in March 1935: "You had better set an ultimatum immediately if you want to get anything accomplished about Oud or Mies," he warned, explaining that Goodwin had come out against a foreign architect as his collaborator and that the building committee supported him "and, incidentally, as his assistant Stone." In a postscript he added, "I'm afraid your technique of letting everybody fry until the last minute will not work as well in this case, unfortunately, because how can you undraw plans? And Goodwin is working away like a beaver. He wants the job."[134] In another letter Goodyear informed Barr that he and Rockefeller did not think it wise to invite a foreign architect because Goodwin "would withdraw entirely and we would be in a very unfortunate situation," adding that a foreign architect would only be feasible if Goodwin decided so.[135]

---

[133] Barr to Rockefeller, May 12, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

[134] Tom Mabry to Alfred Barr, June 18, 1936, Barr Papers. Born in Clarksville, Tennessee, Mabry graduated from Harvard in 1925 after which he studied abroad, worked for two years in the gallery of John Becker and was executive secretary at the New School for Social Research in New York City and at the museum until 1939. After serving in the Office of War Information, in 1942 he married Ethel L. Haven, granddaughter of George Griswold Haven, first president of the Metropolitan Opera and Real Estate Company. See the *New York Times* announcements: "Art Post for T. D. Mabry Jr.," March 13, 1935; "Susan H. Mabry To Marry Oct. 4," September 14, 1975; and "Miss Ethel Haven Engaged to Be Wed," October 12, 1942.

[135] A. Conger Goodyear to Alfred H. Barr, Jr., June 17, 1936, Barr Papers.

In response, Barr began a frenetic campaign in defense of his position. He successfully appealed to Rockefeller's mother, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller (1858-1957), who as one of the museum's founders had hired him, writing, "To rest content with a mediocre building on such a site would be to betray the very purposes for which the Museum was founded as well as to make a laughing stock of the Museum's five years' work in the cause of the best modern architecture," he wrote. Barr asked her to tell her son that Mies—by then the only one of the three European architects to have expressed definite interest—was available and that "Stone must not be confirmed as Goodwin's collaborator." He also threatened to resign from the building committee.[136] She cabled her husband, John D. Rockefeller Jr., instructing him to "tell Nelson if collaborating architect not actually engaged please delay action until after return…Mies van der Rohe probably will be at Harvard School…..everyone agrees he is best possible man."[137] Nelson Rockefeller replied, "Collaborating architect already employed afraid it is too late to do anything Mies Goodwin says he will withdraw if we insist plans now being developed are very satisfactory."[138] She then cabled again, "Tell Nelson cable received feel grave mistake has been made urge reopening of question after Alfred's letters."[139]

Barr also sent a letter of appeal to Goodyear, stating that

---

[136] Alfred Barr, telegram to Mrs. John Rockefeller, July 2, 1936, Barr Papers. Barr also made one last desperate attempt by saying, "I wonder if Mr. Rockefeller has any interest in the quality of the Museum's architecture? After all, the building is to be at the end of Rockefeller Plaza."

[137] Mrs. John Rockefeller, telegram to Nelson Rockefeller, July 6, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

[138] Nelson Rockefeller, telegram to Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, July 6, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder `122.

[139] Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, radiogram to John Rockefeller, July 8, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

> Goodwin was originally engaged for a project of considerably less architectural importance. For the original site a young American collaborator might have been adequate though as time went on it seemed to me increasingly difficult to choose a young American from the scanty data which their restricted experience provided. The new site with its potentially magnificent architectural position seemed to me a real challenge to the Museum to secure the collaboration of a really great architect.[140]

He continued, "I can hardly believe that Goodwin's possible reluctance will cause him to abandon the idea of an architectural masterpiece."[141] Goodyear would not change is mind and on July 7 cabled back, "Too late to consider any European architect. Goodwin using Stone. Greatly pleased with preliminary plans."[142] Barr then sent two cables to Rockefeller: in the first he said, "hope Stone adequate but under circumstances must resign from committee…fear museum losing position leadership" and in the second he said, "Didn't you say that it would not be fatal if Goodwin resigned? I wonder why you changed your mind."[143] Then, in a three-and-a-half-page letter to Goodwin, Barr said that he understood from Mabry that "Young Stone of Harrison's office" had been helping him. He continued, "I do not quite understand his position but suppose that his appointment is temporary—or, at least, subordinate, since the other members of the

---

[140] The trustees had decided on May 28th to exchange their ninety-seven foot property on the south side of the street for 130 feet on the north side so that the new museum would head a potential new street running to Rockefeller Center from 49th to 53rd Street between Fifth and Sixth avenues. Numbers 6, 8, and 10 West 53rd Street were exchanged for 9, 11, and 13. Numbers 15, 17, and 19 were a gift of Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller Jr. They also gave 4 and 10 West 54th Street. As part of Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia's ambitious scheme for a Municipal Art Center then under consideration the museum was to be flanked on either side by a symphony hall, opera house, music library, and a music museum. See "Modern Art Group to Have New Home," *New York Times*, October 1, 1936; "Rockefeller Site Given Museum: Unique $1,000,000 Building for Modern Art to Rise in 54th St.," *New York American*, June 18, 1937; and "Rockefeller Home Is Given to Museum," *New York Times*, June 18, 1937 as well as Roob, "1936: The Museum Selects an Architect," 22.

[141] Alfred Barr, cable to A. Conger Goodyear, July 6, 1936, Barr Papers.

[142] A. Conger Goodyear, cable to Alfred Barr, July 7, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

[143] Alfred Barr, cables to Nelson Rockefeller, July 7, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

building committee have not written me about it." He explained, "Since 1930 a whole generation of young American architects have tried to master modern principles (in spite of their anachronistic schooling) but they have not had time—at least the American-bred ones—or experience enough to prove their mastery...For these reasons, I think we are under obligation to consider one of the obviously superior Europeans," and he concluded, "The Museum, as a patron of modern architecture, cannot afford to run the risk of mediocrity in the design of its new building. It must have the superlatively best."[144]

Before responding to Barr's letter, Goodwin sent a copy of his proposed reply to Rockefeller, who wrote on July 20, the same day that Goodwin's contract was signed, that he thought the cable "fine" and commended Goodwin for his "great deal of patience."[145] Goodwin's cable to Barr—a crucial and, as yet, unpublished link in the well-known selection process—explained that because the site of the building had changed after he was appointed architect, he did little until May 1936 when he had been requested to make full studies, plans, and elevations while "consulting on alternate scheme with Stone." Although not yet associated, Stone's contribution had been so "useful and important" that he would consider employing him as a "special draftsman," even though he had met with a number of younger architects "conspicuous for contemporary work," among them, Frederick Kiesler, Alfred Kastner, Oskar Gregory Stonorov and probably Hamilton Beatty, who had been a pupil of Le Corbusier.[146] He

---

[144] Alfred Barr, cable to Philip Goodwin, July 6, 1936, Barr Papers.

[145] Philip Goodwin to Nelson Rockefeller, July 17, 1936 and Rockefeller to Goodwin, July 20, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233. A copy of the contract is in the NAR Personal Projects, Box 127, folder 1236.

[146] Since Goodwin just said "Beattie" [*sic*] it could also have been Edward Beatty (b. 1902) of Brooklyn, New York, who was listed in the *American Architects Directory* (1970). For more about Hamilton Beatty

also considered Howe and Lescaze, Walter Peter Baermann (then working on a room in a house designed by Goodwin), as well as Albert Frey, Alfred Claus, and George Nelson, the latter three unavailable on account of distance.[147] Concerning the "eminent foreign architect," Goodwin explained that when he had been asked to be the architect, the concept was "definitely stated as abandoned," and the question of associating with a "younger American architect" was referred to and left up to him. He further asserted that if his association with a foreign architect had been proposed at the start he "would have declined as I decline now."[148] In his opinion, an attempt to import the leaders of schools of experimental architectural thought "would be disastrous" because the museum would only get a German, or possibly International Style building, planted on American soil for the sake of astonishment rather than one that would more appropriately express the

---

see Hitchcock, "The Brown Decades and the Brown Year," 275 and Beatty's own house in "Portfolio of Current Architecture," *Architectural Record* 72 (September 1932): 169-172.

[147] In 1930 Frey worked on several schemes for the museum under Lescaze. By May 1937 Goodwin had hired him to work on museum designs for the street facade as well as the reading room, lecture hall, and typical flush-door and window details. In an interview Frey said he detailed the aluminum sections of the glass wall because there were no manufacturers at that time and that Goodwin "did not know much about modern design, so that was why he engaged me to work with him" Albert Frey, interview by Volume 5 (www.volume5.com/albertfrey/ architect_albert_frey_intervie.html). Also see Joseph Rosa, *Albert Frey, Architect* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999), 53-54. Goodwin also asked Clauss to help him work on the final schemes. See Philip L. Goodwin to Alfred Clauss, January 4, 1937, Barr Papers.

[148] The reason Philip Goodwin refused to work with an "eminent foreign architect" is probably because of his experience in 1935 with Le Corbusier, whose sixteen-venue lecture tour in the United States (accompanied at the Museum of Modern Art with a week-long exhibition of models, plans, and photographs) Goodwin helped organize and sponsor (by guaranteeing Le Corbusier's expenses up to a deficit of one thousand dollars). Goodwin also hosted a luncheon on October 23 in honor of Le Corbusier. Nelson Rockefeller knew that Le Corbusier had been "terrifically trying" to Goodwin (Rockefeller to Goodwin, October 31, 1935, NAR Personal Projects, box 131, folder 1278). Goodwin subsequently explained to Chick Austin that Le Corbusier had tried to make an "'amende honorable'" and that they were on "best of terms, only that 'once bitten, twice shy,' and I am off <u>any</u> kind of genius for a <u>long</u> time" (Goodwin to Austin, November 6, 1935, Austin Papers). Also see Andreas Huyssen, "Mass Culture As Woman: Modernism's Other," in Tania Modleski, *Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture* 7 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 190-205 and Goodwin to Rockefeller, November 7, 1935, NAR Personal Projects, box 131, folder 1278.

habits, customs, and ideals of the American people. While he wanted the building to be "the very finest possible," a "scholastic viewpoint" would be really wrong and that if "an experimental building" were erected, as Mies had done with the Tugenhat house (1928-1930) in Brno, Czechoslovakia, and the German Pavilion (1928-1929) at the International Exposition in Barcelona, Spain, then it "would remain an exhibition building in New York forever." He concluded that "our Museum…is yet an American museum and not a German Dutch or even Geneva international one."[149]

Barr acquiesced, at least on the surface, writing to Goodwin, "Appreciate magnificent cablegram count on my friendly attitude."[150] At the same time he wrote Mabry, "I had a long and patriotic cable from Goodwin who says that Stone has not been appointed collaborator although Nelson telegrammed that he had. The discrepancy is, I suppose, a matter of terms."[151] Rockefeller was aware of Barr's dissatisfaction, writing to Mabry, "Alfred pretty upset about our going ahead with Stone and not Mies however don't see there is much we could do about it. Goodyear agrees."[152]

But Barr did not lay the idea of using Mies van der Rohe to rest for some time. On August 26 he confided to Hudnut, "I'm not entirely (but almost) beaten in my struggle to

---

[149] Philip Goodwin, cable to Alfred Barr, July 17, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233. Robb did not think this letter survived, stating on page 28 of "1936: The Museum Selects an Architect" that "regrettably, however, this answer to Barr's letter is lost. Mrs. Barr remembers that it was bulky, perhaps ten pages or more; it filled so many telegraph forms that the glue used by the French post office could not adequately seal the packet."

[150] Alfred Barr, cable to Philip Goodwin, July 1936, Barr Papers.

[151] Alfred Barr, cable to Tom Mabry, July 7, 1936, Barr Papers.

[152] Nelson Rockefeller, cable to Thomas Dabney Mabry Jr., July 10, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

have Mies as collaborating architect."[153] After he helped arrange for Mies to design a house in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, for Stanley Resor (1879-1963) and his wife, Helen Lansdowne Resor (1886-1964), a trustee of the museum beginning in 1935, she wrote to Rockefeller in October 1937, "Mr. Mies van der Rohe will be glad to do what you wish provided Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Stone are agreeable….He expressed the same criticisms of the plans that you did before I told him of your point of view regarding them. I am even more sure than I was that it is worth any inconvenience to get his contributions."[154]

Imagine the pressure put on Stone: Not only would he inevitably be compared to Mies, at least by the experts, but he would also be judged for his ability to "adequately counteract Mr. Goodwin's conservative Beaux-Arts tendencies."[155] While the project was the most outstanding opportunity Stone had yet encountered, he faced an extraordinary challenge of not only working alongside Barr, the very man who had resisted his appointment but who was also fast becoming, in the opinion of many, "the most powerful tastemaker in American art…and probably in the world."[156] The stakes were high, but Stone took the whole situation in stride as he started work on the museum plans. On June

---

[153] Barr to Joseph Hudnut, August 26, 1936, Barr Papers. I disagree with Cary Reich's simple conclusion in *The Life of Nelson A. Rockefeller: Worlds to Conquer, 1908-1958* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 49 that "what it probably came down to in the end was that Mies would have been Barr's architect, while Stone, surely, was Nelson's."

[154] Helen Lansdown Resor to Nelson Rockefeller, October 1937, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

[155] Alfred Barr to Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, July 2, 1936, Barr Papers. Even though Stone later said he was "honored" to second a proposal for Mies to join the Institute of Arts and Letters, Stone is remembered for saying that every time he looked at the Seagram's Building (1956-1958) in New York City he thought, "what a jewel McKim, Mead and White's Racquet Club is across the street." See Edward Durell Stone to Henry Shepley, May 11, 1960 (Shepley Papers) and Cranston Jones, *Architecture: Today and Tomorrow* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), 14.

[156] John Canaday, "In the Gleaming: Twilight Seems to Be Settling Rapidly For Abstract Expressionism," *New York Times*, September 11, 1960.

8, 1936 Goodwin had written to Goodyear, "Have started intensive work on sketches for the second site of the Museum, which are to be ready in two or three weeks time. Edward Stone is going to work on them in my office during part of this time."[157] And to Rockefeller he wrote on June 23:

> I have been working constantly on the plans in the last ten days with Edward Stone. We have what might be called two variations of the same scheme, and I am preparing a booklet of photostats with about fourteen drawings of my own scheme and four or five of Stone's variations, which will be ready to be submitted to you and Mr. Goodyear.…In the album will be a short description of this scheme and how it came to be selected from a dozen or more different ideas.[158]

While the booklet with the two schematic variations is not known to have survived, it is interesting that even though Stone was only assisting at this point he was asked to produce his own designs. Even though he worked closely with Goodwin for the first five months designing "the first tentative plans," the announcement of the architect in the *New York Times* on November 13, 1936, made no mention of Stone: "Museum Picks Architect—Philip Goodwin will be designer of new home of modern art."[159] At about the same time a brochure was produced for fundraising purposes, illustrating the general plan as well as a perspective drawing by the well-known delineator Hugh Ferriss (fig. 71) and not by Stone who was also capable of creating such drawings.[160] Although in December Rockefeller told Stone that he hoped he had cleared up "the somewhat indefinite

---

[157] Philip Goodwin to A. Conger Goodyear, June 8, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

[158] Philip Goodwin to Nelson Rockefeller, June 23, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 127, folder 1236.

[159] Christine to Henry-Russell Hitchcock, November 27, 1936, MoMA Archives, Early Museum History, box 1, file 8.

[160] A copy of the brochure is in the Rockefeller Archive Center, Nelson A. Rockefeller Cultural Interests, box 23, file 228. Also see Philip Goodwin to Nelson Rockefeller, November 4, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

arrangement" with Goodwin,[161] it was not until May 1, 1937, when preliminary sketches were filed with the city, that both Goodwin and Stone were named and June 18 that they were publicly proclaimed "associate architects."[162]

Even though Goodwin expected that he and Barr would collaborate closely, Barr followed through with his threat to resign from the building committee, and therefore John McAndrew, curator of the department of architecture and industrial art between 1937 and 1940, represented the museum staff in the weekly planning meetings. However, Barr did not "stay on the sidelines through most of the planning stages," as some have concluded, but rather met separately with the architects and participated in all major decisions.[163] Guided by the recommendations of Hitchcock, Barr's ability to be "enormously persuasive" had an influence on the ultimate design.[164]

---

[161] "Nelson Rockefeller to Edward Stone, December 21, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 122, folder 1201. It appears that at this time Fantl and Barr were still searching for a second-generation modern architect, perhaps as Goodwin's associate: Fantl again cabled Clauss ("that possibility of a job about which we had so much correspondence last spring has come up again") and Barr cabled Hazen Edward Sise (1906-1974), a Canadian architect who had trained in the atelier of Le Corbusier, about "the possible job for you here assisting on our new building" (Ernestine M. Fantl to Alfred Clauss, December 7, 1936 and Alfred Barr, telegram to Hazen Sise, December 2, 1936, MoMA Archives, Early Museum History file). Also see in the same file Fantl, telegram to Clauss, December 18, 1936; Clauss to Fantl, December 9, 1936; and Clauss, telegram to Fantl, December 19, 1936.

[162] "Architects File Building Plans: Modern Art Museum Submits Preliminary Sketches for $1,000,000 Home," *New York Times*, May 1, 1937 and "Plans Revealed for New Home of Art Museum," *New York Herald Tribune*, June 18, 1937. Goodwin obviously came to respect and rely on Stone's judgment: In 1946, when asked by the museum to prepare a model for a western addition, Goodwin wrote to Johnson and to Stone asking them to take a look at it (Philip Goodwin to Edward Durell Stone, October 10, 1946, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 82, file 6). His plan is pictured and described in "The Museum of Modern Art Announces Plans for Expansion of Its Facilities," *New York Herald Tribune*, February 9, 1947.

[163] See for example Helaine Ruth Messer, *MOMA: Museum in Search of an Image* (New York: Columbia University, 1979), 5 and Ricciotti, "The 1939 Building of the Museum of Modern Art:" 66.

[164] Alfred Barr to Nelson Rockefeller, n.d., NAR Personal Projects, box 127, folder 1234. In his letter of December 9, 1936 Goodwin reported to Rockefeller that Barr "prizes highly" the opinion of Hitchcock, (NAR Personal Projects, box 131, folder 1278). Barr was very much involved in working out the technical problems regarding the glass façade with Stone and Goodwin and also worked with McAndrew and Stone in finding "a very good solution of the marquee awning problem."

In spite of the internal politics, Stone appeared unaffected by the pressure even though the planning meetings were "very stormy, very trying, nearly killed poor Goodwin, such a gentle soul."[165] Stone agreed that "there were a number of emotional moments," as did Rockefeller who told Goodwin, "I don't know any job where there have been as many diversified interests represented or where there was less precedent."[166] But Stone was able to accommodate his colleagues, his easy-going slow manner contributing to an almost unconscious diplomacy. He always said "yes" to whatever was proposed, remembered McAndrew, who also admitted that instead of intruding his own opinion in the meetings, he introduced them through Stone, who apparently was more able to make them happen in addition to being "a fountain of ideas."[167] However, many delays occurred because, as McAndrew explained, everyone cared so much and was "desperate" that the building be the best; but "the trouble was nobody could say with an assurance what was best," he recalled, and therefore the building was constantly being redesigned.[168]

Stone realized early on that it would be advantageous to established direct communication with Rockefeller. In a letter of December 15, 1936, he asked to meet with him to show the most recent work, which may have included his "progressive steps" plan

---

[165] Philip Goodwin to Nelson Rockefeller, December 9, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 131, folder 1278 and McAndrew, interview by Lynes.

[166] Stone, *Evolution of an Architec*t, 36 and Nelson Rockefeller to Philip Goodwin, August 2, 1937, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

[167] McAndrew, interview by Lynes. McAndrew provided a number of important details himself, including, the diagonal plan of the entrance and the pierced slab of the penthouse. He was also responsible for the approval of all selections of furnishings, lighting, fixtures, and hardware.

[168] McAndrew, interview by Lynes.

(today unknown) and Goodwin's "circular concrete ramp"[169] as well as a plan with galleries and offices on the same floors. He also included the article by Philip N. Youtz, entitled "Museum Planning," which had appeared that month in *Architectural Record*. "You will notice that it is almost a perfect description of the scheme which we have been working on," he said.[170] The article advocated the collaborative effort of the trustees, architects, and staff in creating "a new type of museum design unlike any that has been tried in this country." It recommended that a museum be located in the center of a city, adjacent to a municipal center; that the style not "hamper" the functions of the building; and that there be one main entrance without a monumental flights of steps. It advised that the main galleries be located near the entrance for a minimum of walking; that there be continuous controlled circulation with elevators and functional stairs conveniently located to entrance; and that the functions of the museum be divided according to the permanent and special exhibition galleries (main floors), offices (upper floors), maintenance and storage rooms (basement), and the classrooms and restaurant accessible to the main entrance. Equally significant, it also advocated an interior devoid of ornament and serving only as a background for the objects; indirect artificial lighting; and movable installations.[171]

Stone's relationship with Rockefeller developed as the project progressed to the point that Goodwin was sometimes not even aware of their communication. When Stone

---

[169] Goodwin's "ramp" design is illustrated in Ricciotti, "The 1939 Building of the Museum of Modern Art," 62, figs. 12-13.

[170] Philip Goodwin to Nelson Rockefeller, December 9, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 131, folder 1278 and Edward D. Stone to Rockefeller, December 15, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 122, folder 1201.

[171] Youtz, Philip. "Museum Planning, *Architectural Record* 80 (December 1936): 417-422.

had particular concerns about the building, he would send a note to Rockefeller before the planning meetings: for example, on April 25, 1938, he wrote that he did not like the name of the museum over the revolving doors, nor did he think the proposed illumination was dignified. Even though he did not necessarily get his way, Stone also had wanted to omit the curved soffit over the entrance to the passageway and thought the circular pierced holes in the cantilevered concrete slab over the penthouse were not only too large but should be glazed with vault lighting.[172]

By March 1937 preliminary plans were ready for presentation to the trustees. The interior arrangements of the six-story building were substantially complete: an auditorium and lounge as well as storage, packing, and shipping spaces were to be below the street level; the first three floors had flexible exhibition galleries, each uniquely posed as an open loft, or warehouse, with movable partitions, which reportedly was Stone's idea; the fourth floor would house offices, a film department, and library; the fifth floor administrative offices; and on the sixth floor, a members' lounge and terrace as well as a trustees room.[173]

In June 1937 the museum released photographs of a model of the building (fig. 72): the steel and reinforced concrete main block was faced with white Georgian marble and ground-floor stainless-steel-framed plate-glass windows on the front and a combination of glass brick and clear plate glass on the back. A tower faced with dark

---

[172] Edward D. Stone to Nelson Rockefeller, April 25, 1938, NAR Personal Projects, box 127, folder 1234.

[173] Goodyear, *The Museum of Modern Art: The First Ten Years*, 127. Even though it was unclear whether the Municipal Art Center would be approved, the museum's building plans were filed with the city on April 30, 1937: "We couldn't wait any longer," Goodwin said. "We just went ahead and designed a building which we thought was equally adapted to face either a comparatively narrow street or an open plaza" ("Plans for City Art Center Put Off Until After Election by Mayor," *New York Herald Tribune*, May 12, 1937).

stone rising twenty-six feet above the level of the penthouse contained a delivery entrance, services, and vertical circulation. Even though it was eminently recognizable that the building was the only one in the country "in the so-called international or functional style of architecture," no one intimately involved with the project was satisfied with the design [174] A letter attributed to Goodwin complained that the tower was "overpowering and made a very definite asymmetrical scheme which did not please the building committee."[175] Although, as Stone recalled, they found agreement on the plan itself, with regard to the front façade, "there was a wide variance of opinion and taste," and the two architects struggled to resolve the elevation by creating "hundreds of studies."[176] A polemical debate ensued—not only about the broad expanse of white marble but also about the gallery lighting. As opposed to the architects who were satisfied with artificial light, Barr, supported by Hitchcock, fought vehemently in favor of the more traditional use of natural light in museums, arguing to Rockefeller that the third floor alone would cost the museum around five hundred dollars a year if it were lit artificially.[177]

By July, Goodwin confessed to Rockefeller, "If we undertake to have as many elements on it as are now proposed, both in material and sizes and shapes, there is no possibility of making it restful or monumental; we have studied and restudied this

---

[174] See "Rockefeller Home Is Given to Museum," *New York Times*, June 18, 1937.

[175] N.d., MoMA Archives, Museum Building files.

[176] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 36.

[177] Henry-Russell Hitchcock to Alfred Barr, January 1, 1938, MoMA Archives, A Modern Museum and Barr to Nelson Rockefeller, June 26, 1937, Barr Papers.

elevation until we are stale on it, and I should like to give it a rest for a few days."[178] The frustration was shared by Goodyear, who wrote to Abby Rockefeller on the same day, "We are now in the last throes of major decisions on the revised plans for the new building. I am not entirely happy about them, but everyone is doing the best he can to help find the most satisfactory solution."[179]

Finally, on August 31, 1937, the *New York Times* reported that the museum's plans for a "'functional' type" of building had been filed the day before with the city, although it was not illustrated in that paper until the following January (see fig. 73).[180] The most notable were the absence of the tower and the long horizontal window, now replaced by two squat rectangular windows over the entrance.[181] Hitchcock exclaimed in a lengthy letter to Barr that after not having seen the drawings for so long he was "rather horrified" with the "cold white marble façade, rising like a cliff for two-and- a-half stories over most of the façade!" The entrance "has lost its point and even more the two windows over it have lost theirs." Such a warehouselike effect "makes one shiver," he lamented; "The timid barrenness" would be "a positive blemish" on the city. He concluded:

> You know I feel this intensely, and even feel a certain personal responsibility having elected not to resign from the architecture committee as George Howe did….It is already evident I was justified in hoping, that Philip and you could

---

[178] Philip Goodwin to Nelson Rockefeller, July 30, 1937, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233.

[179] A. Conger Goodyear to Abby Rockefeller, July 30, 1937, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center, Record Group 2, box 8, folder 106.

[180] "Plans Filed for Art Building," *New York Times* (August 31, 1937).

[181] "New Art Museum to Flout Custom," *New York Times*, January 12, 1938. Also see "New Building for Modern Art Museum," *Architectural Forum* 68 (February 1938): 7.

> work out, if not a great masterpiece of modern architecture, at least a building which the museum could worthily call its own. [182]

However, by this time Goodwin was inclined to consider all major problems settled, except for the details, and was apprehensive about making changes.[183] According to Bunshaft, who had started working in Stone's office in 1937, while Goodwin was preparing the working drawings, "Ed was restudying the main elevation of what you see now. It was all kept secret because this poor guy up there was making working drawings of some design, and Ed was changing it."[184] Perhaps this explains why on February 4, 1938, when Stone sent Rockefeller four new sketches he had created over the weekend, he informed him, "I have not discussed these ideas with Phil [Goodwin] as I wanted to make sure that you thought that these represented an improvement over the present elevation, and I would not want him to know that I had prepared these drawings." Stone said, however, that he had shown them to Barr, who was pleased with this third scheme and thought it the finest façade design to date, and to Wallace Harrison, who liked the second scheme better but realized certain practical advantages to the third one.[185] Stone himself was convinced that either scheme would make a handsome façade, but

---

[182] Hitchcock to Barr, January 1, 1938. In November 1936 the preliminary plans had been sent to Hitchcock by the museum with a note, "Mr. Mabry is anxious to hear any suggestions you care to make, but asks that you regard this at present as confidential, and any changes you think of send to him directly" (Christine to Hitchcock, November 27, 1936). In 1936 three new members were added to the architectural committee: Chauncey Stillman, John Coolidge and Catherine Bauer (Philip Goodwin to Nelson Rockefeller, February 21, 1936, NAR Personal Projects, box 126, folder 1233).

[183] Hitchcock to Barr, January 1, 1938.

[184] Gordon Bunshaft, oral history taken by Betty J. Blum, April 4–7, 1989 (www.artic.edu/aic/ libraries/ caohp/bunshaft).

[185] Edward D. Stone to Nelson Rockefeller, February 4, 1938, NAR Personal Projects, box 127, folder 1234. This date conforms to Riccotti's note 54, in *The 1939 Building of the Museum of Modern* Art, which states that the earliest drawings of the final façade are dated February 17 and 28, 1938.

considering all angles, preferred the third, which may well have been chosen, as Stone later recalled in his autobiography, "I felt the best design for the façade was the one that was finally adopted."[186]

Significantly, these drawings introduced square Thermolux panels, an experimental sandwich of spun glass between sheets of clear glass with hermetically sealed edges, intended not only to reduce heat loss by one-third compared to clear glass but also to diffuse the sunlight entering the building so that it reached further back into the galleries. "The stuff was like alabaster," Stone later said about Thermolux, "You got light through it, yet it had the feeling of solidity. It gave the monolithic effect of marble, but provided a luminous interior."[187] Thermolux had never been used in this country, and Stone urged Rockefeller's approval, explaining to him that the panels would be close in value to marble and would not be seen as "dark holes" like clear-glass windows would in the evening.[188] But according to Goodyear, it was Barr who really carried the torch for Thermolux, particularly after Hitchcock had suggested to Barr that using four bands of fenestration "not necessarily all the same width and possibly in part filled with Thermolux" would make the façade lighter and more interesting.[189] Just five days after receiving the schemes, Rockefeller informed Goodwin that the advisory committee had

---

[186] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 36.

[187] Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches."

[188] Stone to Rockefeller, February 4, 1938. According to Lynes , *Good Old Modern*, 195, the light entering through the Thermolux panels turned out to be too intense, and a false wall had to be built behind with artificial light.

[189] Goodyear, *Museum of Modern Art: The First Ten Years*,128 and Hitchcock to Barr, January 1, 1938.

"unanimously selected the all glass front."[190] Even Barr was enthusiastic, informing Rockefeller, "I really think the façade is looking up."[191] After that, the project progressed: a model of the building (fig. 74) was ready in April 1938, the exterior structure was finished by late August, and the interior completed in time for the opening on May 10, 1939.[192] Rockefeller and Goodyear were pleased with the outcome: Rockefeller wrote to Goodwin after the opening, "I don't know when I have been connected with anything that has been so successfully received by the public….I hear nothing but praise on all sides," and Goodyear wrote in his book, "Almost without exception the new building met with critical acclaim."[193]

Since its completion in 1939 and because of its successive alternations and expansions in the early 1950s (by Philip Johnson; demolished), in 1964 (by Johnson; fig. 75), in 1984 (by Cesar Pelli), and in 2004 (by Yoshio Taniguchi), the architecture of the museum has received a running critique. Notably, Stone's most significant contribution,

---

[190] Nelson Rockefeller to Philip Goodwin, February 9, 1938, NAR Personal Projects, box 127, folder 1234. According to Stephens "Are Museums Suffering From Architectural Overload?" in the recent museum renovation, Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates PC of New York City installed an updated version of the Thermolux panels made by the manufacturer who bought the original patent.

[191] Alfred Barr to Nelson Rockefeller, n.d., NAR Personal Projects, box 127, folder 1234.Yet, according to Blake, who was curator of architecture at the museum between 1948 and about 1950, "Barr never ceased to deplore the low level of sophistication displayed by the new building" (*No Place Like Utopia*, 129). Also see Lynes, *Good Old Modern*, 276.

[192] Philip L. Goodwin to Dorothy H. Dudley, March 28, 1938, MoMA Archives; "New Art Museum to Open for Fair," *New York Times*, August 30, 1938; and Lewis Mumford, "The Dead Past and the Dead Present," The Sky Line, *New Yorker*, March 23, 1940. The Stones attended one of "forty brilliant dinners" given after the opening, hosted by Goodwin and attended by Aalto, Austin, Hitchcock, Lescaze, and Mrs. Charles B. Goodspeed of Chicago (press release no. 39509-23, MoMA Archives).

[193] Goodyear, *Museum of Modern Art: The First Ten Years*, 129 and Nelson Rockefeller to Philip Goodwin, May 15, 1939, NAR Personal Projects, box 127, folder 1234. In a letter of May 24, 1939 to Henry Luce (NAR Personal Projects, box 152, folder 1510), Nelson Rockefeller said that "the general consensus of opinion at the Museum" was that the *Time* article "Nelson Rockefeller...From a Center to a Citadel" was "the most interesting and comprehensive" that had been written since "The Museum of Modern Art," *Fortune*, December 1938.

the front façade (left more or less intact; fig. 76), which has been considered "responsible for making modern architecture acceptable, even fashionable, in contemporary American culture," is still considered a hallmark of the International Style.[194]

A brief survey of the reviews reveals that with the progression of time, the perception and meaning of the building has changed, not only because of the museum's growth, transition, and extended interests but also because of stylistic developments and evolving theoretical considerations. The 1939 reviews, which tend to be traditional formalistic evaluations, praised the museum for its break with conventional museum design—particularly its monumental and ceremonial aspects. "Even if it veers slightly to the Germanic, compared to past museums, it is a refreshing and exciting experiment," said the *Magazine of Art*, which proclaimed it "America's first great modern museum."[195] Likewise, the *New York Times* called it "one of the most modern museum edifices in the country," and *Time* lauded it as "the first 'functional' museum building in the U.S."[196]

Critics were impressed with the numerous innovations that allowed for flexibility (figs. 77-78), including the huge gallery spaces with movable partitions, the removable toggle-bolted, or "buttoned," fixtures arranged in strips (track lighting), and the white plaster walls that could be penetrated with nails.[197] Instead of starting with the typical external neoclassical façade for the "remembrance of things past," the planning was

---

[194] G. E. Kidder Smith in association with the Museum of Modern Art, *The Architecture of the United States* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1981), 544.

[195] "Alfred H. Barr, Jr. Director," *Magazine of Art* 32 (June 1939): 323.

[196] "New Art Museum to Flout Custom" and "Modern Museum," Art, *Time*, June 28, 1937.

[197] "Art Building Features: Glass Will Be Freely Used for 43rd St. Museum Building," *New York Times*, December 25, 1938.

considered noteworthy because it began with the activities inside the museum, taking into consideration the fixed service elements (stairs, elevators, lavatories), which were concentrated at one end of the building to free up the gallery spaces.[198] Another departure from traditional museum design that drew much praise was that the lobby could be casually entered directly from the street level instead of a formal grand flight of stairs (fig. 68). The sweeping curve of the deep recess of the entrance, positioned by the general direction of the flow of people from Fifth Avenue, complemented by the reverse curve in the marquee above as well as by the curved counter inside, drew the common man in from the street. Thus the design symbolized the beginning of the museum's shift from an institution exclusively for the avant-garde to one that appealed to the middle class.

Although some thought the concrete roof, cantilevered and pierced with eleven round holes five feet in diameter, expanding the sky view and creating the sense of a pergola, was reminiscent of Le Corbusier's pavilion at the 1925 Exposition des arts decoratifs in Paris, it was considered a "strikingly novel motif" and the "most distinctive feature" of the building (fig. 78a).[199] Ever since 1938 when *Fortune* magazine called it "a Swiss cheese roof" the metaphor has stuck: Huxtable wrote about "the famous 'cheese hole' canopy," as did *Time*'s art critic Robert Hughes, who noted that the "futuristic Swiss-cheese holes in the roof canopy…looked apparitional."[200]

---

[198] "Modern Museums New Plans," Field Notes, *Magazine of Art* 30 (August 1937): 496.

[199] Hitchcock, "1930 to the Mid-20th Century," 272 and Stern and others, *New York 1930: Architecture and Urbanism Between the Two World Wars* (New York: Rizzoli, 1987), 144.

[200] Huxtable, "A Dubious Survival Plan For the Modern;" "The Museum of Modern Art," *Fortune*, December 1938; and Robert Hughes, "Revelation on 53rd Street," Art, *Time*, May 14, 1984.

While these comments indicate that the critics relied on one another's interpretations, they also simply repeated the facts that the museum wanted publicized. For example the article "New Art Museum to Flout Custom" in the *New York Times* was one of many highlighting the fact that there would be no masonry cornerstone since there was no place to put it on the steel and reinforced concrete building.[201] Encouraged by the museum's press release "Museum of Modern Art Will Have Glass Walls," the publication reviews commented on the building's extensive use of glass, including the ground-floor plate-glass, which seemed just "like store windows;" the five rows of Thermolux windows framed in marble, which treated the second and third floors as a single unit; the two rows of glass windows allowing direct light into the fourth and fifth floors; and the glass bricks alternating with clear glass panels for both clear and diffused light on the back façade.[202] As stated in one press release, the number of pieces of glass was also deemed newsworthy: "7500 square feet of plate glass," "2222 glass bricks," and "3300 square feet of Thermolux."[203] As a result, the building came to be considered a "Glass-Temple Museum" that was "the ultimate in modern museums anywhere in the world."[204] While *Rockefeller Center Weekly* was biased, Marion Cook's comment in it — that the public had longed for such an archetype—may indeed be realistic. She wrote, "Everybody has been flung around so during the last few years on the subject of what is

---

[201] See "New Art Museum to Flout Custom" and Malcolm S. Forbes, Fact and Comment *Forbes*, July 1, 1958.

[202] Press release no. 381220-32, MoMA Archives. See for example "Art Building Features: Glass Will Be Freely Used for 43rd St. Museum Building," "Rockefeller Site Given Museum," and "New Museum of Modern Art Opens May 10th: Tenth Anniversary Exhibit Will Inaugurate 5-Story, Glass-Walled Building," *New York Herald Tribune*, March 14, 1939.

[203] "New Museum of Modern Art Opens May 10th."

[204] "The Glass-Temple Museum: Modern Art Display Takes Over Own Building in New York," Art, *Newsweek*, May 22, 1939.

or is not modern architecture that perhaps getting out a pointer and the model of the museum…will clarify the situation." In retrospect, her expectation that the museum building would "establish a criterion for authentic modern architecture in America" was fulfilled.[205]

That being said, however, evaluations still reflected skepticism about the concept of functional, utilitarian architecture. In June 1937 an article in the *Lexington [KY] Leader* complained that because the building was being designed from the inside out, architectural beauty would be sacrificed to utility.[206] In the same vein, an article in the *Washington Star* concluded that the whole aesthetic experiment was "radical" and that the majority opinion "is not friendly to modernism, nor is there any expectation that it ever will be….The common reaction to esthetic anarchism has been laughter and derision. No genius for prophecy, then, is wanted to foretell criticism of the Rockefeller edifice."[207]

As these comments suggest, the building fueled the ongoing debate about modernism versus traditionalism. Edward Alden Jewell (1888-1947), art critic of the *New York Times* admired the building's restrained individuality and its cautious restraint from eccentricity, concluding that its pliant and adaptable composition was suitably expressive of the fluid cultural life of the world.[208] Conversely, Cortissoz, who has since been called

---

[205] Marion Cook, "A Million Dollars Goes Modern," *Rockefeller Center Weekly* (July 16, 1937), 6.

[206] "Modernistic Museum," *Lexington (KY) Leader*, June 29, 1937 and Lynes, *Good Old Modern*, 194.

[207] "Modern Art Museum," *Washington Star*, June 20, 1937.

[208] "The Museum of Modern Art: Its New Home Inaugurated by a Brilliant Exhibition," *New York Herald Tribune*, May 14, 1939.

by Macdonald the museum's "most implacable enemy,"[209] grumbled that the new building was "rather difficult to approach in the right mood. It has committed itself to one of the most forbidding facades in the annals of the city, a bold essay in that style which may be in harmony with the Mesopotamian word 'functionalism' but which, in its ugliness, looks just like so much sheeted vacuity."[210]

Since the building was the only part of the museum's collection "permanently and indefinitely on display," as Talbot Hamlin noted in *Pencil Points*, it necessarily served as evidence of the museum's aims and ideals for the some eighteen hundred daily visitors.[211] The simple line drawing of the front façade (fig. 79) prominently placed on the cover of the tenth anniversary exhibition catalogue, *Art In Our Time* (1939), which opened the new building, boldly illustrated that the structure was intended to be a living model of the museum's agenda to continue the object lesson set forth in the 1932 International Style exhibition, namely to shape American architecture by fostering good building with high aesthetic standards and by providing an effective channel for public education in modern architecture.[212]

Interestingly, however, contemporary reviews generally did not reference the International Style exhibition. Nor was any aspect of the design, such as the dematerialized internal staircase (fig. 78b), which Hamlin considered "one of the most

---

[209] Dwight Macdonald, "Action on West Fifty-Third Street-II," Profiles, *New Yorker*, December 19, 1953.

[210] "The Museum of Modern Art: Its New Home Inaugurated by a Brilliant Exhibition."

[211] Talbot F. Hamlin, "Modern Display for Works of Art," *Pencil Points* 20 (September 1939): 615 and "Record-Breaking Attendance at New Home of Museum of Modern Art," press release no. 39606-24, MoMA Archives.

[212] *Art in Our Time: An Exhibition to Celebrate the Tenth Anniversary of the Museum of Modern Art and the Opening of Its New Building* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1939) and Summary Report of the Department of Architecture, June 3, 1939, Barr Papers.

brilliant parts of the entire design," or the vertical lettering on the blue-tiled edge of the exterior (fig. 67), both of which recall the Bauhaus building in Dessau, Germany, judged in relation to European prototypes.[213] Rather, criticism stemmed from current ideas about architecture in America, and, in effect, emphasized individual distinction and organic expression. Lewis Mumford, a self-professed humanist who felt that modern architecture should emerge organically and functionally from the requirements of site, climate, and human needs, did not like the choice of materials because they did not visually complement the lavender-tan bricks of the nearby Rockefeller Apartments (1936) or the limestone of Rockefeller Center.[214] He was not impressed with the blue-glazed terra cotta tiles that faced the exterior side walls and were carried into the members lounge on the top floor to further integrate the exterior with the interior, perhaps because these tiles had been chosen to emphasize the whiteness of the exterior marble (after many different colored samples had been placed on various parts of the building).[215] However, Mumford did like the penthouse cornice skylights for their accent of shadow; the gracious curves that restored freedom of the unexpected, which he said purely rational design sometimes too austerely avoided; and the dramatic play of air, space, and light in the garden as viewed from the ground floor or the staircase—details that all contributed to the vital humanistic environments he advocated. In contrast to European models, Mumford concluded that "the combination of appropriate materials, light, color, and living forms

---

[213] Hamlin, "Modern Display for Works of Art," 616. Most of the stair was demolished twenty years ago and now only a reconstructed remnant remains between the second and third floors.

[214] Robert Wojtowicz, "Toward An Organic Architectural Criticism," in Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, "Lewis Mumford and American Modernism: European Theories for Architecture and Urban Planning," *Architectural Historian in America* 35 (1990): 246-247 and Lewis Mumford, "Modernity and Commerce," The Sky Line, *New Yorker*, October 3, 1936.

[215] Attributed to Goodwin.

here demonstrates the rich decorative resources of modern architecture."[216] Hamlin too was impressed that the building did not follow the tenets of a preordained style, commenting that it was "rich enough in simple form composition to have a value quite apart from its style, yet inventive and distinctively contemporary enough to please all except the most doctrinaire of functionalist critics."[217]

However, one complaint registered by Hamlin persisted: he criticized the "illogical" Thermolux façade because it did not distinguish the stories behind it and therefore privileged form over function. In response, in her 1944 exhibition entitled Built in USA, Elizabeth Bauer Mock (later Kassler; 1911-1998), acting curator in the department of architecture at the museum between 1942 and 1946, wrote, "The entrance facade has little to do with actual floor and ceiling levels and deliberately ignores the vertical shaft of the staircase, yet has a dramatic appeal of its own."[218] As a representative of the museum, she surely was acknowledging the perceived flaw with regard to functionalism but at the same time was trying to defend it. (Still in 1993 Peter Blake complained that the "flat, bland, glass and marble facades expressed neither structure nor function nor any significant form," and he concluded that this "superficially 'modern' art box" satisfied only the "more Philistine trustees."[219])

With time and perspective, criticism of the building naturally evolved, perhaps stimulated, as Norval White conjectured, by the museum's self-appointed role as arbiter

---

[216] Mumford, "Modernity and Commerce."

[217] Hamlin, "Modern Display for Works of Art," 118.

[218] Elizabeth Mock, Captions, MoMA Archives, Built in USA, 1932-44, Exhibition File, 258c, May 24–October 22, 1944 (hereafter cited as Built in USA).

[219] Blake, *No Place Like Utopia*, 128 and 148.

"of official and officious modernism."[220] Ironically, by mid-century the building was formalistically compared to European prototypes, and the attempt to depart from accepted models and experiment with individual expressions appropriate for America was no longer appreciated, Johnson, for example, stated in a 1958 slide lecture that although Stone was "certainly the most popular modern architect today," his museum of 1939 was "a very pedestrian piece of International Style work. [The year] 1937 was too early in this country for it and, as Le Corbusier said, 'My God, they can't even copy me!'"[221] Jordy agreed, stating in his 1965 retrospective essay, "The International Style in the 1930s," that none of the buildings created after the 1932 exhibition, including the Museum of Modern Art, compared to the buildings erected between 1926 and 1927 in Europe. Moreover, he asserted that the most interesting modern American work successfully modified the principles set down by Hitchcock and Johnson, which in his opinion the Museum of Modern Art did not do.[222] In *A Personal View of Modern Architecture* (1962), Reyner Banham too argued that like a paranoid teenager, the museum strictly conformed to the precepts of the International Style.[223]

With the crisis of modernism in the 1970s, Johnson, who by then was immersed in postmodernism, made an attempt, together with Bunshaft, Harrison, and Edward Larrabee Barnes (1915-2004), to replace the Goodwin/Stone façade during one of the

---

[220] Norval White, *Architecture Book*, 292.

[221] Johnson, "Retreat From the International Style to the Present Scene" in *Writings*, 97. His comment may reflect professional resentment, as Johnson had become the museum's house architect by that date. When both appeared on *The Eye of New York* in June 1959, Johnson and Stone had been "articulately opposed in their theories," which "made for the best form of argument" (Warren Wallace to Edward Durell Stone, June 8, 1959, Stone Papers).

[222] Jordy, "The International Style in the 1930s," 152 and 158.

[223] Banham, *A Personal View of Modern Architecture* (London: Architectural Press, 1962), 13.

museum's expansion projects; they reportedly "urged" Cesar Pelli to create a new, more unified image. [224] In defiance, Huxtable, who as a student had worked at the museum under Johnson between 1946 and 1950, proclaimed that this "major architectural and cultural landmark" was "a rare, superb and almost unique example of the International Style." She continued, "The museum built it in its enthusiasm for that style, with which the museum was identified and which it helped put on the map. It is unthinkable that those who owe so much to this image would simply wipe it out."[225] This interest in maintaining the building as a symbol of the International Style reflected a postmodern historical perspective, which saw modernism as one of a succession of styles subject to preservation and reference in contemporary work.[226]

In a second article, in which Huxtable celebrated the museum's decision to clean and restore the original façade rather than eliminate it, she claimed, "It has become as symbolic an image of early modernism as Duchamp's 'Nude Descending a Staircase' and the famous fur-lined teacup. To destroy it is to destroy an era and a milestone in the history of art."[227] For her, the concept of "modern" had become historical and the museum façade its relic. Thus, the meaning of the façade had changed from its original "radical" and "experimental" position to one that was "symbolic" and "nostalgic," both

---

[224] "Modern Art for the New Museum of Modern Art," *Architectural Record* 172 (October 1984):164-165. Blanchette Rockefeller, David Rockefeller, and William Paley backed the scheme to preserve what was left of the original façade.

[225] Lynes, *Good Old Modern*, 276 and Huxtable, "A Dubious Survival Plan For the Modern."

[226] McLeod, "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernism to Deconstructivism," 37.

[227] Ada Louise Huxtable, "The Modern Prepares for Expansion," *New York Times*, June 29, 1980. In 1911 Marcel Duchamp (1887-1968) created "Nude Descending the Staircase," a notorious symbol of modern art. The fur-lined teacup, an archetypal surrealist work, was designed in 1936 by Meret Oppenheim (1913-1985) and exhibited that year at the Museum of Modern Art's Art, Dada and Surrealism exhibition.

of which were strong undercurrents of contemporary theory. Indeed, much of the criticism in the 1970s and 1980s evolved from retrospective interpretations that included current ideological motives, cultural meanings, and dominant values. These perspectives, according to McLeod, reflected new interests in cultural signs, encouraged by semiology and communication theories, by which "meaning," instead of "institutional reform," became the objective.[228]

Nonetheless, some still insisted on a formalistic reading that incorporated citations from past styles, the most obvious characteristic of postmodernism. Accordingly, Ricciotti read the three-part elevation as reminiscent of an Italian palazzo (the Thermolux being equivalent to the *piano nobile*), which made evident the persistence of Beaux-arts classicism.[229] Goldberger too said in 1989 that the museum's most impressive quality was the extent to which it is "so completely 'modern' and yet so much like a great palazzo at the same time," retaining the formal, self-assured sumptuousness of a Beaux-arts mansion.[230]

In the same article, "A Wistful Ode to a Museum That Once Was," Goldberger presented the building as a heroic, utopian effort that was a vital part of the envisioned renewal of society. Correspondingly, he lamented the loss of the museum's intimate relationship to the neighboring nineteenth-century brownstones and therefore the loss of

---

[228] McLeod, "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernism to Deconstructivism," 38.

[229] Ricciotti, "The 1939 Building of the Museum of Modern Art," 70-73. Ricciotti attributed the classical inspiration only to Goodwin, but Stone too must be considered since he was educated according to Beaux-arts precepts.

[230] Paul Goldberger, "Architecture View: A Wistful Ode to a Museum That Once Was," *New York Time*s, June 11, 1989.

its contextual shock value of "laserlike sharpness."[231] As he had contended in an earlier article, environmental opposition had been crucial to the success of its design, "Like a revolutionary at a ladies' tea party," it was "crisp, sharp, gleaming and hard edged as opposed to somber and soft."[232] In contrast, in her post-renovation review of 1989 Huxtable wrote, "Although the old façade is flush and continues with the new one, its white marble framing will set it apart from the rest as a discrete architectural and historical event."[233] Thus, while for Goldberger the Stone façade could only be understood within its original context as a daring, decisive break from the past, for Huxtable the building took on new meaning as both a historical artifact and a metaphor. According to Huxtable's reassessment, the building is best perceived as a formalist exercise, its value being in its communicative power as a cultural object and not as the redemptive or revolutionary icon, to which Goldberger spoke.

In 1989 McQuaid claimed that the façade had always been an easily recognizable "billboard" for the museum, a comment that not only figuratively reflects the pop sensibility but identified the institution as a vernacular commercial instrument of consumer culture, an image the museum by then was aggressively pursuing. Her metaphor makes it impossible not to consider the museum in relation to the billboard strips that Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour glorified in *Learning from Las Vegas* (1972), a founding text of postmodernism.[234] When Jordy further

---

[231] Ibid.

[232] Ibid.

[233] Huxtable, "The Modern Prepares for Expansion."

[234] Draft of text panel for A Modern Museum: The 1939 Goodwin/Stone Building, MoMA Archives, A Modern Museum.

commented in 1972 that the museum "was placed in the heart of the city, as a cultural Macy's," he too positioned the building as an instrument of mass consumerism instead of high culture.[235]

In "The Museum of Modern Art: The Past's Future" (1992) art historian Alan Wallach considered the museum in relation to some of these mutations, which he organized into three distinct phases.[236] In the first, "Utopia," he agreed with Goldberger that the contrast between the museum's industrial machine look and the neighboring brownstones was crucial in the repudiation of the past and promise for the future. As he reflected on the museum's second phase, "Nostalgia," Wallach observed that Johnson's 1964 east wing, strongly contrasting to the original façade in color and design, reflected the museum's altered mission from constantly acquiring new works and showing representative art of the past fifty years to building a permanent collection of modern art without time limits. Like Huxtable, he asserted that the preserved Goodwin/Stone façade nostalgically became the museum's logo, an architectural emblem. However, alongside Johnson's no-nonsense steel and glass design, it now stood for failed utopian prophecy.[237] In his final, somewhat ambiguous, description of the third phase, "Forever Modern," Wallach claimed that the 1989 Pelli tower intensified the contrast, between the original utopian hopes and the unfocused dynamism of late capitalism, thus further distancing the museum from its ideological origins.

---

[235] William H. Jordy, *American Buildings and Their Architects: The Impact of European Modernism in the Mid-Twentieth Centur*y 5 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), 12.

[236] Alan Wallach, "The Museum of Modern Art: The Past's Future," *Journal of Design History* 5 (1992): 207.

[237] Ibid., 210-211.

Along the same lines, in a special issue about the museum in the *New Criterion* in 1984 Kramer described the deepening, inherent conflict in the museum's identity between "custodian and codifier of history" and "arbiter of contemporary taste." This split, he said, is expressed in the museum's exterior form: the Goodwin/Stone façade as a "historical archive" and each addition as "a living artistic force"[238] Although the façade has so completely been re-read as "historical," it has not marked Stone's current reputation because current discourse is more focused on his transgression of the International Style rather than on its perfection, exemplified by the blatant omission of the 1939 model of the museum (fig. 74) from the retrospective exhibition of the architecture collection at the opening of the new galleries in 2005.

The recent redevelopment of the building by Taniguchi has brought about yet another interpretation, in which the Goodwin/Stone façade has been relieved of its role as relic and turned into a facilitator. As described by the *New York Times* architecture critic Nicolai Ouroussoff, the façade's original mission—to challenge Old World pretensions by allowing the middle class to charge directly into the building right off the street—inspired the design of the new lobby that was punched right through the midtown block, fusing the museum with its urban surroundings. However, instead of being sealed in a time capsule, as Wallach has observed, Stone and Goodwin's "milky white translucent exterior" together with the other volumes, became "a vibrantly powerful composition of overlapping images with multiple historical meanings." "The effect is hypnotic," he proclaimed, resulting in "a near-perfect example of how architecture can be forceful without competing with the art it enfolds." He added, although the formalistic focus on

[238] Kramer, "MOMA Reopened: The Museum of Modern Art in the Postmodern Era,"1 and 44.

"aesthetic purity," as opposed to the social or psychological meaning, returned the façade to its earlier position of idealized, universal truth, it is with the retrospective understanding that "it is a stunning myth."[239]

Jed Perl, art critic for the *New Republic*, asserted that with the changes by Taniguchi the museum was transformed into a "monument" by successfully uniting the various fragments of architecture and giving "a new shine to the best of the old Modern." He explained, "Taniguchi's canniness rests in his decision at once to accept the sense of discrete volumes and voids that was bequeathed to him and to unite them through his strong constructivist feeling, a feeling for form that he underscores through the graphic articulation of two-dimensional surfaces." But, as opposed to Ouroussoff, since the architect worked dialectically, as opposed to confrontationally, he did not think that the various layers of the building had been regarded as historical artifacts. As a result, the Goodwin/Stone façade no longer has meaning as an individual work but instead gains meaning through its relationship with the other volumetric units. Accordingly, the original façade is not a unique, one-time event but rather part of a greater whole, moreover, one that develops over time.[240] In this most recent perspective, the authorship is no longer significant since the original façade is now subordinate to the whole complex.

Stone had worried that glass facades could lead to "complete impersonal anonymity," and, consequently, after the completion of the museum he began to "quarrel with the point of the glass box." Like Wright, he had been passionate that his own

---

[239] Nicolai Ouroussoff, "Art Fuses With Urbanity in an Aesthetically Pure Redesign of the Modern," Architectural Review, *New York Times*, November 15, 2004.

[240] Jed Perl, "Modern Immaturity," Jed Perl on Art, *New Republic* 231 (November 6, 1929): 33.

vigorous personality never be eliminated from a building, and as he began to experiment with more organic, vernacular forms of expression (see figs.29 and 168), he came to the conclusion that he had "little love for glass," not just because of its inability to control heat and glare but also because it could lead to anonymity, which he said, was "not correct for architecture."[241] Nonetheless, the Museum of Modem Art had presented a tremendous opportunity for Stone in terms of exposure, publicity, and experience. And although it was the very building that spurred Stone to seek alternative solutions to modernism, ironically, it is this building more than others that still today symbolizes the International Style.

[241]Allan Temko, "American Architecture: Down to the Skin and Bones," *AIA Journal* 30 (November 1958): 23; "Frank Lloyd Wright Discussion between Frank Jennings and Edward D. Stone," rough draft, May 7, 1959, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 90, file 6; and Edward Durell Stone, "When the Business Man Builds," draft for *Think Magazine*, April 1959, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 90, file 2.

Chapter Three: New Romanticism: A Provocative Aesthetic

In response to his dissatisfaction with what Edward Durell Stone perceived as the "temporary," "transitory," and "expendable" features of the International Style, he wanted to create an architecture of "richness," "warmth," and "delicacy."[1] In the 1950s, in the midst of the Cold War, he was presented with two high-profile opportunities abroad in which he began to realize these goals: the United States Pavilion (1956-1958) at the Exposition Universelle et Internationale Bruxelles (fig.19) and the American Embassy complex (1953-1965) in New Delhi, India (fig. 23). Hailed as masterpieces, together these commissions for the United States government came to represent, in a very conspicuous way, American democracy abroad during a time when, as *Life* explained, "Americans were quietly living with the fact that their enemy had the capacity to destroy tens of millions at a blow."[2]

Because the American defense against Communism was completely intertwined with notions of cultural freedom, the Cold War was uniquely fought with violent propaganda and subversive political activities—in short, with ideas rather than with arms. Thus, the implications of the Stone aesthetic were evaluated as part of a larger concern about artistic supremacy manifesting the ideologies of a democratic society. Consequently, Stone recognized that these projects had to appeal intellectually and emotionally to a broad audience in an effort to "win the hearts of the uncommitted in the Cold War," as John Kenneth Galbraith (1908-2006), the "iconoclastic" diplomat who was ambassador to India between 1961 and 1963, explained. Stone was required to inspire

---

[1] Hall, "Directions in Modern Architecture."

[2] "Our New and Vaster Frontier: America's Past and Future, Blessings and Perils Impose a Mission of Freedom, Law and Prosperity in the World," editorial, *Life*, December 23 1957.

confidence in his architecture by conveying the intangibles of a democratic society: especially stability and friendliness.[3]

Not only did Stone greet the challenge with imagination and ingenuity but, more importantly, with a willingness to depart from established precedents while working under the watchful eye of architectural advisory committees—which perhaps brought out the very best in him. As he consciously strove to bypass dogmatic architectural philosophies and let the conditions specific to each project determine his creations, Stone developed a "romantic" modern aesthetic consisting of simple classical arrangements with a profusion of patterns, textures, and rich details. "It was my own and it was unique," Stone said about his individual expression, which, in fact, was part of a larger effort at the time to reconceptualize modernism.[4] For the initial main objective of modernism—the glorification of a mechanical and the puritanic aesthetic—had long since been accomplished.[5]

As Stone dismantled the codified modernist aesthetic, he sought a warmer, more humanistic variation possessing the dignity and formality commonly associated with government buildings without the more typical official "mausoleum styling."[6] Even though he utilized contemporary ideas about modern planning and technology, Stone gave his architecture meaning by accommodating cultural and regional traditions and

---

[3] John Kenneth Galbraith, "For Public and Potent Building," *New York Times Magazine*, October 9, 1960; Holcomb B. Noble and Douglas Martin, "John Kenneth Galbraith, 97, Dies; Economist, Diplomat and Writer," *New York Times*, April 30, 2006; and "U.S. Embassy Building," *Marg* 10 (December 1956): 68.

[4] Heyer, *Architects on Architecture*, 175.

[5] Lewis Mumford, "Status Quo," The Sky Line, *New Yorker*, October 11, 1947.

[6] Edward Durell Stone to J. William Fulbright, April 13, 1959, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 70, file 20.

honoring long-standing conventions and symbols.[7] He also responded to specific, yet evolving, typological requirements. As Stone himself proclaimed in his article of 1960, "Break the Rules," "We are only beginning to understand the power of individuals to shape their own character[s] by their selection among models and experiences."[8] Thus, these were the projects in which Stone developed his signature, decorative modernist style, which became associated with reigning notions of "Americanness" then being played off against Communism in the Cold War polemic.

Perhaps in anticipation of more success or in order to further solidify his presence on American soil, before the New Delhi embassy and Brussels pavilion were even finished, Stone extended their formalistic vocabularies to private commissions—among them his own house (1956-1957) at 130 East 64th Street in New York City (fig. 4); the Bruno Graf house (1955-1958) in Dallas, Texas (fig. 80); the Stuart Pharmaceutical Company (fig. 31); and the first two of six dormitories (1958) at the University of South Carolina in Camden (fig. 81). Because these were on American turf and therefore more accessible to the media, they reinforced the popular response to the Stone aesthetic that was creating such a sensation abroad. In fact, all four of these projects were illustrated in *Time's* cover story on Stone on March 31, 1958.[9]

---

[7] Ibid. In a letter of March 4, 1958, Stone wrote to Ralph Walker, "I often think of your statement some twenty years ago that 'modern architecture lacked humanism.' Time has proven you a prophet. I hope that I in some small way am bringing some warmth into the picture" (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 83, file 16).

[8] Edward Durell Stone, "Words to Live By: 'Break the Rules!'" *New York Herald Tribune This Week Magazine*, May 8, 1960.

[9] "More Than Modern." Stone said in his letter of March 18, 1958 to Cranston Jones at *Time* that he "trembled" in anticipation of the article but relied on him as a humanitarian to treat him well (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, file 14).

Among their common features, the most notable was the perforated screen, or grille (see fig.32), an inexpensive functional device with decorative implications that after its initial application on the embassy chancery quickly became his "trademark" and recognized as a basic architecture principle.[10] Even though Ellsworth Bunker (1894-1984), the ambassador to India between 1956 and 1961, sounded a "note of warning" when he saw a resemblance between Stone's Indian embassy and the California pharmaceutical plant—which he thought debased the character of the government architecture—in truth, the more ubiquitous the grille, the stronger Stone's reputation became.[11] As James Lull explained in *Media, Communication, Culture*, repetition of images through various forms of publicity is an extremely important means of redefining culture.[12] Thus, the reiteration of his aesthetic as an object of consumption to a diverse constituency via the print or television media enabled Stone to bring about effectively a more inclusive definition of modernism.

Stone understood that "familiarity is necessary to the mass man," as Joseph Bensman and Bernard Rosenberg explained in *Mass, Class and Bureaucracy*, and with each piece of media the recognition of Stone and his work grew steadily.[13] An

---

[10] "More Than Modern." But even then, not everyone responded favorably to Stone's grille trademark: When he was being considered for the theater at the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, a memorandum written by Reginald Allen documenting a meeting with Stone on June 24, 1958 stated, "There was some delicate conversation on the subject of decorative style, suggesting that if perhaps the Edward Stone grille trademark seemed inappropriate for the theater design would that hamper Stone, and he stated that it would not." A subsequent memorandum by Allen of July 17, 1958, stated, "It was generally agreed that Mr. Stone was the least appropriate for this particular assignment"(Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts Archives).

[11] "A New Public Architecture," *Architectural Forum* 110 (January 1959): 84.

[12] James Lull, *Media, Communication, Culture: A Global Approach*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 19.

[13] Bensman and Rosenberg, *Mass, Class, and Bureaucracy*, 345 and John W. Cook and Klotz Heinrich, *Conversations With Architects* (New York: Praeger, 1973), 198.

examination of the public recognition Stone received in the year 1958 as he was nearing the apex of his popularity, documents just how thoroughly self-perpetuating the publicity was. On February 2, 1958, Ed Sullivan not only introduced Stone, who was in the audience, on his television variety show (fig. 82) but he also showed a clip of his own visit to the Brussels Exposition and patriotically proclaimed, "As an American I was so deeply proud that our pavilion is certainly the most magnificent pavilion on the fair grounds."[14] Less than two weeks later Stone was the first architect to be interviewed on Edward R. Murrow's *Person to Person* (1953-1961) television show on CBS (fig. 83), which had an estimated audience of twenty million. As Stone and his wife gave a tour of their recently remodeled brownstone (1956-1958)—"the publicity of the private" in the words of Colomina—the interviewer, Gary Moore, proclaimed that it was "the most talked about house in the city" and Stone one of America's foremost architects.[15] Then in August he made a guest appearance on the game show *What's My Line?* (fig. 84) and was introduced as "Mr. E. D. S." Although the celebrity panel—Arlene Francis, George Sanders, Bennett Cerf, and Dorothy Kilgallen—was disappointed when it failed to establish his identity, Miss Francis responded after being told he was the architect of the United States Pavilion in Brussels, "It's the most beautiful building there, Mr. Stone. Everyone says that is absolutely glorious to look at." The host, John Daly, then added, "At the risk of once again weighting things with my personal opinion, I consider it the most beautiful building I've ever laid my eyes on."[16] Stone also received extensive

---

[14] *Ed Sullivan Show*, Sofa Entertainment, February 2, 1958.

[15] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 8 and "Architect Stone in the Public Limelight," 77.

[16] *What's My Line?* Mark Goodson Bill Todman Production, August 10, 1958.

"potent propaganda," as he called it, in the print media at the time. In February his house was featured in the fashion magazine *Vogue* (which had "inspired" Murrow to extend the invitation to be on his show) and in March he was the cover story of *Time* (fig. 9).[17] The following month, when the exposition opened, a three-cent United States postage stamp with an aerial view of the pavilion was issued (fig. 85).[18]

All the while, Stone was recognized within his own profession, generating even more coverage in newspapers and trade journals. In February he was elected to the National Institute of Arts and Letters (after being nominated by Henry Shepley and seconded by Pietro Belluschi and Ralph Thomas Walker [1889-1973]), founded in 1898 as the highest ranking honor society of the arts in the United States with membership limited to 250 native or naturalized citizens qualified by notable achievements.[19] In March he was named a fellow of the AIA for his achievement of design.[20] In May he received from the AIA one of five Honor Awards out of four hundred entries for his Stuart Pharmaceutical Company building (fig. 31) as well as one of nine Awards of Merit

---

[17] See "Most Talked About House in New York City;" Edward Durell Stone, interview by Gary Moore, *Person to Person*, CBS, February 14, 1958*; Ed Sullivan Show;* "News About Architects," *Memo: A Newsletter* no. 180 (February 24, 1958), AIA Archives; and Edward Durell Stone to Allison Bisgood, February 12, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 75, file 8.

[18] The stamp was designed by Bradbury Thompson and issued on April 17, 1958 in Detroit, Michigan.

[19] Henry Shepley's nomination for Stone, along with letters of support by New York architect Aymar Embury; Gilmore D. Clarke, chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts; and Eric Gugler, who redecorated the White House in the 1930s and 1940s, are in the archives of the American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters (which merged with the National Institute of Arts and Letters in 1967, after which the latter was dissolved in 1992; see www.artsandletters.org/index.php?page=history).

[20] "More Than Modern" and "Honor for Architects: Four Here Are Among Twenty Elected to Institute," *New York Times*, April 27, 1958. Stone did not become a fellow of the AIA until 1958 because, as Ralph Walker explained in his letter of August 23, 1954 to Antonin Raymond in response to his inquiry, he had only became a member of the AIA in 1946 (nominated by Philip Goodwin and Morris Ketchum) and therefore had not yet belonged to the AIA for the requisite ten years (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 74, file 3).

for the United States Pavilion at the Brussels Exposition.[21] In June Stone was chosen as one of the thirteen "form givers" who would be featured in the two-year traveling architecture exhibition of the same title organized co-operatively by *Time* and the American Federation of Arts to mark the latter's fiftieth anniversary.[22] Pasadena client Ludwig Lauerhass exclaimed in a letter to Stone, "Scarcely a publication appears without a story or pictures or both about you and your great work."[23] Stone received all this attention even though the archetype of his full-blown aesthetic—the American Embassy in New Delhi—would not even open until early the following year. Nor did it matter that it was remotely located on the other side of the world—in a country about which not even President Eisenhower had much knowledge or personal interest.[24]

However, nine months before the New Delhi embassy debuted, the world was exposed to Stone's architecture at the Exposition Universelle et Internationale Bruxelles 1958, which opened in April (fig. 86). While the two projects in many respects shared a similar formalistic vocabulary, they differed in that the objective of the United States Pavilion was to elicit an emotional response from the public—not just from the thirty-million visitors who entered the building but from people all across the world who knew it only through the media. In keeping with the exposition theme, "A World View—A

---

[21] See "First Honor Award: The Stuart Company," *AIA Journal* 30 (July 1958): 32; "Architects Institute Selects Best Building Design of Year," *New York Times*, May 26, 1958; "Honor Awards," *Memo: A Newsletter* no. 186 (May 26, 1958): 2, AIA Archives; and Ludwig Lauerhass to Edward Durell Stone, May 5, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, file 15.

[22] The records for the Form Givers exhibition are in the AFA Records.

[23] Stone to Lauerhass, May 19, 1958. Stone designed a house for Lauerhass, the assistant of Arthur Hanisch, the president of the Stuart Pharmaceutical Company.

[24] "More Plastic Image," *Architectural Review* 130 (July 1961): 4-5.

New Humanism," the pavilion provided a vital opportunity for the United States to symbolize its political ideology as well as its friendly hospitality.[25]

Although more than fifty nations constructed pavilions, the six-month exposition is remembered most for the competitive showmanship that took place between the Soviet Union and the United States in their struggle for world supremacy. As nuclear tension loomed, American diplomats understood that the exposition could provide a cultural arena for the two superpowers to confront each other and where Europeans could compare them. Although viewed by Americans as a critical forum for extending friendship to Western Europe and promoting global peace, as *Newsweek* correctly predicted in April 1957, the two "Rival Neighbors" (figs. 87-88) would soon be "locking horns in a battle of pavilions."[26] To be sure, this face-off became one of the most powerful attractions: "It took no deep vision to see Brussels as a battlefield of propaganda, a priceless chance to pit the American culture against the Red slave system and also against a baker's dozen of serf (socialist) systems," Dillard Stokes observed at the time in *Human Events*.[27]

The United States government had agreed in principle to participate in the international exposition, the first since 1939, by October 1954. But it was not until May 1955 that Paul Cushing Child (1902-1994), an exhibits officer for the United States

---

[25] Harry Gilroy, "Million Gay Visitors Close Brussels Fair," *New York Times*, October 20, 1958.

[26] Office of the U.S. Commissioner General to the Brussels World's Fair, The United States Pavilion at the Brussels World's Fair, 1958; Statement of Adlai Stevenson, June 26, 1958, Exposition Records, box 11; "Special International Report: World's Fair—Brussels '58," *Newsweek*, April 1, 1957, Exposition Records; and Brigitte Schroeder-Gudehus and David Cloutier, "Popularizing Science and Technology During the Cold War: Brussels 1958," in Robert W. Rydell and Nancy Gwinn, eds., *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World* (Amsterdam: VU Press, 1994), 162.

[27] Dillard Stokes, "Bureaucrats and the Brussels Fair: Why America Is Slated for a 'Humiliation'," *Human Events* 15 (April 14, 1958): 15.

Information Agency (USIA; 1953-1999), was sent to Brussels to evaluate potential American involvement.[28] His dispatch to Joseph B. Phillips, director of the Office of Public Affairs at the State Department, recommended that the government seize the opportunity to influence other countries and persuade them to a favorable view of the United States. He recommended that the pavilion be designed by one of the leading architects because it is the "prestige" of the structure that makes a lasting impression. It should be a place, he wrote,

> where our best national architectural effort should be put. (The small pavilion designed for the Barcelona World's Fair…by Mies van der Rohe, is still remembered wherever architects foregather, as a marvel of distinction and beauty.) It is my view, furthermore, that the architect chosen should not have been born outside the United States, even if now an American citizen. If he were, it would give too good a propaganda opportunity to those trying to make trouble. This is unfortunate, but I believe it is necessary.

Child further advised that even though temporary, the building should be impressively beautiful and so distinguished and handsome both inside and out that it would be remembered by every visitor.[29] But in spite of his recommendation, government officials vacillated and did not firmly commit for another seven months to the "magnificent" plot of twenty-five-thousand square meters being held in reserve for the United States.[30]

It was another two months before J. Burke Wilkinson, assistant to the assistant secretary of state in the Office of Public Affairs, asked the opinion of Edmund R. Purves

---

[28] The baron Moens de Fernig to Frederick M. Alger, ambassador to Belgium, December 13, 1955, Exposition Records, box 1. According to Haddow on page 71 of *Pavilions of Plenty* the invitation was received on June 21, 1954. Devoted to public diplomacy, the United States Information Agency had a mission to understand, inform, and influence foreign publics in the promotion of national interest and to broaden the dialogue between American institutions and their counterparts abroad (www.answers.com/ topic /united-states-information-agency).

[29] Paul Child, dispatch to Joseph B. Phillips, May 9, 1955, Exposition Records, box 16. Child was the husband of the chef Julia McWilliams Child (1912-2004).

[30] The baron Moens de Fernig to Ambassador Alger, December 13, 1955.

(1897-1964), executive director of the AIA, on how best to proceed in choosing an architect. Purves suggested forming an advisory committee of five outstanding architects from across the country, following the successful model used for the selection of Hugh Stubbins Jr. (1912-2006) for the Berlin Congress Hall project (1955-1957), which had set a precedent for exhibition architecture.[31] So, in March 1956 it was announced that George B. Cummings, president of the AIA, had appointed Earl T. Heitschmidt (1894-1972) of Los Angeles as the chair of a committee consisting of Edgar I. Williams (1913-1974) of New York City, Richard Koch (1889-1971) of New Orleans, Roy Frank Larson (1893-1973) of Philadelphia, and Clair W. Ditchy (1891-1967) of Detroit—all of whom had more experience in traditional than modern architecture.[32] With the exception of Larson who could not attend, they met on March 19, and after examining and deliberating the qualifications of some seventeen architects, decided on Stone, who, Heitschmidt later recalled "was the only architect all five of us could agree upon."[33] Landreth M. Harrison

---

[31] Landreth M. Harrison, "Brussels Fair-AIA-Purvis-Building," memorandum for the files, February 27, 1956 and "Brussels Fair-1958-Building Plans - AIA," memorandum for the files, March 2, 1958, Exposition Records, box 8. Also see Dianne Ludman Frank, *Hugh Stubbins and His Associates: The First Fifty Years* (Cambridge, MA: Stubbins Ass., 1986), 36-27 and 132; Barbara Miller Lane, "The Berlin Congress Hall, 1955-1957," *Perspectives in American History* 1 (1984): 131-185 and "Dedication of Berlin Congress Hall," *Memo: A Newsletter*, no. 171 (September 9, 1957), AIA Archives.

[32] Edmund R. Purves to Landreth M. Harrison, March 14, 1956, Exposition Records, box 8 and the AIA advisory committee, The Report of the Activities on the Brussels International Exposition Building for the Department of State, October 4, 1956, Stone Papers, 1st acc. According to the minutes of the annual meeting of the AIA board of directors, February 27–March 1, 1956 (AIA Archives), Walter T. Rolfe of Houston, John Wellborn Root Jr. of Chicago, and John Frederick Harbeson of Philadelphia declined to sit on the committee. Ray Larson was educated at the University of Pennsylvania and had worked for Paul Cret; Edgar Williams was educated at M.I.T., had attended the American Academy in Rome, and had worked for William Welles Bosworth; Richard Koch was educated at Tulane University and had worked for W. Aymar Embury II, John Russell Pope, and Bosworth; Earl Heitschmidt was educated at the Eastern School and had worked for Schulze and Weaver; and Clair Ditchy was educated at the University of Michigan and had worked for Albert Kahn. Williams and Larson became architectural advisors to the FBO respectively in January 1957 and March 1959.

[33] Landreth M. Harrison, "Brussels Exhibition 1958 – State—AIA Meeting on Architectural Matters," memorandum for the files, March 19, 1956, Exposition Records, box 8 and the AIA advisory committee's

(1897-1983), a bureaucrat in the office of the under secretary responsible for coordinating and documenting the exposition planning, informed officials of Stone's selection.[34]

This was a moment of supreme opportunity for Stone to create a structure "out of this world" for the first exposition building outside American territory funded by the government.[35] Inviting experimentation, imagination, and daring, he was clearly determined to abide by the legacy of the Crystal Palace at the Great Exhibition of 1851 in London, the very first international exposition, conceived as a means of introducing new products and trade during the Industrial Revolution. Stone explained in a radio address, "The whole building will be, you might say, the Crystal Palace brought up to date."[36] As an innovative structural *tour de force*, the Crystal Palace, a modular glass house of prefabricated parts designed by Joseph Paxton (1801-1865), had established in exhibition architecture the tradition of articulating the spirit of progress using current science and technology.

In April 1956 Stone traveled to Brussels along with Heitschmidt and Williams to view the site reserved for the United States, where they were joined by Leo A. Riordan of the Paris Foreign Building Operations (FBO) office. It was immediately apparent that because of the recent construction of a streetcar tunnel under a portion of the site, a multistory building would not be practical. Accommodations also had to be made for the

---

Report of the Activities on the Brussels International Exposition Building and Earl Heitschmidt, to Jury of Fellows, December 10, 1957, AIA Archives.

[34] Landreth M. Harrison to staff, March 20, 1956, Exposition Records, box 16.

[35] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 88 and Public Affairs Office of the U.S. Commissioner General to the Brussels World's Fair–1958, "Status of Construction: U.S. Pavilion," press release no. 42 (n.d.), Exposition Records, box 22.

[36] Quoted in Robert W. Rydell, *World of Fairs: The Century-of-Progress Expositions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 202.

eleven willow trees on the site that the Belgian king, Baudouin I (1930-1993), wanted preserved.[37] Stone reportedly sketched the design on the spot, seizing on the its natural amphitheater contours, and he so impressed the others that Heitschmidt wrote soon after that he was "convinced that his design ability far exceeds that of any man I have known in recent years."[38]

During the planning stage, the American government was bitterly divided over the exposition: President Eisenhower felt strongly about the need to make a strong showing but encountered opposition in the House of Representatives, which sought to reduce the overall budget to less than $13 million from the requested $15 million—an amount that paled in comparison to Russia's reported $50 million.[39] Nonetheless, Stone proceeded to work in good faith without a contract by beginning preliminary sketches sometime after late May 1956. At the end of July, Stone reported that the pavilion was "all designed and ready for a presentation," but he was not summoned to present his plans until October 1, at which time, according to Harrison, the pavilion concept was "enthusiastically received by everybody" and "universally praised."[40] The architects on the advisory committee considered Stone's "brilliant" solution "practical, structurally sound, and flexible enough

---

[37] "More Than Modern."

[38] Heitschmidt to jury of fellows, December 10, 1957. Stone had apparently wanted Thomas B. Church, who had worked with Stone on the El Panama Hotel, to do the landscaping but Charles Middeleer was chosen. See ibid. and P. G. Nicholson to Dr. Thurston J. Davies, March 22, 1957, Exposition Records, box 1.

[39] Robert W. Rydell, "Brussels Universal and International Exposition," in John E. Findling and Kimberly D. Pelle, *Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, 1851-1988* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), 313.

[40] "Special International Report: World's Fair—Brussels '58," *Newsweek*, April 1, 1957 and Landreth M. Harrison, "Brussels Exhibition 1958 - Architectural Meeting," memorandum for the files, October 3, 1956, Exposition Records, box 8.

to be adapted to any type of arrangement of exhibits."[41] According to Stone, with the exception of enlarging the theater for legitimate productions, the project went ahead as conceived with only limited modifications, which is confirmed by the renderings as well as the presentation and descriptive texts.[42] After the plans were approved by the Operations Coordinating Board on October 24, Stone had to move quickly because the United States was past the deadline for the start of its pavilion construction.[43]

Because of the irregular triangular shape of the site, a rectangular structure would not have been practical, so instead Stone designed a large circular pavilion, with two much smaller structures to the sides. While he later confessed that he had had a long-standing yearning to do a circular building, such structures, including geodesic domed buildings developed by Stone's good friend Richard Buckminster Fuller (1895-1983), had, in fact, become a popular form for exhibitions.[44] In order to obtain a light and airy quality inside the building, Stone used a suspension system consisting of a roof framed in the manner of a bicycle wheel: an outer compressive steel rim was connected to an inner steel ring, or hub, with thirty-six radial high-tension steel cables, or spokes (fig 89). The vertical loads were carried by double rows of gold columns, which could be light and slender since they did not have to carry the lateral force that was instead held in tension.

---

[41] AIA advisory committee, Report of the Activities.

[42] Description by Stone of the United States Pavilion at the Brussels Exposition and the American Embassy in New Delhi, India, c. 1959 (Stone Papers) and Frizzell to Harrison, October 23, 1956. They were subsequently sent to Harrison by Frizzell. The working drawings, created in Brussels by Enterprises Blaton-Aubert and dated January 15, 1957, are in the Stone Papers, 2nd acc., Series 11 "U."

[43] Stone description. The Belgians had wanted the plans submitted for approval before June 30, 1956 and construction to begin no later than October 1 according to the baron Moens de Fernig in his letter of December 13, 1955.

[44] "Geodesic Dome," *Architectural Forum* 95 (August 1951): 144-151.

Although Stone's first inclination had been to place a plastic dome over the inner ring, the sixty-foot-wide aperture, or oculus, was left open to allow for sunlight and for rain water, which collected in a circular pool with water lilies in the center of the structure. Above the tension cables were twenty-one hundred translucent panels, each about four by twelve feet, consisting of two layers of plastic laminated on aluminum frames. The walls were also transparent—vinyl plastic laminated sheets were held in tension with a light-steel lattice system secured with gold-colored escutcheons at the intersection of the diagonals (fig. 90).[45] In addition to the dramatically lit interior visible through the walls, colorful silk flags, standing between the exterior gold columns under the pierced flat roof, added vibrancy and gaiety while the dignified great seal of the United States hung above the main entrance doors (fig. 86). The transparency and visibility of the king's great willow trees, along with the structural lightness frankly recall similar features of the Crystal Palace.

Although cables employed as structural members under tension had been used for centuries in temporary buildings such as tents, applications in more permanent buildings had been infrequent until after 1950 when Matthew Nowicki (1910-1950) designed the State Fair Arena (renamed the J. S. Dorton Arena) in Raleigh, North Carolina.[46] It quickly became apparent that the concept could provide one of the most economical ways to span large spaces, and it initiated a decade of suspension roof construction.[47] In fact,

---

[45] For a more detailed discussion of the structure with illustrations, see "A Final Look at Brussels," *Architectural Forum* 109 (October 1958): 104-109.

[46] Because Matthew Nowicki died shortly thereafter, the structural design was completed by the engineer Fred N. Severud and the architect William Henley Deitrick.

[47] Forrest Wilson, *Emerging Form in Architecture: Conversations with Lev Zetlin* (Boston: Cahners Books, 1975), 83-84.

according to the historian of building technology, Henry J. Cowan, the most notable group of suspension structures ever built was at the Brussels Exposition, validating Henry-Russell Hitchcock's much earlier observation that expositions tended to be "milestones in the history of Modern architecture, not so much because they necessarily produced exceptionally fine work as because they focused the architectural tendencies of certain years."[48] Although Stone's was the largest of the tension structures, it was less flamboyant structurally than some of the others, including the French Pavilion by Guillaume Gillet (1912-1987) with architect Jean Prouvé (1901-1984) and engineer René Sarger (1917-1988), or the hyperbolic-parabaloid pavilion by Le Corbusier for the Dutch electrical manufacturer Philips Company, which Stone considered a small but pure example of the International Style (fig.91).[49]

Stone said the inspiration for his pavilion had been the elliptical arena in the Roman Coliseum (A.D. 70-82), whose dimensions (287 by 180 feet) had guided his 340-foot, free-span structure—the largest of its kind (figs. 17 and 19).[50] Inside this classically inspired pavilion was a gracefully curved, glittering mesh ceiling (which Stone referred to as a "spectacular gold curtain") suspended from the cables and made of thousands of gold-anodized aluminum disks, allowing daylight and artificial illumination to filter

---

[48] Hitchcock, *Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration*, 207.

[49] Henry J. Cowan, *Science and Building: Structural and Environmental Design in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978), 180 and Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 146. For a comprehensive survey of the most notable pavilions see Schroeder-Gudehus and Cloutier, "Popularizing Science and Technology During the Cold War," 157-180 and "The Brussels Exhibition," *Architects' Journal* 127 (May 29, 1958): 790-845.

[50] Philip Johnson also used this structural system for his pavilion at the 1964 World's Fair in Queens, New York.

through (fig. 92).[51] As it was reported to some 5.7 million homes on the *Omnibus* television series, the reflection of the crown of the roof dropped like a tiara in the pool below.[52] In addition to its decorative effect, the ceiling was both economical and functional because it masked rough framing and wiring as well as provided ventilation and sound absorption. The suspended ceiling concept, a favorite of Stone's, was perhaps inspired by his early travels in Europe, where he had sketched a tentlike ceiling hung in folds like a textile (fig. 93). But the direct source for this project was a print of the "interior (restored)" of the Roman Coliseum illustrated in *A History of Architecture* in which Sir Banister Fletcher (1833-1899; fig. 89) explained that "the top storey has Corinthian pilasters, corbels between to support the masts of the velarium [ceiling] which was drawn across the auditorium [on ropes]."[53] This print, of which the original source is unknown, was included in the promotional materials for Stone's pavilion: "Site Plan, Roof Construction, and Prototype" (fig. 89).

The sixty-foot-wide mezzanine level (fig. 94), accessed by stairways on two sides led to an exterior balcony on one side, where there were hundreds of (much appreciated) chairs for visitors. On the other side, the mezzanine overlooked the ground-floor water garden, where Stone had planned for a sculpture by Richard Lippold (1915-2002) to express "the unfolding golden flowering of American culture."[54] But in July 1957, when

---

[51] Edward Durell Stone, Address Given to the NAEA Conference, Kansas City, Missouri, 1963, Stone Papers, 1st. acc., box 2, file 22.

[52] Robert Saudek Associates, "One Man's Brussels World's Fair," vol. 14, *Omnibus VI*, May 4, 1958 and McDonald, "Masscult & Midcult," 39.

[53] See Sir Banister Fletcher, *A History of Architecture on the Comparative Method*, 17th ed. (London: Athlone Press, 1961), 210-213.

[54] Robert H. Haddow, *Pavilions of Plenty*, 86

Architectural Record illustrated a rendering of the interior, the caption stated that the central feature was "undecided."[55] The following March, Stone "put in a final plea" for the strong vertical fountain that could relieve the massiveness of the building and would complement the exterior mood of gaiety, but his request was denied.[56]

To one side of the main building was the 170-foot-diameter circular multipurpose theater, which also contained administrative offices and a reception room. With just two of its five stories above ground, the theater was discreetly joined underground to the main level of the pavilion. The American Theater, as it was called, could hold more than one thousand people and in Stone's opinion, it was the best equipped theater in the world.[57] He employed some of his favorite decorative techniques in it: on the outside a glazed ceramic grille in an arabesque pattern and inside walls illuminated from behind and a metal mesh ceiling (see 137). Stone had first developed a similar ceiling for the auditorium of the Fine Arts Center (1948-1951) at the University of Arkansas, using stampings from movie reels clamped to a metallic braid, and in 1949 for his alteration of the Victoria Theater (formerly the Guild Theater) in New York City (figs. 138-139).[58]

---

[55] "An Architecture of Space and Grace," 156.

[56] Edward Durell Stone to James Plout, March 11, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 21, file 22. This was just one of the situations of conflicting egos over design, in spite of making every effort "to keep things calmed down and to give Plaut exactly what he wanted" (Ken Frizzell to Stone, March 19, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 21, file 22).

[57] Edward Durell Stone to Reginald Allen, July 18, 1958, Stone Papers.

[58] For the Fine Arts building see "University Art Center," *Architectural Forum* 95 (September 1951): 164-169 and "Fine Arts Center, University of Arkansas," *Arts & Architecture* 68 (November 1951): 35-37. In John A. Bradley, "Many Structural Feats Are Accomplished In Remodeling of the Victoria Theatre," *New York Times*, October 31, 1948; and Grace Heiskell Terry, "Architect From Arkansas," *Arkansas Gazette*, March 13, 1949, Stone explained that Robert Dowling wanted to spend a minimum amount of money so Stone clamped movie reel stampings (usually discarded after it is punched from the sides of the reels) to a metallic braid one after another, after which these lines of stampings were crossed so that clusters of four heart-shaped stampings created a pattern similar to a woman's mesh bag or a knight's armor. As one of his favorite devices, Stone patented it in 1960 (Edward Durell Stone, 1980, "Flexible Fabric For Use As A

The third structure, called the Circarama, was a sixty-five-foot-wide cylinder with the same exterior grillework as the theater. It held a 360-degree motion picture screen and utilized eleven projectors to show to standing viewers a nineteen-minute pictorial trip around the United States by Walt Disney, who reportedly said during his four-day visit that the theater was "perfect."[59]

A pavilion of such stature and size, Stone felt, warranted an imposing setting, and he devoted half the site to creating an "irresistible oasis."[60] Emulating great European models, the plaza was paved with rose-colored concrete in a radial grid pattern (which Stone originally had wanted to continue inside). A 224-foot-long elliptical reflecting pool with submerged lighting and some fifty fountains contained a large rotating sculpture by Alexander Calder (1898-1976), a fish-tailed mobile of black sheet metal called *The Whirling Ear* (fig. 86), which was turned slowly by angled jets of water. Stone and Cullman helped select the piece based on the recommendations of the Fine Arts Advisory Committee.[61] Adjacent to the building were more than one hundred equally spaced blooming apple trees and thirteen American flags and one Belgian flag. Besides enhancing the dramatic effect of the pavilion, the formal landscape, the only one at the

---

Ceiling Wall Drape, Divider Or The Like," U.S. Patent Des. 187-464," filed February 20, 1958, and issued on March 22, 1960), and the patent was reported in "Building 'Skin,'" *New York Times*, March 26, 1960.

[59] P. G. Nicholson to Edward Durell Stone, July 7, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, file 15.

[60] Jean-Louis Lhoest, "This Is America! This Candy-Box in White and Gold Lace Is a Fantastic Surprise-Box.," *Le Peuple*, April 23, 1958.

[61] "5 U.S. Sculptors For Fair Chosen," *New York Times*, October 27, 1957; Ogden Tanner, "The Best of Brussels," *Architectural Forum* 108 (June 1958): 80; and Office of the US Commissioner General, "Five Sculptors Commissioned to Create Works for U.S. Pavilion at Brussels World's Fair of 1958," press release, October 27, 1957, Exposition Records, box 18.

exposition, was considered "a magnanimous piece of planning" because so much of the plot was devoted to the great pool.[62]

Even though the impressive structural engineering of the pavilion was promoted in the publicity materials and therefore reported on in the press, it was said that it did not draw attention to itself.[63] Ernest Jacks recalled that for Stone, the cable suspension structure was only a means to an end; his excitement lay primarily in the quality of the decorative effects, especially the filtered lighting through the metal mesh folds of the ceiling.[64] As someone who viewed architecture as a fine art, Stone was innately more inclined towards richness in texture and pattern than structural innovation and indeed at the time admitted in an interview to being partial to the "shimmering patterns of light and shadow" in the manner of sunlight shining through the leaves of trees and arbors.[65] "I am not given to flexing my structural muscles publicly," he liked to respond when asked by interviewers about matters of structure.[66] Nonetheless, as was typical of many of Stone's designs, although each element of the pavilion attracted attention for its aesthetic impact, the first obligation was a functional plan, in accordance with modern principles. This aspect of Stone's work has generally been missed in critical reviews.

An intriguing characteristic of the pavilion, identified in the early descriptive materials from Stone's office, was that "the general aspect of the building would be one

---

[62] Douglas Haskell, memorandum to staff, August 7, 1958, Haskell Papers.

[63] Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches."

[64] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 334.

[65] Stone description, c. 1959.

[66] Stone, "Modern Architecture on the Campus," 12-14.

of crystalline luminosity, in effect, a 'crystal atrium.'"[67] Stone also used the crystal metaphor, explaining that the building would be "all very light and airy and crystalline," as did the subsequent promotional material, which labeled the pavilion a "crystal and gold palace." [68] Reviewers responded: the *New York Times* stated, for example, that the pavilion glittered "like a circular gold and crystal jewel case."[69] In *Architectural Forum* the word *plastic* even became an allusion to crystal in the same way it was said that glass alluded to crystal:

> Some 100 years after Sir Joseph Paxton completed his revolutionary Crystal Palace in London, an American architect, Edward Durell Stone, designed another exhibition structure that will have a place in the history books: the "plastic palace" which, as everyone knows, is the United States Pavilion at this year's World's Fair in Brussels. [70]

As the architectural historian Rosemarie Haag Bletter has written, the crystal metaphor "is an iconographic theme that stretches from King Solomon, Jewish and Arabic legends, medieval stories of the Holy Grail, through the mystical Rosicrucian and Symbolist tradition down to Expressionism."[71] Among the Expressionist architects, Bruno Taut (1880-1938) successfully reinterpreted the crystalline imagery as a metaphor for transformation in his glass pavilion at the Werkbund Exhibition of 1914 in Cologne, Germany, where a circular pavilion was crowned with a pear-shaped dome of Muslim inspiration with colored glass set in a concrete latticework frame. Inside were

---

[67] Kenneth Frizzell to Landreth M. Harrison, October 23, 1956, Exposition Records, box 11.

[68] Stone, quoted in Rydell, *World of Fairs*, 202 and Office of the U.S. Commissioner General, "United States Pavilion at the Brussels World's Fair."

[69] Gilroy, "Million Gay Visitors Close Brussels Fair."

[70] "A Final Look at Brussels,"105.

[71] Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "The Interpretation of the Glass Dream—Expressionist Architecture and the History of the Crystal Metaphore," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 40 (March 1981), 20.

kaleidoscopic patterns of color and light, the constant movement further enhanced by reflecting pools and sparkling fountains. It articulated the writings of Paul Scheerbart (1863-1915) describing the metamorphosis of society from political dependence to liberation through synaesthesia.[72] Stone's crystalline pavilion expressed the same idea: both physically and symbolically his pavilion stood as an invitation for transformation—to an open and free democratic society—and thus reflected the commissioner general's call for all free nations, especially the United States to "utilize every facility at their disposal to emphasize the importance of the freedom they possess."[73]

The United States Pavilion does indeed exemplify "expressionist excess," as McLeod has referred to Stone's architecture, when considered in relation to the Russian scheme, which the Americans kept an eye on during the planning process (figs. 87-88).[74] The earliest report about the Russian pavilion came from officials in the American Embassy in Brussels in 1956, who had learned that a "monumental pavilion of great distinction around eighty feet high" was being planned. Harrison had written to Sam L. Yates, international relations officer in the Office of Western European Affairs: "It would be helpful to Stone if we could get some definite idea of the Russian plans as their 'monumental pavilion' will be contiguous to ours."[75] He was correct in assuming that the United States Pavilion would be compared to its formidable neighbor, and, in fact, a month before the exposition opened, there was national concern that Russia's lavish

---

[72] Ibid., 32-33.

[73] "U.S. to Build Circular Pavilion for '58 World's Fair in Brussels," *New York Times*, January 28, 1957.

[74] Mary McLeod used the phrase "expressionistic excesses" to describe the work of Stone and Eero Saarinen in "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era," 27.

[75] Landreth M. Harrison to Edmund R. Purves, September 27, 1956, Exposition Records, box 8.

spending would give them a propaganda advantage over the more economy-minded Americans.[76] Upon the opening of the exposition, the Spanish newspaper:

> Squarely facing the Russian pavilion is the United States Pavilion. The "big two" look at each other and observe each other, challenge and defy each other. That gives the Fair the thrill of the finale of a Cup match between perpetual rivals, so fitting in international contests.[77]

But both the Europeans and the Americans concluded that the mammoth Russian pavilion —a monolithic rectangular structure topped by a cable-supported frosted-glass roof that consisted of units prefabricated in Moscow—lacked any relationship to human scale or warmth. Designed by Alexandre Boretski, Urii Abramov, Victor Boubov and Anatoli Polanskithat, it too was classically inspired, modeled loosely on the Greek Parthenon. Critics thought the building looked industrial—like a factory or hangar—cold, unimaginative, and forbidding.[78] "Massive, powerful, overwhelming… devoted to propaganda only," said one reviewer in *Aurore-France*; and another called it "an uninspired building resembling a huge factory, except for a pretentious flight of thirty-six steps." Both *Time* and *Newsweek* reported that it had been nicknamed "The Refrigerator" by the Belgians.[79]

The discrepancy between the two designs may well have enhanced the positive response to Stone's pavilion since critics compared it almost exclusively to Russia's and not to the more similar tension structures, which underscores the implications of the Cold

---

[76] Eddy Gilmore, "Russia Expected to Outshine U.S. World's Fair," *Roanoke Times*, March 27, 1958.

[77] USIA, European Press Reaction: Comments on U.S. Pavilion and Others, 1958, Exposition Records, box 13.

[78] Christopher Rand, "Letter From Brussels," *New Yorker*, March 29, 1958.

[79] Gaston Coblentz, "Reds at Brussels Outdo Low-Budget U.S. Show," *New York Herald Tribune*, February 5, 1958; USIA, European Press Reaction; "More Than Modern;" and "Brussels...A Special Report: Where East Meets West, The U.S. at the Fair," *Newsweek*, April 14, 1958.

War at the exposition. Lively descriptions in the *Los Angeles Times* compared the two: One journalist declared that the "graceful, feathery American building makes the Russian pavilion resemble a large Siberian barn constructed of ice blocks," while Jerry Hulse (1924-2002), the travel editor, said it was like "leaving a mausoleum and stepping inside a world where life really matters."[80] Malcolm Stevenson Forbes (1919-1990) explained to American business people:

> The [United States] pavilion itself is outstanding in every respect. It has none of the heavy, almost gaudy, massiveness of the Russian pavilion. It conveys a feeling of freedom, spaciousness, light and inspiration. The architect himself (and those who had the genius to recognize the beauty of this design) deserves great credit because our pavilion reflects great credit on our country.[81]

There was much less enthusiasm, however, for the exhibits inside the United States Pavilion, which Stone had not been allowed to design or coordinate. During their April 1956 trip to Brussels, Stone, Williams, and Heitschmidt had agreed that it would be advantageous if they could advise on the selection of the exhibit designer so that the interior would relate to the architecture. In a letter to Harrison, Stone not only proposed that this person work in his office, but he also offered his own expertise for the layout and exhibits design, writing, "I respectfully suggest an alternate arrangement which may in the end prove better; that I be given the responsibility for designing the exhibits under the direction of the overall coordinator."[82] With the support of the advisory committee, Stone repeatedly asked for control of the exhibits (the extant correspondence refuting the

---

[80] "U.S. Faces Task at Brussels Fair: Lack of Funds May Bring Loss of World Supremacy in Showmanship to Russia," *Los Angeles Times*, March 23, 1958 and Jerry Hulse, "Miniature World Unfolds at Fair," *Los Angeles Times*, April 23, 1958.

[81] Malcolm Stevenson Forbes, Fact and Comment, *Forbes*, July 1, 1958.

[82] Earl T. Heitschmidt to Landreth M. Harrison, April 24, 1956, Stone Papers; and Edward D. Stone to Harrison, April 27, 1956, Stone Papers. Shortly after, Heitschmidt asked Stone to collaborate with him on designs for Harvey Mudd College in Claremont, California.

conclusion of Robert Haddow in *Pavilions of Plenty* that Stone "assumed that he was responsible for the entire project)."[83]

At about the same time, James Sachs Plaut (1912-1996), a consultant to the State Department on matters of United States participation and representation in the arts who had been approved as a consultant for planning, more successfully made known his interests in "the programming angle."[84] Upon being named commissioner general on September 26, Howard Stix Cullman (1891-1972) "expressed his enthusiastic acceptance" of the proposal that Plaut be given responsibility for all vital decisions in the selection of exhibits.[85] Under Plaut was Peter Graham Harnden (1913-1971), a Paris-based stateside designer of trade fairs and exhibitions who had headed the exhibits division for the Marshall Plan (1947-1951). In spite of the fact that as chief designer and producer in 1955 of the Department of Commerce's European trade fairs his installations had received "long and prolonged" complaints from spectators for being "shoddy" with "corny" scenes of American life, he was put in charge of interior design and installation

---

[83] Earl T. Heitschmidt to Landreth M. Harrison, May 22, 1956, Exposition Records, box 8; Edward D. Stone to Harrison, August 31, 1956, Stone Papers; Heitschmidt to Harrison, September 17, 1956, Exposition Records, box 8; Harrison, Brussels Exhibition 1958 - Talk With Stone, Architect, Memorandum for the files, September 17, 1956, Exposition Records, box 11; and Haddow, *Pavilions of Plenty*, 71.

[84] Landreth M. Harrison to Earl T. Heitschmidt, June 14, 1956, Exposition Records, box 8. James Plaut was the founder and first director of the Institute of Contemporary Art in Boston. As a consultant to the State Department, during World War II he had been director of the Art Looting Investigation Unit of the Office of Strategic Services (the first intelligence agency in America) and had also served in the Office of Naval Intelligence. See "James Plaut, 83, Museum Founder," *New York Times*, January 17, 1996.

[85] Landreth M. Harrison, memorandum to staff, September 19, 1956, Exposition Records, box 16; Harrison to Edmond R. Purves, September 27, 1956, Exposition Records, box 8; and Department of State, "Howard Cullman Sworn in as the United States Commissioner General," press release, October 3, 1956, Exposition Records, box 16. Cullman had been president of the tobacco company, Cullman Brothers and was also honorary chairman of the Port of New York Authority. He sat on numerous boards, including Bankers Trust, Philip Morris, Prudential, the Waldorf Astoria and Fifth Avenue Lines and was a director of the Metropolitan Opera and of the Museum of the City of New York and sponsored some 150 plays and musicals, among them *The King and I* and *South Pacific*.

of the exposition pavilion.[86] Harnden was assisted by Bernard Rudofsky (1905-1988), "a provocative architect" and an engineer, who had just designed an installation for the Museum of Modern Art (now recognized for its active involvement on the cultural front of the Cold War).[87] Compared to these three men, Stone lacked political experience and clout, so it is not surprising that he was not selected to design the exhibits.[88] However, this decision had repercussions.

Because no formal consideration had been given to the exhibits until after the building design had been approved, the designers were forced to take their cue from the architecture, which they considered more of a "pleasure dome" than an exhibition hall.[89] As was observed in *Saturday Evening Post*, they acted like "stubborn individualists" who instead of acknowledging the circular shape of the building "squared the circle, constructing a rectangular world within the drum."[90] The lack of coherence between the

---

[86] Keith N. Morgan and Richard Cheek, "History in the Service of Design: American Architect-Historians, 1870-1940," *Architectural Historian in America* 35 (1990): 72.

[87] Maura Reynolds, "Bernard Rudofsky, 82, Architect And 'Outspoken' Social Analyst," *New York Times*, March 13, 1988. According to Stuart Preston in "A Decade of Design," *New York Times*, September 2, 1956, the exhibition Textiles U S A. was "one of the most lavish and imaginative" ever installed. Rudofsky's relationship began with the Museum of Modern Art in 1940 when he was one of the winners of the Industrial Design Competitions for Home Furnishings for which Stone was one of the five judges. Between 1944 and 1945 Rudofsky was director of apparel research for the museum's exhibition Are Clothes Modern and in 1964 was curator of museum's exhibition Architecture without Architects. See Wojtowicz, "Lewis Mumford: The Architectural Critic as Historian," 39 and 44; Douglas Haskell, "Architecture and Popular Taste," *Architectural Forum* 109 (August 1958): 104-109; and Ada Louise Huxtable, "Architecture: 'Bigger—And Maybe Better'," *New York Times*, August 26, 1979.

[88] On the other hand, it is impossible to support Haddow's view on page 70 of *Pavilions of Plenty* that Stone "should never have been asked to build a structure whose interior design was subject to committee decisions and the meddling of politicians. What the U.S. Government needed was an empty shell—a big dome or a tent—within which they could organize things according to ideological schemes and the whims of powerful administrators."

[89] Bernard Rudofsky, memorandum to James Plaut, June 5, 1957, quoted in "Brussels '58: The United States Speaks to the World, Progress Report," *Interiors* 117 (September 1957): 139.

[90] Ernest O. Hauser, "We'll Go on Trial at the Fair," *Saturday Evening Post*, January 25, 1958.

building and the exhibits was not missed: in contrast to the Russians, who appeared to have a definite idea of what they wanted to achieve with their exhibits, the American installation looked as if it had been created completely independent of the building plans. Howard Taubman (1907-1996), chief music critic of the *New York Times*, complained, "the individual exhibits, for the most part, one suspects, were made to fit the building instead of the other and more logical way around."[91] Stone had anticipated as much: "The rectangle design of the exhibits may not be at home in my building," he had written to a colleague a couple of months earlier, "I tremble with fingers crossed."[92]

The exhibits stemmed from discussions at a three-day conference at M.I.T., from which Plaut concluded "that the dominant theme, simply stated, should be that the United States constitutes a society in ferment."[93] The idea, targeted at the non-American visitor, was not to tell directly a success story using strong propaganda but instead to use a more subtle, indirect methodology, where people could experience and learn by implication rather than from direct experience. This soft-sell approach, one in which "America Will Show Its 'Heart,'" as the *New York Times* reported, was intended to excite the sophisticated European audience deemed likely to appreciate the total absence of propaganda.[94]

---

[91] Howard Taubman, "Brussels: American Mistakes and Lessons: A 'Hotchpotch' Approach, Says a Visitor, Has Marred America's Portrait at the Fair," *New York Times Magazine*, June 1, 1958.

[92] Edward Durell Stone to Domenico Mortellito, April 2, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, file 15. Mortellito was the manager of the design and exhibitions section of the advertising department at E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.

[93] For a discussion on the goals of the exhibits see "Brussels '58: The United States Speaks to the World," 158.

[94] "Aims of U.S. Cited for Belgian Fair: American Will Show Its 'Heart,' Though Russia Outspends It, Cullman Declares," *New York Times*, January 31, 1957 and Hauser, "We'll Go on Trial at the Fair."

But this plan backfired and Americans themselves were especially critical, the consensus being that the approach was too confusing and failed to present a cohesive and convincing picture of America.[95] It also did not fulfill President Eisenhower's promise that it would give insight into the character of our national community, the fruits of its land, and the spirit of its citizens. The exhibits were said to be superficial, frothy, and above all distorted in the presentation of "the American way."[96] Stone explained to Heitschmidt, "I guess you realize that we have had nothing but universal praise on our effort and universal criticism on the exhibits."[97] He also confided to a colleague that the exhibit was "terrible, which damn near broke my heart."[98]

By comparison, critics thought the Russian display—tracing forty years of technological and scientific progress—made a far more powerful impression. Gaston Coblentz announced in the *New York Herald Tribune*: "Reds at Brussels Outdo Low-Budget U.S. Show." Despite the bleak interior, which contained at its center a colossal statue of the Communist revolutionary Vladimir Lenin (1870-1924) and propaganda slogans on tall columns, the Russian pavilion contained a commanding display of big machines, among them a jet plane, automobiles, and rockets. The biggest draw was the Sputnik, fresh from its triumphant launching. Taubman concluded in the *New York*

---

[95] Taubman, "Brussels: American Mistakes and Lessons."

[96] Walter H. Waggoner, "Americans Score U.S. Fair Exhibits," *New York Times*, April 24, 1958 and Sol Linowitz to Representative Keating, May 27, 1958, J. William Fulbright Papers, Special Collections, University of Arkansas Libraries, Box 21, folder 20 (hereafter cited as Fulbright Papers).

[97] Edward Durell Stone to Earl Heitschmidt, September 10, 1958, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 69, file 16. He also said "Plaut proved to be the disappointing element in the job. He took the exhibit program to himself and turned in a thoroughly botched up job."

[98] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 342.

Times, "People go through the Russian pavilion remarking on its impression of size, strength and material well-being."[99]

As a consequence, many Americans expressed their discontent, exemplified by one letter sent to Congressman Teague:

> I wish you and a few other congressmen would hop a plane and take a quick look at our exhibit here….Our building is beautiful—probably too beautiful. Inside most of the floor space is a pool of water. On an island—our main feature—is a fashion show of mink stoles, costly evening gowns! Russia—next door in a large, factorylike building—features sputnik, manufacturing, education. The impression one gets—U.S. pretty rich, indolent, frivolous. Russia—strong, serious, down to earth.[100]

Such harsh criticism soon reached the White House and President Eisenhower ordered George V. Allen (1903-1970), then director of the U.S.I.A., to Brussels as a special representative for an official inspection.[101] Significantly, in spite of the controversy over the exhibits, Allen agreed with those to whom he spoke—that the United States Pavilion was "the finest single building there" and as a brilliant piece of engineering with exquisite design stood alone as a "precious gem."[102] Other political dignitaries had similar reactions: Adlai Stevenson said it was "serene and beautiful" and Herbert Hoover called it "a stroke of genius."[103] It was the pavilion alone that earned such headlines as

---

[99] Taubman, "Brussels: American Mistakes and Lessons."

[100] Louis La caster to Congressman Teague, April 26, 1938, Exposition Records, box 11.

[101] John D. Morris, "Brussels Exhibit Irks Eisenhower," *New York Times*, June 18, 1958. However, the letter praised the pavilion itself.

[102] George V. Allen, Statement About the Brussels Pavilion, June 39, 1958, Exposition Records, box 11.

[103] Statements of Stevenson and of President Herbert Hoover, July 5, 1958, Exposition Records, box 11. After Stone read "Hoover Returns From World Fair," *New York Times*, July 7, 1958, he sent a letter the same day to Hoover, "I was most gratified by the inspired address which you made on the occasion of your recent visit to Brussels...The compliment which you paid my handiwork in this morning's New York papers, was ample reward for my efforts" (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 75, file 10).

"Brussels World's Fair Pays Off in Prestige" in the *New York Times*.[104] The cheerful and optimistic building was recognized as a symbol of freedom, making a favorable impression with Europeans while at the same time effectively confronting Russian bombast and grandiloquence.[105] In light of the fact that Stone had not been given a strong *parti* from the State Department, it is all the more remarkable that the pavilion so successfully illuminated the government's message to Western Europe, as observed in an influential liberal daily newspaper in Amsterdam:

> Let's take a look at the pavilion of the greatest power of the moment. She knows that she is suspected of lust for power, of being anxious to assume leadership in the world, but also lives in fear of becoming unpopular as a result…It has erected a monument to this desire for comradeship. The United States Pavilion is lacking completely in severity. The predominant impression it makes is of the sociable pleasant life in the United States. This is how America wishes to be seen, open and humanly.[106]

Even though Americans disputed among themselves about the impact of the exposition on their Cold War image, Stone's architecture was nearly always excluded from the attacks. *Newsweek* reported: "Scarcely a critical dart was tossed at the elegant, airy United States Pavilion…an unqualified success, admired equally by Americans and foreigners."[107] Similarly, the assistant coordinator of the United States exhibits reported to Stone, "Nowhere is to be found anything but extreme compliments for the building and theatre."[108] In fact, the more disturbed people were about the exhibits, the more

---

[104] Brendan M. Jones, "Brussels World's Fair Pays Off in Prestige," *New York Times*, November 3, 1958.

[105] Stone description, c. 1959.

[106] U.S.I.A., European Press Reaction.

[107] "An Architect Goes East," *Newsweek*, November 17, 1958.

[108] Nicholson to Stone, July 7, 1958.

passionate they were about the architecture, with most agreeing that the pavilion "made up for a lot of everybody else's sins of omission and commission."[109] The contrast between the reception of the exhibits and of the pavilion was evident in the judgment of the American citizens who had visited the fair and were asked by President Eisenhower to offer their feedback.[110] Although opinions about the exhibits ranged from satisfactory to shocking, there was almost unanimous praise for the pavilion itself in their letters: an "architectural triumph—beautiful, gay and inviting," and "an engineering masterpiece… handled with such delicacy and finesse," were just some of the impressions. Professional opinions were similarly favorable: the director of engineering at General Mills admired the pavilion's "ingenuity," while the director of the Research Institute of America said it was "the single most beautiful, graceful, gently imposing, genuinely and inartificially creative in the entire Brussels Fair."[111] Everyone understood its symbolism: "The spirit of freedom" and "the land of the free" were expressed in the transparent walls, dramatic illumination, festive atmosphere, and abundant landscape.

In addition to the general press, the American architectural journals consistently reported on the exposition: *Architectural Record* pictured the model of the pavilion on its cover in July 1957 and *Architectural Forum*, recognizing that it was "the building that is actually the exhibit," published two articles "Acrobatic Structures at Brussels" and "The Best of Brussels" in May and June 1958, respectively, before publishing a more

---

[109] "Architecture at Brussels: Festival of Structure," *Architectural Record* 123 (June 1958): 166.

[110] The letters are in the Exposition Records, box 11.

[111] H. Schmelzer to President Dwight Eisenhower, June 30, 1958 and Lee Cherne, memorandum on exhibition, n.d., Exposition Records, box 11. The exception was an article by Philip Siekevitz in "The Decadent Pavilion," *Nation* 187 (October 11, 1958): 211-213, who said the pavilion was "a dismal flop" only appropriate as "possibly a circus, rodeo or a bullfight."

comprehensive piece in October.[112] The European press also commented on the Stone pavilion: During the first week of the exposition, the Brussels newspapers devoted more articles to the United States Pavilion than to all the others combined. *Le Peuple*, for example, said it displayed a "dignity befitting the greatness of the country it represents; yet it seduces by joy, humor, and novelty." So impressed was the Belgian government with the structure that (after some prodding from the United States) at the conclusion of the exposition it retained the theater, landscaping, and lower part of the pavilion as "a permanent memorial of American participation."[113]

In spite of such enthusiasm for the building, some American critics were wary about Stone's departure from modernism. In *Interiors* it was observed that its "very size might predispose towards monumentality and grandeur as the prevailing style of its contents." Aware that the subject of monumentality could be disquieting to modernists, Stone had effectively countered the pavilion's scale, classical references, and grand layout with the light and airy transparency that made it suggestive of temporal, utopian fantasy rather than permanent, stately tradition.[114] His effort was recognized and appreciated. *Interiors* continued:

> Fortunately, the architectural mood of the building is quite independent of its size. Its merry-go-round shape, the turn-buckled rigging that yanks its umbrella roof taut, the lightness and translucency of that roof, its escutcheon-adorned walls of gilt mesh honeycombing—suggest play, joy in ornament, an idyllic humanism.[115]

---

[112] The pavilion had also been briefly mentioned in *Architectural Forum*—"Sunday-Best in Brussels," People, 105 (December 1956): 39; "Architect Stone in the Public Limelight;" "Brussels Fair Designs," Projects, 106 (February 1957): 35; and Haskell, "Architecture and Popular Taste."

[113] Howard S. Cullman to Charles Merz, June 3, 1959, Exposition Records. See also Edward D. Stone to Howard A. Rusk, January 26, 1959, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 70, file 19.

[114] See for example, Arthur Drexler, *Transformations in Modern Architecture* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1979), 119.

[115] "Brussels '58: The United States Speaks to the World," 158.

Stone's concept of the building as expressive of futuristic fantasy (the beginning of a legacy for American fair architecture) made it possible for even the staunchest advocates of modernism to respond positively to the pavilion.[116] Ada Louise Huxtable, for example, who commented on the pavilion three times between 1962 and 1968, recognized the "distinguished" yet "airy palace," which "made this country stand tall," as "one of the best fair fantasies in the fairyland tradition."[117] Similarly, Esther McCoy observed that the pavilion was "pure magic," as did the interior designer Ward Stanleigh Krewson (1899-1983) when he explained his "thrill" as he approached the pavilion at night, "with all the illumination making it look like some great and wonderful constellation which had just floated down for a moment from the cosmic unknown" (fig. 95).[118]

The pavilion as fantasy also played into contemporary popular tastes for glitzy, extravagant displays—seen, for example, in Disneyland (founded 1955) in Anaheim, California, or in the "Miami Baroque" hotels of Morris Lapidus (1902-2001).[119] By being consistent with existing popular tastes, it was easier for Stone to successfully transgress modernist tenets by softening the rigid mechanical austerity of the International Style with dramatic effect. His effort had mass appeal, which did not go unnoticed by the critics. In the middle of the exhibition Douglas Haskell, editor of *Architectural Forum* questioned, "Is modern architecture molded by popular taste?" As he described in his

---

[116] Rydell, *World of Fairs*, 11.

[117] Ada Louise Huxtable, "Fairs and Architecture," *New York Times*, March 13, 1964 and Huxtable, "The American Image Abroad," *New York Times*, July 28, 1968.

[118] McCoy, "The Screen of Stone" and W. Stanleigh Krewson to Edward D. Stone, October 20, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 70, file 17.

[119] Deborah Desilets, *Morris Lapidus* (New York: Assouline, 2004), 14.

article "Architecture and Popular Taste" the three new trends in architecture—decoration, drama, and free improvisation—he identified Stone's pavilion with the first, which in popular terms would be labeled as "schmaltz" and in more sophisticated terms as "new Alhambra" or "new romanticism," the latter of which has frequently been used to describe Stone's aesthetic. By incorporating such "pleasures of 'consumption'" as pools with lighted fountains, latticed plastic screens, and ceiling mesh into modern functional design, Haskell concluded, the "star-spangled" pavilion did indeed exemplify the "coming rapprochement between modern architecture and popular taste"[120]

Although Haskell saw the building as transitional with an inherent conflict yet to be resolved between modernism (identified with high art and the avant-garde) and popular taste (identified with low culture and the middle class), just a month later Haskell returned to his modernist allegiance as he circulated a memorandum to his staff stating that although "flukes" had kept the pavilion from being critically reviewed, it was "one of the great buildings of modern architecture." He focused on the "magnanimous" site plan, a large portion of which had been given to a lagoon, the only open area at the fair; the "extraordinarily functional" buildings; the novel engineering of the "great bicycle-spoke suspension roof," which no publication had successfully explained in conjunction with the diagonal and vertical wind-bracing of the walls; the magnificent interior space in which "no amount of bungling" of the exhibits could seriously interfere; the "easy, comfortable, and exhilarating" circulation pattern; the wiring and lighting systems tucked so cleverly under the roof disc canopy that no one was conscious of them; and the theater, an "architectural gem" that operated beautifully. The essence of the pavilion was its

[120] Douglas Haskell, "Architecture and Popular Taste," 106.

modernism expressed in its straightforward and rational structural approach.[121] And so, the following October the five-page article, "A Final Look at Brussels," which reiterated all of these points, stated, "Millions of words have been written about this Pavilion and the controversial exhibit (designed by others) which it houses. This story is written...for the record," and it proceeded to painstakingly describe some of the less obvious, but nonetheless critical modern features. Significantly, there was not one comment about the decorative features more typically highlighted in the reviews, reflecting Haskell's inability to comfortably locate decoration within a modernist framework or, within his understanding of modernism.[122] That he could not comprehensively discuss the building in one article but rather had to split it up into two, markedly illustrates that inherent conflict in modernism that Stone's architecture identified and determined to resolve.

Equally provocative was Stone's design for the American Embassy in New Delhi (fig. 97).[123] He had first become involved in the spring of 1953, when asked to make some embassy design studies by Leland Wiggins King (1907-2004), who had joined the State Department's Foreign Building Operations (FBO) in 1937 and was its director between 1952 and 1953.[124] Although an American ambassador had been positioned in

---

[121] Douglas Haskell, memorandum to staff, August 7, 1958, Haskell Papers.

[122] "A Final Look at Brussels," 105.

[123] In 2003 I visited the embassy in New Delhi and for the most part it is still in its original condition.

[124] "Architect Leland King Dies at 96; Commissioned Bold Embassies," *New York Times*, May 7, 2004; Leland King to Edward D. Stone, July 17, 1953, Loeffler Collection; and King, Notes for the Period 1937-1954 on The Office of Foreign Buildings: A History, April 24, 1987, Private Collection. According to an interview with Loeffler, King met Stone through Hans Knoll (1914-1955) whose firm Knoll Associates (founded 1946) was in the process of designing the interiors of the Havana embassy. See "U.S. Architecture Abroad," *Architectural Forum* 14 (March 1953): 101-115; Jane C. Loeffler, *The Architecture of Diplomacy: Building America's Embassies* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998), 190 and King, interview by Loeffler, January 7, 1993, Loeffler Collection.

India in 1947 (following its independence from Great Britain), the housing situation for the officers and their families had become "critical" because many were living in hotels where there was no control over food preparation and sanitary conditions.[125] Therefore, before leaving his post in 1951, Loy Wesley Henderson (1892-1986), the second American ambassador to India, who was also "very anxious" to have an embassy that could symbolize America's commitment to India and encourage friendly relations, initiated the much-needed building program by convincing the American government to buy property in the Chanakyapuri (Diplomatic Enclave) area of New Delhi, the capital of the new democracy.[126]

According to Jane C. Loeffler, who has written extensively about the FBO's foreign embassy building program, the rapid growth of foreign service responsibilities after World War II had brought about a great need for American expansion abroad.[127] Even though the embassy building program had become a "showcase for modernism" by 1948, mounting Congressional criticism, public skepticism, and cutbacks had begun to severely hamper operations. In response to Cold War fears, the assistant secretary for administration, Edward "Tom" Wailes, allegedly gave King a directive to design all buildings "literally, in the Georgian and Renaissance neo-classicism of Massachusetts

---

[125] Abstract of correspondence in the collection of Leland King, November 20, 1950, Private Collection.

[126] Loy Henderson said in an interview with Jane Loeffler that he considered the embassy the finest in India and was "really proud" of it (Loeffler Collection).

[127] In addition to Loeffler's book *Architecture of Diplomacy*, see Jane C. Loeffler, "The Architecture of Diplomacy: Heyday of the U.S. Embassy-Building Program, 1954-1960," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 49 (September 1990): 251-278; Jane C. Loeffler, "Diplomacy Doesn't Belong In Bunkers," *Washington Post*, August 23, 1998; and Jane C. Loeffler, Book Review, *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53 (March 1994): 109-111. High foreign currency assets enabled the acquisition of properties and construction of buildings, with the FBO spending $120 million between 1946 and 1954. I would like to thank Jane Loeffler for her support of my research by providing me with copies of the State Department records as well as her own.

Avenue!"[128] This thrust towards traditionalism, as Jane De Hart Mathews explained in her essay, "Art and Politics in Cold War America," stemmed from modernism being associated with Communism by some right-wing critics who claimed that it had the potential to subvert the American government.[129] The political persecution of modernism was also driven by the American populous, who according to Alfred Barr, "simply do not like the kind of art they do not understand, and politicians find it convenient both to express their own prejudices and to win political favor by expressing similar prejudices of the majority."[130]

The movement against modernism as it specifically pertained to the embassy program was outlined in a letter that the architect photographer G[eorge] E[verard] Kidder Smith wrote to Philip Johnson, then director of the architecture and design department at the Museum of Modern Art. Aware that the museum was in the process of mounting the exhibition Architecture of the State Department, he wrote in October 1953:

> It seems that two State Department upper echelon boys, Thomas A. Wailes and Donald Lowrie [*sic*] by name, (or their wives) do not like modern architecture. Period. And they are fully determined that the State Department will no longer have the glorious United States represented by such "modernistic" clap-trap as is being erected in Stockholm, Athens, Madrid or the numerous towns in Germany where Skidmore [Owings and Merrill] and [Ralph] Rapson are doing such excellent work. Wailes and Lowrie [*sic*], who, I am ashamed to say, are old

---

[128] Loeffler, "The Architecture of Diplomacy: Heyday of the U.S. Embassy-Building Program," 114 and Leland King to Andree Lynn Abecassis, March 22, 1960, Loeffler Collection.

[129] Jane De Hart Mathews, "Art and Politics in Cold War America," *American Historical Review* 81 (October 1976): 778. She also contended on page 787 that the anti-modernism stance was part of "a revitalization movement designed to eliminate foreign influences and revive traditional values and beliefs in a period of societal stress." See also Alfred H. Barr Jr., "Is Modern Art Communistic?" *New York Times*, December 14, 1952 and Eva Cockcroft, "Abstract Expressionism, Weapon of the Cold War," in Frascina, ed., *Pollock And After*, 125-134.

[130] Alfred Barr to Hudson D. Walker, May 3, 1947, MoMA Archives, Political Controversy File. Also see Justin Davidson, "Preserving the Past or Building the Future," *New York Newsday*, December 10, 2003 and Thomas Craven, "Is American Art Degraded?" June 1948, MoMA Archives, Barr Papers, record group 7.

> Princeton men came to power with the new administration and are out to leave their mark.

He then described how King had been caught in the political crossfire and dismissed:

> Leland King, who, as you know, is the one man responsible for getting really decent official architecture, being head of Foreign Building Operations, is the man they have to axe. Last week Ed Stone told me they got him. Which means that Ed's New Delhi Embassy will never materialize—he was ready to sign the contract—and we shall be represented instead by some fine Colonialized monstrosity on the plains of the Punjab. And which also means that the rest of the program all over the world will reverse itself and the columns will sprout.

Kidder Smith, however, did not believe that the government's turn to a conservative aesthetic was inevitable. He continued:

> Now this can be stopped if the right people bring the right pressure to the right places. Would it be possible for you and Alfred [Barr] and Nelson Rockefeller to get in touch with John Foster Dulles (Alfred might even know him, both are Princeton) and bring the Department to its sense in diplomatic fashion. There is a hell of a lot you can do if it is done right away. Time, however, is darn short. You know what to do and what can be done as well as I—better than I do—but it's got to be done at once. Will you? And will you be kind enough to keep me informed?[131]

Kidder Smith's impression—that the museum was so powerfully connected that it could influence the direction of modern architecture at the governmental level—has since then been expanded upon by Mary Anne Staniszewski, who stated in *The Power of Display* (2001), "The Museum's involvement with the United States government—its production of propaganda and its deployment of culture as an instrument of politics—is an important aspect of the museum's history."[132] While it is not known if Johnson took the request

---

[131] G. E. Kidder Smith to Philip Johnson, October 2, 1953, MoMA Archives, Built in USA. Kidder Smith probably meant Donald "Louire." Kidder Smith's relationship with the museum goes back to least to the early 1940s when he wrote an article in the August 1940 issue of *Pencil Points* about its traveling exhibition Stockholm Builds and he went to Brazil with Philip Goodwin to take photographs for his exhibition and catalogue *Brazil Builds: Architecture New and Old, 1652-1942* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1943).

[132] Staniszewski, *Power of Display*, 224.

further, as it turned out, the foreign embassy architecture continued to be modern, due to, at least in part, the efforts of King.[133] For before his departure, according to King's wife, Nickie (1910-2001), his final note had been to put the future of the embassy firmly in Stone's hands (so that "the tide that wanted to turn back toward 'little White Houses' around the world" could be stemmed for all time).[134] Equally significant, King initiated an architecture advisory committee consisting of "a carefully selected cross-section of professional and lay opinion" to review proposed embassy designs.[135] Architecture critics have concluded that the advisory committee was responsible for protecting the modern design policy and, in effect, taking modernism to its next level of development: Allan Temko stated that "the importance of this innovation cannot be overestimated" because for the first time the design of government architecture was completely freed from political pressure; and the editors of *Architectural Forum* stated that the utilization of

---

[133] In her review of the exhibition, "State Department Opens Show Today," *New York Times*, October 7, 1953, Aline B. Louchheim (later Saarinen) stated: "These may not be the greatest most original or most imaginative examples of American modern architecture, but they are without any doubt the best group of official buildings that we have seen produced by any government…directed by…King and in this reviewer's opinion the nation owes him and the State Department gratitude for intelligently trying to put our best artistic foot forward in foreign countries."

[134] Nickie King to Edward D. Stone, March 26, 1957, Private Collection. She also said, "I remember being present the night you and Lee King first discussed the building. The form which you have given this most precious of Embassies and the heart which I feel is Maria's presence in the finished plan are the answered hopes of that evening and of the succeeding days of frustration when the fate of the building as you would design it hung in the balance."

[135] Quoted in Loeffler, "The Architecture of Diplomacy: Heyday of the U.S. Embassy-Building Program," 115. This idea was subsequently sanctioned by Nelson A. Kenworthy (1901-1989) an engineer who was first hired as a consultant with his partner Webster B. Todd to advise on a course of action for the State Department and then was named acting director of the FBO. According to Okrent on page 391 of *Great Fortune*, while Rockefeller Center was being constructed, Kenworthy had run all on-site operations for Todd & Brown, an engineering/construction management business, and therefore he and Stone knew each other. Loeffler stated on page 190 of *Architecture of Diplomacy* that after Stone was fired, Kenworthy hired him to design his own office there for fifty dollars.

architect advisers of "real stature" who served not as figureheads but as hard-working, trusted committee members was ultimately "the key stroke" of the program's success.[136]

In addition to the representatives from the State Department, the three architects chosen by the AIA for the first advisory committee were Ralph Walker, Pietro Belluschi, and Henry Shepley, the latter, according to Loeffler, promising to take personal responsibility for Stone's performance when concerns were raised about his reputation for drinking.[137] Stone signed the contract in March 1954, after which he sent a thank you note to Shepley, writing:

> I am elated and grateful to you for your efforts in my behalf. I assure you that your vote of confidence will be justified and I look forward to working for you again. I like very much the idea that you, Ralph, and Pietro will review the preliminary ideas. It should prove to be a busman's holiday.[138]

Although the three architect advisors felt strongly that the embassy architects should be given free rein, they were told by the State Department that their responsibilities included recommending the most appropriate style of architecture; reviewing or advising on quality, fitness, and merit of design; and making recommendations and advising on

---

[136] Allan Temko, "Lifting the Federal Facade," *Horizon: A Magazine of Art* 11 (January 1960), 119 and "U.S.A. Abroad," 115.

[137] The committee members included Colonel Harry A. McBride, a former foreign service officer and assistant secretary of state, Nelson A. Kenworthy, and Henry J. Lawrence, deputy director (technical) of the FBO. The alternative architect choices had been John Wellborn Root Jr., George Howe, and William Wilson Wurster (Kenworthy, memorandum to Thomas Wailes, October 23, 1953, Loeffler Papers). Also see "Architects to Advise on Foreign Buildings," *Memo: A Newsletter* no. 90 (February 1, 1954), 2, AIA Archives. In January 1958 the three architects were replaced by Richard Marsh Bennett, Edgar I. Williams, and Eero Saarinen. See Thomas W. Ennis, "American Architecture Fulfills Diplomatic Mission on Four Continents," *New York Times*, January 26, 1958 and Loeffler, *Architecture of Diplomacy*, 190. In addition to the New Delhi and London embassies, Stone was proposed for the Hong Kong embassy (Minutes of the First Meeting of the Foreign Building Architectural Advisory Committee, January 21, 1954, Shepley Papers) and for sketches for The Hague (Shepley to Henry J. Lawrence, January 17, 1956, Shepley Papers).

[138] Edward Durell Stone to Henry Shepley, April 12, 1954, Shepley Papers.

the plans.[139] During the first committee meeting, however, when the chairman, Colonel Harry A. McBride, an administrator at the National Gallery of Art in Washington D.C. between 1939 and 1953, asked them to suggest a style of architecture, they responded that it would be more desirable to keep an open mind.[140] Belluschi subsequently drew up a policy manifesto with the input and consensus of the other architects:

> It is hoped that such policy be so interpreted as to encourage the architects who will be selected to find solutions which are truly creative rather than uninspired [and] conventional.
>
> To the sensitive and imaginative designer it will be an invitation to give serious study to local conditions of climate and site, to understand and sympathize with local customs and people, and to grasp the historical meaning of the particular environment in which the new building must beset. He will do so with a free mind without being dictated by obsolete or sterile formulae or clichees [*sic*], be they old or new; he will avoid being either bizarre or fashionable, yet he will not fear using new techniques or new materials should these constitute real advances in architectural thinking.
>
> It is hoped that the selected architects will think of style not in its narrower meaning but as a quality to be imparted to the building, a quality reflecting deep understanding of conditions and people. His directness and freshness of approach will thus have a distinguishable American flavor.
>
> The committee feels that if the above philosophy is adhered to, we need not fear criticism; on the other hand, if we act timidly, solely in the hope of avoiding any and all criticism from whatever quarters, we shall surely end up in dull compromises with the result that we shall have nothing but undistinguished buildings to represent us abroad. We would thereby have forfeited our opportunity to display the high American cultural achievements in the field of architecture generally recognized by architects of the more advanced nations of the world.[141]

---

[139] Statement of Department of State's Architectural Policy and Specific Functions of the Architectural Board for Foreign Buildings, 1954, Shepley Papers.

[140] Minutes of the First Meeting of the Foreign Building Architectural Advisory Committee.

[141] Pietro Belluschi, memorandum to Nelson A. Kenworthy, January 27, 1954, Loeffler Collection and Shepley Papers.

Sensitive to the Cold War concern about modernism, Belluschi was careful not to use even once the word *modern*, instead referring to "new" techniques or materials and "freshness of approach." On the other hand, his caution against "obsolete or sterile formulae" and "undistinguished buildings" was indirectly referencing the undistinguished steel and glass skyscrapers multiplying throughout urban America, which Stone too had come to resent. Belluschi likewise discouraged conventional past solutions, as they represented a failed attempt to renew cultural values. Instead, he invited the architects to use vernacular traditions—in terms of people and customs, topography and climate. This emphasis on the local situation, reflecting Belluschi's own interest in regionalism, distinguished him from other modernists less focused on meaning, iconographic content, historical retrospection, or memory.[142] Although the manifesto invited architects to experiment with alternatives that could be fused with modern planning and technologies, it was only loosely incorporated into an ambiguous State Department architectural policy issued on July 7, 1954, which stressed the importance of creating "goodwill" in foreign countries through appropriate architecture.[143]

Even so, the manifesto clearly guided Stone, who was the first architect to work under the new directive and therefore essentially required to create a new model for embassy architecture. In retrospect, few could have been more ideally suited than Stone to the role of architect of an unprecedented program of government architecture. Having interpreted the International Style before growing disenchanted with it for both economic

---

[142] Colin Rowe, Introduction to *Five Architects: Eisenman, Graves, Gwathmey, Hejduk, Meier* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), 3-7. See Pietro Belluschi, "The Meaning of Regionalism in Architecture," *Architectural Record* 118 (December 1955): 131-139.

[143] FBO, Architectural Policy Issued July 7, 1954, Loeffler Collection.

and artistic reasons and then experimenting with his own vernacular expression stemming from Wright's inspiration, Stone was at that moment searching for an architecture more satisfying to both his clients and himself. The clear *parti* and support of the architect advisors (in addition to the reassurance and inspiration of his new wife, Maria) encouraged Stone to seek a unique solution within the modernist structure, in place of traditional, staid governmental monumentality.

In April 1954 Stone flew to India for a two-week visit, where he met with George Allen, ambassador between 1953 and 1954, and his staff as well as with members of the Indian government. In August he presented two preliminary schemes for a master site plan incorporating the embassy chancery, the ambassador's residence, and staff and servant housing.[144] After the architectural advisory committee discussed the schemes at length, he was asked to restudy the plan and submit his new designs and specification outlines for the next meeting.[145] In September Stone presented another, considerably reduced, scheme to which the committee responded positively and encouraged further development. Judging by the minutes of the following monthly meetings, the committee was thoroughly involved with virtually every detail and made numerous suggestions with regard to layout, proportion, design, and construction.

The model (fig. 98) presented at the committee meeting on March 29, 1955, which showed the general scheme (although many decorative details had yet to be worked out), instigated a heated discussion that would ultimately have an impact on the embassy program. William Pulaski Hughes (1911-1979), director of the FBO until 1961,

---

[144] FBO Architectural Advisory Meeting Minutes (hereafter cited as AAC Minutes), January 21, 1954, Loeffler Collection.

[145] AAC Minutes, August 19, 1954.

was concerned that the design was "rather extreme" for the region and not in keeping with local architecture traditions. He particularly disliked the "sculptured screens," or grillework, flanking the entrance, preferring instead the benches that had originally been indicated.[146] He was joined by other non-architect committee members who feared that such "modern" architecture could be "freakish" or only represent "temporary fads."

In response to their apprehension, which reflected the opinion of many politicians as well as the American people, the architect advisors stood firm with their architectural policy and with Stone, reassuring the others that "modernizing" was in keeping with American ideas, and they predicted that the embassy would be recognized for its uniqueness and utility; would prove to be in keeping with local traditions; and would "set a goal" that other architects, both at home and abroad, would seek to attain.[147] When John Sherman Cooper (1901-1999), ambassador to India between 1955 and 1956, also expressed his uneasiness about the suitability of the design for its locale and the size of the grille openings, the architect advisors similarly emphatically replied that the embassy would be "the outstanding architectural achievement of the century."[148]

---

[146] Unfortunately, no extant drawings of this scheme are in the Stone Papers.

[147] AAC Minutes, March 29, 1955.

[148] AAC Minutes," July 30, 1956 and William P. Hughes to Ambassador Bunker, March 26, 1957, Stone Papers. Although Bunker admitted that the chancery was "a helluva pretty jewel box" (Don Connery to John Boyle and Mary Jane Lightbown, September 6, 1958, Haskell Papers), he too complained: the lacy grille impaired his view of the blue sky, he said, perhaps reflecting his wife's earlier run-in with Stone, when only a month after arriving in India, she sent him a cablegram expressing her "deep interest" in the building and at the encouragement of California architect William Wurster had suggested that the grille be hinged so that a better view could be obtained in the months when the sun was not so hot (Harriet Bunker, cablegram to Edward D. Stone, March 22, 1957, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 15 and "India: American Taj" *Time*, January 12, 1959). Stone found her proposal "preposterous," and a polite but stern response was sent from the State Department to Ambassador Bunker (Stone to Hughes, March 23, 1957 and Hughes to Bunker, March 26, 1957, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 15). Stone later refused to endorse the nomination of Wurster to the National Institute of Arts and Letters in 1962, writing to Henry Shepley on June 6, 1962: "I wish I could generate some enthusiasm…but I do not admire him either as a man or an architect. As you may suspect, there is a long story behind this which I will pass on to you sometime."

Since no one on the committee other than Stone had ever been to India and because the FBO officials were apparently still unconvinced by the Stone design, Shepley and Belluschi traveled to India in April.[149] In addition to canvassing the site, they visited such monuments as the Taj Mahal (1631-1653; fig. 96) in Agra, the Mughal mausoleum built by Emperor Shah Jahan (1628-1658) for his favorite wife, Arjumand Banu Begam (her title was Mumtaz Mahal); Shah Jahan's reconstruction of the Red Fort (1639-1637) in Delhi; and Akbar's tomb (1605-1613) at Sikandra near Agra. The tour thoroughly reinforced their "high opinion of Stone's design in that he had taken the best from the local traditions and created a truly modern Embassy of great distinction in the American spirit."[150] Shepley further wrote in his report to the committee that many of the older buildings in India were better protected from the sun and heat than the modern buildings because of their pierced masonry screens of brick or stone and overhanging roof slabs. Speaking for both Belluschi and himself, he said, "It seems to us that Stone had made very intelligent use of all these features and that this Embassy was well adapted to New Delhi living conditions."[151] In fact, they concluded that Stone had successfully met the challenge by setting a new standard for embassy architecture, as documented by Walker, who wrote to the other committee members later that year: "I believe it [is] vitally important in any culture which the U.S. may touch that its buildings achieve a new look,

---

Mrs. Bunker did successfully campaign, however, for bigger rooms (from single to double or two-bedroom quarters), toilets, balconies, and chimneys for stoves for the servants' quarters, which cost an extra $250,000 and delayed completion by more than six months. She was quoted in "India: American Taj" as saying: "'Can You Believe It?' With all that gold out front, why should the servants live in squalor in the back?"

[149] AAC Minutes, March 29, 1955.

[150] Henry Shepley, Notes on India, April 26–May 15, 1955, Shepley Papers.

[151] Ibid.

one totally unrelated to the concepts of the factory engineer, one indicating both the power and richness of American life, yet sensitive to friendly needs. Edward Stone at New Delhi achieved this notably."[152]

Stone had organized the site on an axial plan with the chancery and ambassador's house on one half and the staff housing, servants' quarters, and other service areas on the other (fig. 99). Although the staff housing was at first arranged in offset rows facing the large rectangular open space, Stone revised the plan to accommodate clustered units on the open square. The most notable feature about the staff housing was the woven teak trellis on steel columns outside each unit, which produced dramatic striated patterns of light and shade (fig. 100). It was reminiscent of the lathe roofing over the *Estufa Fria* (cold greenhouse; 1926-1930), created by the architect Raul Carapinha in the Parque Eduardo VII in Lisbon, which Stone had sent some of his associates to visit in 1952 (fig. 101).[153]

According to Stone, the concept for the chancery, a two-story building made of reinforced concrete, was a "simple temple" not unlike the classical temples of Greece or Rome.[154] The single-span rectangular volume hovers between a well-defined cornice and a podium raised seven feet above ground level for automobile parking underneath. The entrance to the grand staircase, paved with strips of marble and smooth pebbles from the

---

[152] Ralph Walker, memorandum to Harry A. McBride, Henry Shepley, and Pietro Belluschi, August 15, 1955, Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations, United States Department of State. I would like to thank Kevin Lee Sarring for his assistance at the State Department.

[153] "U.S. Embassy for New Delhi," 114.

[154] Stone description, c. 1959. Built under the direction of Mohan Singh of the Oriental Building and Furnishing Company of New Delhi, Stone said it was "the happiest association" of his career and had "eternal gratitude for the magnificent work." Edward D. Stone to Mohan Singh, December 24, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 70, file 18.

sacred Ganges River, faced a thirty-nine-foot circular pool with fountains, "a cool refreshing oasis" that Stone said was meant to provide repose and serenity as well as reflect the chancery as the pool in front of the Taj Mahal does (figs. 96-97).[155] Stone retrospectively explained the design, "It was a very natural thing to raise the building up on the floor so all the parking could be had on the first floor providing easy access and shade." It was also natural "to provide a colonnade with a broad overhang to protect from the sun."[156] Supported by gold-leafed steel columns (that some referred to as "golden toothpicks"[157]), the flat cantilevered roof, a structural detail that Stone had noted in a watercolor as a Rotch Scholar (fig. 102), extended twenty feet beyond the wall plane, providing shade and protecting an inner roof from the direct heat of the sun.

The most dramatic aspect of the interior space was the central atrium (figs. 103-104), surrounded by air-conditioned offices one bay deep on both floors, with open balconies on the second floor serving as corridors. In the center of the atrium was a large water garden, with jets, sculpture platforms, and islands of various shapes, which were to be complemented by plantings specified by Stone on the plan, including yellow silk cotton, palm, bamboo, and fern, as well as under-plantings of myrtle, iris, and ginger. Like the Brussels Pavilion, Stone had wanted to transform the visitor through a synergistic experience: Isamu Noguchi (1904-1988), who Stone had hoped would design sculptures for the interior garden, understood his intention better than anyone, writing to Stone on March 6, 1955, "Birds, trees, water—their sound—the play of shadow and of

---

[155] "U.S. Embassy Building," 68.

[156] Stone description, c. 1959.

[157] Jack Leahy, "Dean of American Architects," Mainly for Seniors, *New York Daily News Magazine*, October 31, 1971.

sculpture of which it is all a part—the possibilities are immense and challenging."[158] As was common in much of Stone's work, the atrium had a functional purpose as well: by using the cold greenhouse principle of the *Estufa Fria*, whose wooden lath roofing (replaced the original wood blinds) provided a consistent light intensity and protected the plants from the inclemency of the winter and heat of the summer.[159] Stone covered the opening over his atrium with a "suspended sunshade" of decorative mesh made of anodized aluminum stampings strung on cables, reminiscent of the one in the Brussels pavilion.[160] He later recollected his thought process in developing the atrium design: "In the beginning I conceived of a garden in the middle with offices all around. And with the extreme climate that suggested water, the cooling effects and the cheerfulness of it. And then to shade this, I developed a pattern of sunlight and shade that would dispel that heat."[161]

But perhaps the most noteworthy feature of the chancery is the exterior pierced grille, or screen, that wrapped around the entire building behind the columns (a mock-up of which had been erected on site in late 1956 [fig. 105]).[162] Standing on stilts about nineteen inches away from the glazed curtain-wall (for easy window cleaning), it was

---

[158] AAC Minutes, October 20, 1954; Isamu Noguchi to Edward Durell Stone, February 11, 1957, and March 6, 1955, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 75, file 14. In 1957 Noguchi was still hoping to receive the commission, although apparently did not. See Noguchi to Stone, February 11, 1957, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 75, file 14.

[159] AAC Minutes, September 17, 1954.

[160] The mesh ceiling did not take into consideration the dust storms, pollution, and high humidity, which made the atrium uncomfortable as well as unsightly during certain periods of the year. The employees were forced to deal with these adverse conditions because the atrium was the center of the circulation pattern.

[161] Stone description, c. 1959.

[162] Henry J. Lawrence to Edward D. Stone, November 14, 1956, Stone Papers, box 46, folder 13.

made of molded concrete and marble aggregate tiles strung on rods and finished with gilt-aluminum studs. The grille on the early model and plans was perforated with simple circles (fig. 106), but the drawings of November 15, 1955 show the final, more complex design that became Stone's signature and was patented in 1959.[163] While the exact source (if there is one) of the grille, consisting of four counterpoised tiles that together create a pattern of circles containing squares, is not known, its abstract geometric pattern closely follows Muslim decoration—the light and linear two-dimensional rhythmic multiplicity suggesting infinite pattern.[164] For inspiration, Stone said he had drawn from the Islamic screens of Mogul, Near Eastern, and North African regions.[165] But for a long time he had had a penchant for geometric abstract designs with perforations creating dappled patterns of light and shadow. Although Stone admitted that at least subconsciously he had been working up to the grille design from as far back as 1938 with the curvilinear perforated brick wall surrounding the Goodyear house (fig. 107), he had experimented with such patterning even in 1936—not just with a similar wall but also with the "superintendent's group" at Henry and Clare Boothe Luce's Mepkin Plantation (1936-1937) in Moncks Corner, South Carolina (figs. 108-109), as well as in the front wall of the *Collier's* house model of 1936 (fig. 55).[166]

---

[163] Edward Durell Stone, 1959, Wall Block, U.S. Patent 184,463, filed September 18, 1957, and issued February 17, 1959.

[164] John Sweetman, *The Oriental Obsession: Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture, 1500-1920* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 239-240.

[165] Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches."

[166] "More Than Modern." The grillework of the Peruvian hospital was pictured on page 174 in "An Architecture of Space and Grace."

He may also have looked to Le Corbusier's innovative sun-baffle louvers, or *brises-soleil*, for his Unité d'Habitation (1947-1952) in Marseilles, France,[167] although, in the opinion of Stern, the drained "sculptural force" of Stone's grille is more reminiscent of the interpretation by Oscar Niemeyer (b.1907) at the presidential palace (1957-1964) in the new capital of Brasília.[168] Stone could have also considered the concrete textile-block system that Wright developed for his California houses between 1923 and 1925. But whereas Wright used sixteen-inch-square tiles, Stone used a twelve-inch-square module of four six-inch tiles, and the methods of attachment were different.[169] Moreover, Wright's intent was to emphasize each individual tile while Stone's was to create a continuous abstract pattern.

Even though critics did not comment on the relationship of the grille and its counterpart, the glazed curtain wall, Stone uniquely split the traditional function of the wall between them: the frame infilled with repetitive modules of transparent glass allows for light and insulation while the grille reduces heat and glare, provides visual privacy, and avoids monotony through its decorative patterning. The positioning of the columns in front of the grille enhances the sense of a scaleless floating plane (especially visible in the early models and plans), and, more importantly, accentuates its non-structural essence. Stone explained, "Obviously it was no place to build a glass building with the heat; so enclosing the building with a veil, as the ancient buildings of India were, was a very

---

[167] Kenneth Frampton, *A Critical History of Modern Architecture*, 3rd ed. (London: Thames & Hudson, 1992), 228.

[168] Robert A. M Stern with Raymond Gastil, *Modern Classicism* (New York: Rizzoli, 1988), 53 and 64.

[169] Levine, *Architecture of Wright*, 152.

natural solution to the problem of sunshine and glare."[170] His concept of the grille as a non-structural "veil" recalls the "wall veil" that John Ruskin (1819-1900), with whom Stone shared a passion for Venice (see fig. 131),[171] wrote about in *The Stones of Venice* (1851-1853):

> In perfect architecture, however, walls are generally kept of moderate thickness, and strengthened by piers or buttresses; and the part of the wall between these, being generally intended only to secure privacy, or keep out the slighter forces of weather, may be properly called a Wall Veil. I shall always use this word 'Veil' to signify the even portion of a wall, it being more expressive than the term Body.[172]

Stone may well have been introduced to Ruskin via his academic training, particularly by his Harvard professor Kenneth Conant, an archaeologist-historian whom Stone said had a "profound influence" on him.[173] In the Foreword to his book *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, 800 to 1200* (1959), Conant proclaimed he was "academically the heir of Herbert Langford Warren and his teachers Henry Hobson Richardson and Charles Eliot Norton, the latter an intimate friend of John Ruskin."[174] It is probable that

---

[170] Stone description, c. 1959.

[171] Ruskin considered the Ducal Palace in Venice "the central building of the world" (*The Stones of Venice*, ed. J. G. Links (1960; New York: Da Capo Press, 1985], 19), and Stone considered the Piazza San Marco, where it was located, as "man's greatest and most beautiful architectural composition (Sir Hugh Casson, "Fairest Cities Of Them All: Five Prominent Architects Offer Their Choices, and Explain the Reasons for Them," *New York Times*, December 16, 1959).

[172] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 46.

[173] Stone to Conant, May 3, 1965 and Conant to Stone, January 1, 1965. In 2000 the Fogg Art Museum at Harvard organized the exhibition Before and After the End of Time: Architecture and the Year 1000, focusing on the work of Conant, Richardson, and the art historian Arthur Kingsley Porter (1883-1933).

[174] Kenneth John Conant, *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, 800 to 1200* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959), xxv. Conant had graduated *magna cum laude* in 1915 from Harvard, where he had taken three art history courses from Herbert Langford Warren (1857-1917): Ancient Styles with especial reference to Classic Architecture, Gothic Styles of Architecture, and Renaissance and Modern Architecture (*Harvard University Catalogue, 1912–1913*; *1913–1914*; and *1914–1916*). Warren had worked until 1884 in the atelier of Henry Hobson Richardson (1836-1886; whose firm later became Shepley Bulfinch Richardson and Abbott where Stone worked) after studying architecture at M.I.T. between 1877 and 1879. In 1882 Warren had taken two courses—Art in Italy from the Conquest of Greece by the Romans to the year 1600 as well as Greek Art—as a special student from Charles Eliot Norton (1827-1908), Harvard's

through this lineage Stone also came to appreciate architecture as a fine art, for Ruskin believed that "no person who is not a great sculptor or painter *can* be an architect. If he is not a sculptor or painter, he can only be a *builder*."[175] It may also have been from Ruskin that Stone developed a deep appreciation for veneered architectural surfaces of rich materials producing intricate patterns of light and shade.

Although the grille was originally introduced on the chancery as a functional antidote to the curtain wall, for his subsequent structures on the embassy complex Stone began to favor its aesthetic features over the functional.[176] Even though Stone wanted Roosevelt House (fig. 110), the home of the ambassador, to visually complement the chancery, due to a cost-saving effort he only mimicked the grill of the chancery by using patterned concrete on the front ends of the single-span rectangular structure, which, like the chancery, was topped by a cantilevered roof supported by columns colored gold.

The progression of the design of Roosevelt House began in July 1957, but it was not complete until 1963. Stone's initial conception had been grander than the State Department had envisioned. No consideration had apparently been given to the stipulated budget, and the functional areas were thought to have been slighted in favor of the formal rooms. Thus Stone was asked to revise the plans—in August and again in November of

---

first professor of art history (*Harvard University Catalogue, 1882-83* and student file for H. L. Warren, 1910-1919, Harvard Archives). Norton had a life-long relationship with John Ruskin as his "friend, disciple, and eventually his executor (Michael W. Brooks, "New England Gothic: Charles Eliot Norton, Charles H. Moore, and Henry Adams, *The Architectural Historian in America* 35 [1990], 113). In 1895 Warren established the department of architecture at Harvard and became its first dean in 1914, which became distinguished for its association with the fine arts. See Maureen Meister, *Architecture and the Arts and Crafts Movement in Boston: Harvard's H. Langford Warren* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2003), 4-5 and 16.

[175] Quoted in Kristine Garrigan, *Ruskin on Architecture*, 49.

[176] Jacobus, *Twentieth-Century Architecture*, 158.

1957.[177] Although not approved until after December 27, a November press release announced that the building would be a "simple, two-story glass-enclosed structure surrounded by a screen," and it was pictured in the *New York Times* on December 1, 1957 with the design described as "an elegant though unpretentious atmosphere" (fig. 111).[178] Stone created working drawings between 1958 and 1959, but subsequent modifications, primarily for reasons of cost, necessitated yet another set of drawings, which Stone submitted in 1960.[179] Even though Ambassador Galbraith noted in his diary that the plan was "possibly a trifle too grand in the big state rooms," which could accommodate a party of five hundred to a thousand with no appearance of crowding, and that "it will be a little like living on a balcony overlooking the main concourse of Grand Central Station," Stone reported that the new plans effected "a real economy."[180] Even though the grilles on the front and back of the house had been reduced to patterned concrete, perforated grilles were used on both floors in the interior to define the spaces: they divided the ground floor, for example, into three areas: In the center was a two-story reception hall (figs. 112-113), containing a sculptured spiral staircase above a circular pool with a

---

[177] "AAC Minutes," July 26, 1957. The drawings, dated July 25, 1957, August 30, 1957, and November 12, 1957, are in the Stone Papers, 2nd acc., series 11, "E."

[178] Press release, November 26, 1957, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 63, file 4 and "U.S. Ambassador's Residence to Rise in New Delhi," *New York Times*, December 1, 1957.

[179] Edward Durell Stone to William B. Hughes, June 11, 1959 and Harry Turko to L. V. Del Favero, November 19, 1959, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 16.

[180] John Kenneth Galbraith, *Ambassador's Journal: A Personal Account of the Kennedy Years* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969), 42 and Edward Durell Stone to R. Stanley Sweeley, January 15, 1960 and February 15, 1960, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 76, file 23. In note 27 Galbraith later added, "This indeed proved to be the case. But anyone seeking homelike surroundings does not need to become ambassador."

multi-jet fountain and balcony, with the kitchen, dining room and state dining room on one side and the lounges, toilets, office, library and living room on the other.[181]

The grille was also utilized for the International Cooperative Administration Building, known as the West Building (fig. 114). Although not completed until 1965, as early as June 1960 Stone had been asked to enlarge the chancery by extending the podium (as well as to build another housing unit), but thankfully, Ellsworth Bunker (1894-1984), ambassador to India between 1956 and 1961, was opposed to modifying the building, preferring instead to construct a new office building behind the residence. Upon reflection Stone agreed, and although he did not want the new building to compete with the chancery felt that it deserved the same consideration.[182] In July 1961 he presented "a functional and interesting scheme," which also had an interior atrium (fig. 115). Unlike the chancery, the grille covered the entire large building (which had some thirty-three thousand feet of interior space) with no other architectural variation.[183]

Stone's decision to echo the characteristic features of the chancery undoubtedly stemmed from the tremendous attention the chancery had received.[184] Introduced in *Architectural Record* and *Architectural Forum* in May and June 1955, respectively, the chancery design had created a stir in architectural circles before finished: Wright said it

---

[181] On page 405 of ibid. Galbraith said the fountain, since removed, sounded like "a toilet permanently out of order." It also sank to a dribble when the upstairs toilets were flushed, according to Richard Critchfield, "Our Fancy Embassy in India: A White Elephant Is Put to Work," *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 20, 1964.

[182] Edward Durell Stone to Daljit Singh, June 27, 1960, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 77, file 27; Stone to James R. Johnstone, March 31, 1961, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 78, file 35; and Stone to Thomas Pope, February 20, 1962, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 79, file 46. He thought it would be a "tragic blunder" if the auditorium was placed there instead.

[183] See the drawing for the basement and first floor, May 4, 1962, Stone Papers, Series 11, "E," C19 and "An Embassy Too Beautiful to Enlarge," *Atlanta Journal*, June 10, 1965.

[184] Loeffler, "Architecture of Diplomacy: Heyday of the U.S. Embassy-Building Program," 275.

was "a genuine credit to American architecture;" Bunshaft thought it was "one of the great buildings of twentieth-century American architecture;" and Eero Saarinen (1910-1961) thought it a "marvelous" building that bespoke its typology. In fact, as Haskell explained to Maria Stone, Saarinen "put it in a class by itself compared with many ambitious attempts in the same program."[185] When Chief Justice Earl Warren laid the cornerstone in September 1956 a flurry of publicity fueled the anticipation of its completion: *Time* reported "When it is completed in early 1958 it will perch over a 139-ft.-wide lagoon and glitter in the hot Indian sun like a maharaja's expensive present."[186]

Although unfinished, the inclusion of the New Delhi embassy as one of six examples of "the best recent modern architecture" in the 1957 exhibition Buildings for Business and Government at the Museum of Modern Art provided an exceptional opportunity for critical evaluation, aided by the two full-scale mock-ups of the grille and of the mesh canopy (fig. 116.).[187] Curated by Arthur Drexler, the exhibition emphasized "the new patron" (here the United States government) who at long last rightfully recognized the appropriateness of modern architecture.[188] Drexler presented Stone's embassy as an alternative to the more luxurious formalism of the Seagram Building (1954-1958) by Mies van der Rohe in New York City, which also was featured in the

---

[185] Arthur Pieper, memorandum to Douglas Haskell, n.d., Haskell Papers; Bunshaft to jury of fellows, December 5, 1957; Eero Saarinen to Edward D. Stone, June 6, 1955, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 74; and Haskell to Maria Stone, August 9, 1955, Haskell Papers.

[186] "Taj Mahal Modern."

[187] Arthur Drexler, Exhibition Outline, October 31, 1956, MoMA Archives, Buildings for Business and Government, Exhibition File, no. 615, February 27–April 28, 1957 (hereafter cited as Buildings for Business and Government).

[188] Arthur Drexler, "American Architecture: The New Patrons (Tentative Title)," 1957, MoMA Archives, Buildings for Business and Government.

exhibition.[189] In addition to being impressed by the "transformation" of the structural elements into decoration—such as the perforations in the columns that cast lines of light on the richly shadowed grilles behind them—Drexler admired the large atrium with its shallow pool as well as the majestic hollow space underneath the podium for parking. Although he considered the two-story façade "blandly anonymous," he did not seem to mind that it obliterated "all indication of interior spatial divisions," a feature that some had disliked on Goodwin and Stone's Museum of Modern Art building but was apparently now acceptable, suggesting that a more tolerant view of modernism had emerged.[190]

The exhibition mock-ups of the grille and ceiling were pictured in "An Architecture of Space and Grace" in the July 1957 issue of *Architectural Forum*, which celebrated Stone's new aesthetic, especially the successful merging of such polarities as the conservative and the experimental; the classic and the romantic; and the austere and the highly decorative.[191] Joseph Hudnut also admired Stone's decorated modernism as he discussed the exhibition in *ARTnews*, writing, "Structure transfigured by ornament, the essence of the historical Baroque style re-emerging today, finds its highest expression in architect Edward Durell Stone." Exclaiming that it was "something of a miracle" that Stone's imagination was allowed to prevail in an era that promoted science, Hudnut said Stone had made "magnificent use" of the principle of structure and decoration as

---

[189] The four other featured buildings in the exhibition were: the Chase Manhattan Bank by Gordon Bunshaft of SOM in New York City, the U.S. Air Force Academy Chapel by Walter Netsch of SOM in Colorado Springs, the Air Terminal by Minoru Yamasaki in St. Louis, and the General Motors Technical Center by Eero Saarinen in Warren, Michigan.

[190] Arthur Drexler, "Buildings for Business and Government in America," *Zodiac* 1 (1957), 137.

[191] "An Architecture of Space and Grace," 154.

inseparable parts of a building, allowing head and heart to collaborate as they had in the work of Louis Sullivan, whose ornament emphasized the essence of each part and its relationship to the whole. He noted Stone's ability to merge modern and traditional qualities, which were usually viewed as antithetical and was impressed that Stone had had the courage to privilege idea and feeling over technique as well as romantic impulse over structural virtuosity and candor.[192]

Since the museum has been recognized for its ability to mold public taste, it is probable that the exhibition contributed to such positive responses, which no doubt helped to generate the "flood of public attention" at the opening ceremonies in January 1959, when the reaction to the chancery brought "a rousing cheer that rolled the full range of the architecture profession," as reported in *Time*.[193] The proclamation made at the opening of the chancery by India's first prime minister, Dr. Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964)—that he was "enchanted" with the "dreamlike, haunting beauty and an atmosphere of romance"—flashed all over the world, producing even more "intense public interest."[194]

Reportedly, the Indians were also impressed with the assimilation of Western architecture into an Eastern setting and responded to its sense of fantasy: One reporter of the *Statesman*, the most prestigious newspaper in India, remarked upon entering the building that "it is as if an Arabian Night tale was being enacted against a gorgeous

---

[192] Joseph Hudnut, "A New Eloquence for Architecture," *Architectural Record* 122 (July 1957): 179.

[193] "India's Great Builder," *Architectural Forum* 110 (February 1959): 55 and "More Than Modern."

[194] "India: American Taj" and Ellsworth Bunker to Henderson, Hughes, and Allen, November 18, 1958, State Department Records.

backdrop."[195] As a result of the favorable reports, on the first day the chancery was open to the public, sixty-five hundred people visited in three hours; on the second day, eighty-five hundred with another thousand or more in line at closing; and on the third day, more than fifteen thousand visited in five hours. Ambassador Bunker reported to Stone, "I am sure we could have kept this going for more than two weeks." Thereafter, an average of 125 to 150 people visited every Sunday afternoon, overwhelmingly agreeing with the ambassador that the building was "a work of great beauty and originality."[196]

Recognized as "a modern classic," the embassy quickly became legendary.[197] In 1961 it received the highest honor from the AIA for articulating "serenity and power in government in terms appropriate to the country in which it is guest."[198] In 1962 it was reported that the building was still "the most widely praised" among the foreign embassies, making a "terrific impression" with up to seven hundred people on average visiting every Sunday; and in 1963 it was reported to Congress that it is "really a monument…in the Indian tradition."[199] When Stone died in 1978, the embassy was still

---

[195] Norma Evenson, *The Indian Metropolis: A View Toward the West* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 229; "Diplomatic Temple: America's Embassy Wins India's Praise," *Life*, January 26, 1959; and Staff Reporter, "An American Builds His Taj," *Statesman*, November 26, 1958. Even the embassy staff found it a most "rewarding place to work:" an employee named Winthrop Brown wrote to Stone that the chancery "grows ever more beautiful as one sees its varied moods, in the hard noon sun and in the peaceful evening" (October 25, 1959, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 71, file 22).

[196] Ellsworth Bunker to Edward Durell Stone, April 8, 1959, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 1, file 1.

[197] Wolf Von Eckardt, Introduction to *Mid-Century Architecture in America: Honor Awards of the American Institute of Architects, 1949-1961* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1961), 26.

[198] "First Honor Award: United States Embassy," *AIA Journal* 35 (April 1961): 70. Morris Ketchum, a former employee and friend, was chairman of the jury along with Fred Bassetti, Richard D. Butterfield, Arthur Davis, and William Pereira. See Glenn Fowler, "Architects' Institute Honors Buildings Here and Abroad," *New York Times*, February 26, 1961.

[199] Committee on Foreign Relations, "Amendments to the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926," August 21, 1962, Loeffler Collection and J. William Fulbright, HR 5207, 88th Cong., *Congressional Record* 109 (May 7, 1963), Loeffler Collection

considered "one of the best-known pieces of American architecture of the decade," according to the *New York Times* obituary of Stone by Goldberger.[200]

In spite of consistent, widespread acclaim, there was some hesitancy about this modern hybrid, especially its decoration, which it was feared could be turned into highly predictable aesthetic packages for mass consumption, or kitsch. Robin Boyd (1917-1971), an Australian architect and a strong proponent of modernism, warned that although Stone's grille was the most practical solution yet to respond to the "long-felt want for a sun-sieve" and that its restrained pattern did not detract from the building's continuous surface, it could easily distract the eye from the building's true function.[201] While Huxtable did not use the word itself, she insinuated that the embassy design could lead to kitsch because she was concerned that the "frankly sensuous use of intrinsic decoration" attached to the classical design could be readily reduced by imitators to "a new kind of decorative chaos," and she suggested that richness could be better achieved through the use of luxurious materials, as Mies had done with the Seagram Building.[202] This apprehension of the decorative was shared by such scholars as Serge Chermayeff (1900-1996), a Harvard professor and past director of the New Bauhaus (founded 1937; later renamed the Chicago Institute of Design), who desired a return to architecture less mannered than "that which prevails in our romantic, inflationary culture."[203] William

---

[200] Paul Goldberger, "Edward Durell Stone Services Will Be Held Tomorrow," *New York Times*, August 8, 1978.

[201] Stone description, c. 1959 and Robin Boyd, "Decoration Rides Again," *Architectural Record* 122 (September 1957): 183.

[202] Ada Louise Huxtable, "The Patronage of Progress," *Arts* 31 (April 1957), 24-29.

[203] Serge Chermayeff, "The Shell Game," *Architectural Forum* 109 (July 1958): 54 and 56. In response, Stone stated about Chermayeff: "I know that he dwells in the ivy-clad halls of Cambridge, remote from the work-a-day, messy business of building. This may entitle him to the assumed role of oracle. I do not think

Jordy succinctly summed up these concerns when he said he worried that "making modern architecture beautiful" would predominate over "making beautiful modern architecture."[204]

Whether Stone's embassy design was considered regressive or progressive, because modernism had ostensibly been founded on the obliteration of history—the sweeping away of the clutter of the past in order to reinvent a clean and simple future—the polemic about its decorative effect consistently invaded evaluations of it, indicating that critics themselves were conflicted.[205] Whereas they admired Stone's creative visual ideas and the reassertion of individualism over impersonal structures of glass and steel, they were anxious that Stone's decoration could all too easily become popularized (as the curtain-wall did). Even worse, they were concerned it would return to what Jordy described as the "eclectic heaping of interests and experiences" that had marked late nineteenth-century "revival" architecture.[206] Although he admired the embassy as an outstanding example of recent architecture because it expanded the definition of modernism, Jordy said it was excessively academic: He conjectured that its classical formalism was derived from the Abraham Lincoln Memorial (1911-1922) by Henry Bacon (1839-1912) in Washington, D.C.; its grille, which was superimposed on the

---

that the modicum of acclaim accorded by recent work should upset his mediations. His nostalgia for the return of the 'good old days' is quite understandable. I have a suggestion, figuratively speaking, he has been wearing a Bauhaus' frock since the early 30's, when it definitely was "the new look." I am sure that it looks frayed at the seams by now, and I think that he should try something new--say, a sack or trapeze; it might make him look charming and lift his spirits" (Edward D. Stone, letter to the editor, July 17, 1958, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 62, file 15).

[204] William H. Jordy, "The Formal Image: USA," *Architectural Review* 127 (March 1960): 163.

[205] Goldberger, "Landmark Kitsch: A new generation of architects tries to save the city's ugly ducklings," The Sky Line, *New Yorker*, August 18, 1997.

[206] Jordy, "The Formal Image," 108.

structure, was derived from Indian screens; and the weighty, static effect of the "stereometric" decorated wall was derived from Notre Dame du Raincy (1922-1924) in France, by the rational classicist Auguste Perret (1874-1945), whose non-load-bearing curtain-wall of two-foot-square pre-cast concrete *claustra* were filled with clear or colored glass in diversified patterns (circles, diamonds, and crosses as well as full, half, and quarter squares).[207]

The past arguments against historical recollection and its decorative vigor were still too vivid and therefore for many critics, the grilled embassy was burdened with preexisting historical meaning. When evaluated in relation to the writings of the German architect Adolf Loos, for example, the New Delhi embassy exemplifies his model of the "primitive man" who used a mask to express his social identity rather than the "modern man" who used a mask to conceal his differences and protect his identity.[208] In fact, the famous essay by Loos, "Ornament and Crime" (1908), in which he insisted for economic reasons that "cultural evolution is equivalent to the removal of ornament from articles in daily use," had resurfaced in 1957, thanks to Banham, who wrote in Architectural Revi*ew* that "it is impossible now to imagine how the Modern Movement might have looked as a decorated style, but it might have been just that had not its creators had ringing in their ears Adolf Loos's challenging equation: Ornament equals Crime."[209]

---

[207] Jordy, "The Formal Image,"159. Also see "Le Néo-Classicisme Américain,"46. However, whereas Auguste Perret's wall explored the visual effect of the Gothic Stone's focused on linear abstraction.

[208] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 37.

[209] Loos, "Ornament and Crime," in *Adolf Loos: Pioneer of Modern Architecture*, by Ludwig Münz and Gustav Künstler, trans. Harold Meek, 226 (New York: Praeger, 1966) and Reyner Banham, "Ornament and Crime: The Decisive Contribution of Adolf Loos," *Architectural Review* 121 (February 1957), 86.

There is no evidence that Stone consciously contemplated such theoretical texts, but nonetheless they enhance an understanding of his architecture as well as the criticism. For example, Stone's concept of the grille can be better understood when viewed in relation to the writings of the German architect Gottfried Semper (1803-1879), particularly his model of the wall—as an element distinct from its supporting structure as well as a fitting place for decorative abstract patterns born out of the vernacular. In *Die vier Elemente der Baukunt* (The Four Elements of Architecture) of 1851, Semper divided the primordial dwelling into four basic elements—earthwork, hearth, framework/ roof, and lightweight enclosing membrane—and then assigned a tectonic craft to each element, respectively, masonry, ceramics, carpentry, and textiles. Semper's emphasis on the woven wall—made of textiles, hides, or wattle stretched or hung between structural posts—reflected his conviction that adornment was "the first and most significant step toward art," separating humans from animals.[210] As Mary McLeod noted, Semper considered textiles "to be the origin of many ornament types and symbolic in architecture and design."[211] The correlation between Stone's decorative grille and Semper's concept of the woven wall as a non-structural, yet functional, decorative force is unmistakable. But to consider Stone's abstractly patterned grille, figuratively or symbolically, in relation to textiles—a decorative, or low, art—is an uneasy progression. As the art historians Norma Broude and Mary Garrard explained in *Feminism and Art History:*

---

[210] Kenneth Frampton, *Studies in Tectonic Culture: The Poetics of Construction in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Architecture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006), 88 and Mary McLeod, "Undressing Architecture: Fashion, Gender, and Modernity," in Paulette Singley, ed., *Architecture: In Fashion*, 47 (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994). Also see Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "On Martin Fröhlich's Gottfried Semper," *Oppositions* 4 (October 1974): 146-153.

[211] McLeod, "Undressing Architecture," 47.

Questioning the Litany (1982), low art has been "variously defined as the decorative and often domestic handicraft productions of commercial artists, women, peasants and savages," and thus, by extension decoration has been demeaned because of its connotations of domestic craftsmanship.[212]

Consider the artist Henri Matisse (1869-1954), for example, whose paper cut-outs were directly inspired by textiles. In his effort to raise Matisse's art from the decorative to the heroic, Clement Greenberg argued against the frequent reference to Matisse as a "'mere' decorator."[213] In response, Broude, who has written extensively on this subject, stated, "The levels of absurdity that have been reached in critical attempts to deliver Matisse from the stigma of decoration are illustrated by the circumlocutions set to paper in 1952 and 1961 by Greenberg in order to arrive at the conclusion that Matisse's cutouts are 'more truly pictorial than decorative,' in spite of the fact that Matisse intended several of them to serve mainly decorative ends."[214] As is apparent in the contemporary criticism, to be taken as serious art, the decorative aspect of his work had to be justified in order to receive positive critical reinforcement.

A contemporary (and admirer) of Matisse,[215] Stone's work too has been tarred with the stigma of decoration, but critics and historians have failed to discuss how such established biases have had an impact on the reception of his aesthetic. For example, the gendered reading of Stone's decorated architecture as feminine has been affected by the

---

[212] Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany* (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), 15.

[213] Clement Greenberg, "*Partisan Review* 'Art Chronicle': 1952" in *Art and Culture*, 148.

[214] Broude and Garrard, *Feminism and Art History*, 320.

[215] "Personal Contributions to American Architecture," *Architectural Review* 121 (May 1957): 346.

"masculinist myths of modernism," as Griselda Pollock has called them, corresponding with the opinion of Lilian Robinson and Lise Vogal in *Modernism and History*, "Criticism has denied the existence of a gender point of view or, where it has acknowledged it, dismissed the female one as peculiar, marginal, and subjective."[216] To be sure, the words commonly describing Stone's work—*delicate*, *lacy*, *saccharine*, and *prissy*—are patently feminine, which is consistent with the findings of Valerie Jaudon and Joyce Kosloff in their 1978 survey of canonical quotations in the basic texts of modern art—that decoration is gendered as female, as opposed to the fine, or high, arts, which are gendered as masculine.[217] Colomina too demonstrated that modernity was represented by the "emphatically male" figure, often characterized by military rhetoric of war and virility, as Barr, Johnson, and Hitchcock did in their *International Style* book.[218] Further, the famous proclamation by Le Corbusier and Amédée Ozenfant in *Aprés le cubisme* of 1918 is a striking illustration of this distinction: "There is a hierarchy in the arts: decorative art at the bottom, and the human form at the top. Because we are men!"[219]

It was not until recently that Herbert Muschamp suggested that Stone's "First Lady architecture" was designed "to screen the harsh realities of the Cold War" with its "lacy, soft power look," even though critics had recognized that, like the Brussels

---

[216] Griselda Pollock, "Modernity and the Spaces of Femininity," in Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, *The Expanding Discourse: Feminism and Art History*, 185 (New York: IconEditions, 1992), 264-265 and Lilian S. Robinson and Lise Vogel, "Modernism and History," *New Literary History* 3 (Autumn 1971).

[217] Valerie Jaudon and Joyce Kozloff, "'Art Hysterical Notions' of Progress and Culture," *Heresies: A Feminist Publication on Art & Politics* 4 (Winter 1978): 38-42. Broude discussed this article in "The Pattern and Decoration Movement" in Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, *The Power of Feminist Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994), 208.

[218] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 37 and 210. See also Jaudon and Kozloff, "'Art Hysterical Notions' of Progress and Culture."

[219] Broude and Garrard, *Feminism and Art History*, 15.

pavilion, the embassy was meant to compete with totalitarian regimes (Watson Sims, the Associated Press bureau chief in New Delhi, for example, observed in 1958 that the embassy was "a barefaced effort of the Jones to get ahead of the Ivanovs and the Wongs" in what he called the "New Delhi Embassy Sweepstakes").[220] But rather than being viewed as a positive force, as Muschamp finally realized, Stone's feminine, or what Hitchcock called "more elaborate effects of detail" in *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (1958), were "denigrated as merely decorative."[221]

What is more, in addition to being compared to doctrinaire modernism, Stone's "daintily feminine" architecture was measured against the "exaggeratedly masculine" contemporary variation of modernism called New Brutalism, which Hitchcock predictably considered "superior morally" and "more advanced."[222] Similarly, John Burchard and Albert Bush-Brown stated in *Architecture of America: A Social and Cultural History* (1966) that even though Stone's was among the four best American embassies, it suffered for being "too pretty" in comparison to the monumentally rugged *béton brut*, or raw concrete, capital complex in Chandigarh, India, which preoccupied Le Corbusier between 1951 and his death in 1965.[223] As Muschamp explained in *File Under Architecture* (1974), Stone's embassy was "a pleasant building, but architects sneered: it was not heroic. Corbusian polemics had taken architecture into a bitter moral struggle

---

[220] Herbert Muschamp, "The Secret History," *New York Times*, January 8, 2006 and *San Francisco Chronicle*, December 29, 1958.

[221] Henry-Russell Hitchcock, *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, 3rd ed. (1958; Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books, 1968), 430.

[222] Ibid.

[223] John Burchard and Albert Bush-Brown, *The Architecture of America: A Social and Cultural History* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966), 489-190.

which made merely nice buildings look absurd."[224] Thus, the New Brutalist strain of modernism—which exploited the raw, crude properties of reinforced concrete and extended the heroic masculine image of technical power and highly rationalized, disciplined production—was blatantly antagonistic to the romantic, decorative splendor to which Stone aspired and for which he became best known.[225]

According to McLeod, the gendered binary model has existed since at least the eighteenth century in European architecture discourse, when femininity was associated with "change, fashion, capriciousness, play, artifice, frivolity, charm, delicacy, ornament, and masquerade."[226] Although Andreas Huyssen has claimed that the gendered distinction no longer provides a realistic paradigm, he acknowledged that critics have remained under its sway in their conceptualization of modernism, especially with regards to masculinity being associated with cultural production and femininity with patterns of consumption. Time and again, as Huyssen observed, this "powerful masculinist and misogynist current within the trajectory of modernism" has openly stated its contempt for women and the masses.[227]

Stone understood the gendered distinction between high and low art as the masculine and the feminine: he said on more than one occasion, "The fact that the grille has texture and pattern concerned some people because it was immediately called

---

[224] Herbert Muschamp, *File Under Architecture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1974), 40.

[225] Joseph Hudnut, "The Baroque Revival and Its Clients," *ARTnews* 56 (March 1957): 31. In "From Sassafras Branches" Sargeant stated that "Stone's recent ventures into what architecture critics are beginning to refer to as "the new romanticism" have been received by the public with enthusiasm, and even his most doctrinaire colleagues…[are] forced to admit that they are pleasing to the eye."

[226] Mary McLeod, "Undressing Architecture," 43.

[227] Andreas Huyssen, "Mass Culture As Woman: Modernism's Other," 193 and 200.

decorative, which is as vulgar as tattooing in some circles."[228] His choice of words is revealing since tattooing, which evolved from unusual and frightening customs of far-away places, as Jaudon and Kozloff explained, exemplifies the "racism and sexism" illustrated by Loos in "Ornament and Crime." In contrast to the Papuan who tattooed everything he could lay his hands on because he was not yet fully evolved, according to Loos, the moral and civilized standards of modern man are such that if he tattoos himself he is either a criminal or a degenerate. "There are prisons in which 80 percent of the inmates show tattoos. The tattooed who are not in prison are latent criminals or degenerate aristocrats. If someone who is tattooed dies at liberty, it means he has died a few years before committing a murder," he claimed.[229]

Importantly, Stone rejected an aesthetic that was considered "masculine" by giving equal distinction to the feminine characteristics of buildings. Instead of viewing them as polarizing forces, Stone sought androgynous harmony by reconciling traditional notions of high and low art, whose qualities, in the case of the New Delhi embassy, are respectively expressed in its structure and decoration. As Anne-Marie Sankovitch has written, architectural narratives typically configure a binary construction of structure and ornament, which presupposes a consistently sequential continuous linear movement from one style to the next. Structure typically is given temporal priority over ornament—a non-essential embellishment dependent on structure for its definition. Although the embassy criticism privileged this traditional binary model of opposition, in which the grille was viewed as "gift-wrapping" around a curtain-walled rectangular form, an alternative

---

[228] Atcheson, "Stone: Maker of Monuments."

[229] Adolf Loos, "Ornament and Crime," in *Adolf Loos: Pioneer of Modern Architecture*, by Münz and Künstler, 226.

model, in accordance with Sankovitch's concept, offers a more suitable approach to understanding the Stone aesthetic. The grille "completes" the structure by revealing or making it known, while at the same time compensates for what the structure lacks—privacy and environmental controls.[230] Decoration, then, is essential to the structure of the building.

Although entrenched in the Indian vernacular, Stone did not directly copy or imitate specific models for his decoration, structure, or plans, but rather he sympathetically synthesized details he had seen. In his article "The Meaning of Regionalism in Architecture," Belluschi described the "deep thrill" he and Shepley experienced when they toured India and observed how sensitively Stone had understood the essence of India by subtly incorporating into his design regional features that had evolved through the centuries by the demands of the climate and the culture of the people. Stone's serene proportions, axial plan, exquisite materials, and profusion of abstract patterns illustrate just some of the details he had observed in the many humble places and great monuments in India. Belluschi proudly declared, "It took an artist like Stone to express with a sure hand a renewed sense of the region."[231] *Architectural Forum* admired the embassy's "faithful abstraction of the old spirit," as did Jordy who agreed that Stone had successfully adapted native architecture to modernity, and Elie Abel (1920-2004), a foreign correspondent of the *New York Times*, proclaimed that the

---

[230] Anne-Marie Sankovitch, "Structure/Ornament and the Modern Figuration of Architecture," *Art Bulletin* 80 (December 1998): 686-717.

[231] Belluschi, "The Meaning of Regionalism in Architecture,"138.

embassy was "probably the most elegant in the world" due to its blend of ancient Mogul grandeur with contemporary American design.[232]

Nonetheless, there were those who did not appreciate Stone's ability to transcend Indian traditions in modern architecture. In 1966 John M. Jacobus said in *Twentieth-Century Architecture: The Middle Years, 1940-65* that while it was a praiseworthy aim to reflect the character of its host country, Stone's embassy was "possibly delusory, based as it was upon the curiously bureaucratic assumption that an architect can somehow, Aladdin-like, produce a design 'expressive' of a culture which, at best, he can only know secondhand." It is even worse, he said, to accept that Stone's "shallow formalism" grew out of the "special circumstances of a particular situation" because in actuality it reduced architecture "to the level of trivia."[233] Similarly, the distinguished Indian author Patwant Singh reportedly considered Stone's templelike imagery—an eclectic unapproachable monument provoking the sense of "visiting a shrine"—to be inappropriate.[234] He objected to its formalistic derivation from the Taj Mahal and its landscape, including the strict bilateral symmetry, white massing, patterns of filtered sunlight, and reflecting pool (fig. 96). Nor did he admire Stone's effort to synthesize the intricately patterned decoration of traditional Islamic design with such modern features as a flat cantilevered roof and a glass curtain-wall. Stone's effort to incorporate a place and culture foreign in modern design led to charges of cultural imperialism (recalling the earlier criticism of the Delhi work by the English architect Edwin Lutyens [1869-1944] even though his was different

---

[232] "U.S. Embassy for New Delhi," *Architectural Forum* 102 (June 1955): 115; Jordy, "The Formal Image," 160; and Elie Abel, "New U.S. Embassy Praised by Nehru," *New York Times*, January 4, 1959.

[233] John M. Jacobus, *Twentieth-Century Architecture*, 150-152.

[234] Evenson, *Indian Metropolis*, 229.

from Stone's in that Muslim details were grafted onto a thoroughly monumental Western image in order to reinforce colonial power).

Another modern conflict that Stone's chancery illuminated was the incompatible relationship between craftsmanship and machine production, exemplified by a statement made by Stern in *Modern Classicism*: "Stone, curiously, was proud of the least Modernist aspect of his work—its manual construction."[235] *Time* reported that during its four-year construction period, when some eighteen hundred workers lived on the embassy site doing most of the work by hand, "each finished piece transported by Indian artisans from makeshift workshops on the grounds."[236] Among the items fabricated were the pre-cast grille tiles fired in twelve-inch-square molds and then finished, polished, and assembled by hand. At first it might seem paradoxical that *Architectural Forum*, which promoted modernism, recognized so enthusiastically that the embassy was "put together as meticulously as a piece of elegant Indian filigree" with the "loving hand workmanship" of the profusely patterned and textured details typifying Indian craft. The publication even quoted Stone as saying, "This thing was literally built by hand. There were forges on the site to make the rough hardware. Except for the mechanical equipment, everything has a hand polish."[237] Likewise, Temko reported, "The brilliant finish of the building, its almost machined quality of precision, is actually the result of painstaking and exquisite handwork by Indian workers. 'This building,' the architect has said, 'was assembled like

---

[235] Stern with Gastil, *Modern Classicism*, 53.

[236] "India: American Taj" and Loeffler, *Architecture of Diplomacy*, 193.

[237] "A New Public Architecture," 84.

the Parthenon.'"[238] However, in contrast to traditional Indian craftsmanship—which honored the uniqueness of each piece and the pride of the creator—Stone's grille tiles looked as if they were mass produced so that the "brilliant finish" of the embassy appeared to have a machine-quality precision. For Stone, hand-craftsmanship was simply the most economical means to achieve the end; it carried no moral value, as it did for Ruskin and other nineteenth-century revivalists, nor did he use it as part of the aesthetic as Le Corbusier did. Stone was never sentimental about the process; he only cared about the building's classical beauty—that is to say, its formality and organization enhanced by its materiality and decoration.

At the time, practitioners and scholars alike were grappling with the developing interest in using neoclassical features within the modern format, as exemplified by two essays written by the architectural historian Colin Rowe (1920-1999) between 1956 and 1957. "On the face of it," Rowe wrote of the tendency, "this is so odd and so much a violation of what was thought to be the idea of modern architecture that it deserves a serious attention."[239] Correspondingly, Stone's compositions, which sometimes included grand scales, rigorous symmetries, axial definitions, centralized spaces, hierarchical organizations, and fanciful decorative details, have been viewed as the antithesis of modern expressions of dematerialization and transparency.

Stone's chancery was inevitably compared to the elegant structures of the master architect, Mies van der Rohe, even though the latter differed from Stone in that he united

---

[238] Temko, "Lifting the Federal Facade," 119.

[239] Colin Rowe, "Neo-'Classicism' and Modern Architecture I," in *The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa and Other Essays* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987), 122. Along with "Neo-'Classicism' and Modern Architecture II," which is also reprinted in *Mathematics*, it was first published in the inaugural issue of *Oppositions* in September 1973.

classicism with functionalism and emphasized their tectonic relationship. In 1958 Philip Johnson, author of what is still viewed as among the most respected books about Mies, described the "beautiful" New Delhi embassy in relation to Mies: "It is on a Miesian podium with a Miesian stair," but, is a more classical arrangement: "You come right through the center door into the long axis and the screens then are hung over two floors." Johnson then favorably concluded, "It is not a great hall, as you might think from looking at it from the outside, but a more graceful combination of screens in classicism could hardly be imagined."[240] In *American Architecture and Urbanism* (1969) Vincent Scully also saw a Miesian influence in Stone's work. However, he complained that rather than being designed from the inside out as early modernists had done, the embassy functions were "fitted" into a Miesian container, which was then superficially decorated with obvious rococo confections of grilles and gold columns—its simple, volumetric "package" manipulated for spectacular effect.[241] Von Eckardt echoed Scully when he proclaimed in 1978 that Stone "had trifled with the Miesian box merely by gift-wrapping it in grilles, flutes, and tinsel," as did the historian William Curtis when he stated in 1984 that Stone's application of such classical devices as grand porticos, processional axes, symmetrical organizations, and ceremonial platforms was "superficial."[242] In his *History*

---

[240] Philip Johnson, *Mies Van Der Rohe* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1947) and Johnson, "Retreat From the International Style to the Present Scene," in *Writings*, 97 The Stone staircase and podium recall two Illinois projects by Mies: Crown Hall at the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago and the Farnsworth House (1946-1950) in Plano. Not long after it was reported in "More Than Modern" that Johnson said: "The New Delhi embassy? How could I help but love it? It's a jewel! But architecture is more than putting up drapes in front of a house to hide it."

[241] Scully, *American Architecture and Urbanism*, 191.

[242] Wolf Von Eckardt, "Las Vegas Is Not Almost All Right," *Back to the Drawing Board!: Planning Livable Cities* (Washington, D.C.: New Republic Books, 1978), 87 and William J. R. Curtis, "Modern Architecture, Monumentality and the Meaning of Institutions: Reflections on Authenticity," *Harvard Architecture Review* 4 (Spring 1984), 67.

of Architecture (1985), Spiro Kostof more specifically compared the embassy to Mies's Crown Hall (1952-1956) at the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago since both are single-span volumes enclosed by plate-glass skins and raised on platforms with grand flights of stairs at the entrance. However, in the opinion of Kostof, the embassy "vitiated" the Crown Hall paradigm with its grillework and "anemic uprights." Compared to Mies, who subtracted and distilled until he reached an architecture that was "almost nothing," which he then perfected and polished, such imitators (as Stone) "strained for variety," he said.[243] Some, such as the historian Alan Colquhoun, did not connect Stone's embassy to Miesian reductivism but rather to the symmetrical plans of Palladianism and the private cloistered atria of Pompeian houses.[244] In "The Formal Image" Jordy too effectively positioned the embassy within a classicizing trend, which he called *new formalism* because of its technological innovations, revived interest in ornament, and reawakened sense of history.[245] Jordy admired the classical massing of the historicized temple block form, emphasized by the base and roofline. As the first modern American government building of consequence, it was, according to Jordy, a clear-cut reaction to the mass-produced, transparent curtain-wall. The grille, he said, provides a means for individuality against the austere Miesian aesthetic, but, he argued, it "masked" the skeleton construction so that the weighted grillework made the metal and glass aesthetic seem even more abstract than it already was. Even though he agreed that the embassy

---

[243] Kostof, *History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals*, 729.

[244] Alan Colquhoun, *Modern Architecture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 247.

[245] Jordy, "The Formal Image: USA," 160.

convincingly synthesized the classical and the modern, as the final stage of modern classicism he concluded that it implied mannerism.

While Stone's classicizing manner was deemed superficial by some because it did not express the structural attributes of the building as Mies had done with his, critics did not acknowledge that for the New Delhi embassy and the Brussels pavilion Stone had carefully avoided a classical architecture that could be considered "evidence of architectural stagnation or, worse, a retreat into the nostalgic formalisms of historicists, even fascist, architectural ideology," which others were producing, according to John Harwood and Janet Parks in their monograph on the New York City architect Max Abramovitz (1908-2004).[246] At the time, there was the perceived risk that a neoclassical aesthetic could be likened to the totalitarian regimes of the Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini—a stripped down, monumental classicism with rhetorical means to sway the masses. Peter Blake, who had become editor-in-chief of *Architectural Forum* in 1964, later explained in *No Place Like Utopia*, "We thought those who insisted on pursuing such pomposities were not worth anybody's attention" because such monuments "belonged to the times of Albert Speer and Stalin's pet architects."[247] Although some of Stone's later buildings, such as the Kennedy Center (fig. 10) and his Perpetual Savings and Loan Association (fig. 179), were criticized for their bold, classical presentations of overwhelming scale or regimented formal repetitions, extolling the order, discipline, and strength of dictatorial governments, the temporal fantasy of the Brussels pavilion and

---

[246] John Harwood and Janet Parks, *The Troubled Search: The Work of Max Abramovitz* (New York: Miriam and Ira D. Wallach Art Gallery, Columbia University, 2004), 117.

[247] Blake, *No Place Like Utopia*, 167.

feminine delicacy of the New Delhi embassy made them exempt from such criticism in spite of their classical format.[248]

Nonetheless, these buildings by Stone did provoke the larger issue of monumentality, which doctrinaire modernists also reviled because of the association with former cultural traditions and its inability to address the postwar issues of housing and urbanization. The accepted view of 1938, as Mumford had announced, was that "if it is modern it cannot be a monument" and vice versa.[249] Hudnut similarly stated in 1939, "I am inclined to think that a genuine monumentality is definitely prohibited by our contemporary technique of construction and also by contemporary use."[250] He then described the conflict:

> Monumental building or buildings which are obviously heavy—buildings which are built or which appear to be built of massive stone walls and heavy columns—are to be apprehended as more majestic, enduring and reposeful than buildings devoid of these qualities. Heavy buildings are taken more seriously as architecture than buildings which are made of light, thin walls hung on metallic frames.[251]

However, the Swiss historian Sigfried Giedion (1883-1968) subsequently led a great debate about how to achieve the emotional charge and expressiveness of great architecture of the past while remaining loyal to the tenets of modernism. In his "Nine Points on Monumentality" (1943), Giedion (with José Luis Sert and Fernand Léger)

---

[248] Curtis, *Modern Architecture*, 351 and 354. See Grover, "Heeded Words: Ada Louise Huxtable Has Formidable Power As Architecture Critic," *Wall Street Journal*, November 7, 1972 and Charles Jencks, *Modern Movements in Architecture* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1973), 185.

[249] Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of the Cities*, in *Architecture Culture*, by Ockman, 27.

[250] Joseph Hudnut, quoted in McDonald, "Smithsonian Institution," in *Modernism in America*, 194

[251] Ibid.

declared monumentality as "the expression of man's highest cultural needs,"[252] and then in his influential essay "The Need for a New Monumentality" (1944) he proclaimed: "People want buildings representing their social, ceremonial and community life. They want their buildings to be more than a functional fulfillment. They seek the expression of their aspirations for monumentality, for joy and excitement." Monumentality, he concluded, derives from an eternal need to own symbols that reveal people's lives, actions, and conceptions. [253] But still, as observed in *Architectural Review* in September 1948, there was vast uncertainty about how best to achieve it within a modernist aesthetic.[254]

Even though in March 1958 *Time* boldly proclaimed that Stone had managed in a single building "to reintroduce into modern architecture the quality of monumentality," the persistent ambiguity about monumentality due to its perceived incompatibility with modernism existed.[255] Sargeant explained in the *New Yorker* profile on Stone that "while the word 'monumentality' has fallen out of fashion to the point of becoming taboo, it has been replaced by the phrase 'government character.'"[256] Thus, although critics observed the monumental effect of the embassy, they often avoided the word itself. Recognizing that Stone had created "A New Public Architecture," *Architectural Forum*, for example,

---

[252] José Luis Sert, Fernand Léger, and Sigfried Giedion, "Nine Points on Monumentality," in *Architecture Culture*, by Ockman, 27.

[253] Sigfried Giedion, "The Need for a New Monumentality," in Ann Eden Gibson, *Abstract Expressionism: Other Politics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 54. Also see Louis Kahn, "Monumentality," *Architecture Culture*, by Ockman, 48-54.

[254] McLeod, "Undressing Architecture," 26.

[255] "More Than Modern."

[256] Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches."

explained that Stone had substituted grace for grandiose traditions of muscular, monumental, and heavy authoritarian stereotypes. This new government style, it went on to say, represented "democratic vitality and romance, its pleasures as well as its power, its strength, all without ponderous weight."[257] Temko too believed that the embassy, "the most admired" of all that were built under the State Department's new program," showed what can be done when "inventiveness is substituted for the traditionally heavy hand of official architecture."[258] Huxtable was also forced to process her thinking about the embassy as a monumental piece of architecture. In April 1959 she asked in her article "Buildings Are Symbols Too," if such buildings as Stone's chancery—with beauty and dignity bespeaking its function—could become accepted symbols since they communicated the spirit of the age or its people.[259] She proceeded to answer her question affirmatively, explaining that the embassy had successfully merged traditional and modern values by articulating "dignity, scale, and monumentality" while at the same time provoking an emotional response—its form befitting its function and its great force establishing meaning. However, she cautioned that its passage to greatness as a symbol of its epoch could only be determined over time, a notion that corresponds to the first of Giedion's "Nine Points of Monumentality:"

> Monuments are human landmarks which men have created as symbols for their ideals, for their aims, and for their actions. They are intended to outlive the period

---

[257] "A New Public Architecture," 84.

[258] Temko, "Lifting the Federal Façade," 20. Stone's monumental presentation was not sanctioned by everyone, however: On page 242 of *A Critical History of Modern Architecture,* Frampton said the embassy typified the "vulgar rhetoric" of American official architecture—an "imperialistic monument" whose level of decorative as well as labored monumentality was rarely surpassed in respect of its authoritarian overtones.

[259] Ada Louise Huxtable, "Buildings That Are Symbols, Too," *New York Times*, April 5, 1959.

> which originated them, and constitute a heritage for future generations. As such, they form a link between the past and the future.[260]

In another article written the same year, "Ten Buildings That Say Today," Huxtable reiterated her claim that Stone's embassy was a visible manifestation of the *Zeitgeist*, an important modernist criteria. Moreover, she declared it a testimony to the continuing vitality of contemporary design, its decorative enrichment stressing "luxury and genteel ostentation new to modern architecture."[261] Finally, in 1960, as she defended the foreign embassy program against antagonistic attacks in Congress in an article entitled "Sharp Debate: What Should an Embassy Be?," Huxtable concluded that Stone's embassy had indeed become a symbol of the United States due to its international recognition as a "uniquely beautiful modern building" that reflected its official role. It was, she maintained, a prime example of the new kind of American architecture in which Stone's use of frank ornamentation had transformed earlier modern work.[262]

Although the criticism of Stone's New Delhi embassy documents that monumentality no longer had to be articulated in a specific aesthetic format, in 1984 Curtis asserted that the building could not be considered monumental because it reflected an "exploration of a chic historicism," instead of "lasting presence," articulated through an "intensity of expression, elemental formal power, dignity, and gravity."[263] He extended his postmodern reading of the building in 2000 when he wrote in *Modern*

---

[260] Quoted in Gibson, *Abstract Expressionism*, 62.

[261] Ada Louise Huxtable, "Ten Buildings That Say Today," *New York Times*, May 24, 1959.

[262] Ada Louise Huxtable, "Sharp Debate: What Should an Embassy Be?" *New York Times*, September 18, 1960.

[263] Curtis, "Modern Architecture, Monumentality and the Meaning of Institutions," 65 and 74-75.

Architecture Since 1900 that Stone's embassy disguised "an essentially bogus and skin-deep understanding of the nature of monumentality by using an abundance of classical allusions instead of its principles."[264] Although Stone's embassy had confronted and in fact was admired for its ability to shift the definition of monumentality in architecture, the emphasis on historical memory in postmodernism made it difficult for Curtis to consider the building using more expansive definitions of modernism extending beyond formalism.

Even though Stone was recognized in his own time for successfully challenging accepted doctrines of modernism, the traditional concept of style, generally defined as a characteristic manner of expression, guided his way of thinking about architecture, as exemplified by his 1959 proclamation: "In the last ten years I feel that I have found my own personal style."[265] Somewhat later he added, "just as a painter has his own style, so it is with an architect."[266] He was criticized by Banham, who said: "It cannot be too emphatically said the style that Stone set out to replace or abolish with such designs as his elegant embassy was only a style, it was not modern architecture, whatever he himself may have thought."[267] His statement reflects the declaration of Le Corbusier, "Let us talk no more of style, whether modern or traditional.[268] The resistance of Banham, stemming from his understanding of modernism as an approach rather than as a style, was

---

[264] Curtis, *Modern Architecture Since 1900*, 517.

[265] Hall, "Directions in Modern Architecture."

[266] Stone, "Hero Prophet Adventurer."

[267] Banham, *Guide to Modern Architecture*, 18-19.

[268] Le Corbusier, "La Ville Radieuse" (speech, Woman's Radio Review, WEAF-NBC, October 24, 1935).

undoubtedly intensified by historicist connotations left over from nineteenth-century eclecticism, in which a style of choice could be attached to a structure to define its purpose or typology. As Barr explained, progressive modernists distrusted style because it smacked of Beaux-arts academic superficiality and threatened individual freedom.[269]

In addition to privileging the traditional attitude towards style, which certainly was not uncommon in consumer America (i.e. "modern" was just one of a number of styles available), Stone promoted his aesthetic (somewhat ironically) as a lasting, permanent architectural solution and not as an ephemeral commodity subject to change: "We should not be carried away by the latest avant-garde enthusiasm; we should not try to be 'in style.' Architecture is not like millinery. Fashions pass but buildings remain to become grim reminders of transient enthusiasms," he told his clients.[270]

In contrast, many of Stone's peers began to recognize that as a result of the growth in American consumerism, architecture was just as subject to rapid cycles of changes in taste as any other commodity and represented life in progress.[271] James Trilling explained in his 2003 book on ornament that style is the sphere in which the creator and the consumer converge; the moment at which personal taste and social convention interact.[272] But Stone did not understand, as the sociologist Stuart Ewen explained in *All Consuming Images*, that "a sense of rootedness or permanency is elusive

---

[269] Alfred Barr, In "What Is Happening to Modern Architecture? A Symposium at the Museum of Modern Art." *Museum of Modern Art Bulletin* 15 (Spring 1948), 6.

[270] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 157. His statement was not original; Henry Ford had said: "We are no longer in the automobile, but in the millinery business" (quoted on page 158 of Marchand, *Advertising the American Dream*).

[271] McLeod, "Undressing Architecture," 40.

[272] James Trilling, *Ornament: A Modern Perspective* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), 203.

in the world of style, and it is perhaps this quality, more than any other, that locates style in the modern world."[273]

Satisfied with the acclaim that his aesthetic had brought him, Stone thought that the public "yearning" for richness, warmth, and delicacy in reaction to the more austere International Style would continue. But, of course, it did not, since his aesthetic was, in fact, a product of a specific moment in time.[274] Stone's fundamental error in thinking that his classically inspired aesthetic could be timeless is apparent in his later work. Roosevelt House, for example, a variation of the chancery, lacked the original creative enthusiasm. Using the same formalistic vocabulary but for a different purpose and time, the embassy aesthetic could not sufficiently respond to the house requirements. The reviews reported its shortcomings, as exemplified by the title of one article in the *San Francisco Chronicle* entitled "Our Fancy Embassy in India: A White Elephant Is Put to Work." Explaining that the austerely elegant, $700,000 dream house was "the most talked about, remodeled, refurbished and hectically busy building in New Delhi," the building was "essentially unlivable," partially because it was "begrilled" inside and out. Accordingly, Ambassador Galbraith, its first occupant, also described the house as "a non-functional show-piece" that was unaccommodating as a home, while his wife, Kitty, more specifically reported that the open grillework in the interior made it "a house for open diplomacy, openly arrived at."[275] Sound was so audible through the grilles, she complained, that "you can't have a quiet chat anywhere in the house without being heard everywhere," and house

---

[273] Ewen, *All Consuming Images*, 23.

[274] Hall, "Directions in Modern Architecture."

[275] John Kenneth Galbraith to Anne D. Nissen, December 7, 1981, Loeffler Collection and "Open Diplomacy," Design, *Time*, April 12, 1963.

guests could overhear even a whisper. In addition to maintenance issues (dust inside and sparrows outside), the grillework in the upstairs living and guest quarters also provided limited visual privacy, moving one guest to comment, "People who live in Stone houses should undress in the dark."[276]

Whereas the Galbraiths "joked away the discomforts and enjoyed the elegance," when Ambassador Bowles and his wife returned to India for a second tenure in 1963, they flat out refused to live in the house even though the interior grilles had been modified with plaster walls behind them, and during their tenure the house only served as a center for receptions, meetings, and press conferences.[277] Thomas Creighton, then editor of *Architectural Record*, fully comprehended the discrepancy between Stone's earlier and later applications of the grille: When Stone applied the grille with sensitivity and restraint and lovingly developed it in conjunction with such structural elements as the columns of the embassy, he was able to prove that related decoration could be a sympathetic addition to modern architecture and could lift it to new heights of emotional and sensual pleasure. But in his later attempts "to throw screen walls around *everything*, and then to approach neo-eclecticism" he renounced his original intention.[278] Haskell's early apprehension that he made known in *Architectural Forum*—that if Stone's "stock" grille tiles became popular they could "cloy even faster than functional nakedness can bore"—also began to take hold.[279]

---

[276] Thomas F. Brady, "U.S. Embassy in New Delhi Offers a Challenge," *New York Times*, March 20, 1963.

[277] Critchfield, "Our Fancy Embassy in India."

[278] Thomas H. Creighton, "The New Sensualism," *Progressive Architecture* 40 (September 1959): 145.

[279] Douglass Haskell, "Ornament Rides Again," editorial, *Architectural Forum* 108 (April 1958): 85.

As Huxtable reminisced in 2004, after the "outstanding success" of the chancery building—"an enchanted place of fountains, arcades, and screens,"—Stone was "besieged with commissions, and he obliged—with screens." Clients could not get enough of them, she recalled, "and they convincingly covered everything he built." Yet, she remembered, although this "signature gimmick" was "a crowd pleaser" and was "very popular," it "never rose much above mediocrity."[280] Thus, the Stone aesthetic (which included the grille), thoughtfully constructed under the guidance of architectural advisors and according to a specific *parti* for the New Delhi embassy was at first recognized by critics as a provocative and intriguing alternative to modernism. However, as Stone began to repeat or refashion it as an established, permanent style for other projects, it not only lost the polemical edge that had generated notoriety and excitement, but also its original creative inspiration expressive of time and place.

Even so, as his aesthetic was increasingly disseminated to the public, Stone was becoming recognized as a popular architect who was giving decoration back to the American majority. In contrast to the International Style, his modern aesthetic responded to the public demand for more elaborate notions of culture and design.

---

[280] Huxtable, "The Lollypop Building."

Chapter Four: Architecture for the Average Man

The Gallery of Modern Art, designed for George Huntington Hartford II at Two Columbus Circle in New York City between 1956 and 1964 (fig. 117), the most debated work by Edward Durell Stone, who embarked on the project at the crest of his career, just after the debut of his pavilion at the Brussels Exposition. While Hartford was reportedly indecisive on many fronts, it is apparent that he was clear in his objective to create a museum that conveyed democratic values and challenged modernism, especially as it was embodied in the Museum of Modern Art, ironically also by Stone, which was the antithesis of Hartford's museum in mission, content, and design (fig. 2). Stone perfectly grasped Hartford's anti-modernist agenda, which perhaps is the most important way in which the building is postmodern. But for the architect, anti-modernism was only a mutation within the ideology of modernism, not a complete break as some critics have wanted to believe. Even though the significance of this museum as the next step in Stone's stylistic development after the New Delhi embassy has been well established, what has been critically overlooked is that the building successfully linked modernism with the middle class through the modern phenomenon of kitsch, or camp, which was made possible by Hartford since the museum was created as a mirror image of himself and his ideas.

While Stone was experienced at closely collaborating with clients, few were as thoroughly vested in their projects as Hartford, a self-proclaimed "financier," "art patron," and "eccentric millionaire" whom Stone considered "a modern-day Medici."[1] "I

[1] "And the Livin' Is Easy," *Saturday Review*, July 11, 1959; Huntington Hartford to Winslow Ames, c. 1960, Winslow Ames Papers, Archives of American Art/ Smithsonian (hereafter cited as Ames Papers); and Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 150.

did have a lot to do with…the whole thing…the layout, the design and everything," Hartford recounted about his museum—officially named the Gallery of Modern Art Including the Huntington Hartford Collection.[2] As heir to the giant American chain of retail food stores, the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company (A & P; founded 1859), reportedly the fifth largest corporation in America at the time, Hartford possessed a fortune valued at nearly 500 million in today's dollars and thus was favorably positioned to "put a great building into existence," as John Knox Shear, the editor-in-chief of *Architectural Record* well understood.[3] Encouraging Hartford to avoid the "bland" or "already old," Shear advised him: "This must be a stimulating building. It must have the power to inspire men's imagination. They must feel that they have never seen anything quite like it before."[4]

In both concept and design the Gallery of Modern Art was very much the product of Hartford's vision, and its fate was closely linked to his "inflammatory purpose of challenging the canonical view of modernism" as well as his steadfast "intent upon reversing every modernist trend," as the critics Herbert Muschamp and Hilton Kramer

---

[2] Huntington Hartford, interview by Paul Cummings, May 19, 1970, Smithsonian Archives of America Art (www.aaa.si.edu/collections/ oralhistories/transcripts/hartfo70.htm). The Museum of Modern Art unsuccessfully fought an injunction to stop Hartford from using the words *Modern Art* in the title of his museum, but in the settlement he did agree to include his own name in the official title. See "'Ideal' Man Departs," *Newsweek*, May 29, 1961 and Lisa Rebecca Gubernick, *Squandered Fortune: The Life and Times of Huntington Hartford* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1991), 136.

[3] "George Hartford of A. & P. Dies at 92," *New York Times*, September 25, 1957; Tom Wolfe, "The Luther of Columbus Circle," in *The Kandy-Kolored Tangerine-Flake Streamline Baby* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1965), 233; and Suzanna Andrews, "Hostage to Fortune," *Vanity Fair*, December 2004.

[4] John Knox Shear to Huntington Hartford, August 1, 1956, New York Cultural Center Collection, Fairleigh Dickinson University Library, Florham-Madison Campus, Madison, New Jersey (hereafter cited as NYCC Collection).

stated respectively.[5] Before Hartford had even conceived of his museum, he had become known in the contemporary art world as an exceedingly controversial figure, exemplified by a caption under his photograph in *Time* in 1955 that read "POLEMICIST HARTFORD/A three-lane highway to mediocrity."[6] In his own words, Hartford had become "uptight" over what was being promoted as "good art," and he argued against modernism for its dangerous moral corruption, especially abstract expressionism, an art movement well represented in the work of Jackson Pollock (1912-1956).[7] Hartford blamed the avant-garde—"exclusive cliques" of artists, wealthy patrons, museum directors, dealers, and critics—for sanctioning and then commercializing an aesthetic that he thought privileged sensationalism over "the love of subject matter;" disorganization and violence over permanent ethics and values; and "private thrill of release" over communication with the public.[8] Believing that art is the highest form of teaching as well as the greatest contribution man can make to society, he declared it was high time for the average intelligent American to hold up his head with the best of the critics and stop apologizing for his amateur standing.[9] "If anything is to be done to halt the downward trend of

---

[5] Herbert Muschamp, "The Short, Scorned Life Of an Esthetic Heresy," *New York Times*, July 31, 1996 and Hilton Kramer, "...While the Cultural Center Closes Its Doors," *New York Times*, September 15, 1975.

[6] "Battlefronts," *Time*, Art, June 20, 1955.

[7] Hartford, interview by Cummings; Huntington Hartford to Nelson A. Rockefeller, January 9, 1952, NAR Personal Projects, box 133, folder 1301; and Serge Guilbaut, *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 176.

[8] Huntington Hartford, "The Public Be Damned? in *Art Or Anarchy? How the Extremists and Exploiters Have Reduced the Fine Arts to Chaos and Commercialism* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1964), 10, 34, and 37.

[9] Sally Mclean, "The Gallery of Modern Art," press release, 1964, NYCC Collection.

esthetic standards in America today, it must be done by the public," he declared.[10] Thus, contrary to what some have assumed—that Hartford devoted himself to the arts in order to remove the "commercial taint" from the A& P—he acted as an "egalitarian" by accepting the role of "peripatetic patron" (or, as Kramer called him, "philistine militant") as he sided with the middle-class consumer, who, perhaps not incoincidently, had patronized his family's business for four generations.[11]

Hartford's hostility towards the cultural Establishment had first surfaced in 1952 with an angry seven-thousand-word tract entitled "Has God Been Insulted Here?" which deplored the debauchery of contemporary artists, composers, and writers, whom he considered part of a destructive minority intent on revolution and anarchy.[12] He sent his essay to some four thousand "opinion makers," such as Nelson Rockefeller, with a letter describing his "attempt to improve the condition of art."[13] In 1955 he intensified his crusade in "a spontaneous outburst" more specifically aimed at the visual arts, particularly painting, in an essay called "The Public Be Damned." After it was published in the *American Mercury* in March, Hartford produced another version for a full-page

---

[10] Hartford, "The Public Be Damned? in *Art Or Anarchy?* 19. Hartford continued this argument on pages 79-80 of "The Pushovers," in *Art Or Anarchy*, which was an expanded version of his "Has God Been Insulted Here?" (Chicago: Reilly & Lee, 1952). Hartford's call for action is reminiscent of Clement Greenberg's earlier call to the avant-garde against the increasing aggressiveness and expansion of the middlebrow culture. See Clement Greenberg, "State of American Writing," *Partisan Review* 15 (August 1948): 879.

[11] Brian O'Doherty, "Hartford Gallery: Old Wine, A New Bottle," *New York Times*, January 12, 1964; Hilton Kramer, "The Hartford Retreat," *New York Review of Books* 4 (February 11, 1965): 16; Thomas B. Morgan, "George Huntington Hartford, II: Peripatetic Patron," *Esquire*, March 1961; and Hartford, *Art Or Anarchy?* 80.

[12] Hartford, *Has God Been Insulted Here?* 25-26.

[13] Hartford to Rockefeller, January 9, 1952.

advertisement that ran in six New York newspapers.[14] As reported by *Time*, this "call for greater public participation in art matters" drew "a hearty cheer" by thousands.[15] A version of the essay was later included as a chapter in Hartford's book *Art Or Anarchy? How the Extremists and Exploiters Have Reduced the Fine Arts to Chaos and Commercialism*, which he had hoped would be published within a month of the opening of the museum in March 1964 but was not released until later that year.[16] Hartford's fervent words, presented in what some considered a "pseudo-Biblical" or "deplorably evangelistic" style, were poignant and memorable: he spoke of "the diseases which infect the world of painting today—obscurity, confusion, immorality, and violence" and singled out the artist Pablo Picasso (1881-1973) for wiping out almost all the gains that had been made in painting during the past five hundred years.[17] Such posturing led Tom Wolfe to conclude (and Hartford to agree) that he was like the German preacher Martin Luther, "decrying the evil and corruption of the established religion" of modern culture.[18] The

---

[14] Hartford, interview by Cummings; Hartford, "The Public Be Damned," *American* Mercury 80 (March 1955): 35-42; and Aline B. Saarinen, "Museums Go to Law for Right To A Name," *New York Times,* February 1, 1959. See Hartford's "Public Be Damned?" advertisement in the *New York Times*, May 16, 1955. Hartford also sent a reprint to a select constituency, including Rockefeller (NAR Personal Projects, box 133, folder 1301).

[15] "Battlefronts."

[16] "Notes on the Gallery of Modern Art," n.d., NYCC Collection. According to the articles "'Ideal' Man Departs," and "Hartford Modern," the book at first was going to be published by Random House as *Art Without Culture* and then by Bobbs-Merrill as *Armageddon of Art*. In "Hostage to Fortune," Andrews reported that Hartford still "spends hours each day editing out 'the negative parts,'...hoping to have it republished—but he does not regret his passion."

[17] Priscilla Young, "Art for All: Two Defenses of Traditional Art," *Roanoke (VA) Times*, November 22, 1964; Helen Borsick, "Art for Whose Sake? Critics Do Battle," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, November 29, 1964; Hartford, "The Public Be Damned? in *Art Or Anarchy?* 17 and 21-22; and Sanka Knox, "Art Museum at Columbus Circle Planned by Huntington Hartford," *New York Times*, June 11, 1956.

[18] Wolfe, "Luther of Columbus Circle," 236 and 242. Agreeing with Wolfe that his crusade for culture was for him a religion, Hartford claimed that this article had a "profound effect" on him in "The Unreal Estate," ?, October 17, 1966, NYCC Collection.

corresponding reformation that Hartford aspired to lead on behalf of the public directly confronted the elitist position—that only the avant-garde could save art from mass mediocrity—put forth by Clement Greenberg, considered by some "the single most influential" modern critic, and Dwight Macdonald, former editor of the quarterly political and literary journal *Partisan Review*.[19] As Hartford boldly took on the "high priests of criticism, the teachers of mumbo jumbo," as he called them, he pleaded with the public not to "be afraid to disagree—loudly, if necessary" with critics, such as Thomas B. Hess, the executive editor of *ARTnews*, who were "strongly associated" with the first generation of abstract expressionists.[20] Aline Saarinen (1914-1972), then an art correspondent at NBC who later strongly criticized Hartford's museum,[21] was among those who jeered at his "one-man crusade," writing in 1959:

> No matter how many full-page advertisements or privately printed pamphlets Mr. Hartford produces, the fact will still remain that the professionally trained and experienced editors, museum men and critics have been—and will undoubtedly continue to be—allied with the fresh, personal, imaginative, forward-looking creative expressions which the public has come to accept as "modern art."[22]

---

[19] Robert Storr, "No Joy In Mudville: Greenberg's Modernism Then and Now," in *Modern Art and Popular Culture: Readings in High & Low*, ed. Kirk Varnedoe and Adam Gopnik, 161 (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1990). Also see Serge Guilbaut, "New York, 1935: The De-Marxization of the Intelligentsia," in *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art*, 17-48 and Dwight Macdonald, "Masscult & Midcult," in *Against the American Grain* (New York, Random House, 1962), 3-75.

[20] Hartford, "The Public Be Damned?" in *Art Or Anarchy?* 6 and 21-22 and John Russell, "Thomas Hess, Art Expert, Dies; Writer and Met Official Was 57," *New York Times*, July 14, 1978. On pages 4 and 5 of "The Public Be Damned?" Hartford also referred to the article "DeKooning Paints a Picture" by Thomas Hess, which was in *ARTnews* 53 (March 1953): 63-66 and on page 14 he referred to "Cultural Diplomacy: An Art We Neglect," *New York Times*, January 3, 1954, in which Aline B. Louchheim (later Saarinen) condoned the U. S. government for refusing to officially partake in the international exposition in São Paulo, Brazil.

[21] According to "Programming: Intelluptuously Speaking," Television, *Time*, November 3, 1967, "while assistant curators winced in the background" in 1964 Saarinen "tore apart" Stone's Gallery of Modern Art "stone by stone."

[22] Saarinen, "Museums Go to Law for Right To A Name." See also Huntington Hartford, interview by Aline Saarinen, *Today Show*, November 25, 1964, a transcript of which is in the Aline B. Saarinen Papers, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian.

Hartford's valiant campaign against modernism and its advocates was motivated in part by his belief that modern art was a form of Communist and revolutionary propaganda. He had been impressed with such "excellent" essays as "Art for Whose Sake?" (1955) in which Esther Julia Pels alleged that the introduction of modern art in America was a "sickening story of decadence, perversion, and revolutionary purpose."[23] In 1962 he stated, "If we believe in democracy, I believe we must fight for it in the same tough and aggressive manner in which the Soviets fight for Communism."[24] The museum presented him with an opportunity to make a Cold War statement in compliance with his belief that "feelings *against* something, hatred for the evil aspects of society can never be a positive force unless it includes within itself the concept of goodness and beauty."[25] He was interested in articulating in three-dimensional form his desire to tell a story about himself, to make a propagandistic statement, and to demonstrate his ability to influence taste. At the time, there were few architects better suited to this purpose than Stone, who had already proved in his foreign projects for the United States government that he was exceedingly adept at conveying democratic messages while countering totalitarian

---

[23] Esther Julia Pels, "Art For Whose Sake?" *American Legion Magazine* (October 1955) and Huntington Hartford, "Ivory Towers—1964," in *Art Or Anarchy?* 36.

[24] Huntington Hartford Biography (1962), NYCC Collection. A letter written to Hartford on December 27, 1962 by Julius Samuel Held (1905-2003), a prominent art historian at Barnard College in New York City, documents that Hartford frequently raised the issue of Communism in conversation. Held appreciated the depth of Hartford's feelings but advised, "I believe there are better ways of combating communism than by exhibiting paintings by Doré, Burne-Jones, or Reginald Marsh. Let us admit that there are people who loath communism as much as you, and still see merit in paintings by Picasso and Jackson Pollock" (Julius Held Papers, Special Collections and Visual Resources, Getty Research Institute Research Library). Hartford consulted with Held about the museum even though he was a renowned scholar of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish art. Perhaps Stone introduced Hartford to Held since he had been an art advisor beginning in 1954 for the Museo de Arte de Ponce in Puerto Rico, which Stone designed between 1961 and early 1965.

[25] Hartford, "Pushovers," 63.

perspectives. Although his architecture as it was assimilated in the political struggle has not received the same attention as abstract expressionism in the writings of Serge Guilbaut, for example, it nonetheless played a critical role in establishing American cultural supremacy.[26]

But Hartford's intention of creating a meaningful form—one that would be a radical departure from established modernist precedents as well as expressive of, as he explained, "a different aesthetic point of view from the vulgar commercialism on the one hand and the 'ivory tower' intellectualism on the other"—was not achieved as originally envisioned.[27] For the building came to symbolize the ambiguity of the time—of the cultural Cold War and of shifting art patronage to middle-class consumption (called "masscult" by Macdonald, "vanguard audience" by Hess, and "middle-brow" by Russell Lynes).[28] More significantly, as an emblem of individual artistic freedom, the idiosyncratic building boldly challenged the established glass and steel aesthetic and in so doing illuminated the growing tension between those steadfast to the original monistic intention of modernism and those willing to consider more openly a pluralistic reconciliation.[29]

---

[26] See Serge Guilbaut, "The New Adventures of the Avant-Garde in America," in Frascina, ed., *Pollock and After*, 153-166. Also see Guibaut, *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art.*

[27] In *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, rev. ed. (1993) "ivory tower" is defined as "a state of seclusion from the ordinary world and protection from the harsh realities of life."

[28] Ellen Perry, "Stone's New Gallery of Art Opens," *Progressive Architecture* 45 (April 1964): 71; Macdonald, "Masscult & Midcult," in *Against the Grain*, 3-75; Thomas B. Hess, "A Tale of Two Cities," *Location* 2 (Summer 1964), 37-42; and "High-Brow, Low-Brow, Middle-Brow," *Life*, April 11, 1949.

[29] Justin Davidson, "Preserving the Past or Building the Future; 2 Columbus Circle and a Battle Over Keeping Its Architecture Intact," *New York Newsday*, December 10, 2003.

Hartford's concept for the "anti-modern museum," as Katharine Kuh (1904-1994), art editor of the *Saturday Review* described it, did not evolve slowly over time but rather stemmed from one particular event.[30] He had wanted to mount an exhibition for which experts would select the artworks and the public would be given an opportunity to vote on them—the preference for representative over abstract art, Hartford was certain, would become readily apparent.[31] "Incensed" at being turned down by institutions such as the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (then part of the Natural History Museum) and suspecting that museums were controlled by a small group of elitists with shared opinions, Hartford set out to break the "monopoly." He decided to build his own museum, initially conceived as a building "Spanish in feeling" to be erected in Los Angeles, but when that did not work out (for reasons not totally clear) he turned to New York City—the center of high culture in the postwar period as well as the very place where the art movement he intended to dismiss was centered. He considered a townhouse owned by Doris Duke on Fifth Avenue (the Beaux-arts building at Seventy-eighth Street designed in 1912 by Horace Trumbauer, which today houses New York University's Institute of Fine Arts) but then "hit upon" the "better" Columbus Circle location.[32]

By putting his museum in New York City, Hartford hoped to "have a good influence" by challenging the Museum of Modern Art, which he said was too avant-garde, fostering "the extremists, the negativists, and those who communicate nothing to

---

[30] Kuh, "New York's Modern Merry-Go-Round," The Fine Arts, *Saturday Review*, March 21, 1964.

[31] Wolfe, "Luther of Columbus Circle," 242.

[32] "Notes on the Gallery of Modern Art."

the beholder but only to themselves and to one another."[33] He later recounted, "I decided if only I could put up *something* in a small way, that would compete with the Modern Museum it would be a very healthy thing."[34]

In June 1956 the New York City newspapers announced that although not yet in blueprint stage, Hartford planned "a marble showplace of the visual arts" that would "contribute to a better understanding by the public of the nature of modern art."[35] The new museum was to be located on an extremely small, oddly-shaped but centrally-located site on Columbus Circle (on which stood a five-story building with offices, a shoe store, and a large advertising sign for Chevrolet automobiles; figs 118-120), which Hartford had purchased for about a million dollars. Hartford had done his homework and knew he could erect on the site a freestanding vertical building 150 feet high (the equivalent of one-and-a-half times the width of the street) with about ten floors.[36] In addition to galleries, he intended to include a restaurant on top and a theater, all housed in a simple white (or off-white) marble building that would complement the nearby Coliseum (1954-1956; demolished 2000) then under construction.[37] Equally significant, he did not want the building to express any "extreme trends."[38]

---

[33] Hanford Yang, "Gallery of Modern Art—A Museum" (master's thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1957), 6; Kuh, "New York's Modern Merry-Go-Round;" "'Ideal' Man Departs;" and Hartford, "Ivory Towers," 38.

[34] Sally Hammond, "Huntington Hartford And His Museum," *New York Post*, March 15, 1964.

[35] Knox, "Art Museum at Columbus Circle Planned by Huntington Hartford" and "Here is the Gallery of Modern Art," *New York Village Voice*, June 13, 1956.

[36] Adrian H. Phillips to Huntington Hartford, August 16, 1957, NYCC Collection.

[37] The Coliseum was built by Leon and Lionel Levy in consultation with John B. Peterkin, Aymar Embury II, and Eggers & Higgins.

[38] Knox, "Art Museum at Columbus Circle Planned by Huntington Hartford."

Although the unusually awkward site was bound to be limiting in plan and construction, Stone wanted the job—perhaps because it was so prominently situated in New York City. As a Cold War architect experienced with articulating global American power by incorporating glamorized exoticism, fantasy, and structural innovation in his buildings, Stone felt he could do the same for this "imaginative and sympathetic" patron.[39] After the announcement of June 11, his office forwarded Stone a newspaper clipping with a note that said everyone had read "with glee" that "the essential" component—the selection of the architect—was still incomplete.[40] Stone wrote to Hartford asking for an opportunity to discuss the "unique and marvelous architectural opportunity" that his museum represented.[41]

Even though Stone had not yet won the project, in July 1957 "A Proposed Gallery Building for New York City" was published in *Architectural Record* in the article "An Architecture of Space and Grace" featuring Stone's work. The illustrations (figs. 121-122) reveal that at the time, Stone envisioned a rectangular building, supported on simple rectangular columns "encased with a veil of perforated terrazzo" and set on a landscaped plaza with sculptures. On the top floor was a planted loggia topped by a cantilevered roof. The ground-floor sliding panels of plate glass were faced on the interior with opaque sliding screens—similar in detail to the concrete blocks Stone had used on the exterior of the hospital at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California (1955-1959; fig.

---

[39] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 150 and Kerr, "How 2 Columbus Circle Saved the World."

[40] Stanley [Torkelsen], memorandum to Edward Durell Stone, June 12, 1956, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 62, file 15.

[41] Edward Durell Stone, memorandum to Stan [Torkelsen], June 14, 1956, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 81, file 5.

123)—so that any combination of wall and window could be arranged.[42] The flexibility was further enhanced by movable interior partitions reminiscent of the intersecting planes of Mies van der Rohe, marking the persistence of the International Style in Stone's thinking.[43]

But the commission did not come immediately to Stone. Hartford apparently also considered New York architects Perry M. Duncan (w. c. 1937-1965) and Alfred Easton Poor (1899-1988).[44] Moreover, in June 1957 Pietro Belluschi informed Hartford that at his suggestion, one of his students, Hanford Yang (b. 1929), had chosen the museum project as the subject of his thesis.[45] In "Gallery of Modern Art—A Museum," Yang developed his building concept based on a meeting with Hartford and subsequent conversations with Winslow Ames (1907-1990), the director of Hartford's museum between September 1957 and December 1961.[46] Reportedly, Hartford considered Yang's design of two interlocking cylinders—the large one covered in translucent plastic panels held by metal mullions, the small one of concrete containing the services—"the best of

---

[42] See "A Milestone in Hospital Design," *Architectural Forum* 106 (June 1957): 116 and "Medicine's New 'Taj Mahal,'" *Architectural Forum* 111 (December 1959): 98-101

[43] "Huntington Hartford Museum—Columbus Circle, New York," press release, 1957, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 80, file 4 and "An Architecture of Space and Grace," 167-168.

[44] Charles Nagel to Winslow Ames, September 26, 1957, NYCC Collection. Alfred Easton Poor did some "exploratory services in connection with Mr. Hartford's museum," and was "vitally interested in his project" (Alfred Easton Poor to Agnes Hardecker, May 8, 1958, NYCC Collection).

[45] Pietro Belluschi to Huntington Hartford, April 29, 1957 and Hartford to Belluschi, May 13, 1957, NYCC Collection and Yang, "Gallery of Modern Art—A Museum." According to Hanford Yang in an interview by the author, July 3, 2006, Hartford had also approached Belluschi to design the building.

[46] Winslow Ames had worked between 1930 and 1942 as director of the Lyman Allyn Museum in New London, Connecticut, and between 1947 and 1950 as director of the Springfield Art Museum in Missouri. Charles, Nagel, director of the City Art Museum in St. Louis, Missouri, had recommended Ames for the Gallery of Modern Art job, from which he resigned in 1961 because Hartford kept "jumping into his jurisdiction"(John G. Rogers, "Modern Art Gallery Head Resigns Post," *New York Herald Tribune*, May 22, 1961). Also see "'Ideal' Man Departs" and Ames to Hartford, July 25, 1958, NYCC Collection.

many designs he had seen for the museum" (figs. 124-125). According to Yang, Hartford sent him a telegram while he was visiting his family exiled in Taiwan requesting that he return at once to New York City because he wanted him to build the museum.[47] But upon discovering that Yang was not an American citizen, nor a registered architect, Hartford told Yang he needed someone famous to work with him, and Hartford chose Stone. In spite of only a letter of intent, Stone capitulated to Hartford's request that Yang be made project manager, and the young architect started working in the Stone office on April 29, 1958.[48] Negotiations between Stone and Hartford were reportedly "delicate" since Stone was not very happy about having to take on the "recalcitrant" Yang whose concept the Stone office considered a "typical schoolboy solution."[49]

In late May 1958 Stone invited Ames, who managed the day-to-day details of the architecture project for Hartford, to visit him in Italy, where he was spending the summer in Andrea Palladio's sixteenth-century Villa Foscari in Malcontenta di Mira outside Venice (fig. 126).[50] Upon his return, Yang recalled, Ames announced that Stone would be given an opportunity to create his own scheme instead of using Yang's. In the July 1958 issue of *Architectural Forum*, which included a photograph of Yang and an

---

[47] Yang, interview by the author.

[48] "Architect Picked for Art Museum," *New York Times*, May 19, 1958; Harry Turko to Edward Durell Stone, April 29 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, file 15; Douglas Haskell to Edward Durell Stone, July 3, 1958, Haskell Papers; and "Ed Stone to Design Manhattan Art Gallery," *Architectural Forum* 109 (July 1958): 11. Yang considered his design in competition with Stone's (Mar Lib Young, memorandum to Douglas Haskell, July 3, 1958, Haskell Papers).

[49] Turko to Stone, April 29, 1958.

[50] Harry Turko to Edward Durell Stone, May 8, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, file 15.

[50] According to a letter Harry Turko sent to Edward Durell Stone on September 25, 1958 (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 69, file 16), not only did Ames provide input for the function of the building but he also persisted in having a say on its exterior treatment.

illustration of his model (about which Stone was unhappy[51]), it was announced that although Hartford was "delighted at being able to bring together two such talents," he was "still intrigued" with the Yang design but was also "curious to see what Stone's answer to the same problem will be."[52] According to Yang, the two architects subsequently met with Hartford to present their individual concepts. Yang lamented that he did not have a chance, especially because his plan appeared highly undeveloped compared to Stone's lavish presentation.[53] In retrospect, Hartford explained that the "little guy"

> came up with a kind of Rube Goldberg idea perhaps inspired by the Guggenheim [Museum] that I thought was quite interesting. So I kept looking around for an architect….and I got the bright idea of having….them work together. And of course I was very, very lucky because the Chinese guy walked out in a rage after two or three months of working in Stone's office…. There was a tendency with Stone and all his people…to put him down to some extent…[because] he thought he was the big genius. So it was better for me. I ended up with Stone.[54]

If Hartford actually thought he "ended up" with Stone almost by default, then the story of the collaboration between these two "prescient thinkers" is all the more intriguing because their visions were much aligned in a shared disdain for high modernism—abstract expressionist painting for Hartford, International Style architecture and some of his subsequent manifestations for Stone.[55] Ada Louise Huxtable spotted the

---

[51] Douglas Haskell to Edward Durell Stone, July 3, 1958, Haskell Papers and Stone to Haskell, July 18, 1958, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 62, file 15. Yang reportedly "appeared" at *Architectural Forum* with photographs of his model and his story.

[52] "Ed Stone to Design Manhattan Art Gallery," 11.

[53] Yang, interview by the author.

[54] Hartford, interview by Cummings. Rube Goldberg (1883-1970) was a cartoonist famous for his complex devices that performd simple tasks in indirect and convoluted ways.

[55] Affidavit of Barry Bergdoll, Index no. 03/119036, Supreme Court of the State of New York County of New York, February 2004, Landmark West!

parallel: Hartford was "a collector who does not admire modern art;" Stone was "an architect who rejects the provocative, puzzling and sometimes brutal aspects of today's architecture in much the same way."[56] Hartford thought Stone was, like himself, not "the typical pillar of the Establishment" and he responded to his "characteristic old-world formality."[57] He appreciated Stone's preference for "arches and textures and fountains" instead of "cold abstractions" as well as the "lustiness and love of life" that gave Stone's architecture "a feeling of warmth."[58] Hartford and Stone "always got along beautifully" and "never had an unpleasant moment," according to Hartford, as they "worked hard" during their many long hours "readjusting models and experimenting with interior arrangements."[59] Moreover, they both shared the view that fine art should be appreciated by the general public. Hartford wrote:

> Yes, the man who walks by a shop window on his way home, or stares at the ads in the subway, or looks with a pleased eye at the garden in front of his house—that man is a critic of art; and how foolish of him to say, "I have nothing to do with art. I don't know anything about it."[60]

Stone similarly stated at about the same time:

> I have this belief that great architecture will give everyone, the man in the street, the uneducated man, the uninformed man, an exhilaration. He'll be thrilled by it. The idea that architecture is something that can only be appreciated by a

---

[56] Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum." Huxtable was probably making a reference to New Brutalism, which Stone considered "just another current fad that replaced the glass box;" it seemed paradoxical to him that architects preferred concrete for its "heavy, crude medieval massiveness" instead of its sculptural refinement (*Recent & Future Architecture*, 9).

[57] Huntington Hartford, *You Are What You Write* (New York: Macmillan, 1973), 292. On page 52 of "Pushovers" Hartford said, "Yes, by nature I am against the Establishment. I too, favor liberty."

[58] Hartford, *You Are What You Write*, 292-293.

[59] Hartford, interview by Cummings; and Edward Durell Stone, "What Architecture Should Be," *Show*, March 1964 and Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 150.

[60] Hartford, *Has God Been Insulted Here?* 37-38. Also see Hartford, "Pushovers," 79-80.

> minuscule minority of precious initiates is all wrong….I think great architecture, people should sense and feel.[61]

Although still without a contract, by July 1958 Stone had already started making changes to his initial scheme based on Hartford's feedback.[62] Stone was committed to creating a building that would not be "a mannered piece of architecture" but rather one that would exhibit the "character of permanence."[63] He was, however, reportedly "uncertain and uneasy" because the proposed building was "a total departure from anything the office had done before—very historical, very sentimental, very romantic," recalled Stone's former employee Ernest Jacks, as he further explained, "We were in uncharted waters."[64] Stone's tentativeness led to sketch after sketch (figs.127-128), many of the ideas abandoned: gold-leafed Italian Renaissance barber poles at the corners; Italian and American flags flanking a small balcony at the bottom of a central multi-story window; and a strip of small square windows at each corner running the full height of the façade.[65]

As the plans were being developed, Laurence Vail Coleman, director of the American Association of Museums between 1927 and 1958 and author of *The Museum in America* (1939) and *Museum Buildings* (1950), was brought in as a consultant. He recommended that the museum be promoted at the outset as a great public—as opposed to personal—institution, the persistent concern among Hartford's staff and colleagues

---

[61] Quoted in Peter, *Oral History of Modern Architecture*, 68.

[62] Jean Lincoln to Winslow Ames, September 4, 1958, NYCC Collection.

[63] Sanka Knox, "Hartford Tells of New Museum," *New York Times*, June 14, 1959.

[64] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 132.

[65] Ibid., 135.

being that the museum would be branded as a "personal showcase or toy."[66] Carl J. Weinhardt Jr. (1927-1986), the second director of the museum, between October 1963 and October 1965, warned Hartford that there was "considerable doubt within the profession as to the seriousness of the museum's purpose and its staying power." He also cautioned that if it were perceived as an anti-museum instead of as a positive force, it would be in danger of being laughed off as reactionary or backward. [67]

Through the entire process, there were many "long-time lags and changes," some of them due to Hartford's uncertainty (while Hartford "professed to think highly of the design and was profuse in his compliments," said Jacks, "he still asked the doorman at his residence, as well as the girls in his model agency, for their opinions").[68] In early September, Hartford was "beginning to be anxious to see drawings," but it was not until November that he authorized Stone to proceed with working drawings.[69] By late January 1959 Stone confided he was "very proud" of the design, but the plans were not filed until late April.[70] Although demolition of the existing building finally began in March 1960, in the fall of that year Hartford decided he needed more gallery space, and so the eighth

---

[66] Winslow Ames, memorandum to Huntington Hartford, August 1958; L. V. Coleman to Hartford, August 7, 1958; and Lincoln to Hartford, September 4, 1958, NYCC Collection. It was also recommended to Hartford that the plan be developed free from "the special and personal features" he had been considering, including exhibiting work from Hartford's artist colony (founded as the Huntington Hartford Foundation in 1948) and about the history of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company. Hartford also considered giving space to the Artists' Technical Research Institute.

[67] Carl Weinhardt to Huntington Hartford, July 7, 1963, NYCC Collection.

[68] Harry Turko to David Sher, September 20, 1960, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 77, file 30 and Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 133.

[69] Winslow Ames to Huntington Hartford, September 3, 1958, NYCC Collection and Harry Turko to Edward Durell Stone, November 20, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 70, file 18.

[70] Edward D. Stone to Bill Bierach, January 22, 1959, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 70, file 19 and Sanche De Gramont, "Huntington Hartford Files Plans for 10-Story Museum," *New York Herald Tribune*, April 28, 1959.

floor, originally slated for administration offices and Hartford's own pied-a-tier, was converted into a combination gallery and lounge.[71] Therefore, the final drawings were not completed until December 1960 with ground broken for the new museum in June 1961.[72]

Other delays were brought about by the eviction of an existing tenant; a lawsuit by the Museum of Modern Art over the name of the museum; the resignation of Ames and the hiring of Weinhardt; as well as such construction problems as a strike by concrete truck drivers, blasting the solid rock, bridging an underground stream, and dampening the subway vibration.[73] All these factors contributed to escalating costs (some $7.5 million instead of the initial $2.5 million estimate) and time (eight years instead of two).

Although the building concept underwent extensive changes from the time Stone produced the first design in 1957 to 1959 when the revised plans were published, its essence, as Stone later explained, was founded on the limitations of the property: no two sides of the tiny island surrounded by streets were the same length (75 feet, 11 inches on the east; 97 feet, 1 ⅞ inches on the south; 40 feet, 8 ½ inches on the west; and 75 feet, 3 inches on the north).[74] "I was, in effect, putting a watch together—and a miracle was needed to get an orderly, spacious gallery area," he said, and it became clear that because

---

[71] Edward Durell Stone to Huntington Hartford, September 22, 1960, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 77, file 30 and Winslow Ames to Laurence Vail Coleman, September 15, 1960, NYCC Collection.

[72] Stone to Bierach, January 22, 1959 and to David Sher, December 2, 1960, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 78, file 33.

[73] David Lyle, "Art Gallery Wins, Shoe Store to Go," *New York Herald Tribune*, February 29, 1960; Saarinen, "Museums Go to Law for Right To A Name;" John Canaday, "Hartford Names His Gallery Head," *New York Times*, August 28, 1963; Grace Glueck, "Director Leaves Modern Gallery," *New York Times*, October 19, 1965; and Hartford, interview by Cummings.

[74] See "Architecture of Space and Grace," 167-168 and John Molleson, "Modern Art in a 'Marble Monolith': Architect Shows Plans for 'Permanent' Gallery at Columbus Circle," *New York Herald Tribune*, May 29, 1959. The dimensions are from the deed descriptions cited in a letter from Agnes Hardecker to Harry Turko, April 17, 1958, NYCC Collection.

of its plasticity, he could maximize the space by using poured concrete rather than steel-frame construction.[75]

Interestingly, a sketch of unknown authorship (fig. 129) —illustrated in the earliest announcements about the building in June 1956, in both the *Village Voice* and the *New York Herald Tribune*—contained some of the central ideas that Stone eventually utilized in his design: the building footprint quoted the trapezoid-shaped site; the concave front façade conformed to the 217-degree radius of Columbus Circle, and the solid façade was relieved at the top with horizontal fenestration.[76] As built, the ten-story building (fig. 117) was Stone's first vertical structure, and its load-bearing reinforced concrete foundation was wrapped with a marble veneer made of two-inch-thick square panels of grey-veined white Vermont Imperial Danby. Stone had reduced the perforated marble "screen" that had veiled the entire building in an early scheme to a border on all sides, consisting of square "vision panels," each with four circles, twelve inches in diameter, cut out of the marble.[77] Some of the 1,472 bronze-framed circles were glazed so that light could enter the galleries while others were filled with recessed Swedish Rose Red granite to appear consistently opaque on the exterior. (When Stone saw the mock-up of the cut-out circles he reportedly exclaimed, "Wow, quite a change from aluminum and glass."[78]) Both the tenth-floor penthouse for the mechanicals and the ground-floor were equally set

---

[75] Stone, "What Architecture Should Be."

[76] "Here is the Gallery of Modern Art" and "Huntington Hartford to Build Art Gallery," *New York Herald Tribune*, June 11, 1956. Although on page 671 of *New York 1960: Architecture and Urbanism Between the Second World War and the Bicentennial* (New York: Monacelli Press, 1995) by Robert A. M Stern and others it stated that Stone created this scheme, it is more likely he did not since Stone was not involved in the project at the time.

[77] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 204.

[78] De Gramont, "Huntington Hartford Files Plans for 10-Story Museum."

back from the principal façade—the former sheathed in solid square marble panels and the latter with plate-glass windows framed in bronze mullions on the front and book-matched Verde Antique marble on the other three sides.

One of the most distinctive features of the building was the ground-floor arcade, the first Stone ever designed, which went around the building to shelter visitors from inclement weather. Although Ames had been "strongly" opposed to the arcade because it took space away from the interior, Stone was firm about this feature; when he first saw the arches after they had been removed from their forms he exclaimed to Hartford, "I think they look absolutely beautiful."[79] After experimenting with various shaped arches and columns (even Hartford had submitted a suggestion, although Stone thought it contrary to the nature of an arch), Stone had settled on stylized Venetian Gothic columns inset with Swedish Red Rose granite ovals, which lightened the appearance of the arches. Importantly, the arches were designed to accommodate the various widths of the building without being obvious.[80] The open arcade concept was repeated on the eighth and ninth floors, albeit in a more simplified variation of the ground-floor arcade. For these features Stone was not at all hesitant about admitting his renewed appreciation for the Ca'd'Oro (1428-1430; also known as the Palazzo Santa Sofia; see fig. 130) and the Doges Palace (1309-1424; fig. 20) in Venice, which Stone had studied as a Rotch scholar (fig. 131). In

---

[79] L. V. Coleman to Huntington Hartford, August 7, 1958; Winslow Ames to Hartford, August 11, 1958; Ames to Hartford, August 19, 1958; Ames to Hartford, September 3, 1958, NYCC Collection; and Edward Durell Stone to Hartford, August 30, 1961, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 78, file 40.

[80] Winslow Ames to Huntington Hartford, June 18, 1959, NYCC Collection; Hall, "Directions in Modern Architecture;" and Stone, "What Architecture Should Be."

fact, he told *Time* that the museum's resemblance to those buildings was "probably unmistakable."[81]

Although the interior plan (fig. 132) was not apparent from the exterior, it consisted of two floors below ground, the uppermost containing a 154-seat auditorium; a ground-floor lobby; four floors of galleries—the second and third floors for temporary exhibitions, the fourth and fifth for the permanent collection; the sixth and seventh floors for storage and administration, respectively; and the eighth and ninth floors for an adjoining lounge and restaurant. According to Stone, because the stringent building codes were appropriate to larger buildings, the museum could easily have been virtually all service core and no galleries.[82] His solution on the gallery floors (see fig. 133) was to position a long main gallery with a convex wall along the front, or north, side—with circular windows only at the corners (fig. 134) for "pleasantly tantalizing glimpses of Central Park," rather than panoramic views, which would have competed with the art and diminished the wall space.[83] On each side of a central service core of elevators, stairs, and utilities were two smaller, windowless galleries (fig. 132). The circulation pattern echoed that of the nearby Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum (1943-1959) by Frank Lloyd Wright: after entering the lobby, visitors took an elevator to the fourth floor and descended through the galleries by way of a wide staircase with two double-height, half-level landings—a concept that evolved from the Yang plan (fig. 124b), although Stone

---

[81] "The New Architecture," *Time*, April 27, 1959.

[82] Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum."

[83] Peter Blake, "The Museum Explosion," *Art in America* 2 (1964): 103

did not admit as much.[84] Originally conceived for "smoking and reading," in the end, the half-level landings also served as galleries—the one between the second and third floors housed a twenty-three-foot-high Aeolian Skinner organ with thirty-five-hundred pipes (fig. 135), and the one between the fourth and fifth floors exhibited *The Discovery of America by Christopher Columbus* (1959) and *The Battle of Tetuan* (1962) both by Salvador Dali (1904-1989), whom Hartford considered "the greatest living artist" (fig. 136).[85]

The interior decoration was carried out by the Stone office under the direction of John Crews Rainey (1934-2003) with the assistance Mildred Hull (d. 1993), a Florida decorator who worked full time for Hartford.[86] Because he wanted his museum to imbue visitors with a desire to have original works in their own houses, Hartford specified a setting that would feel more like "an elegant, spacious home than…a public building."[87] Intimate in size and domestic in mood, the warmth and richness of the fully integrated interiors were conveyed in the selection of materials—marble, bronze, exotic woods, textured fabric, and plush carpeting—a dramatic departure, as Stone noted, from the white, austere, and brilliantly illuminated spaces of the Bauhaus days. Echoing Hartford's sentiments, Stone wrote, "I have long felt that one of the objectives of a museum should

---

[84] In the interview with Cummings Hartford said, "What Ed Stone got out of this Japanese [*sic*] fellow's ideas was to have this staircase that wound down with rungs in the middle intermediary floors."

[85] Lincoln to Ames, September 4, 1958 and Jerome Zukosky, "A Posh Place For Pictures," *New York Herald Tribune*, September 9, 1962.

[86] Winslow Ames to Samuel Baum, December 19, 1960, NYCC Collection. For more about Mildred Hull see her obituary in the *Palm Beach Daily News*, December 11, 1993.

[87] "Art Gallery," *Architectural International* 1 (1965): 82 and William Wolf, "World's Tallest Museum: Hartford Art Gallery Opens Friday," ? (March 1964), NYCC Collection.

be to make the visitor aspire to original works of art in his own home" with fabric covered walls, parquet floors, and comfortable furniture, he said.[88]

The bronze saucer-shaped fixtures mounted on the white marble walls at the entrance to the theater—equipped for cinema, lectures, concerts, and slide presentations—were indicative of the "jewel-box" space inside, consisting of fabric-covered walls, wood grilles, red carpeting, and gold nylon plush upholstery, as well as red curtains and bronze doors that employed the circle motif repeated throughout the building (figs. 137-139).[89] The theater ceiling was covered with what by then had become one of Stone's signatures—the gold-colored metal mesh of anodized aluminum discs. The marble ground-floor lobby had a ceiling of deep, rectangular-shaped coffers with bronze pin-spot fixtures. Embedded in the terrazzo floor were the marble roundels that had been cut from the windows, and the pattern was extended outside to the curb line.

The galleries were floored in oak parquet in the Versailles pattern, which complemented the cotton jacquard wall coverings for changing exhibitions on the second and third floors and the blueprint-matched American white walnut paneling on the fourth and fifth floors, both of which were Hartford's suggestion.[90] The lighting plan, created by the distinguished designer Abe Feder (1909-1997), whom Stone had recommended, included incandescent spotlights and indirect fluorescent lighting recessed in a troffer,

---

[88] Stone, "What Architecture Should Be."

[89] Emily Genauer, "The House That Hartford Built," Emily Genauer on Art, *New York Herald Tribune*, September 1, 1963.

[90] Hartford, interview by Cummings and Winslow Ames to Edward Durell Stone, November 24, 1959, NYCC Collection.

positioned in a dropped ceiling four feet from the walls (fig. 134).[91] Black upholstered sofas by Harvey Probber were intended to encourage the experience of viewing a painting as one would watch a play at the theater.[92]

The sumptuous eighth-floor lounge was given a South Seas theme in accordance with Hartford's collection of Oceanic art on display. Designed to accommodate sixty people, it was paneled in Macassar ebony (again Hartford's idea) and had a leather-topped ebony bar, leather stools, walnut seating covered with red Danish wool, and gold carpeting.[93] The adjoining ninth-floor Polynesian restaurant, called the Gauguin Room (figs. 140-141) accommodated fifty-two people seated on chairs upholstered in Chinese red and on banquettes cantilevered from large boxes of greenery, with silk match-stick dividers behind them. Gold carpeting, Rattan blinds, Japanese grass-cloth covered walls, and a Chinese oven promoted the exotic theme. A geometric patterned grille on the ceiling in walnut veneer with laminated fabric was loosely reminiscent of the Starlight roof at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel (fig 23), where Stone had first worked, and was exactly like the ceiling in the library-study and guest bedroom in the New York City duplex Stone designed for Sam Spiegel between 1959 and 1960 (fig. 142).[94]

Reportedly, Hartford looked "for some Gauguin paintings" for the room but apparently never found them since there were two gros- and needlepoint tapestry copies

---

[91] See Edward Durell Stone to Huntington Hartford, January 12, 1962, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 79, file 45 and "Gallery Lighting," *Progressive Architecture* 45 (September 1964): 195.

[92] Hartford, interview by Cummings.

[93] Huntington Hartford, cablegram to Winslow Ames, July 1, 1959, NYCC Collection. During the opening the model of Stone's Kennedy Center (along with photographs and smaller interior models) was displayed in the eighth-floor lounge (fig. 135).

[94] See "Duplexes on Park," *Interior Design* 31 (August 1960): 86-87.

of paintings by Paul Gauguin (1848-1903) instead: Over the buffet hung *Tahitian Landscape* after the painting of 1891 in the Minneapolis Institute of Arts (fig. 140); and on the west wall *Nave nave Mahanna* after the work of 1896 in the Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lyon.[95] Like the building itself, Gauguin's tapestries contained a complex mixture of eastern and western elements from both historical and contemporary contexts with rare and exotic decorative inspirations drawn from the so-called "primitive," or "other" cultures. While no one has considered why Hartford chose to focus on Gauguin, parallels can be drawn between the two men: Freely engaging fantasy and imagination in his Tahitian canvases, Gauguin had also shed established traditions in exchange for his own version of paradise, where he could perpetuate his own myths and ignore hierarchies of history, class, and race.[96] On some level, Hartford must have identified with the renegade reputation of Gauguin.

Upon its opening in March 1964, an event that eclipsed all others in New York City at the time (see fig. 143), the Gallery of Modern Art was enthusiastically received—especially by those who believed that "the appreciation of art is the privilege of just plain people" too.[97] In fact, during the first day it was open to the public, 3,358 visitors toured the building in five-and-a-half hours, and during the next two weeks 38,573 people.[98] Hartford's declaration that "my museum represents the taste of the country" more than

---

[95] William Rollins, "Is UN Nitery a Museum Piece?" *New York Standard*, February 6, 1963.

[96] Kirk Varnedoe, "Gauguin," in *"Primitivism in 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern* ed. William Stanley Rubin, 178-209 (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1984).

[97] Stuart Preston, "Conservative Realism Resurgent: Other Shows Eclipsed by Hartford Opening," Art, *New York Times*, March 21, 1964 and Andrew A. Bradick, letter to the editor, *Time*, April 10, 1964.

[98] Thomas Buckley, "Huntington Hartford's White Marble Tower Is Open," *New York Times*, March 22, 1964 and "4,719 at Modern Gallery Set Attendance Record," *New York Times*, April 2, 1964.

any of the other museums in the city seemed accurate, at least during the first year, when attendance was about 330,000, a figure surpassed by the Museum of Modern Art only after fourteen years.[99] In her article "The First Year on Columbus Circle," the *New York Herald Tribune* art critic Emily Genauer (1910-2002) recounted that the museum had quickly become "a tourist 'must'" as well as "a cultural institution of first importance."[100] Peter Blake, then managing editor of *Architectural Forum*, commented that "the mob" had become so "ecstatic" that the museum might just become "one of the biggest popular attractions since the Ziegfeld Follies."[101] While somewhat cynical, his observation commented on the appeal the museum had to the general public. It was a crowd-pleaser, *Life* reported, "packed like Macy's at Christmas."[102] Huxtable recognized that the public was attracted to Stone's decorative splendor, particularly the "many running feet" of rich materials "all applied with lavish generosity and occasionally smothering overtones of domestic luxury."[103]

But this initial enthusiasm ran its course, and after just five years Hartford's museum followed suit with his other ill-fated investments.[104] Although constantly in the public eye, Hartford had not been able to attract the prominent patrons whose

---

[99] Richard F. Shepard, "Hartford Talks of Varied Plans," *New York Times*, December 11, 1964 and Emily Ganauer, "The First Year on Columbus Circle," *New York Herald Tribune*, March 8, 1965.

[100] Ganauer, "The First Year on Columbus Circle."

[101] Blake, "Museum Explosion," 102.

[102] Brian Doherty, "A Millionaire Art Buff Takes on the Bad Guys," Review, *Life*, November 27, 1964.

[103] Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum."

[104] These investments included a legitimate theater, an artists' colony, a liberal newspaper, a theater-arts magazine, an automatic parking garage, a Broadway play, a modeling agency, a handwriting institute, a Bahamian resort, and a café in Central Park.

contributions he needed to offset operating expenses, perhaps because, as Hartford's biographer Lisa Rebecca Gubernik stated, Hartford had never learned "how strong men used their wealth to wield power."[105] Even though his heart was in the "right place" Hartford's head "was in trouble," as a *Life* review concluded, and consequently few held him in the same regard as his more successful contemporary and rival Nelson Rockefeller, the "tycoon-patron" who had managed the Museum of Modern Art building project some twenty-five years earlier.[106] Nor was Hartford able to secure a comfortable niche in the New York City art world, possibly because he was not able to relinquish control to his staff of experts as he was encouraged to do.[107] As a result, his museum did become known as a statement of "One Man's Taste" or, as Kuh later described it in *Saturday Review*, as a "personal venture," chiefly reflecting Hartford's "private and sometimes dubious taste," including his collection of figurative works of art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[108]

In July 1969, Hartford transferred ownership of the museum to Fairleigh Dickinson University of New Jersey, which operated it as the New York Cultural Center

---

[105] Grace Glueck, "Hartford to Shut His Artist Colony," *New York Times*, April 2, 1965 and Gubernick, *Squandered Fortune*, 23.

[106] Doherty, "Millionaire Art Buff Takes on the Bad Guys" and Morgan, "George Huntington Hartford, II: Peripatetic Patron." Inevitably, Hartford was compared to the Rockefellers whose buildings and public spaces were "universally admired" as opposed to the "critical hoots and catcalls" that Hartford had received for his New York projects (Olga Gueft, "Non-Conformity on Columbus Circle," *Interiors* 123 [June 1964]: 92). Alvin Toffler discusses the tycoon patrons in chapter eleven of *The Culture Consumers.*

[107] Winslow Ames to Huntington Hartford, July 31, 1961 and Julius S. Held to Huntington Hartford, December 27, 1962, NYCC Collection.

[108] "One Man's Taste," Art, *Time*, March 27, 1964 and Katharine Kuh, "The Ironies of Art," The Fine Arts, *Saturday Review*, September 25, 1965. For more about Hartford's art collection see Emily Genauer, "Building Fine, Pictures Awful: Hartford Gallery Vs. Its Art," *New York Herald Tribune*, March 17, 1964.

until 1975, when the "distinguished building" was put up for sale (fig. 144).[109] In 1976 Gulf & Western Industries, headquartered across the street, announced it would purchase the building as a gift to the city, which occupied it until 1998.[110] In 2002 the city agreed to sell the building to the Museum of Arts & Design (formerly the American Craft Museum), and in spite of a number of lawsuits and intense protests, a thorough redesign of the building began in spring 2005.[111] This more recent history is relevant because it has generated on-going commentary and re-evaluation, not just about the building but also about Stone.

According to Hartford, the building was "belittled" during construction because no one could visualize or understand it, and Stone "bore the brunt" of the mostly adverse criticism.[112] To be sure, the building had invited "curious glances from passers-by wondering about the odd-shaped building" and encouraged more "talk and speculation among New Yorkers than anything since the Guggenheim," which opened in October

---

[109] "Cultural Center Appoints Director," *New York Times*, January 2, 1970 and Grace Glueck, "Cultural Center to Close After 11 Years," *New York Times*, September 10, 1975.

[110] Grace Glueck, "Gulf & Western Gives New York A Cultural Center," *New York Times*, December 9, 1976. Beginning in 1980 the building housed the Department of Cultural Affairs, a regional office for the National Endowment for the Arts, the headquarters for a Convention and Visitors Bureau, and an exhibition space. See C. Gerald Fraser, "Columbus Circle Museum Gets a New Cultural Life," *New York Times*, November 7, 1980 and David W. Dunlap, "Acquiring a Taste For Marble Lollypops; 2 Columbus Circle, Much Despised, Is Now Somewhat Admired," Metropolitan Desk, *New York Times*, December 11, 1998.

[111] See David W. Dunlap, "Craft Project at Columbus Circle: Museum Plans $30 Million Makeover and Expansion," Metropolitan Desk, *New York Times*, July 12, 2002 and Leonard M. Kliwinski and Alan Hess, "Two Columbus Circle," National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, January 31, 1994, sec. 8, p. 7, Landmark West!

[112] "Notes on the Gallery of Modern Art" and "The Gallery of Modern Art," press release, 1968, NYCC Collection. The criticism may well have taken its toll on Stone, as he lamented in a letter of February 6, 1964 to the *Time* senior staff editor Thomas Griffith (1915-2002) that "hardly anyone is intuitive enough to grant that the effort was worthwhile" (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 1, file 8).

1959.[113] Reactions to the eccentric, "strange growing structure" ranged "from pleasure to bewilderment" with "contemptuous sniggers as well as heartfelt applause."[114] In 1959 when the model (see fig. 2) had been exhibited at the Boston and Pittsburgh venues for the Form-Givers exhibition, Cranston Jones, the curator, observed that "it had a way of becoming the most discussed model, a few liking it very much, most hating it."[115] Although the art critic Stuart Preston (1915-2005) stated "honestly" in *Apollo* in March 1964 that it looked like the museum was "getting off to a better start than anyone in the recent past could have hoped," it was consistently viewed as a "magnet for controversy."[116] As recently explained by Frank Sanchis, executive director of the Municipal Arts Society in New York City, "It has always been a curiosity from the day it went up, and a building for which people have a love-hate relationship. And there is plenty of hate and plenty of love."[117]

Upon its opening, the critics deliberated its merit: whereas Blake thought that New York City was all the better for having such a building expressive of "a point of view at variance with most current thinking about architecture," Huxtable contended that

---

[113] Paul Gardner, "Modern Gallery Is Due Next April: Huntington Hartford Project in 3d Delay—Cost Rising," *New York Times*, June 10, 1963 and Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum."

[114] Kuh, "The Ironies of Art;" Wolf, "World's Tallest Museum;" and James J. Kilpatrick, "Uncle Sam As an Art Patron—Like Ouch!," *Los Angeles Times*, March 19, 1965.

[115] Cranston Jones to Virginia Field, December 4, 1959, AFA Records. According to Doris Herzig, "Hartford at Home," *Garden City (NY) Newsday*, May 12, 1971, the model stood in the foyer of Hartford's New York City apartment.

[116] Lore Croghan, "Legal Wrangling Over 'Lollypop'," *New York Daily News*, March 22, 2005; Stuart Preston, "More Space for Modern Art," Letter from New York, *Apollo* 79 (March 1964): 245; and Kilpatrick, "Uncle Sam as an Art Patron."

[117] Quoted in Celestine Bohlen, "Oregon Firm to Design for Museum," *New York Times*, November 5, 2002.

the costly, comfortable building "breaks no architectural frontiers" and "poses no challenges, asks no hard questions and gives no controversial answers."[118] In other words, it wasn't avant-garde or modernist.

To be sure, the "quirky little building," as Terence Riley called it in 2003 as chief curator of the department of architecture and design at the Museum of Modern Art, was not "an ill-conceived museum that never caught on with the public or the press or the patrons."[119] In fact, for many, the museum has long been viewed as a significant critique of the Museum of Modern Art. The media had eagerly anticipated the inevitable rivalry: In June 1956 the *Village Voice* proclaimed "Here is the Gallery of Modern Art or Huntington Hartford's answer to the Museum of Modern Art;" in July 1958 *Architectural Forum* cited the new museum as "a sort of reaction to the Museum of Modern Art;" and in September 1963 Genauer informed her *New York Herald Tribune* readers, "Whether the new museum can replace the Museum of Modern Art even temporarily is a hotly debated question."[120] The two museums seem worthy of comparison, especially given the similarities in plan (classical tripartite composition with a restaurant and open loggia on top and an auditorium below the ground floor) and design (neither of their flush facades indicated the internal function). But the composition of the paintings collections (abstract at the Museum of Modern Art and figurative at the Gallery of Modern Art) and the operations of the respective administrations (Rockefeller relied on his expert staff;

---

[118] Blake, "The Museum Explosion," 103 and Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum."

[119] Terence Riley, "What a Building Says About Us," letter to the editor, *New York Times*, October 15, 2003.

[120] "Here is the Gallery of Modern Art" and Genauer, "The House That Hartford Built."

Hartford did not) were distinctly different. More significantly, Hartford's mission—to create "a bastion from which I can constantly project my ideas"—began with the building itself and not with the art collection, as it did at the Modern Museum.[121] In fact, critics generally agreed that Hartford's "strongly personal" collection of some seventy works was "sadly inadequate," "mediocre," "unmemorable," and "second rate."[122] United only by a consistent denial of any form of abstraction, it lacked the authority that museum collections typically convey. Consequently, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the criticism of the collection from that of the man or of the architecture of his museum: "The man, the concept, and the landmark itself have combined to generate hours of discussion," one person mused.[123] Similarly, even though John Canaday (1907-1985), art critic of the *New York Times*, was considered "emphatically against abstract expressionism," he frankly noted that Hartford's notorious public pronouncements on art "strongly colored" the critical view of the museum.[124]

---

[121] "Hartford Has Nearly Everything," *West Palm Beach Post-Times*, February 9, 1964. Hartford later confessed, before conceiving of the museum he "had never been a large collector" and only owned some twenty-five paintings ("Notes on the Gallery of Modern Art" and Knox, "Art Museum at Columbus Circle Planned by Huntington Hartford"). This was "a classic example of putting the cart before the horse," Kuh said in "New York's Modern Merry-Go-Round."

[122] Carl J. Weinhardt Jr., "Why Manhattan Needs Another Museum," *Show*, March 1964; Gueft, "Non-Conformity on Columbus Circle;" Genauer, "House That Hartford Built;" Kuh, "New York's Modern Merry-Go-Round;" and "A Gallery of Modern Art," *Regina (Canada) Leader-Post*, May 15, 1964.

[123] Wolf, "World's Tallest Museum." It did not help that at the time of the opening Hartford was still embroiled in a six-year dispute over a sidewalk café that was also designed by Stone to be at the edge of Central Park near the Plaza Hotel. Hartford's gift of $862,500, reported Walter Waggoner in "Art-and-Park Man" in the *New York Times* on August 21, 1960, was "about as popular as a baby on a doorstep." Hartford had also asked Stone to design a "Nassau nightclub," which was not built (Edward Durell Stone to Huntington Hartford, July 7, 1961, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 78, file 39). Stone was also working with the commissioner of parks to redevelop Columbus Circle reusing the columns from the recently demolished Pennsylvania Station in New York City ("The History of Columbus Circle," *Manhattan Shopper*, May 9, 1964, NYCC).

[124] John Canaday, "Hartford Collection," Art, *New York Times,* March 17, 1964 and L. A. W to Huntington Hartford, February 7, 1962, NYCC Collection.

In spite of the prejudices toward Hartford and his mission, the most thoughtful early reviews generally evaluated the building objectively. Although Huxtable, known for her "razor-sharp, often brutally sarcastic, prose style," did not like the façade for its historical and exotic references, nor the interior for its lavish decoration, she commended the dignity and formality of the space—its plan, function, and suitability to purpose.[125] Genauer, who was recognized for her interest in figurative art and was the first art critic to tour and review the building, in her complimentary review admired Stone's imaginative innovations, including the way in which the building functioned, the intimate yet elegant interiors, and its place in the urban setting.[126] Although Preston reported in *Apollo* that "the scheme was derided as a millionaire's eccentric whim and as a foolish futile attempt to put back the aesthetic clock," he claimed that "there can be little criticism of the building itself," with its interior living up to "the elegance of the outer shell" built in the streamlined terms of twentieth-century architecture.[127]

In contrast, Alfred Frankfurter (1906-1965), the editor of *ARTnews*, known for his interest in abstract expressionism, attacked every aspect of the "avowedly anti-modern museum," which he said had been financed, planned, and run by the self-advertised, anti-modernist owner.[128] In his article "Caviare?—New York's Newest Museum" he remarked that the "conspicuous building…offers little but obstacles and an unfortunate aura of taste." While Frankfurter accepted Stone's effort to counter "the acres of

---

[125] Francis Morrone, "Do Architecture Critics Matter?" *New Criterion* 20 (April 2002), 31 and Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum."

[126] Genauer, "The House That Hartford Built" and L.A.W. to Hartford, February 7, 1962.

[127] Preston, "More Space for Modern Art," 244.

[128] L. A. W. to Hartford, February 7, 1962.

geometric glass-palaces" covering the city, he called his solution "a turkey" due to the banality of its design (including its historical references), its non-functional gallery space (evidenced by its little respect for art), and its cheap glamour.[129]

Significantly, Frankfurter was the only critic to be thoroughly negative at the time of the opening, although recent revisionists have professed otherwise. For example, it was reported in the *Washington Post* by Linda Hales in 2004 that "the building was savaged by critics," in the *New York Times* by Julie V. Iovine in 2002 that it "was a critical lightning rod from the very start," and by Sherida E. Paulsen in 2005 that it became known as "the black hole of Columbus Circle," the design of which inspired neither subsequent work of other architects nor the look of other institutions.[130]

Such historical inaccuracy has meant that many do not realize that certain aspects of the building were initially much admired. The plan, for example, was considered "an accomplished demonstration of one of the basic principles of architectural design," as Huxtable wrote, with an "expert manipulation of space by an expert hand."[131] Critics were also impressed at the way in which Stone had so "triumphantly overcome" the "architectural dilemma" caused by the limitations of the size and shape of the property and accordingly responded to the "insurmountable" gallery requirements "with masterful grace" while complying with what seemed like "almost impossible" building codes was

---

[129] Alfred Frankfurter, "Caviare?—New York's Newest Museum," *ARTnews* 63 (March 1964): 32-34 and 59-61. Also see Frankfurter's editorial, "The Question of the Private Museum," on page 25 of the same issue.

[130] Linda Hales, "At Columbus Circle, Going Round & Round Over a Building's Fate," *Washington Post*, May 29, 2004; Julie V. Iovine, "On Columbus Circle: Fighting a Face-Lift," *New York Times*, January 22, 2004; and Sherida E. Paulsen, "The Black Hole of Columbus Circle," *New York Times*, July 31, 2005.

[131] Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum."

ingenious.[132] The general consensus was that "Stone knows how to make his buildings work."[133]

The museum's exterior and interior decoration, said to have "set a new standard in museum opulence," also evoked much comment, although it was polemical in character.[134] To those who liked it, the "Posh Place For Pictures," as it was headlined in the *New York Herald Tribune*, was admired for its warm and human domestic scale instead of the stark and cold functional spaces that had become "epidemic" in museums throughout the country.[135] The interior space was filled with a decorative beauty that no other modern gallery in New York City had ever approached, as Genauer explained in her art column, appropriately titled, "The House That Hartford Built."[136] But to those who did not like it, the "Marble Ornament" was not an improvement over the "cool cube" of the Museum of Modern Art or its successors.[137] The *Washington Post* architecture critic, Wolf Von Eckardt called the façade a "clumsily ornate mausoleum" on one occasion and on another a "gift-wrapped…confection that stood for bourgeois decadence."[138] Accordingly, Blake relayed that Stone's concept of "architectural beauty"

---

[132] Gueft, "Non-Conformity on Columbus Circle," 95; "'Healthy New Force'," Art, *Newsweek*, September 9, 1963; and "A Gallery of Modern Art."

[133] Blake, "Museum Explosion," 102.

[134] Inez Robb, "An Elegant Showcase," *New York World-Telegram and the Sun*, December 11, 1963.

[135] Zukosky, "A Posh Place For Pictures" and Buckley, "Huntington Hartford's White Tower to Open."

[136] Francis Sugrue, "E. D. Stone to Design Gallery of Modern Art," *New York Herald Tribune*, May 19, 1958 and Genauer, "The House That Hartford Built."

[137] "Castle on Air and a Marble Ornament," *Life*, November 9, 1962 and Blake, "Museum Explosion," 102.

[141] Wolf Von Eckardt, "50 Years Later—Still Far Out," *Washington Post*, October 2, 1971 and *A Place to Live*, 215.

chilled "the blood of the Puritan elite" as he conjectured that no member of the New York Art Establishment was going to like anything about Hartford's museum.[139] To the avant-garde the museum was, as Robert A. M. Stern later explained, "a pot of paint flung in the face of the high modernist establishment."[140]

Although the building's strength stemmed from this "spirit of aggression," as Nicolai Ouroussoff, the current architecture critic of the *New York Times* astutely observed, its feminine overtone was also patently clear.[141] Stone was well aware of the danger of the charge of "effeminacy" in architecture, remarking in 1963 that many Americans shied away from beauty and its attributes—refinement, harmony and grace—as if they were stolen properties.[142] In addition to the windows that were described as "lacelike borders" and "long rows of eyelets" and the columns as "boudoir hand mirrors" and "dainty pillars," the overall appearance was considered "prissy," "delicate," and "embroidery-like."[143] In her review, "Non-Conformity on Columbus Circle," Olga Gueft, editor of *Interiors* said: "These rows of portholes, like borders of eyelet hand-embroidered on a marble christening robe are too winsome for heavyweight architectural

---

[139] Blake, "Museum Explosion,"102.

[140] Robert A. M. Stern, letter read at "2 Columbus Circle: At the Crossroads" (panel discussion, Steelcase, New York City, February 12, 2003).

[141] Nicolai Ouroussoff, "Taming the Beast From 1965," Architecture Review, *New York Times*, October 4, 2004.

[142] Edward Durell Stone, "An Architect's Religion," in *Faith Is a Star*, ed. Roland Gammon, 105 (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1963).

[143] Muschamp, "The Short, Scorned Life of an Esthetic Heresy;" Hammond, "Huntington Hartford And His Museum;" Martin Filler, "Goodbye Columbus," *New Republic* 223 (August 28, 2000): 30; "Hartford Has Nearly Everything;" and Burt Wasserman, "News and Notes," ? 17 (October 1964), 41, NYCC Collection.

criticism. Only a Bauhaus ogre with the hardened arteries could fail to smile at them."[144] Her comment, which has since been repeated many times, indirectly referred to—in an amusing and therefore not so threatening way—the exclusion of women as a universal subject of modernism.[145]

Closely associated with the feminine taint were comments regarding the building's exotic, sexual allure—associated with shame, scandal, and exposure rather than wholesome beauty. For example, Frankfurter saw the Gauguin Room (figs. 140-141) as "the crowning vulgarity" because it "gives a spurious South Seas atmosphere to a bar-restaurant that looks all too much as if strip-teasers, already conveniently reduced to grass skirts, were about to do a Polynesian floor show."[146] Similarly, even before the building was completed, Huxtable commented that as a "provocatively misplaced pleasure pavilion transplanted from some Shalimar garden to a Manhattan traffic island," the building was "Stone's little seraglio." Subsequently, the museum has often been referred to as a "Persian whorehouse."[147] Such descriptions point to one of the ways in which the building transgressed modernism from objective rationalism to sensual hedonism. As an unspoken discourse, the "dangerous other" (the feminine or homosexual[148]) lurked just beneath the surface of the white heterosexual male society modeled on virulent heroism

---

[144] Gueft, "Non-Conformity on Columbus Circle," 95.

[145] See Mary McLeod, "Everyday and 'Other' Spaces," in *Architecture and Feminism*, by Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze, and Carol Henderson, 9 (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996).

[146] Frankfurter, "Caviare?—New York's Newest Museum," 60.

[147] Ada Louise Huxtable, "Architecture Stumbles On," *New York Times*, April 14, 1963. In two other *New York Times* articles, "Architecture: Fun and Games," June 9, 1966 and "Columbus Circle: A Project Without a Plan," January 14, 1999, Huxtable again called the building a seraglio. For the "Persian whorehouse" quotation see, for example, Goldberger, "Landmark Kitsch."

[148] Muschamp, "The Secret History."

as a general feature of 1960s America, and the opulence of Stone threatened to position modernism within that discourse.[149]

In addition to decoration with its subtexts of femininity, fashion, and sexuality, the criticism evoked other issues raised in Stone's earlier work, including monumentality, historicism, fantasy, and the persistent presence of the Stone style. Intent on distinguishing the museum from its International Style antecedents, and in particular the Museum of Modern Art, in his interviews Stone made sure to focus on the qualities of permanence and monumentality in his building. In April 1959 the *New York Herald Tribune* announced that in contrast to the glass walls of the Museum of Modern Art, Stone said he had tried for a "simple monumental effect."[150] The next month an article in the same newspaper was entitled "Modern Art in a 'Marble Monolith:' Architect Shows Plans for 'Permanent' Gallery at Columbus Circle." While at the time critics deemed it newsworthy that Stone questioned if New York City was ready for "a monument for generations to come," when the museum finally opened, the concept of monumentality no longer provoked strong interest and was therefore not mentioned in the reviews.[151] However, retrospectively, the building has been appreciated for successfully standing "as a kind of amiable monumental presence at the foot of Central Park West," as Paul Goldberger stated in 1997.[152]

---

[149] Gibson, *Abstract Expressionism*, 45-54 and Muschamp, "The Secret History."

[150] De Gramont, "Huntington Hartford Files Plans for 10-Story Museum."

[151] Molleson, "Modern Art in a 'Marble Monolith'."

[152] Goldberger, "Landmark Kitsch."

In contrast, Stone's adaptation of the Venetian Gothic elicited attention from the critics right after the building's inception. In *Architecture: Today and Tomorrow* Cranston Jones maintained that Stone was "among the first of the modern architects unabashedly to evoke the past and to bring back lost richness of surface and familiar forms." According to Stone's former wife Maria, who accompanied Stone to Venice, where he first worked on the design concept (fig. 130), Stone "often said, there is 'a fantasia' in all things Italian." Stone acknowledged that when he designed the museum he had been under the spell of the architecture of Byzantium, the root of Venetian Gothic.[153] Not surprisingly, critics noted that it was "bizarre," "exotic," or "Oriental" in feeling—to the amusement of some and displeasure of others, who called it "a hideous Moorish tomb," "Moorish Delight," and "worse."[154] For some, Stone's Venetian Gothic reference invoked fantasy and illusion: In "Stone Ivory Tower" Blake said he considered the building "about as elegant a piece of architecture delight as New York has seen to date," and Frank Getlein of the *New Republic* said that instead of being "shocking" he found it to be as "fanciful" as a Venetian Nights themed masked ball (fig. 145).[155]

There were also those who deemed the Venetian Gothic arches "startling" and those who jested that it was "Like Venice on Subway" or that it would more

---

[153] Maria Stone to the author, August 25, 2004 and Atcheson, "Stone, Maker of Monuments."

[154] Cranston Jones, *Architecture: Today and Tomorrow*, 119; Stone, "What Architecture Should Be;" Fowler, "Lincoln Center Sparks Vast Renewal on the West Side;" Timothy Noah, "Ada Louise Huxtable Vs. Tom Wolfe," Chatterbox, *Slate*, January 8, 2004; and Blake, "Museum Explosion," 103.

[155] Frank Getlein, "Square on the Circle," Art, *New Republic* 150 (April 11, 1966): 37 and Blake, "Museum Explosion," 103.

appropriately "look at home along the Grand Canal of Venice.[156] In 1959 Stone was criticized by the San Francisco architecture critic Allan Temko for endeavoring "to transform the Modern itself into a historical style" by using a nineteenth-century formula (promoted by Ruskin) of concealing essential structures instead of using "truly monumental ornamentation, which does not conceal but emphasizes structure."[157] But it was Huxtable's now famous, and frequently repeated, statement, "The new museum resembles a die-cut Venetian palazzo on lollypops" that solidified the building's reputation as "a flagrant violation of the modernist taboo against historical reference," as Herbert Muschamp later observed in the first of four articles he wrote about the building between 1996 and 2006.[158]

Even though Muschamp argued that "what really mattered" about Stone's use of the Venetian Gothic was that it provided "the means by which Stone broke ranks" with existing modernist codes," he was the only critic ever to discuss the building in relation to John Ruskin—the English critic of art, architecture and society who sought through his polemical prose to bring about widespread cultural and social change.[159] In addition to maintaining that Stone's rounded arches of the top loggia evolved from Ruskin's First

---

[156] "Castle on Air and a Marble Ornament;" "Like Venice On Subway: Huntington Hartford to Open His Own Art Museum March 15," *Los Angeles Times*, February 9, 1964; and Favre, "Simplicity, Order, and Permanence."

[157] Allan Temko, "The Dawn of the "High Modern," *Horizon: A Magazine of the Arts* 2 (September 1959), 19-20.

[158] Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum" and Muschamp, "The Short, Scorned Life of an Esthetic Heresy." See also "Eye on the Environment," Press, *Newsweek*, August 23, 1965.

[159] Herbert Muschamp, "A Building's Bold Spirit, Clad in Marble and Controversy," *New York Times*, November 24, 2003 and Fremont-Smith, "After the Ticker Tape Parade."

Order,[160] Muschamp insisted that the building is "a latter day tribute" to Ruskin, based on his observation that Hartford and Ruskin were similar in a number of ways: both were partial to the Pre-Raphaelites (Hartford owned eight panels from the Perseus series by Sir Edward Coley Burne-Jones and also mounted a Pre-Raphaelite show in the spring of 1964); both made themselves known as enemies of modern art; and both considered ornament "the principal part of architecture."[161] Stone too held much in common with Ruskin: he agreed with Ruskin that the Ducal Palace was "the central building of the world" and also loved all sorts of abstract filigree and embroidery ornament especially for its ability to create dramatic optical patterns of light and shade.[162] Further, both were preoccupied with two-dimensional surface textures and were fascinated with rich building materials, especially marble, which could provide a supremely precious skin.[163] However, Stone did not share Ruskin's core belief that architecture cannot be separated from morality. As a Beaux-arts trained architect and a self-professed classicist at heart, he could not have considered the Gothic as the highest form of architecture.[164] Rather, his enthusiasm stemmed from its decorative effect and its ability to be manipulated so that it could mask merely utilitarian construction, a sharp departure from modern thinking.

---

[160] Muschamp, "Hartford's Generous Folly" and Muschamp, "Secret History." Ruskin discussed his First Order in sections xxxv and xxxvi in *Stones of Venice* (1851-1853).

[161] John Canaday, "Those Pre-Raphaelites," *New York Times*, April 26, 1964 and Herbert Muschamp, "Huntington Hartford's Generous Folly," *New York Times*, April 2, 2000.

[162] Ruskin, *Stones of Venice*, 19.

[163] Kristine Ottesen Garrigan, *Ruskin on Architecture* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1973), 42-55.

[164] Jones, *Architecture: Today and Tomorrow*, 14.

Recently, Muschamp further stated that the building "rolled back time to the world of the Victorians, to the ethos of John Ruskin, Walter Pater, and the Aesthetic Movement."[165] Stone designed the building at the cusp of a renewed appreciation for the Victorian period—exemplified by the founding of the Victorian Society in America in 1966 and the reassessment of pre-Raphaelite painters who until then had been hopelessly outside the mainstream of European painting.[166] Even though there is no evidence that Stone was directly motivated by the revival of nineteenth-century design, it cannot be denied that parallels can be drawn with high Victorian design, in which richness was a goal in itself; with the Aesthetic Movement, which valued art for its decorative qualities; or with such reformists as Christopher Dresser (1834-1904) who in a chapter on the "Decoration of Buildings" (1873) wrote about the Gothic,

> Let not the ornament, however, be a mere servile imitation of what has gone before, but let the designer study the ornament of bygone ages till he understand and *feels* its spirit, and then let him strive to produce new forms and new combinations in the spirit of the ornament of the past.[167]

It is surprising that little or no effort has been made to extend the discussion about Stone's historical references. For example, there is no question that Beaux-arts principles of planning and decoration informed the design. However, critics do not comment on the classical tripartite organization of the façade, nor the treatment of the central staircase as the apex of the design, its prominence enhanced by the Dali paintings, two of Hartford's

---

[165] Muschamp, "The Secret History."

[166] For example, when commenting on the museum's Pre-Raphaelite exhibition, John Canaday wrote in his *New York Times* review of April 26, 1963 that "the tendency to throw up is difficult to control….the Pre-Raphaelites are not, nor are they ever likely to become worthy of serious adult attention."

[167] Stephen Wildman and others, *Edward Burne-Jones, Victorian Artist-Dreamer* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1998), 2-3; Simon Jarvis, *High Victorian Design* (London: Boydell Press, 1983), 9-11; and Christopher Dresser, *Principles of Victorian Decorative Design*," 2nd ed. (New York: Dover Publications, 1995), 74.

most treasured works of art.[168] When Stone declared that "the building *is* [emphasis mine] a grand staircase with the galleries serving as landings," it seems as if he was inviting comparison with the *grand escalier* in Charles Garnier's Paris Opéra House (1857-1874), where public spectacle was as significant a part of the function of the building as its ostensible cultural use.[169] Stone's characterization of the building as a "grand staircase" also recalls the opulent interiors by other Beaux-arts inspired Americans such as Richard Morris Hunt (1828-1895) and Charles Follen McKim (1847-1909).

The building was, in the opinion of Stone, "very much in the character of my other things" even though it was not wrapped with the grillework that had become Stone's trademark since the completion of the New Delhi embassy.[170] In an article entitled "A Touch of New Delhi" a London critic observed that the circular windows of Hartford's museum were derived from the grille that evoked the Taj Mahal, and in her *Progressive Architecture* review, Ellen Perry said there was "no doubt" that the museum was "Stone-work—from what might be called the Middle Stone Age."[171] Such comments echo the concern of Macdonald who cautioned that once an idea "catches on," the danger is that the creator will package it as a marketable commodity for public consumption:

---

[168] See Kliwinski and Hess, draft of "Two Columbus Circle," National Register of Historic Places, section 8, p. 1.

[169] "Hartford Modern."

[170] De Gramont, "Hartford Files Plans for 10-Story Museum."

[171] "A Touch of New Delhi," *London Daily Telegraph and Evening Post*, June 19, 1959 and Perry, "Stone's New Gallery of Art Opens," 71.

"You may expect him to hang onto it for a lifetime, like a dog worrying a bone," as the English writer W. Somerset Maugham once said, Macdonald recalled.[172]

To be certain, Stone did apply proven formulas guaranteed to produce certain reactions—such as his imperial color scheme and repetitive two-dimensional decorative patterns—which became increasingly predictable during the final phase of his work. Nonetheless, the Gallery of Modern Art is still remembered for its idiosyncrasy—not just the building but also its site.[173] Some took "a dim view" of the absurdly shaped hemmed-in site, which they thought made the building look like "an architectural afterthought on an oversize traffic island."[174] Not only did it stand "defiantly as an island unto itself," but it "looked terribly misplaced in midtown Manhattan, orphaned in a swarm of traffic," Huxtable claimed. To Gueft it seemed "forlorn and absurd" to see the "ladylike apparition in immaculate fancy dress tip-toed at the knees of General Motors' callous brute of a skyscraper," which had been completed in 1928.[175] In contrast, many concurred with Genauer that the building "works so brilliantly in its setting that even its neighbors (like the dismal Coliseum, for example) take on a new grace," and they considered it a welcome relief from the glass and steel structures that had come to dominate New York City.[176] The *New York Herald Tribune* proclaimed in 1959, "There is nothing 'safe'" about the plan Stone had just revealed, "and we are glad" because it will bring a badly

---

[172] Macdonald, "Masscult & Midcult," 27-28 and 37.

[173] See Huxtable, "Lollypop Building."

[174] Gueft, "Non-Conformity on Columbus Circle," 92; O'Doherty, "Hartford Gallery: Old Wine, A New Bottle;" and "Home for 'Wholesome' Art," *Life*, April 3, 1964.

[175] Ada Louise Huxtable, *Will They Ever Finish Bruckner Boulevard?* (New York: Collier Books, 1970), 159 and Gueft, "Non-Conformity on Columbus Circle," 92.

[176] Genauer, "The House That Hartford Built."

needed flair to a cluster of nondescript blocks.[177] Others agreed it stood out "like a small white palace against a background of drab skyscrapers" and as a "dazzling white façade" against a "backdrop of ordinary structures."[178]

In spite of such conflicting opinions about its contributions to the urban setting, no one can argue that this courageously provocative building—universally recognized for challenging contemporary New York City architecture as well as for questioning the orthodoxy of the modern movement—has always made people stop, look, and react.[179] In 1964 one critic conjectured that it was "well on its way to becoming a landmark in a city meagerly blessed with outstanding architecture," but in 2002 Christopher Gray more accurately surmised in the *New York Times* that its uniqueness had been detrimental to its reception and long-term survival: "The building's principal sin was that it stood out from the sameness that had taken over New York architecture."[180] With each new phase of occupancy or ownership, it was greeted with more intense opposition than before. For example, when it was for sale in the 1970s (fig. 144), critics focused on its "short, unhappy life," marked by controversy, criticism, and administrative difficulties.[181] Comments centered on both the interior and exterior decoration, its perceived inflexible and impractical plan, and inappropriate site. The overall impression was that the building

---

[177] "Design for A Museum," *New York Herald Tribune*, June 1, 1959.

[178] "A Gallery of Modern Art" and Zukosky, "A Posh Place For Pictures."

[179] Barry Bergdall, Remarks Made at the Preservation League for New York State's Press Conference, November 24, 2002. I would like to thank Dr. Bergdall for sending me a copy of his remarks.

[180] "Art in New Setting," *Interior Design* 35 (June 1964): 102 and Christopher Gray, "Edward Durell Stone and the Gallery of Modern Art; An Architect Who Looked Both Forward and Back," Streetscapes, *New York Times*, October 27, 2002.

[181] Grace Glueck, "Cultural Center to Close After 11 Years," *New York Times*, September 10, 1975.

never functioned properly: The plain truth about the "White Elephant" that had thankfully been pronounced dead after a lifelong illness, Canaday explained, is that it was "licked from the moment of its inception."[182] Similarly, Kramer said as "one of the worst-designed museum structures in the world," its interior resembled "a rest home for retired bankers," and David Bourdon of *Art in America* said it had been a disaster before it left the drawing board.[183] Due to the battle to preserve the building in its original state, which began in the 1990s, other negative opinions have not only persisted but have circulated with more frequency. As the building's fate became more precarious, its presence grew more controversial and the criticism therefore increasingly relentless, so that by 2003 it was declared by Kerr (in her otherwise thoughtful article) that "nobody considers 2 Columbus Circle an aesthetic success."[184]

What is more, the building has now become associated with the aesthetic phenomenon called *kitsch*. It was Paul Goldberger in the *New Yorker* Sky Line column in 1997—"Landmark Kitsch: A new generation of architects tries to save the city's ugly ducklings"—who memorialized the building as kitsch: "No one has yet made a persuasive case that the building is much more than kitsch," he wrote as he raised the issue of whether the building should be preserved and likened it to the work of Claes Oldenburg (b. 1929), whose colossal art installations of quotidian objects were expressive of the popular culture to which Stone's designs also appealed.[185] Thereafter, kitsch

---

[182] John Canaday, "Days Are Numbered For a White Elephant," *New York Times*, March 23, 1975.

[183] Kramer, "...While the Cultural Center Closes Its Doors" and David Bourdon, "N.Y. Museum Crisis: Two Bite Dust," *Art in America* 63 (September/October 1975): 38.

[184] Kerr, "How 2 Columbus Circle Saved the World."

[185] Goldberger, "Landmark Kitsch."

analogies appeared more often even though no one ever fully explained why they considered the building as kitsch: in 2000, an editorial in the *Wall Street Journal* noted that the building had "acquired a certain kitsch allure" and in the *New Republic* the architecture critic Martin Filler called it a "silly little piece of kitsch."[186] By 2002 David W. Dunlap concluded in his Blocks column in the *New York Times* that the museum had been "easily dismissed as kitsch."[187]

Although Dunlap more recently explained that the building was admired by some "as a milestone of romantic modernism and deplored by others as a blank-walled bit of 1960s kitsch," these were not oppositional forces in the work of Stone.[188] In *Kitsch and Art* (1996) Tomas Kulka explained that "romanticism, with its emphasis on dramatic effects, pathos, and overall sentimentality, displays intrinsic affinities with kitsch," his position being grounded in the writings of Hermann Broch (1886-1951), who established in the 1950s that romanticism "is the mother of kitsch."[189]

Because Stone's museum building has been understood as "the first of its romantic kind" and Stone has been considered a romantic architect (which he was willing accept as part of his "credo"), the criticism of his work as kitsch follows logically.[190]

---

[186] "Architecture," Comment, *Wall Street Journal*, March 8, 2000 and Filler, "Goodbye Columbus."

[187] David W. Dunlap, "Fate of 2 Columbus Circle is Hidden Behind Marble Walls," Blocks, *New York Times*, May 23, 2002.

[188] David W. Dunlap, "Museum Wins a Court Battle on Columbus Circle Renovation," *New York Times*, February 25, 2005.

[189] Tomas Kulka, *Kitsch and Art* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 15. The essay by Hermann Broch, "Notes on the Problem of Kitsch" is reprinted in Gillo Dorfles, *Kitsch: The World of Bad Taste* (New York: Bell Publishing, 1968), 49-67.

[190] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 149; Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 132 and 134; Atcheson, "Stone: Maker of Monuments."

However, because kitsch is an issue of sensibility, it has always dodged a conclusive definition and characterization and therefore connotations have changed over the course of the past several decades. Even so, kitsch has consistently implied some sort of aesthetic inadequacy and has been viewed, according to Kulka, as "an embarrassment of modern culture."[191] As architectural historian Miriam Gusevich explained, kitsch is viewed not as "a single, unified animal, but…a monstrous Hydra, spurting heads at the slightest provocation."[192]

Inevitably, the kitsch criticism with regard to Stone was based on the theory put forth by Clement Greenberg in his essay "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," first published in 1939 in *Partisan Review* and then again in 1961 in his *Art and Culture: Critical Essays*.[193] According to Greenberg, kitsch exposed the volatile relationship between high art and mass culture, the latter of which, according to Robert Storr, Greenberg consistently viewed "as irredeemably crude, institutional, and retrograde" because it was the product of a prosperous entrepreneurial economy.[194] As a result, Greenberg was intent on preserving the closed, limited system of the avant-garde by insisting on the separation of high art from the culture of the masses. For Greenberg kitsch was "*debased* high art" because it reproduced the artistic effects of the avant-garde while ignoring its causes. Whereas the avant-garde takes nothing for granted, kitsch functions mechanically by

---

[191] Miriam Gusevich, "Purity and Transgression: Reflections on the Architectural Avant-Garde's Rejection of Kitsch," *Midgard: Journal of Architectural Theory and Criticism* 1 (1987): 141-142 and 147.

[192] Kulka, *Kitsch and Art*, 5 and 16 and Miriam Gusevich, "Decoration and Decorum, Adolf Loos's Critique of Kitsch," *New German Critique* no. 43 (Winter 1988): 100.

[193] Clement Greenberg, *Art and Culture: Critical Essays* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), 21-33.

[194] Storr, "No Joy in Mudville," 179. Storr also discussed the significant parallels between Greenberg's political and aesthetic position in "Avant-Garde and Kitsch."

applying established formulas. It borrows "devices, tricks, stratagems, rules of thumb, [and] themes" from the mature cultural tradition and then "converts them into a system and discards the rest."[195]

With the exception of Von Eckardt, who stated in his chapter on kitsch in *A Place to Live* in 1967 that "a big hunk of marble kitsch is plunked squarely on New York's Columbus Circle where it is to launch Huntington Hartford's counter-revolution against Modern Art," none of the early criticism of the museum included the word *kitsch.*[196] Nonetheless, kitsch was "the daily art" of the time, as the art critic Harold Rosenberg (1906-1978) declared in 1959 in his essay "Pop Culture: Kitsch Criticism." Therefore, even though the word was not used, the most memorable criticisms of the building were imbued with the kitsch sensibility or were even kitschy themselves, corresponding to Rosenberg's opinion that "every fabricator of kitsch looks down on other people's kitsch."[197] Indeed, the words used to describe Stone's museum connote commercial objects mass-produced for a capitalist society: lollypops and tennis rackets for the columns; punch-cards, computer cards, and punched railroad tickets for the circular windows; and a marble egg, perfume bottle, superbly packaged chocolate box, and shoe emporium for the exterior.[198]

---

[195] Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 25.

[196] Von Eckardt, *A Place to Live*, 215. Von Eckardt's criticism was motivated by his vehement opposition to the plan, design, and especially location of Kennedy Center.

[197] Harold Rosenberg, "Pop Culture: Kitsch Criticism," in *The Tradition of the New* (New York: Horizon Press, 1959), 265.

[198] Huxtable, "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum;" Huxtable, "Lollypop Building;" Daniel J. Wakin, "An Effort To Preserve A Monolith: Derived Building Has Big-Name Help," *New York Times*, April 15, 2000; Joseph L. Eldredge, "Today's Architecture: Master Milliner's Touch," *Boston Globe*, July 1966; Genauer, "The House That Hartford Built;" "'Healthy New Force';" Muschamp, "The Short, Scorned Life of an Esthetic Heresy;" Robin Boyd, "The Counter-Revolution in Architecture," *Harper's*

Significantly, the same year that the museum opened, the much celebrated essay "Notes on 'Camp'" by Susan Sontag (1933-2004) was published in the *Partisan Review*, providing a useful and up-to-date working construction for thinking about camp, or kitsch.[199] By 1966 camp had become a catch-all term to describe all things that until then had been loosely labeled as "so bad, they're good," and Sontag herself had become famous as one of the most controversial critics writing in America.[200] "If that essay has today lost its capacity to shock," her obituary in the *New York Times* concluded two years ago, "it is a reflection of how thoroughly Ms. Sontag did her job, serving as a guide to an underground aesthetic that was not then widely known."[201]

If the Gallery of Modern Art is considered in relation to the fifty-eight points in Sontag's essay, it is clear that camp, or kitsch—whose hallmark is "outrageous aestheticism" (point twenty-five)—informed its design, although not consciously on the part of Stone or Hartford. In the opening paragraph Sontag described camp as "a sensibility (as distinct from an idea)," whose essence is "its love of the unnatural: of artifice and exaggeration."[202] She further explained (in point thirty-seven) that in contrast

---

Magazine, September 1959; and Frankfurter, "Caviare?—New York's Newest Museum," 60. After Stone read Boyd's article he wrote to him, "No one has so eloquently pronounced the benediction nor written the epitaph to the glass box. I congratulate you on your service to mankind" (Edward D. Stone, telegram to Robin Boyd, August 28, 1959, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 81, file 12).

[199] Susan Sontag, "Notes on 'Camp'," *Partisan Review* 31 (Fall 1964): 515-530. The essay was reprinted in Susan Sontag, *Against Interpretation and Other Essays* (New York: Picador, 1966), 275-292.

[200] Thomas Meehan, "Not Good Taste, Not Bad Taste—It's 'Camp'," *New York Times*, March 21, 1965 and Winslow Ames to Huntington Hartford, July 31, 1961, NYCC Collection.

[201] Margalit Fox, "Susan Sontag, Social Critic With Verve, Dies at 71," *New York Times*, December 29, 2004. Even though not discussed here, the essay also explored the relationship between camp and homosexuality.

[202] Sontag, "Notes on 'Camp,'" in *Against Interpretation*, 275.

to the first two "great creative sensibilities" (moralistic high culture and the extreme states of feeling in avant-garde art), as the third and only "wholly aesthetic" sensibility, camp standards are "different" and cannot be subjected to the traditional good-bad axis of high art, which has a straightforward relationship between intention and performance. Sontag also explained (in points fifteen and sixteen) that even though an object can be "pure artifice," containing features suggestive of "a disengaged, unserious, 'aesthete's' vision" that allows it to be experienced as camp, it can also carry political or moral "meaning," which is not contained in camp. By extension, it can be argued that although Stone's building was a Cold War statement, it can also be considered kitsch because of its extreme sentimentality (point thirteen); the presence of the nineteenth-century aestheticism of Ruskin (point fourteen); its emphasis on textured, sensuous surfaces (point five); its emergence on the scene as an anti-style (point forty); and its conversion of one thing into another (point eight).

But it is Sontag's twenty-third point that best positions the building as an exemplar of kitsch:

> In naïve, or pure, Camp, the essential element is seriousness that fails. Of course, not all seriousness that fails can be reduced to Camp. Only that which has the proper mixture of the exaggerated, the fantastic, the passionate, and the naïve.
> When something is just bad (rather than camp), it's often because it is too mediocre in its ambition. The artist hasn't attempted to do anything really outlandish.

Stone had a burning desire to displace the "glassy office buildings," which he believed made Park Avenue look like "a crevice in a glacier."[203] For him, as he proclaimed in *Recent & Future Architecture*, architecture was "a grimly serious business;" there was no

[203] Stone, "Cast Against the Tailfin Age."

irony or humor in his intention or architectural expression.[204] His earnest pursuit seemed at odds with the design of the Gallery of Modern Art: Goldberger commented in 1979 that the museum was a "bizarre, funny kind of monument," which he considered "closer than anything New York has to the wonderful jokes of Claes Oldenburg. If only Stone had *intended* that way."[205] Others too reflected on its failed seriousness: in 1975 Kramer explained that it "very soon became something of a joke, a comic irrelevance to the city's busy art life;" and in 1992 Gray stated in "Schlock of All Ages" that "the jokes that likened the building to a Persian boudoir persist to this day."[206]

Aware of Sontag's critical framework, Goldberger also recognized that the building exemplified "naïve, or pure," camp, since in 1979 he referred to it as "an innocent child" that could "hardly be blamed for its misbehavior," and in 1997 he commented on the "strangely innocent, fanciful quality."[207] Then, as the moderator of a panel of experts who, during a three-week online dialogue in 2003, contemplated the underlying issues that made the future of the building so troubling, Goldberger likened it to "a kindly, not-very-bright creature that we instinctively want to take care of," after which he concluded, "I have always thought of it as one of New York's great works of innocent architecture, and its value comes as much from the rarity of such innocence."[208]

---

[204] Stone, *Recent & Future Architecture*, 8.

[205] Goldberger, *The City Observed*, 181.

[206] Kramer, "...While the Cultural Center Closes Its Doors" and Christopher Gray, "Schlock of Ages," *Avenue*, December 1992.

[207] Goldberger, *The City Observed*, 181 and Goldberger, "Landmark Kitsch."

[208] Paul Goldberger, Online Forum: 2 Columbus Circle, June 17 and June 26, 2003, Collector's World Forum (www.collectorsworld.com/ sections /w/forums/forum?forum_id=22830; accessed June 16–July 2, 2003). The panel included Witold Rybczynski, Karrie Jacobs, Terence Riley, John Kaliski, Diane Lewis, and Michael Sorkin.

During the same forum, the historian and critic, Witold Rybczynski, recognized the building's ability to provoke "the passionate," as Sontag coined it in her camp essay, when he questioned why people were made "uncomfortable by an architecture that appeals chiefly to the senses rather than to the intellect."[209] Ouroussoff also observed that the building "certainly incites passion" in its "garish interpretation of Venetian palazzos."[210] "The exaggerated" camp, discussed by Sontag, was also referenced in the "ornamental lushness" and "Venetian exuberance" that Sargeant recognized; the "too-much induced awe" of which Frankfurter spoke; and the "daring curves and exciting shapes" that Boyd saw.[211]

While kitsch historically has been associated with "bad taste," as an advocate of the building Stern was compelled to question if kitsch was "really bad," undoubtedly aware that some theorists have admitted that kitsch is not always an indicator of reduced quality.[212] For example, Greenberg had said that not "every single item of kitsch altogether is worthless. Now and then it produces something of merit, something that has an authentic folk flavor," and Sontag stated in point five that "not only is Camp not necessarily bad art, but some art which can be approached as Camp…merits the most serious admiration and study."[213] In his introduction to *After the Great Divide*, Andreas

---

[209] Witold Rybczynski, Online Forum: 2 Columbus Circle, June 16, 2003.

[210] Ouroussoff, "Taming the Beast From 1965."

[211] Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches;" Frankfurter, "Caviare?—New York's Newest Museum, 61; and Boyd, "The Counter-revolution in Architecture."

[212] Dorfles, *Kitsch: The World of Bad Taste* and Robert A. M. Stern, "Aesthetics and the City: We Should Save Edward Durell Stone's Maligned Marble Masterpiece in New York," *Architectural Record* 188 (November 2000): 64.

[213] Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," 26.

Huyssen likewise noted that "not every work of art that does not conform to canonized notions of quality is therefore automatically a piece of Kitsch."[214] When Stone's museum building was called *kitsch* the implication was that it was a failure, but it must once again be asked, as a panelist observed in the "Two Columbus Circle at Crossroads" forum in 2003, if "beneath the kitsch are incredible bones of serious, thoughtful architecture."[215]

Using the theoretical model of Huyssen to evaluate the Gallery of Modern Art, it can be said that in producing a work of kitsch, Stone made high art palatable to a large audience by incorporating elements of mass culture. Huyssen explained that although modernist dogma has historically prevented the engagement of high art with current cultural phenomena, as capitalism continued to flourish the boundaries inevitably became blurred. Nonetheless, the avant-garde, and correspondingly its critics, have resisted the synthesis between high art and mass culture. It was this conscious strategy of exclusion and anxiety of contamination of the avant-garde that Stone, and Hartford, confronted, designing a museum that was intended to give "everyone, the man in the street, the uneducated man, the uninformed man, an exhilaration."[216] In so doing, they bestowed the building with a familiar and instantly identifiable quotidian language capable of evoking an emotionally charged response. Its intimate atmosphere, for example, saturated with "hominess" (which Matei Calinescu considered indicative of kitsch [217]) was understood by many more people than the unsentimental functionalism of the wholly modern

---

[214] Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, ix.

[215] Reed Kroloff, "2 Columbus Circle: At the Crossroads," February 12, 2003, quoted at www.collectorsworld.com/sections/lw/item?item_id=22791 (accessed June 16, 2003).

[216] Quoted in Peter, *Oral History of Modern Architecture*, 68.

[217] Matei Calinescu, "Kitsch," in *Five Faces of Modernity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987), 249.

interior. By inserting those things often denigrated as kitsch—decoration and metaphor, historicism and derivation—into a modern format of structural logic, truth of materials, and technological innovation, Stone was able to engage the high with the low and the new with the old. As a universal language kitsch, in effect, enabled the building to function as a radically inclusive pluralistic statement of discontinuous members.

Shortly after the completion of the museum building, the architect Robert Venturi successfully exploited such architectural contradictions and ambiguities in *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (1966). But surprisingly, rather than interpreting Hartford's museum with respect to Venturi's ideas of the "both-and" construction, critics of the Stone building have continued to utilize conventional stylistic categories in discussing it.[218] "In terms of style and iconography," the modern art historian Stanislaus von Moos stated, "the building might be described as a proto-Pop representation of a Venetian palazzo."[219] Similarly, as Muschamp described the irony of Stone's Venetian Gothic reference he said: "The surprise was that a lollypop palazzo was just what Pop art fans were dying for" during the period that the borders between art and kitsch were being patrolled.[220] On the other hand, Barry Bergdoll stated that in hindsight many understand Stone's reintroduction of quotation and decoration to have laid the groundwork for postmodernism—although Huxtable countered that this characterization is a "stretch."[221]

The question of Stone's relationship to postmodernism aside, it is clear that his

---

[218] Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1966).

[219] Stanislaus von Moos to Preservation League of New York State, November 8, 2003 (Landmark West!).

[220] Muschamp, "Hartford's Generous Folly."

[221] Bergdoll, affidavit and Huxtable, "Lollypop Building."

aesthetic had enormous appeal in its period, and rather than a “failure,” the Gallery of Modern Art was a success with its patron and with the public. But as a result of his self-conscious romanticism and desire to meet the expectations of the mass audience, in the eyes of those critics who still cling to a Greenbergian, putative understanding of kitsch, the aesthetic value of the building was denied.

Chapter Five: Quest for Celebrity

While much of Stone's sensational success can be attributed to his break with established modernist dogma, his transgressive aesthetic alone was not enough to generate quick, widespread popular response. To promote his work Stone had to know how to exploit the increasingly powerful mass media—radio, television, and print—and how to be a player in the personality cult and star system by engaging such activities as public speaking engagements, publishing, exhibitions, and competitions.

Under the watchful eye of the media and its mass audience—who equated fame with success—by the mid-twentieth century, such architects as Stone had become more fashionable than ever. Competing for the expanded limelight, they navigated the fine line between traditional artist and pop celebrity, the latter defined as someone who can be easily understood and is eminently recognizable by great numbers of people. Stone successfully met this criteria: by 1967 he was known as one of those "popular architectural stars" who created "mostly arty sensations" that vied for attention "like stunt shows at a country fair."[1] Stone had become, in effect, the "instant character" that Susan Sontag described in point thirty-three of her "Notes on 'Camp'"— "a person being one, very intense thing," who, she said, is in a continual state of incandescence.[2]

Expanding on Sontag's definition, in his later essay "Recent American Architecture Camp–Non Camp" in *Modern Movements in Architecture* (1973), Charles Jencks explained that in his "unalloyed pursuit of fame," a particularly twentieth-century phenomenon, a celebrity architect must glorify the mass media—the authority of the

---

[1] Von Eckardt, *A Place to Live*, 9 and 181.

[2] Sontag, "Notes on 'Camp,'" in *Against Interpretation*, 286.

massive middle class—while simultaneously questioning, "How does my historical image look today?"[3] To be sure, Stone was intent on constructing such a celebrity image, but his journey was gradual. Slowed down by the effects of the Depression and by World War II, he was forced to find innovative ways to introduce his work to consumers who might be interested in building new houses.[4] Then, when he began to obtain international fame (at about age fifty-six) he honed his promotional skills as he focused on larger public projects while capitalizing on assorted publicity prospects at which he could best present his gracious showmanship.

Three people stand out as important forces in the development of Stone's professional image. The first was Henry Shepley, whose enduring relationship with Stone was one of master-student, or perhaps even surrogate father-son, for he was the only person to whom Stone signed his letters "Eddie."[5] Not only was Shepley Stone's first mentor, but he defended him throughout his career. In addition to hiring Stone after observing his talent at the Boston Architectural Club and then writing a letter of recommendation to Harvard, Shepley was on the jury that awarded Stone the Rotch Travelling Scholarship in 1927 as well as on the juries for the Smithsonian gallery competition in 1939 in Washington, D.C. and for the John M. Olin Library competition in 1956 at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. After serving on the architectural advisory committee that oversaw Stone's American Embassy in New Delhi, in 1957 Shepley endorsed his nomination for a fellowship at the AIA and in 1958 proposed him

---

[3] Jencks, *Modern Movements in Architecture*, 196-197 and 212.

[4] See Col. G. M. Goodman, letter of recommendation, August 17, 1945, Stone Papers, 1st acc.

[5] Edward Durell Stone to Henry R. Shepley, February 26, 1954, Shepley Papers.

to the National Institute of Arts and Letters.[6] Surviving correspondence confirms Stone's respect and gratitude: In a letter to Pietro Belluschi he wrote in 1956, "You may take it for the absolute gospel that I would rather have you, and Henry Shepley think well of my handiwork than any other two people extant;" and to Shepley he wrote in 1962, "I am in the process of writing an account of my career…it has been a pleasure to me to recall our days together when you found me in an attic on Somerset Street and became my patron."[7]

While Shepley helped Stone refine his architectural skills and made initial introductions, Howard Myers (1894-1947), publisher of *Architectural Forum*, exposed Stone to the benefits of self-promotion and publicity.[8] Sometimes cited as one of Stone's "drinking cronies" (along with Buckminster Fuller, George Howe, Alfred Shaw, Samuel Marx, Alvar Aalto, and John Fistere[9]) to Stone, and others, Myers was far more. Stone formed "an inseparable friendship" with this "affable and imaginative" man, and they "saw each other daily" until Myers's untimely death at age fifty-two.[10] Harry Anderson, then publisher of *Interior Design*, attested to the strength of their friendship: "I am one of the many people who owe a great deal to Howard Myers, and I know that Ed Stone would insist on being in the very front row if a count could ever be made."[11] Similarly,

---

[6] Henry R. Shepley to Jury of Fellows, November 29, 1957, AIA Archives and Henry R. Shepley, Nomination of Candidate, 1958, American Academy of Arts and Letters Archives.

[7] Edward Durell Stone to Pietro Belluschi, January 5, 1956, Stone Papers, and Stone to Henry R. Shepley, June 6, 1962. The Boston Architectural Club was located at 16 Somerset Street in Boston.

[8] See "Howard Myers, 52, Housing Authority," *New York Times*, September 20, 1947.

[9] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 186.

[10] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 31.

[11] Anderson, "Edward Durell Stone: Architect," 79.

when another old friend later complimented Stone on his achievements, he wrote, "Only one regret—that Howard is not here to see his 'boy' finally reach the Sun."[12]

Myers championed modern architecture not for its new images and functions instead of its political associations, according to Peter Blake, who further explained that although perceptive, courageous, and skillfully diplomatic, Myers was not especially sophisticated in his taste, but one of those people able to sense that "something absolutely terrific was going on."[13] Stone considered Myers a "guardian angel" who helped young architects like himself find work and get exposure during the Great Depression. It was probably through him that in 1940 Stone was put on the Versus exhibition committee and the advisory board of the American Way, an organization founded to coordinate the art-in-industry movement in this country.[14] Myers also asked Stone to be a member of the jury for a Magic Chef competition in 1946 and was probably responsible for putting him on the architectural advisory committee that Myers chaired for the Federal Public Housing Authority.[15] As advisers to the Rockefeller Home Center, Myers and Stone (as well as John Cushman Fistere [1906-1986] who in 1939 was architectural editor of *Ladies' Home Journal*) conceived of the modern demonstration house that Stone designed for the second-floor terrace of the International Building at Rockefeller Center in 1940 (fig. 146). Sponsored by *Collier's* magazine, this "House of Ideas" was a

---

[12] Lawrence Sheffield to Edward Durell Stone, May 26, 1960, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 77, file 26.

[13] Blake, *No Place Like Utopia*, 25 and 48.

[14] "Vs," *Architectural Forum* 72 (April 1940): 15 and "Group to Push Art in Lines for Home," *New York Times*, April 6, 1940.

[15] "Gas Range of Tomorrow," *Architectural Forum* 84 (June 1946):150 and "Howard Myers, 52, Housing Authority.

moderately sized, redwood-clad house for the average family. Myers promoted it in *Architectural Forum*, writing, "To say the house is far ahead of the usual run of model and sample houses is too faint praise." As a result, according to Stone, it was visited "by the hundreds of thousands."[16]

Myers also made important introductions for Stone, Frank Lloyd Wright being the most significant. Stone recalled, "When Mr. Wright came to New York, the three of us joined forces and had gay times together," but in these early years Stone's role was "more as an audience than as an architect."[17] However, a personal friendship evolved after Stone visited Wright in 1940 at Taliesin East in Spring Green, Wisconsin, where he found himself "overwhelmed by its beauty."[18] Their mutual admiration for Myers united them; when Myers died, Wright (whose career, said Stone, Myers had resurrected[19]) wrote, "The loss of Howard leaves me not only grief-stricken but defenseless. I feel as though I had lost the sword in my scabbard."[20]

The third inspiring figure in Stone's life, J. William Fulbright, the Democratic senator from Arkansas whose family had been as prominent in that state as Stone's once

---

[16] "Houses," *Architectural Forum* 73 (July 1940): 106 and Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 31 and 92. According to "It So Happens: Streamlined," *Rockefeller Center Magazine*, August 1940, the average daily attendance was fifteen hundred. For more about the *Collier's* house see the four segments by Ruth Carson in *Collier's*: "Collier's Week-End House," April 23, 1938; "Living at Ease," July 20 1940; "We Furnish the House," August 10, 1940; and "Lights On!" September 14, 1940.

[17] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 31-32.

[18] Ibid., 92.

[19] Ibid., 31. In January 1938, Myers had devoted an entire issue of *Architectural Forum* to the work of Wright.

[20] Frank Lloyd Wright to Edward Durell Stone, September 30, 1947, Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, Taliesin West, Scottsdale, Arizona (hereafter cited as the Wright Foundation).

was, served as a crucial political catalyst for Stone.[21] Fulbright was extremely proud of the success of his boyhood friend, announcing to the United States Senate in 1967 that "one of the most famous and successful architects in the world comes from my hometown in Fayetteville."[22] Their relationship had been renewed about 1949 when Fulbright asked Stone to create some furniture designs that could be made in the family's fledgling lumber and wood-parts company in Fayetteville, which were produced until 1954 (see fig. 159).[23] About the same time, Fulbright advised Lewis Webster Jones (1899-1975), president of the University of Arkansas between 1947 and 1951, that despite Stone's student reputation for being a loafer and roisterer, he was the only man really qualified to undertake the design of the university's Fine Arts Center, which Stone executed between 1948 and 1951 (fig. 147).[24] Subsequently, when Stone was bypassed for the men's dormitories project at the university because he was not a resident of Arkansas, he wrote to Senator Fulbright, "With proper modesty, I can do a better job, and I feel that for buildings that are to last several generations, political expediency should not be the criterion. Please feel free to give your friends on the Board of Trustees hell for me."[25]

---

[21] "Senator J. William Fulbright Remembers Edward Durell Stone," *Dimensions* 5 (Arkansas Chapter of the AIA; 1969): 9.

[22] J. William Fulbright, "American Architect Edward Durell Stone," *Congressional Record—Senate* 13311 (May 19, 1967).

[23] For more about the furniture made by Fulbright Industries see Mary Anne Hunting, "Furniture Designed by Edward Durell Stone for Senator Fulbright," *The Magazine Antiques* (May 2004).

[24] J. William Fulbright to Edward Durell Stone, March 21, 1949, Fulbright Papers, box 21, folder 20. Fulbright told Stone in the same letter that he was deeply interested in having him leave a monument to his talent on the campus.

[25] Edward Durell Stone to J. William Fulbright, September 8, 1958, Fulbright Papers, box 21, folder 20.

Fulbright supported Stone on the international level as well. In July 1958 he urged the State Department to sustain Belgium's interest in making Stone's United States Pavilion at the Brussels Exposition a permanent installation.[26] Then, in 1960, Fulbright asked the International Cooperation Administration to appropriate funds for the new campus Stone was designing for the International College (1961-1971) in Beirut, Lebanon (fig. 148).[27] And in October 1963, he wrote to President Kennedy recommending Stone and his associates (Giffels & Rossetti and Charles A. Maguire & Associates) for the NASA Electronics Center project in Cambridge, Massachusetts, which they were awarded in November 1964.[28]

But it was Fulbright's endorsement in 1958 of Stone as the consulting architect of the National Cultural Center (later the John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts) in Washington, D.C. that demonstrates the senator's most sincere allegiance to Stone. As the senior sponsor of its legislation, not only did Fulbright personally urge the decision makers to consider him, but he also coached the architect on how to obtain the commission. In response, Stone wrote to Fulbright, "You have created the architectural

---

[26] J. William Fulbright to Douglas Dillon, July 18, 1958, Fulbright Papers, box 21, folder 20. Also see Edward Durell Stone to Fulbright, July 17, 1958, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 18, file 10; Fulbright to Stone, Fulbright Papers, box 21, folder 20; and Stone to Fulbright September 8, 1958.

[27] Edward Durell Stone to J. William Fulbright, September 28, 1960; Fulbright to Desmond A. FitzGerald, October 10, 1960; FitzGerald to Fulbright, October 17, 1960; and Fulbright to Stone, October 20, 1960, Fulbright Papers, box 21, folder 20.

[28] Lawrence F. O'Brien to J. William Fulbright, October 22 1963, Fulbright Papers and P. C. Hyzer to Edward Durell Stone, November 6 1964, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 81, file 7. After President Kennedy was assassinated, Stone asked Fulbright to put in "a word" if not too embarrassing to President Johnson (Stone to Fulbright, July 2, 1964, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 81, file 7). The model is pictured in Stone, *Recent & Future Architecture*, 61.

plum of the twentieth century, and I think it would be a whimsical twist if two boys from the Ozarks brought it into being."[29]

In spite of such ongoing support, because there was limited work early in his career, Stone took what he could find, producing primarily plans for residences appearing in magazines such as *Better Homes & Gardens*, *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Good Housekeeping*, *Woman's Home Companion*, and *House & Garden* as well as *Collier's*, *Life*, and the architecture trade publications. The plans tended to be low to medium budget—some modern, others traditional, but all experimented with innovative spatial planning, new applications of materials, and the modern interest in integrating the interior with the exterior. In some cases the house designs were actually built, the best known being the *Collier's* House of Ideas of 1940 (fig. 146), while for others only small models were produced and photographed, such as the House for Moderns (fig. 149), one of twelve house designs pictured in *Good Housekeeping* in 1946 and exhibited at Macy's, Wanamaker's, and other department stores, attracting more than 100,000 requests for copies of the plan in one year.[30]

Less frequently, Stone allowed his buildings to be used in other manufacturer's advertisements, the most interesting example being for Oldsmobile's "Futuramic" automobile (fig. 150), which pictured Stone's A. Conger Goodyear house. John Fistere convinced Stone that the ad would serve as "an excellent kind of public education in modern design" and would reach millions of American families as it appeared in *Life*,

---

[29] Edward Durell Stone to J. William Fulbright, March 27, 1959, Stone Papers.

[30] "House for Moderns," The Building Forum, *Good Housekeeping*, August 1946 and Joseph B. Mason, *History of Housing in the U.S., 1930-1980* (Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1982), 53.

Saturday Evening Post, *Fortune*, *Time*, and *Collier's*.[31] Presented as a symbol of modernism, the house represented "the dramatic design of the future—the finest of functional modern design in any field." Its physical characteristics were similar to those of the car, described as having a low, modern hood; curved windshield; extra sized windows; and lower, wider body. Colomina discussed a similar interest of Le Corbusier to involve the Michelin tire company with his Plan Voisin (1925) so that it would be called *Plan Michelin et Voisin du Centre de Paris*. The association of Stone's Goodyear house with Oldsmobile would have had the same "multiplying effect owing precisely to the reputation of their names and products within mass culture," as Colomina explained, and every time a magazine reader saw the Oldsmobile advertisement it would be associated with Stone.[32]

More often, however, Stone worked directly with manufacturers designing houses or rooms to showcase their products. In 1945 the Ingersoll Steel and Disc division of Borg-Warner in Kalamazoo, Michigan, commissioned eight "big-name architects," all of whom were "highly sympathetic to the Modern movement" to design houses that would demonstrate the flexibility of the company's patented utility core—kitchen, laundry, and bathroom as well as the heating and plumbing equipment (fig. 151).[33] Conceived by Donald Deskey, with whom Stone had worked on the Radio City Music Hall and the Mandel house, Ingersoll Village, as it was called, contained Stone's large and luxurious "southern modern" house, considered by *Interiors* to have "that extra measure of daring"

---

[31] John Fistere to Edward Durell Stone, November 11, 1947, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 82, file 5.

[32] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 192.

[33] The other architects were Alden B. Dow, Harwell H. Harris, George F. Keck, Hugh A. Stubbins, Royal B. Wills, L. Morgan Yost, and J. Fletcher Lankton.

because it had a semi-protected recreation area on the first floor, with the second floor devoted to ordinary living—eating, sleeping, and cooking. [34]

In 1949 Stone was one of three architects chosen by Durisol Inc. to build demonstration houses in Garrison, New York (fig. 152), utilizing the company's lightweight, pressure-molded panels or blocks of chemically treated wood shavings and Portland cement, which were fire-resistant, termite and moisture proof, insulating, and sound-absorbing.[35] Stone was also one of forty-nine architects commissioned by the Libby-Owens Ford Glass Company to design a solar house for inclusion in the book *Your Solar House* (1947; fig. 153).[36] Then, in 1953 he created a "uniquely modern bathroom" design for the Tile Council of America (founded 1945), with the mock-up illustrated in *House Beautiful* (fig. 154).[37] Tiled in warm, rich natural tones, the rectangular bathroom was complemented by an outdoor garden covered with a trellis and containing plantings

---

[34] "Eight Men on a Unit: A Group of Brilliant Young Architects Build Houses Round a Prefabricated Utility Package," *Interiors* 105 (May 1946): 92-93 and Ingersoll Steel Division, *Presenting the Complete Ingersoll Utility Unit* (c. 1945), Alden B. Dow Archives. See also "House Equipment Packages to Save Space, Ultimately Money," *Architectural Forum* 84 (February 1946): 84 and 88 and David A. Hanks with Jennifer Toher, *Donald Deskey: Decorative Designs and Interiors* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1987), 126 and 128.

[35] The other two architects were Armand P. Bartos and William Lescaze. The two Stone houses are on Durisol Road in Garrison, New York. See "Four Experimental Houses by Modern Designers Demonstrate the Application of a New and Versatile Building Material," *Architectural Forum* 91 (November 1949): 84-89 and "New Homes for the Young Family: Hudson River Modern," *Today's Woman* (1949), Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 95, file 19.

[36] Maron J. Simon, ed., *Your Solar House* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1947), 40-41. See also Mary Roche, "New Ideas," *New York Times*, November 2, 1947.

[37] "How to Bathe in Luxury," *House Beautiful*, August and September 1953. In 1959 this bathroom was still Stone's favorite (see M. Larson to Mrs. J. C. Furnas, June 10, 1959, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 75, file 15). It also inspired the two lower bathrooms in the Bruno Graf house in Dallas: Stone instructed his staff that the Graf bathrooms "should be real bitchy like the Tile Council bath" and that in their duplication they needed to be even "more deluxe" because "this house is a unique opportunity, and I do not want to miss a good bet" (Edward Durell Stone to Stanley Torkelson and Richard Snibbe, June 21 and August 9, 1955, Stone Papers, 1st acc.).

and a statue by Gwen Lux (1908-2001).[38] The play of light and shade in the garden contrasted with the more secluded dressing area of the bathroom but together they created an organic space.[39]

The demonstration house in New Canaan, Connecticut, that Stone designed for the Celanese Corporation of America received the most publicity in magazines and newspapers, first during its three-month showing in 1958 (fig. 155) and then when the interior was reconstructed in September 1959 on the seventh floor of W. & J. Sloan in New York City.[40] In accordance with the theme "The American Idea," Stone's modern steel-framed house, which rested on reinforced concrete, also utilized traditional American building elements—gray cedar shingles and white latticework. Based on a square module, two separate structures, one containing the living quarters and the other the garage and maid's quarters, were each topped with continuous roof overhangs, respectively pierced with nine and three steeply pitched shingled and glazed pyramids (said to be reminiscent of the Native American tepee). A breezeway covered with translucent plastic panels joined the two structures, and the whole, as well as a garden at one end, were wrapped in latticework (figs. 156-157). Combining two concepts that

---

[38] Gwen Lux, an intimate friend of Stone's, also had designed the large nude "Eve" for Rockefeller Center; the wall lights (fig. 138) for Stone's Victoria Theater in New York City, and four wall sculptures in his Fine Arts Center at the University of Arkansas.

[39] "Tile Council Bathroom: Guiding Principles," August 3, 1954, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 48, file 12.

[40] According to Carl Spielvogel in "Advertising: Celanese at Home in Sloane's" *New York Times*, October 20, 1959, the company also had considered using Frank Lloyd Wright. The most extensive articles about the house include "The Celanese Family of Fibers," *American Fabrics* 51 (Fall 1960-Winter 1960): 75-82; "The Celanese House," *Interiors* 119 (September 1959):132-139; "Edward Stone Puts Fanciful Ideas to Practical Use," *House & Home*, September 1959; and "The House With the Built-In Sky," *House & Garden*, October 1959.

Stone had already developed—the "dogtrot"[41] and Pompeian atrium plans—he created a continuous open central living space with private rooms on either side, which, according to Ernest Jacks, was the culmination of Stone's life-long search for a house without wasteful corridors, with soft and diffused light, and with spatial contrasts.[42] As with the other demonstration houses, Stone benefited from the vast exposure to the middle-class consumer market; just a year later he was asked to build an almost identical house for Carlo Paterno in nearby North Salem (fig. 158).[43]

Stone's talents were also promoted in home-furnishing shows, two of which were held at the Bertha Schaefer Gallery (1944-1972) in New York City: in 1947 The Modern House Comes To Life exhibition showed his plans for an "exceptionally casual" house in Long Branch, New Jersey, and in 1948 he created a living-dining scheme for the House That "Lives" exhibition.[44] Other domestic spaces that Stone designed for exhibition included a patio setting for Art in Interiors at the Midtown Galleries in New York City in 1952 (fig. 159), and at the Fifth Annual Homefurnishings Show in 1953, a mazelike, circular boudoir that was considered "most startling" because "a body could relax on a

---

[41] According to Jacks on page 32 of "Elegant Bohemian," the dogtrot plan, which was sometimes enclosed with screens or glass, was indigenous to Arkansas, consisting of two groups of rooms arranged on either side of a large open hallway, or breezeway, through which passed "any and everything: people, dogs, chickens, pigs, whatever."

[42] "New Work, Serene and Classic, By Edward Durell Stone," *Architectural Record* 132 (October 1962): 138-141.The home furnishings consultants, John and Earline Brice, spent nearly a year compiling research on American design elements for the interiors, some of which were made of such Celanese products as synthetic textile fibers, chemicals, and plastics. According to Jacks in "Elegant Bohemian," pages 319-320, it made Stone furious that they filled the house with an "overwhelming profusion of furnishings," but he could do nothing about it.

[43] See and Ralph Blumenthal, "Cattle Display Draws Many in the Field," *New York Times*, September 12, 1966.

[44] Mary Roche, "Exhibit of Homes Will Open Today: Sketches and Models of Four Structures Accompanied by Designs for Interiors," *New York Times,* September 18, 1947 and "House That 'Lives'" Theme of Exhibit," *New York Times*, September 20, 1948.

fur couch while gazing at a muted abstract painting on the wall and at a sculpture of a tubby ceramic pig suspended from the ceiling." This room design was a rare, conscious attempt at kitsch.[45]

Whereas these types of promotions helped Stone obtain broad exposure and subsidized his income, they were geared to a general audience, for whom Stone had developed an obvious appreciation. He also entered architectural competitions, which were subject to more critical assessment by his profession, but he had limited success. At least initially the plans were judged according to their small-scale elevations and not by the more elaborate Beaux-arts presentations at which Stone excelled. In a review of the first competition Stone entered in 1938, the *New Yorker* critic Lewis Mumford observed: "The real news is that competitions are now being held in which the judges refuse to be bamboozled by elegant renderings in color, whose greatest architectural achievement is the sky."[46]

Stone's first two competition entries in 1938 and 1939 were, respectively, for a Festival Theatre and Fine Arts Center for the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia, and for a gallery at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., neither of which was built. Nonetheless, according to the art historian James D. Kornwolf, these two competitions played a crucial role in changing prevailing attitudes of both architects and the public toward modern architectural theory and design.[47] The

---

[45] Betty Pepis, "Designers Exhibit Art in Interiors," *New York Times*, September 16, 1952 and "Art for Interiors," *Time*, October 5, 1953. See also Hunting, "Furniture Designed by Edward Durell Stone," fig. 2.

[46] Lewis Mumford, "The American Tradition," The Sky Line, *New Yorker*, March 11, 1939.

[47] James D. Kornwolf, "Introduction: The Competitions, the Thirties, and Architectural Issues Related to Them, Then and Now," in *Modernism in America 1937-1941: A Catalog and Exhibition of Four Architectural Competitions: Wheaton College, Goucher College, College of William and Mary,*

Festival Theater competition, organized by the American National Theatre and Academy (of which A. Conger Goodyear was president) in association with *Architectural Record*, was the first step in a campaign to encourage the building of "beautiful and technically efficient theatres as community centers."[48] Of the 126 competition designs, the two entries submitted jointly by Stone and his collaborator of the Museum of Modern Art building, Philip Goodwin (fig. 160) placed second and third to the first place design by Eero Saarinen, Ralph Rapson, and Frederick James.[49] For the Smithsonian Gallery competition, organized by Hudnut, Stone was named to the short list of 10 out of the 408 entries. Although his design (fig. 161) was commended for its grouping of buildings, placement of the auditorium, and arrangement of the entrances and exits, the jury thought that the overdeveloped circulation elements in the center impaired the flexibility of the exhibition spaces, and Stone again lost to Saarinen, this time working with his father Eliel Saarinen (1873-1950).[50] In 1941 Stone entered a competition for the ventilation tower on Governor's Island for the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel in New York City, his drawing showing his lifelong predilection for fountains to which he admitted later on he was "pretty heavily addicted" (fig. 162).[51] Although Stone lost to the prestigious firm of

---

Smithsonian Institution, ed. James D. Kornwolf, 9 (Williamsburg, VA: Joseph and Margaret Muscarella Museum of Art, 1985).

[48] "Theatre Designs Put on Exhibition: Modern Museum Shows Prize Architectural Works for College in South," *New York Times*, March 1, 1939.

[49] James D. Kornwolf, "College of William and Mary: Competition for a Festival Theatre and Fine Arts Center, November 1938–February 1939," in *Modernism in America*, ed. Kornwolf, 125-144.

[50] Travis C. McDonald Jr., "Smithsonian Institution: Competition for a Gallery of Art, January 1939–June 1939," in ibid., 177-195. Also see "Stone Is On Short List for Smithsonian Gallery of Art," *Architectural Forum* 70 (June 1939): 28; "Father and Son Win Smithsonian Award," *New York Times*, May 12, 1939; and "Architects Named for Art Gallery," *New York Times*, May 12, 1939.

[51] Stone, Address Given at the NAEA Conference.

McKim, Mead and White, his design, which stemmed from using a Beaux-arts approach with water being central to the *parti*, was published in *Architectural Forum*—albeit with the uncomplimentary comment, "Ed Stone, who presumptuously looked into the technique of ventilation, found that water was liberally used in the process. His indelicate revelation of this fact quite naturally removed him from the running."[52]

In 1947 Stone submitted a joint entry with Isamo Noguchi and Henry Billings to the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial competition in St. Louis to memorialize Thomas Jefferson and the Louisiana Purchase of 1803. The architecture, according to Noguchi, almost completely buried except for round shapes resembling Native American mounds, was inspired by the great Serpent Mound in Ohio, which the sculptor had recently visited (fig. 163).[53] Unimpressed by the design, which did not even place, the jury awarded the project to Eero Saarinen.[54]

Subsequent to the New Delhi embassy assignment, Stone entered a competition in 1956 for the American Embassy in London, which brought the most recognition as well as the greatest disappointment (fig. 164).[55] Given the embassy's prominent location in

---

[52] "The Curious Story of the Ventilating Tower," Forum of Events, *Architectural Forum* 75 (November 1941): 12. See also Talbot F. Hamlin, "The Frustrated Monument Complex," *Pencil Points* 22 (October 1941): 651; Robert A. M Stern, Thomas Mellins, and David Fishman, *New York 1960: Architecture and Urbanism Between the Second World War and the Bicentennial* (New York: Rizzoli, 1995), 899; and "With Record Readers," *Architectural Record* 90 (October 1941): 10.

[53] Isamu Noguchi, *A Sculptor's World* (New York: Harper and Row,1968), 60 and figs. 197-198. Their entry, now in the Jefferson Memorial Competition Records at the Jefferson National Parks Association Library, makes no mention of this source.

[54] See Jones, confidential report to Linen and Prior and "Jefferson National Expansion Memorial," Competition *Progressive Architecture* 29 (May 1948): 54-59. The competition drawings were circulated for a year in an exhibition organized by the American Federation of Arts (AFA Records).

[55] See Architectural League of New York, "Exhibition of Competition Drawings for the London Embassy," press release, June 1956, Architectural League of New York Records, Archives of American Art/Smithsonian.

Grosvenor Square, the FBO's architectural advisory committee thought the building important enough to justify a limited competition of eight architects and asked Robert W. McLaughlin (1900-1989), director of the School of Architecture at Princeton University between 1952 and 1965, to manage this one and only embassy competition.[56] Belluschi later recalled that the selection of the winning design by Saarinen was controversial because the jury thought that both the Saarinen and Stone entries were equally meritorious.[57] But Ralph Walker was "tremendously upset" by the overall quality of the entries and thought the competition a "failure."[58] Even so, he wrote to Stone:

> I thought your London design good as far as it went. None of us liked the plan with its interior court, but that might be a matter of personal prejudice. I was a little dumfounded, and I am sure you will be when you see the results of the competition as published in *Progressive Architecture*, at the lack of taste displayed in most of the designs. This however does not apply to yours.[59]

The journals reported that Stone was "an extremely close runner-up" and was therefore given a special commendation by the jury.[60] Belluschi later confided to Cranston Jones of *Time* that Stone had won the first time the committee voted, but that the decision had

---

[56] "Candidates Named for U.S. London Embassy Design Contest," People, *Architectural Forum* 103 (December 1955): 29. The other architects in the competition were Louis Sert, Ernest Kump, Eero Saarinen, Hugh Stubbins, William Wurster, Minoru Yamasaki, and Anderson & Beckwith. Alfred Shaw and Don Hatch had also been considered.

[57] Even though Pietro Belluschi said Edward Durell Stone seemed to be the favorite, he remembered voting for Saarinen, but not with great enthusiasm (Marjorie Belluschi to Jane Loeffler, April 2, 1992, Loeffler Collection). In 1958 Saarinen again was chosen over Stone (as well as Frederick Keisler and Gordon Bunshaft) for the repertory theater at Lincoln Center. See Reginald Allen, memorandum, July 18, 1958, Lincoln Center for Performing Arts Archives.

[58] Ralph Walker to Henry Shepley and Pietro Belluschi, February 20, 1956, Loeffler Collection.

[59] Ralph Walker to Edward Durell Stone, March 27, 1956, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 14, file 6. Also see "Saarinen to Design Embassy," PA News Survey, *Progressive Architecture* 37 (March 1956): 89-91.

[60] "Eero Saarinen Wins London Embassy Design Contest," *Architectural Forum* 104 (March 1956): 21 and "Saarinen to Design Embassy."

been reversed.[61] Stone was upset but cautioned his staff, "I think we should soft pedal the idea that we were framed on the competition, which may be far from the case—if it gets back to the State Dept.—we will certainly not get any more work, so let's sweat out our martyrdom quietly."[62]

Surprisingly, Stone was apparently not deterred by the loss, because soon after he agreed to participate in the competition for the John M. Olin Library at Washington University, perhaps because Shepley was a member of the jury.[63] While the jury thought the considerable mass of Stone's exterior design (fig. 165) was handled with distinction and taste and was pleased with the pleasant way the surrounding covered walkway related the building to the campus, he did not win, presumably because the formalized rigid plan of the central multistoried hall prevented flexibility and good functional interior arrangements.[64]

In spite of the publicity these competitions generated, primarily in trade publications, in the end Stone did not win a single professional competition, which quite possibly explains his professed "allergy to architectural competitions."[65] In contrast, his

---

[61] Jones, confidential report to Linen and Prior.

[62] Edward Durell Stone to Dick Snibble and Erma Larson, 1956, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 73, file 40.

[63] The other competitors, selected by a faculty committee, were the St. Louis firms Hellmuth, Obata and Kassabaum; Jamieson, Spearl, Hammond and Grolock; and Murphy and Mackey as well as Louis I. Kahn of Philadelphia, and Caudill Roweltt, Scott of Bryan, Texas. The committee had originally wanted Eero Saarinen instead of Kahn. See "St. Louis Architects Win," *Progressive Architecture* 37 (July 1956): 76-77.

[64] Charles W. David, Henry R. Shepley and William W. Wurster, Report of the Jury—John M. Olin Library Competition, Washington University, May 5, 1956, Washington University Libraries. The project was awarded to the local firm of Murphy and Mackey, Architects.

[65] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 36. When the AIA offered to manage a competition for the proposed National Cultural Center, Stone wrote to Fulbright on July 10, 1958 (Stone Papers) that the leaders in the profession would not enter because they already have enough to do. He further warned: "Competitions are very often won by inexperienced architects, who are unable through inexperience and lack of organization, to complete such an important project. Juries, no matter how carefully selected, have been known...to pass

work was more positively received in the various exhibitions it was shown in. Photographs and models of his buildings appeared periodically in shows organized by small academic institutions, such as the AIA centennial exhibition in 1957; the annual exhibition at the National Academy of Design in New York City in 1960, during which time he won the academy's Samuel Finley Breese Morse Medal; and the memorial exhibition at the American Academy of Arts and Letters in 1979.[66] However, such exhibitions were more honorary than critical and had limited promotional value outside the host institution. An exception may have been the 1940 Versus exhibition mounted by the Architectural League of New York, for which Stone was on the selection committee, and in which his Goodyear house (fig. 7) was shown in the "Modern" section.[67]

However, Stone garnered the most attention when his buildings were shown in exhibitions mounted by the Museum of Modern Art, where curators were intent on promoting modernism, at first narrowly defined but in time more broadly represented, paralleling the emergence of postmodernism. Because its goal was to showcase and educate, the museum considered its exhibitions more effective in shaping American

---

up the best design for one of less quality." Similarly, Stone told Robert Dowling in a letter of April 16, 1959 (Stone Papers) that a competitive effort among architects must be avoided because it would be "fatal."

[66] See Frederick Albert Gutheim and the National Gallery of Art, *One Hundred Years of Architecture in America, 1857-1957: Celebrating the Centennial of the American Institute of Architects* (New York: Reinhold Publishing, 1957), 79; *Memorial Exhibition* (New York: American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters, November 19–December 30, 1979) and National Academy of Design, *135th Annual Exhibition of Painting in Oil, Sculpture, Graphic Art, Watercolors, Architecture and Murals* (New York: National Academy of Design, February 25–March 20, 1960).

[67] Hugh Ferriss, *Power in Buildings: An Artist's View of Contemporary Architecture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), 15. Even though an impartial effort was made in the Versus exhibition to illustrate the "heroic conflict" between traditional and modern design, Lewis Mumford stated in his *New Yorker* review, "The Dead Past and the Dead Present" that "one floor is a cemetery, the other is a delivery ward. How can they clash? How can there be any question of choice?" Mumford also lamented the omission in the exhibition of Goodwin and Stone's Museum of Modern Art building because "the advantages of its steel-cage construction would have been obvious," even though he said it was "no perfect building either."

architecture than most other forms of media, including the buildings themselves.[68] After introducing architecture as a museum discipline in 1932 in the International Style exhibition, the museum increasingly organized exhibitions that traveled (often for more than two years) for a middle-class audience. Stone gained exposure from these exhibitions: the drawings of the Smithsonian gallery competition, for example, hyped by the Museum of Modern Art as "America's most important architectural contest during the last fifteen years," were shown for nearly two months at the museum, after which time they traveled, and the drawings of the Festival Theater and Fine Arts Center competition similarly traveled after being shown at the museum.[69]

In the summer of 1938 John McAndrew exhibited Goodwin and Stone's model of the Museum of Modern Art building (fig. 74), then under construction, in Trois Siècles d'Art aux Etats-Unis, an exhibition sent to the Musée du Jeu de Paume in Paris.[70] The following year, a variation of this exhibition called Three Centuries of American Architecture, which traveled to twelve American cities, also included the model as well as photographs of the Albert C. Koch house (1936-1937 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, by Stone in association with the architect Carl Koch Jr. (1912-1998). This small house (fig. 166), cleverly intersected by a stone wall continuing around the exterior to create a

---

[68] Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 204 and 206. In "'Tastemaking' Mr. Barr of the Museum of Modern Art Files a General Demurrer," *New York Times*, September 25, 1960, Barr confessed that the museum had "a few times set out deliberately to be a 'tastemaker.' It may even have succeeded."

[69] Museum of Modern Art, "Modern Building Planned for Washington's 'Petrified Forest,'" press release no. 40111-3, MoMA Archives; Museum of Modern Art, Exhibition Scrapbook, Architecture A3, MoMA Archives; and Museum of Modern Art, "New Architectural designs for Theatres," press release no. 39227-3, MoMA Archives and "Theatre Designs Put on Exhibition: Modern Museum Shows Prize Architectural Works for College in South," *New York Times*, March 1, 1939.

[70] However, there is no mention of the model in the exhibition catalogue *Trois Siecles D'Art Aus Etats-Unis* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1938).

cloistered garden on a small suburban plot, expressed current enthusiasm for vernacular materials in addition to an awareness of Le Corbusier's solid rubble walls on the Maison de Mandrot (1931-1932) near Toulon, France, and on the Pavillon Suisse (1930-1931) at the Cité Universitaire in Paris.[71] The Koch house was also illustrated in the museum's famed opening exhibition, Art in Our Time.[72]

The Museum of Modern Art building (fig. 67) was again displayed by Elizabeth Bauer Mock (1911-1998) in her seminal exhibition Built in USA, 1932-44. In the exhibition catalogue she made note of its flexible plan, dramatic façade, and protruding floor and roof slabs that made the glass and brick walls in between seem incidental.[73] The same exhibition featured Stone's Goodyear house, which, along with the museum building was again included in What is Modern Architecture?—an exhibition that, beginning in 1938, traveled to seventy-one venues to introduce students to the principles of modern architecture.[74] Another exhibition organized by Mock in 1946—If You Want to Build a House—included photographs of the dining alcove (fig. 167) Stone had designed for the Contemporary American Industrial Arts exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1940.[75]

---

[71] In February 1939 the Koch house received first prize for architecture from *House & Garden* and in September 1947 was chosen as one of the twelve best houses of the last twelve years by *House Beautiful.* It was illustrated with plans on pages 33-34 of McAndrew's *Guide to Modern Architecture: Northeast States*, along with the Goodyear house (p. 56) and the Museum of Modern Art (pp. 75-77).

[72] *Art In Our Time*, cover, 2, and 304.

[73] Elizabeth Mock, *Built in USA Since 1932* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1945), 88-89.

[74] Ibid., 42-43 and *What Is Modern Architecture*? (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1942), 5 and 17, figs. 8-9.

[75] Elizabeth B. Mock, *If You Want to Build A House* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1946), 73. Stone's dining alcove was shown in a section of the exhibition chaired by Harvey Wiley Corbett (1873-1954) along with the work of Norman Bel Geddes (1893-1958) and Donald Deskey. In "Interior

Stone undoubtedly benefited from the museum's promotion of this early work. However, as he began to retreat from the International Style and enter into what he called his "hairshirt period," in which he experimented with houses of solid lumber, stone, and rough brickwork inspired by Wright (fig. 29), the museum grew perplexed about whether to include his work in its exhibitions. While Stone had built a strong reputation for himself in the International Style, there was less certainty about his transitional work since it did not fit neatly into the museum's definition of modern architecture.[76] When the exhibition Built in USA: Postwar Architecture, which opened in 1952, was being organized, an impressive advisory committee of editors and scholars was asked to submit suggestions of buildings to include.[77] Extant correspondence reveals that while most everyone thought Stone deserved a place in the exhibition, no one could determine an appropriate work that followed the directive to express "quality and significance of the moment."[78] Peter Blake, then associate editor of the *Magazine of Building*, proposed the three-bedroom house that Stone had designed in conjunction with *Ladies' Home Journal* in 1949 for David Stech (d. 1988) and Virginia Stech in Armonk Village, New York, (fig. 168).[79] He wrote to Philip Johnson, who at the time was again head of the department of

---

Decoration 1940," *Pencil Points* 40 (July 1940), 433, Talbot Hamlin commented on the "artful contrast of brick wall, foliage, bamboo screen, and split-bamboo awning."

[76] Hall, "Directions in Modern Architecture."

[77] According to the exhibition catalogue, the committee included Peter Blake, Thomas H. Creighton, John D. Entenza, Talbot F. Hamlin, Douglas Haskell, Joseph Hudnut, Elizabeth Mock Kassler, Frank G. Lopez, Joseph B. Mason, Charles Magruder, G. Holmes Perkins, and P. I. Prentice.

[78] Philip Johnson, Preface to Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Arthur Drexler, *Built in USA: Post-War Architecture* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1952), 9.

[79] Richard Pratt, "You Can Build Your Own Home for Half the Price," *Ladies Home Journal*, April 1950; Stone, *Evolution of an Architect,* 98 and 110; and Donald R. Brann, "Here's A House You Can Build," *Los Angeles Times*, June 25, 1950. David Stech was vice president in charge of art and production of Contempo

architecture and design, "Running it would not only get Ed into this, and I think he probably deserves being in this show, but it would also give you representation on the East Coast of the New Empiricist school."[80] Talbot Hamlin likewise recommended the Stech house as well as Stone's Walter Janney house (1946) in Cold Spring Harbor on Long Island (fig. 169).[81] Johnson, on the other hand, contemplated Stone's W. T. Grant house (1948-1949; fig. 170) in Greenwich, Connecticut (which not even Stone liked).[82] Both Mason and G. Holmes Perkins (1904-2004), dean of the Graduate School of Fine Arts at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, agreed Stone should be included but also could not come up with a representative building.[83] In spite of the support for Stone by his peers, Arthur Drexler finally concluded to Hitchcock that "Stone's small wood house [the Stech house], which is the only Stone house that was at all acceptable, is

---

Advertising Artists ("News and Notes in the Advertising Field," *New York Times*, June 13, 1946). The plans, elevations, and sections, which are in the Stone Papers (2nd acc. Series 11, X15), were supplied by the Easi-Bild Pattern Company and could be ordered (as Ranch House Pattern No. 501) for five dollars from the Women's Service Bureau of the *Los Angeles Times*.

[80] Peter Blake to Philip Johnson, April 3, 1952, MoMA Archives, Built in USA: Postwar Architecture, Exhibition File, no. 528, January 20–March 15, 1953 (hereafter cited as Postwar Architecture).

[81] See "Year Round House for Middle Atlantic Region Shows Skillful Use of Available Materials, Built-in Features," *Architectural Forum* 87 (September 1947): 102-106. In volume I on the elements of building in *Forms and Functions of Twentieth-Century Architecture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), Talbot Hamlin repeatedly referred to the Janney house to illustrate his points. Hamlin was incorrect when he said on page 58 that it was in the Hudson Valley.

[82] Philip Johnson to Joseph B, Mason of May 16, 1952, MoMA Archives, Postwar Architecture. In a confidential memorandum of October 5, 1950 (Haskell Papers), Peter Blake wrote to Douglas Haskell, "Ed is pretty unhappy about the Grant house and says that he would not feel badly at all if we just published two or three pictures of it. He thinks that Grant and Dan Cooper jointly botched up the job. He brought this whole thing up all by himself so it doesn't seem as if he would mind if we do play the house down." For the Grant house see Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 99 and 111-113 and Katherine Morrow Ford and Thomas H Creighton, *The American House Today* (New York: Reinhold Publishing, 1951), 31-35. The house was more recently owned by Raymond R. Sackler, who had also commissioned Stone to design Yardley of London (1958-1960) in Totowa, New Jersey.

[83] G. Holmes Perkins to Philip Johnson, April 10, 1952, MoMA Archives, Postwar Architecture.

simply too trivial."[84] Thus, although his professional colleagues recognized his prominence, this period of Stone's work was deemed critically unacceptable.

Just five years later, however, Drexler featured Stone's New Delhi chancery in the exhibition Buildings for Business and Government (1957). As one of five examples of "the best recent modern architecture," Drexler positioned it as an alternative to the Miesian approach because it was "a superb example of decoration."[85] Photographs of the building were shown alongside a model and full-scale mockups of the fifteen-foot grille that faced the building and of the mesh ceiling n the atrium (fig. 116). In comparison to the earlier exhibition, Drexler's endorsement of Stone's decorated aesthetic was a significant shift, reflecting the museum's willingness to entertain alternatives to the International Style.

In 1965, in the retrospective exhibition of sixty-five years of modern architecture, Modern Architecture U.S.A., the embassy was again featured.[86] In his notes, Drexler named three categories of architecture—"masterpiece," "historical significance," and "best of kind"—with Stone's embassy categorized as the last because by then it represented the highest level of general practice.[87] He then contrasted the embassy with

---

[84] Arthur Drexler to Henry-Russell Hitchcock, July 9, 1952, MoMA Archives, Postwar Architecture.

[85] Drexler, "Buildings for Business and Government," 137. Also see "A Design Tour de Force Destroys Walls to Turn Illusion into Reality," *Interiors* 116 (May 1957): 132-135; Museum of Modern Art. *Buildings for Business and Government: Exhibition, February 25–April 28, 1957.* New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1957; and Buildings for Business and Government, MoMA Archives, Exhibition File, no. 615, February 27–April 28, 1957.

[86] Photographs and models of the New Delhi embassy were also exhibited in 1958 at the Octagon, the national headquarters of the AIA in Washington, D.C. (see "U.S. Foreign Building Exhibit," *Memo: A Newsletter* no. 282 [March 10, 1958], 3, AIA Archives) and in an exhibition organized by the Architectural League of New York called Ceilings: Forms and Textures (see Morris Ketchum Jr. to Edward Durell Stone, January 13, 1959 and Laura McSherry to Ketchum and Sharp, February 4, 1959, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 63, file 2).

[87] MoMA Archives, Modern Architecture U.S.A. Exhibition File, no. 767a, May–July 1965.

Stone's six dormitories (called the Honeycombs; fig. 171) at the University of South Carolina, the first two of which were opened in 1958. As opposed to the embassy building, the dormitories were completely wrapped "in a featureless grille of pierced tile" with no other architectural features, which led Drexler to conclude that the perforated grille concept, then in its final mannerist stage, "is here carried to its logical conclusion."[88] In contrast to the termination of this demonstrable trend, which was no longer fresh or original, Drexler highlighted two other Stone buildings: the Goodyear house for its "air of comfortable modernism" and the Museum of Modern Art for its "warehouse construction, " suggesting that interest in the International Style was being revived by the museum.[89]

In 1977 Drexler considered Stone one more time, for the museum's comprehensive exhibition Transformations in Modern Architecture, a survey of the trends and achievements during the previous twenty years. Based on a thorough review of the architectural journals, a research associate informed Stone's office that some of his California projects were being considered for inclusion, as was the State University of New York (1961-1968) in Albany (Nelson Rockefeller's pet project), and in reply the Stone office made some other suggestions.[90] Reflecting the museum's declining interest

---

[88] Arthur Drexler, *Modern Architecture USA* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1965), figs. 40 and 41. See also "Educational Work of Edward Durell Stone, 186-189 and Edward and Elizabeth Waugh, *The South Builds: New Architecture in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1960), 66-67. In "The Dawn of the 'High Modern,'" Temko wrote, "There are no apertures in the frilly lacework even for the windows, so that the buildings have been described as resembling platforms for wedding cakes."

[89] Drexler, *Modern Architecture USA,* figs. 20-21.

[90] Mary Jane Lightbown to Edward Durell Stone, July 22, 1977 and to Jane Collin, May 14, 1979, MoMA Archives, Transformations in Modern Architecture Exhibition File, no. 1250, February 21–April 24, 1979. The California projects included Stone's Eisenhower Memorial Hospital (1967-1971) in Palm Desert, the City Hall (1964-1966) in Seaside, and the Monterey Peninsula Community Hospital (1959-1962) in

in Stone, however, only one token building—the Beckman Auditorium (1959-1963) on the campus of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena (fig. 172)—was exhibited, in the section on "Elements: Colonnade and Roof" because it illustrated a current trend for projecting attic floors with a conical roof giving a graceful rather than heavy presence.[91] This unremarkable gesture of inclusion combined with the ambiguity about what to show in the exhibition indicates the museum's declining interest in the Stone aesthetic since it no longer was pioneering.

Whereas the museum's reception of Stone's work tended to parallel the critical reviews, the American Federation of Arts (AFA; founded 1919), a not-for-profit museum service organization for which Stone was a trustee between 1960 and 1964, demonstrated a greater interest in his later buildings, suggesting that the AFA's criteria were more attuned to popular demand. Stone's buildings were included in at least seven traveling exhibitions in the 1950s and 1960s, among them Architecture of Industry (1965-1967), Fountains (c.1965), and On Campus (1963-1965).[92] Another exhibition, The Ideal

---

Carmel. The Stone office suggested the PepsiCo headquarters (1967-1970) in Purchase, New York; the Standard Oil Building in Chicago; and the Museo de Arte de Ponce (1961-1965) in Puerto Rico.

[91] Drexler, *Transformations in Modern Architecture*, 118-119. For more about the Beckman Auditorium see "New Work, Serene and Classic by Edward Durell Stone,"132-135 and "Classic Temple in California Olive Grove," *Progressive Architecture* 46 (May 1965): 59. In "'Bigger—And Maybe Better;' The Outlook in Architecture," Architecture, *New York Times*, August 26, 1979, Ada Louise Huxtable said the exhibition angered "knowledgeable observers with its undifferentiated, deadpan mix of curiosity and creativity and almost perverse cultivation of stylistic excess."

[92] The Stuart Pharmaceutical Company and Yardley of London buildings were illustrated in the Architecture of Industry exhibition. The Clinical Sciences (1962-1966) building at Stanford's Medical Center in Palo Alto, Perpetual Savings & Loan Association (1961-1962) in Beverly Hills, Perpetual Branch Bank (1961-1962; demolished) in Westwood, and the Monterey Peninsula Community Hospital, all in California; All Souls Unitarian Church (1958-1959) in Schenectady, New York; the United States Pavilion in Brussels; and the National Geographic Society building (1960-1963) in Washington, D.C. were illustrated in the Fountains exhibition (see Minor L Bishop, *Fountains in Contemporary Architecture* [New York: American Federation of Art, 1965]). Harvey Mudd College (1958-1961), built in association with Earl T. Heitschmidt in Claremont, California, and the State University of New York in Albany were illustrated in the On Campus exhibition, which traveled to twenty-three venues.

Theater: Eight Concepts (1962-1964; fig. 173), initiated and sponsored by the Ford Foundation to inspire new staging concepts, showcased a design by Stone and Eldon Elder (d. 2001), the first resident designer for Joseph Papp at the New York Shakespeare Festival.[93] The exhibition received extensive publicity, with the Elder-Stone design pictured on the cover of the December 1961 issue of *Progressive Architecture*.[94]

However, the most important exhibition to highlight Stone's work was organized by the AFA in conjunction with Time Inc. Curated by Cranston Jones, the associate editor who had written the Stone cover story in *Time*, with Belluschi as senior adviser, Form Givers At Mid-Century opened in April 1959 at the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., after which it traveled to more than fifteen other prominent venues.[95] It was accompanied by an illustrated catalogue and a forty-minute film entitled "The New Age of Architecture," in which Stone was one of seven architects interviewed.[96]

Stone was "greatly honored to be included" among the thirteen architects whose buildings from the previous two years were formalistically surveyed in the show, but he was disappointed that his work was displayed at the end rather than at the middle of the

---

[93] See Margaret Cogswell, ed., *Designs for Eight New Theaters* (New York: American Federation of Arts, 1962) and the "Ideal Theatre" file in the AFA Records.

[94]Two years later the article "Design for New Center Adelphi Rd." in *Prince George's Post* announced on June 18 that the hypothetical design would be adapted for the Prince George's Center in Hyattsville, Maryland.

[95] The itinerary included the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh; Minneapolis Institute of Art; Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond; Art Institute of Chicago; Des Moines Art Center; Museum of Fine Arts in Houston; Department of Municipal Art in Los Angeles; Seattle Art Museum; Portland Art Museum in Oregon; San Francisco Museum of Art; Montreal Museum of Fine Arts; Cranbrook Academy of Art in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; Commercial Museum in Philadelphia; and Time Inc. in New York City.

[96] Created by the editors of *Architectural Forum*, the film also included interviews by Eero Saarinen, Frank Lloyd Wright, Mies van der Rohe, Buckminster Fuller, Nathaniel Owings, and Wallace Harrison as well as Herbert S. Greenwald, William W. Caudill, Robert Moses, Victor Gruen, J. B. Thomas, Albert M. Greenfield, Edmund N. Bacon, and Henry Luce. A copy of the script is in the Time Inc. Archives.

exhibition.[97] The New Delhi project, championed for its classical format and regional references, was showcased along with four other buildings that also had meaningful forms expressive of the circumstances of the culture and time: the Graf house (fig. 80), the El Panama Hotel (1946-1951; fig. 174), the United States Pavilion at the Brussels Exposition (fig. 86), and the Gallery of Modern Art (fig. 117). While the original intention had been to display photographs and only one model (the embassy in New Delhi), Stone was "anxious" that his model of the Gallery of Modern Art also be included, and it eventually was.[98]

Interestingly, Stone had not been named one of the original "form givers" when the term was first used in a box title in the cover story on Eero Saarinen in *Time* on July 2, 1956.[99] However, the fact that Stone had been the subject of the *Time* cover story just a month before the selection meeting clearly necessitated his inclusion.[100] In a confidential report of June 1958, Jones seemed relieved that in the selection meeting with Belluschi, the latter had agreed that Stone be named one of the "second level" form givers—along

---

[97] Edward Durell Stone to Harris K. Prior, August 12, 1958 and Stone to Cranston Jones, May 22, 1959, AFA Records. The architects in the exhibition—listed in the order as they appeared—were Frank Lloyd Wright; Ludwig Mies van der Rohe; Le Corbusier; Walter Gropius; Richard J. Neutra; Alvar Aalto; Marcel Breuer; Wallace K. Harrison; Philip C. Johnson; Skidmore, Owings & Merrill; Eero Saarinen; Edward D. Stone, and R. Buckminster Fuller.

[98] Edward Durell Stone to Cranston Jones, March 16, 1959, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 63, file 2 and Jones to Field, December 4, 1959.

[99] The architects listed were Wright, Le Corbusier, Gropius, Mies van der Rohe, Breuer, Neutra, Harrison, Bunshaft, Johnson, Yamasaki, Pei, Rudolph, Fuller, and Catalano. In a letter of July 9, 1956 (Stone Papers, 1st acc.) Saarinen informed Stone that he was "very, very upset" that in the list of architects who had made a major contribution to architecture his name was not included and that he had told the editors that in his mind Stone would always be the first "after the indisputable 'Gods' like Wright, Mies and Corbu."

[100] In "The Fame Game," *Oculus* 66 (Winter 2004): 46 Roger Yee listed the twelve architects who have been pictured on the cover of *Time*: Cram (1926), Wright (1938), Mumford (1938), Luckman (1946), Neutra (1949), Harrison (1952), Eero Saarinen (1956), Stone (1958), Le Corbusier (1961), Yamasaki (1963), Pereira (1963), and Johnson (1979).

with Gropius, Breuer, Saarinen, and Aalto—after Wright, Le Corbusier, and Mies. "Bellluschi put no brackets around Stone," he happily recorded.[101]

The naming of Stone as one of the thirteen form givers in the exhibition underscores the gainful relationship Stone maintained with Clare Boothe Luce (1903-1987) and her journalistic entrepreneur husband, Henry Robinson Luce (1898-1967).[102] On more than one occasion Stone said that Luce had been responsible for making him "so worthy in the eyes of the world" by continuously publishing his work in the Luce publications, which included *Time* (founded 1923), *Fortune* (founded 1930), *Life* (founded 1936), *Architectural Forum* (1917-1974; majority acquired by Time in 1932), and *House & Home* (1952-1977).[103] Stone worked with the Luces on seven architectural projects—five residential and two religious—although only two ever came to fruition: an insignificant apartment renovation at 778 Park Avenue in New York City in 1940 and Mepkin, their 7,226-acre rice plantation in Moncks Corner, South Carolina, some forty miles north of Charleston (fig. 175). After acquiring the latter in April 1936, Luce hired Stone to make the site suitable as a bird hunting retreat, the centerpiece to be four guesthouses arranged around a rectangular enclosed courtyard with views of the Cooper River.[104] The simple white brick structures with flat roofs and metal-framed windows

---

[101] Jones, confidential report to Linen and Prior.

[102] On page 215 of *A Place to Live*, Von Eckardt, complained about the "the effusive touting of the 'form giver' image buildings in the Luce magazines."

[103] Edward Durell Stone to Clare Boothe Luce, May 26 and September 5, 1958, Clare Boothe Luce Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress (hereafter cited as CBL Papers).

[104] The drawings in the Stone Papers (2nd acc., series 11, K22 and K23) illustrate many of the other buildings on the property, including the superintendent, farm, and stable groups; chicken, boat, "typical negro," and chauffer houses; dog kennel; laundry and cold storage buildings; corn crib and hay storage buildings; tool and wagon sheds; blacksmith's shop; gate lodge; power plant; and garage.

were admired for their integration of modern forms and materials with vernacular traditions, and the design received a silver medal for domestic architecture in 1937 from the Architectural League of New York.[105] Stone probably received the commission through Myers because six years later, when Luce contemplated alterations, Myers felt "strongly" that Stone continue his work there, writing:

> There are not more than a handful of designers even in his class, and he is one of the few men capable of interpreting the Luces' very special requirements. Gracious living is an art, and no architect better understands that than Ed. He has already created the nucleus of an extraordinary fine plantation group. It would be a disastrous mistake to place the alterations and additions in hands less expert and sympathetic.[106]

Luce's reservation about Stone stemmed from ongoing structural problems with the buildings. In 1941 Clare had dramatically complained:

> And now the main house leaks—and the cottages leak—the roofs leak—everything leaks….Mr. Stone is, and always has been, incapable of making any other suggestion than to use the same contractors all over again….Give me a three-act play to write or assign me to war duty in Europe, but don't ask me to solve <u>this</u> one. Help! Help! Help![107]

Stone admitted in his autobiography that there were "a succession of misfortunes" at Mepkin, and, according to Jacks, his "professional ineptness" was always "an embarrassment in his mind."[108] Stone said about Henry Luce, "Although I'm sure I shook

---

[105] "Architects Award Prizes in 3 Fields," *New York Times*, April 22, 1937 and Staniszewski, *Power of Display*, 10. For more about Mepkin Plantation see "Mepkin Plantation, Moncks Corners, S.C.," *Architectural Forum* 66 (June 1937): 515-522 and "Modern in South Carolina," *House & Garden*, August 1937.

[106] Howard Myers, office memorandum to Wesley Bailey, August 31, 1945, Henry R. Luce Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress (hereafter cited as HRL Papers).

[107] Clare Luce to Allen Grover, January 4, 1941, CBL Papers.

[108] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 28.

to its foundation his avowed faith in the amateur, I stand in evidence that as a client he is a great humanitarian."[109]

While Stone continued to work on various alterations and improvements at the plantation, another opportunity arose after the Luces unsuccessfully tried to sell the plantation in 1945. In July 1949 they decided to deed much of the property to the Bishop of Charleston for the foundation of a Cistercian monastery. Clare Luce had converted to Catholicism in 1946 after her only daughter, Ann Clare, had been killed in a car accident in 1944. Benefiting both spiritually and emotionally from her ongoing correspondence and visits with the monks, in May 1958 she asked Stone if he would "draw up the preliminary plans as an eleemosynary effort," which the monks would use to build the new abbey themselves.[110] Not only did she appeal to Stone for an act of charity but, more importantly, she promised permanency and legacy, two crucial components to a celebrity architect such as Stone:

> You are doing a splendid and generous thing in contributing your great architectural skill—no genius—to this wonderful cause….As the monks would say, 'It is all for the greater glory of god;' but most surely in the final analysis it must also be for the greater glory of Stone, and one which will endure, as monasteries have a habit of doing, throughout the centuries.[111]

---

[109] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 34.

[110] W. L. Bailey to T.D. Sanders, April 20, 1945, HRL Papers. See also "Luce Plantation Slated To Become Monastery," *New York Times*, August 10, 1949 and Father M. Benedict Gemignani, *An Account of the Foundation of Our Lady of Mepkin of the Cistercian Order of the Strict Observance in South Carolina and Its Subsequent History, 1949-1964* (Moncks Corner, SC: Our Lady of Mepkin, 1964), CBL Papers. A 1963 biography of Stone in the Time Inc. Archive said about Mepkin Plantation, "fiasco; donated to Catholic Church." Ann Clare's remains, along with those of Clare's mother, were removed by the monks to a garden at Mepkin Plantation in 1951.

[111] Clare Boothe Luce to Edward Durell Stone, August 21, 1958, CBL Papers.

Having wanted to redeem himself in the Luces eyes, Stone replied, "The ingredients are here—an idealistic cause and your confidence. I will try."[112] His design, a rectangular structure to be built of concrete block and brick with a series of cloistered courtyards (fig. 176), was approved by the Catholic church in June 1960 and published in October 1961 in *Architectural Forum* (and then again in 1965 in the *New York Times*).[113] According to Jacks, the design "was one of the best we produced," illustrating Stone's "love of filtered light, domed spaces, and colonnaded cloisters." Sadly, the abbey was never built.[114]

About a year later, Henry Luce, whose father had been a Presbyterian missionary in China, was on a committee to build a National Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C., and perhaps because he gave a large donation to acquire a suitable site had the authority to select the architect.[115] In spite of pressure from his son, Henry Luce III (1925-2005), to hire Eero Saarinen, the senior Luce insisted on Stone for the preliminary plan.[116] After an agreement was signed in June 1959, Stone designed a cast concrete structure intended to have a tower by the sculptor Harry Bertoia (1915-1978) wrapped in a gilded

---

[112] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 28 and Edward Durell Stone to Clare Boothe Luce, September 5, 1958, CBL Papers. Stone added in the same letter, "I want to assure you and Harry…that there be no calamities which will require 'further study,'" as there had been when he first worked at Mepkin Plantation.

[113] Edward Durell Stone to Clare Boothe Luce, September 18, 1958, CBL Papers; Alane, memorandum to Henry R. Luce, June 30, 1960, HRL Papers; "New Work in the Office of Ed Stone," *Architectural Forum* 115 (October 1961): 127; and "Stone Designs a Sylvan Retreat for Monks," *New York Times*, April 11, 1965.

[114] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 262.

[115] Edward L. R. Elson to Henry Luce, December 26, 1957, HRL Papers.

[116] Henry Luce III to Eero Saarinen to Henry Luce III, July 16, 1957, Francis Edwin Brennan Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress (hereafter cited as Brennan Papers) and Hank Luce, memorandum to Henry R. Luce, August 5, 1957, HRL Papers.

screen of many pieces of multicolored metal (fig. 177).[117] The interior, consisting of four slender columns flared at the top to support a roof of concrete mixed with colored glass and a series of domes, was one of Stone's favorite designs.[118] Even though his former teacher at Harvard, Professor Conant, a medieval specialist, later commended Stone for "so gifted a design," Luce was "dour and none too complimentary" when he was shown the plan before it went to the full committee and then to President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, J. Edgar Hoover, and the actor Jimmy Stewart.[119] While the committee members thought the interior was "just plain beautiful," the exterior, they said, "needs further study," and Stone was sent home to make changes.[120] According to Luce's assistant Ellen Nollen, Stone did not change the exterior enough "to appease in the slightest degree the conservatives," adding, "I am personally convinced that the antipathy to the 'modern' (and unfortunately, this antipathy extends to Eero Saarinen too) is so strong that it could impede fundraising."[121] The committee chairman reported that "no satisfactory overall concept" had been presented and that the reaction was "uniformly negative."[122] They wanted a building constructed of modern materials but with a traditional exterior, preferably Gothic in inspiration, as reported by Francis Edwin

---

[117] William S. Culbertson to Edward Durell Stone, June 23, 1959, HRL Papers and Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 223.

[118] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 152.

[119] Kenneth J. Conant to Edward Durell Stone, January 1, 1965, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 2, file 9 and Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 225.

[120] Hank Brennan to Henry R. Luce, December 16, 1959, Brennan Papers.

[121] Emmie Nollen to Henry R. Luce, April 6, 1960, Brennan Papers.

[122] Harold Dean Krafft, memorandum to Henry R. Luce, April 6, 1960, Brennan and HRL Papers.

"Hank" Brennan (1910-1992), at the time art adviser to Henry Luce and his representative at the meetings: "Ed's design is too fanciful, too delicate, too decorative, and lacks the architectural authority....In short, Ed's plan is simply not 'great' enough." Clearly unimpressed with the decorative aspect of the Stone aesthetic, particularly its feminine implication, which by then was firmly established as part of his expression, Brennan convinced Luce to discontinue Stone's services in April 1960.[123]

Clare Luce, however, kept up with Stone through the years. In 1961 she inquired about building a house in Bermuda, and in 1962 she asked him to research a fountain by the abstract expressionist sculptor Mary Callery (1903-1977) for her house in Phoenix, Arizona.[124] In 1966 Stone also produced plans for a three-bedroom house with a guesthouse, studio, and servants' quarters in Hawaii—"gorgeous" but too large and extravagant for Clare.[125] In spite of these unrealized projects, Clare continued to tout Stone. For example, in June 1964 she proclaimed in her Monthly Commentary in *McCalls* that her "old friend" was "America's foremost living architect."[126]

---

[123] "Francis Brennan, 82, Retired Art Director," *New York Times*, December 11, 1992 and Hank Brennan, memorandum to Henry R. Luce, March 30, 1960, Brennan Papers. The church was eventually built between 1967 and 1969 by Harold Eugene Wagoner (1905-1986), an architect known for ecclesiastical structures.

[124] Edward Durell Stone to Clare Boothe Luce, June 28 and July 20, 1962, CBL Papers; and Stone to Nat Hutchings, September 16, 1961 and to Luce, September 26, 1961, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 78, file 41.

[125] Stone to Luce September 26, 1961 and July 20, 1962, CBL Papers. The drawings, dated February 1966, are in the Stone Papers, 2nd acc., series 11, L-10. Vladimir Ossipoff (1907-1998) ended up designing the house.

[126] In turn, Stone proclaimed Clare Luce "the greatest living woman," and in 1970, because she was a member of a women's committee to advise on the landscaping of the plaza of his Standard Oil building in Chicago, he invited her to accompany him to the formal dinner, writing, "I insist on being your escort and fellow Republican. I would not insist on this but I think the silent majority should see what the most glamorous and brilliant woman of this century looks like. My allegiance and love is eternal" (Edward Durell Stone to Clare Boothe Luce, October 1970 and December 9, 1971, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 4, file 1 and 7).

As Stone had understood with the Luces, to be successful an architect must establish strong relationships with the rich and powerful, for whom, as Deyan Sudjic explained in *The Edifice Complex*, "building is the means by which the egotism of the individual is expressed in its most naked from."[127] Recognizing that architecture is meant to tell a story about those who build it, Stone was adept at accommodating his client's emotional needs and their interests while at the same time instilling confidence and giving them a sense of control over their environment. For example, after his presentation to the development committee for the National Presbyterian Church, Dr. Edward Elson told Stone, "You made many friends by the discrete methods of your presentation. You banished the apprehension of some people and evoked from everyone a sense of confidence."[128] Similarly, the president of the American Institute of Decorators said to Stone: "Your friendly manner and your delightful talk soon relaxed everyone in the audience and left us with the impression that your 'sense of humility' and your marvelous 'sense of humor' must have helped you over many rough spots in the past and contributed to your greatness."[129]

In addition to the other prominent clients Stone served early in his career—Nelson Rockefeller, Vincent Astor, Frank Altschul, and A. Conger Goodyear—many more followed, including Robert Dowling, Robert Moses, Bruno and Josephine Graf, Sam Speigel, Victor Borge, Howard Ahmanson, Huntington Hartford, Joyce Hall, foreign ministers and ambassadors, and four presidents of the United States (and sometimes their

---

[127] Sudjic, *Edifice Complex*, 11.

[128] Edward L. R. Elson to Edward Durell Stone, October 23, 1959, HRL Papers.

[129] J. H. Leroy Chambers to Edward Durell Stone, May 29, 1959, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 70, file 20.

wives), from Dwight Eisenhower to Richard M. Nixon (see fig. 178). In return, many clients gave Stone their unremitting support; for example, when Stone was not selected for the 1965 addition to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (which went to William L. Pereira [1909-1985]), Howard Ahmanson (1906-1968), a large donor who had favored Stone, asked him to design the $2.5 million Perpetual Savings and Loan Association building (1960-1962) on Wilshire Boulevard in Beverly Hills (fig. 179).[130] Similarly, Arthur Oscar Hanisch (1895-1966) was so pleased with Stone's design for his Stuart Pharmaceutical Company—because it fulfilled every expectation from an operational standpoint and because it continuously attracted visitors from all over the world—that he helped Stone obtain two other Pasadena commissions: the Beckman Auditorium and the Carmelita Cultural Center (1960; unbuilt).[131]

Stone was able to attract such clients in part because he created a publicity director position in his office, filled by at least three people: his second wife, Maria between 1957 and about 1964; Hank Brennan between June 1964 and December 1965; and Gerre Jones between 1967 and November 1968.[132] But it was Maria, his wife of eleven years, who was the most vested and is the best remembered of the three.[133] As wife, muse, and publicist—none of the three mutually exclusive—Maria reportedly

---

[130] Douglas Haskell, memorandum to staff, September 8, 1960, Haskell Papers and Edward Durell Stone to Arthur O. Hanisch, April 25, 1960, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 77, file 25.

[131] Arthur Hanisch to Edward Durell Stone, October 16, 1958, Stone Papers. See also Stone to Hanisch, July 15 and August 18, 1960, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 77, files 28 and 29.

[132] See Francis Brennan to A. E. Jeffcoat, May 15, 1964; to Stone, April 27, 1965; and to Joseph Scarin, November 18, 1965, Brennan Papers.

[133] Maria Stone sued for a separation on November 23, 1964, which was legally granted on April 26, 1966. They received their divorce in Juarez, Mexico. See "Wife of Stone, Architect, Is Granted a Separation," *New York Times*, April 27, 1966 and "Divorced," Milestone, *Time*, May 6, 1966.

devoted herself to her husband's career "twenty-four hours around the clock."[134] "The gorgeous Maria," as Olgivanna Lloyd Wright called her, had a sharp, intuitive mind; keen eye; and charismatic personality—but was also frankly outspoken.[135] A talented writer in her own right, Maria was not only intimately involved in producing Stone's autobiography, *The Evolution of an Architect*, but also handled much of his correspondence (sometimes using a pseudonym).[136] What is more, she was responsible for effectively refining his image, for popularizing his name, and for cultivating his celebrity. In fact, according to one former employee, people in the Stone office said she was 90 percent of his success.[137]

Soon after they were married in June 1954, Maria concentrated on transforming her husband from country boy to courtly gentleman—dressed in a homburg and fur-collared coat over his Saville Row suit (fig. 180). Her shrewd manipulation of his public image masked his private feelings of inferiority, inner emptiness, and pathos as well as the towering rages he is known to have had.[138] As part of this effort, Maria was the only

---

[134] Radio TV Reports, *Girl Talk* transcript, WABC-TV, July 30, 1965, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 71, file 14.

[135] Wright, *Shining Brow*, 242. Maria Stone responded to Olgivanna Lloyd Wright on December 2, 1959 (Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 63, file 2), "I was very flattered with your comments on me. I readily see that you understand me and I'm happy you admire my frankness, because unfortunately a lot of people resent it."

[136] See Knickerbocker, Society, *New York Journal American*. In a letter to Olgivanna Wright of January 16, 1962, Maria said, "We are trying to finish the first book to be published on his work. I'm sure I don't have to tell you how time-consuming that is." (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 79, file 45).

[137] Raymond Gomez, interview by the author, September 23, 2004.

[138] Robert Stone, interview with the author, September 25, 2004 and Francis Brennan to Edward Durell Stone, April 27, 1965, Brennan Papers.

one who helped him to stop drinking, which he had unsuccessfully attempted five years earlier (although she was never able to completely dispel his reputation for drinking).[139] Not surprisingly, Stone attributed both his personal and professional renaissance to Maria: "I was like Rip Van Winkle, asleep in the hills, until I came down and Maria brought me back to life," he said.[140] The transformation did not go unnoticed: Whereas Jones crassly stated, "Overnight Stone changed from a man his acquaintances described as 'an unmade bed, a kind of one-man slum' into a somewhat sheepish figure of elegance," Senator Fulbright more eloquently observed that Maria had brought "a gracious order" into Stone's life as well as "intensified his unique creative power."[141] But friends and colleagues grumbled when she encouraged him to use his full name, as Wright did: Walter Kilham recalled, "His wife was ambitious for her husband. No longer plain Ed, he became the noted architect Edward Durell Stone, going on to fame and fortune."[142] In a more recent recollection, Huxtable remembered, somewhat resentfully, that Stone's life came together "with the help of a new wife and helpmate, who informed me that he was to be referred to henceforth, in anything I wrote, as Edward Durell Stone. Thus began the new persona and second career of Edward Durell Stone."[143]

As a duo, Stone was the talent, his wife was the glamour; he was a likeable guy who could sell just about anything; she was savvy about business with a knack for self-

---

[139] Edward Durell Stone to George Howe, August 19, 1949, Stone Papers, 1st acc.

[140] "More Than Modern."

[141] Jones, *Architecture: Today and Tomorrow*, 14 and J. William Fulbright, "Fayetteville's Ed Stone: A Giant on America's Cultural Stage," *Northwest Arkansas Times*, November 12, 1962.

[142] Kilham, "Journeys in Two Worlds."

[143] Huxtable, "Lollypop Building."

promotion. She helped him use the prime media of the day to promote himself, and Stone came to depend on her unrelenting support. Virginia Graham, the host of the television show *Girl Talk*, described an awards dinner for Stone that she once attended: "He looked over at Maria as he finished each thought as if to say, 'Is that all right, how am I doing?' Maria would look up "smiling and nodding as though to say, 'That's fine dear, you're doing just great.'"[144]

When a young bride Maria was mesmerized with the media attention, writing to Haskell in 1954:

> I want to thank you heartily for doing such a good publicity job on me. I never realized my fame until tonight at Perry Prentice's party, where I heard the "oh's, ah's" about the girl whose picture was in *Architectural Forum*. I suddenly realized that to many your magazine rivals the *Bible*. I feel just as heralded as I would have been on the cover of *Life* in the nude. So this girl on Page 41 [fig. 181] has now a claim to fame.[145]

In turn, the media became fascinated with Maria—her friends, clothes, interests, travel, and sense of style. She wrote to the interior designer Gladys Freeman, who as an employee of James Pendleton, Inc. Decorator, had decorated the Luces' Mepkin Plantation and was also decorations editor of *Town & Country*, "Have you read any of the *New York Journal American* articles each Sunday titled 'The Most Fascinating Women in

---

[144] G*irl Talk* transcript. Stone confidentially wrote about their relationship to her older sister, Universe, on December 6, 1963 (Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 1, file 8), "We both have temperaments and as I said to you, our life is a continuous soap opera which is strenuous but indispensable to my wellbeing."

[145] Maria Stone to Douglas Haskell, February 1954, Haskell Papers and People, *Architectural Forum* (September 1954), 41. While Maria was intriguing, she was also capable of repelling the editors at both *Architectural Record* and *Architectural Forum*, making them "furious" with seemingly unreasonable demands. See Haskell, memorandum to John Fistere, December 16, 1958, Haskell Papers and John Knox Shear, telegram to Edward Durell Stone, May 21, 1957, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 92, file 11.

N.Y?' Well, I am amused to say they have called and asked if they could do an article about me."[146]

As is often the case for celebrities, the media, especially the Luce magazines, were engrossed in the Stones' intense romance, first reported in *Architectural Forum* in September 1954, and then in their separation, which was eulogized in *Time* in December 1964:

> Stone's genius shone with a special brilliance, and they called the wind that fanned the flame Maria. For her he built one of his famed grillework facades on a $250,000 Manhattan townhouse "just as," she explained, "the Shah Jahan did the Taj Mahal in India for his wife." But the Taj Mahal, of course, is a tomb, and behind the Stone front ember day came as well.[147]

In fact, the pending divorce became such a favorite subject for gossip that Stone quipped to one friend that he picked up the *New York Daily News* as gingerly as he would a cobra.[148]

For decades, it has been publicly debated just how much sway Maria had on Stone and his aesthetic. The interviews that peers gave for his *Time* cover story invariably led to the question about whether Maria's input was subtle or insidious.[149] To be sure, Stone had often professed that Maria was his "great inspiration:" On one occasion he said her dark eyes and black hair made him think of the Medicis and the Borgias, the Roman

---

[146] Maria Stone to Gladys Freeman, n.d, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 62, file 1.

[147] People *Architectural Forum* (September 1954), 41and People, *Time*, December 4, 1964.

[148] Jacks, "Elegant Bohemian," 50 and Edward Durell Stone to Relman Morin, December 1965, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 3, file 6. Between November 1964 and April 1966, Alfred Albeli of the *New York Daily News* consistently reported on the failed marriage.

[149]The interviews were with Richard Marsh Bennett, Pietro Belluschi, Gordon Bunshaft, Thomas Church, J. William Fulbright, Robsjohn Gibbins, Joseph Hudnut, Philip Johnson, Lewis Webster (?) Jones, John McAndrew, Isamu Noguchi, Eero Saarinen, and Louis Skidmore. Unfortunately, Time Inc. would not grant permission to utilize this rich resource. I hope that someday the historical value of this file will be better understood and donated to the Stone Papers.

families "happiest in rich colors and the accumulated elegance of years;" and on another, "Maria's fine Italian hand began to show in my attire and my work: both began to move toward elegance (fig. 15). More marble floors, gold accents, fountains, lagoons, and courtyards crept into my designs."[150] While it is true, as Goldberger concluded in his *New York Times* obituary of Stone, that there was little doubt that Maria made clear "her preference for a more ornate architecture," skeptics have doubted that "after falling in love with Maria Elena Torch, Stone...completely abandoned his former severe architectural style," as Richard Horn wrote in *Fifties Style: Then and Now* (1985).[151] "Does, indeed, a sharp change in the style of a ranking architect occur so simply as that," another critic inquired?[152] Similarly, Winthrop Sargeant informed the *New Yorker* readers that "Stone has been around for a long time and was a fairly important figure in architecture well before he met her."[153] While the extent of Maria's influence may never be known, because of her ongoing support Stone's confidence soared, and he began to promote himself articulately and unabashedly: "The best in architecture has shifted from Western Europe to the United States, and I don't doubt that I share part of the responsibility for the shift," he boasted to a *New York Times* journalist in 1958.[154]

On the eve of the opening of the Brussels Exposition Stone learned about the enormous, and perhaps even limitless, advantages of television. Possessing the ability to

---

[150] McLendon, "Jet-Age Architect Stone;" Early, "Consulting Architect for National Cultural Center;" and Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 142.

[151] Goldberger, "Edward Durell Stone Services Will Be Held Tomorrow" and Richard Horn, *Fifties Style: Then and Now* (New York: Beech Tree Books, 1985), 130.

[152] Walton Green, review of *Evolution of an Architec*t, *AIA Journal* 40 (November 1963): 73.

[153] Sargeant, "From Sassafras Branches."

[154] "U.S. Pavilion Architect to Build 'Trade Temple'."

expose, dramatize, and popularize, television was fast becoming a powerful tool not just because it could reach a mass audience but because it could organize individuals around centralized ideas. Stuart Ewen explained in *All Consuming Images* that television "was the cornerstone of suburban panopticism" by which people were given a common experience.[155] By 1963 more than 43 million American homes had at least one television, each of which was turned on for 5¼ hours a day.[156] While Stone appeared on such regional talk shows as *Eye on New York* and *Horizons* in New York City and *Sam Yorty* in Los Angeles, it was his appearances on national television shows such as *Merv Griffin* and the *Today Show* that had a far-reaching impact.[157]

A far more select audience could be cultivated in speaking engagements, but Stone refused many more invitations than he accepted. To respond to the requirements of a particular group, he generally pasted together his various ideas presented in previous talks, one of his favorites being the nine "Stone's Don'ts" (somewhat reminiscent of Le Corbusier's Five Points of Architecture). Geared towards the non-professional, they were entertaining and anecdotal, quotable and memorable. For example, the third on his list was Don't Be Modern:

> Being modern simply consists of closing your mind to twenty-five hundred years of Western culture and proving yourself content to copy the next-door neighbor's glass building, house, chair, draperies and poodle clip. I have two tests by which you can readily determine whether you are modern or not. If you prefer a bent chrome chair to a rocker or a Cadillac to a horse-drawn carriage, you need

---

[155] Ewen, *All Consuming Images*, 231.

[156] Bensman and Rosenberg, *Mass, Class, and Bureaucracy*, 333-334.

[157] Warren Wallace to Edward Durell Stone, June 8, 1959, Stone Papers; "'Horizons' to Join WCBS Talk Shows," *New York Times*, September 28, 1964; and a recording of *The Sam Yorty Show*, August 20, 1967, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 139. A transcript of the *Merv Griffith Show*, May 28, 1965, is also in the Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 72, file 5. Stone appeared on the *Today Show* a number of times, including February 2, 1966.

> therapy. It doesn't hurt pulp writers to know Shakespeare, and remember that Chippendale was handy with wood. [158]

Importantly, most of the "Stone Don'ts" were neutral and open-ended and thus did not offend potential new clients. His approach was to use indirect persuasion by first drawing the audience in through his fame and charisma. When he gave an address in 1963 for his client Joyce Hall (1891-1982), founder of Hallmark Cards, at a conference in Kansas City, Missouri, the slides were shown only after he had offered his "Stone Don'ts." In essence, he first sold himself and then his product.[159]

This is not to say that Stone did not impart his opinions about the American landscape or what he considered good design. But he did so with such ingenuity that it was difficult not to be impressed, as Haskell was when he informed his *Architectural Forum* staff in 1957 that Stone was "delivering talks to every kind of Lion's Club, Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce groups etc. that he can reach out [to]." Stone's "classically simple" methodology—to juxtapose "the colonnades of Bernini, the cathedral squares of the Île de France, the open spaces of Paris, in short the great places that architecture has produced in other ages, against the quick, cheap, temporary places we produce"—so impressed Haskell that he thought the lecture could easily be re-created as "one of the most powerful pieces of journalism for the *Forum*," concluding that "this in journalism

---

[158] The other "Stone Don'ts" are: Don't work too hard; Beware of progress; Go to bat for beauty; Don't fall in love with your first idea; Don't get in trouble; Don't be a money changer in the temple; Don't talk back to your wife; and Don't be too worthwhile.

[159] Stone, Address Given at the NAEA Conference.

would be the equivalent of Masefield's famous poem about the stately Spanish galleons and the dirty little boat, etc. etc."[160]

Of course a positive spin was given to the Stone image whenever an opportunity presented itself. In response to a request in 1963 to review the entry on architecture by the historian Albert Bush-Brown (1926-1994) for the *World Book Encyclopedia*, Stone said that the section on modern architecture was not particularly enlightening or objective, but he nonetheless made sure that his name was included in the list of fifteen modern architects who had made substantial twentieth-century contributions.[161] Moreover, he deleted architects he felt had not made a lasting impact, among them, Richard Neutra (1892-1970)—whom he felt only emulated Mies van der Rohe and Le Corbusier—and Eero Saarinen, whom he said had first been a disciple of Mies and then became derivative of Pier Luigi Nervi (1891-1979): "His contribution to many of us in the profession," his letter to the editor said, "is very questionable."[162] (Given all the competitions and/or commissions Stone had lost to Saarinen, one wonders if professional jealousy played a part in his comment.)

Stone recognized that the ever-increasing selection of publications about architecture, art, and design were capable of transforming architecture into an article of

---

[160] Douglas Haskell, memorandum to staff, September 13, 1957, Haskell Papers. The poem to which he was referring was "Cargoes" by John Masefield (1878-1967).

[161] Edward Durell Stone to Mr. Whitney, March 15, 1963 and Comments on "Architecture" for the *World Book*, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 6, file 19; and in *The World Book Encyclopedia* (1960), s. v. "Architecture," the list included: Henry Hobson Richardson, Daniel Burnham, Eliel Saarinen, Greene & Greene, Louis Sullivan, Stanford White, Charles McKim, Mies van der Rohe, Walter Gropius, Le Corbusier, Alvar Aalto, Frank Lloyd Wright, Edward Durell Stone, Pier Luigi Nervi, and Buckminster Fuller.

[162] Interestingly, in 1971 Stone agreed to write Neutra's obituary in *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Letters and the National Institute of Arts and Letters* 21 (1971): 81-83.

consumption that could circulate around the world as if it had no mass and volume.[163] He also knew that when his name was attached, his reputation was instantly boosted. Thus, he was greatly interested in the print media. The themes of the articles he wrote were accessible to everyone—simple, familiar, and understandable, appealing more to the emotions than to the intellect.[164] In the more than fifty examples surveyed, Stone made little mention of his buildings or projects; instead he espoused his own aesthetic agenda with emphasis given to urban planning, the environment, and historic preservation: "I find that I am not a lone nostalgic sentimentalist, but only one of a highly vocal, anti-progress group," he wrote in 1962.[165] The tone of his articles was homiletic, yet they carried brief, punchy messages expressive of his ideas or impressions. In one of his most memorable articles, "The Case Against the Tailfin Age," Stone proclaimed that the automobile tailfin exemplified the vulgarity of standardized mass production—in clothing, cooking, and the mechanized home—its dogmatic superficiality having taken the place of individual expression.[166] "Beware of progress" was another proclamation, a warning not to give up something worthwhile from past days for something new but less attractive.[167] While at first it might appear as if Stone was demoralizing the very consumer culture to which he owed his success, such statements were created with an eye toward the greater goal of replacing International Style modernism with his personal,

---

[163] Beatriz Colomina, *Privacy and Publicity*, 43.

[164] Bensman and Rosenberg, *Mass, Class and Bureaucracy*, 338.

[165] Edward Durell Stone, "Progress: Spare That Building!" *Harpers Bazaar*, May 1962.

[166] Stone, "The Case Against the Tailfin Age."

[167] Ibid.

decorative aesthetic, which he hoped would be viewed like Wright's prairie school, as a formal, long-lasting school of architecture.

In 1961 Stone was approached by two book publishers, Alfred A. Knopf and McGraw-Hill, even though he already had two book manuscripts in the works.[168] The first, "The American Landscape," largely made up of articles he had written, was a diatribe on the environmental condition of the United States with remedies for correcting the careless despoiling of our architectural heritage, but it was cancelled by E. P. Dutton in 1962, perhaps because of a change in editors.[169] The other, his autobiography, *The Evolution of an Architect* (fig. 8) was published in 1962 by Horizon Press under the direction of Ben Raeburn, whom Stone had met through Wright.[170] Although filled with superlative prose, *The Evolution of an Architect* describes Stone's life, architecture, and ideas. With more than 470 illustrations, the written text comprises less than 20 percent of the 287 pages. Still the most comprehensive source about Stone, the autobiography was also his most ambitious promotional tool. As a narrative rather than a theoretical work, it was intended to be compellingly attractive to the mass audience. In fact, marketing notes in the Stone Papers propose that Stone and/or his book be introduced on three popular

---

[168] Henry Robbins to Edward Durell Stone, July 13, 1961; Robbins, memorandum to Alfred A. Knopf, Alfred A. Knopf collection, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin; and M. Joseph Dooher to Stone, July 28, 1961, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 92, file 12. Robbins, the editor of Knopf, said that Stone's *New York Herald Tribune* article, "America—The Not So Beautiful" of July 12th had prompted him to write. Also at this time Maria Stone wrote a novel "pretty much patterned after Edward," called "Not in Lone Splendor," which still has not been published (see McLendon, "Jet-Age Architect Stone"). Stone was subsequently approached by Beacon Press to write about his "attitudes toward architecture," but he declined (Stone to Arnold C. Tovell, July 16, 1964, Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 2, file 7).

[169] Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 92, file 1.

[170] Edward Durell Stone to Ben Raeburn, May 23, 1961, Stone Papers, 1st. acc., box 78, file 37. Horizon had been Wright's publisher since 1953. Stone had originally asked G. E. Kidder Smith to write the book for him in a letter of September 23, 1960 (Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 77.).

television shows: *The Price is Right*, *Concentration*, and Johnny Carson's *Tonight Show*.[171] An advertisement for the book in the *Los Angeles Times* not only boldly proclaimed that Stone was "America's Most Famous Architect," but a testimonial endorsement by Fred Winship of United Press International proclaimed that "the Golden Age of Stone has only started."[172] The similarly hyped flyleaf, as well as a more extensive advertisement in the *New York Times* (fig. 182), invited readers to witness "the miracle" of the creation of "romantically beautiful structures" and to learn about the "life which may be said in itself to be an American work of art."[173]

The autobiography served as a fundamental approach for Stone to style himself as one of America's foremost architects. He may well have modeled his book on Wright's autobiography of 1932 (which, in turn, had been influenced by Sullivan's *Autobiography of an Idea* of 1924), which was also framed as a heroic story of overcoming overwhelming adversities.[174] According to Neil Levine in *The Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright* (1996), Wright's autobiography utilized the narrative structure of a fairy tale, and it has therefore been perceived as antithetical to modernism—coercive, moralizing, and manipulative as opposed to the denotative and axiomatic modes of the more scientific approach.[175] As a nostalgic, highly personal recollection, Stone followed

---

[171] Notes from a meeting between Martial & Co. and Raeburn, October 31, 1962.

[172] Display ad for *Evolution of an Architect* in the *New York Times*, December 12, 1962. In a telephone interview with the author in January 2005, Fred Winship said that he did not remember the endorsement

[173] Display ad.

[174] See "Excerpts from *An Autobiography*," in Levine, *Architecture of Wright*, 192-193 and Frank Lloyd Wright, *An Autobiography* (London: Faber and the Hyperion Press, 1945).

[175] Levine, *Architecture of Wright*, 431 and 433.

the format of Wright, in particular his first edition.[176] The first of three parts described his formative years and early career in the International Style; the second, the cross-country trip that awakened him to indigenous work and talent, especially Wright's, and his own residential work of the 1940s and 1950s; and the third, and most extensive, discusses his mostly large, institutional, government or corporate buildings, beginning with the embassy in New Delhi and ending with the State University of New York in Albany. The third part also provides the now legendary "moving account," as an advertisement described it, "of his meeting with the fascinating Maria, who became the inspiring force in his life."[177] On page 137 of *Evolution of an Architect* Stone wrote:

> In 1953 my life took a new and—as it turned out—highly significant turn. On a night flight from Idlewild to Paris my seat-mate turned out to be a tiny, spectacular brunette beauty, and as the trans-Atlantic night wore on I found her to be the brightest and most captivating young woman I had ever met….We formed a mutual admiration society during the night, and as dawn broke over the English Channel I proposed to her. I pleaded my case for a week while I squired her around Paris and postponed the project which had brought me to Europe. Eleven months later we were married.

This narrative has been recounted in every major piece written about Stone—including the *Time* cover story, the Goldberger obituary, and Tom Wolfe's *From Bauhaus to Our House* (1981).[178] Even at a recent fundraiser to support the preservation of the Gallery of Modern Art building, a respected architectural historian inquired upon seeing Maria, "Is that the airplane wife?" confirming that the story still has strong promotional value. According to Lull in *Media, Communication, Culture*, such narratives are not only imperative to promotion but are basic to our culture. They help people to empathize with

---

[176] Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 15.

[177] Display ad.

[178] "More Than Modern;" Goldberger, "Stone, Dead at 76;" and Wolfe, *From Bauhaus to Our House*, 85.

the subject and understand his or her values, and by extension connect them to their own emotions and imagination.[179] Thus, the story of the Stone's first romantic encounter reinforced the portrayal of Stone as a romantic architect.

In "Recent American Architecture Camp–Non Camp," Jencks argued that stories epitomize camp, or kitsch, and to exemplify his point he used a story of how Maria rescued from the wastebasket a sketch on "a coffee-stained Manila envelope" (illustrated on page 183 of the autobiography; fig. 183) that became the basis for the final design of Stone's embassy in New Delhi.[180] The narrative's "optimistic mood of fast change and exciting news flash," Jencks claimed, make it camp: "One can almost feel the electric excitement rip off the page: 'new grill work by Ed Stone changes course of Modern Architecture.'"[181] Whether or not the story merits camp identity is not as significant as the fact that its superficiality cannot be denied. Gerre Jones, Stone's third publicity director, explained in *How to Market Professional Design Services* (1973) that "certain nonbelievers caballed to spread the word that the envelope shown in the book was only a carefully prepared reconstruction of the original, which had gone the way of all airplane waste many years before."[182] Nonetheless, he explained, Stone got much mileage out of the story, and it contributed to the book as an inspiring success story that could be easily

---

[179] Lull, *Media, Communication, Culture*, 169.

[180] "More Than Modern" and Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 138.

[181] Jencks, *Modern Movements in Architecture*, 203.

[182] Jones, *How to Market Professional Design Services*, 56.

understood by "every red-blooded American boy or girl," as architecture historian Albert Christ-Janer (1910-1973) astutely observed.[183]

But while the narrative approach appealed to the general reader, it undermined the book's critical assessment. "One looks in vain for the deeper roots" of the Stone aesthetic, a critic complained in *Architectural Forum*.[184] Even Stone's former employee Richard Snibbe confessed in his review that Stone revealed "very few of his ideas…in the field of architectural theory."[185] The book also produced strong reactions from Stone's antagonists, among them Hilton Kramer, who wrote in the *Nation*, "If, as is the case with the present reviewer, you can only regard Stone as a flashy, flowery, overestimated designer of unreal structures, then nearly everything in this book will reinforce your view."[186] Thus, *The Evolution of an Architect* was an effective vehicle for Stone to construct and popularize his identity for a broad, middle-class audience but not for his peers or critics.

According to Stone, Maria had "insisted" he write the autobiography, which he dedicated to her "with love." Correspondence in the Stone Papers confirms she actively participated in the writing of the book and thus was effective in determining what would make fascinating, general reading.[187] Maria was also exceedingly proficient in making

---

[183] Albert Christ-Janer, "The Master Builders: Building on the Wright Foundation," *Saturday Review*, February 2, 1963.

[184] Review, *Architectural Forum* 118 (January 1963): 121.

[185] Richard W. Snibbe, "Search for a Personal Style," *Progressive Architecture* 44 (July 1963): 168.

[186] Hilton Kramer, "Art Books of 1962: Part I," Books on the Arts, *Nation* 195 (December 15, 1962): 428.

[187] See Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 142.

available narratives to appropriate publicity sources. For example, after their visit with Wright on July 28, 1955, she immediately sent off a letter to *Architectural Forum*:

> As an avid reader of the *Forum* I wish to pass on to you something you might consider newsworthy. Last Thursday afternoon in the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco, Frank Lloyd Wright entertained Edward and I for tea in his hotel suite. Since the old gentleman is so maligned for never paying a fellow architect a compliment, you and all his followers will be amused to hear that Mr. Wright saw Edward's design for the U.S. Embassy in last months *Forum* and he just raved! He said it was one of the most beautiful buildings he had ever seen.
> "Its more beautiful than the Taj Mahal," he exclaimed, "and I intend to say so many times. Why if I had had the project to design, I would have done it the same way."
>
> Mr. Wright continued to say that Edward was a brilliant young (younger than Frank Lloyd Wright by thirty years) architect with a rich and great future. Stating that the Taj Mahal had been built by Shah Jahan for his beloved wife, Mr. Wright with a twinkle in his eye remarked that they should call the embassy in New Delhi the 'Taj Maria' (for you know whom) since the building was designed while we were on our honeymoon travelling around the world. Edward was deeply moved by Mr. Wright's statement, and I promptly asked if I could quote him, he said, by all means."[188]

This story, which Stone later claimed to an associate was absolutely true, was first published in the *Palo Alto Times* in a story headlined "Its News When Wright Lauds an Architect" and thereafter in other publications.[189] In fact, even Ed Sullivan commented on his television show that Stone "effected the lavish praise of Frank Lloyd Wright for the magnificent United States Embassy at New Delhi."[190]

---

[188] Maria Stone to Douglas Haskell, August 1, 1955, Haskell Papers.

[189] Edward D. Stone to Stanley Torkelson, August 5, 1955, Stone Papers and "Its News When Wright Lauds an Architect," August 3, 1955. Wright's visit was also confirmed in a letter that John Hill, one of Stone's California associates, sent to Jacks, which is quoted on page 23 of "Elegant Bohemian." In addition, an undated Time Inc. memorandum to Haskell from Arthur David Pieper (1928-1997) states, "Thought you would like this from Frank Lloyd Wright: 'Now concerning the Edward Durell Stone Embassy building in New Delhi: here we see a genuine credit to American Architecture.' For publication if you like," (Haskell Papers). Pieper was a former apprentice of Wright, was married to his daughter Iovanna, and was an associate editor of *House & Home* between 1954 and 1955.

[190] *Ed Sullivan Show*, SOFA Entertainment, February 2, 1958.

It was also newsworthy when Wright spoke out in favor Stone again: the *New York Times* reported that he congratulated Stone on the United States Pavilion in Brussels, exclaiming, "That young man shows promise," and the Stone cover story in *Time* recounted Wright's visit to Stone's remodeled New York City brownstone. As he eyed "the house with a connoisseur's discrimination, Wright said: 'You know, Ed, we'll have to trade details.' Then in an astonished voice, he added: 'Listen to me, I'm raving. And they say that old crank never has a kind word to say about anything. But I'm raving.'"[191]

Admittedly, Wright and Stone clearly shared similar ideas about architecture, with Stone clearly being stimulated by Wright's example, especially his later, more decorative phase of work. But although Stone believed Wright to be "the greatest architect in history" and that no modern architect could take a pencil in hand without subconsciously paying homage to him, Stone did not view Wright as his mentor, nor himself as one of Wright's disciples.[192] Their mutually affectionate relationship of twenty-five years (fig.

---

[191] "Innovating Architect: Edward D. Stone," *New York Times*, April 18, 1958 and "More Than Modern." Stone in turn buttressed Wright: In 1957 he wrote William Hughes, the FBO director, suggesting that Wright be retained for one of the embassy projects: "He is hurt that the United States has never called upon him to design a building. This is a sad situation and I think that it should be corrected" (Edward Durell Stone to William Hughes, May 1, 1957, Wright Foundation). Wright replied to Stone on July 29, 1957 (Wright Foundation): "But Ed, the case is more simple than it seems. The gang now up on 'modern' is a blight from managed publicity which is all government can know even if it wanted to know more. So let's continue the good times we have and try to forget mediocrity in high places." And in 1959 he wrote to Harry Frank Guggenheim (1890-1971), president of the Guggenheim Foundation, defending Wright's plan of the great interior space of the Guggenheim Museum, then under construction: "The purity of the vertical, structural supports which thread through the various floors and are terminated in the ceiling lantern are a vital part of the whole conception, and if modified, the structural integrity and beauty of the building would be impaired" (Edward Durell Stone to Harry Frank Guggenheim, January 20, 1959, Wright Foundation). A copy of the letter was sent to Wright with a note: "Dear Mr. Wright. I hope this is helpful. Ed."

[192] Quoted in Christ-Janer, "The Master Builders;" Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 90; Stone, "Frank Lloyd Wright: A Tribute to a Personal Hero," *Pacific Architect & Builder* 66 (March 1960): 20; and "E. D. Stone, With Billion of Current Construction, Wins Acclaim As First Global Architect," *Omaha (NE) World Herald*, July 31, 1966.

[192] Mary Burns to Barbara B. Freeman, January 24, 1963, Stone Papers, 1st acc., box 6, file 17.

184), which also involved their wives—documented with cables and letters acknowledging birthdays, book launches, gifts, and recent visits—was obviously grounded in their shared disdain for the International Style as well as their respect for each other's effort to offer alternatives.[193] On the occasion of the publication of his *Testament* (1957) Wright confided to Stone, "as one great individualist to another," about a review by Hitchcock: "How did you like seeing my work reviewed by an internationalist?...Daughter Iovanna's comment—'Daddy, it smells bad right from the start.'"[194]

Wright and Stone were also both shrewd self-promoters (down to the use of all three of their names) and developed distinct personal styles (down to body and clothes), perhaps due to their exotic, artful wives. Their affinity ran even deeper, however, not only in certain aspects of their work, which included romanticism, ornamentalism, and historicism, but in their perceptions of themselves as lone pioneers from the frontier gifted with artistic genius, which they refused to compromise for academicism.[195]

Stone may well have turned to Wright as a role model for a famous architect who had cannily exploited the possible avenues of self-promotion. He learned his lessons

---

[193] The ongoing correspondence between the Wrights and Stones is in the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation and in the Stone Papers. Maria Stone stated in "Friends," in *About Wright: An Album of Recollections by Those Who Knew Frank Lloyd Wright*, ed. Edgar Tafel, 57-58 (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993) that when she had traveled to Taliesin East as a journalist for a four-day visit in 1954 to research an article called "A day in the life of Frank Lloyd Wright," he "explained to me about 'that foreign flavor' that was 'strangling the flow of expression' in the design schools and in the buildings being constructed around America. That 'International Style dogma,' as he called it, was being forced on us." She also said on page 56 that "his charisma was overwhelming. He was energetic and spirited. I was immediately drawn to him and knew that I was in the presence of a remarkable man." The admiration was mutual; in a letter to Stone written in November 1957 (Wright Foundation) Wright referred to her as "Santa Maria."

[194] Henry-Russell Hitchcock, "Architecture and the Architect," *New York Times*, November 17, 1957 and Wright to Stone, November 1957.

[195] See Levine, *Architecture of Wright*, 419-434.

well: Although steadfast in his loyalty to Wright, Stone valued publicity over privacy and publicized their friendship in lectures, interviews, and writings by repeating such engaging anecdotes as, "Another of my friends and personal heroes for almost thirty years, the late Frank Lloyd Wright, was fond of saying 'love your wife, love your work and tell the truth. That is all there is to life.'"[196] Stone also evaluated Wright's work according to his own values or interests; In an article for the *Saturday Review* entitled "Hero Prophet Adventurer" Stone highlighted those salient features of Wright that also informed his work. Among them were the large-scale cantilevers that "revolutionized architecture;" houses with horizontal planes that hugged the earth and nature; and towers raised skyward to express human aspiration rather than an eagerness to escape the world.[197] Similarly, on the opening of the Gallery of Modern Art Stone claimed that his spacious stairway with intermediate galleries was just as unique as Wright's continuous ramp in the Guggenheim Museum (which Stone considered "one of the architectural sensations of this country").[198]

After Wright's death in 1959, some saw Stone as his successor, a view promoted by the Stone office itself, judging by a letter signed by Maria's assistant:

---

[196] Edward Durell Stone, "Inside Fashion: For a Moratorium on Trivia," *New York Herald Tribune*, August 9, 1961. Also see Stone, *Evolution of an Architect*, 159.

[197] Stone, "Hero Prophet Adventurer." Stone's words were appreciated by Wright's sister, Maginel Wright Barney (1881-1966), who wrote to Stone on November 5, 1959: "I must tell you with what gratitude and delight I read your article about my brother…I knew he had admiration and affection for you too. It is so wonderful to have known an appreciation for him as understanding and eloquent as yours," (Stone Papers, 2nd acc., box 90, file 6). In 1967 the article was reproduced in a section labeled "Triumph" in the children's text book *The New Basic Readers: Challenges,* Book 8 (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1967), 454-463.

[198] "Hartford Modern" and Hall, "Directions in Modern Architecture." In the former article, the critic rebutted that Stone's museum lacked "the arrogant daring" of Wright's "spectacular spiral," concluding, "And this is proper."

> Mr. Stone has been one of the giants in architecture for over thirty years, and it is generally known that he is the only architect who can take Frank Lloyd Wright's place in American architecture….Mr. Stone is the only American architect of any great standing who is left and truly as indigenous and as rare as the American buffalo itself.[199]

The popular press endorsed this connection, with Blake Clark writing in *Reader's Digest*, "Some feel Stone inherited Wright's mantle as the country's greatest living architect—and with it some of Wright's prerogatives as leading critic of the American scene."[200] According to Boorstin in *The Image; or What Happened to the American Dream*, to desire a replacement for a lost hero is not unusual, and in many ways Stone seemed the logical candidate.[201] Like Wright, he was a proficient self-promoter and self-mythologizer who successfully positioned himself with the mass audience. And like Wright, he fulfilled the role of the twentieth-century celebrity architect—albeit imperfectly, as John Pastier, architecture critic of the *Los Angeles Times* between 1969 and 1975 recognized, observing, "Of course, few people think of the *Reader's Digest* as a cultural arbiter, and few of Stone's peers consider him a major architect."[202] Stone's former employee Snibbe also conjectured in *Progressive Architecture* in 1963, "Ed Stone will not fit Wright's shoes, and I think he knows this. The structural and technical inquisitiveness of Wright is not there, nor the interest in new form."[203] Hence, when

---

[199] Burns to Freeman, January 24, 1963.

[200] Blake Clark, "America's Unconventional Master Builder," *Reader's Diges*t, February 1965. Others noted that Stone was "the most quoted architect since the late Frank Lloyd Wright" and that "after the death of Frank Lloyd Wright, Stone more or less inherited the title of America's leading architect" (Tom Cameron, "Nailing It Down," *Los Angeles Times*, August 5, 1962 and Gerald Nachman, "Dean of Architects," Close-up, *New York Post*, September 21, 1964.)

[201] Boorstin, *The Image*, 70-72.

[202] John Pastier, "Architects: Their Works and Worth," *Los Angeles Times*, January 17, 1971.

[203] Snibbe, "Search for a Personal Style."

Stone died in 1978 it was apparent, as Allan Temko observed in his *San Francisco Chronicle* obituary, that he had only "nearly" replaced his hero Wright "as the popular image of a great national architect."[204] Stone had failed to maintain the condition of greatness—because his aesthetic was transgressive and, more significantly, because it had been closely tied to popular taste. Using Boorstin's models, Wright is still a hero because he has grown more respected with each passing generation while Stone was only a celebrity (defined as someone always contemporary)—when his moment of success faded, he did too. Today few recognize that Stone was once considered alongside Wright. By aligning himself with contemporary middle-class tastes, which he resourcefully did via the mass media—ranging from television game and talk shows and radio interviews to children's textbooks, inspirational testaments, and corporate advertisements—he became a great celebrity. But at the same time he virtually guaranteed his own later obsolescence; when his aesthetic no longer responded to the *Zeitgeist*, he passed out of fashion.[205]

---

[204] Allan Temko, "The Legacy of Edward Durell Stone," *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 21, 1978.

[205] Jencks, *Modern Movements in Architecture*, 192.

Conclusion

On November 26, 2006, in his third *New York Times* Op Ed article that addressed the former Gallery of Modern Art building by Edward Durell Stone at Two Columbus Circle, the popular writer Tom Wolfe (fig. 185) continued to bemoan the decision made by New York City's Landmarks Preservation Commission not to hold a hearing for the building in spite of "an incredible uprising of scholars, world-renowned architects, deans of art and architecture at the great universities, mega-wattage art worldings—the greatest massing of cultural luminaries in a single cause since the anti-fascist crusades of the 1930s!"[1] Those in favor of a hearing, he counted, included two eminent architectural historians, nine deans and graduate program directors, an urban studies scholar and theorist, three chief architectural critics of the *New York Times*, the former board president of the Museum of Modern Art, and three former chairmen of the landmarks commission in addition to an elite lineup of architects, the most highly respected preservation societies at city, state, and national levels, and a petition signed by fifty artists.

Never has there been such an organized effort to evaluate the work of Edward Durell Stone (fig. 187) a premier mid-twentieth-century architect—remembered in his *New York Times* obituary as someone who was more satisfied in knowing that "every taxi driver in New York will tell you...his favorite building" is by Stone than in pleasing the "architectural *cognoscenti*."[2] In the interest of success (measured as much by media attention as the actual buildings themselves) after working in the International Style—his first attempt being the

---

[1] Tom Wolfe, "The (Naked) City and the Undead," Op-Ed, *New York Times*, November 26, 2006. Wolfe had earlier written two other *New York Times* Op-Ed pieces in support of the Columbus Circle building: "The Building That Isn't There," October 12, 2003 and "The Building That Isn't There, Cont'd," October 13, 2003.

[2] Goldberger, "Edward Durell Stone Services Will Be Held Tomorrow."

Richard H. Mandel house; his zenith being the Museum of Art (figs. 41 and 67)—Stone transgressed the basic principles of modernism by creating his own modern aesthetic, which he applied in numerous variations throughout the remainder of his forty-year career, achieving widespread popular approval but critical dismissal.

This conflict was reignited in the debate that transpired over the controversial redesign of Stone's Two Columbus Circle building, revealing that the architecture of Stone still cannot be accommodated in the history of modern architecture (even though its definitions are now more inclusive than ever before). For the texts do not take into consideration the fact that Stone's architecture perfectly matched public expectation by grasping the salient characteristics of the postwar culture and articulating them in an aesthetic representing that historical moment. His architecture responded to a demand for more variation, individual expression, and the conveyance of American democratic values—in essence an architecture that reflected a consumer-driven, capitalistic society. His designs were provocative by refuting established modern formats, especially the glass box for which Stone held much contempt and incorporating such features as feminine details, monumentality, and ornamentation, all considered anathema to the avant-garde but welcomed by the middle class whose new fortunes were being spent on building construction.

Current histories also do not allow for the unprecedented tastemaking influence of the mass communication systems—particularly television and print—which exploded during Stone's professional tenure. Were it not for the mass media, Americans would not have had access to such work as his American Pavilion at the Exposition Universelle et Internationale Bruxelles, 1958 (fig. 19). On account of the United States government's impressive publicity

campaign to promote American participation, the public was exposed to his fantasy pavilion at all levels of viewing and reading, making Stone an instant celebrity. Shortly thereafter, his fame was reinforced by the international acclaim of his American Embassy in New Delhi, India (fig. 23). Subsequently, under the direction of his second wife, Maria, Stone succeeded in tenaciously pursuing the media on his own. His reputation as a star architect lasted as long as he was willing to play by the rules—supplying the media with new and stimulating materials about his architecture, ideas, and lifestyle. At first the press was intrigued and the public elated over Stone's new "romantic" aesthetic, the outstanding feature being the perforated grille that functioned in partnership with the glazed curtain wall. After being introduced on the American Embassy chancery in New Delhi, Stone began to modify it for other project requirements by treating the grille as a reproducible commodity (fig. 186), Stone showed an awareness of the current pop art sensibility (and especially the quintessential pop artist Andy Warhol who said, "I like things to be exactly the same over and over again"). But when Stone continued to refashion aspects of his mid-century aesthetic decades after its original conceptualization and market it as a "movement" or "school of architecture," he lost the attention of the media, as well as other American tastemakers such as the Museum of Modern Art, and henceforth the public too.[3]

It is fitting that Tom Wolfe has most consistently endorsed Stone's position on modernism. The flamboyant New Journalism style (non-fiction told like a novel) of his 1981 bestseller *From Bauhaus to Our House*, enabled Wolfe to posthumously resurrect the public persona and narratives that Stone and his publicity-savvy wife had consciously fashioned. By calling Stone an "Apostle" for renouncing the fundamental principles of modernism, Wolfe

[3] Edward Durell Stone & Associates Marketing Booklet, New York City, c. 1971.

challenged those who established or clung closely to strict modernist tenets as he brought Stone back into the limelight.[4] While architecture critics, ranging from Robert Hughes at *Time* to Michal Sorkin at the *Nation*, panned Wolfe's discourse, the public disagreed: Introduced in late October 1981, by mid-November the book was already in its fourth printing, and about a month later it was reported that 110,000 copies were in print.[5] The response could not be ignored by the architectural press: in December of that year *Progressive Architecture* noted that "the short little book" had "caused… a stir in the architectural world," and by February 1982 *Architectural Record* claimed that it had "generated more public attention than any other book on architecture in recent years."[6]

Even though over-dramatized (as well as not altogether accurate), in his book Wolfe successfully recaptured Stone's predilection for luxurious decoration, which "catered to the Hog-stomping Baroque exuberance of American civilization" but not to Stone's own fraternity with whom Stone was considered "poison." After Stone had embarked on his personal stylistic journey, Wolfe explained, "he was beyond serious consideration. He had removed himself from the court. He was out of the game." But, as Wolfe sagely reminded readers, it was Stone's professional prestige that collapsed, not his flourishing business.[7]

Wolfe's implication—that an aesthetic "wholly unique or specifically American in spirit" can not receive critical acclaim if it is not originated by the avant-garde—echoes the

---

[4] Wolfe, *From Bauhaus to Our House*, 88.

[5] "White Gods and Cringing Natives: Tom Wolfe's Look at Architecture Gets It Half Right," *Time*, October 19, 1981; Michal Sorkin, "Wolfe at the Door," Books & The Arts, *Nation* 14 (October 1981): 445 and 447; Edwin McDowell, "Publishing: Anatomy of An Author," *New York Times*, November 13, 1981; and Tony Schwartz, "Tom Wolfe: The Great Gadfly," Magazine Desk, *New York Times*, December 20, 1981.

[6] David A. Greenspan, "Right Again? Books, *Progressive Architecture* 62 (December 1981): 106 and Bradford Perkins, "Who Should Be Afraid of Tom Wolfe?" *Architectural Record* 170 (February 1982), 86.

[7] Ibid., 85-86, 89 and 92.

Greenbergian theory postulating there can be no positive exchange between high art and the mass culture, the relationship between the two being one of "relentless refusal."[8] This exclusionary stance has most often been assumed by critics and scholars as they reviewed Stone's architecture. But what they seemed to overlook is that through his architecture, Stone was making an effort to destabilize the hostile barrier between the high modernism of the avant-garde and the quotidian social, economical, and political concerns of the middle class. Stone offered an alternative by integrating popular cultural ideas and forms with modern strategies. Some have declared his architecture as kitsch, using the traditional notion of kitsch as "bad taste."[9] But if Stone's architecture is surveyed according to the structure established by Susan Sontag in "Notes on 'camp'" (1964), it can not only be argued that kitsch provided the vocabulary that enabled Stone to bring modernism to the middle class, but also, as Andreas Huyssen claimed in *The Great Divide*, that "the working of Kitsch into art can indeed result in high-quality works."[10]

While Stone's architecture is a distinct statement about the aspects of modernism with which he was most dissatisfied, it is not "anti-modern," nor an outward rejection of the International Style as so many have contended. Rather, Stone offered a new set of relations in modern architecture, which he was able to achieve due to his early Beaux-arts training in which he learned how to devise simple, straightforward solutions using clean, geometric forms complemented by ideas absorbed from cultural or traditional surroundings. His architecture exposed the anxieties of the critics, who feared their modernist positions were

---

[8] Crow, "Modernism and Mass Culture," 239.

[9] See Dorfles, *Kitsch: The World of Bad Taste.*

[10] Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, ix.

being overwhelmed by the middle-class consumption of postwar capitalism. Moreover, it successfully responded to and embodied the mid-twentieth-century American ideals that high modernist dogma failed to sufficiently fulfill.

Bibliography

Archives

Alfred A. Knopf Collection, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

American Federation of Arts Records. Archives of American Art/Smithsonian, Washington, D.C.

American Institute of Architects Archives, Washington, D.C.

Ames, Winslow, Papers. Archives of American Art/Smithsonian, Washington, D.C.

Architectural League of New York Records. Archives of American Art/Smithsonian, Washington, D.C.

Austin, A[rthur] Everett Jr., Papers. Wadsworth Athenaeum Museum of Art, Hartford, CT.

Barr, Alfred H., Papers. Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York City and Archives of American Art/Smithsonian, Washington, D.C.

Brennan, Francis Edwin, Papers. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations Records, United States Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Crowell-Collier Collection. Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library, New York City.

Foreign Building Operations Records, State Department, Jane C. Loeffler Collection, Washington, D.C.

Fulbright, J. William, Papers. Special Collections, University of Arkansas Libraries, Fayetteville, AR.

Gapp, Paul Papers. Manuscript Collection, Ohio University Libraries, Athens, OH.

Haskell, Douglas Putnam, Papers. Avery Drawings and Archives Collection, Columbia University, New York City.

Ingersoll Utility Unit Records. Alden B. Dow Archives, Midland, MI.

Jefferson Memorial Competition Records. Jefferson National Parks Association, St. Louis, MO.

John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts Building Records. Jarold A. Kieffer Collection, Fairfax, VA.

John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts Building Records. Kennedy Center Archives, Washington, D.C.

Lincoln Center Building Records. Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts Archives, New York City.

Luce, Clare Boothe, Papers. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Luce, Henry R., Papers. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Lynes, Russell, Papers. Archives of American Art/Smithsonian, Washington, D.C.

Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York City.

National Institute of Arts and Letters Archives. American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters, New York City.

New York Cultural Center Collection. Fairleigh Dickinson University Library, Madison, NJ.

Records of International Conferences, Commissions, and Expositions. National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.

Rockefeller, Abby Aldrich, Papers. Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

Rockefeller, Nelson A., Personal Projects and Cultural Interests. Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY.

Rockefeller Center Archives, New York City.

Rotch Travelling Scholarship Records. Manuscript Collection, Institute Archives and Special Collections, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries, Cambridge, MA.

Shepley, Henry R., Papers. Shepley Bulfinch Richardson and Abbott Archives, Boston, MA.

State Department Records. National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.

Stone, Edward Durell, Papers. Special Collections, University of Arkansas Libraries, Fayetteville, AR.

Stone, Edward Durell & Associates Records. Raymond Gomez Architect, New York City.

Student files. Office of the Registrar, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Student files. Office of the Registrar, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR.

Student files. Office of Student Services, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University and Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, MA.

Time Inc. Archives, New York City.

Two Columbus Circle Records. Landmarks West!, New York City.

Library Competition Records. Washington University Archives, St. Louis, MO.

Wright, Frank Lloyd, Papers. Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, Taliesin West, Scottsdale, AZ.

Primary Sources

Major Periodicals

Architectural Forum
Architectural Record
Fortune
Interiors
New York Herald Tribune
New York Times
Los Angeles Times
Progressive Architecture
Time

"Adaptive Reuse." *Builder and Developer* 13 (October 2003): 160-162.

"Airport Cities: Gateways to the Jet Age." *Time*, August 15, 1960.

"Alternative Elevations." *Architectural Review* 129 (February 1961): 81.

"And the Livin' Is Easy." *Saturday Review*, July 11, 1959.

Anderson, Harry V. "Edward Durell Stone: Architect." *Interior Design* 30 (May 1959): 79.

_____. "For Modern Living." *Decorators Digest* 5 (August 1935): 28-35 and 100.

_____. "Modernity," *Decorators Digest* 5 (August 1935): 25.

Andrews, Wayne. "Three Who Made the Monuments of Our Time." *New York Herald Tribune*, November 25, 1962.

"An Architect Goes East." *Newsweek*, November 17, 1958.

"Architect Stone in the Public Limelight." Limelight and Filigree. *Architectural Forum* 108 (April 1958): 77.

"Architecture at Brussels: Festival of Structure." *Architectural Record* 123 (June 1958): 163-170.

"An Architecture of Space and Grace." *Architectural Record* 122 (July 1957): 153-176.

"Art for Interiors." *Time*, October 5, 1953.

"Art Gallery." *Architecture International* 1 (1965): 78-83.

"Art In New Setting." *Interior Design* 35 (June 1964): 102-105, 171.

Art In Our Time: An Exhibition to Celebrate the Tenth Anniversary of the Museum of Modern Art And the Opening of Its New Building. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1939.

Atcheson, Richard. "Edward Durell Stone: Maker of Monuments." *Show*, March 1964.

Bagli, Charles V. "G.M. Building Sells for $1.4 Billion, A Record." *New York Times*, August 30, 2003.

Banham, Reyner. *Guide to Modern Architecture*. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1962.

Barr, Alfred H. Jr. "Is Modern Art Communistic?" *New York Times*, December 14, 1952.

_____. "'Tastemaking:' Mr. Barr of the Museum of Modern Art Files A General Demurrer." *New York Times*, September 25, 1960.

"Battlefronts." Art. *Time*, June 20, 1955.

Beale, Betty. "Edward D. Stone Discusses His Views On National Cultural Center in Capital." Exclusively Yours. *Washington Star*, July 17, 1959.

Belluschi, Pietro. "The Meaning of Regionalism in Architecture." *Architectural Record* 118 (December 1955): 131-139.

Bishop, Minor L. *Fountains in Contemporary Architecture*. New York: American Federation of Art, 1965.

Blake, Peter. "The Museum Explosion." *Art in America*, no. 2 (1964): 97-103.

Blumenthal, Ralph. "Cattle Display Draws Many in the Field." *New York Times*, September 12, 1966.

Borsick, Helen. "Art for Whose Sake? Critics Do Battle," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, November 29, 1964.

Bourdon, David, "N.Y. Museum Crisis: Two Bite Dust." *Art in America* 63 (September/ October 1975): 37-39.

Boyd, Robin. "The Counter-Revolution in Architecture." *Harper's Magazine*, September, 1959.

_____. "Decoration Rides Again." *Architectural Record* 122 (September 1957): 183-186.

Bradley, John A. "Many Structural Feats Are Accomplished In Remodeling of the Victoria Theatre." *New York Times*, October 31, 1948.

Brady, Thomas F. "U.S. Embassy in New Delhi Offers a Challenge." *New York Times*, March 20, 1963.

Brann, Donald R. "Here's A House You Can Build." *Los Angeles Times*, June 25, 1950.

Briefly Noted: General. *New Yorker* January 6, 1968.

Brock, H. I. "Architecture Styled 'International;' Its Principles Set Forth in Models Displayed in a New York Exhibition." *New York Times*, February 7, 1932.

"Brussels...A Special Report: Where East Meets West, The U.S. at the Fair." *Newsweek*, April 14, 1958.

"The Brussels Exhibition." *Architects' Journal* 127 (May 1958): 790-845.

Brussels Fair Designs." Projects. *Architectural Forum* 106 (February 1957): 35.

"Brussels '58: The United States Speaks to the World, Progress Report." *Interiors* 117 (September 1957): 128-141.

Buckley, Thomas. "Huntington Hartford's White Marble Tower Is Open." *New York Times*, March 22, 1964.

Burchard, John, and Albert Bush-Brown. *The Architecture of America: A Social and Cultural History*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.

Bureau of Overseas Building Operations of the Department of State. *Secretary of State's Register of Culturally Significant Property*. Publication 11192 (June 2005), Property No. X1001 (www.state.gov/documents/organization66242.pdf).

Burns, James T. "Edward Durell Stone? Who Ever Heard of a Book Called Edward Durell Stone?" Book Review. *Progressive Architecture* 49 (April 1968): 222.

Cameron, Tom. "Nailing It Down." *Los Angeles Times*, August 5, 1962.

Campbell, Edmund S. "French Comrades in America: Jacques Carlu." *Pencil Points* 7 (May 1926): 267-289.

Canaday, John. "Days Are Numbered For a White Elephant." *New York Times*, March 23, 1975.

_____. "Hartford Collection." Art. *New York Times*, March 17, 1964.

_____. “Hartford Names His Gallery Head.” *New York Times*, August 28, 1963.

“Candidates Named for U.S. London Embassy Design Contest.” People. *Architectural Forum* 103 (December 1955): 29

Carson, Ruth. “Collier’s Week-End House.” *Collier’s*, April 23, 1938.

_____. “Lights On!” *Collier’s*, September 14, 1940.

_____. “Living at Ease.” *Collier’s*, July 20, 1940.

_____. “We Furnish the House.” *Collier’s*, August 10, 1940.

_____. “What’s a Garden For?” *Collier’s*, April 11, 1936.

Casson, Sir Hugh. “Fairest Cities Of Them All: Five Prominent Architects Offer Their Choices, and Explain the Reasons for Them.” *New York Times*, December 16, 1959.

“Castle on Air and a Marble Ornament.” *Life*, November 9, 1962.

Catalogue of the University of Arkansas, 28th ed. Fayetteville, AR: Press of Arkansas Democrat, 1901.

Catalogue of the University of Arkansas, 29th ed. Fort Smith, AR: Thrash-Lick Ptg, 1902.

Catalogues for 1926-27 and *1927-28*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Catalogues of the University of Arkansas, 30th ed., 1902-1903; 31st ed. 1903-1904; 32nd ed., 1904-1905; 33rd ed., 1905-1906; 1906-07; and 1907-08. Fayetteville, AR.

“The Celanese Family of Fibers.” *American Fabrics* 51 (Fall–Winter 1960): 75-82.

“The Celanese House.” *Interiors* 119 (September 1959): 132-139.

Cheney, Sheldon, and Martha Candler Cheney. *Art and the Machine: An Account of Industrial Design in 20th-Century America*. New York: Acanthus Press, 1992.

Chermayeff, Serge. “The Shell Game.” *Architectural Forum* 109 (July 1958): 54 and 56.

Christ-Janer, Albert, “The Master Builders: Building on the Wright Foundation.” *Saturday Review*, February 2, 1963.

Clark, Blake, “America’s Unconventional Master Builder.” *Reader’s Digest*, February 1965.

"Classic Temple in California Olive Grove." *Progressive Architecture* 46 (May 1965): 59.

Coblentz, Gaston. "Reds at Brussels Outdo Low-Budget U.S. Show." *New York Herald Tribune*, February 5, 1958.

Cogswell, Margaret, ed. *Ideal Theater: Eight Concepts.* New York: American Federation of Arts, 1962.

"Competition: Jefferson National Expansion Memorial." *Progressive Architecture* 29 (May 1948): 54-59, 68-69 73.

Cook, John W., and Heinrich Klotz**.** *Conversations with Architects*. New York: Praeger, 1973.

"Co-Operative Exhibitions Attract Prospective Clients." *Architectural Record* 83 (June 1938): 83-85.

Cox, H. Bartle. "M. Victor Laloux: The Man and His Work." *Architects' Journal* (April 28, May 12 and 19, and June 9, 1920). 609-610, 639-670, 731-732.

Creel, George, "Money to Build Your Home." *Collier's*. May 2, 1936.

Creighton, Thomas H. "The New Sensualism." *Progressive Architecture* 40 (September 1959): 141-147.

Critchfield, Richard. "Our Fancy Embassy in India: A White Elephant Is Put to Work." *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 20, 1964.

Croghan, Lore. "Legal Wrangling Over 'Lollypop'." *New York Daily News*, March 22, 2005.

Cullman, Marguerite. *Ninety Dozen Glasses*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1960.

"The Curious Story of the Ventilating Tower." Forum of Events. *Architectural Forum* 75 (November 1941): 10, 12, 14.

D'Harnoncourt, Rene. "Foreword: The Museum of the Future." *Art in America* 54 (February 1964): 25.

Davidson, Justin. "Preserving the Past or Building the Future: 2 Columbus Circle and a Battle Over Keeping Its Architecture Intact." *New York Newsday*, December 10, 2003.

"Debut of a City." *Fortune*, January 1933.

De Gramont, Sanche. "Huntington Hartford Files Plans for 10-Story Museum." *New York Herald Tribune*, April 28, 1959.

"A Design Tour de Force Destroys Walls to Turn Illusion into Reality." *Interiors* 116 (May 957): 132-135.

"Diplomatic Temple: America's Embassy Wins India's Praise." *Life*, January 26, 1959.

"Divorced." Milestones. *Time*, May 6, 1966.

Doherty, Brian. "A Millionaire Art Buff Takes on the Bad Guys." Review. *Life*, November 27, 1964.

Drexler, Arthur. "Buildings for Business and Government in America." *Zodiac* 1 (1957): 119-129.

_____. *Modern Architecture USA*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1965.

_____. *Transformations in Modern Architecture*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1979.

Duncan, Carol, and Alan Wallach. "The Museum of Modern Art As Late Capitalist Ritual: An Iconographic Analysis." *Marxist Perspectives* 1 (Winter 1978): 28-51.

Dunlap, David W. "Acquiring a Taste For Marble Lollypops; 2 Columbus Circle, Much Despised, Is Now Somewhat Admired." Metropolitan Desk. *New York Times*, December 11, 1998.

_____. "Craft Project at Columbus Circle; Museum Plans $30 Million Makeover and Expansion." Metropolitan Desk. *New York Times*, July 12, 2002.

_____. "Fate of 2 Columbus Circle Is Hidden Behind Marble Walls." Blocks. *New York Times*, May 23, 2002.

_____. "For 2 Columbus Circle, a Growing Fan Club." Blocks. *New York Times*, August 18, 2005.

_____. "Museum Wins a Court Battle on Columbus Circle Renovation." Metropolitan Desk. *New York Times*, February 25, 2005.

Dunn, Alan. "*Meetings and Miscellany.*" Cartoon in *Architectural Record* 44 (March 1959): 25.

_____. *"Now, This Is Where Ed Stone and Me Go Our Separate Ways!"* Cartoon in *Architectural Record* 136 (October 1964): 23.

"Duplexes on Park." *Interior Design*, 31 (August 1960): 82-87.

Early, Eleanor. "Consulting Architect for National Cultural Center Is Man of Monumental Achievement." *Diplomat* 10 (August 1959): cover, 10-13, 42.

"Ed Stone to Design Manhattan Art Gallery." *Architectural Forum* 109 (July 1958): 11 and 13.

Ed Sullivan Show. SOFA Entertainment, February 2,1958.

Editors Note, *Saturday Review*, November 7, 1959.

"Educational Work of Edward Durell Stone." *Architectural Record* 123 (February 1958): 177-196.

"Edward Stone Puts Fanciful Ideas to Practical Use." *House & Home* 16 (September 1959): 88-94.

"Eero Saarinen Wins London Embassy Design Contest." *Architectural Forum* 104 (March 1956): 21.

"Eight Men on a Unit: A Group of Brilliant Young Architects Build Houses Round a Prefabricated Utility Package." *Interiors* 105 (May 1946): 82-93.

Eldredge, Joseph L. "Today's Architecture: Master Milliner's Touch," *Boston Globe*, July 1966;

"An Embassy Too Beautiful to Enlarge." *Atlanta Journal*, June 10, 1965.

Ennis, Thomas W. "American Architecture Fulfills Diplomatic Mission on Four Continents." *New York Times*, January 26, 1958.

"Eye on the Environment." Press. *Newsweek*, August 23, 1965.

Favre, George H. "Simplicity, Order, and Permanence." *Christian Science Monitor*, May 15, 1967.

Ferriss, Hugh. *Power in Buildings: An Artist's View of Contemporary Architecture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.

Field Notes. *Magazine of Art* 30 (August 1937): 496.

Filler, Martin. "Goodbye Columbus." *New Republic* 223 (August 28, 2000): 30-33.

"A Final Look at Brussels." *Architectural Forum* 109 (October 1958): 104-109.

"Fine Arts Center, University of Arkansas." *Arts & Architecture* 68 (November 1951): 35-37.

"First Honor Award: The Stuart Company." *AIA Journal* 30 (July 1958): 32.

"First Honor Award: United States Embassy." *AIA Journal* 35 (April 1961): 70.

Flanders, Danny C. "International Flair 'Modern' Architecture Lends Unusual Touch to the City Neighborhoods." *Columbia (SC) State Newspaper*, February 6,1994.

Flynn, John T., "A Good Place to Live." *Collier's*, March 28, 1936.

"For Week-Ends: Four Vacation Cottages Designed by Edward D. Stone." *House & Garden*, June 1938.

Forbes, Malcolm S. Fact and Comment. *Forbes*, July 1, 1958.

Ford, James, and Katherine Morrow Ford. *Classic Modern Homes of the Thirties.* 1940, Reprint New York: Dover Publications, 1989.

_____. *The Modern House in America*. New York: Architectural Book Publishing, 1940.

Ford, Katherine Morrow, and Thomas H Creighton. *The American House Today*. New York: Reinhold, 1951.

"Four Experimental Houses by Modern Designers Demonstrate the Application of a New and Versatile Building Material." *Architectural Forum* 91(November 1949): 84-89.

Fowler, Glenn. "Architects' Institute Honors Buildings Here and Abroad." *New York Times*, February 26, 1961.

_____. "Lincoln Center Sparks Vast Renewal on the West Side." *New York Times*, September 16, 1962.

Frankfurter, Alfred. "Caviare?—New York's Newest Museum." *ARTnews* 63 (March 1964): 32-34 and 59-61.

Fraser, C. Gerald. "Columbus Circle Museum Gets a New Cultural Life." *New York Times*, November 7, 1980.

Fremont-Smith, Eliot. "After the Ticker Tape Parade." Books of the Times. *New York Times*, January 31, 1966.

Fulbright, J. William. American Architect Edward Durell Stone." Congressional Record—Senate. 13311 (May 19, 1967).

_____. "Fayetteville's Ed Stone: A Giant on America's Cultural Stage." *Fayetteville Northwest Arkansas Times*, November 12, 1962.

Galassi, Peter, Robert Stoor and Anne Umland. *Making Choices.* New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2000.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. *Ambassador's Journal: A Personal Account of the Kennedy Years*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

"Gallery Lighting." *Progressive Architecture* 45 (September 1964): 195.

Galupo, Scott. "Wolfe Barks." *Washington Post*, December 2, 2003.

Gammon, Roland, ed. "*Faith Is A Star*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co, 1963.

Genauer, Emily. "Building Fine, Pictures Awful: Hartford Gallery VS. Its Art." *New York Herald Tribune*, March 17, 1964.

_____. "The First Year on Columbus Circle." *New York Herald Tribune*, March 8, 1965.

_____. "The Fur-Lined Museum." *Harpers*, July 1947.

_____. "The House That Hartford Built." Emily Genauer on Art: *New York Herald Tribune*, September 1, 1963.

Gapp, Paul. "Ambiguous Statement Snarls Center Debate." Architecture. *Chicago Tribune*, June 30, 1974.

Gardner, Paul. "Modern Gallery Is Due Next April: Huntington Hartford Project in 3d Delay—Cost Rising." *New York Times*, June 10, 1963.

"Gas Range of Tomorrow." *Architectural Forum* 84 (June 1946): 150.

Getlein, Frank. "Square on the Circle." Art. *New Republic* 150 (April 11, 1966): 36-37.

Gilmore, Eddy. "Russia Expected to Outshine U.S. World's Fair." *Roanoke (VA) Times*, March 27,1958.

Gilroy, Harry. "Million Gay Visitors Close Brussels Fair." *New York Times*, October 20, 1958.

"The Glass-Temple Museum: Modern Art Display Takes Over Own Building in New York." Art. *Newsweek*, May 1939.

Glueck, Grace. "Director Leaves Modern Gallery." *New York Times*, October 19, 1965.

_____. "Hartford to Shut His Artist Colony." *New York Times*, April 2, 1965.

Goldberger, Paul. *The City Observed: New York, A Guide to the Architecture of Manhattan*. New York: Random House, 1979.

_____. "Edward Durell Stone, Dead at 76; Designed Major Works Worldwide." *New York Times*, August 7, 1978.

_____. "Edward Durell Stone Services Will Be Held Tomorrow." *New York Times*, August 8, 1978.

_____. "Landmark Kitsch: A New Generation of Architects Tries to Save the City's Ugly Ducklings." The Sky Line. *New Yorker* (August 1997): 38-41.

_____. "The New MoMA: Mixing Art With Real Estate." *New York Times Magazine.* November 4,1979.

_____. "Wistful Ode to a Museum That Once Was." Architecture View. *New York Times*, June 11, 1989.

Goodwin, Philip. *The Museum of Modern Art: The First Ten Years*. New York: Vrest Orton, 1943.

Gray, Christopher. "Edward Durell Stone and the Gallery of Modern Art; An Architect Who Looked Both Forward and Back." Streetscapes. *New York Times*, October 27, 2002.

_____. "Schlock of Ages." *Avenue*, December 1992.

Green, Walton. Review of *The Evolution of an Architect. AIA Journal* 40 (November 1963): 73.

Gueft, Olga, "Non-Conformity on Columbus Circle." *Interiors* 123 (1964): 92-96.

Gutheim, Frederick Albert, and National Gallery of Art. *One Hundred Years of Architecture in America, 1857-1957: Celebrating the Centennial of the American Institute of Architects*. New York: Reinhold, 1957.

Hales, Linda. "At Columbus Circle, Going Round & Round Over a Building's Fate." *Washington Post*, May 29, 2004.

Hall, Emma Gene. "Directions in Modern Architecture: A Conversation with Edward Durell Stone." *Gentlemen's Quarterly*, April 1959.

Hamlin, Talbot F. *Forms and Functions of Twentieth-Century Architecture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

_____. "The Frustrated Monument Complex." *Pencil Points* 22 (October 1941): 651-653.

_____. "Interior Decoration 1940." *Pencil Points* 140 (July 1940): 431-441.

_____. "Modern Display for Works of Art." *Pencil Points* 20 (September 1939): 615-620.

Hammond, Sally. "Huntington Hartford And His Museum." *New York Post*, March 15, 1964.

Hartford, Huntington. *Art Or Anarchy? How the Extremists and Exploiters Have Reduced the Fine Arts to Chaos and Commercialism.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday& Company, 1964.

_____. *Has God Been Insulted Here?* Chicago: Reilly & Lee Co., 1952.

_____. "The Public Be Damned." *American Mercury* 80 (March 1955): 35-42.

_____. "The Public Be Damned?" *New York Times*, May 16, 1955.

_____. *You Are What You Write*. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

"Hartford Modern: What's In A Name!" Art. *Newsweek*, March 1964.

Harvard University Catalogue, 1882-83. Cambridge, *MA*: Charles W. Sever,

Harvard University Catalogue, School of Architecture, 1927-28. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Harvard University Catalogues, 1912-13; 1913-14; 1914-15. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Haskell, Douglas. "Architecture and Popular Taste." *Architectural Forum* 109 (August 1958): 104-109.

_____. "Ornament Rides Again." Editorial. *Architectural Forum* 108 (April 1958): 85, 87.

Hauser, Ernest O. "We'll Go on Trial at the Fair." *Saturday Evening Post*, January 25, 1958.

Hayward, Mary Ellen, and Frank R. Shivers Jr., eds. *The Architecture of Baltimore: An Illustrated History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2004.

"'Healthy New Force.'" Art. *Newsweek*, September 1963.

Heath, Wallace W. "Big As You Like It." *Woman's Home Companion* 75 (November 1948): 63-65.

"Here is the Gallery of Modern Art." *New York Village Voice*, June 13, 1956.

Herzig, Doris. "Hartford at Home." *Garden City (NY) Newsday*, May 12, 1971.

Hess, Thomas B. "A Tale of Two Cities." *Location* 2 (Summer 1964): 37-42.

Heyer, Paul. *Architects on Architecture: New Directions in America*. New York: Walker, 1966.

"The History of Columbus Circle." *Manhattan Shopper*, May 9, 1964.

Hitchcock, Henry-Russell. *Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. 3rd ed. 1958; Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books, 1968.

_____. "1930 to the Mid-20th Century." In *Encyclopedia of World Art*, 270-278. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Hitchcock, Henry-Russell, and Arthur Drexler, eds. *Built in USA: Postwar Architecture*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1952.

"Home for 'Wholesome' Art." *Life*, April 3, 1964.

"Homelike for a Residential Area." *Architectural Forum* 99 (August 1953): 114-116.

"Honors." *Journal of the American Institute of Architects* 23 (May 1955): 203.

"House & Garden Presents Four Architectural Prize Winners." *House & Garden*, February 1939.

"House Equipment Packages to Save Space, Ultimately Money." *Architectural Forum* 84 (February 1946): 81-96.

"House for Moderns." The Building Forum. *Good Housekeeping*, August 1946.

"House of Richard H. Mandel." *Architectural Forum* 63 (August 1935): 78-88.

"The House That Works: I." *Fortune*, October 1935.

"The House with the Built-In Sky." *House & Garden*, October 1959.

"Houses." *Architectural Forum* 73 (July 1940): 106-110.

"How to Bathe in Luxury." *House Beautiful*, August 1953.

Hudnut, Joseph. "The Baroque Revival and Its Clients." *ARTnews* 56 (March 1957): 28-31 and 50.

_____. "A New Eloquence for Architecture." *Architectural Record* 122 (July 1957): 177-182.

_____. "The Post-Modern House." In *Architecture Culture, 1943-1968: A Documentary Anthology*, Joan Ockman 71-76. New York: Rizzoli, 1993.

Hughes, Robert. "The New Monuments." Art. *Time*, September 13, 1971.

Hulse, Jerry. "Miniature World Unfolds at Fair." *Los Angeles Times*, April 23, 1958.

Hunt, William Dudley Jr. *Encyclopedia of American Architecture*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Hunting, Mary Anne. "Through the Eye of the Editor: Ethel Brown Power (1881-1969)." Paper for the Domesticity and Architecture course, Graduate Center, City University of New York, Spring 2000.

Huxtable, Ada Louise. "The American Image Abroad; Architecture." *New York Times*, July 28, 1968.

_____. "Architecture Stumbles On; Recent Buildings Are Nothing Much to Brag About Other Newcomers 'Sixth' Avenue Coming Up." *New York Times*, April 14, 1963.

_____. "'Bigger—And Maybe Better;' The Outlook in Architecture." Architecture. *New York Times*, August 26, 1979.

_____. "Buildings That Are Symbols, Too; Every Age Has Created Great Architectural Monuments After Its Own." *New York Times*, April 5, 1959.

_____. "Columbus Circle: A Project Without a Plan." *Wall Street Journal*, January 14, 1999.

_____. "A Dubious Survival Plan For the Modern." Architectural View. *New York Times*, August 7, 1977.

_____. "Fairs and Architecture; Metropolitan Museum Show Recalls Expositions Since the First in 1851." *New York Times*, March 13, 1964.

_____. *Four Walking Tours of Modern Architecture in New York City*. New York: Museum of Modern Art and the Municipal Art Society, 1964.

_____. "Fun and Games." Architecture. *New York Times*, June 19, 1966.

_____. "Huntington Hartford's Palatial Midtown Museum." Architecture. *New York Times*, February 25, 1964.

_____. "Idlewild: Distressing Monument to Air Age; Paradox." *New York Times*, November 25, 1962.

_____. "The Lollypop Building: The Best Way to Preserve 2 Columbus Circle? A Makeover." *Wall Street Journal*, January 7, 2004.

_____. "The Modern Prepares for Expansion." Architecture View. *New York Times*, June 29, 1980.

_____. "The Patronage of Progress." *Arts* 31 (April 1957): 24-29.

_____. "Sharp Debate: What Should an Embassy Be?" *New York Times Magazine*, September 18, 1960.

_____. "Some Sour Notes Sound at Kennedy Center." *New York Times*, September 19, 1971.

_____. "Ten Buildings That Say Today; Ten Buildings That Say Today." *New York Times*, May 24, 1959.

_____. "Trend-Setting Departures and Pinnacles of Excellence in U.S." Architecture. *New York Times*, May 18, 1965.

_____. *Will They Ever Finish Bruckner Boulevard?* New York: Collier Books, 1970.

"In Scale." The Talk of the Town. *New Yorker*, July 7, 1956.

"India: American Taj." *Time*, January 12, 1959.

"India's Great Builder." *Architectural Forum* 110 (February 1959): 55.

"Intelluptuously Speaking." Programming. Television. *Time*, November 3, 1967.

Iovine, Julie V. "On Columbus Circle: Fighting a Face-Lift." *New York Times*, January 22, 2004.

"It So Happens: Streamlined." *Rockefeller Center Magazine*, August 1940.

Jacobus, John M. *Twentieth-Century Architecture: The Middle Years, 1940–65*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

Jencks, Charles. *Modern Movements in Architecture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1973.

Johnson, Philip. "Retreat From the International Style to the Present Scene (lecture, Yale University, New Haven, CT, May 9, 1958). In *Writings Philip Johnson*, 96-97. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Jones, Brendan M. "Brussels World's Fair Pays Off in Prestige." *New York Times*, November 3, 1958.

Jones, Cranston. *Architecture: Today and Tomorrow*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Jordy, William H. *American Buildings and Their Architects: The Impact of European Modernism in the Mid-Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

_____. "The Formal Image: USA." *Architectural Review* 127 (March 1960): 157-163.

_____. "The International Style in the 1930s." In *"Symbolic Essence" and Other Writings on Modern Architecture and American Culture*, ed. Mardges Bacon, 151-158. New Haven: A Buell Center/ Columbia Book of Architecture, 2005.

Kerr, Laurie. "How 2 Columbus Circle Saved the World." *Wall Street Journal*, December 2, 2003.

Kilham, Walter H. Jr., "Journeys in Two Worlds." Cornwall, CT: 1992.

Kilpatrick, James J. "Uncle Sam As an Art Patron—Like Ouch!" *Los Angeles Times*, March 19, 1965.

Knickerbocker, Suzy. Society. *New York Journal American*, November 10, 1964.

Knox, Sanka . "Art Museum at Columbus Circle Planned by Huntington Hartford." *New York Times*, June 11,1956.

_____. "Hartford Tells of New Museum." *New York Times*, June 14, 1959.

Kostof, Spiro. *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Kramer, Hilton. "Art Books of 1962: Part I." Books and the Arts. *Nation* 195 (December 1962): 428.

_____. "The Hartford Retreat." *New York Review of Books* 4 (February 1965): 16.

_____. "MOMA Reopened: The Museum of Modern Art in the Postmodern Era." *New Criterion*: Special Issue (Summer 1984): 1-44.

_____. "...While the Cultural Center Closes Its Doors." *New York Times*, September 15, 1975.

Kuh, Katharine. "The Ironies of Art." The Fine Arts. *Saturday Review*, September 25, 1965.

_____. "New York's Modern Merry-Go-Round." The Fine Arts. *Saturday Review,* March 21, 1964.

Lawrance, Clive. "A 'Necessary Force' in Architecture: He Believes in Simplicity, Order, and Elegance." *Christian Science Monitor*, January 4, 1972.

Leahy, Jack. "Dean of American Architects." Mainly for Seniors. *New York Daily News Magazine*, October 31, 1971.

Leipold, L. Edmond. "Edward Durell Stone: Builder of Beauty and Permanence." In *Famous American Architects*, 41-48. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison, 1972.

Lhoest, Jean-Louis, "This Is America! This Candy-Box in White and Gold Lace Is a Fantastic Surprise-Box." *Le Peuple*, April 23, 1958.

"Life Calls on Vincent Astor at 'Ferry Reach' in Bermuda," *Life*, January 29, 1940.

Loh, Jules. "Edward Durell Stone: At 71, He Has the Vigor of an Idealist Beginner." *Arkansas Gazette*, October 28, 1973.

Luce, Clare Boothe. Without Portfolio: A Monthly Commentary. *McCalls*, June 1964.

"Lux Decor for New University Theater." *Art Digest* 25 (January 1951): 33.

Lyle, David. "Art Gallery Wins, Shoe Store to Go." *New York Herald Tribune*, February 29, 1960.

Lynes, Russell. *Good Old Modern: An Intimate Portrait of the Museum of Modern Art*. New York: Athenaeum, 1973.

Macdonald, Dwight. "Action on West Fifty-Third Street-II." Profiles. *New Yorker*, December 1953.

_____. "Masscult & Midcult." In *Against the American Grain*, 3-75. New York: Random House, 1962.

"Man with a Billion on the Drawing Board," Names and Faces, *Business Week*, October 8, 1966

"The Mandel House: A Home Resulting From Close Cooperation Between Architect, Decorator and Owner." *Interior Decorator* 95 (August 1935): 6-9, 34 and 36.

McAndrew, John., ed. *Guide to Modern Architecture: Northeast States*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1940.

McCoy, Esther. "Bookshelf: The Screen of Stone." Bookshelf. *Los Angeles Times*, January 13, 1963.

McCue, George. "The Evolution of an Architect: Edward Durell Stone's Homely Account of His Life and Designs." *St. Louis Sunday Post-Dispatch*, November 18, 1962.

McLendon, Winzola. "Cultural Center is 'Righteous Cause.'" *Washington Post*, November 24, 1959.

_____. "Jet-Age Architect Stone: Cupid's Arrow Outflew His Plane." *Washington Post*, November 29, 1959.

McQuade, Walter. "The Architects: A Chance for Greatness." *Fortune*, January 1966.

_____. Structure & Design. *Fortune*, April 1966.

"Medicine's New 'Taj Mahal.'" *Architectural Forum* 111 (December 1959): 98-101.

Meetings and Miscellany. *Architectural Record* 44 (March 1959): 25.

"Mepkin Plantation, Moncks Corners, S.C." *Architectural Forum* 66 (June 1937): 515-522.

"A Milestone in Hospital Design." *Architectural Forum* 106 (June 1957): 116.

"A Million Dollars Goes Modern." *Rockefeller Center Weekly*, July 1937.

Mock, Elizabeth. *Built in USA Since 1932*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1945.

_____. *If You Want to Build A House*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1946.

"Modern Art for the New Museum of Modern Art." *Architectural Record* 172 (October 1984): 164-77.

"A Modern Home for the Modern Museum." *Art Digest* 11 (July 1, 1937): 15.

"Modern Museum." Art. *Time*, June 1937.

"Modern in South Carolina." *House & Garden*, August 1937.

"Mogul Modern." Architecture. *Time*, August 12, 1968.

Molleson, John. "Modern Art in a 'Marble Monolith:' Architect Shows Plans for 'Permanent' Gallery at Columbus Circle." *New York Herald Tribune*, May 29, 1959.

Morch, Albert. "Celebrated Architect's New Hope." *San Francisco Examiner*, November 28, 1971.

"More Plastic Image." *Architectural Review* 130 (July 1961): 4-5.

"More Than Modern." Art. *Time*, March 31, 1958.

Morelle, Dorris. "'American Idea' in Celanese House." *New York Journal American*, September 18, 1959.

Morgan, Carlyle. "An American In Brussels." *Christian Science Monitor*, June 23, 1958.

Morgan, Thomas B. "George Huntington Hartford, II: Peripatetic Patron." *Esquire*, March 1961.

Morris, John D. "Brussels Exhibit Irks Eisenhower." *New York Times*, June 18, 1958.

Mumford, Lewis. "The American Tradition." The Sky Line. *New Yorker*, March 11, 1939.

_____. "The Dead Past and the Dead Present." The Sky Line. *New* Yorker, March 23, 1940.

_____. "Modernity and Commerce." The Sky Line. *New Yorker*, October 3, 1936.

_____. "Status Quo." The Sky Line. *New Yorker*, October 11, 1947.

Muschamp, Herbert. "An Appraisal; Art Deco Authenticity." *New York Times*, October 4, 1999.

_____. "A Building's Bold Spirit, Clad in Marble and Controversy." Critic's Notebook. *New York Times*, November 24, 2003.

_____. *File Under Architecture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1974.

_____. "Huntington Hartford's Generous Folly." Art/Architecture. *New York Times*, April 2, 2000.

_____. "The Secret History." Architecture. *New York Times*, January 8, 2006.

_____. "The Short, Scorned Life Of an Esthetic Heresy; Designed in Defiance of Modernist Tenets, 2 Columbus Circle Awaits Its Fate." *New York Times*, July 31, 1996.

Musée du Jeu de Paume. *Trois siècles d'art aus* États-*Unis*. Paris: Éditions des musées Nationaux, 1938.

"The Museum of Modern Art." *Fortune*, December 1938.

"The Museum of Modern Art, New York: A Building for New Needs." *Museums Journal* 41 (August 1941): 93-97.

Museum of Modern Art. *Buildings for Business and Government: Exhibition, February 25–April 28, 1957.* New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1957.

_____. *Modern Architecture: International Exhibition New York, February 10 to March 23, 1932.* New York, 1932.

Nachman, Gerald. "Dean of Architects." Closeup. *New York Post*, September 21, 1964.

National Academy of Design. *135th Annual Exhibition of Painting in Oil, Sculpture, Graphic Art, Watercolors, Architecture and Murals*. New York: National Academy of Design, 1960.

Nelson, George and Henry Wright. *Tomorrow's House: How to Plan Your Postwar Home Now*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945.

"Nelson Rockefeller...From a Center to a Citadel." *Time*, May 22, 1939.

"Le Neo-Classicisme Americain." *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui* 29 (April 1958): 51-52.

"The New Architecture." *Time*, April 27, 1959.

"New Art Museum to Flout Custom." *New York Times*, January 12, 1938.

"New Building for Modern Art Museum." *Architectural Forum* 68 (February 1938): 7.

"New Face For America Abroad." *Time*, July 11, 1960.

"New Homes for the Young Family: Hudson River Modern." *Today's Woman*, 1949.

"A New Public Architecture." *Architectural Forum* 110 (January 1959): 84-88.

"New Work in the Office of Ed Stone." *Architectural Forum* 115 (October 1961): 118-129.

"New Work, Serene and Classic, By Edward Durell Stone." *Architectural Record* 132 (October 1962): 129-144.

News Report, *Progressive Architecture* 56 (August 1975), 21.

Next Week. *Collier's*, March 1936.

Noguchi, Isamu. *A Sculptor's World*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

"Noted Architect Designs Home Here." *New Canaan (CT) Advertiser*, January 22, 1959.

Novina, Trudi. "All-American House Traces Our History." *New York World Telegram*, September 19, 1959.

O'Doherty, Brian. "Hartford Gallery: Old Wine, A New Bottle." *New York Times*, January 12, 1964.

Off the Record. *Fortune*, October 1935.

"One Man's Taste." Art. *Time*, March 27, 1964.

Online Forum: "2 Columbus Circle." June 16–July 2, 2003. Collector's World Forum, www.collectorsworld.com/ sections /w/forums/forum?forum_id=22830 (accessed June 16–July 2, 2003).

"Open Diplomacy." Design. *Time*, April 12, 1963.

"Our Image at Brussels." Editorial. *Life*, July 14, 1958.

"Our New and Vaster Frontier: America's Past and Future, Blessings and Perils Impose a Mission of Freedom, Law and Prosperity in the World." Editorial. *Life*, December 23, 1957.

Ouroussoff, Nicolai. "Art Fuses With Urbanity in an Aesthetically Pure Redesign of the Modern." Architecture Review. *New York Times*, November 15, 2004.

_____. "Taming the Beast From 1965." Architecture Review. *New York Times*, October 4, 2004.

Palmer, Gretta. "The New Clare Luce." *Look*, April 15, 1947.

Pastier, John. "Architects: Their Works and Worth." *Los Angeles Times*, January 17, 1971.

Patterson, Augusta Owen. "An Architect On the Skyline." *Town & Country*, December 1941.

Paulsen, Sherida E. "The Black Hole of Columbus Circle." *New York Times*, July 30, 2005.

People. *Architectural Forum* 101 (September 1954): 41.

People. *Time*, December 4, 1964.

Pepis, Betty. "Designers Exhibit Art in Interiors." *New York Times*, September 16, 1952.

Perl, Jed. "Modern Immaturity." Jed Perl on Art. *New Republic* 231 (November 1929): 29-34.

Perry, Ellen. "Stone's New Gallery of Art Opens." *Progressive Architecture* 45 (April 1964): 69 and 71.

Person to Person. CBS. New York, February 14, 1958.

"Personal Contributions to American Architecture." *Architectural Review* 121 (May 1957): 346-347.

Peter, John. *The Oral History of Modern Architecture: Interviews with the Greatest Architects of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994.

"Plan and Elevation of Prize Winning Design for 'An Architect's Office,' by Edward D. Stone." *Pencil Points* 8 (July 1927): 440.

"Plans Filed for Art Building." *New York Times*, August 31, 1937.

Pratt, Richard. "You Can Build Your Own Home for Half the Price." *Ladies Home Journal*, April 1950.

Preston, Stuart. "Conservative Realism Resurgent: Other Shows Eclipsed by Hartford Opening." Art. *New York Times*, March 21,1964.

_____. "A Decade of Design." *New York Times*, September 2, 1956.

_____. "More Space for Modern Art." Letter from New York. *Apollo* 79 (March 1964): 244-245.

Rand, Christopher. "Letter From Brussels." *New Yorker*, March 29, 1958.

Rather, John. "Consortium to Preserve Threatened Landmark." *New York Times*, December 30, 2001.

The Razorback. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1921.

Ray, Marie Beynon. "Night Life at Home." *Collier's*, April 25, 1936.

"Recent Work by Edward D. Stone." 75 *Architectural Forum* (July 1941): 13-20.

Reese, Ilse Meisner. "Architects Can Draw Again." *Progressive Architecture* 42 (March 1961): 134-143.

Review. *Architectural Digest*, January 1963.

Ricciotti, Dominic. "The 1939 Building of the Museum of Modern Art: The Goodwin-Stone Collaboration." *American Art Journal* 17 (Summer 1985): 51-76.

Riley, Terence. "What a Building Says About Us." *New York Times*, October 15, 2003.

Robb, Inez. “An Elegant Showcase.” *New York World Telegram*, December 11, 1963.

Roberts, Gene, Jr. “New Yorker, Raleigh Architects to Design Legislative Building.” *Raleigh (NC) News and Observer*, December 3,1959.

Roberts, Mary Fanton. *Inside 100 Homes*. New York: Robert M. McBride & Company, 1936.

Robertson, Nan. “Leading Architect Warns of Dangers in Progress.” *New York Times*, April 3, 1959.

Robinson, Helen M., and others. *Challenges*, Book 8. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967.

Roche, Mary. “Exhibit of Homes Will Open Today: Sketches and Models of Four Structures Accompanied by Designs for Interiors.” *New York Times*, September 18, 1947.

_____. “New Ideas.” *New York Times*, November 2, 1947.

Rogers, John G. “Modern Art Gallery Head Resigns Post.” *New York Herald Tribune*, May 22, 1961.

Rollins, William. “Is UN Nitery a Museum Piece?” *New York Standard*, February 6, 1963.

“The Romantic World of Edward Durell Stone in A New Book of Incomparable Beauty.” Display Ad. *New York Times*, December 2, 1962.

Roob, Rona. “1936: The Museum Selects an Architect; Excerpts From the Barr Papers of The Museum of Modern Art.” *American Art Journal* 23 (1983): 22-30.

Rosenbloom, Stephanie. “Architectural Landmark.” On the Market. *New York Times*, June 4, 2006.

Saarinen, Aline B. “Museums Go to Law for Right To A Name.” *New York Times*, February 1, 1959.

_____. “Our Cultural Pattern: 1929—and Today: Twenty-five Years of the Museum of Modern Art Reflect Deep Changes in the Nation’s Taste.” *New York Times*, October 17, 1954.

[_____] Aline B. Louchheim. “State Department Opens Show Today; Exhibitions of Nine Structures for Overseas Aids on View at the Museum of Modern Art.” *New York Times*, October 7, 1953.

“Saarinen to Design Embassy.” PA News Survey. *Progressive Architecture* 37 (March 1956): 89-91.

Sabin, Rainer. "Weathered Stone." *Little Rock Arkansas Democrat Gazette*, September 15, 2005.

Sargeant, Winthrop. "From Sassafras Branches: Edward Durell Stone." Profiles. *New Yorker*, January 3, 1959.

Schultz, Leonard. "The Waldorf-Astoria Hotel." *Architecture* 64 (November 1931): 251-196.

Scully, Vincent. *American Architecture and Urbanism*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969.

Shepard, Richard F. "Hartford Talks of Varied Plans." *New York Times*, December 11, 1964.

Siekevitz, Philip. "The Decadent Pavilion." *Nation* 187 (October 1958): 211-213.

Simon, Maron J., ed. *Your Solar House*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1947.

Sims, Watson. "Delhi Sweepstakes: A Super-Embassy For U.S. in India." *San Francisco Chronicle*, December 29, 1958.

Snibbe, Richard W. "Search for a Personal Style." *Progressive Architecture* 44 (July 1963): 168.

Spielvogel, Carl. "Celanese at Home in Sloane's." Advertising. *New York Times*, October 20, 1959.

"Spotlight on Business: The Architects Come Into Their Own." *Newsweek*, March 20, 1967.

"Squires at Large." *Esquire*, June 1964.

"St. Louis Architects Win." *Progressive Architecture* 37 (July 1956): 76-77.

A Stage for Excellence: The National Cultural Center. NBC News, November 11, 1962.

Stephens, Suzanne. "Criticism with Yoshio Taniguchi's Design: New York's Museum of Modern Art Finally Becomes What It Wanted to Be All Along." *Architectural Record* 193 (January 2005): 94-109.

Stern, Robert A. M. "Aesthetics and the City: We Should Save Edward Durell Stone's Maligned Marble Masterpiece in New York." *Architectural Record* 188 (November 2000): 63-64.

_____. "International Style: Immediate Effects." *Progressive Architecture* 63 (February 1982): 106-109.

_____. Letter read at "2 Columbus Circle: At the Crossroads." Panel discussion, Steelcase, New York City, February 12, 2003).

Stokes, Dillard. "Bureaucrats and the Brussels Fair: Why America Is Slated for 'Humiliation.'" *Human Events* 15 (April 14, 1958): 4.

Stone, Edward Durell. "America—The Not So Beautiful." *New York Herald Tribune*, July 12, 1961.

_____. "The American Way of Life." Congressional Record—Appendix (May 1959).

_____. "An Architect's Religion." In *Faith Is a Star*, ed. Roland Gammon, 104-207. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co, 1963.

_____. "The Case Against the Tailfin Age." *New York Times*, October 18, 1959.

_____. "The Case for Modern Architecture On the Campus." *Technology Review* 62 (May 1960): 27-29 and 44.

_____. *The Evolution of an Architect*. New York: Horizon Press, 1962.

_____. "Flexible fabric for use as a ceiling wall drape, divider or the like." U.S. Patent Des. 187-464," issued on March 22, 1960.

_____. "Frank Lloyd Wright: A Tribute to a Personal Hero." *Pacific Architect & Builder* 66 (March 1960), 20.

_____. "Hero Prophet Adventurer." *Saturday Review*, November 7, 1959.

_____. "Hero, Prophet, Adventurer." In *Challenges*, by Helen M. Robinson and others, 454-463. Book 8. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967.

_____. "Inside Fashion: For a Moratorium on Trivia." *New York Herald Tribune*, August 9, 1961.

_____. "Is This the Year to Build Your House?" *House & Garden*, February 1947.

_____. "Progress: Spare That Building!" *Harpers Bazaar*, May 1962.

_____. *Recent & Future Architecture*. New York: Horizon Press, 1967.

_____. "Richard Neutra, 1892-1970." *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Letters and the National Institute of Arts and Letters*, no. 21 (1971): 81-83.

_____. "U.S. Is Becoming Nation of Boxes, Billboards, Bar-B-Q's." *Richmond News Leader*, December 31, 1960.

_____. "Wall Block." U.S. Patent Des.184,463, filed September 18, 1957, and issued February 17, 1959.

_____. "What Architecture Should Be." *Show*, March 1964.

_____. "Words to Live By: 'Break the Rules!'" *New York Herald Tribune* and *Los Angeles Times*. May 8, 1960.

Stone, Maria Durell. "Friends." In *About Wright: An Album of Recollections by Those Who Knew Frank Lloyd Wright*, 56-62. ed. Edgar Tafel. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993.

[Stone], Maria Elena Torch. "Three Architects View of Japan." *This Is Japan* (1955): 214-217.

"Stone is on Short List for Smithsonian Gallery of Art." *Architectural Forum* 70 (June 1939): 28.

Stuart, Betty Thornley, "The Cook Gets the Last Word." *Collier's*, May 30, 1936.

Sugrue, Francis. "E. D. Stone to Design Gallery of Modern Art." *New York Herald Tribune* May 19, 1958.

"Summer Cycle." *Vogue*, June 15, 1935.

"Sunday-Best in Brussels." People. *Architectural Forum* 105 (December 1956), 39.

Tafel, Edgar, ed. *About Wright: An Album of Recollections by Those Who Knew Frank Lloyd Wright*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993.

"Taj Mahal Modern." Art. *Time*, September 10, 1956.

Tanner, Ogden. "The Best of Brussels." *Architectural Forum* 108 (June 1958): 78-87.

Taubman, Howard. "Brussels: American Mistakes and Lessons: A 'Hotchpotch' Approach, Says a Visitor, Has Marred America's Portrait at the Fair." *New York Times Magazine*, June 1, 1958.

Temko, Allan. "American Architecture: Down to the Skin and Bones." *AIA Journal*, 30 (November 1958): 23.

_____. "The Dawn of the "High Modern." *Horizon: A Magazine of the Arts*, September 1959.

_____. "The Legacy of Edward Durell Stone." *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 21, 1978.

_____. "Lifting the Federal Facade." *Horizon: A Magazine of the Arts*, January 1960.

Thompson, Helen G., "Home Is Like This." *Collier's*, May 16, 1936.

"12th Annual Small House Competition." *House Beautiful*, March 1940.

"Two Approaches to Hospital Design." *Architectural Record* 122 (October 1957): 217-236.

"2 Columbus Circle: At the Crossroads." February 12, 2003, quoted at www.collectors world. com/sections/lw/item?item_id=22791 (accessed June 16, 2003).

"U.S. Architecture Abroad." *Architectural Forum* 14 (March 1953): 101-115.

"U.S. Embassy Building." *Marg* 10 (December 1956): 68-71.

"U.S. Embassy for New Delhi." *Architectural Forum* 102 (June 1955): 114-119.

"U.S.A. Abroad." *Architectural Forum* 107 (December 1957): 114-123.

"University Art Center." *Architectural Forum* 95 (September 1951): 164-169.

"Vogue's Fashions in Living: Most Talked About House in New York City." *Vogue*, February 1958.

Von Eckardt, Wolf. "50 Years Later—Still Far Out." *Washington Post*, 2 October 2, 1971.

_____. "Las Vegas Is Not Almost All Right." In *Back to the Drawing Board!: Planning Livable Cities*, 86-95. Washington: New Republic Books, 1978.

_____. *A Place to Live: The Crisis of the Cities*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1967.

"Vs." *Architectural Forum* 72 (1940): 15.

Waggoner, Walter. "Americans Score U.S. Fair Exhibits." *New York Times*, April 24, 1958.

_____. "Art-and-Park Man." *New York Times Magazine*, August 21, 1960.

Wakin, Daniel J. "An Effort To Preserve A Monolith: Derived Building Has Big-Name Help." *New York Times*, April 15. 2000.

Wallach, Alan. "The Museum of Modern Art: The Past's Future." *Journal of Design History* 5 (1992): 207-215.

Wallach, Amie. "From Austerity to Opulence." *New York Newsday*, August 8,1978.

"Washable Dinner Dresses." *Vogue*, June 15, 1945.

Waugh, Edward and Elizabeth. *The South Builds: New Architecture in the Old South.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1960.

Webb, Robert N. "A House is Born." *Rockefeller Center Magazine*, June 1940.

Weil, Martin. "Architect Edward Durell Stone, 76 Dies." *Washington Post*, August 7, 1978.

Weinhardt, Carl J. Jr., "Why Manhattan Needs Another Museum." *Show*, March 1964.

"We're in the Picture at New Art Museum." *Round Table* 16 (May-June 1965).

What Is Modern Architecture? New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1942.

What's My Line? Mark Goodson Bill Todman Production. August 10, 1958.

White, Norval. *The Architecture Book*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976.

White, Peter. "The World in New York City," *National Geographic*, June 1964.

Winter, Rebecca. "Perfect Pitch." *Time*, November 24, 2003.

"With Record Readers." *Architectural Record* 90 (October 1941): 10.

Wolfe, Tom. "The Building That Isn't There." Op-Ed. *New York Times*, October 12, 2003.

_____. "The Building That Isn't There, Cont'd." Op-Ed. *New York Times*, October 13, 2003.

_____. *From Bauhaus to Our House*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1981.

_____. *The Kandy-Kolored Tangerine-Flake Streamline Baby*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1965.

_____. "The Luther of Columbus Circle." In *The Kandy-Kolored Tangerine-Flake Streamline Baby*, 232-44. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1965.

_____. "The (Naked) City and the Undead." Op-Ed. *New York Times*, November 26, 2006.

"The Work of Edward Durell Stone." *Architectural Record* 125 (March 1959): 157-172.

Wright, Olgivanna Lloyd. *The Shining Brow: Frank Lloyd Wright*. New York: Horizon Press, 1960.

Yang, Hanford. "Gallery of Modern Art—A Museum." Master's thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1957.

"Year Round House for Middle Atlantic Region Shows Skillful Use of Available Materials, Built-in Features." *Architectural Forum* 87 (September 1947): 102-106.

Young, Priscilla. "Art for All: Two Defenses of Traditional Art." *Roanoke (VA) Times* November 22, 1964.

Zukosky, Jerome. "A Posh Place For Pictures." *New York Herald Tribune* September 9, 1962.

Secondary Sources

"Adventures of Pioneering Bauhaus." *New York Times*, January 25, 1931.

Agrest, Diana, Patricia Conway, and Leslie Weisman. *The Sex of Architecture*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996.

"Alfred H. Barr, Jr. Director." *Magazine of Art* 32 (June 1939): 323.

Allwood, John. *The Great Exhibitions*. London: Studio Vista, 1977.

Alofsin, Anthony. *The Struggle for Modernism: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and City Planning at Harvard*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002.

_____. "Toward A History of Teaching Architectural History: An Introduction to Herbert Langford Warren." *Journal of Architectural Education* 37 (Fall 1983): 2-7.

American Academy in Rome Report, 1959–1964. New York: Spiral Press, 1964.

Andrews, Suzanna, "Hostage to Fortune." *Vanity Fair*, December 2004.

Bacon, Mardges, ed. *"Symbolic Essence" and Other Writings on Modern Architecture and American Culture*. New Haven: A Buell Center/Columbia Book of Architecture, 2005.

Banham, Reyner. "Ornament and Crime: The Decisive Contribution of Adolf Loos." *Architectural Review* 121 (February 1957): 85-88.

Barr, Alfred H., Jr. "The Philip L. Goodwin Collection." *Museum of Modern Art Bulletin* 26 (Fall 1958): 4-11.

Barreneche, Raul. "10,000 Square Feet of History." *Interior Design* 73 (October 2002): 162-168.

Barzun, Jacques. "Romanticism: Definition of A Period." *Magazine of Art* 42 (November 1949): 242-248.

Bayer, Herbert, Ise Bayer, and Walter Gropius, eds. *The Bauhaus: 1919-1928*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1938.

Bensman, Joseph, and Bernard Rosenberg. *Mass, Class, and Bureaucracy: The Evolution of Contemporary Society.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Blackall, Clarence Howard. *A History of the Rotch Travelling Scholarship, 1883-1938*. Boston: Privately printed, 1938.

Blake, Peter. *No Place Like Utopia: Modern Architecture and the Company We Kept*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.

Blau, Judith. "A Framework of Meaning in Architecture." In *Signs, Symbols and Architecture*, ed. Geoffrey Broadbent, Richard Bunt, and Charles Jencks, 334-366. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980.

Bletter, Rosemarie Haag. "The Interpretation of the Glass Dream—Expressionist Architecture and the History of the Crystal Metaphore." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 80 (March 1981): 20-43.

_____. "On Martin Fröhlich's Gottfried Semper," *Oppositions* 4 (October 1974): 146-153.

Bohlen, Celestine. "Oregon Firm to Design for Museum." *New York Times*, November 5, 2002.

Bonta, Juan Pablo. *American Architects and Texts: A Computer-Aided Analysis of the Literature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.

Boorstin, Daniel J. *The Image; or What Happened to the American Dream*. Harmondsworth, UK: Pelican Books, 1963.

"'Brick House,' Woodside Circle, Hartford, Conn.: Philip L. Goodwin, Architect." *American Architect* 127 (May 1925): pl. 126.

Broadbent, Geoffrey, Richard Bunt, and Charles Jencks, eds. *Signs, Symbols and Architecture.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980.

Broch, Hermann Broch. "Notes on the Problem of Kitsch." Reprinted in *Kitsch: The World of Bad Taste*, by Gillo Dorfles, 49-67. New York: Bell Publishing, 1968.

Brooks, Michael W. *John Ruskin and Victorian Architecture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987.

_____. "New England Gothic: Charles Eliot Norton, Charles H. Moore, and Henry Adams." *Architectural Historian in America* 35 (1990): 113-124.

Broude, Norma. "The Pattern and Decoration Movement." In *The Power of Feminist Art*, eds. Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, 208-210. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994.

Broude, Norma, and Mary D. Garrard. *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

_____, eds. *The Expanding Discourse: Feminism and Art History.* New York: IconEditions, 1992.

Calinescu, Matei. "Kitsch." In *Five Faces of Modernity*, 225-259. Revised ed. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987.

Canaday, John. "Those Pre-Raphaelites." *New York Times*, April 26, 1964.

_____. "Twilight Seems to Be Settling Rapidly For Abstract Expressionism." *New York Times*, September 11, 1960.

Cockcroft, Eva. "Abstract Expressionism, Weapon of the Cold War." In *Pollock And After: The Critical Debate*, ed. Francis Frascina, 125-134. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

Coleman, Deborah, Elizabeth Danze, and Carol Henderson, eds. *Architecture and Feminism*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

Coleman, Laurence Vail. *The Museum in America: A Critical Study*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1939.

Colomina, Beatriz. *Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture As Mass Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.

Colquhoun, Alan. *Modern Architecture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Conant, Kenneth John. *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, 800 to 1200*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959.

Cowan, Henry J. *Science and Building: Structural and Environmental Design in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Crow, Thomas. "Modernism and Mass Culture in the Visual Arts." In *Pollock and After: The Critical Debate*, ed. Francis Frascina, 233-266. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

Curtis, William J. R. "Modern Architecture, Monumentality and the Meaning of Institutions: Reflections on Authenticity." *Harvard Architecture Review* 4 (Spring 1984): 65-85.

_____. *Modern Architecture Since 1900*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 2000.

Dale, Anthony. *James Wyatt, Architect, 1746-1813*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936.

Desilets, Deborah. *Morris Lapidus*. New York: Assouline, 2004.

Dorfles, Gillo. *Kitsch: The World of Bad Taste*. New York: Bell Publishing, 1968.

Dresser, Christopher. *Principles of Victorian Decorative Design*." 1873. Reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1995.

Drexler, Arthur, ed. *The Architecture of the École Des Beaux-Arts*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1977.

Dumas, Ann. *Matisse, His Art and His Textiles: The Fabric of Dreams*. New York: Royal Academy of Arts, 2004.

Dunlap, David W. "Theodore Conrad, 84, Modeler And Architecture Preservationist." *New York Times*, August 20, 1994.

Dunn, Alan. *The Last Lath*. New York: *Architectural Record*, 1947.

Egbert, Donald Drew. *The Beaux-Arts Tradition in French Architecture*. ed. David Van Zanten, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Evenson, Norma. *The Indian Metropolis: A View Toward the West*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

Ewen, Stuart. *All Consuming Images: The Politics of Style in Contemporary Culture*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.

Fergusson, Peter. "Medieval Architectural Scholarship in America, 1900-1940: Ralph Adams Cram and Kenneth John Conant." In *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 127-142. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990.

Findling, John E., and Kimberly D. Pelle, eds. *Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, 1851-1988.* New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

Fitch, James Marsden. "They Saw That It Was Good; They Saw That It Was Good." *New York Times*, December 25, 1966.

Fleming, John, Hugh Honour and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture.* 4th ed. London: Penguin Books, 1991.

Fletcher, Sir Banister. A History of Architecture on the Comparative Method. 17th ed. London: Athlone Press, University of London, 1961.

Floyd, Margaret Henderson. *Architectural Education and Boston: Centennial Publication of the Boston Architectural Center, 1889-1989*. Boston: Boston Architectural Center, 1989.

Fox, Margalit. "Susan Sontag, Social Critic With Verve, Dies at 71." *New York Times*, December 29, 2004.

Frampton, Kenneth. *A Critical History of Modern Architecture*. 3rd ed. London: Thames and Hudson, 1992.

_____. *Studies in Tectonic Culture: The Poetics of Construction in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Architecture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

Frampton, Kenneth, and Yukio Futagawa. *Modern Architecture, 1851-1945*. New York: Rizzoli, 1983.

Frank, Dianne Ludman. *Hugh Stubbins and His Associates: The First Fifty Years*. Cambridge, MA: Stubbins Associates, 1986.

Frankfurter, Alfred. "The Question of the Private Museum." Editorial. *ARTnews* 63 (March 1964): 25.

Frascina, Francis, ed. *Pollock and After: The Critical Debate*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. "For Public and Potent Building." *New York Times Magazine*, October 9, 1960 .

Garrigan, Kristine Ottesen. *Ruskin on Architecture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1973.

Gauguin, Paul. *Noa Noa: The Tahitian Journal*. 1926. Reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1985.

Gebhard, David. *200 Years of American Architectural Drawing*. New York: Whitney Library of Design, 1977.

"Geodesic Dome." *Architectural Forum* 95, no. 2 (August 1951): 144-51.

Gibson, Ann Eden. *Abstract Expressionism: Other Politics.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.

Gill, Brendan. "Wallace K. Harrison." In *A New York Life of Friends and Others*, 151-158. New York: Poseidon Press, 1990.

Giovannini, Joseph. "Arthur Drexler, 61, Authority on Architecture." *New York Times*, January 17, 1987.

Glueck, Grace. "Cultural Center to Close After 11 Years." *New York Times*, September 10, 1975.

_____. "Gulf & Western Gives New York A Cultural Center." *New York Times*, December 9, 1976.

Goldberger, Paul. "Philip Johnson Is Dead at 98; Architecture's Restless Intellect." *New York Times*, January 27, 2005.

Greenberg, Clement. "Avant-Garde and Kitsch." In *Art and Culture: Critical Essays*, 21-33. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.

_____. "*Partisan Review* 'Art Chronicle:'1952." In *Art and Culture: Critical Essays*, 146-153. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.

_____. "State of American Writing." *Partisan Review* 15 (August 1948): 876-879.

_____. "Towards a Newer Laocoon." *Partisan Review* 7 (1940): 296-310.

Greenspan, David A. "Right Again? Books. *Progressive Architecture* 62 (December 1981): 106-110.

Grossman, Elizabeth Greenwell. *The Civic Architecture of Paul Cret*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Grover, Stephen. "Heeded Words: Ada Louise Huxtable Has Formidable Power As Architecture Critic." *Wall Street Journal*, November 7, 1972.

Gubernick, Lisa Rebecca. *Squandered Fortune: The Life and Times of Huntington Hartford*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1991.

Guilbaut, Serge. *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom, and the Cold War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

_____. "The New Adventures of the Avant-Garde in America." In *Pollock And After: The Critical Debate*, ed. Francis Frascina, 153-166.New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

Gusevich, Miriam. "Decoration and Decorum, Adolf Loos's Critique of Kitsch." *New German Critique* 43 (Winter 1988), 97-122.

_____. "Purity and Transgression: Reflections on the Architectural Avant-Garde's Rejection of Kitsch." *Midgard: Journal of Architectural Theory and Criticism* 1 (1987): 141-158.

Haddow, Robert H. *Pavilions of Plenty: Exhibiting American Culture Abroad in the 1950s*.Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997.

Hamlin, Talbot F. "The International Style Lacks the Essence of Great Architecture." *American Architect* 143 (January 1933), 12-16.

Hanks, David A. "The Eric Brill Collection and The Richard H. Mandel House." *Sotheby's Important 20th Century Design* (December 2005): 206-237.

Hanks, David, with Jennifer Toher. *Donald Deskey: Decorative Designs and Interiors*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1987.

Harwood, John, and Janet Parks. *The Troubled Search: The Work of Max Abramovitz*. New York: Miriam and Ira D. Wallach Art Gallery, Columbia University, 2004.

Hess, Thomas B. "DeKooning Paints a Picture." *ARTnews* 53 (March 1953): 30-32 and 63-66.

"High-Brow, Low-Brow, Middle-Brow." *Life*, April 11, 1949.

Hine, Thomas. *Populuxe*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987.

Hitchcock, Henry-Russell. "Architecture and the Architect." *New York Times*, November 17, 1957.

_____. "The Brown Decades and the Brown Year." *Hound and Horn* 2 (January–March 1932): 272-277.

_____. "Six Modern European Houses: That Represent Current Tendencies in France and Germany." *House Beautiful*, September 1928.

_____. "International Style Twenty Years After." *Architectural Record* 110 (August 1951): 89-97. Reprinted in *International Style*, by Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson, 241-261, W. W. Norton & Company, 1995.

_____. *Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration*." New York: Payson & Clarke, 1929.

Hitchcock, Henry-Russell, and Philip Johnson. *The International Style*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1995.

_____. *The International Style: Architecture Since 1922*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1932.

Honour, Hugh, and John Fleming. *The Visual Arts: A History*. 5th ed. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1999.

Horn, Richard. *Fifties Style: Then and Now*. New York: Beech Tree Books, 1985.

Horsley, Carter B. "'Modelmakers' Work Gaining New Recognition." *New York Times*, July 28, 1974.

"House of Ralph D. Cutler, West Hartford, Connecticut." *Architectural Record* 75 (February 1934): 158-160.

Hughes, Elizabeth Blish. "Second Generation." *House & Garden*, February 2006.

Hughes, Robert. "White Gods and Cringing Natives: Tom Wolfe's Look at Architecture Gets It Half Right." *Time*, October 19, 1981.

_____. "Revelation on 53rd Street." Art. *Time*, May 14, 1984.

Hunter, Sam. "Introduction." In *The Museum of Modern Art: The History and the Collection*, 8-41. New York: Harry N. Abrams in association with the Museum of Modern Art, 1984.

Hunting, Mary Anne. "Furniture Designed by Edward Durell Stone for Senator Fulbright." *The Magazine Antiques*, May 2004.

_____. "The Reform Club in London: A Nineteenth-Century Collaboration." *The Magazine Antiques*, June 1994.

_____. "The Richard H. Mandel House in Bedford Hills, New York." Living With Antiques. *The Magazine Antiques*, July 2001.

Huxtable, Ada Louise. "Architectural Forum Dropped; House and Home Magazine Sold." *New York Times*, May 28, 1964.

Huyssen, Andreas. *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

_____. "Mass Culture As Woman: Modernism's Other." In *Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture*, ed. Tania Modleski, 188-207. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

"'Ideal' Man Departs." *Time*, May 29, 1961.

Jacks, Ernest E. "The Elegant Bohemian: Tales of Architect Edward Durell Stone." Private collection, 2000.

Jarvis, Simon. *High Victorian Design*. London: Boydell Press, 1983.

Jaudon, Valerie, and Joyce Kozloff. "'Art Hysterical Notions' of Progress and Culture." *Heresies: A Feminist Publication on Art & Politics* 4 (Winter 1978): 38-42.

Jones, Gerre L. *How to Market Professional Design Services*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Jordy, William H. "Robert Venturi and the Decorated Shed." In *"Symbolic Essence" and Other Writings on Modern Architecture and American Culture*, ed. Mardges Bacon, 261-275. New Haven: A Buell Center/Columbia Book of Architecture, 2005.

Kahn, Louis. "Monumentality." In *Architecture Culture, 1943-1968: A Documentary Anthology*, Joan Ockman, 48-54. New York: Rizzoli, 1993.

Katz, Herbert and Marjorie. *Museums, U.S.A.: A History and Guide*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1965.

"Kenneth J. Conant: 1894-1984." *JSD News* 12 (May–June 1984): 16.

Kentgens-Craig, Margret. *The Bauhaus and America: First Contact, 1919-1936.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999.

Kieffer, Jarold A. *From National Cultural Center to John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: At the Front End of the Beginning*. Fairfax, VA: Privately published, 2004.

Kornwolf, James D. "College of William and Mary: Competition for a Festival Theatre and Fine Arts Center, November 1938–February 1939." In *Modernism in America, 1937-1941: A Catalog and Exhibition of Four Architectural Competitions*, ed. James D. Kornwolf, 176-223. Williamsburg, VA: Joseph and Margaret Muscarelle Museum of Art, 1985.

Kulka, Tomas. *Kitsch and Art*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.

Lane, Barbara Miller. "The Berlin Congress Hall, 1955-1957." *Perspectives in American History* 1 (1984): 131-185.

Le Corbusier, *Towards A New Architecture*. 1927. Reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1986.

Levine, Neil. *The Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Loeffler, Jane C. *The Architecture of Diplomacy: Building America's Embassies*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998.

_____. "The Architecture of Diplomacy: Heyday of the U.S. Embassy-Building Program, 1954-1960." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 49 (September 1990): 251-278.

_____. Book Review. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53 (March 1994): 109-111.

_____. "Diplomacy Doesn't Belong In Bunkers." *Washington Post*, August 23, 1998.

Loos, Adolf. "Ornament and Crime." In *Adolf Loos: Pioneer of Modern Architecture*, by Ludwig Münz, Ludwig and Gustav Künstler, trans. Harold Meek, 226-231, New York: Praeger, 1966.

Lull, James. *Media, Communication, Culture: A Global Approach*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

MacDougall, Elisabeth Blair, ed. *The Architectural Historian in America: A Symposium in Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Architectural Historians*. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990.

Marchand, Roland. *Advertising the American Dream: Making Way for Modernity, 1920-1940*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Mason, Joseph B., *History of Housing in the U.S., 1930-1980*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1982.

Mathews, Jane De Hart. "Art and Politics in Cold War America." *American Historical Review* 81 (October 1976): 762-787.

Mattie, Erik. *Worlds Fairs*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998.

"The Maturing Modern." *Time*, July 2, 1956.

McDonald, Travis C. Jr. "Smithsonian Institution: Competition for a Gallery of Art, January 1939–June 1939." In *Modernism in America, 1937-1941: A Catalog and Exhibition of Four Architectural Competitions*, ed. James D. Kornwolf, 177-195. Williamsburg, VA: Joseph and Margaret Muscarelle Museum of Art, 1985.

McDowell, Edwin. "Publishing: Anatomy of An Author." *New York Times*, November 13, 1981.

McLeod, Mary. "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernismn to Deconstructivism." *Assemblage* 8 (February 1989): 23-59.

_____. "Everyday and 'Other' Spaces." In *Architecture and Feminism*, ed. Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze and Carol Henderson, 1-37. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

_____. "Undressing Architecture: Fashion, Gender, and Modernity." In *Architecture: In Fashion*, Paulette Singley, ed., 38-123. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994.

Meehan, Thomas. "Not Good Taste, Not Bad Taste—It's 'Camp.'" *New York Times*, March 21, 1965.

Meister, Maureen. *Architecture and the Arts and Crafts Movement in Boston: Harvard's H. Langford Warren*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2003.

Messer, Helaine Ruth. "MOMA: Museum in Search of an Image." 1979.

Meyer, Karl E. *The Art Museum: Power, Money, Ethics*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1979.

"A Modern House." *House Beautiful*, January 1930.

Morgan, Keith N., and Richard Cheek. "History in the Service of Design: American Architect-Historians, 1870-1940." *Architectural Historian in America*, ed. Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, 61-75. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990.

Morrone, Francis, "Do Architecture Critics Matter?" *New Criterion* 20 (April 2002), 31.

Münz, Ludwig, and Gustav Künstler, trans. Harold Meek, *Adolf Loos: Pioneer of Modern Architecture.* New York: Praeger, 1966.

The Museum of Modern Art: The History and the Collection. New York: Harry N. Abrams in association with Museum of Modern Art, 1984.

Nelson, June Kompass. *Harry Bertoia: Sculptor*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1970.

"New York's Changing Scene," *New York Sunday News*, June 30, 1963.

Newhouse, Victoria. *Wallace K. Harrison, Architect*. New York: Rizzoli, 1989.

Next Month. *House Beautiful*, November 1932.

Noah, Timothy, "Ada Louise Huxtable Vs. Tom Wolfe." Chatterbox. *Slate*, January 8, 2004.

Noble, Holcomb B., and Douglas Martin. "John Kenneth Galbraith, 97, Dies; Economist, Diplomat and Writer." *New York Times*, April 30, 2006.

Noffsinger, James Philip. *The Influence of the École Des Beaux-Arts on the Architects of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1955.

Ockman, Joan. *Architecture Culture, 1943-1963: A Documentary Anthology*. New York: Rizzoli, 1993.

_____. "Mirror Images: Technology, Consumption, and the Representation of Gender in American Architecture Since World War II." In *The Sex of Architecture*, Diana Agrest, Patricia Conway, and Leslie Weisman, 191-210. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996.

Okrent, Daniel. *Great Fortune: The Epic of Rockefeller Center*. New York: Viking Press, 2003.

Oliver, Richard, ed. *The Making of An Architect, 1881-1981*. New York: Rizzoli, 1981.

"Our Modern House." *House Beautiful*, December 1928.

Packard, Vance. *The Status Seekers*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books, 1966.

Parish, William J. *The Charles Ilfeld Company: A Study of the Rise and Decline of Mercantile Capitalism in New Mexico*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Pels, Esther Julia. "Art For Whose Sake?" *American Legion Magazine*, October 1955.

Perkins, Bradford. "Who Should Be Afraid of Tom Wolfe?" *Architectural Record* 170 (February 1982): 86-89.

Perl, Jed. *New Art City: Manhattan at Mid-Century*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005.

Perry, William G. "French Comrades in America, II: Jean Jacques Haffner." *Pencil Points* 8 (February 1927): 67-84.

"Plans for A Contemporary Museum, New York City: Howe and Lescaze, Architects." *Architectural Record* 80 (July 1936): 43-50.

Pohl, Frances K. *Framing America: A Social History of American Art*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2002.

Pollock, Griselda. "Modernity and the Spaces of Femininity." *The Expanding Discourse: Feminism and Art History*, eds. Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, 264-265. New York: IconEditions, 1992.

"Portfolio of Current Architecture." *Architectural Record* 72 (September 1932): 169-72.

Prak, Niels L. *Architects: The Noted and the Ignored*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984.

Reich, Cary. *The Life of Nelson A. Rockefeller: Worlds to Conquer, 1908-1958*. New York: Doubleday, 1996.

Reynolds, Maura. "Bernard Rudofsky, 82, Architect And 'Outspoken' Social Analyst." *New York Times*, March 13, 1988.

Ricciotti, Dominic. "Edward Durell Stone and the International Style in America: Houses of the 1930's." *American Art Journal* 20 (1988): 48-73.

Riley, Terence, and Barry Bergdoll. *Mies in Berlin*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2001.

Robinson, Lilian S., and Lise Vogel. "Modernism and History." *New Literary History* 3 (Autumn 1971): 177-199.

Rohan, Timothy M. "Rendering the Surface: Paul Rudolph's Art and Architecture Building at Yale." *Gray Room* 1 (Fall 2000): 85-107.

Rosa, Joseph. *Albert Frey, Architect*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999.

_____ and others, eds. *Glamour: Fashion and Industrial Design and Architecture*. New Haven, CT: San Francisco Museum of Modern Art in association with Yale University Press, 2004.

Rosenberg, Harold. "Pop Culture: Kitsch Criticism," 259-268. In *The Tradition of the New*. New York: Horizon Press, 1959.

Rowe, Colin. "Introduction." In *Five Architects: Eisenman, Graves, Gwathmey, Hejduk, Meier*, 3-7. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

_____. "Neo-'Classicism' and Modern Architecture I" and "Neo-'Classcism' and Modern Architecture II." In *The Mathematics of the ideal Villa and Other Essays*, 120-158. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987.

Rubin, William Stanley, ed. *"Primitivism" in 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern*, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1984.

Ruskin, John. *The Stones of Venice*. Edited by J. G. Links. 1960, Reprint. New York, Da Capo Press, 1985.

Russell, John. "Thomas Hess, Art Expert, Dies; Writer and Met Official Was 57." *New York Times*, July 14, 1978.

Rydell, Robert W. "Brussels Universal and International Exposition." In *Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, 1851-1988*, eds. John E. Findling and Kimberly D. Pelle, 311-318. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

_____. "The New Day Dawns: The American Pavilion at the 1958 Brussels World's Fair." In *World of Fairs: The Century-of-Progress Expositions*, 193-211. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1993.

Rydell, Robert W., and Nancy Gwinn. *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994.

[Saarinen], Aline B. Louchheim. "Cultural Diplomacy: An Art We Neglect; How US Artists Might Win Friends and Influence Allies Is Shown in A South American Exhibition." *New York Times*, January 3, 1954.

Sankovitch, Anne-Marie. "Structure/Ornament and the Modern Figuration of Architecture." *Art Bulletin* 80 (December 1998): 686-717.

Schiffer, Nancy N. *Silver Jewelry Treasures*. Atglen, Pennsylvania: Schiffer Publishing, 1993.

Schroeder-Gudehus, Brigitte, and David Cloutier. "Popularizing Science and Technology During the Cold War: Brussels 1958." In *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World*, eds. Robert W. Rydell and Nancy Gwinn, 157-180. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994.

Schulze, Franz. *Philip Johnson: Life and Work*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994.

Schwartz, Tony. "Tom Wolfe: The Great Gadfly." Magazine Desk. *New York Times*, December 20, 1981.

"Senator J. William Fulbright Remembers Edward Durell Stone." *Dimensions* 5 (1969): 9.

Sert, José Luis, Fernanand Léger, and Siegfried Giedion. "Nine Points on Monumentality." In *Architecture Culture, 1943-1968: A Documentary Anthology*, Joan Ockman, 29-30. New York: Rizzoli, 1993.

"Shepley Bulfinch, Richardson & Abbott." *Architectural Record* 125 (February 1959): 153-157.

Singley, Paulette, ed. *Architecture: In Fashion*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994.

Smith, G. E. Kidder, in association with the Museum of Modern Art. *The Architecture of the United States*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1981.

Sontag, Susan. "Notes on "'Camp.'" In *Against Interpretation and Other Essays*, 275-292. New York: Picador, 1966.

Sorkin, Michal. "Wolfe at the Door," Books & The Arts. *Nation* 14 (October 1983): 445-447.

_____. "Notes on 'Camp.'" *Partisan Review* 31 (Fall 1964): 515-530.

Staniszewski, Mary Anne. *The Power of Display: A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001.

Stephens, Suzanne. "Are Museums Suffering From Architectural Overload?" *Architectural Record* 192 (January 2004): 89-91.

Stern, Robert A. M., and others. *New York 1930: Architecture and Urbanism Between the Two World Wars*. New York: Rizzoli, 1987.

Stern, Robert A.M., Thomas Mellins, and David Fishman. *New York 1960: Architecture and Urbanism Between the Second World War and the Bicentennial*. New York: Monacelli Press, 1995.

Stern, Robert A.M., with Raymond W. Gastil. *Modern Classicism*. New York: Rizzoli, 1988.

Stockton, Robert P. "Carolina Landmark." *Columbia (SC) State Newspaper*, August 27, 1978.

Storr, Robert. "No Joy in Mudville: Greenberg's Modernism Then and New." In *Modern Art and Popular Culture: Readings in High & Low*, eds. Kirk Varnedoe and Adam Gopnik, 160-190. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1990.

Sturgis, R. Clipston. "Obituary: Herbert Langford Warren." *Journal of the American Institute of Architects* 5 (July 1917): 352-353.

Sudjic, Deyan. *The Edifice Complex: How the Rich and Powerful Shape the World*. New York: Penguin Press, 2005.

Sweetman, John. *The Oriental Obsession: Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture, 1500-1920*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Taylor, Ronald, Elsie Callander, and Antony Wood. *A History of Architectural Theory From Vitruvius to the Present*, trans. by Hanno-Walter Kruft. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994.

"Tom Wolfe's Walk on the Wild Side." Horizons. *U. S. News & World Report*, November 23, 1987.

Toffler, Alvin. *The Culture Consumers: Art and Affluence in America.* Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965.

Trilling, James. *Ornament: A Modern Perspective*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003.

Van Zanten, David. "Felix Duban and the Buildings of the Ecole Des Beaux-Arts, 1832-1840." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 37 (October 1978): 161-174.

Varnedoe, Kirk. "Gauguin." In "*Primitivism" in 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern*, ed William Stanley Rubin, 178-209. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1984.

Varnedoe, Kirk, and Adam Gopnik, eds. *Modern Art and Popular Culture: Readings in High & Low*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1990.

Venturi, Robert. *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture.* New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1966.

Venturi, Robert, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour, *Learning from Las Vegas: The Forgotten Symbolism of Architectural Form* (1977; repr., Cambridge: MA: MIT Press, 2001), 105 and 114.

Von Eckardt, Wolf. "Introduction." In *Mid-Century Architecture in America: Honor Awards of the American Institute of Architects, 1949-1961*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961.

Watkin, David. *The Rise of Architectural History*. London: Architectural Press, 1980.

Weber, Nicholas Fox. *Patron Saints: Five Rebels Who Opened America to a New Art, 1928-1943.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

"What is Happening to Modern Architecture? A Symposium at the Museum of Modern Art." Museum of Modern Art Bulletin 15 (Spring 1948): 1-21.

Wildman, Stephen, and others. *Edward Burne-Jones, Victorian Artist-Dreamer*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1998.

Williams, John G. *The Curious and the Beautiful: A Memoir History of the Architecture Program at the University of Arkansas*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1984.

Williamson, Roxanne Kuter. *American Architects and the Mechanics of Fame*. Austin: University of Texas, 1991.

Wilson, Forrest. *Emerging Form in Architecture: Conversations with Lev Zetlin*. Boston: Cahners Books, 1975.

Wilson, Kristina. *Livable Modernism: Interior Decorating and Design During the Great Depression.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004.

Wilson, Richard Guy. "Architecture in the Machine Age." In *The Machine Age in America, 1918-1941*, by Richard Guy Wilson, Diane H. Pilgrim, and Dickran Dashjian, 149-204. New York: Harry N. Abrams in association with the Brooklyn Museum, 1986.

_____. "International Style: The Museum of Modern Art Exhibition." *Progressive Architecture* 63 (February 1982): 92-104.

Wodehouse, Lawrence. *Ada Louise Huxtable: An Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1981.

Wojtowicz, Robert. "Lewis Mumford: The Architectural Critic As Historian." *Architectural Historian in America* 35 (1990): 244-249.

_____. "Toward An Organic Architectural Criticism." In *Lewis Mumford and American Modernism: European Theories for Architecture and Urban Planning*, 74-112. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Wright, Frank Lloyd. *An Autobiography.* London: Faber and the Hyperion Press, 1945.

Yee, Roger. "The Fame Game." *Oculus* 66 (Winter 2004): 46-47.

Youtz, Philip N. "Museum Planning." *Architectural Record* 80 (December 1936): 417-422.

Illustrations