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The Promotion of Modern Architecture by the Museum of Modern Art in the 1930s

In the 1930s the Museum of Modern Art in New York played a pivotal role in the definition and promotion of modern architecture in America. The museum's 1932 international exhibition of modern architecture [1], which toured the nation for two years, was a central event in the transformation of American architecture in the decades that followed. The small group of articulate historians and curators, Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Alfred Barr, and Philip Johnson, responsible for its conception and realization, vigorously pursued their aim to replace the pluralism of current American architecture with what they saw as a cohesive modern style based on the work of a select group of Europeans. Their identification and definition of the International Style radically changed critical perceptions of architecture.

The almost complete recreation of that exhibition at Columbia University sixty years later in the spring of 1992, and the concurrent publication of Terence Riley's book, The International Style: Exhibition 15 at the Museum of Modern Art, revived interest in the
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subject and provides us with new insights, based on
previously unpublished material.1 Riley gives an
account of the events leading up to the exhibition
and the roles of the principal protagonists. He
clarifies their relationship with Frank Lloyd Wright
and their negative views on American architecture
in general. The present article, however, focuses on
the influential writings of Hitchcock, Barr, and Johnson,
which became central to MoMA philosophy in the
early 1930s.

In the 1920s numerous American architects,
following a tradition of revivalism dating back to the
1820s, became more concerned with the expression
of regional identity. For example, in 1929 the
architect and planner Charles Cheney exhorted his
audience at a national planning conference:

Plan for character. Every city, county or region has some-
thing of its very own, of life and subtle character
individually. This is most precious. Its presentation and
enhancement is the prime duty of every planner.2

Cheney, fervently dedicated to the development of
architecture appropriate to its region and setting,
was one of those who in California in 1929 drafted a
resolution, quickly adopted by many cities, pro-
claiming the existence and validity of a regional
architecture [2]:

The time is now ripe for us in California to recognize that
we have arrived at a distinctive style of architecture which
is our own and a real expression of our culture and civiliza-
tion. This type of architecture shall hereafter be designated
as Californian Style.3

Meanwhile in New Mexico John Gaw Meem was
developing a way of building based on the
indigenous traditions of the Southwest. His Pueblo
Revival style combined the Arts and Crafts respect
for vernacular building methods and the elimination of
spurious applied ornament. At the same time,
working in a more progressive and original manner,
Frank Lloyd Wright designed two projects in the
Arizona desert that responded to their rocky, arid
sites at Ocotillo and San Marcos in the Desert [3]. In
these two projects Wright demonstrated, as he had
done thirty years earlier through the Prairie House,
that regionalism and modernism were not neces-
sarily in conflict.

The same year, 1929, also saw the launching on
the East Coast of a very different crusade. Henry-
Russell Hitchcock in his first book, Modern Archi-
tecture, Romanticism and Reintegration, published in
that year, wrote: The most central question that lies
open today in architecture is that of the relation
between technics and aesthetic expression.4 His
thesis, stressing the need for universality rather than
for regional identity, concluded with a compelling
argument for bringing European Modernism to
ascendancy in America. Hitchcock was joined in his
admiration of the European avant-garde by Alfred
Barr, the first director of the Museum of Modern Art
in New York and their mutual friend, Philip Johnson.
The three men, deeply preoccupied with style, were
steadfast in their belief that the time was ripe for a
universal, modern, architectural style.

Alfred Barr, the oldest of the three, became the
director of the Museum in 1929, at the age of 31, on
the recommendation of Professor Paul Sachs who
taught the Museum Course at Harvard University’s
Fogg Museum. Sachs, who had been a pupil of
Bernard Berenson, instilled in Barr, his most brilliant
doctoral student, the discipline of connoisseurship.
Henry-Russell Hitchcock, who had graduated from
Harvard summa cum laude in 1924, spent a year in
Europe before returning to Harvard to study with
Barr under Sachs. When he published Modern Archi-
tecture, Romanticism and Reintegration in 1929 he was
only 26 years old. Philip Johnson, an extremely
wealthy young man, graduated from Harvard in
1930 at the age of 24. He had studied classics and
philosophy, but once introduced to modern archi-
tecture by Hitchcock and Barr he found his direction
in life.

Barr’s aim for the Museum of Modern Art was to
introduce the American public to a type of art that
had not been accessible before. While the Metro-
politan Museum had firmly stopped at Impression-
ism, which it described as modern, Barr intended to
show the work of the most progressive living artists.
It is true that, to avoid critical mayhem, he opened
the museum in 1929 with a relatively safe Post-
Impressionist exhibition, but he succeeded in
mounting a sequence of epoch-making shows in
which the modern masters of Europe predominated.5
Barr wrote excellent introductions in the catalogues
and issued carefully worded press releases both to
attract and educate the public. The attendance
records certainly attest to his success. In the first
sixteen months over a quarter of a million visitors
crowded into his cramped galleries.6
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Alfred Barr was determined to broaden the scope of the museum beyond the conventional display of painting, drawing, and sculpture, and Johnson helped him to realize that goal. His wealth allowed him to indulge in architectural connoisseurship and, with Hitchcock's support, to curate the first architectural exhibition in 1932 entitled Modern Architecture: International Exhibition. Johnson collaborated with Hitchcock in the writing of the exhibition catalogue, which then stood as an official endorsement of Hitchcock's theories. To further their aims the two authors published concurrently their book *The International Style: Architecture Since 1922*, whose title fixed the concept of a world-wide style in the public mind. Indeed these books provided the basis of an architectural doctrine that was to be preached for more than thirty years.

In the late spring of 1930 the three were in Paris, and it was here, after Barr's marriage to the art historian Margaret Scolari-Fitzmaurice, that they laid the plans for an international exhibition. Hitchcock and Johnson immediately began selecting material for the show. Having learnt at Harvard the importance of making value judgements in art, it was through the lens of connoisseurship that they viewed the architecture they saw. However, it was Barr who found a name for the new architectural movement. In September 1930 recalling the International Gothic, he suggested that it be called the International Style. Hitchcock was not, as is often claimed, the first to...
introduce European modernist architecture to America. Jane Heap, as editor of the *Little Review*, had published examples of avant-garde architecture during the 1920s. In 1927 she organized the ambitious Machine Age Exhibition in a large warehouse in New York. The exhibits included both machine-inspired art and actual machines and their components. There were also photographs of broadcasting stations, grain elevators, power plants, airports, garages and factories. A significant part of the gallery was devoted to architecture, including works by Le Corbusier and Gropius. But the show embraced a broader spectrum of design than Hitchcock and Johnson were willing to support in their exhibition five years later. Heap did not share their prejudice against Constructivism or Expressionism and she included work by the German Expressionists Hans and Wassily Kandinsky and such Russian architects as Melnikov and the Vesnin brothers [4].

The visionary American architect Hugh Ferriss, who organized the architectural section of the Machine Age Exhibition, included several skyscrapers including Raymond Hood’s American Radiator building, and his own project for a glass skyscraper [5]. It is significant that, while Hitchcock admired the objectivity of modern design, Heap and Ferriss associated it also with spiritualism. Both were followers of the Armenian mystic Gurdjieff. Pursuing his philosophy Heap believed that the machine was both a manifestation of the structure of the universe and the next step in its spiritual evolution. Unfortunately the popular press all but ignored the exhibition, as they celebrated Charles Lindbergh’s solo flight across the Atlantic. However Alfred Barr, who had commented favourably on the activity of the *Little Review*, visited it.

4 Alexander Vesnin, project for a Palace of Labour, Moscow, 1923 (A. V. Shchusev Museum, Moscow)

5 Hugh Ferriss, ‘Philosophy’, project for a glass skyscraper, 1929 (Avery Library, New York)
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In contrast to Jane Heap, Henry-Russell Hitchcock, first in *Modern Architecture, Romanticism and Reintegration*, then in the 1932 exhibition and the accompanying books, accepted a far narrower field of examples. In order to understand his viewpoint at the time when he began with Johnson and Barr to plan the exhibition, it is necessary to analyse the concepts of his 1929 book.

In the first part he presented his case that, from the period of the Late Gothic onwards, architects had ‘believed only in the revival of one period or another’. Thus architecture had disintegrated under the ‘impasse of romanticism’. The ‘Sentimental reminiscence’ that caused the decay reached its peak of ‘utter degeneration of detail’ between 1850 and 1875. Hitchcock then outlined his theory that after 1875 architecture had passed into a phase of reintegration which he characterized as ‘The New Tradition’. He showed how architects like Richardson, Sullivan, and Wright in America and Lutyens, Berlage, Perret, Hoffmann, and Behrens in Europe had paved the way for the next generation by simplifying architecture. He drew attention to a general trend to ‘give up rigid stylistic revivalism for the virtues of good, simple building’. He applauded ‘the increasing avoidance of decorative embellishment’ and a ‘greater emphasis on engineering’.

However he stated the opinion that the New Tradition had ‘continued without any real development, whenever it penetrated’.33

Hitchcock identified another group, which he characterized as the ‘New Pioneers’, who carried the developments of the New Tradition to ‘a more perfect synthesis of the technical and aesthetic’. He singled out Le Corbusier, Walter Gropius, J. J. P. Oud, Mies van der Rohe, and André Lurçat as the leaders of the New Pioneers. In their work he perceived a decided change from the previous generation:34

Instead of composing in three dimensions in values of mass, the New Pioneers compose in values of volume; instead of complexity as a means of interest they seek a strenuous unification; instead of diversity and richness of surface they strive for monotony and even poverty in order that the idea of the surface as the geometrical boundary of the volume may be most clearly stressed.35

He also wrote that the New Pioneers represented the triumph of the technical point of view; their buildings ‘appeal in the same way as machinery with its generally recognized technical beauty’ [6].36

The list of architects Hitchcock excluded from both generations of progressive architects helps to clarify his aesthetic preferences, which were closely

---

followed by Barr and Johnson. Since he based his theory of modern architecture on his definition of style he tended to eliminate all those who did not fit his definition. While dealing with the first group of the New Tradition he made his prejudices clear. He gave Louis Sullivan only lukewarm treatment; unable to forgive him for his love of architectural ornament [7], he judged the reaction against him as 'largely justified'. He spoke of the 'fiasco of Art Nouveau'; he charged Voysey and Mackintosh with a certain conscious 'eclecticism of style' and dismissed their work as 'not of prime importance'. But he accused Gaudi of worse, 'a purposeful distortion of Medieval forms' leading to 'some of the more extravagant works of Expressionism'.

From the elite circle of the New Pioneers, Hitchcock excluded the Expressionists whose work appeared utterly futile to him and the Constructivists whose experiments were 'unbuilt and unbuildable'. He wrote off Tony Garnier, the social significance of whose work he ignored, dismissing him as 'a true son of the Ecole des Beaux Arts, sacrificing everything to brilliant planning, remaining retardaetaire in his construction and basing his simplified classical expression usually on 'Pompeii'. But Hitchcock's most serious exclusion was Frank Lloyd Wright. With his rigid compartmentalization of styles he could not conceive of Wright leaping the barrier between prophet and pioneer. While recognizing Wright's past significance and his influence in Europe he was destructively critical of much of his work. He praised Wright's Larkin Building as 'an expression of design truly integrated with the engineering' and far ahead of anything in Europe, but commented adversely on the 'greater use of ornament' in the Unity Temple [8], which he characterized as a 'less successful monument'. While celebrating the 'admirably functional plan' and the unprecedented 'three dimensional organization of planes' at the Robie House, he described the building as 'exceedingly mannered'. His prejudice stands out most forcefully in his comments on Taliesin [9]:

the irregularity of the rough local stone, the interminable extension of the roofs and the diffuseness of the plan quite destroy an effect which was no doubt intended as a further advance along the lines of the Robie House.

Dismissing Wright's ornamentation he wrote of 'trivial patterns in the leaded glass reminiscent of Sullivan's geometric dallyings' and 'a peculiarly awkward and ill understood Cubism, foreshadowing some of the worst efforts of German Expressionists after the war'. Summing up his analysis he stated:

Wright's theories are curiously incomplete and even in part contradictory. He has learnt very little the lesson of Ford and he has but a limited sympathy for the spirit of the machine as such. His approach to a pure architecture is complicated with the Nature worship and the ecstatic and individualistic democracy of Whitman. There is moreover an orientalism which appears as much in his writing as in his work.

Furthermore he completely failed to recognize the significance of other American architects of the early twentieth century. He made no mention, for example, of the innovative Californian architects Irving Gill and the Brothers Greene who were all still active in the late 1920s. Irving Gill had in many ways worked in parallel to Hitchcock's New Pioneers. Not only had he made use of technical advances to construct geometrically pure concrete buildings, he
had also developed a strong interest in solving problems of workers' housing [10]. But Gill had taken inspiration from the architecture of the Spanish missions; his liberal use of the arch may have appeared retardataire to Hitchcock. The Greene Brothers had much in common with Wright; despite their spatial innovation and their expression of structure, their aesthetic did not appear linked to that of the International Style. If Wright was tainted by an Oriental influence, so were they.

Skyscrapers represented another achievement of early twentieth-century American architecture.
repudiated by Hitchcock. Because their architects did not forsake ornamentation and insisted on clothing steel in stone or terra cotta he regarded them with contempt. He was particularly incensed by modernistic design with Art Deco detail, which he saw as an object of national shame.

Hitchcock's critiques of those he identified as the New Pioneers further illuminated his doctrine. He accused Oud, before the First World War, of 'experiment in incompletely digested cubist architecture' and explained that 'the association with the painters of de Stijl had tended [during the war years] to carry Oud dangerously far in the direction of free aesthetic experimentation' [11]. He wrote that Mies van der Rohe, in the technical development of his glass skyscraper of 1921, 'displayed extraordinary imaginative power' but the design was regretfully 'influenced by the monumentality of the New Tradition and the crystalline planning of the Expressionists' [12]. However Hitchcock showed the leading architects progressing in their quest for a new architectural aesthetic. He credited Le Corbusier with success after the war in 'offering however prematurely rhapsodic expression of ferro-concrete construction' while his 'lyricism surpasses a rigid machine aesthetic.' [12]

It is clear from such deterministic comments that Hitchcock dealt with architecture largely in aesthetic

11 J. J. P. Oud, project for a factory, 1919 (Nederlands Dokumentatie-Centrum voor de Bouwkunst, Amsterdam)
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Mr. Wright’s contribution to architecture has been so pre-
eminently that of revolutionising the plan that it is especi-
ally important in his case to have plans accompanying each
picture.29

Johnson recognized Wright’s past virtues but
criticized him for his ‘design in mass rather than
volume’ and his use of ornamentation. Hitchcock
and Johnson praised one of his most recent projects,
the apartment towers for St. Marks-in-the-Bowerie
of 1929, for technical innovation, but criticized it in a
manner reminiscent of Hitchcock’s first book, for its
plan ‘suggesting the early post war work of the
German expressionists ... based on an ill-chosen
scheme of triangles’. The conclusion of the catalogue
essay on Wright sent a clarion call to American
architects:

American architecture need not develop entirely in the
footsteps of her great genius. A larger and newer world
calls. The day of the lone pioneer is past, the advance may
be on a more general front at last. Throughout the World
there are others beside Wright to lead the way towards the
future.30

Clearly Hitchcock and Johnson relegated Wright to
the role of a prophet with no further part to play in
modern architecture. Wright, humiliated, responded
to one of Johnson’s letters: ‘There is a radical
divergence between the international propaganda
and ideal of architecture I have fought for all my life.’31
While the exhibition was on show in New York
Johnson tried to build bridges with Wright. However
he and his colleagues had done their utmost to
marginalize Wright.

In the two publications of 1932 Barr, Hitchcock
and Johnson treated the American skyscraper with
much the same disdain that they had shown to
Wright. They complained that the typical skyscraper
represented ‘the architectural taste of real estate
speculators, renting agents and mortgage brokers’
[14]. They characterized Raymond Hood as a recent
convert to modernism, progressing from his Tribune
Tower of 1923 and Radiator Building of 1924 [15],
‘both of them wigged and bearded with applied
Gothic’, to the Daily News Building of 1930 and the
McGraw Hill Building of 1931 [16]. However,
leaving Sullivan’s theory far behind in the nine-
teenth century, they criticized the Daily News Build-
ing for its vertical expression that did not reflect the
many tiers of horizontal floors. In contrast they
approved the horizontal emphasis of the McGraw
Hill Building which ‘comes nearest to achieving
aesthetically the expression of the steel cage’. Never-
theless they judged it ‘something less than distin-
guished architecture’ because it was ‘distorted into
the old silhouette of the massive tower’, crowned
with a ‘necssusally heavy’ and ‘unnecessary
pyramidal feature’.32 Johnson’s condemnation of
American architects and his conviction that the
future lay in the hands of the Europeans comes
across clearly in a letter he wrote to Oud in April
1932:

14 William Van Alen, Chrysler Building, New York, 1928–
30. Representing ‘the taste of real estate speculators’
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The Americans, as you can see by the catalogue, show up badly. Frank Lloyd Wright was included only out of courtesy and in recognition of his past contributions; Raymond Hood because some day he may be attracted into the fold by his opportunism, the Bowman Brothers because they are primarily steel engineers and might one day standardize a half-way decent steel house; Neutra and Howe and Lescaze because they are the only successful modern architects in America.

However Hitchcock and Johnson were not always complimentary about the Europeans they admired. In a letter to Barr in July 1931 about Le Corbusier’s Villa Stein at Garches, Johnson wrote:

It is very amusing to see you writing about the Stein house with such scorn of the planning. It certainly is rather ghastly, but standing on that upper level of the terrace and looking through the thin roof and lower terrace towards the garden is certainly an experience.

The extent to which they claimed their status as the arbiters of quality in modern architecture is made plain in the captions to the illustrations in The International Style. In these they state what is good and bad about the designs, leaving no doubt that the path to acceptability is narrow. In some cases they clarify principles; for example, they commend Gropius in his City Employment Office at Dessau in 1928 for the ‘skilful asymmetrical placing of the stair tower and vertical window’ [17], and they explain that in the case of Otto Haesler’s Kurhaus warehouse and offices in Brunswick (1930) the symmetry is ‘functionally justified since the stairwell serves central corridors’. Other captions appear more arbitrary. Le Corbusier’s houses at the Weissenhofsiedlung elicit the terse comment, ‘window arrangement is brilliant and disciplined’ [18]. In contrast they accuse Hans Scharoun, who had worked earlier in an Expressionist manner, of ‘arbitrary and complicated fenestration’ in his Siemensstadt housing of 1930 [19]. Similarly Erich Mendelsohn, whose ‘Expressionist tendencies’ they had earlier decried, is taken to task for the design of a stair tower at the German Metal Workers’ Union (1929–30) which they con-
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sider ‘unsatisfactory in placing and proportion’. They show a preference for thin balconies and roof caps, criticizing Gropius’s workshop block at the Bauhaus (1926) for the ‘unfortunate projection of the roof cap’, and his Siedlung Töplitz housing in Dessau for the thickness of the top balcony. Hitchcock and Johnson’s comments also show clearly their view that appropriate materials and functional elements should take the place of applied ornament. In their brief eulogy of Mies van der Rohe’s Barcelona Pavilion (1929) they write, ‘The different textures, including that of the water, provide decoration’. They describe a spiral staircase at the Pavilion of the City of Brno at the 1928 Brno Exhibition as ‘good decoration’. Although they express satisfaction with Oud’s ‘thin disc of the shelter, repeated in the disc of the pavement below’ in the shop at the end of his workers’ housing at the Hook of Holland, they are unable to accept the ‘downward curve of the shelter projection and the added wall capping’ on the long sides which they call ‘purely decorative’ [20].

J. J. P. Oud, on receiving a copy of the book from Johnson, commended the authors on their choice of illustrations and on the text but protested ‘the schoolmastering under the illustrations’. Many other architects must have shared under the dismissive comments. If the works of the world’s best architects, as selected by Hitchcock and Johnson, were guilty of such transgressions, one may reasonably doubt the ability of the next generation of American or even European architects to pass muster. In their desire to promote the cause of a pure architecture they denied many valid possibilities, even the use of materials that had proved their worth for centuries. For example, they considered brick ‘undoubtedly less satisfactory than other materials, including stucco’. Their ‘principle of achieving a smooth surface’ seemed less important than the proven principles of good building:

The use of brick tends to give a picturesqueness which is at variance with the fundamental character of the modern style.

They also denied some of the programmatic principles of the architects whom they admired. For example, Gropius had made the integration of painting, sculpture, furniture, and architecture fundamental to the teaching at the Bauhaus. He had paired avant-garde artists with craftsmen in an attempt to realize such integration. Designs executed by Kandinsky, among others, and the built design of Gropius’s Sommerfeld house had proved this point well enough. However Johnson probably considered these projects of the early 1920s as passé. His direct experience of the Bauhaus was during the period of
19 Hans Scharoun, apartment house, Siemensstadt, Berlin, 1930

20 J. J. P. Oud, workers' housing, Hook of Holland, 1924-7
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Hudnut of the Department of Architecture at Harvard to approach both Gropius and Mies to discuss an appointment as chair of the Graduate School of Design at Harvard. After some uncertainties Gropius was awarded the chair, and by February 1937 he had arrived in the United States to begin a long and influential career in architectural education.\(^1\)

In the same year Mies, having been unwilling to compete with Gropius as a candidate for the chair at Harvard, was invited to head the department of Architecture at the Armor Institute in Chicago. He was at first reluctant, but visiting Chicago and finding an openness to his ideas, he eventually agreed. Ironically a visit to Taliesin may have contributed to his decision. Wright, who had refused to see both Le Corbusier and Gropius, welcomed him. He admired Mies’s work, particularly the Barcelona Pavilion and the Tugendhat House. Mies in turn was moved by what he saw at Taliesin. Indeed the two architects, placed by Hitchcock in virtually incompatible stylistic compartments, met as equals and as two leaders of the same broad architectural movement. Mies took up the position permanently in 1939 and immediately took part in the creation of the new Illinois Institute of Technology with which the Armor Institute was merged.\(^2\)

In 1938 Walter Gropius invited the Swiss critic Siegfried Giedion, the leading evangelist of international modernism in Europe, to deliver the Charles Eliot Norton seminars at Harvard University. His brilliant, though deterministic, analysis of the growth of the modern tradition in architecture was published as a book in 1941 as Space, Time and Architecture which became the essential text for all progressive schools of architecture.\(^3\)

There can be little doubt that by appointing Alfred Barr as director, and Philip Johnson as the head of the Architecture Department, the Museum of Modern Art played a central role in the definition of modern architecture. The torch lit by Hitchcock, and carried by Barr and Johnson, was handed to Gropius and Mies to light the way of architecture in America. Giedion then presented the apostles with a revised bible, and so the faith spread. Although Hitchcock soon grew to accept a broader range of achievements in American architecture,\(^4\) and while the Museum of Modern Art held several architectural exhibitions in the 1930s that explored a more varied spectrum of ideas,\(^5\) the far-reaching effect of the 1932 exhibition and its associated publications is undeniable.
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