

impressive by running them over double page spreads. The one place she does this, with admirable success, is for the endpapers where Crane's photograph of the interior of Mother Bethel Church positively glows. *Historic Houses* set a very high standard of scholarship, storytelling, photography, and graphic design. *Historic Sacred Places* not only maintains that standard, it exceeds it.

Roger Moss's intent is to inspire readers to visit these special places. He encourages this by including maps showing the location of each place described, as well as phone numbers and websites when they exist. For the scholarly minded there is an excellent bibliography for each sacred place, and every sacred place and architect mentioned in the book can be found on the comprehensive website, www.philadelphiabuildings.org, created by the Athenaeum in collaboration with four other institutions.

Although a book about architecture, the publication of *Historic Sacred Places* comes at a timely moment in our nation's history. It reminds us that tolerance of religious difference and the pluralistic society it created was perhaps the most important gift both William Penn and the United States gave to the world. In an era when religious differences appear to be at the heart of world affairs, it is good to remember that a society based on tolerance of differences is possible and is a necessary prerequisite to peace.

John Andrew Gallery

Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

1. See Roger W. Moss, *Historic Houses of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998).

*Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture II:
Making Postwar Landscapes Visible*

Edited by Charles A. Birnbaum, with Jane Brown Gillette and Nancy Slade. Washington, DC: Spacemaker Press, 2004; 128 pp., photographs, drawings, plans, notes; paper \$24.95.



There is little doubt that the modernist design canon has fallen on hard times in America. Here at the University of Wisconsin-

Madison, for example, a recently completed campus master plan calls for the demolition of several structures, including the Humanities Building, designed in the 1960s by Harry Weese, an important modernist architect. Although Humanities serves as one of the best examples of architectural Brutalism in Wisconsin, local critics refer to it as "the building everyone loves to hate."

If this and better-known examples of architectural modernism are scorned, then what is the situation regarding modern landscape architecture? While preservationists are often able to rally public support for threatened buildings designed by such 20th-century master architects as Eero Saarinen, Louis Kahn, Philip Johnson, and Frank Lloyd Wright, the works of landscape architecture's modernist luminaries—Tommy Church, Hideo Sasaki, Garrett Eckbo, Dan Kiley, John O. Simonds, Lawrence Halprin, M. Paul Friedburg, and others—fail to generate the same attention and passion.

Landscape architect Charles Birnbaum wants to change this. In 1995 Birnbaum organized a New York City conference that addressed the theme, "Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture."¹ That conclave, more than anything else, demonstrated the vulnerability of many modernist landscapes throughout America. In 2002, the inde-

fatigable Birnbaum put together a second conference that highlighted a few recent successes in landscape preservation, even though most of the discussion bemoaned the continued lack of recognition and concern given to the modern era.

The proceedings of the second assembly, the subject of this review, were published in 2004. The volume begins with an introduction by Birnbaum, who notes the apparent lack of interest in preservation exhibited by contemporary landscape architects: only 200 of the American Society of Landscape Architects' 13,000 members belong to its historic preservation professional interest group. Following the introduction are 17 brief essays by practicing landscape architects, critics, and academics; 14 feature the United States, while 3 are devoted to Canadian, British, and Portuguese subjects.

Most of the articles written by or about landscape architects address projects and places that have been destroyed, modified drastically, or are under threat. The authors overwhelmingly decry the situation, noting that several of the projects were launched with much fanfare some decades ago. Mark Johnson's entire essay, for example, is devoted to Denver's Skyline Park, originally designed by Halprin, but under siege at the time of the conference. While these essays include no scholarly documentation or references, they do provide extremely meaningful information about places that the authors deeply understand and appreciate.

Each writer, either directly or indirectly, asks two interrelated questions: Why do people fail to appreciate modernist landscapes, and why are these sites constantly in danger? "The average person feels very little love for modern design generally," answers Paul Bennett in his survey of Friedberg's work; "this antipathy," he continues, "runs deepest in terms of landscape." Halprin notes that fine arts icons emerge only after a considerable period of time has elapsed, whereas various issues, usually commercial, often threaten

landscape architecture with little more than short notice. "It is, therefore, important to formalize a process for preservation that can react as quickly as the attack," Halprin recommends.

Marc Treib and Richard Longstreth provide the most nuanced and scholarly interpretations of the modernist era. Treib writes about the urban work of Church, Eckbo, and Halprin from 1948 to 1968, a period when California landscape architects made the transition from residential gardens to the urban scene. The pedestrianized street or mall evolved during this period, with Halprin's designs for San Francisco's Ghirardelli Square and the Nicollet Mall in Minneapolis representing the optimistic idea that landscape design "can sufficiently counter, if not totally vanquish, the forces of economics and demographics." The fact that the designs implemented for such highly urban places as Ghirardelli Square and Nicollet Mall were subsequently modified and later totally discarded is a complex issue that, as Treib suggests, might be linked to their genesis in the garden and suburb.

Longstreth's concluding essay is appropriately entitled "The Last Landscape." He argues that no greater preservation challenge exists today than the one of protecting modern landscapes. "The last landscape frequently is cast as one of errors, functional and esthetic, before it has had the time to acquire a substantial past of its own," he writes. Included among Longstreth's examples are private gardens, museum gardens, public parks, urban malls and plazas, and even urban renewal projects. Greatest attention, however, is given to those places that reflect the significant landscape changes caused by post-war development practices in the United States—regional shopping malls, suburban corporate headquarters, and residential areas. Longstreth is the only author who mentions vernacular examples, specifically community gardens and motel landscapes. The preservation of modern environments, he asserts, can only be accomplished by adopting an integrative approach that relies heavily on the skills and approaches of

landscape architects and historians of landscape architecture.

Calls for immediate attention and action regarding modernist landscape architecture are timelier than ever, given the changes that have occurred since this book appeared. Death claimed landscape architects Dan Kiley in 2004 and John Simonds in 2005; and in Denver, a redesigned and reconfigured Skyline Park that reveals little of Halprin's initial design was dedicated in 2004.

Other than the lack of an index, this is a well-conceived and well-executed volume that will appeal to a wide range of readers. Those who already belong to the "preservation chorus" will acquire considerably more knowledge about familiar lost landscapes, whereas others who are just being introduced to landscape preservation may be motivated to join the movement.

Arnold R. Alanen

University of Wisconsin-Madison

1. See Charles A. Birnbaum, ed., *Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture: Papers from the Wave Hill-National Park Service Conference* (Cambridge, MA: Spacemaker Press, 1999).

Campus Heritage Preservation: Traditions, Prospects & Challenges

Edited by Elizabeth Lyon. Eugene: University of Oregon, School of Architecture & Allied Arts, 2003; 65 pp., notes, bibliography, participants list; free of charge.

The choice of a college is an important step in defining identity. As colleges become broadly diversified—even global—in their student body, the appearance of the campus becomes a principal aspect by which students make their selection. The preservation of historic buildings has long been one of the means by which established colleges

represented their status—often signified by a building with "old" in its title, "Old Main," "Old West," etc. To those applicants attuned to traditional cultural markers, historic buildings validate their choice.



Preservation is an issue for most college campuses. Colleges have preserved by default, adapting old structures to new uses to save money, or, for purely emotional reasons, keeping buildings that tug at the heartstrings of alumni and provide access to their wal-

lets. But there are also times when colleges trying to evolve beyond their origins are constrained by outsiders who use the tools of preservation to prevent their evolution. Unfortunately, preservationists often oppose changes inherent in the evolving culture of the late 20th and early 21st centuries.

As the 21st century begins, the old top-down cultural hierarchy has been transformed into a multi-dimensional "nobrow" culture (to borrow John Seabrook's 2000 title) that, rather than being based on a singular elite high culture model, is based in identity and subcultures that create a kaleidoscopic mainstream driven by media buzz.¹ The old "high culture" is but one subculture in the new order and as Seabrook demonstrates, the old unified elite culture has been replaced by popular culture. Elite college campuses are responding to this change by shifting from architecture that parroted the college's origins to a burst of original design that seeks to engage students attuned to the contemporary world of pop culture, television, and the Internet. As new becomes a magnet for students seeking to determine their own identity, it is reasonable to question the value of the old.

It is against this background that the Getty Grants Campus Heritage Initiative prompted the University of Oregon's 2002 symposium on college

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship

Volume 3 Number 1 Winter 2006



CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship
Winter 2006
ISSN 1068-4999

CRM = cultural resource management

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship is published twice each year by the National Park Service to address the history and development of and trends and emerging issues in cultural resource management in the United States and abroad. Its purpose is to broaden the intellectual foundation of the management of cultural resources.

The online version of *CRM Journal* is available at www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal. Back issues of *CRM* magazine (1978–2002) are available online at <http://www.cr.nps.gov/crm>.

Guidance for authors is available online at <http://www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal>.

Manuscripts, letters to the editor, and all questions and recommendations of an editorial nature should be addressed to Martin Perschler, Editor, email martin_perschler@nps.gov, telephone (202) 354-2165, or fax (202) 371-2422. Incoming mail to the Federal Government is irradiated, which damages computer disks, CDs, and paper products. These materials should be sent by a commercial delivery service to Editor, *CRM Journal*, National Park Service, 1201 Eye Street, NW (2286), Washington, DC 20005.

Views and conclusions in *CRM Journal* are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the U.S. Government. Acceptance of material for publication does not necessarily reflect an opinion or endorsement on the part of the *CRM Journal* staff or the National Park Service.

CRM Journal is produced under a cooperative agreement between the National Park Service and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers.

To subscribe to *CRM Journal*—

Online <http://www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal>
email NPS_CRMJournal@nps.gov
Facsimile (202) 371-2422

U.S. Mail—
CRM Journal
National Park Service
1849 C Street, NW (2286)
Washington, DC 20240-0001