

MELTEM Ö. GÜREL
Bilkent University

KATHRYN H. ANTHONY
University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign

The Canon and the Void

Gender, Race, and Architectural History Texts

Architectural history books play a significant role in conveying the culture, norms, and values of the architectural discipline to newcomers. In recent years, numerous publications have spotlighted the importance of women and African Americans as critics, creators, and consumers of the built environment. Yet, to what extent is this recent discourse on gender and racial issues included in architectural history texts? And how gender or racially inclusive are they? Are twenty-first-century architectural educators presenting newly uncovered architectural histories from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries? Building upon prior research, this article seeks to address these issues by examining history texts currently assigned at fourteen leading architectural schools accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board. In textbooks with multiple editions, we compared relevant information in both earlier and later versions. Our analysis of these history texts revealed that contributions of women remain only marginally represented in the grand narrative of architecture. And for the most part, African Americans are omitted altogether. We challenge authors to reassess the next generation of architectural history texts and suggest ways to do so.

Architectural history books play a significant role in conveying the culture, norms, and values of the architectural discipline to newcomers. In recent years, numerous publications have spotlighted the importance of women and African Americans as critics, creators, and consumers of the built environment. Yet, to what extent is this recent discourse on gender and racial issues included in architectural history texts? And how gender or racially inclusive are they? Architectural history relies upon the analysis of great monuments to explain the development of the built environment.¹ Whether interpreted primarily within formalistic, stylistic, or aesthetic concerns or, more recently, sociocultural contexts, buildings encompassing the traditional boundaries of the canon reflect traditional Eurocentric patriarchal

perspectives. Inevitably, this provides only a partial view since the built environment in its totality is shaped by diverse groups of people. If buildings are to be interpreted as sociocultural objects and architecture as an artifact of social, cultural, economic, and political phenomena that mirror societies at certain points in time, architectural history must recognize how diverse groups of people contribute to the built environment.

In this spirit, this paper examines how gender and racial issues are addressed in architectural history survey textbooks. The study focuses on twentieth-century architecture, spilling marginally into the late nineteenth and early twenty-first centuries, as this period coincides with the entry of women and African Americans into the field. Within this framework, we

conducted a comparative content analysis of “popular” architectural history survey texts required in architectural history classes in several American architectural schools accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). We used a chronological analysis, comparing earlier and later editions, to chart the influence of gender and racial research on architectural history survey books over the past twenty years.

Architectural history textbooks are a primary part of survey courses that introduce students to the canonical premises of the discipline. Not only do they transmit the culture and normative precepts of architecture to newcomers but they also “offer a case by which to explore how to sustain communication among different branches of knowledge and to allow

the possibility of larger historical reflection."² Recent architectural survey courses taught in the United States have been modified to accommodate additional perspectives such as non-Western experiences. Through the adoption of more inclusive textbooks, the content in these history courses has widened the traditional boundaries of the canon, shifting from an exclusive focus on Eurocentric histories to a broader view. For example, Sir Banister Fletcher's *The History of Architecture* has long been replaced by more "inclusive" texts, such as Spiro Kostof's *A History of Architecture*. To encourage such practices, the NAAB has recently introduced an accreditation criterion requiring the restructuring of mandatory survey courses to include non-Western architecture at an "understanding" level.³ Arguably, these changes, in turn, will increase interest of non-Western architectural research in American universities.

In fact, the NAAB has played a critical role in the gradual transformation of architectural history courses. The 2004 NAAB Student Performance Criterion 8, Western traditions, calls for "Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape, and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them." Criterion 9, Non-Western Traditions, calls for "Understanding of the parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world." Criterion 13, Human Diversity, calls for "Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals, and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects."⁴ Note that the 1998 NAAB Student Performance Criteria called for only an awareness of both non-Western traditions and human diversity.⁵ This increase from awareness to understanding, a shift to a desired higher level of learning, reflects NAAB's will to strengthen this aspect of the architectural curriculum.

The last two decades have also witnessed a body of creative research on women, African Americans, and the built environment, which attempts to integrate them into a broadened view of history as well as more enlightened general education courses. Gender and racial issues have entered into the field of architectural history, theory, and criticism. However, has this research made its way into mainstream architectural history textbooks that expose students to the world of architecture? In other words, has the grand narrative of architecture responded to the dynamism of this recent body of research? If so, to what extent do current architectural history texts reflect this trend? To what extent have they kept pace with recent research? Moreover, can architectural history survey courses be gender and racially inclusive? And why is this important?

Next we will provide an overview of research and criticism of the canon. Then, we will analyze some major architectural history textbooks to assess the extent to which they include gender and racial research that expand upon the existing canon.

Rethinking Architectural History in Terms of Gender, Race, and Space

Ever since the late 1970s, the architectural discipline has witnessed an increased interest in feminist research. *Women in American Architecture: A Historic and Contemporary Perspective* (1977), a publication and exhibition organized by the Architectural League of New York through its Archive of Women in Architecture, was one of the earliest attempts to document women's architectural history.⁶ Edited and curated by Susana Torre, this pioneering project assembled a collection of work exploring the accomplishments of women practitioners in American architecture. While early feminist work, in the tradition of radical feminism, offered critical insights on women's experience of "man-made environments,"⁷ the ensuing approaches have addressed postmodern thought by questioning the traditional premises of the male canon through introducing new objects of

study—"the actual material which historians chose to look at"—and reevaluating "the intellectual criteria by which historians interpret those objects of study."⁸ According to Jane Rendell, drawing upon psychoanalysis, poststructuralism, philosophy, and gender theory, this interdisciplinary research has embraced theory, history, and criticism, promoting a fundamental rethinking of architectural history.⁹

Although scholastic contributions vary in focus, content, approach, and method, they all reflect the common stance that women's contributions should be given appropriate representation. In this regard, some feminist historians have pursued research to expose contributions of "prolific" women architects who left a mark on the architectural landscape yet did not receive the recognition that they deserved. Among these are biographies, essays, and exhibitions on Julia Morgan, Eileen Gray, Lilly Reich, Charlotte Perriand, and others.¹⁰

One avenue through which unacknowledged contributions of women architects/designers has been illuminated has entailed exploring architectural collaborations of now famous historical pairs such as Mies van der Rohe and Lilly Reich, Le Corbusier and Charlotte Perriand, Edwin Lutyens and Gertrude Jekyll, Charles Rennie Mackintosh and Margaret Macdonald, Walter Burley Griffin and Marion Mahony Griffin, Louis Kahn and Anne Tyng, Alvar Aalto and Aino Marsio-Aalto, Alison and Peter Smithson, and Ray and Charles Eames. More recent partnerships, such as Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown, Margaret McCurry and Stanley Tigerman, Tod Williams and Billie Tsien, Frances Halsband and Robert Kliment, Elizabeth Diller and Ricardo Scofidio, and Laurinda Spear and Bernardo Fort-Brescia, have also sparked the interest of feminist historians and critics.¹¹ In this spirit, women architects such as Denise Scott Brown who denounced sexism and the star system had a major impact in promoting scholarly interest in this area.¹² Gwendolyn Wright's *A Partnership: Catherine Bauer and William Wurster* presented yet another model of collaboration by showing "how Catherine Bauer,

a social historian, ‘metamorphosed’ the practice of the architect William Wurster, whom she met and married in 1940, by ‘politicizing’ him, infusing his domestic designs with her social and political ideas, just as he helped her to become aware of the needs of middle-class American families.”¹³

Other historians have examined the contributions of women to the built environment by shifting the focus from the individual architect/designer to the client. The capacity of patronage to illuminate women’s influence as clients and consumers in the design of the built environment has been intriguing to many historians. They reassessed the role of the architect, portraying the client as collaborator in the design and the development of spaces, and the architect as operator in this collaboration, rather than as genius solely responsible for the creation of a building. Research on female patronage has been broad in scope ranging from the Western modern to Islamic architecture. Alice T. Friedman’s *Women and the Making of the Modern House* is among the most significant scholarly works on this topic.¹⁴

In search of an alternative architectural history, feminist historians proposed a paradigm shift from the “monumental” to the “residential” to explore the links between domestic architecture and feminist theories. In this arena, the seminal work of Dolores Hayden and Gwendolyn Wright aimed to clarify “relationships between house design, urban growth, cultural and economic factors, and work structures.”¹⁵ Hayden’s *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities* (1981) explored the history of feminist ideas and theories of nineteenth-century figures such as Catharine and Harriet Beecher, Melusina Fay Pierce, and Charlotte Perkins Gilman in the development of housing.¹⁶

Other scholars focusing on the built environment traditionally considered as peripheral to the domain of architecture, such as interior design, landscape architecture, and urban history, have perpetuated “a view of architecture as part of a continuum of space which extends from a consid-

eration of objects and interiors at the macro scale to regional and local planning processes at the macro level.”¹⁷ Material culture studies and vernacular architecture constitute two major areas of exploration.¹⁸ Numerous books and articles examine the history of female interior designers and their role in shaping the built environment starting at the turn of the twentieth century.¹⁹ Isabelle Anscombe’s *A Woman’s Touch* (1984) is considered to be a pioneer in this area.²⁰ Pat Kirkham and Penny Sparke’s study of “Women Designers in the USA 1900–2000” is an example of research analyzing the paradigm of women designers.²¹

An examination of feminist research in the history of built environment shows that women’s contributions are not limited to their participation in the design of buildings. Women architectural critics’ rich history ranges from Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s “economic, social, and architectural arguments for collective domestic life”²² to Edith Wharton and Ogden Codman’s views on division of labor in architecture toward the end of the nineteenth century.²³ In the twentieth century, by addressing housing, planning, and architectural design, women critics such as Catherine Bauer, Jane Jacobs, Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, and Ada Louise Huxtable played significant roles.²⁴ They each addressed architectural issues relevant both to the profession and to the general public. In fact, these women were ahead of their time in criticizing the Modern Movement at a time when their colleagues often promoted it uncritically.²⁵

Just as feminism has sparked a new brand of scholarship in architecture, an increasing awareness of the role of race, and especially that of African Americans in architectural history, has begun to do so as well.²⁶ Toward the end of the twentieth century, the history of African Americans and their architecture was rediscovered. In fact, according to Brad Grant and Dennis Mann, longtime scholars of African American architects, “African Americans have had a lengthy tradition in the building of this country beginning with architects like Joseph Francis Mangin,

the principal designer of New York City’s City Hall; Benjamin Banneker, who assisted Pierre Charles L’Enfant in the planning of Washington, DC; Julian Abele, who designed the Widener Library at Harvard University; and Paul Revere Williams, who designed Hollywood homes for a number of movie stars. Even today, architects like J. Max Bond, former Dean of the School of Architecture and Environmental Studies at City College of New York has been honored for his award-winning design of the Martin Luther King Center for Non-Violent Social Change in Atlanta (1984), and Donald Stull and David Lee, partners in their own firm in Boston, have been recognized for their many award-winning designs.”²⁷ Others have described the early architecture of Pre-Civil War slave plantations, many of which were designed and built by African Americans. The pioneering role of Booker T. Washington in shaping the Tuskegee University, one of the nation’s first African American institutions of higher education, has also been recognized. A body of scholarly literature on these groundbreaking architects is now beginning to appear.²⁸

The sample of gender and racial architectural research included here is far from complete. Nonetheless, it illustrates various attempts to integrate women and African Americans into architectural history. Such critiques prompt the reconsideration of the confinements of the canon. They raise the questions, what kind of picture do architectural history survey texts provide about our built environment? And how complete is that picture? What are the selection criteria used to build the canon? And who decides what is included—and what is excluded? Who have been the gatekeepers of the architectural profession, and who are the gatekeepers of architectural history?

Rethinking the Canon and Architectural History Textbooks

Historians of art and architecture have challenged the metanarrative or the canon presented through mainstream history texts. Drawing upon Pierre

Bourdieu's social theory, Christopher B. Steiner suggested that the canon was "a structuring structure which is in a continuous process of reproducing itself, mediating its identity through market forces."²⁹ Steiner argued, "it is not . . . what is in and out of the canon that ought to be of concern to us, but rather the social structure of the canon itself that must be reconsidered."³⁰ Questioning the rationale behind the canon has probed the expansion of its premises to include new entries such as non-Western architecture in various ways.³¹ However, an important consideration is the nature of how these new entries are included. New inclusions, when tacked onto the existing grand narrative, are inevitably defined by the dominating discourse. A prominent survey textbook that has been both praised and criticized for its inclusiveness is Spiro Kostof's *A History of Architecture*. According to Zeynep Celik, Kostof's book is "a remarkable example . . . which goes beyond mere 'inclusion' and pulls the non-Western material into the heart of the argument."³² By contrast, drawing attention to the limitations of Kostof's book, Panayiota Pyla argued that addition of suppressed or alternative histories "constructs a false dichotomy between existing knowledge and new knowledge" for they "have the potential to revise our understanding of history at large."³³

Perhaps the value of Kostof's book lies in how it serves as a seminal example of rethinking and challenging the structure of the Western canon. As the canon is restructured to include emerging ideas and tendencies, the principles that underlie its presence become stronger. According to Gulsum Baydar, "when other architectures entered the grand narrative of architectural discipline (i.e., the canon) they found themselves always already inscribed by the premises of the latter."³⁴ Proponents of vernacular architecture, such as Dell Upton and Henry Glassie, suggested the replacement of the canonical approach with a more populist endeavor that portrayed a society—its sociopolitical agenda—through the study of ordinary everyday life.³⁵

Debates on the status and operation of the canon open new paradigms through which architectural history may be reevaluated. Meanwhile, teaching architectural history through the pedagogy of an accepted grand narrative remains standard practice. Moreover, architectural survey courses substantiate the only historical exposure a student is most likely to acquire in a professional program. In this respect, the visibility of "other" architectures and "other" people (women, African Americans, non-Westerners, etc.) in history textbooks demystifies the belief that no alternative histories exist.³⁶ Such visibility has not only the potential to provoke awareness of women's and other influences in the evolution of the built environment but also to spark critiques of the hegemonic discourses.

Research Methodology: Selection of Architectural History Textbooks

Acknowledging the capacity of major textbooks to reshape our understanding of architectural history, this study focused primarily on coverage of twentieth-century architecture—an era characterized by women's proliferation and dissemination in the field. To evaluate the extent to which research reflecting women's and African Americans' contribution to the built environment penetrated into the text, we analyzed architectural history textbooks published since 1985. In order to provide a chronological dimension to our study, we also compared both earlier and later editions of the same text, if available. We sought to understand if and how the grand narrative of architecture has changed. Have prior omissions or misattributions of women's work been corrected? How, if at all, have African Americans been portrayed in American architectural history texts?

Two genres of textbooks were targeted: (1) general survey books covering architecture from prehistory to the present and (2) twentieth-century architecture. In this respect, we build upon Karen Kingsley's 1988 essay on gender issues in teaching

architectural history.³⁷ Almost two decades later, was Kingsley's description of architecture as a "womanless history" still true? Were architectural history texts still, as Peggy McIntosh argued, "taught without any attention to the products, contributions, or experience of women?"³⁸

We used two broad-reaching criteria to identify the architectural programs whose history textbooks were included in this research. (1) The school was one of the 113 institutions offering an NAAB-accredited undergraduate and/or graduate program. (2) On the basis of its history, reputation, and contribution to architectural education, the school could be considered a benchmark program, influencing the curricula of other programs around the world. We narrowed down the selection process in three ways. First, we drew upon a list of 13 schools that architectural historian Stanford Anderson identified as having "played a role in . . . producing the emerging voices in history of architecture" and shaping the debates on history, theory, and criticism.³⁹ Second, we reviewed three of the most recent volumes ranking architectural programs in the United States, *America's Best Architecture & Design Schools* (2005) and the *Almanac of Architecture & Design* (2002, 2004).⁴⁰ Practitioners and firms rate schools based on their ability to prepare students for professional practice. We included only those schools that appeared consistently in all three volumes. Third, we supplemented the prior two lists with a historically African American institution with a longstanding architecture program. Based on this selection process, we identified a total of twenty-one schools.

For the first phase of research, we contacted each of these twenty-one architecture programs with a request to name the textbooks used in their introductory architectural history survey courses. Faculty representatives who teach these courses at fifteen architectural programs responded. One school did not provide book titles for the introductory course; as a graduate program only, it relied only on theoretical texts for its courses on modern architecture. As

a result, we obtained information from a total of fourteen schools.⁴¹ A number of faculty members indicated their dissatisfaction with the scope of the textbooks that they assign. Four professors noted that they and their colleagues have previously used different architectural history survey books. One professor mentioned using supporting documents in addition to the textbook. Two faculty members indicated that they recently switched to textbooks that included greater coverage of non-Western traditions than was the case in their prior texts. Three professors used supplementary textbooks to address non-Western architecture. They assigned Dora P. Crouch and June G. Johnson, *Traditions in Architecture: Africa, America, Asia, and Oceania* (2001).⁴² Two professors assigned Leland M. Roth, *Understanding Architecture: Its Elements, History, and Meaning* (1993).⁴³

Our responses indicate a strong consistency among architectural history textbooks assigned at all 14 architectural programs. Not only did we find consistency across schools but also we found consistency over time; in fact, some textbooks were the same as those to which Kingsley referred.⁴⁴ Table 1 displays the results of our analysis, listing architecture history survey textbooks according to their genre and popularity. Note that some schools used multiple texts. For general architectural history survey courses, all schools studied assigned one of the following three books: Trachtenberg and Hyman, *Architecture, from Prehistory to Postmodernity* (2002); Kostof, *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals* (1995);

and Moffett, Fazio, and Wodehouse, *Buildings across Time* (2004).⁴⁵

For the second phase of this research, we examined texts addressing twentieth-century architecture and American architecture. Faculty had mentioned some of these texts in their responses to our query. The text most often cited was that by Curtis, *Modern Architecture Since 1900* (1996) (see Table 2).⁴⁶

Analysis of General Survey Texts Covering Architecture from Prehistory to Present

One of the most commonly assigned introductory textbooks in architectural programs appears to be *Architecture, from Prehistory to Postmodernity* by Marvin Trachtenberg and Isabelle Hyman. While an admirable volume that reflects a vast amount of historical research, as is no doubt true of all architectural history texts, this book exemplifies the traditional Eurocentric, monumental, patriarchal approach. The contributions of women creators, clients, and critics are largely overlooked. For example, in a discussion of the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris, established in 1819, the authors state, “it was in theory completely open and democratic; anyone, French or foreign, between fifteen and thirty years of age, could take and pass the entrance exam.”⁴⁷ But what about women? In fact, they were not allowed. The authors later mention Richard Morris Hunt, the first American at the Ecole (1846–1952). Here would be an ideal opportunity to discuss the pioneering role

of Julia Morgan. Bernard Maybeck encouraged her to pursue her studies in architecture after she received an engineering degree from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1894, passing on a rumor that the Ecole might be ready to accept women. Yet, when Julia Morgan arrived in Paris to begin her studies in 1896, she was initially refused admission for two years because the Ecole had never admitted a woman. Morgan was eventually admitted.⁴⁸

The discussion of Frank Lloyd Wright overlooks Marion Mahony Griffin, who worked in his studio from 1895 to 1910 and played an active role both as a designer and in creating outstanding renderings of Wright’s ideas. The same section could also include an entry on one of Wright’s greatest masterpieces, the Dana Thomas House (1902–1904) in Springfield, Illinois, where client Susan Lawrence Dana (1862–1946) encouraged Wright to stretch his design talents in new directions. By contrast, a later section cites Edgar Kaufmann, the client for Fallingwater in Bear Run, Pennsylvania (1937).⁴⁹ In retrospect, if Kaufmann merits a brief mention, why exclude Dana? Both clients were unusually enlightened, allowing Wright to create some of his most creative residential designs.

Both 1986 and 2002 versions include a lengthy discussion on the Barcelona Pavilion (1929) and its textual qualities; yet, they fully dismiss Mies’s long-term collaboration with Lilly Reich on this and other projects of the interwar period.⁵⁰ Even in the 2002 edition of this text, women architects and designers,

Table 1. General survey textbooks covering architecture from prehistory to present

No. of schools using book	Title	Author(s)	First edition	Second edition
7	Architecture, from Prehistory to Postmodernity	M. Trachtenberg and I. Hyman	1986	2002
7	A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals	Spiro Kostof	1985	1995
5	Buildings across Time	M. Moffett, M. Fazio, and L. Wodehouse	2004	

Table 2. Survey textbooks covering twentieth-century architecture and American architecture

No. of schools using book	Title	Author(s)	First edition	Newer editions
5	Modern Architecture Since 1900	William J.R. Curtis	1982	1983, 1987, 1996
2	Modern Architecture: A Critical History	Kenneth Frampton	1980	1985, 1992, 2000 (reprint), 2004 (reprint)
2	American Architecture	Leland M. Roth	2001	

such as Eileen Gray and Charlotte Perriand, influential figures of Modern architecture, are omitted.

A four-page section focusing on Post-Modernism and Robert Venturi briefly mentions Denise Scott Brown: “In 1972, Venturi, together with his wife, Denise Scott Brown, an architect and planner, and the architect Steven Izenour, published a second assault on Modernism—*Learning from Las Vegas* . . .”⁵¹ Yet, the authors fail to acknowledge her elsewhere. For example, “So crucial were Venturi’s ideas to contemporary architecture that he might well be called the Viollet-le-Duc of Post-Modernism . . .”⁵² But what about Scott Brown? She herself stated, “We both design every inch of a building together.”⁵³

To the authors’ credit, the latter portion of the 2002 edition of this book includes new discussions of three female “star” architects, among them, Zaha Hadid.⁵⁴ Also mentioned is Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, along with her husband, Andres Duany, in the context of the New Urbanism movement and Seaside, Florida.⁵⁵ Another woman featured is Gae Aulenti and the Musee d’Orsay in Paris, the adaptive reuse of the turn-of-the-century (originally built circa 1898–1900) train station before and after interior remodeling.⁵⁶

Broadening the paradigm from a focus purely on the monumental to include non-Western as well as vernacular architecture, Kostof’s *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals* recognizes the contributions of Catharine Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe to nineteenth-century American

residential architecture. Yet, the discussion of the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago makes no mention of Sophia Hayden and her pioneering role in designing the Women’s Building.⁵⁷ Given Kostof’s location at the University of California, Berkeley, one might expect to see a description of the prolific work of Julia Morgan, who practiced in the San Francisco Bay Area. Yet, it cannot be found. Like Trachtenberg and Hyman, Kostof’s discussion dismisses most contributions of women architects.

Nonetheless, the later edition of Kostof’s classic text (revised by Greg Castillo), published posthumously, corrects some prior oversights and is more gender inclusive. For example, while Kostof’s 1985 edition discusses *Learning from Las Vegas* (1972) and cites it as “one of Venturi’s influential books”⁵⁸ without mentioning coauthors Denise Scott Brown and Steven Izenour, the 1995 edition acknowledges Scott Brown, drawing her into the discussion of Venturi’s work.⁵⁹

Moffett, Fazio, and Wodehouse’s *Buildings across Time*, the newest of the volumes analyzed here, discusses nineteenth-century developments that include Richard Morris Hunt and the World’s Columbian Exposition, but it overlooks the contribution of Sophia Hayden (1869–1953), the first woman to graduate in architecture from MIT and the designer of the Woman’s Building (1893).⁶⁰ The discussion of twentieth century and Modernism addressing Charles Rennie Mackintosh omits the role of his wife, Margaret MacDonald (1864–1933), one that Mackintosh, himself, identified as critical.⁶¹ In

a letter that Macintosh wrote to his wife, he stated, “You must remember that in all my architectural efforts, you have been half, if not three-quarters of them.”⁶² The authors’ discussion of Gerrit Rietveld’s Schroeder House (1924) as a quintessential De Stijl building omits the role of Truus Schroeder (1924), his female client, who, as Alice Friedman argued, served as collaborator in design or catalyst for architectural innovations.⁶³ Similarly, a section on Le Corbusier makes no mention of Charlotte Perriand.⁶⁴ The section on Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1886–1969) includes a short mention of Lilly Reich (1885–1947) and her role in the Barcelona Pavilion (1929): she “shares credit with him for the interior design, particularly for the deep red velvet curtain that hung over the front glass wall.”⁶⁵ In fact, her contributions to Mies’ designs are minimized. As Mark Wigley has acknowledged, much of Reich’s collaboration with Mies—“as is the case with almost all of the many such relationships in modern architecture that confuse the overdetermined opposition between the ‘masculine’ domain of structure and the ‘feminine’ domain of ornament—has been stricken from the apparently exhaustive accounts of the ‘master’ . . .”⁶⁶

Moffett, Fazio, and Wodehouse also discuss Edith Farnsworth and the Farnsworth House (1950–1952); however, no mention is made of the lengthy legal battle fought out in the courts and in the press between Mies and his client.⁶⁷ Their analysis of Modernism in the mid- and late twentieth century includes Alvar Aalto, Louis Kahn, and Robert Venturi

and their reactions to earlier ideals of Modernism; yet, it omits any mention of their female collaborators.⁶⁸ This theme could be enriched by a discussion of women critics such as Jane Jacobs who reacted strongly against the modern movement.

To what extent is racial diversity included as a component of architectural history in these texts? It is fair to say that it is generally overlooked. In particular, the African American dimension of recent architectural history is ignored, giving students the impression that it does not even exist.

Analysis of Survey Textbooks Covering Twentieth-Century Architecture and American Architecture

In the domain of twentieth-century architecture, William J.R. Curtis's *Modern Architecture since 1900* is a widely used textbook. Within the canonical premises, the 1996 edition includes "non-Western architects," such as Hasan Fathy and Sedad Hakki Eldem, as well as a few women.⁶⁹ Marion Mahony marginally enters the 1996 edition, relegated only to an illustration, her 1912 competition rendering for the design of Australia's New Federal Capital. Yet, her role as a professional partner to her husband, Walter Burley Griffin, and her contribution to winning the Canberra competition entry, is totally overlooked.⁷⁰ No mention is made of Julia Morgan and her prolific architectural career. In his 1996 version, Curtis's extensive coverage of Le Corbusier and his influence on the International Style briefly mentions Charlotte Perriand, who had been omitted from the prior 1982 edition: "Working in collaboration with Charlotte Perriand, he [Le Corbusier] developed an entire range of tubular steel furniture relying upon bicycle technology and fitted to the human body in sitting or reclining positions."⁷¹ Curtis also recognizes architect and designer Eileen Gray for her "refined aesthetic for the interior" in somewhat greater length in the same paragraph.⁷² Yet, one can argue that these two women had an even greater impact than that acknowledged in the text. For example, Gray's departure from the mainstream Modernist discourse

on functionalism at the time may signal her as a forerunner of a later Modernist perspective. Gray's close consideration of everyday and domestic activities led her to design the first colored sheets and drawers with pivotal mechanisms.⁷³ Her work can be best understood at the intersection of interior content and the container or architectural shell. In this respect, she brought a fresh perspective to the plurality of Modernism and can be viewed as a figure ahead of her time.

Curtis's extensive examination of Mies's work excludes his important collaboration with Lilly Reich while in Germany. Understanding the changing nature of this collaboration sheds light on some of the differences between Mies's earlier pre-World War II work in Germany and his later postwar work in the United States. Another prolific collaboration excluded is that of Ray and Charles Eames. Curtis describes their classic 1945-1949 residence, in Santa Monica, California, as "Charles Eames's own house"; yet, he makes no mention at all of Ray Eames either as an architect or as a client/owner.⁷⁴ Other famous couples of midcentury modernism, such as Alison and Peter Smithson, and Jane Drew and Maxwell Fry, are given shared credit. Curtis includes voices of selected women critics of Modern architecture such as Denise Scott Brown in *Learning from Las Vegas*,⁷⁵ Jane Jacobs in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*,⁷⁶ as well as Catherine Bauer's writings in praise of Dutch town planning.⁷⁷

A careful examination of Curtis's text reveals an absence of African American architects and their role in shaping modern architecture since 1900. For example, no mention is made of such luminaries as Paul Revere Williams, known as "architect to the stars" because of his many Hollywood clients, or of Max Bond, architect of the Martin Luther King Junior Center for Nonviolent Social Change in Atlanta, Georgia.

Kenneth Frampton's *Modern Architecture: A Critical History* appears to be more sensitive to recognizing collaborations. Even in his early 1980 edition, Frampton refers to Gertrude Jekyll's "small

but complex gardens"⁷⁸ when describing early country houses of Edward Lutyens, to Margaret Macdonald alongside Charles Rennie Mackintosh, and to Anne Tyng and Louis Kahn. Frampton's 1985 revision acknowledges Tyng's influence on Kahn, and their common fascination with the geometric forms of Buckminster Fuller, in the following passage: "It is clear from Kahn's subsequent career that this side of Fuller's thought exercised a strong hold over his development, and never more so than during the period of his association with Ann Tyng, who was an ardent follower of the Fuller line."⁷⁹ Frampton's 1985 revision briefly lists Eileen Gray and Charlotte Perriand in the context of the Parisian Neo-Cubist traditions of the 1930s but, unlike Curtis, provides no discussion of their work. Gray and Perriand are woven into the modern fabric regarding their elaborations of "French lightweight ferrovitreous constructions" along with Jean Ginsberg, Bruno Elkouken, "and above all Le Corbusier."⁸⁰ Similarly, the discussion of rational architecture and Ernst May's work briefly refers to Margarete Schutte-Lihotzky's design of the Frankfurt Kitchen. Although criticized for creating a severe working environment, Schutte-Lihotzky's kitchen design for the city of Frankfurt aimed to eliminate "household drudgery through rationalization."⁸¹ In fact, the Frankfurt Kitchen has often been misattributed to Ernst May.⁸²

Frampton's approach is more theoretical and perhaps more challenging for an undergraduate audience than the other textbooks covered here; accordingly, it is usually a recommended rather than a required text. Nevertheless, it portrays a commendable start to incorporate women architects and designers into the historical mainstream or the canonical premises. That said, as was the case for the Curtis text, a review of the Frampton monograph revealed no mention of African American architects or their work.

Leland Roth's *American Architecture: A History* makes a modest attempt to integrate women.⁸³ For example, a section on the architecture of the

American city and suburb (1885–1915) includes a discussion of women and the American architectural profession. Contributions of Catharine Beecher, Mariana Griswold van Rensselaer, Louise Bethune, Minerva Parker Nichols, Sophia Hayden, Theodate Pope, and Julia Morgan are outlined here.⁸⁴ Marion Mahony is credited with “the splendid published perspective drawing” for Wright’s plans of the third model house, published in the April 1907 issue of the *Ladies’ Home Journal*.⁸⁵ In a discussion of responses to Modernism (1973–2000), Denise Scott Brown is credited for her collaborative work with Robert Venturi and John Rauch for such projects as the Fire Station No. 4 in Columbus, Indiana (1966), and for her partnership with Venturi on their competition for the Yale Mathematics Building (1968), which won first prize but was not built.⁸⁶

Elsewhere, however, the Roth text falls short. For example, in a chapter on architecture in the age of energy and enterprise (1865–1885), a section discussing architectural education lists when architecture curricula were first offered at American colleges and universities: MIT, 1868; University of Illinois, 1870; and Cornell, 1871.⁸⁷ Here would be an opportunity to point out that few, if any women or persons of color attended these architecture schools until much later. In a chapter on nostalgia and the avant-garde (1915–1940), a section describing the architecture of the Southwest fails to mention Mary Colter and her extensive work for the Fred Harvey Company.⁸⁸ Nor does a subsequent chapter on the emergence of Modernism mention Elissa Alto, Alvar Alto’s wife, although Alto is given substantial coverage.⁸⁹ The section on preservation omits the role of women as preservationists and could include Jacqueline Kennedy who helped launch the preservation of Lafayette Square and the revitalization of Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, DC, and Beverly Willis and her catalytic role in the adaptive reuse of historic Victorian structures on San Francisco’s Union Street.⁹⁰ A subsequent section could also discuss the pioneering preservation work of Ann Beha. A search for African American architects and their work found

only one: Joseph Mangin, who trained in France and designed New York City’s City Hall (1802–1811).⁹¹

Conclusion

Recent historical research on women’s contributions to the built environment has expanded the boundaries of architectural history. A myriad of books and articles have illuminated the limitations of the canonical core and urged us to rethink its scope from a feminist perspective. So, too, have recent publications stressed the contributions of African American architects. Yet, our study of architectural history texts indicates that such critical thinking continues to remain marginal to the grand narrative of architecture. Even in the most recent texts published in the twenty-first century,⁹² figures that other authors widely acknowledged as prolific female voices remain, at best, marginally covered in the canonical premises of the text or at worst, totally dismissed. Most works on modern American architecture omit the work of African American architects altogether. While we recognize the enormous amount of research and depth of scholarship required to produce these volumes, and we understand the complexities confronted by each of these authors in determining what to include and exclude in their surveys, we challenge historians to reassess the next generation of architectural history texts.

Unfortunately, this void in today’s leading architectural history survey texts continues to portray an almost exclusively white male, “womanless” history. Perhaps, it is not quite the absolute womanless history described by Kingsley, yet overall not much has changed. Despite the fact that only recently have significant numbers of women been entering the architectural profession, the accomplishments of a few early leading women architects were acknowledged—up to a point—even during their lifetimes. For example, Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson included the interior designs of Lilly Reich and Charlotte Perriand, along with the architecture of Mies and Le Corbusier in *The International Style* (1932); it aimed to formulate a prescription of

European Modernism for an American architectural audience.⁹³ Eileen Gray was considered a successful designer when she practiced in the first half of the twentieth century—before history left her out. Her furniture and interiors were published widely, and the prestigious Dutch journal *Wendingen* dedicated an issue to her work in 1924. Gray was rediscovered in the 1970s and elevated to star status.

Subsequently, she was included in Sir Banister Fletcher’s *A History of Architecture* (1987).⁹⁴

In this respect, the continued dismissal or marginal coverage of these women and others in architectural history texts can be tied to prevailing attitudes dominating the construction of architectural history. Reich, Perriand, and even Gray constitute illustrious cases of women who have been largely absent from mainstream architectural texts because their work had been largely relegated to furniture and interior design, two professions emblematic of an inferior status by the standards of the canonical core of architecture. And even today, when numerous scholarly works have illuminated the spatial contributions of designers like Reich and Perriand, as well as their collaborative role with their respective “masters,” both women remain distant to the grand narrative of architecture as rendered in history texts. The most widely used architectural textbooks examined here, whether covering world history or twentieth-century modern history, overlooked Reich’s influence on Mies’s early work. Discussions comparing Mies’s earlier work in Europe and his later work in America, devoid of Reich’s influence, bear testimony to the voids in the selection and evaluation processes that form canonical premises. Documenting such collaborations enables readers to better understand and assess the work of architects who have been elevated to star status. It also has potential to expose “the collaborative nature of modern architecture and the success of bringing different values to the design process.”⁹⁵

The almost total exclusion of African American architects in the texts analyzed here poses new challenges to authors revising these works and to

scholars writing future architectural history surveys. One hopes for greater coverage of African American architects and their contributions especially in future surveys of twentieth-century architecture and American architecture, since that is when their most solid body of work began to emerge. The recent volume by Dreck Spurlock Wilson, *African American Architects: A Biographical Dictionary 1865–1945* is an excellent starting point, providing a wealth of information for historians who may be unfamiliar with this work.⁹⁶

Furthermore, criteria for inclusion in future texts can be broadened to include historic significance as well as artistic merit. In this regard, the criteria for listing buildings on the National Register for Historic Places can serve as a useful model for future historians to consider, thus widening the gates of architectural history. Among the evaluation criteria for the National Register are buildings or structures

- a) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; and/or
- b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; and/or
- c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; and/or
- d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.⁹⁷

Expanding the criteria for inclusion in such a manner would allow historians to integrate milestones in African American architectural history into the broader spectrum of American architectural history, for example, the role of Booker T. Washington and the founding of Tuskegee University in Tuskegee, Alabama; the contributions of Historically Black Colleges and Universities; the formation of the

National Organization of Minority Architects; the jolting impact of Whitney Young's accusations of racism at the 1968 American Institute of Architects National Convention;⁹⁸ and, most recently, the 2004 opening of the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, designed by the late Walter Blackburn, a grandson of slaves. Key issues of historical importance that could be discussed in future architectural history texts include the ways in which spaces define insiders and outsiders, space as a framework for constructing racial and ethnic identity, and the invisibility of racialized spaces.⁹⁹

Textbooks provide a medium through which students and readers with an interest in architecture are exposed to the premises of architectural history. As a primary component of survey courses that must fulfill accreditation requirements of the NAAB, these texts play a major role in shaping how students formulate their conceptions of the built environment. For students who are not majoring in architecture, architectural history courses are likely to be their only exposure to the field. Faculty members at most schools included in this study supplement their mainstream textbooks with additional non-Western material. Yet, by doing so, and because history texts, for the most part, fail to fully integrate non-Western work, these suppressed histories still retain secondary status. African Americans remain overlooked in architectural history texts. One cannot help but wonder if the NAAB had not required the non-Western component, would architectural courses have changed at all?

NAAB has not yet specifically acknowledged gender issues in architectural history as a criterion for accreditation. Thus, it is possible for students to graduate from an accredited architecture program without ever being exposed to women's contribution to the built environment. Because they remain relegated to elective courses and small-scale seminars—still rarities in most architectural programs—women's architectural history remains segregated from the 'mainstream' history of architecture.¹⁰⁰

If called upon during their graduation ceremonies, how many architecture students could name at least five African American architects and their work? Our guess is that at best, very few students at *any* school of architecture—with the exception of Historically Black Colleges and Universities—could do so. In this respect, architectural education is missing the mark. And in a profession where the number of African American students continues to remain astonishingly low, at less than 5%, it is all the more important that texts recognize their heritage and contributions.¹⁰¹ It is up to authors of future NAAB student performance criteria as well as future architectural history texts to remedy these deficiencies. In order for change to occur, NAAB criteria regarding diversity, and gender and racial issues in particular, must be strengthened and more specific. A greater measure of accountability is needed to ensure that faculty teach and students learn about the importance of gender and racial diversity in architectural history. As we have already seen, changes in the NAAB criteria can translate into enhanced versions of architectural history, but one need not preclude the other.

The tendency of faculty members to select the same few books, as indicated here, underscores the power of the canon. While conserving what has been sanctioned as "great works of architecture," the void remains predominantly unnoticed. Architectural history textbooks play a critical role in shaping and reshaping architectural education. They bear an important responsibility in exposing the students to more diverse histories, and those that have only recently been uncovered. As Edward Said has argued, "society and culture have been the heterogeneous product of heterogeneous people in an enormous variety of cultures, tradition and situations."¹⁰² In the architectural sphere, women and African Americans and their contributions to the mosaic of the built environment constitute a significant component of this heterogeneity. In sum, the premises of the canon must continue to be challenged.

Acknowledgment

We thank all faculty members who responded to our inquiries and enabled us to conduct this research.

Notes

1. Karen Kingsley, "Gender Issues in Teaching Architectural History," *JAE* 41/2 (Winter 1988): 21–25.
2. Panayiota Pyla, "Historicizing Pedagogy: A Critique of Kostof's A History of Architecture," *JAE* 52/4 (May 1999): 223.
3. Until 2004, NAAB specified three levels of competence for accreditation purposes: (1) awareness, (2) understanding, and (3) ability. The 2004 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation now specify only (1) understanding or (2) ability.
4. The National Architectural Accrediting Board, *The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* (Washington, DC: NAAB, 2004), <http://www.naab.org> (accessed August 15, 2005).
5. The National Architectural Accrediting Board, *1998 Guide to Student Performance Criteria* (Washington, DC: NAAB, 1998).
6. Susana Torre, ed., *Women in American Architecture: A Historic and Contemporary Perspective* (New York: Whitney Library of Design, 1977).
7. See, for examples, Dolores Hayden, "What Would a Non-Sexist City Be Like? Speculations on Housing, Urban Design and Human Work," in Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner, and Iain Borden, eds., *Gender, Space, Architecture* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 266–81; Matrix, *Making Space: Women and the Man-Made Environment* (London: Pluto Press, 1984); Leslie K. Weisman, "Women's Environmental Rights: A Manifesto," in *Making Room: Women and Architecture*, special issue, *Heresies* 11 3/3 (1981): 6–8; Leslie K. Weisman, *Discrimination by Design* (Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1992).
8. Jane Rendell, "Introduction: Gender, Space, Architecture," in Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner, and Iain Borden, eds., *Gender, Space, Architecture* (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 232.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 232.
10. See Peter Adam, *Eileen Gray: Architect/Designer* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1987); Sara Holmes Boutelle, *Julia Morgan Architect* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1988); Caroline Constant, *Eileen Gray* (London: Phaidon, 2000); Sonja Günther, *Lilly Reich, 1885–1947: Innenarchitektin, Designerin, Ausstellungsgestalterin* (Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1988); Mary McLeod, *Charlotte Perriand: An Art of Living* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 2003); Matilda McQuaid, *Lilly Reich Designer and Architect* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1996).
11. See Kathryn H. Anthony, *Designing for Diversity: Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Architectural Profession* (Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2001), pp. 56–65.
12. Denise Scott Brown, "Room at the Top? Sexism and the Star System," in Ellen P. Berkeley and Matilda McQuaid, eds., *Architecture: A Place for Women* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), pp. 237–246.
13. Gwendolyn Wright, "A Partnership: Catherine Bauer and William Wurster," in Marc Treib, ed., *An Everyday Modernism: The Houses of William Wurster* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995), p. 188; Cited in Beatriz Colomina, "Collaborations," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58/3 (September 1999/2000): 467–468.
14. Alice T. Friedman, *Women and the Making of the Modern House: A Social and Architectural History* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1998) see also Alice T. Friedman, "Architecture, Authority, and the Female Gaze: Planning and Representation in the Early Modern Country House," *Assemblage* 18 (1992): 40–61.
15. Kingsley, "Gender Issues in Teaching Architectural History," 24.
16. Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981).
17. Rendell, "Introduction: Gender, Space, Architecture," pp. 227–228.
18. See, for example, Annmarie Adams, "The Eichler Home: Intention and Experience in Postwar Suburbia," *Gender, Class, and Shelter: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* V (1995), 164–178.
19. See, for examples, Cheryl Robertson, "From Cult to Profession: Domestic Women in Search of Equity," in Katharine Martinez and Kenneth L. Ames, eds., *The Material Culture of Gender: The Gender of Material Culture* (Winterthur, DE: Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, 1997). For an argument on the reception of interior designers, see Dana Arnold, *Reading Architectural History* (London: Routledge, 2002), pp. 131–32. See also Dana Arnold, "Defining Femininity: Women and the Country House" in Dana Arnold, ed., *The Georgian Country House: Architecture, Landscape and Society* (Stroud, NY: Sutton, 1998), pp. 79–100. There are numerous books on prolific women designers, such as Elsie de Wolfe, Dorothy Draper, and Candice Wheeler (as well as books and articles written by them). For a recent addition to this genre, see Penny Sparke, "Elsie de Wolfe and Her Female Clients, 1905–15: Gender, Class and the Professional Interior Decorator," in Brenda Martin and Penny Sparke, eds., *Women's Places: Architecture and Design 1860–1960* (New York: Routledge, 2003), chap. 3.
20. Isabelle Anscombe, *A Woman's Touch* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1984).
21. Pat Kirkham and Penny Sparke, "A Women's Place . . .? Part 1," in Pat Kirkham, ed., *Women Designers in the USA 1900–2000* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 305–316.
22. Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*, p. 183.
23. Edith Wharton and Ogden Codman, *The Decoration of Houses* (London: B.J. Batsford, 1898).
24. See Anthony, *Designing for Diversity*, pp. 65–67.
25. Suzanne Stephens, "Voices of Consequence: Four Architectural Critics," in Susana Torre, ed., *Women in American Architecture: A Historic and Contemporary Perspective* (New York: Whitney Library of Design, 1977), pp. 136–143.
26. Literature on race in architecture, including the contributions of Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Latino/a Americans has also begun to emerge but it is outside the scope of this article.
27. Brad Grant and Dennis Mann, "Directory of African American Architects," <http://blackarch.uc.edu/publications/introd91.html> (accessed April 24, 2005).
28. Several bibliographic sources on the historical contributions of African American architects can be found in Anthony, *Designing for Diversity*, 2001, p. 81–91.
29. Christopher B. Steiner, "Can the Canon Burst?" *Art Bulletin* 78/2 (June 1996): 217.
30. *Ibid.*, 213.
31. It should be noted that Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978) has been very influential in promoting the reassessments of the canon.
32. Zeynep Celik, "Colonialism, Orientalism, and the Canon," *Art Bulletin* 78/2 (June 1996): 202.
33. Pyla, "Historicizing Pedagogy," 223.
34. Gulsum Nalbantoglu Baydar, "The House of Architecture," *Proceedings of the 19th EAAE International Conference* (Ankara, Turkey: Gazi University, 2001), p. 106.
35. See Dell Upton, "Architectural History of Landscape History?" *JAE* 44/4 (1991): 195–99; Henry Glassie, "Vernacular Architecture," in *Material Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), chap. 5.
36. Our use of the term demystification is inspired by Roland Barthes' discussion on the "myth." See Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, trans. Annette Lavers (New York: Hill and Wang, 1972).
37. Kingsley developed recommendations to incorporate women into architectural education. She proposed that architectural history courses should render Lilly Reich, Charlotte Perriand, and Margaret MacDonald for their collaboration with Mies, Le Corbusier, and Charles R. Mackintosh, respectively, Julia Morgan for her prolific career and Catharine Beecher for her contribution to feminist domestic theory and nineteenth-century residential architecture. See Kingsley, "Gender Issues in Teaching Architectural History."
38. *Ibid.*, 22.
39. Stanford Anderson, "Architectural History in Schools of Architecture," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58/3 (September 1999/2000): 285.
40. *America's Best Architecture & Design Schools* 6th ed. (Atlanta, GA: Design Futures Council, 2005); *Almanac of Architecture & Design* (Atlanta, GA: Greenway Communications, 2002 and 2004). All three publications are affiliated with Design Intelligence.
41. Information was obtained from Cornell University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Harvard University, Iowa State University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Tuskegee University, University of California Berkeley, University of Cincinnati, University of Colorado, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Michigan Ann Arbor, University of Pennsylvania, University of Texas at Austin, Syracuse University, and University of Virginia. We were unable to obtain many responses from faculty about which books were required for twentieth-century and American architecture. While some instructors provided this information, others noted that course offerings on these subjects varied—either no specific course was offered or else a variety of courses were offered. We noted books that were cited more than once by faculty who included this material.
42. Dora P. Crouch and June G. Johnson, *Traditions in Architecture: Africa, America, Asia, and Oceania* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).
43. Leland M. Roth, *Understanding Architecture: Its Elements, History, and Meaning* (New York: Icon Editions, 1993).
44. Kingsley, "Gender Issues in Teaching Architectural History."
45. Marvin Trachtenberg and Isabelle Hyman, *Architecture, from Prehistory to Postmodernity* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 2002); Spiro Kostof, *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals* (New York: Oxford University

- Press, 1995); Marian Moffett, Michael Fazio, and Lawrence Wodehouse, *Buildings across Time* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004).
46. William J. R. Curtis, *Modern Architecture Since 1900* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1996).
47. Trachtenberg and Hyman, *Architecture, from Prehistory to Postmodernity*, 2002, p. 428.
48. "Julia Morgan Biography, the Julia Morgan Collection," Special Collections, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, http://www.lib.calpoly.edu/spec_coll/morgan/bio/bio.html (accessed February 25, 2005).
49. Trachtenberg and Hyman, *Architecture, from Prehistory to Postmodernity*, 2002, p. 508.
50. Trachtenberg and Hyman, *Architecture, from Prehistory to Postmodernity*, 1986, pp. 531–34.
51. Trachtenberg and Hyman, *Architecture, from Prehistory to Postmodernity*, 2002, p. 536.
52. *Ibid.*
53. Jill Jordan Sieder, "A Building of Her Own." *US News and World Report* (October 14, 1996), p. 67.
54. Trachtenberg and Hyman, *Architecture, from Prehistory to Postmodernity*, 2002, pp. 562–563.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 575.
56. *Ibid.*, pp. 578–579.
57. Kostof, *A History of Architecture*, 1995, 670 (text) and 673 (photo).
58. Kostof, 1985, p. 750.
59. "The bright young architecture and planning team of Robert Venturi (b. 1925) and Denise Scott Brown (b. 1931) relieved the tension by embracing Main Street as it was—cars, tinsel, and all. Their *Learning from Las Vegas* (1972) is a serious analysis of the form and meaning of the Strip—from supermarket parking lots, service stations, and billboards to the neon marquees of gambling casinos." Kostof, *A History of Architecture*, 1995, p. 751.
60. Moffett, Fazio, and Wodehouse, *Buildings across Time*, 2004, pp. 433–34. Note that some architectural history faculty indicated that they selected this book in large part because, compared to other texts, it pays greater attention to non-Western architecture such as indigenous architecture in the pre-Columbian Americas, Islamic architecture, the traditional architecture of China and Japan, and the architecture of ancient India and Southeast Asia.
61. *Ibid.*, pp. 457–460.
62. Thomas Neat, *Part Seen, Part Imagined: Meaning and Symbolism in the Work of Charles Rennie Mackintosh and Margaret Macdonald* (Edinburgh: Canongate Press, 1994), p. 18.
63. Alice T. Friedman, *Women and the Making of the Modern House* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1997), ch. 2; Alice T. Friedman, "Not a Muse: The Client's Role at the Rietveld Schroeder House," in Diana Agrest, Patricia Conway, and Leslie Kanes Weisman, eds., *The Sex of Architecture* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1996), pp. 217–232.
64. Moffett et al., *Buildings across Time*, 2004, p. 522.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 517.
66. Mark Wigley, "White Walls, Designer Dresses" (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995), p. 151.
67. Moffett et al., *Buildings across Time*, 2004, p. 522.
68. *Ibid.*, pp. 533–542.
69. "Non-Western architect" is a problematic term that is beyond the scope of this study. Considering both Fathy and Eldem had "Western" education, can they be accounted as "non-Western" architects? For a discussion on Curtis's approach to non-Western architecture, see Sibel Bozdogan, "Architectural History in Professional Education: Reflections on Postcolonial Challenges to the Modern Survey," *JAE* 52/4 (1999): 207–215.
70. Curtis, *Modern Architecture*, 1996, p. 299.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 265.
72. *Ibid.*
73. See Deborah Nevins, "Eileen Gray," *Making Room: Women and Architecture*, special issue, *Heresies* 11 3/3 (1981), 68–72; Karen A. Franck, "A Feminist Approach to Architecture," in Ellen P. Berkeley and Matilda McQuaid, eds., *Architecture: A Place for Women* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), pp. 202–211; For Eileen Gray's different approach and criticism of modern architecture, also see John Kurtich and Garret Eakin, *Interior Architecture* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1993), pp. 14–16.
74. Curtis, *Modern Architecture*, 1996, p. 405. For the collaborative work of Ray and Charles Eames, see Diana Murphy, ed., *The Work of Charles and Ray Eames: A Legacy of Invention* (New York: H.N. Abrams in association with the Library of Congress and the Vitra Design Museum, 1997). Pat Kirkham, *Charles, and Ray Eames, Designers of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995).
75. *Ibid.*, p. 562.
76. *Ibid.*
77. *Ibid.*, p. 246.
78. Kenneth Frampton, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2000), p. 50.
79. *Ibid.*, pp. 243–244.
80. *Ibid.*, p. 334.
81. Susan R. Henderson, "A Revolution in the Women's Sphere: Grete Lihotzky and the Frankfurt Kitchen," in Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze, and Carol Henderson, eds., *Architecture and Feminism* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996), p. 245.
82. Such is the case in Curtis, *Modern Architecture*, 1982. However, this was corrected in the 1996 edition.
83. Leland M. Roth, *American Architecture: A History* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001).
84. *Ibid.*, pp. 266–267.
85. *Ibid.*, p. 308.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 487.
87. *Ibid.*, pp. 211–212.
88. *Ibid.*, pp. 348–349.
89. *Ibid.*, pp. 454–455.
90. *Ibid.*, pp. 468–471.
91. *Ibid.*, pp. 127–128.
92. Trachtenberg and Hyman, 2002, and Moffett et al., 2004.
93. Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson, *The International Style* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1966, first published in 1932), pp. 204, 127.
94. Lynne Walker, "Architecture and Reputation: Eileen Gray, Gender and Modernism," in Brenda Martin and Penny Sparke, eds., *Women's Places: Architecture and Design 1860–1960* (New York: Routledge, 2003), pp. 86–111.
95. Kingsley, "Gender Issues in Teaching Architectural History," 23.
96. Dreck Spurlock Wilson, ed., *African American Architects: A Biographical Dictionary 1865–1945* (New York: Routledge, 2004). For a thorough account of the work of Paul Revere Williams, the most prominent African American architect of the first part of the twentieth century, see Karen Hudson, *Paul Revere Williams: A Legacy of Style* (New York: Rizzoli, 1993).
97. National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places. "Listing a Property in the National Register of Historic Places," <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/listing.htm> (accessed August 15, 2005).
98. "You are not a profession that has distinguished itself by your social and civic contributions to the cause of civil rights . . . You are most distinguished by your thunderous silence and your complete irrelevance." Stephanie Stubbs, "Breaking through a Thunderous Silence," *American Institute of Architects Memo* (December 1992): 4.
99. These themes and others were the subject of a symposium on "Constructing Race: The Built Environment, Minoritization, and Racism in the United States" held at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, March 5–6, 2004. The symposium forms the basis of a forthcoming issue of *Landscape Journal* (Dianne Harris, ed.).
100. The second author teaches such a seminar. This article is a collaborative outgrowth of that course. Several reference materials can be found on the following Web site: "Architecture/Gender & Women's Studies 424—Professor Anthony—Gender and Race in Contemporary Architecture," <http://www2.arch.uiuc.edu/kanthony/arch424FA04/> (accessed August 15, 2005).
101. "Data Collection," *ArchVoices* (June 25, 2004), <http://www.archvoices.org> (accessed August 17, 2005).
102. Edward Said, "Politics of Knowledge," *Raritan* (Summer 1991), 25.