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Abstract
After modernism was conceptualized as the “International Style” at the Museum of Modern Art in 1932, historians and critics sought to legitimate American architecture through the construction of a linear ancestry which placed the beginnings of modernism in the nineteenth century, on American soil. Victorian-era revivalism complicated this thread, but it also served as the impetus for a revision of history. The possibilities of interpretation offered by the architectural exhibition, and its key evidence, the photograph, were critical to this endeavor. It is my contention that having first established modernism as the “International Style” and second, located its history in select architectural monuments of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, architectural historians and critics spent the remainder of the 1930s de-emphasizing European influences by crafting an American heritage for modernism. While modernists initially chose to ignore this revival style architecture, their proliferation, popular appeal, and seeming discrepancies with the present, both socially and formally, inspired two exhibitions which examined these buildings more critically. Lincoln Kirstein employed the term “indigenous” with regard to his 1933 MoMA exhibition, Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses, in order to distance, but not disavow Victorian-era domesticity and society. Conversely, Henry-Russell Hitchcock utilized “vernacular” in his 1934 exhibition at Yale University, The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, to establish a formal continuity between Greek Revival antebellum urban architecture and 1930s modernism. In part a reaction to Kirstein's claims, Henry-Russell Hitchcock produced a selective “vernacular” which made the nineteenth century past accessible as a functional precedent for modernist designers. This thesis explores the construction, and the impact of these two efforts, which coded revivalism as something “native” to America in order to negotiate a relationship between the modernist present and its seemingly incompatible past.
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Negotiating an American History for Modernism
Through the Lens of the Architectural Exhibition
A Placard
for a Museum Gallery Wall

“A good art exhibition is a lesson in seeing to those who need or want one, and a session of visual pleasure and excitement to those who don't need anything—I mean, to the rich in spirit—that's you. Grunts, sighs, shouts, laughter and implications ought to be heard in a museum room, precisely the place where these are usually suppressed. So, some of the values of pictures may be suppressed too—or plain lost in formal exhibitions. I'd like to address the eyes of people who know how to take the values straight through and beyond the inhibitions of public decorum. I suggest that religious feeling is sometimes to be had even at church, and, perhaps, with luck, art can be seen and felt on a museum wall. Those of us who are living by our eyes—painters, designers, photographers, girl-watchers—are both amused and appalled by the following half-truth: 'What we see, we are;' and by its corollary: 'Our collected work is, in part, shameless, joyous autobiography, cum confession, wrapped in the embarrassment of the unspeakable.' For those who can read the language, that is—I mean, I never know just who is in the audience—when the seeing eye man does turn up to survey our work and does perceive our metaphors, we are just caught in the act, that's all. Should we apologize?”

Walker Evans, 1971
Introduction
The Nineteenth Century in the 1930s

“Suddenly there is a difference between a quaint evocation of the past, and an open window staring straight down a stack of decades.”

− Walker Evans, 1931

Founded in 1929, the Museum of Modern Art soon offered a new medium by which architectural history could be written—the architectural exhibition, which possessed as its key evidence, the photograph. In 1932, Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson staged the Museum's first such endeavor, entitled Modern Architecture: International Exhibition, which, along with their accompanying book, The International Style Since 1922, defined modernism. [Figure 01] Hitchcock and Johnson followed this project with another, as they were anxious to legitimate, in the face of criticism, America's influence on this new architectural movement. They established the precedents for modernism in a January 1933 exhibition entitled: Early Modern Architecture: Chicago, 1870-1910. Hitchcock and Johnson argued that architectural innovations leading up to the birth of the skyscraper were encouraged by new conditions of the nineteenth century's growing cities: higher land values and the desire for more sunlight. The answer was the skyscraper, which they deemed unique to American cities and the basis of modern design. The work of three architects comprised the majority of the exhibition; H. H. Richardson, Louis Sullivan, and Frank Lloyd Wright, but the underlying crux of the endeavor was that Chicago,
thanks to the fire of 1871, was freed from “traditional” influences. This “freedom”, Johnson and Hitchcock claimed, enabled the seed of modernism to sprout. Hitchcock’s inspiration for Early Modern Architecture came from Lewis Mumford who had authored The Brown Decades two years prior, and who had also requested that the curators include a history for modernism in the 1932 International Style show. Early Modern Architecture, and Mumford’s book, established a formal, historical, linear thread for modernism which selectively found redemption in mid-late nineteenth century urban architecture—primarily the commercial and institutional work of a select canon of architects.

The east coast signified an epicenter of intelligence and cultural superiority to many historians and critics—an attachment which complicated efforts to locate a pure historical lineage for American modernism. The emphasis on Chicago allowed Hitchcock and Johnson to physically distance themselves from the revival style architecture which had been contemporaneously cropping up on the east coast during the mid-late nineteenth century. Deemed antiquated and out-dated in the 1930s, however, and often constructed of machine-made ornament and based on designs found in pattern books, most of these buildings rejected by modernists were only between fifty and one hundred years old—“Greek Revival”, “Gothic Revival”, “Queen Anne”, “Italianate”, “Mansard”, and variations on these themes which eclectically manifest as the American iterations of “Carpenter Gothic” and “Gingerbread”. [Figure 02] Seen as conflicting with modernism, these revival styles were typically ignored by twentieth century historians.

After modernism was conceptualized at the Museum of Modern Art, revival style architecture began to present a greater challenge to the historians and critics who chose to eliminate it from architectural discourse. Historians and critics continued to seek to legitimate American architecture through the construction of a linear ancestry which placed the beginnings of modernism in the nineteenth century, on American soil. It is my contention that having first established modernism as the
“International Style” and second, located its history in select architectural monuments of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, architectural historians and critics spent the remainder of the 1930s de-emphasizing European influences by crafting a selective American heritage for modernism based in the nineteenth century. While Modernists chose to ignore Victorian-era revival style buildings, their proliferation, their continued popular appeal, and seeming incompatibility with twentieth century modernism, both socially and formally, propelled two individuals to examine these buildings more critically. By coding these architectural styles—“wild oats” as Hitchcock later cast them—as something native to America, two architectural exhibitions developed in the wake of the International Style show sought out a means of negotiating the relationship between the present and its seemingly incompatible past.³

Two exhibitions organized between 1931 and 1934 for museum and educational contexts exemplify these efforts to classify the nineteenth century in relationship to modernism. [Figure 03] First exhibited from November 16-December 8, 1933, Lincoln Kirstein and Walker Evans' MoMA exhibition, *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses*, was the result of over two years of photographic endeavors commissioned by Lincoln Kirstein. The exhibition was comprised of thirty-nine photographs taken by the then-struggling photographer Walker Evans.⁴ Through Evans' depictions, Kirstein portrayed these houses as “relics of the indigenous past” and argued that in order to move forward with modernism, this 19th century past must first be properly addressed. These buildings were rejected by the majority of 20th century historians and critics and they were seen as the antithesis to modernism. Although these buildings were intentionally ignored, the aim of Kirstein's project was to come to terms with this past, and subsequently leave it behind. This project emphasized a particular social heritage inherent in the proliferation of revival style architecture of the nineteenth century, and the complexities which framed the ancestry from which Depression-era modernists came, both formally and socially.
Alternatively, in 1934, Henry-Russell Hitchcock, co-curator of both the *Modern Architecture* exhibition and *Early Modern Architecture*, curated another exhibition in reaction to *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses*. This show was entitled *The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War*. As opposed to Kirstein's model which set aside Victorian-era houses as a passive history, Hitchcock classified Greek Revival style urban buildings as the formal precursors to modernism. Through 55 photographs he commissioned of Berenice Abbott, and six nineteenth century architectural drawings, Hitchcock used proportion, massing, rationality, and universality of architectural forms to link an antebellum Greek Revival past with the formal characteristics of the International Style. He deemed these buildings America's "vernacular" architectural language, and this term was employed to evoke a continuity between past and present. This second project emphasized the importance of urban density in enabling a vernacular character to emerge which blurred the boundaries between industrial, commercial, and residential use. While the MoMA exhibition catered to a more public audience, and the Hitchcock exhibition to an educational one, these exhibitions subsequently traveled throughout the east coast (and at times farther west), disseminating their histories for the remainder of the decade.  

The relationship of this seemingly contradictory, yet immediate past, with the 1930s modernist present was negotiated through the application of two similar, but ultimately divergent modalities for interpreting the past—the portrayal of selective nineteenth century architecture as "indigenous" in one exhibition, and "vernacular" in the other. Both of these terms positioned nineteenth century architecture in correlation with 1930s modernism, and both asserted nineteenth century architecture as native to America. The connotations of these two terms treated the relationship between past and present radically differently. Whereas "vernacular" functioned as a tool by which to familiarize a period and set it forth as a precedent, demonstrate continuity over time, and compress both time and space; "indigenous" was used to
distance a period, and emphasize its polemical duality as both the “origins” of a culture and its most base and naive state.

Similar in approach and execution, but wildly different in their inspiration and in their motivations, Lincoln Kirstein and Henry-Russell Hitchcock had both set out at the beginning of the 1930s to explore careers in writing, in architectural history, and in the museum. Like many of their contemporaries, both men sought to write a history of nineteenth century architecture. Rather than simply record a history, however, these two men devised modalities by which they could decode meaning from the visual architectural “artifacts” of the nineteenth century, and in architectural history more generally, which was relevant to the present state of the discipline. These modalities facilitated an understanding of the relationship of the present to its immediate past—a past which, perhaps more so than any before in history, haunted the present in its seemingly oppositional character. Henry-Russell Hitchcock deemed his project a study of an urban “vernacular”. Conversely, Kirstein called his architecture, among other terms, an “indigenous American expression” or as belonging to an “indigenous past”. Whereas “indigenous” set an eclectic Victorian-era architecture in opposition to modernism, vernacular established antebellum urban architecture in tandem with the principles of the International Style.

Let me end this section with a quote by Lewis Mumford from *The Brown Decades*, published in 1931. Made the subject of his paintings in the 1920s, Edward Hopper brought Victorian houses to the attention of art critics. In the following statement Mumford concludes that the Victorian architecture of the “Awkward Age” as he deems it (1865-1895) should be put aside so that historians can locate the more useful ancestors for modernism. However, the quote nevertheless highlights the tension, and anxieties Victorian-era architecture posed for modernist historians, critics, and designers.

The commonest axiom of history is that every generation revolts against its fathers and makes friends with its
grandfathers. This reason alone might perhaps account for the fact that the generation which struggled or flourished after the Civil War now has a claim upon our interest. In the paintings of Burchfield and Hopper, the very buildings of the Awkward Age (1865-95) come to us with a certain sentimental charm: those mansard roofs, those tall, ill-proportioned windows, those dingy facades which concealed the dreadful contortions of walnut furniture, in fact, the worst emblems of the period no longer afflict us like an inappropriate joke told too frequently by a tiresome uncle. If we are lenient to the worst the Gilded Age can show, are we not perhaps ready to receive the best?

Mumford was aiming to salvage from this Awkward Age, some value for modernism, and he located it in the select monuments of the architects I have already listed. Nevertheless, the mansard roofs and ill-proportioned windows of revival style houses constituted the majority of the built environment. Kirstein and Evans set out to photographically salvage these Victorian-era houses which had been rejected as the “worst” of the Gilded Age and held them up for one final, definitive examination before bidding them farewell.

To situate these modalities, I will first explain how this interest in the architecture of the nineteenth century was part of a larger trend emerging during the 1930s, and then what I mean by these classifications of “vernacular” and “indigenous”, nineteenth century revivalism, and the use of photography in both of these exhibitions. These modalities, and their distinctions, form the backbone of my thesis.

The solidification of modernism propelled historians and critics to re-evaluate more recent architecture of the nineteenth century—types which constituted the fabric of American cities and towns. Writing in the March 1934 catalogue of his exhibition, *Springfield Architecture*, Henry-Russell Hitchcock indicated that “Springfield, like most American cities, owes the great bulk of its architecture to the nineteenth century.” Hitchcock, and Kirstein for that matter, were not alone in their nineteenth century interest. During the 1920s, according to Hitchcock, the history of European architecture was generally of more concern to young American architects.

14
At the end of the 1920s, the young American expatriate community in Europe was vibrant, and Walker Evans had joined these ranks as an aspiring writer. It was the economic recession which forced many Americans to return to the United States. “Of necessity,” Hitchcock wrote, “the field of American architectural history, hitherto little cultivated beyond 1830, began to look greener, and there soon appeared a number of standard biographies and monographs” on figures such as Stanford White, Thomas Hastings, Louis Sullivan, Robert Mills, Richard Upjohn, and Hitchcock’s own on H. H. Richardson. “Of these, [the majority] were concerned wholly, or in part with nineteenth-century architectural production, and none with the earlier Colonial period on which attention had hitherto been increasingly focused since the Centennial in 1876,” Hitchcock noted in 1939. Until the 1930s, Colonial architecture was typically considered to be America’s vernacular architectural language. While Hitchcock’s interest in the nineteenth century had begun with his collaboration with Johnson on the 1933 MoMA exhibition, *Early Modern Architecture: 1870-1910*, his period of study extended further back in the century, over the course of the 1930s. This was part of his efforts to establish the American vernacular origins for modernism.

For Lincoln Kirstein, however, this interest in the nineteenth century was driven by more than a need to locate a new period of study, or the desire to locate a new ancestor for modernism. Kirstein felt a personal attachment to the domestic architecture of the Victorian age. What Kirstein had set out to do was not only to record the architectural “relics” of a rejected past. He was seeking, through this architecture, the remains of an elite society, the legacy of which he idolized and identified as his own. Having spent much of his life in Boston, Kirstein found the atmosphere of the city replete with a “cultural and intellectual hegemony” guided by the Victorian-era. As an example I provide a statement from Lincoln Kirstein, influential patron of American arts, and graduate of Harvard College, circa 1930. [Figure 04] In the following he describes his departure, both physically away from Boston, his childhood home, and temporally away from the environment of the
nineteenth century.

I'd lived in Boston, Massachusetts, since 1912. It is perhaps hard to understand the feeling that I still have about Boston—and Cambridge. When I went to school, the nineteenth century was only terminating its cultural and intellectual hegemony. I felt and feel I am a man of the nineteenth century...In our late twenties, my nineteenth century was indeed alive. Identification with a society of living and thinking New England dynastic actors gave a security and assurance prompting freedom of action, a sense of inevitability of possibility achieved which I do not think any other locus in America then offered.¹¹

A loaded statement, I use it for the moment to demonstrate the intense attachment to the previous century which continued to haunt the 1930s as American modernists quantified their architectural past in order to define their architectural present and future. Kirstein's statement also alludes to his regionalist bent toward the north east as an inherently historical and superior world—aristocratic in its legacy. Hitchcock's project was concerned with cities on the east coast as well, and his examination extended as far south as Baltimore and North Carolina. Sentimentalized, Kirstein's comments are none the less relevant to explain both his intentions, and the mind-set his fellow critics shared during the reception of Walker Evans' nineteenth century house photographs.

“Vernacular” is now a common category of architectural studies but as a notion was rarely used during the first few decades of the twentieth century. Before this assertion of a vernacular nineteenth century past as a relevant precedent for modernism could come to be, however, the more ambiguous, complex, and problematic notion of an American “indigenous” architecture was introduced by Lincoln Kirstein with regard to the Victorian-era revival style houses photographed by Walker Evans which appeared in the 1933 MoMA exhibition, *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses*. Kirstein's application of the term pertained to more than just architecture, and he used it with respect to all aspects of American artistic production—objects, art, song, literature, and theatre. Kirstein inherited this notion of a “native accent” from his mentor John Brooks Wheelwright, who had conceived of the
photographs which would become *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses* with Kirstein in 1931 as illustrations for a book and exhibition.\textsuperscript{12}

However, it was Kirstein who first introduced the notion that revival style architecture of the nineteenth century could be considered along these lines when he termed Victorian-era houses the nation's "indigenous past". Today, "indigenous" evokes an innate and native relationship to a particular region—in this case the north east—and environment, which for Kirstein was mainly social and economic. Having associated the north east, specifically Boston, with a particular “dynastic” heritage, Kirstein was using terms such as “indigenous” and even “primitive” to assert the authenticity of both the architecture and the society he was documenting and drafting a place for in history.\textsuperscript{13} The social environment which had bred this indigenous Revival style architecture was shaped by wealth, often newly acquired, a particular educational background, and a particular variety of life experiences. It was from this society that Kirstein and his contemporaries had emerged.

These terms have a dual connotation however, of which Kirstein undoubtedly grew increasingly aware. “Indigenous” also implied a crudeness, a rawness, a naivety, if not ignorance; and a lack of refinement, sophistication, and training. It allowed Kirstein to cleverly assert the dominance of his own class while simultaneously critiquing it for its rudimentary ways in spite of its ornate, ornamental exterior. Kirstein further elaborated on this “native accent” evident in Evans' photographs when he wrote an essay in 1938 to accompany Evans' *American Photographs* exhibition at MoMA. This exhibition is considered Evans' first official one-man show, as well as the Museum's first official one-man photography show. It was a highly influential project which resulted in the publication of an accompanying book by the same name, and the exhibition was stage two years before the Museum established a photography department. In his essay, Kirstein wrote that Walker Evans recorded;

...a "vulgarization"...
...a"corrupt homage"...
The judgment he weighed against the architectural remnants of Victorian-era society in 1938, were even more harsh, however, as the following denote. Evans' photographs captured;

...“survivals of our early imperialistic expansion”...
...“disintegration and its contrasts”...
...“records of the age before an immanent collapse”...
...“symptoms of waste and selfishness that caused the ruin”...
...“unquenchable appetite for the prestige of the past”...

“Vernacular”, as opposed to “indigenous”, was employed by Henry-Russell Hitchcock in his exhibition, *The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War*, as a functional tool to rationalize the relationship between the American modernist present and the Victorian-era past—a past which fell outside a more official historical lineage. The power embedded in “vernacular” as a construct is not its stability, but precisely its mobility, and it is on this premise—that vernacular architecture could evolve and be re-defined in accordance with contemporary design. It is also on this premise that the significance of these two exhibitions for architectural history lies. Camouflaged in the course of history, the “vernacular” as a signifier of the origins of a culture shifts forward and back in time. As the contemporaneous aesthetic is distanced from its architectural past, old aesthetics move in and out of this “vernacular” focus. More specifically, it defines the beginning of a particular period—the crafted history that a group or nation uses to justify its own significance. In terms of the crafting of an architectural history, the vernacular serves as a tool which facilitates the fulfillment of a particular agenda—an agenda which, in this case, belonged to modernism. During the 1930s, defining years for modernism, the “vernacular” served as both opposite and
The “vernacular” as a cultural construct was reformulated as modernism continued to be defined and refined over the course of the decade, with a new accompanying vernacular established as its point of interest and departure.

This connection between a modernist 1930s present and an 1830s past allowed Hitchcock to negate the architecture which developed between these two periods. As a definition, the vernacular is a mode of expression, an established language which perpetuates and reflects popular taste and as such, embodies an “active history”. Its conventions are a tradition which links past and present. This strategy diminishes space and time, and makes of the past a useful model for the future. As opposed to Kirstein and Evans' project wherein nineteenth century architecture was classified as “indigenous” in order to render it distant and something antithetical to modernism, Hitchcock demonstrated the usefulness of one revival style. The past legitimated the present through the continuity of this vernacular language and the present, in turn, legitimized this past. An active continuity defines the vernacular and the principles of design embodied in this model, Hitchcock argued, survived from their original vernacular conception to modern day.

Arguably one of the most revered and most hated building trends in American history, the revival styles of the Victorian-era proliferated during the nineteenth century in both the United States and in Great Britain. The numerous titles given to design of the Victorian-era contemporaneously and by historians implied the types' loosely derived “historical” inspirations and referred to particular romanticized periods in time, to the materiality of the building, or to a characteristic architectural form. The endless variety of ornamentation available appealed to popular taste during the latter half of the nineteenth century, encouraging the eccentricity of output in the construction of domestic buildings. [Figure 05] Among the revival styles which proliferated in the United States, “Greek Revival had more immediate
success than the Gothic Revival,” Agnes Addison Gilchrist observed in 1938.\textsuperscript{15} Italianate influences were also commonplace among new American construction of the nineteenth century, as was Queen Anne during the latter half of the century. “Gingerbread” or “Carpenter’s Gothic” became a common term to describe the impact of these revival styles within the domestic sphere of the middle class as ornamental aesthetics were reinterpreted through different materials (wood rather than stone), and then newly applied, often to domestic architecture.

Modern designers, critics, and historians, including Hitchcock, Johnson and those associated with MoMA, frequently objected to Victorian-era revivalism on the basis of its formal inconsistencies, frivolity, and untruthfulness. Appearing hand-carved, much of the ornament that detailed revival style homes was in actuality machine made. An indiscriminate mixing and adaptation of period styles to modern materials and objects of modern use; a certain bulginess of form (the replacement of the straight line with a curve);\textsuperscript{16} \textit{horror vacui}—a tendency to cover empty spaces with ornament of all kinds; a lack of formal refinement and inventive, technical skill; and the emphasis on decoration over functional and structural form were all reasons cited for the twentieth century’s rejection of domestic revivalism.\textsuperscript{17} However, the other conflict modernists faced, more often than not, was with the meaning inherent in revival style ornament.

Associated with the new middle class emerging in American society, revival styles, and the ornament which accompanied them had become synonymous with an expression of wealth and social standing. Traversing from “high style” to “popular culture”, by the 1930s revivalism was “sarcastically damned by the critics” who reviewed Evans’ photographs of nineteenth century houses, and Victorian-era design was scorned for “the sins of the carpenters and architects who flourished in what is generally referred to as the General Grant era”.\textsuperscript{18} In line with twentieth century condemnation of Grant’s presidency, multiple writers referred to the flourishing of revival styles in such a manner—the “proverbial depths of the time of Grant”; a
period ripe with economic scandal, frivolous spending, and corruption during the Gilded Age. A phrase employed by Hitchcock, this political signifier demonstrates how rife with social implications these efforts to locate a native architectural language were. This brief reference made by Hitchcock illustrates how his seemingly objective identification of an American vernacular based on formal concerns was actually overshadowed by an interest in locating an architecture not only formally, but also socially “pure”. For Hitchcock, this was achieved by simply skipping over the “time of Grant” to a period pre-dating the Civil War. According to Hitchcock's claim, in the urban condition, uniformity could be more efficiently achieved and was best exemplified by the buildings constructed in antebellum east coast cities during the early-mid decades of the nineteenth century.

As opposed to the connotations associated with the Arts and Crafts movement, the revival styles in American domesticity were understood by modernist critics as antiquated, fake, and crass interpretations of older European architectural movements. Regardless, by the 1930s, these revival styles had gained popularity with a broader array of American society and the more popular they became, the “crasser” their execution, and the greater the threat of a regression to revivalism, modernist critics such as Hitchcock feared. This divide will be emphasized in my discussion of the public reception of Evans' nineteenth century house photographs in Part Two. As the 1930s wore on, it became increasingly necessary for forward thinking historians, critics, and designers to negotiate their relationship to these styles, and to place them in the past. I argue that this is what Kirstein was trying to do with his exhibition, but did not immediately achieve.

Advances in photography, combined with the increasing ease of its reproduction, allowed historians and critics to bring the visuality of their respective “vernaculars” into focus—classified, quantified, and categorized on museum walls. But more than that, both Kirstein’s and Hitchcock’s exhibitions were photographic-
documentary projects which enlisted the services of art photographers who had been, until this point, primarily concerned with social photography. In some capacity, these projects would not only reinforce the legitimacy of photography for the crafting of architectural history, but would also influence Evans' and Abbott's “vernacular visions” in their own work for the remainder of their careers. This thesis draws attention to the essential role of photography in the architectural exhibition, and a brief, but powerful moment of production wherein the fields of photography and architecture joined in a collaboration which left a legacy behind in both domains.

Photography provided what architectural historians understood to be an objective tool, and it enabled the profession to “directly compare new buildings with the old without the intervention of any deforming pictorial process of reproduction”, Henry-Russell Hitchcock wrote in 1929 of the relevance of photography to the discipline.21 The honesty of vision which Hitchcock thought photography offered, however, was in reality, not the case for either of these documentary projects. While Kirstein described their domestic subjects as falling into ruins and disintegrating “between snaps of the lens”, Evans' images were understood by Kirstein to be the romantic photographic salvaging of “America's heritage”.22 The evolving preservation discourse in the 1920s and 1930s meant that the documentation of endangered or condemned buildings was a worthy venture, but the photograph itself became the preservation of the structure, supplanting this antiquated reality with a “surgically” composed photograph taken under idealized conditions.23 Both Kirstein and Hitchcock sought out only the most pristine examples and the staging of the photograph was critical. Kirstein wrote;24

"The process technically was rather complicated even aside from the actual sighting, clicking etc. of the camera itself,” Lincoln Kirstein wrote during the first photographic trip he took with Evans and John Brooks Wheelwright in April, 1931. “The sun had to be just right and more often than not we would have to come back to the same place 2 or even 3 times for the light to be hard and bright."25 [Figure 06]

Similarly, Hitchcock sought out Greek Revival urban buildings left unaltered
and unspoilt by renovation. [Figure 07] Hitchcock chose the itinerary and Abbott made the final aesthetic decisions on site. A conflict therefore remained, particularly in Kirstein and Evans' exhibition, between architectural and art photography. Whereas Evans' photographs of architecture for his 1938 MoMA exhibition, *American Photographs* embraced the visuality of destruction and decay ever-present in the built environment of the 1930s and evocative of American culture more generally, Kirstein drafted a selective history composed of pristine nineteenth century domestic types, despite what the words he wrote to accompany his exhibition suggest. Kirstein's intention was to create an "exhausting survey" of a "given locale" but the exhibition certainly fell short of that with only thirty-nine photographs. For the most part, it was a highly selective survey of the dwellings of what remained of an eccentric period in American history.

From its conception as a serious medium for the articulation of history, the architectural exhibition used the photograph as its key evidence. However, the architectural exhibition was not the only venue for architectural history which was taking advantage of photography as a versatile medium. Texts, often in the form of a survey were still a relatively new project at the time when Kirstein and Evans were working. In fact, the architectural text as a survey was most likely one of the inspirations driving Kirstein and Wheelwright’s initial conception of the endeavor. In the 1930s, the idea of conducting a survey of either one specific type of architecture, or of the architectural character of a particular region, state, or city, was still relatively new. Kirstein and Evans were among the first to begin such a project and might have been more successful if they had maintained a clearer direction and if their methods had not been so haphazard. Through the photographic survey, these historic buildings, often of the nineteenth century were both officiated and preserved. The photographic architectural survey often supported regionalist and nationalist aims of the 1930s and these texts situated nineteenth century buildings as particularly characteristic of a region, or as particularly American.
eventual disappearance of nineteenth century revivalism, all that would be left were Evans' and Abbott's photographs, accompanied by Kirstein's and Hitchcock's commentaries. Its mode of preservation, the photograph would come to replace the building itself.

Although Hitchcock treated the photograph mainly as a tool for expressing his theories in his own exhibitions, Lincoln Kirstein realized, that it deserved a place in the museum, as much, or more so, than the object it documented did. “Photography, the instrument of amateur sentimentalist, professional portraitist and serious historian,” Kirstein wrote in 1938, “has been elevated by enthusiastic entrepreneurs to challenge comparison with the independent language of cut stone and oil paint.” One wonders in which of these roles—sentimentalist or historian—he saw himself. Undoubtedly the enthusiastic entrepreneur, it was through his recognition of the medium that it entered the museum.

The inspiration for these projects similarly derived from a desire to legitimate American modernism through the construction of a linear ancestry based in the nineteenth century. However, the product of these two endeavors ultimately diverged. The “serious historian”, Henry-Russell Hitchcock revealed a legitimate ancestry for modernism based on his conclusion that a formal continuity existed in the nineteenth century which was consistent with modern design principles. While Kirstein set out to record an American architectural history, what he ultimately created was a cultural analysis which simultaneously romanticized and distanced a dying society through its architecture. That is to say that this “amateur sentimentalist” ultimately saw nineteenth century architecture as a metaphor for society and these buildings had value not as “artistic monuments” or formal precedents, but as “social documents”--and they only became visible as such through the photograph.

It is not that one model became the norm for architectural history and that
one faded into the wings. Ultimately what these two projects demonstrate are the complexities modernists were facing with respect to their past—a past at times incompatible with the modernist present, both socially and formally. Ultimately, we can see Hitchcock's project as a refinement of what Kirstein introduced—a native, vernacular, functional nineteenth century model for twentieth century designers. It can equally be argued that Kirstein's revival style houses belonging to an “indigenous past”, a complication to the modernist project, were ultimately taken up again by critics and historians during the 1950s and 1960s in both photographic projects and architectural history as modernism was further institutionalized. This sentimentalization manifest in preservation rather than design discourses and as these eclectic styles were no longer a threat to an established modernism, Victorian-era eclectic revivalism could safely enter the annals of history.

As opposed to simply historicizing revivalism, the classification of architecture as a “Victorian other“ allowed it to retain legitimacy as the remnants of an elite American heritage. Not only did these diverse efforts facilitate the refinement of American modernism, they also challenged and expanded the very definition of “vernacular”, a significant contribution to the discipline of architectural history. Contrary to the common perception that interest in the vernacular in American architectural studies wasn't taken up until the 1950s and 1960s, these two exhibitions, *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses* and *The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War* are evidence of the diversity of thought which consistently accompanied modernism from its conception in the early 1930s. Valuable for the historiography of vernacular architecture are Kirstein's and Hitchcock's rethinking of the very definition of a native architectural language for America—the “indigenous past” and “vernacular” precedents, as something which can belong to the very recent past. Furthermore, these exhibitions assert the value of the vernacular as a component of history capable of contributing to a better understanding of the contemporary. A “useful past for the present”, these
traditions were only a part of the broader project taken up during the solidification of modernism. By institutionalizing America's vernacular heritage and America's modern present simultaneously, both projects were authenticated by the museum, and both were also indelibly linked.

In summary, the disparities between these two projects should not be taken as discouraging, but rather should be understood as indicative of the sense of urgency which inspired American critics and historians to define their immediate past in order to understand their imminent present. These disparities underlie the ambiguity inherent in the “vernacular” or “indigenous” as a construct. Kirstein and Evans' project, sentimental in their motivations, was a survey, and looked for variations of style among one building type—the domestic structure. In terms of material, Kirstein romanticized the fragility of wood construction and identified the proliferation of revival styles in a specific region as constituting its indigenous “status”. Hitchcock and Abbott's project, by contrast, was analytic in scope: a systematic examination which looked for density and uniformity of one style, and its adaptability to different uses. Hitchcock's vernacular was stone, or stone faced construction, and the urban condition was what enabled a vernacular language to flourish.

To return to Walker Evans' quote; “Suddenly there is a difference between a quaint evocation of the past, and an open window staring straight down a stack of decades.” Evans was referring to the distinction between pictorial and straight photography, but in the context of these revival style buildings, it signifies even more. In his diary, Kirstein wrote that he “felt like a surgeon's assistant to Walker. Cleaning up neatly after him, and he a surgeon operating on the fluid body of time.” These photographs were, as were the “indigenous” and “vernacular” categorizations, modernist incisions into the past. These incisions, however, also re-framed history and more clearly delineated the past from the present. With the distinction between
past and present clarified, the two could co-exist. These photographs of nineteenth
century houses and cityscapes, were taken in the 1930s, and therefore
simultaneously belonged to both periods, as the cars evident in Berenice Abbott's
photographs suggest. [Figure 08]
During the 1930s, Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson guaranteed their own place in architectural history through their interpretations of the birth of modernism. They accomplished this mainly through the crafting of exhibitions and the publication of accompanying catalogues and books. The founding director of the Architecture and Design Curatorial Department at the Museum of Modern Art in 1932, Johnson's venue for the re-education of architects was located in what was fast becoming one of the most prestigious institutions in America. Hitchcock produced at least four exhibitions staged at MoMA, and an additional eight which opened and circulated at museums across the north east.

The Museum of Modern Art opened on November 7, 1929 with Alfred H. Barr Jr. as director. Jere Abbott was chosen as associate director of the museum. The circle of individuals hired at the founding of the Museum of Modern Art and the institutions which fed into it (such as Lincoln Kirstein's publication, the Hound & Horn, and the Harvard Society for Contemporary Art) all had some connection to Harvard University. Jere Abbott had shared an apartment with Alfred H. Barr, Jr. (who had begun a doctoral degree in art history at Harvard but was teaching at Wellesley at
the time) in Cambridge, Massachusetts. While in Cambridge, Abbott had been a student in the Department of Fine Arts at Harvard. Philip Johnson was first inducted into the MoMA community while living in New York City. Finishing his remaining courses as a Harvard undergraduate, Johnson occupied an apartment in the same New York City building as Alfred H. Barr, Jr. and his wife. Johnson had admired Henry-Russell Hitchcock's early writing on J. J. P. Oud and his first book, *Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration*. Hitchcock too had been educated at Harvard and in 1929 was a fledgling historian, writer, and professor at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut. Having met at the parties Alfred H. Barr, Jr. hosted in his apartment the year the Museum opened, the two men took on a joint collaboration to re-write Hitchcock's book on modern architecture. [Figure 09] The project, which would become *The International Style: Architecture Since 1922* and the coinciding exhibition at MoMA was begun in the summer of 1930 when the men traveled in Europe together as part of their research.38

Lincoln Kirstein had co-founded the *Hound & Horn* as a “Harvard miscellany” and opened the Harvard Society for Contemporary Art with his father's financial support, a means by which he would fund many of his early endeavors. [Figure 10] Among the prestigious artists he persuaded to contribute writing, painting, drawing, photography, and criticism were the circle who would define MoMA during its formative years—Jere Abbott submitted photographs, Barr provided criticism, Hitchcock wrote critiques.40 The artists Kirstein brought into his own projects were taken up by those involved with MoMA. Namely, Hitchcock collaborated with Berenice Abbott on the *American Cities* exhibit after her photographs were published in *Hound & Horn* [Figure 11] and it was Kirstein himself who would collaborate with Walker Evans, as well as frequent *Hound & Horn* contributor John Brooks Wheelwright (Kirstein's mentor in Boston, ten years his senior). Wheelwright was trained in architecture and poetry and often wrote architectural criticism. He was also the son of an architect, and advised Kirstein and Evans on the 1933 Museum of Modern Art
exhibition of nineteenth century houses.

Although he did not provide a definitive answer in his 1971 interview with Paul Cummings, Evans claimed that he and Kirstein may have first met through the publication of the artist's photographs in Kirstein's publication. “[T]o tell you the truth,” Evans acknowledged, “I’d love to know myself where I met Lincoln Kirstein. I just don’t know.”41 Unsure who made the initial contact, the photographer surmised;

...he was interested in photographers and in unknown artists and he may have found out that I was an unknown artist and looked me up. But I just do not know. I must ask him some day. But he won’t know either. He’s very untrustworthy; that is, you can’t count on the accuracy of what he says. He just loves to throw things around.42

This first group of Evans' photographs published in *Hound & Horn* numbered four in total, a collection of scenes in New York City which appeared in the Fall 1930 issue. Focusing on people and objects, they are almost entirely devoid of architecture.

[Figure 12] Evans received numerous commissions from *Hound & Horn* after this first piece, and the publication of these first images appeared about the time that Kirstein and Wheelwright had begun concocting the Victorian-era architecture trips.43

In America, the 1930s brought not only the nation's first modern art museum and first curatorial department of architecture in such an institution, but also some of the first circulating exhibitions. 1933 was a turning point for the Museum of Modern Art and a number of institutional policies were adopted which made the museum one of the most versatile as well as one of the most dedicated to education in the nation. This education policy included the creation of a department of Circulating Exhibitions headed by Wellesley graduate, Elodie Courter, as well as the production of books to accompany exhibitions, and other educational opportunities offered to the community.44 The *Museum of Modern Art Bulletin* began publication in June 1933.45 Barr had “conceived of the MoMA as an array of departments organized by media representing modern visual arts” and this vision had already begun with the formal founding of the architecture department. Other departments were founded
throughout the decade but the photography department was not founded until 1940.⁴⁶

According to Barr’s formulation, the museum “would function like a kunsthalle or kunstverein”; not only would exhibitions rotate, so would the entire collection, with works passed on to the Metropolitan Museum of Art and other venues when “their status as modern was no longer valid.”⁴⁷ With the Museum controlling not only what it displayed, but what other museums in the region displayed as well, these curators were granted authority to determine what was modern, what was the ancestry of modernism, and what wasn’t. 1933 was the year Barr developed his famous “torpedo” diagram, and it was also the year in which Alan Blackburn, secretary, drafted “a confidential report...to the museum’s executive committee” defining this agenda. [Figure 13] The Museum would follow a “dual institutional mission: first, to form ‘taste’ and promote ‘production’ through scholarship and criticism; and second, to democratize an appreciation of modern art for public consumption through channels of ‘distribution’ including exhibitions, traveling exhibitions, catalogues, radio programs, and other forms of ‘publicity.’”⁴⁸ As such, the 1933 exhibition, Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses should be understood as possessing an educational component and was possibly intended to educate the public to see revival style architecture as something in the past and no longer in vogue.

Fostered by the Museum of Modern Art as well as New York’s galleries, the American scene was an influential movement in both the fine arts and in literature during the 1930s. The influence of the American Scene on architecture, however, was that it brought an interest in “vernacular” or “indigenous” crafts to the attention of architectural historians.⁴⁹ Alfred H. Barr, Jr., director of the Museum of Modern Art, maintained an interdisciplinary focus at the museum, and it is no surprise that it was within the community of the Museum that new modes of conceptualizing America’s conflicted Victorian-era architecture were being envisioned. In 1939 Henry-Russell
Hitchcock discussed how the American Scene impacted architectural history; “It is widely recognized today that one of the side effects of the Depression was the discovery (or rediscovery) of the American scene. This was especially evident in the field of painting, but there was also apparent a new interest both by scholars and by the general public in the earlier architecture of America—not only in the Colonial and so-called Federal periods of the two centuries before 1830, but also in American architecture of the mid and even late nineteenth century.”

The Museum of Modern Art and many New York galleries (such as Edith Halpert's Downtown Gallery, and Alfred Stieglitz's An American Place) shared this focus.

MoMA's project involved the drafting of an architectural lineage for modernism on American soil—a lineage of famous architects which sprung from the nineteenth century. The linearity of this heritage was confused by historical revivalism, which Alfred H. Barr, Jr., director of the Museum of Modern Art argued “nearly stifled the one genuinely important tradition in American architecture, the thread which passed from Richardson to Sullivan, from Sullivan to Frank Lloyd Wright.”

Lewis Mumford addressed this lineage in his book, The Brown Decades (1931), and on Mumford's heels came a number of exhibitions which definitively sought to characterize the nineteenth century as modernism's shadowy foundation. Early Modern Architecture: Chicago 1870-1910, another exhibition organized by Hitchcock and Johnson at MoMA in January 1933, emphasized this lineage and almost immediately preceded Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses, put on display at the end of the same year.

Three exhibitions staged at MoMA during the 1930s by Hitchcock, two in conjunction with Johnson, established an essential history for modernism. Providing a historical lineage for modernism, Mardges Bacon claims, “was undoubtedly a belated response to Mumford, who had unsuccessfully lobbied Johnson to dedicate a section of the exhibition to the history of modern architecture. It was needed, Mumford explained, 'so that no one would think it was invented by Norman Bel Geddes and the
Bowman Brothers . . . the day before yesterday." The first project, *Modern Architecture: International Exhibition* (February 9-March 23, 1932), highlighted modern architectural design since the 1920s. Throughout the summer and fall of 1932, Hitchcock and Johnson organized another exhibition which established the historical precedents for the skyscraper in the architectural giants of the nineteenth century. Their efforts resulted in *Early Modern Architecture: Chicago 1870-1910* which went on display from January 18-February 23, 1933.

Although he was involved with MoMA throughout the 1930s, Hitchcock's exhibition on an American urban vernacular was never displayed at MoMA. Kirstein's was, but most likely only by coincidence. Nevertheless, the Evans exhibition emphasized nineteenth century domestic, rather than institutional architecture, and emphasized period styles over well-known influential architects. photographs broke the mold that MoMA's curators had been religiously following which was the exhibition of famous architecture by known, influential architects. After Johnson's departure from MoMA, Hitchcock built on the *Early Modern Architecture* project, the third exhibition to complete this history for modernism, and he organized a Henry Hobson Richardson exhibition in 1936 (January 14-February 16, 1936)—showcasing one of America's most famous and influential nineteenth century designers. Hitchcock crafted a fourth exhibition for MoMA during the 1930s—*Modern Exposition Architecture*, on display from June 8-September 2, 1936. Additionally, one of eight circulating architectural exhibitions Hitchcock organized independently while a professor at Wesleyan, *Early Museum Architecture* was exhibited, but did not open, at MoMA.

**Early Modern Architecture: Chicago 1870-1910**

*at the Museum of Modern Art, January 18-February 23, 1933*

“Before the Civil War,” Henry-Russell Hitchcock asserted in early 1933, “American architecture developed few important national characteristics. The various types of design which followed the Colonial in the first half of the nineteenth
century were based, as the Colonial had been, on the contemporary architecture of England.” Americans were slow to develop an innovative architectural language of their own and for much of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, wood-frame construction was “the most conspicuous national characteristic” as it was not a common practice in Europe. “Technically the first important American development was the introduction of cast iron and wrought iron in commercial buildings by Bogardus in N.Y. [in 1848],” Hitchcock concluded. “But American architects failed to find for the construction in which metal more and more took the place of masonry, any expressive type of design. The repeated arcades and colonnades of cast iron differ little from the more luxurious facades of marble and stone.”

Hitchcock was continuously reworking his understanding of the relevance of nineteenth century architecture to modernism over the course of the 1930s. In 1934 he would prove himself wrong when he would curate an exhibition which would assert that America had developed “vernacular” national characteristics through the use of the Greek Revival style in the growing, nineteenth century, east coast city.

Hitchcock and Johnson argued that the nineteenth century skyscraper was the basis of modern design based on its responsiveness to functional concerns. Architectural innovations leading up to the birth of the skyscraper were encouraged by higher land values (and thus the desire to build higher on smaller plots of land), they asserted, and the desire for more light in the lower stories of buildings. These assertions—that the skyscraper was both unique to American cities and the basis of modern design, were the underlying premises of Hitchcock and Johnson's early 1933 exhibition. Mainly, three architects were featured; H. H. Richardson, Louis Sullivan, and Frank Lloyd Wright.

Early Modern Architecture: Chicago 1870-1910, MoMA's twenty-third exhibition, was held from January 18 – February 23, 1933 and occupied three rooms of the museum. The research began in Chicago in June, 1932, only a few months after Modern Architecture: International Exhibition closed at the end of March.
Calling it “the most conspicuous achievement of American architecture in the second half of the nineteenth century”, the skyscraper was able to proliferate in Chicago for a number of reasons which Hitchcock and Johnson outlined. As an “inland frontier city,” Chicago escaped the influence of traditionalism which plagued the Atlantic Seaboard.” Furthermore, “[t]he great Chicago fire of 1871 razed the city and this, with the business boom of the late 70’s, caused architects to flock to the city to meet the demand of frenzied rebuilding and higher structures.”

This freedom from tradition was an obsession for this duo of critic and historian, and their emphasis on Chicago allowed them to physically distance themselves from the revival style architecture contemporaneously cropping up on the east coast—the very architecture which had already been of sentimental interest to Kirstein for well over a year.

The popularity and influence of the Chicago exhibition exceeded the expectations MoMA set out for it. The exhibition did not originally have an accompanying book or catalogue but it was so popular that when a catalogue was posthumously printed, demand for it required at least one reprinting. Such popularity demonstrates the immediate and broad influence the exhibition produced. It traveled to a number of exhibition spaces throughout the 1930s—beginning at Brown University, and continuing to Princeton, the Wadsworth Atheneum, Marshall Field and Co. in Chicago, Illinois, Duke University, Hitchcock's own Wesleyan, and ending at Harvard University's Architectural School in 1942. Unlike Hitchcock's exhibition of industrial antebellum “vernacular” architecture organized for exhibition in 1934 wherein the rising photographer Berenice Abbott created an entire portfolio of photographs to accompany drawings, most of the photographs included in the Early Modern Architecture exhibition were reproductions of older photographs or images obtained from architectural firms in Chicago. Biographical information was also obtained from architects and local historians. Johnson and Hitchcock made a special trip to Chicago to obtain some of the rarer material and images while the rest was obtained through correspondence. Like the 1932 exhibition Modern Architecture:
International Exhibition, the use of photography in this architectural exhibition was key. The images were the argument, and the more experimental nature of the exhibition allowed this new attribute of the photograph to thrive. Although the images were re-printed quite large, as they were for Modern Architecture: International Exhibition, Hitchcock and Johnson treated the photograph as a supplementary document, like a map or a drawing, rather than as an independently valuable piece of art.\textsuperscript{52}

Initially, at least two variations of the title existed and the difference of only one word is significant regarding Hitchcock's subsequent work crafting a historical lineage for modernism. One title was Early Modern Architecture—the one eventually used. Occasionally in letters however, the show was also referred to as Pre-Modern Architecture. This distinction is significant in that Early Modern not only pushes the beginning of modernism into the nineteenth century (as opposed to Pre-Modern which puts the start of modernism twenty years later in the second decade of the twentieth century), it also firmly establishes the American skyscraper as pre-existing early European influences, thus setting the American stage as the site for the birth of modernism. The end of this era of foreword thinking design, according to Hitchcock and Johnson, was brought on by the re-emergence of revivalism due to Chicago's 1893 World's Fair. Such revivalism, the scholars claimed, squashed “[t]he free non-traditional architecture of the Chicago School”.\textsuperscript{61} Using the skyscraper to set the precedent for modernism in the American city, Hitchcock and Johnson intentionally ignored the Victorian-era domestic buildings which proliferated during the second half of the nineteenth century. Although wooden structures such as these comprised the majority of the built environment, Hitchcock and Johnson glossed over these buildings entirely, in favor of mainly stone faced institutional structures designed by famous architects. These buildings, at least in terms of their materiality, had much more in common with their European counterparts.

Johnson and Hitchcock promoted these early beginnings of the American
skyscraper as a native form of American architecture. “Few people realize that on the ashes of the Chicago fire of 1871, there was built the only architecture that can truly be called American” one reporter enthused in January, 1933. Unlike the Pueblo housing identified by Vere Wallingford in a 1906 Architectural Record article as “original American architecture”, or even the “indigenous past” of Victorian-era domestic structures promoted by Kirstein wherein the materiality, versatility, and sheer abundance of a style were among the main arguments supporting their status as “vernacular” architecture, these early “ancestors of modern skyscrapers” were deemed native solely by their originality and recent technical innovation. They responded to new possibilities of materials and economic restraints rather than to climate or societal concerns. The following quote by Philip Johnson demonstrates the curators’ attempts to re-define the very definition of an American architectural language on the basis of originality and aesthetics;

The great names in the building of the frontier city... H. H. Richardson, Louis Sullivan, and Frank Lloyd Wright, who with their followers made the end of the nineteenth century the greatest epoch in the architectural development of our country. They created a native product not indebted to English or continental precedent. To these men goes the credit of bridging the gap between the Crystal Palace of steel and glass in London in 1851 and the skyscraper of today. They were the first to take advantage of the shift from masonry to cast iron and from cast iron to steel. This independent American architecture finally succumbed to the wave of classical revivalism which the World Fair first brought to Chicago in 1893.

As with each of these exhibitions, the graphic, and in particular, photographic evidence was essential in the making of an argument and it was not only the quality, but also the boldness and sheer size of the image which made the most compelling case. Extensive communication between Johnson and the Chicago Architectural Photography Company reveals the significant emphasis placed on these visuals. Writing a review in January 1933, journalist Malcolm Vaughan criticized the clarity of thought steering the project and noted the disproportionate clarity of Johnson and Hitchcock's visuals. “Considering the wealth of material that must still be available,“
An important and surely influential exhibition, *Early Modern Architecture* fell short of offering an account much different from that offered by Lewis Mumford in *The Brown Decades* with the exception that Hitchcock and Johnson made the argument with photographs. Emphasizing the most famous architects of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the project ignored the majority of the built environment by visually showcasing only a few select buildings. The result was a clearly delineated path from 1870-1933 which was too selective, and too concise to be accurate. In contrast, both Kirstein/Evans' and Hitchcock/Abbott's projects aimed to locate and come to terms with the American architectural fabric which resonated with American culture and out of which, they argued, modernism had grown.
Part Two
A Past to Modernism's Present: Re-framing the Nineteenth Century

“...At least a part of my life consists in filling up the ledger of the indigenous past, in recording these places, and in time which by accident and preference I know best...”

– Lincoln Kirstein, 1931

Lincoln Kirstein, patron of the arts, most famous for his role as co-founder of The School of the American Ballet in 1934, wrote these words in his diary in April 1931. [Figure 15] He had been out of Harvard University for less than a year and was in the midst of a photography project documenting nineteenth century architecture, which he had commissioned of the (then) struggling photographer, Walker Evans. This was the first time he used the term “indigenous” in reference to Victorian-era architecture, but in the years following, he would continually use it to portray this period, as well as other modalities for distancing this recent past, including “primitive” and “dynastic”.

Lincoln Kirstein had been working as a junior adviser for the Museum of Modern Art when he suggested the architecture project to Evans around February of 1931. [Figure 16] Kirstein and Evans spent the next two years conducting a number of small trips throughout the north east, collecting enough images for what Kirstein hoped would be an exhaustive survey of nineteenth century domestic structures. Kirstein became the proprietor of the photographs, and he used them according to his own agenda—placing some in small gallery exhibitions, offering their
use to other authors such as Lewis Mumford who politely refused them, and finally selecting thirty-nine for the November-December 1933 exhibition *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses* at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City—a seemingly last-ditch effort to find a suitable venue for their display. Taking advantage of the architectural exhibition as a relatively new form for the dissemination of ideas; and eccentric in its creation, output, and display, the MoMA exhibition provides a case study relevant for both the gains it made in architectural and art discourses, as well as the failures and disappointments which resulted. [See Appendix I for a reconstruction of the exhibition]

Through this photographic survey project and the exhibition which eventually resulted, Lincoln Kirstein was approaching his own Victorian-era architectural heritage as an “indigenous past”. By depicting the Victorian-era as something “alien” and “other”, Kirstein was drawing a temporal boundary between past and present which allowed modernists to classify it, categorize it, and distance it—but not reject it; while simultaneously legitimating it as a part of America’s heritage.

Underlying the formalist objections of 1930s modernist historians, critics, and designers to the untruthfulness of its aesthetic, lack of innovation, and stylistic confusion, was an objection to what the aesthetic of eclectic revival styles symbolized. Victorian-era houses visually signified a moment of prosperity ingrained in the heritage of upper class Americans, as well as a frivolity incompatible with a society in the midst of the Great Depression. The nineteenth century saw the emergence of a middle class in American society, and perhaps more so than had been true in the past, a more intimate link between economic standing and visual architectural expression. “The post-Civil War era marked the birth of that entrenched American belief that your home expresses who you are,” Gwendolyn Wright has recently asserted. Antebellum domestic architecture emphasized “collective standards”, Wright has suggested which is much in line with Henry-Russell Hitchcock’s exhibition as I will outline it in Part Three. “American houses now
accentuated self-expression," Wright noted. “Street facades and interiors mixed materials in distinctive, eye-catching patterns, while irregular massing supposedly signaled the distinctive interests of those inside.” This association between ornament, massing, and the expression of wealth was enhanced by the desire for home ownership. According to Gwendolyn Wright, “[o]nly a quarter of most suburban households in 1890 owned their own homes...making appearance all the more important an indication of status and stability.” For an age—the 1930s—wherein architecture was inspired by universality rather than by the solidification of class status, Victorian-era revivalism was the antithesis to modernism. In the 1930s, the Victorian-era house represented a fantasy and its “stubby country court-house columns, the thin wooden gothic crenelation on rural churches, [were] images of an unquenchable appetite for the prestige of the past in a new land” Kirstein wrote in 1938. Modernism, however, was not a fantasy, but rather concerned with the real problems of twentieth century life and its architecture needed to reflect this.

The fragility and impermanence of Victorian-era houses ironically made these structures more romantic in the inevitability of their demise, and the materiality of the revival style house strengthened the metaphor Kirstein and others employed. “[Evans] is providing illustrations for a monumental history of the American art of building in its most imaginative and impermanent period,” Kirstein wrote in December, 1933. “These wooden houses disintegrate, almost, between snaps of the lens.” In the instance of Kirstein and Evans' project, the use of wood construction also facilitated the distinction of American revival styles from European counterparts who had depended more heavily on stone construction. During the 1930s, wood also maintained an association with America's “native building traditions”. More harsh critics writing mid-nineteenth-century found comfort in the inevitability of demise implied in wooden vernacular building. The following quote by Louisa Caroline Huggins Tuthill, cited by Hitchcock in 1939, highlights this point: “‘Happily,’ wrote Louisa Caroline Huggins Tuthill in 1848, referring to the earliest buildings in
America, 'they were all of such perishable materials, that they will not much longer remain to annoy travelers, in 'search of the picturesque' through the beautiful villages of New England.'

This obsession with the impermanence of materials was something Walker Evans indulged in as well. This appreciation would become apparent in Evans' photographs for the remainder of his career, and he likely inherited this vision from Kirstein. Like Kirstein, Evans understood wood to be particularly American and associated it with an American identity. When asked in a 1970s interview about the clarity of the texture of materials in the buildings Evans photographed, he responded;

Well, that's just an instinctive natural love of what it was—the unpainted wood is very attractive to me... that's America, of course, and I guess I'm deeply in love with America—traditional old-style America anyway. Now, if I go and I see those houses painted over, I am displayed. I don't want them to be painted.

Wood had an impermanence and malleability which stone did not and this facilitated the characterization of revival styles as indigenous as Kirstein had conceived the term.

For Kirstein, this period of fantasy and indulgence was a part of American culture and needed to be acknowledged and historicized in order to move forward into the modernist present. Kirstein called these houses, not just “indigenous” but rather the “indigenous past”. As a term, this allowed the past to be memorialized, yet simultaneously made “other” and even “primitive”. Kirstein used other phrases with regard to Evans' photographs which emphasized the relegation of Victorian-era houses to a historical status. In 1938 he called these buildings “records of the age before an immanent collapse” and “symptoms of waste and selfishness that caused the ruin”. The photographic survey provided tools for this, the categorization of revivalism as “indigenous” facilitated its relegation to a historical status, and the architectural exhibition provided a venue for the dissemination of Kirstein's ideas. Kirstein asserted that Evans' particular talents as a social documentarian allowed him to treat these scenes of America's past with dignity while highlighting the reality of
the American built environment. He wrote the following about Evans in 1938;

Such ornament, logical for its place and its time, indigenous to Syracuse in Sicily, or London in England, was pure fantasy in Syracuse, New York, or New London, Connecticut. Evans has employed a knowing and hence respectful attitude to explore the consecutive tradition of our primitive monuments, an advanced philosophical and ideological technique to record their simplicity.80

Having recorded these “primitive monuments”, the photographic project, and its subsequent exhibition at MoMA became a way to confront the present with the past, and re-configure it so as to subsequently enable the discipline to bid it a definitive farewell.

“Professor Kirstein”: Patron, Publisher, Publicist

Evans had begun photographing in earnest in 1928 and this documentary project with Kirstein, no matter its outcome, would have signified a lucky break for an artist desperately in need of money, of a portfolio, and of connections. In an interview nearly four decades later, Evans played down the significance of the MoMA exhibition, *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses*, however, it is my contention that this project immensely impacted how Evans' vision shifted from one which sought meaning in people and objects, to a vision that incorporated the built environment as representative of American culture. “I don’t consider that business about architecture a show” he quipped in a 1971 interview with Paul Cummings. It wasn't something he would have done himself, Evans explained, but documenting architecture “was a perfectly respectable thing to do and this gave [him] a certain sophistication.” Historical research didn't interest Evans, but architecture, as a visual manifestation of society did, and it was along these lines that he found value in the project as his subsequent work suggests. What Evans did acknowledge in 1971 was the importance of the connections he made through this commission;

It just wasn’t my idea; it wasn’t a very important thing to do... But it meant something else much more important, which was meeting and getting to know Kirstein, a wonderful mind, a very stimulating boy.81
The influence of the 1933 exhibition on the course of the photographer's career was far more significant than he allowed himself to disclose. In reality, Evans had done very little photography of buildings as subjects during his early career, having tended toward people, objects, and city scenes. [See Figure 12] However, after the Kirstein trips, his work for the Farm Security Administration, which occupied much of his time during the 1930s, was replete with commonplace, everyday buildings, as was much of his work for *Fortune* magazine during the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. [Figure 17]

During the 1930s, Evans found himself a place as the commissioned artist of a number of amateur architectural historians. Playing the part of both the gentleman scholar and patron of the arts, Lincoln Kirstein was the most famous of this group. However, other individuals, some involved directly in the architectural discipline, commissioned work from Evans as well, and each man and his commission during the 1930s allowed Evans to create some of the most important images featured in his seminal 1938 exhibition at MoMA, *American Photographs*. Evans' several patrons included John Brooks Wheelwright, eccentric poet, architectural critic, and mentor to Kirstein; Charles Fuller, a well-to-do architect; and Gifford Cochran, a successful rug manufacturer. Charles Fuller had commissioned portraits of Greek Revival houses in his town of New Bedford, New York and Cochran had taken Evans south to Florida and New Orleans during 1934 and 1935 to photograph revival style architecture there. [Figure 18] Evans detested his dependence on these patrons, however, it was their belief in and promotion of him during the early 1930s which was critical in enabling his photographic career to take flight.

Walker Evans initially aimed for a writing career, and he attended Williams College before leaving for two years to study at the Sorbonne in Paris. While abroad, Evans did little photography, concerned instead with his own writing and with making translations. While abroad, Evans met few of the more legendary American expatriates and although he had seen James Joyce, a fellow contributor to the *Hound*
& Horn, he refused to be introduced—frightened, he “didn’t dare”. Having returned to the U.S. in 1927, he worked odd jobs and lived in both the Village and Brooklyn where he met artists and discovered that he possessed a natural interest in photography. In 1928, Evans began to photograph in earnest, often taking night jobs so as to be free to photograph during the day. After befriending Evans, Kirstein took the photographer to Muriel Draper’s “imitation French salon”—a gathering place for artists and their critics, and almost immediately he had attracted a small but influential group of supporters. [Figure 19] Primarily, he was taken up by Lincoln Kirstein and his fellow Harvard associates.

Lincoln Kirstein possessed a skill for attracting contemporary artists, writers, critics, dancers, choreographers, and historians of the period. Part of this came, of course, from his chosen role as a benefactor for artists, funded by his father’s wealth. As an undergraduate, he was capable of drawing a wide variety of participants to his publication, Hound & Horn, some better known or more established than others, but all mainly young and influential beyond their immediate disciplines. Writers such as Gertrude Stein, James Joyce, E. E. Cummings, and William Carlos Williams often contributed. Beyond historians, critics, and poets, the work of artists was often featured, including that of Ben Shahn, Berenice Abbott, and Charles Sheeler. Kirstein published a series of four Charles Sheeler photographs—“Ford Plant 1-4” in the April-June 1930 issue, a few months before the Victorian-era houses project was conceived originally as a documentation of revival style homes and industrial landscapes.

[Figure 20] Wheelwright, a figure who would prominently, if not eccentrically figure into the early work of Walker Evans, was a mentor of Lincoln Kirstein and he frequently published work in Hound & Horn which alternated between poetry and architectural criticism. Jere Abbott was an aspiring artist at the time and he initiated this industrial theme with his publication of four photographs of the Cambridge Necco Factory included in the first issue of Hound & Horn—immediately following an article by Hitchcock (who would have obtained his masters degree from Harvard that year)
entitled, “The Decline of Architecture”.[89] [See Figure 21]

Following the inclusion of Evans' photographs in the publication during the fall of 1930, Kirstein had already begun formulating other commissions for Evans—photographs for the April-June 1931 issue as the visual accompaniment to an article comparing The New School for Social Research building designed by Josef Urban, and the Red Cross Building by Delano and Aldrich. The text—“Is Character Necessary?” was written by Lyman Paine.[90] [Figure 22] These images are visually less powerful than his Farm Security Administration photographs of buildings or even his images for the 1933 exhibition in that they demonstrate little of the human presence which makes architecture so visually expressive in his later photographs. Evans was still resolving his approach to architectural photography during the early 1930s, and it was the social connotations inherent in America's architecture which inspired his eye. Architecture alone was not enough. Although his photographs of nineteenth century houses never appeared in Hound & Horn for which they were originally intended, Evans was probably the photographer most often featured in the magazine.

In place of the publication of Evans' photographs of Victorian-era houses in Hound & Horn, Kirstein published Evans' photographs from the same period of production which emphasized a social rather than architectural content. Featured in Hound & Horn in 1932 were South Street: 1932, a depiction of homeless New Yorkers lounging in doorways and reading the newspaper; and Ossining: New York: 1932[91]—a portrait of two men lounging outside of a dirty shingled home with a woman leaning out of an open window, the glass of which features words transcribed in soot. [Figure 23] Evans photographed in Ossining multiple times, at least once with Kirstein, and in sorting through his photographs of this place, two visions emerge: that of Evans—people going about their daily lives, interacting with one another and with their environment; and that of Kirstein—Folk Victorians and Gingerbread facades. Some of his most endearing Victorian-era examples may have been captured on an Ossining trip—a Folk Victorian gazebo in a farm field and a Folk
Victorian out house.92 [Figure 24] None of the Ossining portraits of architecture made it into the MoMA exhibition, but two reminiscent of Kirstein’s interest did become a part of Evans’ important American Photographs exhibition at MoMA in 1938. [Figure 25]

Similar to the value of the architectural exhibition as an experimental venue, Hound & Horn provided an avenue by which to write an interdisciplinary history that included architecture. More radical in scope, Kirstein’s magazine “published what the commercial magazines, Scribner’s, Atlantic Monthly, and Harper’s, were not ready for.”93 It surveyed the contemporary art scene—painting, photography—and included contributions on architecture, literature, history, and society as they specifically related to American culture. Kirstein treated the Victorian-era houses as if they were the evidence of a disappearing culture, much like an anthropologist would have done. In 1933 he described the photographs as if the buildings had been placed within an “airless atmosphere” or a climate-controlled museum display.94

“I started the magazine as ‘Harvard Miscellany,’” Kirstein wrote retrospectively, “intending it to be a kind of historical or archaeological survey of a site, its buildings, traditions, and the men who made them.” He continued;

Most of the little magazines (so called because of their relatively minuscule readership) were short lived; they lasted for a year or two, if that. Sometimes just one issue sufficed to express its editor’s message, the demise occurring because of lack of funds, because of the dearth of usable material, or simply because of the accomplishment of the editor’s mission. Because the Hound & Horn could rely on regular funding, it had continuity that enabled it to undertake long-term projects. It could also afford to remain detached from the demands of the marketplace and thereby remain aloof from current movements and fads, if it chose.95

To give a reference for the period in which the magazine featured Evans, Kirstein had moved the Hound & Horn headquarters to a small office in New York City during the winter of 1930. At this point it transformed into a national publication, growing in reception and prestige, and had come to be perceived as the “successor to the Dial”.96
In 1931, Kirstein's mentor, John Brooks Wheelwright, had proposed to write a book on American architecture—the endeavor which provided the initial fuel for Kirstein and Evans' photographic survey. Evans' photographs were to provide the illustrations. This book project was interdisciplinary in scope and was to be about the abandoned “eclectic” Victorian-era American architecture which bespeckled north eastern cities such as Boston. Examples of Victorian-era houses were intentionally forgotten by modernist designers, critics and historians, but not lacking in number and they proliferated throughout the north east—New England, New York state, and New Jersey. Preferring to think of his architectural subjects as indigenous (an even more romantic vision than “vernacular”), Wheelwright merged literary giants of the day with architecture of the everyday, with objects, and with folklore, thus defining more than an American architecture—he was defining an American heritage. Wheelwright's “encyclopedic” plan, as described to Kirstein, was an “essential background for the study of American architecture”;

My first article will deal with wig-wam hut and shed, temporary ramshackle building, Holmes' Chambered Nautilus, the Americans as speculative nomads. City, country and seashore speculative building, the railroad, the industrial jungle, tourists, bohemians, E. E. Cummings living in a corrugated iron shed. Walt Whitman, Blackstone, Johnny Appleseed, the Lords Brethren and the Lords Bishop, Thoreau, the Simple Life, solitude and society (Emerson), Nature's Picture Gallery, rustication, naturalistic parks.

In the context of Wheelwright's un-executed plans, Victorian-era architecture was just one piece of a broader American vernacular context. The other quality of Wheelwright's proposal which makes it especially worthy of note with regard to Evans, is his interest in the interweaving of American literary and architectural pasts—a relevant point given Evans' own inclinations.

John Brooks Wheelwright, poet and architect, was as eccentric as the architecture he sought to write about. Having graduated from the Harvard Poetry Society after World War I, he went to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to
study architecture, following in the footsteps of his father, architect of the Harvard Lampoon and other public buildings in Boston. Described by Kirstein as an “Anglo-Catholic-crypto-Communist,” a “Brahmin of Boston's best, an Angelican Trotskyite, and a most interesting theological poet”, Wheelwright joined both the Socialist party and the Socialist Workers party during the Great Depression. Considered a literary radical by his biographer, Alan M. Wald, he also published in *Old-Time New England* (the *Bulletin of The Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities*) an article on Cambridgeport's Valentine-Fuller House which included an un-credited photograph by Evans taken on their early 1930s trips. [Appendix I, No. 11.33]

Fancying themselves architectural archaeologists conquering the abandoned culture of their childhoods, the patron and historian-poet-architect set out with Evans to find what existed all around them—the nineteenth century houses intentionally left out of architectural histories of the nineteenth century, such as Lewis Mumford's *The Brown Decades* or Hitchcock and Johnson's *Early Modern Architecture* exhibition. These were the relics of “another” culture American modernists had alienated, but in reality were still struggling to shed, as Kirstein was. Kirstein and Wheelwright treated the project as if they were venturing to an unknown wild, even though the architecture they were studying was only between fifty and one hundred years old. The stuff that interested them was “romantic revival and other unstudied, undiscovered really, styles in American architecture” Evans said in 1971. “I was a photographer and Kirstein had the natural idea, “Well, let’s go and photograph these things.”

For Lincoln Kirstein specifically, the nineteenth century houses photographic project was a very personal endeavor. “It is perhaps hard to understand the feeling that I still have about Boston—and Cambridge,” he began in his forward for a book of letters relating to *Hound & Horn*. “When I went to school, the nineteenth century was only terminating its cultural and intellectual hegemony. I felt and feel I am a man of
the nineteenth century.” He felt an attachment to the physical place, and to the inherited intellectual and “ancestral” legacy embodied in it. In retrospect, Kirstein wrote that “[i]dentification with a society of living and thinking New England dynastic actors gave a security and assurance prompting freedom of action, a sense of inevitability of possibility achieved which I do not think any other locus in America then offered.” These revival houses inspired in him the times of Henry James, a subject of near-obsession for Kirstein and the writers who frequently contributed to his magazine. An entire issue of the *Hound & Horn* was dedicated to this American expatriate living in England, and Evans owned an extensive collection of books by and about Henry James and the Victorian-era more generally. This attachment was Kirstein's way of adopting a past and an ancestry with which he identified, but which in reality, did not belong to him.

Lincoln Kirstein's father was Louis Kirstein, a “nothing...a large, coarse-looking man with limited education and income—and even more limited prospects” according to Lincoln Kirstein biographer Martin Duberman. A salesman in an optical firm, Kirstein's father was about as far as possible in economic and class stature from Kirstein's mother. His mother, Rose Stein, on the contrary, had been born into one of the most prominent Jewish families in Rochester. Although her parents first aimed to prevent the union, Kirstein's mother and father eventually wed in 1896 following a three-year waiting period enforced by her parents. Living in both Rochester and Boston before settling permanently in the latter, the upwardly mobile family was comprised of three children with Lincoln, the middle child, born in 1907. In 1901 they lived in a modestly sized home on a street neighboring the wealthiest neighborhood of Rochester. Returning to Boston in 1911, Kirstein's father obtained a junior partnership in one of the world's largest and most progressive department stores through his friend, Lincoln Filene. Known to be both aggressive and a bully in the business world, Louis Kirstein rapidly ascended the ranks of the company, and the family was soon residing in the Hotel Ericson, an affluent locale on Commonwealth
Avenue before moving into a five-storey home with an “unadorned” limestone facade near Kenmore Square. With an elevator, high ceilings, and a full staff including maids, cooks, and a laundress, the home was grand, but it was not “architecturally distinguished” as it “had not been designed by the illustrious firm of McKim, Mead & White” as the other homes in the area were.111 [Figure 26]

Later in his life, Kirstein wrote that through the purchase of a silver Rolls-Royce, his father was “fill[ing] the role of one of Boston's housebroken, token aliens.”

A family divided between two worlds, Kirstein's father was typically cost conscious with the exception of a few indulgences such as the car, a chauffeur, expensive suits, and golf clubs. He had amassed a fortune to supply comforts for himself and for his family, however, he hadn't been educated past grade-school, and had been both a “hobo” and a janitor in a St. Louis brothel before finding his niche in retail. His children, on the other hand, had grown up surrounded by wealth; educated at Smith and at Harvard.

Knowing nothing but these comforts, Kirstein critiqued his father's material indulgences while at the same time he himself identified with the upward ascending classes who inhabited the revival style homes he later documented with Walker Evans. To Kirstein's mother's dismay (and most likely Kirstein's as well), his father didn't install his family in a visually ornate home. While Kirstein identified with this wealth, he was also aware of the baseness of his own father's expression of wealth through the purchase of a Rolls-Royce. Simultaneously caught between his own indulgence and dismay at it, Kirstein was unable to escape the lap of luxury—the only lifestyle he had ever known. For Kirstein, it was not enough that he had spent all but four years of his life living in Boston-- his father was, in his words, an “alien”. As a consequence, Kirstein had to resort to the “dynastic actors” he associated with Boston and New England, and adopt them as his own. Of course, a strange contradiction exists here—the revival style homes Kirstein and Evans captured did not always belong to the elite—many were even pattern-book or a few short steps
removed from tract housing. However, it is my speculation that their nineteenth century origins was enough for Kirstein, along with the shame of indulgence they possessed, which he possessed as well.

It was not only the built environment which was modernizing in the early 1930s, it was also academia and scholarship, and the photography project became a metaphor for Kirstein’s “end of an era”. Eccentricity, in both ornament and academics was finished, as the following excerpt from Kirstein’s diary (March 17, 1931) alludes. It was less than one month before Kirstein and Evans embarked on their photographic “campaign”.

Took Walter Sturgis to see Jack Wheelwright to get suggestions for a proposed show at the Harvard Society for Contemporary Art in June. Romantic American Architecture & Industrial Contemporary work. I thought that Walter would like Jack more on closer acquaintance. We looked over various curious Architectural Americana...Walter liked [John Brooks Wheelwright] but was firm in the belief that the age of such eccentric individuals is over. That one can only accomplish good work by the submergence of the individual, not by retreat into a James Gardner-Berenson ivory tower.114

[Figure 27] Kirstein was not a scholar, but rather a promoter and from the earliest stages, his intentions toward the project were that it would result in an architectural exhibition; American history was something tangible and accessible, and only by engaging with remnants of the Victorian-era could it interpreted and left behind.

“In An Automobile, with the Photographic Equipment in the Rumble”: Trips Around the North East

A relatively new tool for the crafting of architectural history, the photograph enabled a new way of telling, and was in the 1930s, “the instrument of amateur sentimentalist, professional portraitist and serious historian” Kirstein later wrote in 1938.115 Kirstein’s group in 1931 consisted of one of each, sometimes making the goals of the effort difficult to negotiate. The conception of a recent Harvard graduate, when melded with an “eccentric” poet-architect-critic, and a fledgling
photographer struggling to find his place between artist and documentarian caused the vision of the project to change with every excursion. “Jack Wheelwright & Walker Evans and I started our photographic campaign to get all the good Victorian-era houses in the vicinity from New Greek, through the influence of Viollet le Duc through English Gothic and Italian & French Renaissance ending up in the MacKinley period,” Kirstein wrote in his diary on April 15th, 1931.

...We had some difficulty in keeping our impulses straight on this stuff, i.e., did we want the best of the Romantic stuff, or the best and most eccentric, or a historical survey of the whole period to be used as illustrations for Jack Wheelwright's book, or for an Exhibition at the Harvard Society for Contemporary Art, where Hack wants to arrange a Victorian-era & Industrial Architecture show? We also took a certain number of industrial subjects but I was more interested in getting the older things because they are all in mortal danger of imminent destruction [or] disrepair...¹¹

Some itinerary must have been drawn up, most likely by Kirstein based on recommendations from John Brooks Wheelwright, Lyman Paine, those in the MoMA circle; architectural historians he had worked with for the Hound & Horn (i.e. potentially Hitchcock), and perhaps even Walker Evans himself who had visited some of these locations, such as Ossining, multiple times during the early 1930s. However, the only evidence of an itinerary comes from Kirstein's diary, which only spottedly covered the trips. The implication in this document is that Kirstein and the photographer, at least during the first trip in April 1931, essentially wandered around Boston and its surrounds—Kirstein's hometown. “We worked hard,” Kirstein wrote, “threading in and out of the streets...looking for whatever landmark or beckoning spire that presented itself above the common roofline of the other houses.”¹¹

Kirstein, as patron, was using Evans' photographs to explore his own interests as a fledgling art and architectural critic, and historian, and his role as director, rather than artist, at times weighed on Evans' ego. The frustration was mutual and during their travels around New England, Kirstein felt like a “surgeon's assistant” to Evans and his patience was often tried.¹¹⁸ However, he also often noted his satisfaction with the project; “The Victorian-era houses that Jack Wheelwright and Walker Evans and I
have been photographing are really remarkable,” he wrote in his diary.\textsuperscript{119} Having begun as one large endeavor, Kirstein’s impatience with Evans forced the project to be completed over a number of excursions throughout 1931 and 1932. By the 21\textsuperscript{st} of April, Evans and Kirstein had boarded a train for New York. Between May and June, Evans sent photographs to Kirstein and on May 13 Kirstein noted that he had received the finished plates of the Victorian architecture images “which [were] except for a very few exceptions better than [he] had dared hope.”\textsuperscript{120} During the month of June, 1931, Kirstein sought out various outlets of publication for the images, lunching with Parker-Lloyd Smith and Archie MacLeish—editors of Fortune, to inquire “...whether or not they would want an article on the Victorian houses Walker Evans and [he had] been collecting.”\textsuperscript{121}

Although they remained acquaintances for the remainder of their lives, the relationship between Kirstein and Evans—both strong minded, extremely talented, and in search of their independent visions—became strained over the course of the Victorian-era houses project. One complication derived from their patron-artist relationship. Kirstein was well-aware of Evans' disparate economic condition, writing in early 1931 about a visit he had made to the photographer's apartment. Describing the filth he wrote, “How [Evans and his roommate Hans Skolle] both looked so clean is a constant mystery to me... I had to feel my very presence compelled a comparison,” he stated, “and it probably did only in my eager mind.”\textsuperscript{122} Regardless, while Kirstein may have had wealthier family ties, both he and Evans understood the photographer as belonging to the same upper register in terms of class. Kirstein wrote in 1938 that Evans was member of the upper class belonging to the houses they had photographed. Educated at Andover and Williams, Evans said in a 1970s interview during the end of his life that he found he was “at heart an aristocrat”. He contended; “I feel that art is aristocratic and an artist is an aristocrat.”\textsuperscript{123}

Professional problems became personal confrontations between the two men and by the summer of 1931 the differences between patron and artist became too
much for either to bear. Speed had always been a problem for Evans, never producing quickly enough to satisfy his patrons, and the recently graduated Kirstein “[found] it impossible not to bully him by rushing him or telling him just what to do”. Before April was out, Kirstein accused Evans of being “intensely irritating, jealous, and possessing of ulterior motives...Colorless, pleasant before exerting a kind of small but concentrated animal magnetism, he seemed now to allow his small size to lead him into the exaggerations of a strutting compensation,” Kirstein wrote in April, 1931. “His actions are governed by springs pretty far below the surface. His jealousy or irritation manifests itself after the initial impulse by a long interval. His self-consciousness and localized egotism I found so difficult to put up with that I knew I must be affected pretty subjectively...” By the 8th of June, 1931, the project was not completed in its entirety, however, Kirstein wrote the following after a dinner the men shared together that evening; “I don't much want to see him anymore yet I feel I ought to go on photographing with him the Victorian-era houses & factories that we started together. Got tired of him--”

During the 1930s, art photographers saw architectural photography more as a job than as a creative endeavor. However, Kirstein's project, as well as Hitchcock's cross this boundary in that both projects were equally an exhibition of a photographer's skill as they were of the architecture analyzed within the photographs. Illustrating the conflict art photographers felt toward documentary work, from Kirstein's account, it appears Evans thought himself above such a commission as an artist. His participation in the endeavor was minimal. During one stop in Buzzards Bay, Lyman Paine and Lincoln Kirstein took photographs of a site on which their friends, Marion and Eliot Porter, were thinking of purchasing a house. “Walker Evans sat in the car,” Kirstein recorded in his diary, “and read the New Yorker.” Kirstein's interest in the photographs quickly waned as time passed.

During the summer of 1931 and extending through the summer of 1932, Kirstein was attempting to establish the School of American Ballet, and he became
increasingly disinterested in his older projects, namely the Evans' photographs and
his magazine, the *Hound & Horn*. Between May 1931 and October 1933, the two
men took a few smaller trips to complete the project—venturing back to Boston in
mid-June 1931,128 a late June 1931 session in Ashfield, and late summer 1931 trips to
Northampton and Greenfield, Massachusetts, and Poughkeepsie, New York.129

Spending the summer of 1933 in Europe, Kirstein was completely consumed
with the agenda of starting a ballet for New York or Hartford, and his diary entries
exemplify this sole interest. A few short, last minute photography excursions
peppered the months leading up to the MoMA show. An October 15th, 1933 trip to
Orange, New Jersey attracted Kirstein’s temporary attention and he intimately
described this “1879 community separated by a stream from Asbury Park, where
prolonged religious conferences take place”;

...A town of tent houses and wooden villas; today, deserted except for a few invalids in wheel chairs. A few dying
cancerous old women immobile on deserted porches. The sun was very dramatic on some of the flat wooden Gothic
detail. A large model under a wooden dome of the Holy City, with a few leaves blown in among the plaster mosques. We
took six pictures with care and dispatch, momentarily expecting to be stopped, and working ourselves into a mild
hysteria of expecting the lady at the window to come in and prevent us. Miracle of photography, why the fixed image
doesn’t escape before the mens-shutter is sprung?130

The trip ended with an excursion to see Ben Shahn's sketch for a mural in a doctor's
office on Bethune Street in Ossining. Like the houses they were documenting and the
life Kirstein was himself shedding, the inhabitants of these houses were dying,
vanishing relics—an eccentric society belonging to an eccentric era; an era which did
not belong to modernism. [Figure 28] Kirstein's final references to the project were
brief in November, 1933—one outlined a lunch and gallery visit with Alfred Barr on
November 9th, the other detailed a November 12th dinner with Walker Evans. Despite
this, his concern at the time was primarily with choreographer George Balanchine's
fever, not with the upcoming exhibition. By the end of 1933, Kirstein had washed his
hands of both his Walker Evans endeavor and his publication. He had donated the
Evans photographs to MoMA, perhaps in an effort to disavow himself fully of the project. With regard to the Hound & Horn, he wrote the following in his journal on January 2, 1934: “To the Hound & Horn which takes less and less of my time and interest, with scarcely a morsel of attendant guilt.”

**Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses at the Museum of Modern Art, November 16-December 8, 1933**

On exhibition for only three weeks at the end of 1933, *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses* now appears relatively unimpressive at first glance. Hung in the third floor architecture room at the Museum of Modern Art, the reviews were consistent: hauntingly truthful photographs of the remnants of a ridiculously frivolous and untruthful architecture. Furthermore, this architecture belonged to a wasteful culture, obsessed with function-less ornament rather than thoughtful modern efficiency. The conclusion of critics was that the photographer was talented, Victorian-era domesticity was repulsive, and MoMA, with its “persistent campaign for recognition of modern design” an ironic venue for such a display of ridicule and mockery. However, held only one year after the architecture and design curatorial department at MoMA was formed as the first of its kind in the world, it was the sixth architectural exhibition. With the exception of the May 1932 show *Murals by American Painters and Photographers*, it was also the first show of significant photography, and the first dedicated to one photographer in its entirety. From June to November of the following year, MoMA would run back-to-back exhibitions on modern housing design, and the second of these, *American Can’t Have Housing*, would include a Victorian-era tenement flat re-constructed within MoMA’s walls.

[Figure 29] Whether modernists admitted it as Kirstein did, historians and critics of the 1930s had yet to absolve themselves of the social implications of their Victorian-era past. At MoMA, modernists began attacking it through housing.

Like an investor, Kirstein used one project to fund the next and depended on wealthy benefactors to support his projects (i.e. his father). These endeavors grew
out of the *Hound & Horn* in his efforts to exploit all influential venues. While Kirstein was still considering a writing career, he had been periodically asked to submit potential pieces to *Fortune*, coincidentally Evans' future employer. One such project involved Evans' photographs of nineteenth century architecture; "Archie was very excited by Walker Evans & my photos of Victorian-era houses," Kirstein wrote during the summer of 1931, "and hoped to arrange an article by me for *Fortune*. I hoped so for the sake of cash, as I can't remember when I have felt I was so hard up. So many of my writers for the *Hound & Horn* seeming to depend on advances for their very existence."¹³⁸

With its scattered beginnings and lethargic pace, the Victorian-era house project envisioned in early 1931 was radically transformed by the end of 1933 when it finally reached a sense of conclusion. The photographs were not originally intended for an exhibition at MoMA, but nevertheless illustrate a particularly interdisciplinary and self-reflective moment for this recently established modern art museum. In addition to Wheelwright's book and a possible exhibition at the Harvard Society for Contemporary Art, Kirstein also hoped to publish them as accompaniment to articles by John Brooks Wheelwright in *Hound & Horn*, and potentially even serve as illustrations for Lewis Mumford's *The Brown Decades* (first published in 1931).¹³⁹ In reality, the photographs were inappropriate for *The Brown Decades*. While they depicted architecture of the same period of concern to Mumford, Kirstein and Evans were documenting fairly anonymous designs, exemplar of prevalent building trends, while Mumford was identifying individual buildings and select architects which established a clear architectural lineage from the nineteenth century forward. In fact, the buildings Kirstein and Evans captured belonged to the very "Awkward Age" Mumford dismissed on the first page of his book.¹⁴⁰

The Harvard Society for Contemporary Art was an "intellectual circle" and "avant-garde student organization" co-founded by Kirstein while a student at the university.¹⁴¹ Essentially, the HSCA provided the foundations of the Museum of
Modern Art in New York City, and therefore perhaps it should be no surprise that Evans' photographs eventually found a home at MoMA. According to Mardges Bacon, "[m]any of the exhibitions organized by the HSCA from 1929 to 1932 served as models for the Modern."\textsuperscript{142} When Wheelwright failed to deliver a manuscript and Mumford rejected Kirstein's offer, the project slowly manifest as an exhibition to be held at MoMA over two years after the first photographic excursion through New England.\textsuperscript{143}

Prior to their exhibition at MoMA, however, the images found a venue in the fine art circle of New York City galleries and in exhibitions of photographs from international photographers in museum circuits. One of the more interesting qualities of Evans' photographs of Victorian-era houses taken during the 1930s is that while the subject matter was considered to be outdated, the actual aesthetic of the photographs was considered to be cutting edge and modern. The main round of photographs were taken over the course of 1931 and Kirstein had a good number of prints to chose from by the summer of that year. Despite their personal conflicts, Kirstein continued to make it his business to promote Evans throughout 1932.

Placing his photographs in gallery and museum exhibitions along with their architect acquaintance Charles Fuller, it was also Kirstein's suggestion that Evans photograph the Metropolitan Museum of Art's sculpture collection.\textsuperscript{144} On February 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1932, Julien Levy exhibited Evans' photographs of Victorian-era architecture alongside those by George Platt Lynes.\textsuperscript{145} A \textit{Brooklyn Daily Eagle} article from February 1932 noted that Evans' and Lynes' photographs were on display at the same time that MoMA was hosting the \textit{Modern Architecture: International Exhibition}. Both exhibitions were considered “modern”. [\textbf{Figure 30}] From February 7\textsuperscript{th} to the 25\textsuperscript{th}, 1932, the Albright Art Gallery in Buffalo, New York hosted a group exhibition which included seven photographs by Evans, four of which derived from the “New England architectural series”\textsuperscript{146}. The project was a traveling exhibit organized by Kirstein for the Harvard Society of Contemporary Art.\textsuperscript{147} All of the Evans photographs were on loan from
Hound & Horn, almost certainly suggesting Kirstein's involvement in their promulgation. The photographs were also shown with the work of two other photographers at the John Becker Gallery. Apparent, among other venues of display and publication sought out by Kirstein, the patron/promoter also attempted to persuade Joseph Brewer to publish a book of Evans photographs.

Kirstein, as commissioner, was the proprietor of the nineteenth century house photographs which resulted. In letters, he and others acted as if Kirstein exclusively owned the photographic rights, and Evans himself described the photographs years later as a commission rather than a grant. For permission to re-print a photograph, Wheelwright contacted Kirstein and made the request in a postscript. There is no evidence that Kirstein ever used a camera, however, Wheelwright calls the images “snapshots that you [Kirstein] took” in the following passage;

P.S. Philip Johnson wants an article by me for Shelter. I have sent him my dope about the Fuller House and suggested to him that you might let him have Walker Evans' photographs for illustration. The snap-shots that you took are very much better than this. Please let him reproduce them if he likes my article enough to publish it. Shelter is a very good name. I look forward to seeing the first number and to writing for it.

In March of the same year, the Brooklyn Museum hosted the “International Photographers Exhibition” wherein of the twelve included Evans photographs, seven were on loan from Charles Fuller and five from the Julien Levy Gallery. The exhibition initially ran from March 8 until March 31, 1932 with the display period being expanded into April due to popularity. Along side the work of “leading masters” of photography, Evans' prints were made available for purchase at $15 each. Eager to one-up the younger Museum of Modern Art, “These photographs,” a press release by the Brooklyn Museum read, “have been assembled by the Museum and it is the first exhibition of international photography held at a public museum in this city.” What is equally significant about the frequent appearance of Evans' images of nineteenth century architecture is that this photographic topic was considered to be of equal and worthy attention in both the gallery setting and the
institutionalized venue. The appearance of images from his trips with Kirstein, Brooks Wheelwright, and Fuller in multiple venues over the course of a year demonstrates that the MoMA show was not an accident or lucky break, but rather a significant milestone in the contemporaneous reception of this “vanishing architecture”.

The MoMA exhibition was made possible through Kirstein’s connections and it was most likely Alfred H. Barr, Jr., not Philip Johnson, who permitted their display in the architecture department, running concurrently with an Edward Hopper retrospective. Kirstein had grown frustrated with Walker Evans and by the fall of 1933 was eager to devote his attention to other projects. When Kirstein gave the exhibition photographs to MoMA as a gift, they became a part of the Museum’s permanent collection. Unfortunately, the process by which the photographs did transform into a MoMA exhibition is undocumented, but some clues do exist. Kirstein was acquaintances with Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and in a November 9th, 1933 diary entry, Kirstein indicates that the two men discussed “a show of Walker Evan’s [sic] photographs of Victorian houses to be held at the Museum of Modern Art, in conjunction with the Edward Hopper show.” On the 12th of November Kirstein dined with Evans, the implication being that the showing at MoMA was potentially concocted at the very last minute. Given that the exhibition opened on November 16th of that same year, a mere four days later, this remains improbable, unless Kirstein had an entire exhibition already prepared, waiting in the wings for MoMA to adopt. The fortuitous coincidence of the Edward Hopper exhibition almost certainly facilitated the exhibition of Evans’ photographs at the same time. Both depicted nineteenth century domesticity, in its grandness and in its imperfections, and the display of Evans’ photographs were an ironic instance of life imitating art—a gentle reminder to modernists that these houses were not imagined by the painter but that they did, in fact, still exist.
Public Reception

Contemporaneous interpretations of the exhibit fell into two categories. One interpretation was that the project was a celebration of the Victorian-era period and the architecture which characterized it. The other interpretation was that the exhibition was ironically displayed at the Museum of Modern Art—a “ridicule” and mockery, which is where I will begin.\textsuperscript{155}

In a blurb featured in \textit{Architectural Forum}, the author wrote the following; “Of all U.S. museums, none is so generous to architecture as New York’s Museum of Modern Art. Founded less than five years ago, with Rockefeller money principally, it boasts a permanent department of architecture, has two traveling architectural shows, and carries on a persistent campaign for recognition of modern design.”\textsuperscript{156}

The article continued;

Last month, in an exhibition of 19th Century American house photographs by Walker Evans, [MoMA] held up to ridicule the sins of the carpenters and architects who flourished in what is generally referred to as the General Grant era. As often as this period has been sarcastically damned by the critics, nothing has been so honest or so cruel as Evans’ untitled pictures. His collection of gingerbread is not exaggerated by undue emphasis. Each photograph is a documentary record. There are no trick angles to his pictures, no distortions contributed by his own opinions.\textsuperscript{157}

Situating the subject of Evans’ photographs as belonging to a “vanished” architectural past no longer a threat to modern design, another journalist posed the following question, asking not—what do we made of these Victorian-era designs, but rather—what do we make of the inspiration to present them? Understanding the exhibition at MoMA as ironic, the \textit{Home & Field} journalist concluded that “[i]n their context, against the baize walls of the American Museum of Modern Art, the original prints hung desolately—phrases in an unspoken sermon the significance of which we have not the heart to analyze.” Addressing the most interesting question stemming from Kirstein and Evans’ project, this contemporaneous journalist was so distraught by the images of Victorian-era houses that he couldn’t write further. \textit{Home & Field} added their own touch to the photographs with the addition of Victorian-era borders,
thus deeming them Victorian-era valentines for architects, or perhaps more appropriately, condolence cards for the deceased. In 1933, at the opening of Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses, Edward Alden Jewell called some of Evans' photographs “priceless” but had little more to say of the show.

The social implications of these Victorian-era houses, however, were not lost on the audience of Evans' photographs—an audience who, like Kirstein and Evans, had sprung from these very origins. Ashamed of the blatant display of wealth that these architectural remains represented in the 1930s (particularly in the midst of the Great Depression), the opposition to this architecture was based as much in embarrassment as it was in formal taste. Regardless, like horrified bystanders straining to see a train wreck, these critics who were struggling toward modernism, could not look away. Author Charles Flato offered a statement in a 1934 issue of Hound & Horn which supports this. Discussing the Victorian-era United States Hotel in Saratoga, New York, he wrote;

As social documentation...these buildings have a value that transcends their essential weaknesses: As mute commentary on their time and the spirit of their time they are an accurate expression of that small but noisy and overmoneyed portion of a victorious Northern democracy; for a society of witless Elizabethan-like adventurers nothing could be quite so remarkably appropriate.

Four photographs of the hotel, taken by Silvia Saunders, accompanied Flato's words. The Victorian-era building, particularly the domestic building, enabled critical modernists to romanticize a stylistic and cultural naivety while simultaneously distancing themselves from this past. The 1930s interpretation of the Victorian era, the very real and recent past, was far more complicated than contemporaneous historians and critics were even aware.

Demonstrating the conflicted environment into which the exhibition was set, other articles detailing the Walker Evans exhibit found in his photographs, not an ironic stance, but rather overdue recognition. With regard to the traveling exhibition which was housed at the Lyman Allyn Museum in New London, Winslow Ames, an art
and architectural historian who had served, over the course of his career, as founding
director of the Lyman Allyn Museum and director of Gallery of Modern Art in New York
City, wrote that “[t]hese...documentary photographs of great precision and
clarity...are journalism of the liveliest sort though they report things that happened
some time ago.” Furthermore, Ames articulated, “[Walker Evans] [had] done
wonders...in recording things which [were] just beginning to disappear, and in calling
them to the attention of people who [had] been blinded to them.”

Winslow Ames’ article for the New London Day, written with regard to the
traveling exhibition of Evans’ 19th century house photographs, provides an adequate
depiction of the conflicted position of Victorian-era architecture in the American built
environment. On one hand it was a vanishing, discarded past, but on the other, it
was a vernacular language even more American than the American Colonial and
early Republican constructions which had been, and are still often considered to be,
the nation’s first vernacular language. “Yet the American nineteenth century house,
particularly in its wooden phase, is a creature that belongs truly to this [American]
soil,” Ames wrote. “It still exists in enormous quantities, of which the majority is of
no distinction, but at its best it possesses style, resourcefulness, and an organic
quality lacking in many other places and periods.” Ames' thoughts mirrored those
of Lincoln Kirstein which were presented in the Museum of Modern Art Bulletin of
December, 1933; “In his series of American Federal and Victorian-era architecture,
taken over the last four years, [Evans] is providing illustrations for a monumental
history of the American art of building in its most imaginative and impermanent
period. These wooden houses disintegrate, almost, between snaps of the lens. Many
shown in these photographs no longer stand.” The photograph would prove to be
the final monument of this disintegrating, wooden Victorian-era house.

The reasons for these conflicting impressions stems entirely from context.
Much of the irony surrounding Evans' photographs had come from their exhibition at
America’s first Museum of Modern Art. Furthermore, although the context was rapidly
changing as each of these articles suggests, Victorian-era buildings, like Hitchcock's pre-Civil War vernacular buildings, constituted the majority of the built environment in the locations to which Evans' exhibition traveled. Modernism was far from dominant, even in 1936, four years after Hitchcock and Johnson's monumental exhibition. Whereas a journalist for Architectural Forum mocked carpenters for their “sins” and deemed a row of Boston houses the “frozen fountain”, 166 Ames praised the same houses in this photograph as “stalacitic gingerbread...proof of high craftsmanship and inventive fertility on the part of some probably anonymous builder.” 167

[Figure 34]

A testament to the power of the context in which his photographs were displayed, the reception of Evans' photographs of 19th century houses also varied by venue—in the gallery setting he was understood as an artist, but in an institutionalized museum hosting the exhibition in its architecture department, the controversial content of the photographs detracted from an appreciation for Evans' “documentary style”. In his biography of Evans, James Mellow cites Helen Appleton Read's contemporaneous article in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, a discussion of the Evans photographs shown at the Julien Levy Gallery in February 1932. Her discussion presents a more formalist appreciation of the photographer's images as pieces of art rather than as documents of history. “Without exaggeration or falsification, Mr. Evans gives his subject a quality of independent life. He goes to the life about him for his subject matter, but he sees and is interested in aspects of the visual universe which have hitherto been disregarded as ugly or negligible.” According to Appleton Read, the visual reproduction transgressed the limitations placed upon the architectural styles they depicted and Evans “liberate[ed] his subjects from the taboos of his time.” 168

In interpreting all reactions to Evans' photographs of nineteenth century houses, there is an additional contextual component to keep in mind. All of these articles were appearing at the same time that articles on new American modern
architecture were being published. Evans showed these photographs for the rest of his life and they were wildly successful as part of his 1938 MoMA exhibition, *American Photographs*, when he set the Gingerbread and the Gothic Revival house alongside portraits of homeless laborers sleeping in New York City doorways, junked cars, and discarded, crumpled tin ornament. Combined in this exhibition with photographs produced for the Farm Security Administration, his roamings around New York, and his travels to Tahiti, Cuba, and the South for an architectural documentary project with Gifford Cochran, his best photographs of Victorian-era houses spoke not as documents of architecture, but rather as documents of society as Kirstein had originally envisioned.

**A “Most Imaginative and Impermanent Period”**

Here are the records of the age before an imminent collapse. His pictures exist to testify to the symptoms of waste and selfishness that caused the ruin and to salvage whatever was splendid for the future reference of the survivors.\(^{169}\)

Lincoln Kirstein's understanding of Evans' photographs of nineteenth century houses was clarified in his 1938 essay which featured these words. The essay accompanied the publication of Evans' MoMA *American Photographs* exhibition.\(^{170}\) No longer was Kirstein coming to terms with the indulgent revival styles he classified in his 1933 collaboration with Evans—he was using the photographs to come to terms with the economic ruins of a society struggling to emerge from the nineteenth century. By 1938, the architectural remnants portrayed in Evans' photographs had become metaphors for this society—“seriously symbols allied in disparate chaos.”\(^{171}\)

An equal exchange, Kirstein offered Evans an appreciation for architecture. As Walker Evans stated in numerous interviews conducted during the final years of his life, the first person to acknowledge the photographer's talent was Lincoln Kirstein—“the most brilliant boy of his class at Harvard.”\(^{172}\) Evans' father had been a “frustrated architect”, and he claimed to have inherited a natural affinity for architecture, albeit no real skill, in this way. Kirstein cultivated this interest in Evans
and offered him an education in the architectural history of the nineteenth century, the photographer admitted to Paul Cummings in a 1971 interview. The trips “introduced [Evans] to a knowledge of how to appreciate and love and respond to various kinds of architecture and architectural styles.” The architecture Kirstein taught Evans to appreciate, however, were more valuable even through Kirstein's eyes as social, rather than artistic documents. The project provided him with “a certain sophistication”—an appreciation for America's vernacular languages which would characterize his body of work for the rest of his career.

In return, Evans offered Kirstein an appreciation for the beauty inherent in imperfections. This was an idea Kirstein had been chasing with the 1933 photographic project, but the subjects of the eventual photographs Kirstein chose to exhibit were not physically in ruins as he claimed they were, they were actually inhabited, well-preserved examples of nineteenth century revival styles. Through the photograph, he wrote, “Evans' eye...elevated the casual, the everyday and the literal into specific, permanent symbols.” Walker Evans' images transformed Victorian-era revival style houses from a passe reality to a cultural symbol. When Evans abstracted these houses through the production of the photograph during the early 1930s, they became evidence of two things: a) the physical reality of the architecture, and b) the social decay and economic ruin of 1930s Depression-era America, emphasized through the frivolous display of wealth which encouraged the construction of houses such as these. Celebrating the visuality of decay evident in Evans' photographs for his 1938 exhibition, Kirstein's understanding of Victorian-era architecture radically shifted over the course of the decade. The photographs Evans himself chose for the American Photographs exhibition at MoMA easily demonstrate the differing attitudes each of these men took toward architectural photography. Whereas Kirstein's writing evoked the disintegration of these impermanent wooden houses, the images he chose for the exhibition held them off at a distance so that imperfections went unnoticed. Furthermore, in spite of his words describing the
exhibition in 1933, Kirstein had been in search of preserved pockets of the nineteenth
century, architecturally and socially speaking, as the following two excerpts from his
April, 1931 diary suggest;

Some satisfaction in exhausting a given locale of its definite
formal atmosphere—so rich, exuberant, gracious and
redolent of a distinguished past.\textsuperscript{178}

South Boston was extremely gracious & clean looking, not
poverty stricken at all and Salem is a miracle of provincial
grace and wealth.\textsuperscript{179}

Salem is, architecturally speaking—a town of the most
astonishing grace—wealth and dignity.\textsuperscript{180}

By 1938, Kirstein’s understanding of photography had changed, I contend. He saw
the photographer’s task as more than that of the documentarian. The photograph
was capable of explaining the inner workings of a society to itself—something
Americans could not see for themselves. In fact, Kirstein eventually gave Evans
credit for possessing a “historian’s view of society”\textsuperscript{181} In his essay for Evans’ 1938
exhibition \textit{American Photographs}, he wrote that the photographer’s task was “to
show us our own moral and economic situation”. The photographer clarified reality
and polished its imperfections. “The facts of our homes and times, shown surgically,
without the intrusion of the poet’s or painter’s comment or necessary distortion, are
the unique contemporary field of the photographer,” Kirstein suggested. “…It is for
him to fix and to show the who aspect of our society, the sober portrait of its
stratifications, their background and embattled contrasts.”\textsuperscript{182}

Kirstein understood his project, and that of Evans for the remainder of the
decade as a social documentation rather than a celebration of revival style
architectural forms. However, under the pressure to fit Evans’ photographs into the
mold of the architectural exhibition in 1933, he organized the images by a categorical
method of “types” and excluded Evans’ more evocative shots. \textbf{[Figure 35]} The
other photographs Evans took on these trips, social scenes and artistic close-ups,
would become the meat of Evans’ solo exhibition at MoMA five years later—\textit{American
Photographs}. 
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Perhaps the most telling legacy of the architecture trips with Kirstein is the impact Evans' production during this period had on the 1938 exhibition at MoMA for which Evans is most famously known. The exhibition was divided into two parts: Evans devoted the focus of his lens to first, portraits of people and objects, and secondly, portraits of buildings and architectural remnants. Of eighty-seven photographs displayed in the 1938 show, six were included in the 1933 exhibition *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses*; at least six more were likely taken on Evans' architectural excursions with Kirstein but were not displayed in *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses*; seven or more were most likely produced on Evans' 1935 photographic trip to Florida, Georgia, and New Orleans with Gifford Cochran; and at least two were taken as part of his work for Charles Fuller. Although the photographs he took with Lincoln Kirstein were completed between 1931 and 1933, some of the photographs included in *American Photographs* which were taken on these trips with Kirstein are dated “1930” and it is unclear if this is an error or if Evans was purposely writing Kirstein out of his work. The inclusion of these six images which first appeared in *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses* in *American Photographs* is evidence that these architectural portraits had a greater influence on Evans' career and photographic “vision” than he was willing to admit. [Figure 36]  Although he is best known for his social photography with the Farm Security Administration, Evans was deeply affected by the early architectural education he received from Kirstein, and he sought out Victorian-era subjects until his death in 1975—a number of color photographs created between 1973 and 1974 depict Victorian-era houses, objects, and a mausoleum, reflecting the intimacy which Evans himself felt with this era. [Figure 37]  The work that Evans produced during a two-decade long career with *Fortune Magazine* mirrored the 1930s projects of both Kirstein and Hitchcock as he spent much of his later career photographing nineteenth century warehouses and industrial sites while still maintaining the “surgical” aesthetic Kirstein praised in the 1930s. [Figure 38]
Kirstein's project offered, not a conceptualization of a past from which modernism sprung, but rather a depiction of what modernism was shedding and leaving behind. Establishing revivalism as the antithesis to modernism, the categorization of revival styles as “vernacular” enabled a disconnect which allowed modernists to distance themselves from, but not disavow Victorian-era society. Such a disconnect would not have been enabled if they were simply categorized as “historic” or even “outdated”. “Indigenous” not only asserted their age, it also authenticated their legitimacy as part of America's past. In the face of critics who mocked and condemned mid-late nineteenth century domestic architecture, Kirstein’s assertion allowed them to fade into America's past with the dignity and grace of sentimentalized ruins. Not only did the very categorization of the nineteenth century as “indigenous” cast it in the light of an “other” “ancient” time, the very act of photography, combined with Walker Evans' developing “documentary style” and the act of display all reinforced a separation between the New York modernist gallery patron and the ornate, Victorian-era revival style house.

The photograph facilitated this distancing—it miniaturized and physically separated nineteenth century houses from the society that lived with them from day to day—abstracted into black and white facsimiles and hung on the walls of the museum to be studied and analyzed from a guarded distance. Waiting for the sharpest quality of light, Kirstein wrote of his and Evans' photographic strategy, Walker Evans “[forced] details into their firmest relief.” More than that, however, Kirstein found something in Evans' photographic style which detached viewer from subject—a style Evans perfected and asserted as one authentically his own in 1938 when he was featured in MoMA's first official one-man photography exhibition, *American Photographs*. This photographic approach was what Evans would call “the documentary style”—a “meagre” and “rigorous [direct] way of looking.” When Evans had written that “[s]uddenly there is a difference between a quaint evocation
of the past and an open window staring straight down a stack of decades” in a 1931 article for Hound & Horn, he was alluding to the difference between straight photography and the pictorial approach photographers had pursued earlier in the twentieth century. This “stripped, cold” approach which Evans himself deemed the “documentary style” was honest and non-painterly; no “tricky angles” or “glossy lighting” were employed to soften the composition. This approach was also one, however, which fit the changing attitude of modernists to one acutely critical of the built environment.

During a decade infused with an interest in the nation’s vernacular production, the crafting of the documentary style photograph was itself understood as an indigenous act. Elizabeth McCauseland, art critic, has said something similar about photographer Berenice Abbott in that she “compared certain photographers (like Abbott) to folk artists and primitives, because they ‘worked directly and without artistic frill.’” Kirstein repeatedly deemed Evans’ vision “Puritan”. This “purity” was, according to Kirstein, “the most characteristic single feature of Evans’ work.”

The vision Evans possessed was as American as the indigenous, commonplace portraits of people and places he captured on film. “We recognize in his photographs a way of seeing which has appeared persistently throughout the American past.”

The value Evans’ documentary style offered was a clarity and honesty of vision which Kirstein classified as a necessary “clinical” and “surgical” detachment. In the midst of the Great Depression, no longer was the visual expression of wealth characteristic of revival style Victorian-era domesticity an acceptable contemporary architectural language. Kirstein deemed Evans a “visual doctor diagnostician, rather than a specialist”—“the family physician, quiet and dispassionate”, a member from the ranks of the elite who once indulged in this revivalism. As such, Kirstein made it the task of Evans’ clinical lens to diagnose and make apparent the “symptoms of waste and selfishness that caused the ruin.” The photograph also enabled its viewers to see themselves, and their own culture in a way that they could not do
without the photographer's eye. Comparing Evans to Atget and Brady, Kirstein wrote that “Walker Evans is giving us the contemporary civilization of eastern America and its dependencies”. It was the elite—visitors to the museum, patrons of artists, and artists themselves, who needed to shed this past, Kirstein suggested, and a member of its own class—Evans—was capable of revealing that; “It is the naked, difficult, solitary attitude of a member revolting from his own class, who knows best what in it must be uncovered, cauterized and why.” The value of this documentary style was the lack of distorting judgment, or of the “intrusion of the poet's comment.” For Kirstein, the task of “indigenizing” the nineteenth century was a moral responsibility and the entire task was both a tribute and a farewell, not only to architectural styles, but to an entire sentimentalized way of life. Evans' style, “based on moral virtues of patience, surgical accuracy and self-effacement” clarified this responsibility.

The distancing of revivalism was facilitated by the photograph and by Evans' unique style. However, it became polemical through the presentation of these photographs in the context of the museum, and at America's newest, modernist venue. In turn, the Museum legitimated Evans, and by the time of his 1938 exhibition, he found this to be true. “[M]ore than I realized, [the 1938 exhibition, American Photographs] established the documentary style as art in photography. For the first time it was, influential, you see. The Museum is a very influential place” Evans concluded in an interview with Paul Cummings in 1971. Of course, it was not solely the Museum, but also Kirstein as patron who legitimated photography as art, and revival style architecture as an indigenous “social document.”

In conclusion, what can we make of this exhibition which came along in the shadows of Lewis Mumford's The Brown Decades, the Modern Architecture: International Exhibition, and the Early Modern Architecture exhibition? An exhibition which pre-dated two no-nonsense modern housing exhibition in 1934? MoMA was housed, throughout the 1930s, in midtown townhouses with Greek columns framing the door—it was not until 1939 that Philip L. Goodwin and Edward Durell Stone's
International Style building would be erected. Evans' photographs asked these budding modernists to consider their own doorstep, but this past was still too close for the discipline to objectively address. [Figure 39]
Part Three
Institutionalizing History: Henry-Russell Hitchcock’s Foundations for Modernism

“The pattern of architectural development in America has often seemed a continuously exploding one, the catholicism of eclectic taste perpetually expanding until at last it could accept even avowedly modern design, and retroactively honor the achievements of a Sullivan and a Wright without giving up an equal affection for various kinds of hybrid ‘traditionalism’.”

- Henry-Russell Hitchcock, 1938

Having begun an assistant professorship of art at Wesleyan University in 1929, Henry-Russell Hitchcock organized a number of architectural exhibitions which found audiences both within and outside of the university. Only a few years after joining the faculty, and one year after his partnership with Philip Johnson on the International Style exhibition, Hitchcock embarked on a series of exhibitions organized in conjunction with the newly established Davison Art Center at Wesleyan University, the institution where he was teaching at the time. The nucleus of this project was the notion that these exhibitions would circulate to educational institutions and museums, each opening at a different locale. Organizing an exhibition, as opposed to authoring a book, meant that Hitchcock’s impact on architectural discourse would be more immediate, and the exhibition allowed Hitchcock to be more experimental in his ideas. His projects were based on the models of the photographic architectural exhibition and the circulating exhibition established at MoMA during the early 1930s. [Figure 40]

Divergent in topic, the majority of Hitchcock’s exhibitions reveal his own efforts to locate a formal source for modernism in American urban architecture of the
nineteenth century. Furthermore, in this exhibition, Hitchcock looked for redeeming value in a revival style architecture and found it in the Greek Revival. Hitchcock's vernacular approach reinforced the linear history he had established in the exhibitions co-organized with Philip Johnson at MoMA in 1932 and 1933. By locating a vernacular language in antebellum urban building, Hitchcock was able to draft this historical thread even further back in time and thus demonstrate a formal continuity from the nineteenth century, through to the 1930s present.

Hitchcock worked on these exhibitions from 1933 until 1936, and often the research he conducted for one exhibition would naturally lead into his next endeavor. The smaller architectural exhibitions he produced throughout the 1930s through his connections at Wesleyan numbered eight in total. Among other topics, these examined buildings of both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, domestic and commercial architecture, and earlier architectural precedents. He also considered the composition of the urban fabric a balance between monuments and a vernacular architectural consistency. A thread throughout these projects reveals that Hitchcock was thinking not only about the architecture of the nineteenth century and its relationship to modernism, but also of the career and legacy of the late nineteenth century architect, Henry Hobson Richardson.

These earlier architectural exhibitions facilitated Hitchcock’s understanding of the context in which Richardson had been working in the 1880s. Like many of the exhibitions Hitchcock prepared leading up to The Architecture of Henry Hobson Richardson, an exhibition he staged at MoMA in 1936, The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War naturally fed into this project. Hitchcock conducted much of his research for the 1936 H. H. Richardson exhibition while preparing both American Cities and Springfield Architecture, 1800-1900. Furthermore, it is likely that the 1934 project influenced his argument regarding Richardson—that the architect’s work “had a utility and simplicity that anticipated the best modern architecture.” For Hitchcock, American
Cities offered the precursor to Richardson, and Richardson was the precursor to American modernism.205 These projects reveal that Hitchcock was re-thinking how architectural history should be structured and disseminated, as well as considering a changing definition of what constituted American vernacular architecture.

Within the context with which this thesis is concerned, the seemingly disparate range of architectural exhibitions Hitchcock staged are significant—they establish the architectural arena into which Evans' photographs of Victorian-era houses came into being, as well as the foil against which Kirstein's “indigenous” modality was positioned. Many of Hitchcock’s studies incorporated contemporary photography of historic buildings, or combined it with historical photographs, maps, and drawings. Both Hitchcock and others found artistic value in the photography he commissioned for his exhibitions, beyond their documentary service; Berenice Abbott produced photographs for Hitchcock's American Cities (see #5 on list below) exhibition as well as for his Richardson exhibition and book.206 [Figure 41] Hitchcock's praise of Berenice Abbott in his unpublished introduction to Abbott's Changing New York is indicative of his view that the art photographer had a vision to contribute to architectural history;

As Miss Abbott has taken architectural photographs for me, I can declare how perfectly her craft adapts itself to such conditions of work. Moreover I must also point out from this experience that in such commissions the photographer may well be so important a collaborator that, when the work is completed, the original initiator must retire as gracefully as may be, recognizing that the quality of the achievements is ultimately due to the photographs.207

Art photographer Richard E. Pope produced photographs of Springfield, Massachusetts architecture for Hitchcock's 1934 exhibition on the city at the same time that he was printing, in large format, “photomurals” to be displayed around town as a Civil Works Administration art project. The Civil Works Administration (CWA) had only been established in November of the previous year and it typically funded arts and mural projects.208 [Figure 42] Well-known are the exhibitions Hitchcock produced for the Museum of Modern
Art during the 1930s—*Modern Architecture: International Exhibition* in collaboration with Philip Johnson (1932); *Early Modern Architecture: Chicago 1870-1910* in collaboration with Philip Johnson (1933); *The Architecture of Henry Hobson Richardson* (1936); and *Modern Exposition Architecture* (1936). Less well known are the abundance of exhibitions Hitchcock organized at MoMA in the years between *Modern Architecture* and the Richardson exhibition. These additional eight architectural exhibitions traveled to the common destinations targeted by MoMA’s circulating exhibitions. One of these, *Early Museum Architecture*, opened at the Wadsworth Atheneum in February 1934, and then subsequently traveled to MoMA in April, 1934 (April 5-May 5, 1934). Hitchcock began staging the architectural exhibitions he organized as a professor at Wesleyan at approximately the same time that Evans’ photographs went on display at MoMA—late 1933. The complete list of these eight exhibitions compiled separately from MoMA is as follows. The date and location listed below are the running dates and opening location for each exhibition:

*French Houses of the Early Eighteenth Century*
  October 7, 1933 (in association with the opening of the Springfield Museum of Fine Arts)
  Springfield Museum of Fine Arts; Springfield, Connecticut

*Roman Baroque Church Facades*
  November 15 – December 1, 1933
  Davison Art Rooms, Olin Library, Wesleyan University; Middletown, Connecticut

*Early Museum Architecture*
  February 1934 (in association with the opening of the Avery Memorial)
  Wadsworth Atheneum; Hartford, Connecticut
  (April 5-May 5, 1934: at the Museum of Modern Art, New York)

*Springfield Architecture, 1800-1900*
  March 11-April 2, 1934
  Springfield Museum of Fine Arts; Springfield, Massachusetts

*The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War; Photographs by Berenice Abbott*
  November 3-17, 1934
  Opened at Yale University; New Haven, Connecticut (funded by the Carnegie Corporation)

*Romanesque Churches of Apulia: Photographs from the Kingsley Porter Collection*
  November 1934
  Opened at Harvard University (funded by the Carnegie Corporation)
Hitchcock's architectural exhibitions, twelve in total when his work for MoMA is included, traveled extensively throughout the east coast during the 1930s. The American public would have become accustomed to a periodic re-hashing of architectural history, and the nineteenth century more specifically, through the museum gallery.

Although he examined the nineteenth century from a number of angles, one of these exhibitions in particular stands out for its creative re-framing of American architecture, its re-formulation of the very definition of “vernacular” architecture, and its contribution to theories regarding the origins of modern architecture: Hitchcock's 1934 The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War.

The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War at Yale University, November 3-17, 1934

For my purposes, the value of Henry-Russell Hitchcock's exhibition, The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities After the Civil War (otherwise known as American Cities) is primarily as a supplement to Kirstein and Evans' project, and to illustrate that their pursuit of a “native” American architecture in the nineteenth century was not an isolated endeavor. In terms of its legacy, Hitchcock's project is more widely known among scholars. However, it is my contention that Hitchcock would have undoubtedly been aware of Evans' photographs of revival style architecture, and that his own exhibition was motivated in part as a reaction to Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses. As opposed to Kirstein and Evans' project wherein nineteenth century architecture was classified as
“indigenous” in order to distance it as “ancient”, “alien”, and “other”, Hitchcock's project understood the “vernacular” as an “origins” for modernism. He used “vernacular” as a classification to define the roots of modernism and to reinforce a linear architectural history for modernism in the United States. Certainly aware of Kirstein and Evans' project, Hitchcock even took Berenice Abbott to some of the same locations in 1934 that Kirstein and Evans had visited in 1931 such as Saratoga Springs.21 [Figure 43] It was not only Hitchcock who would have been aware of Evans' photographs—Kirstein, if not also Evans would have known of, if not also visited the increasing number of exhibitions Hitchcock had begun to organize. Five weeks before the opening of Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses, Kirstein attended the opening of the Springfield Museum on October 7, 1933 for which Hitchcock's exhibition French Houses of the Early Eighteenth Century was specifically organized. Hitchcock's Springfield Architecture exhibition, which took on some of the characteristics that Kirstein's regional survey had, was also part of inaugural festivities and was held the following spring in March, 1934.

The American Cities exhibition provides significant insight into Hitchcock's blossoming career as an academic. Unlike Kirstein's project which found a philosophical purpose in the appraisal of revivalism, Hitchcock was searching among the remnants of nineteenth century architecture for a fruitful precedent modernists could follow. In Hitchcock's project, history offered guidelines for the future of cities and architectural design. In addition to defining a new American vernacular, the project may have been his first interpretation of revival style architecture and his assertion of its relevance to modernism. It was also an assertion of the superiority of one style—the Greek Revival—and an assertion that the urban condition was conducive to the development of a vernacular architectural language. [Figure 44] Finally, because he was establishing his vernacular as an origins of modernism rather than something “alien” and “other”, his arguments regarding the vernacular offer, by association, insight into his arguments regarding modernism.
Before delving into Hitchcock's 1934 exhibition, *American Cities*, I would like to start with an article the historian wrote in 1938 which clarifies his perspective on the role of vernacular architecture in history and in design.

In the fall of 1938, Henry-Russell Hitchcock drafted an essay on Marcel Breuer, a recent emigrant to the United States. Three years prior, in 1935, Breuer had emigrated to England from Germany, and the same year he published a statement entitled “Where do we stand?” in the *English Architectural Review*. Hitchcock's 1938 essay was entitled “Marcel Breuer and the American Tradition in Architecture” and he began his essay with a quote by Breuer, extracted from the *English Architectural Review* article:

> It may, perhaps, seem paradoxical to establish a parallel between certain aspects of vernacular architecture, or national art, and the Modern Movement. All the same, it is interesting to see that these two diametrically opposed tendencies have two characteristics in common: the impersonal characteristic of their forms and a tendency to develop along typical rational lines that are unaffected by passing fashion.  

This quote is relevant to my study for a number of reasons. Most obviously, it demonstrates that Breuer, a modernist (but admittedly not American) architect was consciously seeking out parallels between the “vernacular” past and the modernist present. Secondly, the quote is relevant for Hitchcock's own use of it. Written four years after curating his exhibition, *American Cities*, Hitchcock's examination of Breuer's quote demonstrates that locating an American vernacular was a recurrent interest for Hitchcock throughout the 1930s. Thirdly, Hitchcock's essay provides further insight into how he himself was interpreting the vernacular in American architectural history. The two characteristics of the vernacular which Breuer identified—“impersonal form” and an “underlying rationality independent of design trends”—were two characteristics Hitchcock also identified as characteristic of the vernacular in his 1934 exhibition.

In this essay Hitchcock argued that European modernists more readily
embraced American architectural traditions and found in them a value American modernists had been blind to. Americans, he argued, were unable to distinguish the valuable technical aspects of vernacular building—“valid contemporary tools”—from “revivalistic aspects, which are matters of design alone.” Whereas American modernists understood traditional architecture to be in opposition to modernism, European architects, “with x-ray eyes...[saw] through the stylisms of surface of American wooden and other small-scale construction as easily as from the first they saw through to the skeleton of our skyscrapers and factories” Hitchcock wrote.

European modernists found a respect for the American vernacular which Americans themselves overlooked. European interest in “real American tradition of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries...American methods of construction, particularly of light wooden construction” was evident, Hitchcock felt, “in the comments of other European modern architects who have settled here, like Neutra and Gropius, or who have visited here, like Le Corbusier and Mies van der Rohe.” In Hitchcock's argument, ironically, European modernists had actually inspired American modernists to locate their own relevant vernacular examples at home as design precedents. In his words;

Perhaps because modern architecture itself is already a living tradition in Europe and no longer an [sic] hypothetical and barely practiced innovation or a mere way of covering up large scale engineering constructions, the European modern architects have been far less intransigent toward American traditional values, using traditional even in all its possible senses, than have the modern architects born and brought up here.

Hitchcock's essay called for Americans to re-define the term “tradition” as the “continuance” of valuable innovations rather than as a “revival” of historical design trends. It is herein that Hitchcock's and Kirstein's projects, in their portrayal of nineteenth century architecture as America's new vernacular architecture, diverge. Kirstein valued revival style houses for their sentimentalization of a by-gone society—architecture embodied social connotations and became a cultural symbol. For Hitchcock, however, the regimented historian, the value of vernacular architecture to
modernists lay in the cohesion, consistency, and persistence of particular formal traits. The antebellum vernacular language Hitchcock defined in his 1934 American Cities exhibition both adhered to modernist design principles of the 1930s and set a precedent which he advocated modernists follow.

Henry-Russell Hitchcock opened American Cities at Yale University on November 3rd, 1934, almost exactly one year after the opening of Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses at MoMA. The exhibition photographs were taken by Berenice Abbott and the project was divided into eight sections. Five of these sections were “case studies” of east coast cities: Boston, New York, Baltimore, Charleston, and Philadelphia. The sixth section focused on hotels, the seventh on other cities and towns, and the eighth was comprised of architectural drawings of Greek Revival designs executed by nineteenth century architects—A. J. Davis and N. J. Bradlee. Hitchcock included the drawings as a demonstration of the “mathematical precision with which architects designed under the discipline of the Greek Revival no matter how simple the building.”[Figure 45] After its opening at Yale, the exhibition traveled to a number of universities including Smith College (April 4-18, 1935), Phillips Academy, Andover (April 21-May 14, 1935), Wesleyan University (June 1935), and The College of William and Mary (March 1938). Other proposed venues which were not confirmed in exhibition records included Dartmouth, New London Museum (December 20, 1934-January 5th, 1935), Harvard (January 6-31, 1935), Columbia, Princeton, and the “Hartford Museum” (presumably the Wadsworth; May 15-June 7, 1935).

Like Kirstein, Hitchcock also sought out only the most preserved examples to document, and like Kirstein, he too determined the schedule and location of buildings to document, leaving only the most minimal choices on site to the photographer. “The groups of buildings photographed were usually selected both for their excellence and for their relative freedom from later changes” Hitchcock wrote in his
American Cities was part of a larger endeavor Hitchcock had been pursuing for over five years—parallel efforts of defining the Modern Movement and solidifying its ancestral lineage. Beginning with Modern Architecture: International Exhibition in 1932, and Early Modern Architecture in 1933, Hitchcock's architectural exhibitions were a selective linear march moving backward temporally—a march which placed the origins and precedents for modernism in the nineteenth century. Having defined the beginnings of modernism in Early Modern Architecture, Hitchcock's American Cities sought to locate the precursors and inspiration which led to the beginnings of modernism in Chicago, and he found this in east coast urban, antebellum Greek Revival architecture. By using the term “vernacular” Hitchcock was legitimating these early-mid nineteenth century buildings, but he was also establishing a definitive starting point—it was not “pre-modern”—this new vernacular was the very foundation from which 1930s modernism sprung. It set the beginnings of modernism in America far before any European influences and “vernacular” as a term implied a historical bookend to the modernist debate.

Hitchcock's vernacular, first, and foremost, was an urban architecture; the consistency, uniformity, and proportion of which was enabled precisely by the volume of urban building proliferating in rapidly growing cities on the east coast. Hitchcock's American Cities exhibition can be seen as his exploration to discover the DNA of the American city, albeit the east coast one—the essential architectural elements which characterized it, and their genetic make-up. Each generation does not build a city anew, but rather edits the one inherited, sometimes meticulously and sometimes carelessly and aggressively making additions and subtractions. Hitchcock was looking within the existing fabric for traditions still valuable to modernists in 1934. Hitchcock may have inherited this interest in the city and its relationship to modernism from Lewis Mumford. In addition to volume, the multi-use aspect of urban building (industrial, commercial, and housing in the same structure) and
density of construction occurring in urban areas contributed significantly to the development of a vernacular language—something which Hitchcock claimed necessarily distinguished it from the small town.\textsuperscript{225} In the past, the term vernacular had been applied to residential architecture, however, Hitchcock's study was not based on one architectural type. His argument hinged on his ability to demonstrate the universality of the principles embodied in his vernacular, and how easily they could be adapted to a variety of uses and across class boundaries with very little differentiation.

Focused on the relevancy of his vernacular to modernist designers, Hitchcock's model asserted that the single family house Kirstein romanticized was not appropriate for the modern age. In 1939, Hitchcock wrote the following in an introduction to his own survey of eighteenth and nineteenth century Rhode Island architecture; “[t]he tradition of the isolated single family house, in the thought of present-day economic conservatives, ‘a home' to be 'owned,' has much human dignity. Yet in the vastly more complicated economic world of the twentieth century it may appear that it is an ideal no longer capable of wide realization in the large and elaborately developed centers of population which modern industrial conditions seem to demand.”\textsuperscript{226}

Hitchcock's vernacular in the context of his \textit{American Cities} exhibition was stoic and proportioned; it contributed to the visual cohesion of the urban fabric. “[T]he real architectural quality of a fine city,” Hitchcock contended, “lies in the general consistency and order of its vernacular building.”\textsuperscript{227} This vernacular could be \textit{monumental} in its massing or articulation, but did not function as isolated monuments and as such was the antithesis of the City Beautiful movement.\textsuperscript{228} By centering his vernacular in the urban context, Hitchcock was also arguing that modernity was urban, and that this particular vernacular language developed as a result of the birth of modern, urban life. It was the east coast city, Hitchcock implied with his survey, that provided these foundations for modernism, and each city
spawned a similar, but slightly differentiated vernacular language, particular to each locale.

Formally trained at Harvard University, Hitchcock constructed this lineage for modernism based on formal principles. He found his formal requirements for modernism within nineteenth century buildings associated with the Greek Revival; undecorated, simple; containing a “dignity and sternness of proportions” and a rational organization. Although he admitted that not all of his examples could be defined as Greek Revival, Hitchcock argued that this particular revival style of the nineteenth century offered the foundations of modernism in the most basic execution of its principles. The Greek Revival typically characterized building in the early-mid nineteenth century whereas the other revival styles—Gothic Revival, Gingerbread, Italianate tended to proliferate primarily during the mid to late part of the century.

Most important to Hitchcock was the formal clarity his urban vernacular possessed, which, he asserted, transcended its most superficial application in the form of “temples” and “colonnades”. “[T]he Greek discipline of proportions and the belief that the virtues of ordinary building lay in precise disposition of parts, and simple expanses of the best obtainable materials rather than in detail or ornament lasted on even when High Renaissance and other non-Greek types of design came into favor in the fifties,” Hitchcock wrote in his concluding remarks for the exhibition catalogue. The Greek Revival, he contended, was an “extreme rationalist discipline” and its underlying principles offered a formal continuity with modernism uncharacteristic of the later revival styles of the nineteenth century. Essential to the establishment of a vernacular architectural language, this rationality was applicable to buildings which varied in their use as well as scale, thus facilitating a uniformity in the urban sphere. This formal clarity underlay the best architecture of the nineteenth century and re-emerged with the work of “Richardson, White, Sullivan, Wright, and Hood” who in turn influenced modernists of the twentieth century.

Having condemned revival styles less than a decade before in his book
Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration, Hitchcock's turn to any revival style as exemplar for modernism is somewhat surprising. Hitchcock would surely have been aware of Kirstein and Evans' exhibition at MoMA the previous fall and it is not unreasonable to suggest that Hitchcock's efforts were in part an intellectual response to Kirstein's project. Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses was on display through part, or all of December, 1933 (depending on which set of dates is accurate). Hitchcock began organizing American Cities in the spring of 1934; Berenice Abbott and Hitchcock conducted their own photographic survey across the east coast during the summer of 1934—shooting photographs for use as illustrations in both American Cities and The Architecture of Henry Hobson Richardson. Compared to Kirstein's more free-wheeling survey—a visual feast celebrating discrepancies rather than formal unification—Hitchcock illustrated the uniformity, consistence, and simplicity of form evident in the most reductive and rational of revival styles and did so via a comprehensive comparison of the architecture of the largest cities of an entire region of the United States.

Kirstein's project was a sentimentalization of an abandoned and deteriorating era wherein the materiality of the camera's subjects became a metaphor for the inevitability of decay of the ornamented architecture and the indulgent societies they represented. Conversely, Hitchcock's vernacular was based on a stability, consistence, permanence, and persistence inherent in his vernacular which survived late nineteenth century revivalism, unscathed, for one hundred years—from the antebellum east coast city to 1930s modernism. The material of Hitchcock's vernacular in turn reflected the values he identified. His vernacular was constructed of stone and could be found in “rockfaced granite” commercial buildings of Boston—“monolithic post and lintel construction...gigantic in scale and Egyptian in solidity”; brick, marble, and brownstone commercial buildings in New York's waterfront district featuring Greek embellishments; Baltimore's painted and stuccoed brick and granite townhouses, which varied only by material according to the economic status of its
residences.\textsuperscript{235} \textbf{[Figure 46]}

Because these exhibitions traveled, both provided educational resources for institutions across the east coast. However, the order in which the information from each exhibition was processed in different cities sometimes varied according to each exhibition’s travel schedule. Despite the exhibitions having opened at different times and in a definite sequence, they often crossed paths and reversed order in a given locale during the course of circulation. Take for example the circulation schedules of the \textit{Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses} and the \textit{American Cities} exhibitions. Evans’ show traveled for a longer period of time to a greater number of venues, and opened at MoMA one entire year before Hitchcock’s opened at Yale University. However, Yale University hosted the \textit{American Cities} exhibition over one year before it showed \textit{19th Century Houses}. More of these reversals would have occurred had the \textit{American Cities} exhibition traveled to all of the locations it was originally proposed for.\textsuperscript{226} Andover, Massachusetts staged 19th Century Houses at the Addison Gallery of American Art (associated with the Phillips Academy) from December 3rd to 31st, 1934 and put American Cities on display less than five months later from April 21st to May 14, 1935. \textbf{[See Appendix I for the complete travel schedule of Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses]}

Compared to Hitchcock’s other exhibitions, \textit{American Cities} featured a rather limited tour schedule, which did not include MoMA. Some of these limitations may have been financial—many museums during the Great Depression did not have the funds to bring circulating exhibitions to their respective cities, with each costing $50 to $100 or more for shipping and other expenses.\textsuperscript{236} Hitchcock, who had hoped his exhibitions would “indefinitely” circulate, followed this model and “organized tours through New England”. He charged $25 per institution and requested additional funds from the College Art Association to support circulation.\textsuperscript{237} By 1934, Hitchcock was a well-established figure at the Museum of Modern Art, having organized two of
the largest architectural exhibitions the department had had since its founding. Furthermore, his vernacular project did not fall entirely outside the Museum's agenda as it re-confirmed the historical lineage he and Philip Johnson drew with *Early Modern Architecture*, and Kirstein and Evans' project had already addressed nineteenth century revivalism in the Museum's context. In light of the 1933 exhibition of Walker Evans' photographs, combined with Hitchcock's connections, history of work for, and future work with the Museum, one question does remain—why wasn't *American Cities* exhibited at MoMA?

Based on the agenda of the Museum as well as practical considerations, I will offer a few potential explanations for its exclusion. Hitchcock's collaborator at MoMA, Philip Johnson, was the founding curator of the architectural department, however, by the fall of 1934, he was preparing to leave the Museum. Johnson resigned on December 4th, 1934. Furthermore, for nearly five months spanning June to November, 1934, the architecture department hosted two lengthy exhibitions which addressed modern housing design—*Housing Exhibition* (June-September 13, 1934) and *America Can't Have Housing* (October 15-November 7, 1934). The final housing exhibition concluded in mid-November, only weeks before Johnson's departure. Extensive in both physical size and scope of information, there would have been neither time, nor space for Hitchcock's project. After Johnson left MoMA, the museum did not host another architectural exhibition until the fall of 1935 when *Contemporary Architecture in California* opened on September 30th, followed by *The Recent Work of Le Corbusier*. By this time, Hitchcock was already well-invested into his next project on H. H. Richardson, which went on display at MoMA shortly after in January, 1936.

Even in Hitchcock's exhibition, *American Cities*, wherein antebellum urban architecture provided a precedent for 1930s modernism, nineteenth century architecture was deemed "vernacular" posthumously as a means of validation by modernists. Hitchcock's argument was not that American modernists had based the
principles of 1930s design on 1830s design. His argument was that America's early modernists, such as Richardson had looked to antebellum architecture for inspiration, and that 1930s modernists might find inspiration in this period as well—not only on the level of the individual building, but on the broader scale of the city. By drawing these connections and by highlighting the persistence of basic design principles which linked the 1830s to the present of the 1930s, Hitchcock felt justified to deem these antebellum buildings more than historical; he deemed them vernacular. By establishing an architectural lineage which began in America's urban vernacular of the 1830s, Hitchcock was simultaneously legitimating modernism. This tie to the vernacular implied that the tendencies of modernism were natural and inherent American approaches to design. Hitchcock's vernacular architecture was not simply “historical”, it was functional, relevant, and a valuable model for modern society. The persistence of the underlying principles of modernism throughout the nineteenth century from antebellum architecture to modernism was a demonstration of the continuance of a tradition rather than an isolated historical moment. As Barry Bergdoll has written with regard to Hitchcock's projects; “Unveiling the dynamics of American architecture on either side of the Civil War became a laboratory for thinking about the processes by which the stylistic work of one generation is transmitted to the next.”241
Conclusion

Taking divergent approaches to two different periods within the nineteenth century, Lincoln Kirstein's and Henry-Russell Hitchcock's 1930s exhibitions provided new ways of coding the past in order to understand it more clearly in relationship to the present. Hitchcock's *American Cities* exhibition in 1934 presented a clear case for a renewed interest in an urban, Greek revivalist, vernacular architecture as a precedent for twentieth century design. This project allowed modernists to skip over the indulgences and frivolities of the ornate revival styles popularized during the mid-late nineteenth century, in order to reach a more simple and functional architectural past. However, Kirstein's project, *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses* complicated this linear history, and while Hitchcock's project did serve modernists' aims, it did not tell the entire story of the nineteenth century. Kirstein's Victorian houses were the casualties of modernism, rather than its ancestors. They had become an “indigenous past”—a different vein than the “vernacular” Hitchcock offered in *American Cities*.

These experimental readings of history were enabled by the architectural exhibition, set within the museum, as a new medium for the dissemination of ideas.
To follow an argument set forth by Reyner Banham in 1986, the photograph radically changed how architects observed and interpreted historical precedents. The architectural publication became one form for the dissemination of visual information, and the architectural exhibition similarly depended on the photograph for its visual argument. Reyner Banham wrote that the photograph only became a part of architectural discourse during the late 1920s and 1930s, and was essential in the dissemination of precedents for both history and design. “[I]nsofar as the International Style was copied from American industrial prototypes and models,” he wrote, “it must be the first architectural movement in the history of the art based almost exclusively on photographic evidence rather than on the ancient and previously unavoidable techniques of personal inspection and measured drawing.”

Banham continued;

Having come into the hands of their European admirers in the guise of news photographs, rather than that of ‘art’ photography, they were supposedly free from those elements of personal selection and interpretation that must inevitably infect any artistic rendering, or even the traditional production by architectural draftsmen of finished drawings from measured field notes. The photographs represented a truth as apparently objective and modern as that of the functional structures they portrayed.⁴²

Evans’ documentary style and Abbott’s objective approach offered Kirstein and Hitchcock a detached vision they found critical to their task. Not insignificantly, each photograph was also a piece of art in and of itself. As such, these exhibitions can also be understood as a valuable chapter in the experimental undertaking of photography in architectural history.

In the wake of the defining of modernism during the early 1930s, it became increasingly clear to the architectural discipline that the more eccentric revival styles of the nineteenth century needed to be properly addressed, and Kirstein was among the first to acknowledge this. “The men of the late nineteenth century and of the early twentieth merely shut their eyes to this period [1830-1870] as if it had been an adolescence whose wild oats were too shocking even to consider...” Hitchcock
wrote in 1939. He continued; “many are now coming to delight in, even to recreate exactly those aspects of the mid-century which were a generation ago most decried. Are we to have a Victorian-era revival?”243 It was not a revival which was sought by Kirstein so much as it was a retirement, or a funeral for these relics of the past—these primitive monuments. The act of “indigenizing” Victorian-era design allowed modernists to romanticize these buildings as ruins—not only of architecture, but also of a more frivolous, indulgent, and sentimental way of life. These modernists, like Kirstein, were simultaneously enthralled and embarrassed by the Victorian-era indulgence which resonated with their own backgrounds and lifestyles.

Hitchcock elaborated on this thought in a 1942 article he wrote for the *Journal of the American Society of Architectural Historians*. He advocated that historians properly deal with these buildings of the nineteenth century so that they could subsequently be “buried”;

Our own generation has largely failed to cope critically with the mass of buildings produced in the booming period of our youth. The erudite, I mean those who are training themselves not as architects but primarily as architectural historians, are fascinated by certain aspects of the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth that have to be dug up. But the stylistic and the modernistic which most present-day students—even those perhaps least freed from their subtle influences—positively reject, do not have to be dug up; they rather need to be buried. I would suggest that the somewhat putrescent corpse or corpses will not be really disposed of until some fairly elaborate critical and historical rites are celebrated.244

Kirstein's eulogy sentimentalized an elite past and an architecture which visualized wealth; Hitchcock's vernacular de-stratified society by asserting that one style (the Greek Revival) could be applied universally to different building types and across class boundaries with very little differentiation. This universality was what made Hitchcock's examples vernacular. Kirstein's conception of an indigenous past emerged in the wake of a social change which rendered nineteenth century revivalism irrelevant. For Hitchcock, the modernization inherent in the nineteenth urban condition enabled a vernacular language to form. These uses of the past also
differed in their integration into a broader built environment. Kirstein's indigenous past was comprised of mainly stand-alone monuments. Hitchcock's vernacular depended on an integration with the urban fabric. While Kirstein's indigenous American architecture was a domestic one—traditionally the building type associated with “vernacular”, Hitchcock's exhibition challenged this assumption and asserted a “true” vernacular of the urban fabric. Hitchcock determined this vernacular based on formal continuity rather than social change. By associating industrial and commercial architecture with a category typically considered domestic, Hitchcock was broadening the very definition of what constituted vernacular architecture while also reinforcing the spatial transformations modernism itself intended to bring about.245 Together, these two disparate exhibitions should be taken as evidence that Depression-era modernists were conflicted, and as of the 1930s, had yet to fully resolve their very recent past. A linear architectural history for modernism did emerge out of the ashes of revivalism in the form of American Cities, and it was based on a formal continuity extending from the 1830s to the 1930s.

These two exhibitions remain valuable today in that they contribute another dimension to the vernacular discourse. Not only did they challenge inherited conceptions of what constituted vernacular (the Colonial house), they also asserted that valuable lessons for the present could be obtained from a vernacular (or “indigenous” architecture) which emerged from western society. Influenced by contemporaneous regionalist and folk art interests and a desire to level class structure; spurred on by an increasing interest in nineteenth century architecture among historians and driven by the desire to both come to terms with the past and to selectively establish the correct precedents for modernism to pursue—the vernacular project of the 1930s evolved parallel to modernism. Inspired by it, it was in fact indispensable to the modern movement. Like photography, the vernacular framework was a tool which, when applied to nineteenth century architecture, offered the discipline an opportunity to come to terms with this past and to make sense of it.
retroactively, through the lens of twentieth century concerns. The efforts to interpret these revival styles as something relevant to the present highlight the very mechanisms by which MoMA and the discipline of architectural history were being structured during the defining years of modernism.

MoMA made the architectural exhibition a serious endeavor but this medium was utilized by Hitchcock and Kirstein in very different ways. Kirstein's survey project was ultimately an interdisciplinary exchange between architecture and art. Hitchcock used the exhibition, and photography, as an educational tool to not only reinforce the historical formal lineage for modernism, but also to quickly and efficiently disseminate his theories. Berenice Abbott's photographs mimicked the nineteenth century drawings he selected for the exhibition, in the balance of light and contrast in scenes—something she repeatedly captured. Kirstein and Hitchcock both couched their examinations of nineteenth century architecture within the broader classifications of “indigenous” and “vernacular” and these terms served as mechanisms for giving the past a relevance to the modernist present. What makes both Kirstein's and Hitchcock's exhibitions also unique is that both enlisted the services of art photographers and the resulting photographs can be interpreted as artistic documents in their own right. Images from both excursions were also displayed in galleries as artwork rather than as documents, promoted by their commissioners. However, in the context of the Museum of Modern Art, Evans' aesthetic as a photographer subtly affected how modernists understood their Victorian past. Photography offered a detachment from the actual architecture it depicted. With the eventual abandonment of these nineteenth century buildings, all that would be left were Evans' and Abbott's photographs, accompanied by Kirstein's and Hitchcock's commentaries. Its mode of preservation, the photograph would come to replace the building itself.

We can see Hitchcock's project as a refinement of the notion of a native nineteenth century architecture which Kirstein introduced. Unlike Kirstein's model
which highlighted the conflicts modernists sought to leave behind, Hitchcock produced a vernacular--functionally, aesthetically, and socially pure nineteenth century model for twentieth century designers. It was through Hitchcock’s efforts that the notion of “vernacular” entered modernist discourse and through his project that the ancestry for modernism was officially set on American soil. These buildings were not “early modern architecture,” they were definitive DNA for the modern city. “Vernacular” served to establish the birth of modernism and the modern city in the United States.

However, Kirstein’s project presented an open-ended cultural study valuable to architectural history, albeit less professional and rigorous than the way in which Hitchcock and Abbott recorded the built environment. While Kirstein set out to write an American architectural history, what he ultimately created was a cultural analysis which simultaneously romanticized and distanced a dying society through its architecture. He sought to present architects and the public with a new, more objective way of seeing their world through Evans’ lens. That is to say that this “amateur sentimentalist” ultimately saw nineteenth century architecture as a metaphor and these buildings had value not as “artistic monuments” or formal precedents, but as “social documents”--made visible through the photograph. Whereas Hitchcock set forth an “active” history, Kirstein’s “indigenous houses” became a passive history; something to be gazed at in the detached atmosphere afforded by the museum—ideal specimens to be filed away in archival drawers. This act accomplished the same goal that the act of photography did—it rendered these buildings neither good, nor bad design, but rather preserved them, like “archaeological” remains “in an airless nostalgia”—crisp, black and white objects on a museum wall.
On the preceding page: “A Placard for a Museum Wall”
Walker Evans crafted this piece when asked to write a submission for *The Boston Globe*. Of the piece, Evans said during a talk in 1971, that he hoped “the idea that art museums are rather tight and suppressing places” was evident.


Evans had only begun photographing in 1928 and this was his first serious series of photographs put on display.

Janine A. Mileaf and Carla Yanni have written well-researched essays on Hitchcock’s exhibition which are featured in the following book:


Kirstein makes these references in two places. He first calls this architecture “indigenous” in 1931 in an April diary entry written while he, Evans, and Wheelwright are on their first architectural photography trip.


Kirstein calls the subject of Evans’ lens “indigenous American expression[s]” in his 1938 essay in *American Photographs*, the accompanying book to the photographer’s fall 1938 solo exhibition at MoMA.


To follow my later argument that Hitchcock’s project was in part a reaction to Kirstein’s work —Kirstein had been dancing around the notion of nineteenth century Revival architecture (both houses and industrial scenes) as “indigenous” since 1931, and Hitchcock undoubtedly would have been familiar with Kirstein’s argument as he was producing writing for *The Hound & Horn* and working in the same intimate MoMA circle that Kirstein was involved with.


For Kirstein’s phrase, “native accent”, see Lincoln Kirstein, “Photographs of America: Walker
Evans,” in American Photographs, 198.


14 See the following reference and pages for these quotes; Lincoln Kirstein, “Photographs of America: Walker Evans,” in American Photographs, 194-198.


16 Alf Boe writes that Nikolaus Pevsner identified this characteristic of the Gothic Revival style. On page 49 of High Victorian Design (1951) Pevsner wrote: “A universal replacement of the straight line by the curve...generous, full or...bulgy.” Linking form with culture, “[t]hese characteristics,” Boe summed up Pevsner's thought, “...are taken by Pevsner to express the self-satisfaction and the comfortable plenitude of mid-Victorian bourgeois life.”


17 Alf Boe, From Gothic Revival to Functional Form: A Study in Victorian Theories of Design, 10.


19 The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, Photographs by Berenice Abbott (page 8). Catalogue by Henry-Russell Hitchcock. 1934. Davison Art Rooms Exhibition Catalogs Collection, Collection #1000-45, Special Collections & Archives, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

20 During the early 1930s when Kirstein and Evans had just begun their trips throughout the north east, these revival styles had become associated with typical Americana. In 1930, Grant Wood painted American Gothic and behind his two famous figures, Wood included a pointed arch window. Just as the painting, and the normalcy of its contents became synonymous with American identity of the 1930s, revivalism had joined the ranks of popular culture in America. During the nineteenth century, architects were rarely involved in the design of domestic architecture and the century’s emerging middle class challenged elitist architecture when they indulged in revivalism—attractive in part due to its accessibility in pattern books, the availability of mass-produced ornament, and the visual association of ornament with wealth and social standing. By the early 1930s, these associations had been passed down and were employed by those with more modest means. During the defining years of modernism, the revival style house may have been “disintegrat[ing], almost, between snaps of the lens” as Kirstein suggested, but it was also being solidified as a part of the American normalcy and cultural identity associated with the American Scene.


For more on the popular consumption of revival style architecture see Gwendolyn Wright's book USA (London: Reaktion Books, 2008).


This article is the only known piece of writing Kirstein composed to explain or formally document the exhibition.
23 Kirstein refers to Evans' photographs as the work of a “doctor” in both his diary in April, 1931, and in a 1938 article he wrote to accompany Evans' exhibition at MoMA, American Photographs, as the following quote illustrates:

“The view is clinical,” Kirstein wrote. “Evans is a visual doctor, diagnostician rather than specialist. But he is also the family physician, quiet and dispassionate, before whom even very old or very sick people are no longer ashamed to reveal themselves.”


24 There are a few exceptions wherein the building depicted in a photographs looks run-down, or the landscaping is overgrown, but for the most part Kirstein still had not been able to detach himself from the well-to-do nineteenth past he identified with, and as his diary indicates, he found value in the most preserved homes wherein the abundance of not only care, but also wealth, was evident.


He mirrored these sentiments in his article for the Museum of Modern Art Bulletin when he wrote that “[Evans] could only work in brilliant sunlight, and the sun had to be on the correct side of the streets.”


27 Demonstrating their survey approach, Kirstein wrote the following in his diary on April 15, 1931:

“Jack Wheelwright & Walker Evans and I started our photographic campaign to get all the good Victorian houses in the vicinity from New Greek, through the influence of Viollet le Duc through English Gothic and Italian & French Renaissance ending up in the MacKinley period. We worked hard for about 5 days morning to afternoon—threading in and out the streets of Boston, Brookline, So. Boston, the South End, Somerville, Salem, Medford, Charlestown, East Boston, Cambridge, Belmont, Lynn, Swampscott, Beverly, Watertown, Waltham, Dedham, Revere, Dorchester, Chestnut Hill, and Arlington, looking for whatever landmark or beckoning spire that presented itself above the common roofline of the other houses…” He concluded; “[s]ome satisfaction in exhausting a given locale of its definite formal atmosphere—so rich, exuberant, gracious and redolent of a distinguished past.”


28 In 1939 Hitchcock completed a book entitled Rhode Island Architecture, a pictorial survey he produced as an exhibition on the state's architecture for the Rhode Island School of Design. In his 1968 forward, he explained the relative rarity of the architectural survey which was enabled by photography, in the 1930s; “Today [1968, the date of a new forward] it is quite common for various agencies, some public, some private, to undertake more or less complete architectural surveys of whole cities or parts of them. Surveys of entire states are less frequent and must of necessity be selective. Rhode Island, as the smallest state, is a natural candidate for such treatment, but the survey to which this book is related was a very modest, effectively one-man, effort.”

Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Rhode Island Architecture, v.

29 Somewhat rare in the 1920s, books such as Howard Major's The Domestic Architecture of the Early American Republic: The Greek Revival and Kenneth Clark's 1928 The Gothic Revival: An Essay in the History of Taste exemplify interest in Victorian-era architecture before 1930. Throughout the early-1930s to mid 1940s and beyond, projects were mainly
survey work as the following publications suggest:

- Thaddeus Clapp's *Chronological List of Gothic Revival Buildings in America (Also Alphabetically by City)*, 1933
- Thaddeus Clapp's *List of Gothic Revival Buildings in America*, 1933
- Rexford Newcomb's *Old Kentucky Architecture: Colonial, Federal, Greek Revival, Gothic, and Other Types Erected Prior to the War Between the States*, 1940
- Margaret Golding's *Notes and Photographs of Some Nineteenth Century Gothic Houses in the Neighborhood of Boston*, 1940
- George Boas's *Romanticism in America: Papers Contributed to a Symposium Held at the Baltimore Museum of Art* (1940) and *The Greek Tradition: Papers Contributed to a Symposium Held at the Baltimore Museum of Art* (1939)—which most likely overlapped with the exhibition of Evans's photographs at the Baltimore Museum of Art from May 10 to June 10, 1940.
- *The Greek Revival in the United States: A Special Loan Exhibition* at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (November 9-March 1, 1943)
- Talbot Hamlin's *Greek Revival Architecture in America: Being an Account of Important Trends in American Architecture*, 1944
- Carl Frederick Schmidt's *Greek Revival Architecture in the Rochester Area*, 1946
- Ruth V. Cook's *A List of Greek Revival Buildings in North Western New York*, 1956


31 *The Galveston That Was* was a documentary book which traced the history of Galveston, Texas architecture through text, drawings, and photographs by Henri Cartier-Bresson and Ezra Stoller. Much of the architecture featured in the photographs were nineteenth century revival style buildings.


Although much of the architecture it documented was pre-nineteenth century, Paul Strand and Nancy Newhall also published a similar project entitled *Time in New England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1950).

32 Commonly, Bernard Rudofsky's *Architecture Without Architects* exhibition held at MoMA from November 11, 1964-February 7, 1965 is considered one of the defining moments for vernacular architectural studies. C. Daryll Forde's *Habitat, Economy and Society*, first published in 1934 was an anthropological study which approached development according to the economy of primitive groups. Most interesting, however, as it related to the architectural heritage of North America, is Sibyl Moholy-Nagy's book *Native Genius in Anonymous Architecture*, first published in 1957 with a second edition made available at the height of post-modernism in 1976.


35 The architecture department at MoMA was formally established with an announcement to the press on July 2, 1932—with Philip Johnson serving as the department's founding (but unpaid) director.


40 Jere Abbott's photographs appeared in the first volume of Kirstein's publication.


41 “We got to know each other,” Walker Evans said in a 1970s interview, “and I went up to visit him, and he took me on a trip and taught me a lot about architecture. He wanted to make pictures of American Romantic revival architecture which nobody was interested in at the time. So we went around and did a lot of things of that sort. He was a very exciting person,” Evans said. “He still is. He's too exciting—a very disturbing man.”


In an October 1930 letter from *Hound & Horn* contributor Ezra Pound to Lincoln Kirstein, Pound wrote that “Evans photos. Good; especially Wash Day.”


49 The following MoMA exhibitions are examples of the search for a vernacular origins in the fine arts:
- *American Folk Art: The Art of the Common Man in America, 1750-1900* [MoMA Exh. #22, November 30, 1932-January 14, 1933]
- *American Sources of Modern Art (Aztec, Mayan, Incan)* [MoMA Exh. #29, May 8-July 1, 1933]


52 Mumford’s statements come from letters to Wright and Catherine Bauer which were re-printed in Robert Wojtowicz’s book *Lewis Mumford and American Modernism*.

Bacon cites these letters in her article, “Modernism and the Vernacular at the Museum of Modern Art, New York,” 45.

53 Exhibition #31a at the Museum of Modern Art, *Edward Hopper: Retrospective Exhibition* ran from October 30-December 8, 1933.

54 The official titles and exhibition numbers are as follows:
- *Early Museum Architecture* [MoMA Exh. #34a, April 5-May 5, 1934]
- *The Architecture of Henry Hobson Richardson* [MoMA Exh. #45b, January 14-February 16, 1936]
- *Modern Exposition Architecture* [MoMA Exh. #49, June 8-September 2, 1936]


59 From documents located in:


61 “Chicago’s Art of Building to Be Set Forth,” *Chicago News & Post*, December 17, 1932.

62 The photographs were re-printed for the exhibition with a three-inch margin. My estimate is that they would necessarily then need to be 18” x 18” or larger.


65 A rare example of the search for a “native” architecture, by architects, occurred in 1906 when Vere Wallingford wrote an article entitled “A Type of Original American Architecture” for *Architectural Record*. Accompanied by photographs of Pueblo communities and their constructions, the article situates these structures as pre-dating Mount Vernon, log cabins, and even the formation of the United States as a kind truly indigenous to American soil.

In this article Wallingford lays out the principles of Pueblo building which belong both to modernism and to vernacular architecture:

“If it be true, as we have read, that the characteristics of good architecture are that a
building shall be in harmony with its surroundings; that the exterior shall be in right relation to the interior, the elevation being a natural development of the plan; and that it shall be free from meaningless and meretricious ornament, then Pueblo American architecture is good architecture, and deserves a moment of consideration; and it further possesses the merit of being a frank and logical expression of its purpose, and of the materials used."


66 The phrase “ancestors of modern skyscrapers” comes from the title of a Brooklyn Daily Eagle article—“Ancestors of Modern Skyscrapers on View”—which appeared in the newspaper on January 22, 1933.


68 The Chicago photographs were enlarged and re-printed for the exhibition by the Chicago Architectural Photographing Company with a three-inch margin around entirety of photograph, and were mounted on three-ply wood.


71 Although it is unlikely given Kirstein’s diary entries, dating on photographs in Evans’ archives suggests that trips may have occurred as early as 1930.


73 The domestic examples documented by Evans stood out to Kirstein as “pure examples” in light of the later “neo-gothic Woolworth Tower and the degradation of the collegiate style at New Haven and Princeton, the neo-colonial at Harvard.”


75 Balloon-frame construction was perfected in the nineteenth century. Rarely employed in Europe, it was the wood construction of Victorian-era homes which made them quintessentially American. Both wood and cast iron proliferated during the nineteenth century in America, and its inexpensiveness compared to stone allowed the revival styles to reach a broader economic clientele.


77 This is from Hitchcock’s quoting of Tuthill. See Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Rhode Island Architecture, 9.

78 From Bill Ferris’ interview with Walker Evans in Images of the South: Visits with Eudora Welty and Walker Evans, 34.


“Kirstein’s practical aid as a guide to this neglected (and once fashionably despised) branch of American building,” other historians have written, “was undoubtedly of less importance to Evans than the example of Kirstein’s disciplined intellect, his capacity for excitement over the lessons of tradition, his conception of the past as a dynamic incitement to new, living art.”


Evans translated a number of texts by Gourmont, Baudelaire, Radiguet, Cendrars, Cocteau, Larboud, Gide, Lautréamont, Dottin, and others from French to English.

This is gathered from the existence of various documents in the Walker Evans Archives at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City. See for instance the following personal papers: accession numbers 1994.250.1, 1994.250.3, and 1994.250.52.

From Bill Ferris’ interview with Walker Evans in Images of the South: Visits with Eudora Welty and Walker Evans, 30.

Evans said; “I think I was photographing against the style of the time, against salon photography, against beauty photography, against art photography.”


Evans began taking similar photographs of industrial scenes in Pennsylvania between 1935 and 1936 which he displayed in his 1938 MoMA exhibition, American Photographs.

Both of these articles, “The Decline of Architecture” by Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Jr. and “Four Photographs” by Jere Abbott appeared in Hound & Horn: A Harvard Miscellany 1, no. 1 (September 1927).

Lyman Paine was a close friend of Lincoln Kirstein’s. He was an architect and he also worked for the New York Housing Authority. During his tenure there he worked on housing exhibitions in 1934 for MoMA.


Trellised Gingerbread Trim Privy (Walker Evans Archive accession number: 1994.257.25)
Both images are located in the Walker Evans Archive at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. There is no location listed for the outhouse but it is probable that it located near Ossining given that it appears to be on a farm and Ossining was one of the few locations where they visited a farm.


95 Lincoln Kirstein, “Forward,” in *The Hound & Horn Letters*, xi.


97 See Belinda Rathbone, *Walker Evans*, 64.


99 John Brooks Wheelwright’s book was never published and it is doubtful if a manuscript was ever even produced. His untimely passing in 1940, combined with Lincoln Kirstein’s ever-growing repertoire of undertakings and projects put an end to their loosely defined historical project.

100 From the editor’s note to “Lincoln Kirstein to John Brooks Wheelwright: 7 October 1931” in *The Hound & Horn Letters*, 147.


103 The article was published in 1937, four years after Evans’ exhibition of photographs of nineteenth century houses at MoMA.


107 For more on Lincoln Kirstein’s life, consult:


113 Kirstein refers to these dynastic actors of New England in his “Forward,” to *The Hound & Horn Letters*, xv.


116 The “Hack” Kirstein refers to is, either a nickname for Walter Sturgis who Kirstein refers to with regard to the possibility of this exhibition in another diary entry in March, 1931; or a reference to Howard Hack.


118 “Walker Evans I find a considerable disappointment in so much that he has to be constantly amused—he seems perennially bored, thin-blooded, too easily tired. I find it impossible not to bully him by rushing him or telling him just what to do. His feelings that he is only a paid photographer etc,” Lincoln Kirstein wrote in April, 1931.


   James Mellow also quotes this in his biography, Walker Evans, 137.

120 Kirstein's accompanying comments are, if not always informative, entertaining. He wrote that the acquisition of these images was delayed by the passing of “Clive the mad painter” who died under Walker Evans’ room—“preventing him from working some days.”


122 See James Mellow for the reference to Hans Skolle in his biography, Walker Evans, 126.


123 From Bill Ferris’ interview with Walker Evans in Images of the South: Visits with Eudora Welty and Walker Evans, 36.


127 Lincoln Kirstein, “October 14, 1930-July 23, 1931 Diary, April, 1931 (page 276),” Lincoln
Belinda Rathbone makes mention of the Northampton, Greenfield, and Poughkeepsie trips in her biography, *Walker Evans*, 68.

MoMA lists the official dates for the exhibition as November 16-December 8, 1933. However, in an article he wrote for the first volume of *The Bulletin of the Museum of Modern Art*, Lincoln Kirstein indicated that the show was on display until January 1st, 1934.


Beginning with Philip Johnson and Henry-Russell Hitchcock’s International Style exhibition, the list is as follows:

- *The Work of Young Architects in the Middle West* [MoMA Exh. #28, April 3-April 30, 1933]
- *Summer Exhibition: Project for a House in North Carolina by William T. Priestly* [MoMA Exh. #30a, July 10-September 30, 1933]
- *A House by Richard C. Wood* [MoMA Exh. #30d, October 3-October 27, 1933]
- *Walker Evans: Photographs of 19th Century Houses* [MoMA Exh. #30f, November 16-December 8, 1933]

The details of this show are as follows; *Murals by American Painters and Photographers* [MoMA Exh. #16, May 3-May 31, 1932]

While not chosen for this particular exhibition, Evans was offered the option of exhibiting at MoMA which he declined. This is discussed in a 1932 *New York Times* article; “Those Who Stayed Out,” *New York Times*, May 15, 1932, X7.

The first official solo exhibition of photography at MoMA was also dedicated to Evans and held in 1938. It was called *Walker Evans: American Photographs* [MoMA Exh. #78, September 28-November 18, 1938]

This controversial exhibition was organized by Lyman Paine, who was working at the New York City Housing Authority at the time.

The housing exhibitions of 1934 held at MoMA are as follows:

- *Housing Exhibition* [MoMA Exh. #34d, June-September 13, 1934]
- *America Can’t Have Housing* [MoMA Exh. #36, October 15-November 7, 1934]

“Archie” is Archibald MacLeish; a modernist poet who was a writer and editor at *Fortune Magazine*. 109
Evans biographer Belinda Rathbone provides an account of Wheelwright's unwieldy project on page 64 of her book, *Walker Evans* and makes reference to a desperate plea to Mumford on Kirstein's part when it became clear that the images might not find a publication venue. He had also tried to convince poet Archibald MacLeish to publish the images in *Fortune* magazine where he was then a senior editor. From Belinda Rathbone, *Walker Evans*, 68.

Mumford makes this reference on the first page of his 1931 text *The Brown Decades: A Study of the Arts in America*, 3.


According to Evans biographer James Mellow, Levy was another star in the constellation of “Harvard students, graduates, and tutors” who were institutionalizing American modern art. See James Mellow, *Walker Evans*, 162.


Lewis Mumford was also approached with the proposal that Evans' photographs be included in *The Brown Decades* as illustrations. See “Lincoln Kirstein to John Brooks Wheelwright: 7 October 1931,” in *The Hound & Horn Letters*, 147.


All of the Walker Evans photographs were loaned by Charles Fuller by way of the John Becker Gallery (520 Madison Avenue, New York).


“Some of the Fuller pictures must have been taken as late as November 1931,” Mellow has reported, “when Evans was photographing Greek Revival architecture in such upstate New York sites as Pleasant Valley in Dutchess County; Fly Creek and Cherry Valley in Otsego County; Mycenae, Marcellus, Skaneateles, and Syracuse in Onondago County; indicating a fairly wide-ranging tour.” From James Mellow, *Walker Evans*, 166-167.


170When Walker Evans exhibited his photographs at the Museum of Modern Art in 1938, he did so as an established photographer—the first photographer ever to have a solo exhibition at the Museum; the exhibition did not have an accompanying catalog as it had instead, an entire book. The book contained a copy of each of the photographs as well as a now-famous essay by Lincoln Kirstein entitled, “Photographs of America: Walker Evans”. The intention was that a book, freed from the connotations of an exhibition catalog, would reach a wider audience, a source at MoMA wrote to journalist Edward Alden Jewell in September 1938.


172From Bill Ferris’ interview with Walker Evans in *Images of the South: Visits with Eudora Welty and Walker Evans*, 30.

173Lincoln Kirstein makes this distinction in his article, “Photographs of America: Walker Evans,” in *American Photographs*, 195.


In his essay for the *American Photographs* exhibition, Kirstein wrote that “Evans’ eye and attitude... [elevate] the casual, the everyday and the literal into specific, permanent symbols.”


Six photographs which appeared in Part Two of the 1933 exhibition also appeared in *American Photographs* at MoMA in 1938:

26 [Wooden Gothic House, Massachusetts, 1930],
27 [Wooden Houses, Boston, 1930],
28 [Gothic Gate Cottage Near Poughkeepsie, New York, 1931],
32 [Maine Pump, 1933],
33 [Jigsaw House at Ocean City, New Jersey, 1931], and
35 [Wooden Gothic House Near Nyack, New York, 1931].

Most likely taken on trips with Kirstein are, from Part One:
10 [Parked Car, Small Town Main Street, 1932],
15 [New York State Farm Interior, 1931],
27 [Main Street, Saratoga Springs, New York, 1931],
45 [People in Summer, New York State Town, 1930—this photograph also appeared in *Hound & Horn* and is discussed elsewhere in this thesis];

and from Part Two:
04 [View of Ossining, New York, 1930],
08 [Westchester, New York, Farmhouse, 1931],
21 [Millworkers’ Houses in Willimantic, Connecticut, 1931],
29 [Detail of a Frame House in Ossining, New York, 1931], and
34 [Hotel Porch, Saratoga Springs, New York, 1930].

I have deducted this from images which appear in the Walker Evans Archive at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.


Lincoln Kirstein asserted that Evans was “anti-graphic” like his colleague, Cartier-Bresson. From Lincoln Kirstein, “Photographs of America: Walker Evans,” in *American Photographs*, 192.

Also see Paul Cummings, “Walker Evans Oral History Interview Conducted by Paul Cummings for the Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1971.”

Mardges Bacon makes a similar assertion in her article, “Modernism and the Vernacular at the Museum of Modern Art, New York,” 41-42.

The McCauseland article referenced by Yanni here was reprinted in;


196 See also Paul Cummings, “Walker Evans Oral History Interview Conducted by Paul Cummings for the Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1971.”

197 Lincoln Kirstein wrote in 1938 that “the structures [pictured in Evans’ photographs] are social rather than artistic monuments.” While Kirstein did write this in regard to Evans’ architectural portraits for American Photographs as opposed to Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses, many of the photographs for both exhibitions were completed during the early 1930s, some on the same trips with Kirstein, and a few from the first exhibition were included in the much larger 1938 show.


199 Henry-Russell Hitchcock joined the faculty of Wesleyan in 1929, only two years after receiving his masters degree at Harvard University. The position was one of his most important and followed only one other teaching position which he held at Vassar College for one year. His term at Wesleyan lasted almost twenty years and it was here that he was promoted to the position of full professor for the first time. Hitchcock taught at Wesleyan from 1929-1948.

Hitchcock Biographical Information cited from excerpt in the Special Collections at Olin Library, Wesleyan University.


200 Sometimes these eight exhibitions are referenced informally as the “Wesleyan architectural exhibitions” even though it seems that not all of them opened at the university. Most, if not all were exhibited in the Davison Art Rooms of the university at some point during their touring schedule, and some may have been exhibited there more than once.

201 “Inheritor of the recent Germanic debates,” Barry Bergdoll has written with regard to Hitchcock, “on the concept of ‘Romantic Classicism’—sketched out by Heinrich Wölfflin’s followers from Paul Klepfer to Sigfried Giedion, as they set out both to unearth the underlying unity in the stylistic diversity of late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century architecture struggling with the legacy of historicism—Hitchcock too sought to draw his own map of this complex historical terrain.”

Like Springfield Architecture, 1800-1900, American Cities provided opportunities for Hitchcock to build on his Richardson research and according to Carla Yanni, Hitchcock had begun to prepare the MoMA Richardson exhibition in 1934, thus indicating that both of his smaller architectural exhibitions would have fed into it. Having featured Richardson buildings such as the Marshall Field Wholesale Store in Early Modern Architecture: Chicago 1870-1910, American Cities gave Hitchcock the opportunity to work backward in history to study some of Richardson’s inspirations in the warehouses of Boston.

Carla Yanni provides a good description of this in her chapter on the American Cities exhibition. See “Henry-Russell Hitchcock's American Cities: Making an American History for Modernism,” in Constructing Modernism, 11.

Barry Bergdoll argues that this Greek Revival vernacular prevalently returned in Hitchcock's book on H. H. Richardson. “In the opening pages of Richardson, Hitchcock returned to [the theme of vernacular]: ‘The Greek vernacular, once established, lived on as the basic style of the nation almost down to the Civil War.’ He goes on to explain that the life of this neoclassical model was prolonged by the mid-century fascination with the Italian Villa: ‘Some architects succeeded, as Schinkel and Persius had done at Potsdam... in preserving in the Italian Villa style the refinement of the best Greek Revival’.”

Bergdoll is quoting Hitchcock from The Architecture of H. H. Richardson, pages 5 and 9.


Carla Yanni has alluded to evidence of this direct lineage. In her words; “A few of the buildings chosen for American Cities resemble H. H. Richardson’s works, although they antedated it by several decades... Hitchcock set out to celebrate this link between modest utilitarian structures and Richardson’s High Art architecture.”


Abbott worked in many of the same circles as Evans, producing images for Fortune, Life, Hound and Horn, and Vanity Fair. Only months apart from Evans' exhibition there, Abbott had a solo exhibition organized at the Julien Levy Gallery in 1932, the same year her mural of skyscrapers was shown as part of MoMA’s sixteenth show, Murals by American Painters and Photographers, held in May, 1932, only a few months after the International Style exhibition. The exhibition was organized by Lincoln Kirstein and Julien Levy and, according to Mossette Broderick, it was at this exhibition that Hitchcock and Abbott first became acquainted through a number of mutual friends. Evans had been left out of this MoMA exhibition and had refused an offer to have his work shown at MoMA immediately after

This information is obtained from Janine A. Mileaf’s footnote number 8 in her piece; “Reading American Cities: 1930s Photographs by Berenice Abbott,” 18.


Reference date for the start of the CWA program is from “New Deal/WPA History,” http://www.wpamurals.com/history.html.

Dates for this exhibition conflict; Wesleyan Library’s Special Collections cite the date of the
exhibition in their online catalog as June 1935, however, in other documents relating to the other architectural exhibitions, it is cited as the first architectural exhibition of the series.

210 These dates are my guess from the following newspaper article which appeared in the Springfield Republican in the spring of 1934. The beginning date of the exhibition is given only as the “11th” of the month, with the ending date as April 2nd, implying that the exhibition would have opened the previous month.


211 This date and location is provided in a book accompanying the re-creation of this exhibition at Wesleyan in 1993. This book, Constructing Modernism: Berenice Abbott and Henry-Russell Hitchcock is by Janine A. Mileaf. Its opening at Yale is also confirmed by an article in Wesleyan’s school newspaper; “Hitchcock Arranges Two Photo Displays” in Wesleyan Argus LXVIII:18, Thursday November 22, 1934.


213 I say “revival style architecture” because while Kirstein only exhibited photographs of housing in the 1933 MoMA show Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses, Evans took photographs of stone industrial, commercial, and institutional buildings on their architectural trips around New England in the early 1930s.


214 Belinda Rathbone has written in her biography of Evans that he and Kirstein traveled to Saratoga Springs in autumn, 1931—“where the horse-racing season had ended and the great old Victorian hotels on Main Street stood practically empty. They took a room on a high floor of the United States Hotel, with a corner view of the equally imposing Grand Union. The next morning Evans was dismayed to wake up to a rainy day... It was hardly the view they had come all the way to Saratoga to capture... At Kirstein’s suggestion, Evans later admitted, he set up his camera in the hotel room, composed his photograph through the window, and squeezed the shutter.” From Belinda Rathbone, Walker Evans, 68-9.

See Figure 3 on page 8 of Carla Yanni’s essay “Henry-Russell Hitchcock's American Cities:Making an American History for Modernism” in “Appendix II” in Constructing Modernism: Berenice Abbott and Henry-Russell Hitchcock: A re-creation of the 1934 exhibition; The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War by Janine Mileaf.

The figure is an Abbott photograph—Main Street, Saratoga Springs, 1934; Yanni says that this image was taken during the Hitchcock travels but was not meant to be included in the actual exhibition.


In 1938, Hitchcock had extended his vernacular scope even farther back in time to wood frame construction. As a result of the Great Depression, the building of large projects such as skyscrapers had halted and in this absence Hitchcock began to speculate as to what America's "living tradition" was. He wrote; "It would be an extreme exaggeration, particularly after a period of years when almost no skyscrapers and very few large factories have been built, to claim that the architecture of large-scale engineering construction, in which American achievement has long held the admiration of modern architects throughout the world, was today the sole or even the main living tradition in America. The prestige of the skyscraper, so largely due to its boldness of conception, its size, and its cost, actually falsified the native American approach to contemporary architecture as a whole." Like his colleagues at MoMA had done a few years before, Hitchcock had begun to think about the issue of modern housing.


220Fifty photographs were chosen for the exhibition and American Cities was staged in November 1934.

From Janine A. Mileaf, “Reading American Cities: 1930s Photographs by Berenice Abbott,” 5.

221From Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, 7.

222See Appendix II in Constructing Modernism: Berenice Abbott and Henry-Russell Hitchcock, by Janine A. Mileaf, 64.

223From Henry-Russell Hitchcock, The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, 2.

Ironically, one of the photographs Berenice Abbott took in Boston illustrates not only how the city was changing, but also how the destruction of some of the buildings Hitchcock sought out enabled Abbott to photograph others. Custom House Street (Boston 6) depicts examples of Hitchcock’s vernacular architecture in the middle ground, a more modern skyscraper in the background, and the construction site for a new project emerging on the site of a destroyed vernacular structure in the foreground. See Janet Mileaf’s discussion of this image on pages 19-20 of her article “Reading American Cities: 1930s Photographs by Berenice Abbott”.


225“In the eighteenth century and during the generation of the Early Republic the Eastern and Southern cities were rarely of a size to evolve a truly American urban vernacular. Either they were enlarged towns rather than cities, or else they followed closely English or Dutch contemporary models.” (2)

“In these decades American urban building was comparable in his high general level of excellence to that of European cities in a way that it never has been since. American cities when they first became generally conscious of their difference from the small towns and the country expressed that difference in a sense of communal ordering of design which may well be a model to us today.” (8)

From Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War. Photographs by Berenice Abbott.

226From Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Springfield Architecture 1800-1900, 12.

227From Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties:
American Cities Before the Civil War, 8.

228 He alludes to this on the last page of his catalogue. See Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, 8.

229 From Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, 3.

Also see Carla Yanni, “Henry-Russell Hitchcock's American Cities: Making an American History for Modernism,” 7.

230 See Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, 8.

231 From Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, 8.

232 Hitchcock refers to this early modernists in the conclusion of his catalogue.

See Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, 8.

233 The official dates for the exhibition provided in the MoMA Archives are November 16-December 8, 1933 although in his article for the Museum of Modern Art Bulletin, “Walker Evans' Photographs of Victorian Architecture,” Lincoln Kirstein wrote that the exhibition ran through the end of December 1933.

234 Henry-Russell Hitchcock organized an exhibition on Richardson for MoMA. He also wrote a book which accompanied this project.

The Architecture of Henry Hobson Richardson [MoMA Exh. #45b, January 14-February 16, 1936]

235 From Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, 3-4.


237 From Janine A. Mileaf, Constructing Modernism: Berenice Abbott and Henry-Russell Hitchcock: A re-creation of the 1934 exhibition; The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War, 5.

238 Biographer Franz Schulze has written that “no one has done more in the twentieth century than Philip Johnson did in four years at the museum to establish a connection between artistic creativity and utilitarian production, including activities with a consciously calibrated esthetic dimension, like architecture, and those not, like the design of electric light bulbs. In less than half a decade during the 1930s, he more than anyone anywhere established architecture and design as major museum disciplines.”

From Franz Schulze, Philip Johnson, 100.


240 Hitchcock's exhibition was titled; The Architecture of Henry Hobson Richardson [MoMA Exh. #45b, January 14-February 16, 1936]

The following is the book which Hitchcock published as a supplement to the exhibition. The Architecture of H.H. Richardson and His Times (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1936).


243See Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Rhode Island Architecture, 44.


245The way in which the vernacular was defined in both exhibitions challenged the definition of the term. In their 2006 book Vernacular Modernism, Hüppauf and Umbach have written that, “generally, the term meant things naturally belonging to or pertaining to the domestic sphere—as opposed to matters of state, the res publica. From this time onward, the term ‘vernacular’ expressed a tension between the closed domestic sphere and the public sphere.”
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Microfilm reproduction of article courtesy of the Museum of Modern Art Archives.
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35b) Photograph Taken in Boston by Walker Evans, 1930-31

Images courtesy of the Walker Evans Archive, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
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37c) Gingerbread Trim House, Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts
37d) Victorian Mausoleum
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38 Photographs by Walker Evans Featured in Fortune Magazine; November 1960


39 The Museum of Modern Art in 1933; 11 West 53rd Street, a Rockefeller House

Russell Lynes, Good Old Modern (New York: Atheneum, 1973), between 238 and 239.
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40 Henry-Russell Hitchcock Photographed by George Platt Lynes, 1935


41 Berenice Abbott Photographed by Man Ray, 1921
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42 Factory Tenements, Chicopee, Massachusetts; Photograph by Richard E. Pope

43 43a) *Main Street, Saratoga Springs, New York*, 1931 by Walker Evans
43b) *Main Street, Saratoga Springs*, 1934 by Berenice Abbott


44 Photographs of Greek Revival Buildings for *American Cities*; by Berenice Abbott
44a) *Newcastle, Delaware* by Berenice Abbott, 1934
44b) *North Market Street, Boston* by Berenice Abbott, 1934
44c) *Custom House Street, Boston* by Berenice Abbott, 1934
44d) *Chicopee, Massachusetts Mill Community* by Berenice Abbott, 1934


45 Elevations of a Block of Stores and of a House; Drawing by A.J. Davis
Included in *American Cities*


46 Photographs of Greek Revival Buildings for *American Cities*; by Berenice Abbott
46a) *State Street, Boston* by Berenice Abbott, 1934.
46c) *Cathedral Street, Baltimore* by Berenice Abbott, 1934.
46d) *Beacon Street, Boston* by Berenice Abbott, 1934.
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Appendix I
A Re-construction, *Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses*

A collection of thirty-four photographs donated by Lincoln Kirstein to the Museum of Modern Art exist in the Museum's Photography Department. The photographs were created by photographer Walker Evans between 1931 and 1933. Some, but not all of these photographs match the description of the thirty-nine photographs which were displayed at MoMA and subsequently circulated. Working on the assumption that the list of photographs included in MoMA's archival exhibition files is accurate, I have re-constructed the exhibition.

Quite a few of the photographs listed as part of the exhibition remain in MoMA's collection and were obtained courtesy of the Museum of Modern Art Photography Department. These are as follows; 8.33, 11.33, 21.33, 38.33, 42.33, 45.33, 48.33, 57.33, 65.33, 67.33, 68.33, 70.33, 102.33, and 103.33.

The remaining photographs from the exhibition and others from Kirstein and Evans' trips are located in the Walker Evans Archives at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City. Many of these photographs are labeled with MoMA's accession numbers, and can be confirmed as correct; 20.33, 32.33, 33.33, 39.33, 40.33, 41.33,
46.33, 50.33, 54.33, 58.33, and 59.33.

A number of the photographs in the Walker Evans Archive do not possess MoMA's accession numbers, and therefore I have deduced which were most likely displayed. In a few instances, I have included multiple options when lack of detail made limiting my selection to a single photograph impossible. These are the following: 9.33, 10.33, 31.33, 37.33, 43.33, 47.33, 49.33, 51.33, 55.33, 56.33, 60.33, 71.33, and 72.33.

Finally, in the case of one photograph, 52.33—a Gingerbread house in Belmont, Massachusetts, I have been unable to locate a photograph which suitably matches its description. I have included another photograph of a “Folk Victorian” taken in either Oak Bluffs, Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts or Ossining, New York in its place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boston, (South End), Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valentine House, 1851</td>
<td>Cambridge, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dorchester, Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>Mansard</td>
<td>Worcester Square, corner</td>
<td>South Boston, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South End, Boston, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belmont, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.33</td>
<td>Metal Work</td>
<td>Detail of porches</td>
<td>Provincetown, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South End, Boston, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>Gingerbread</td>
<td>Group of houses</td>
<td>Ocean Grove, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean Grove, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pump house</td>
<td>Kennebunk, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doorway</td>
<td>Nyack, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Boston, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>Oak Bluffs, Martha's Vineyard, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyack, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Bluffs, Martha's Vineyard, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Street view, houses</td>
<td>South Boston, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side view</td>
<td>Dedham, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Kennebunk, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belmont, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.33</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>Chimney</td>
<td>New York State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Salem, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somerville, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caretaker's house</td>
<td>Poughkeepsie, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>Northampton, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salem, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gabled facade</td>
<td>Nyack, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rear view (68.33)</td>
<td>Swampscott, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Front view</td>
<td>Swampscott, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.33</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'71.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salem, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.33</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Swampscott, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chestnut Hill, Mass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses
#### Traveling Exhibition Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Location/Exhibition</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>New Jersey College for Women</td>
<td>N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>Oberlin, O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 29 - Nov. 26</td>
<td>Albright Art Gallery</td>
<td>Buffalo, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb. 3 - Mar. 8</td>
<td>Rochester Memorial Art Gallery</td>
<td>Rochester, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 16 - Apr. 13</td>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td>Burlington, Vt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 1 - 29</td>
<td>Albany Institute of History &amp; Art</td>
<td>Albany, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 5 - Dec. 3</td>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
<td>Hanover, N.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 10 - Jan. 7</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb. 18 - Mar. 18</td>
<td>Baltimore Museum of Art</td>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr. 27 - May 18</td>
<td>Georgia O'Keeffe (bookshop)</td>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1 - Aug. 1</td>
<td>Oglebay Institute</td>
<td>Wheeling, W. Va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 10 - June 10</td>
<td>Baltimore Museum of Art</td>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Packed in 1 box, weighing

---

C E II 19.8 -
No. 8.33
Miscellaneous; Columbia Heights, Brooklyn

No. 9.33
Miscellaneous; South End, Boston, Massachusetts
No. 10.33
Miscellaneous; Northampton, Massachusetts

No. 11.33
Miscellaneous; Valentine House, Cambridge, Massachusetts
No. 20.33
Miscellaneous; Dorchester, Massachusetts

No. 21.33
Miscellaneous; Brookline, Massachusetts
No. 31.33
Mansard; South Boston, Massachusetts

No. 32.33
Mansard; Worcester Square, South End, Boston, Massachusetts
No. 33.33
Mansard; Belmont, Massachusetts

No. 37.33 (Option A)
Metal Work; Provincetown, Massachusetts
No. 37.33 (Option B)
Metal Work; Provincetown, Massachusetts

No. 38.33
Metal Work; Detail of Porches, South End, Boston, Massachusetts
No. 39.33
Gingerbread; Orange Grove, New Jersey

No. 40.33
Gingerbread; Group of Houses, Orange Grove, New Jersey
No. 41.33
Gingerbread; Pump House, Kennebunk, Maine

No. 42.33
Gingerbread; Doorway, Nyack, New York
No. 43.33
Gingerbread; South Boston, Massachusetts

No. 45.33
Gingerbread; Entrance, Oak Bluffs, Martha’s Vineyard, Massachusetts
No. 46.33
Gingerbread; Nyack, New York

No. 47.33
Gingerbread; Oak Bluffs, Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts
No. 48.33
Gingerbread; Cambridge, Massachusetts

No. 49.33
Gingerbread; Street View, Houses, South Boston, Massachusetts
No. 50.33
Gingerbread; Side View, Dedham, Massachusetts

No. 51.33
Gingerbread; Kennebunk, Maine
No. 52.33
See Appendix I Introduction for Description

No. 54.33
Gothic; Chimney, New York State
No. 55.33
Gothic; Salem, Massachusetts

No. 56.33
Gothic; Cambridge, Massachusetts
No. 57.33
Gothic; Somerville, Massachusetts

No. 58.33
Gothic; Caretaker’s House, Poughkeepsie, New York
No. 59.33
Gothic; Northampton, Massachusetts

No. 60.33
Gothic; Salem, Massachusetts
No. 65.33
Gothic; Gabled Facade, Nyack, New York

No. 67.33
Gothic; Rear View (of 68.33), Swampscott, Massachusetts
No. 68.33
Gothic; Front View (of 67.33), Swampscott, Massachusetts

No. 70.33
Greek; Greenfield, Massachusetts
No. 71.33 (Option A)
Greek; Salem, Massachusetts

No. 71.33 (Option B)
Greek; Salem, Massachusetts
No. 72.33 (Option A)
Greek; Cambridge, Massachusetts

No. 72.33 (Option B)
Greek; Cambridge, Massachusetts
No. 72.33 (Option C)
Greek; Cambridge, Massachusetts

No. 102.33
Gothic; Swampscott, Massachusetts
No. 103.33
Gothic; Shutters, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
### Appendix II

**Chronology of Exhibitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Exhibition Name</th>
<th>Curator/Photographer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 30, 1932-January 14, 1933</td>
<td>MoMA</td>
<td><em>American Folk Art: The Art of the Common Man in America, 1750-1900</em> (among other folk art exhibitions held at MoMA during the 1930s)</td>
<td>Philip Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 1933</td>
<td>Springfield Museum</td>
<td><em>French Houses of the Early Eighteenth Century</em></td>
<td>Henry-Russell Hitchcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30-December 8, 1933</td>
<td>MoMA</td>
<td><em>Edward Hopper: Retrospective Exhibition</em></td>
<td>Alfred H. Barr, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15-December 1, 1933</td>
<td>Davison Wesleyan</td>
<td><em>Roman Baroque Church Facades</em></td>
<td>Henry-Russell Hitchcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16-December 8, 1933</td>
<td>MoMA</td>
<td><em>Walker Evans: 19th Century Houses</em></td>
<td>Lincoln Kirstein/Walker Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1934</td>
<td>Wadsworth Antheneum</td>
<td><em>Early Museum Architecture, 1770-1850</em></td>
<td>Henry-Russell Hitchcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11-April 2, 1932</td>
<td>Springfield Museum</td>
<td><em>Springfield Architecture, 1800-1900</em></td>
<td>Henry-Russell Hitchcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-September 13, 1934</td>
<td>MoMA</td>
<td><em>Housing Exhibition</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15-November 7, 1934</td>
<td>MoMA</td>
<td><em>America Can't Have Housing</em></td>
<td>Lyman Paine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1934</td>
<td>Davison Wesleyan</td>
<td><em>Romanesque Churches of Apulia</em></td>
<td>Henry-Russell Hitchcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3-17, 1934</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td><em>The Urban Vernacular of the Thirties, Forties, and Fifties: American Cities Before the Civil War</em></td>
<td>Henry-Russell Hitchcock/Berenice Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-36</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td><em>Paris dans sa splendeur</em></td>
<td>Henry-Russell Hitchcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-36</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td><em>Romanesque Churches of Rhineland</em></td>
<td>Henry-Russell Hitchcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 14-February 16, 1936</td>
<td>MoMA</td>
<td><em>The Architecture of Henry Hobson Richardson</em></td>
<td>Henry-Russell Hitchcock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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