cooperative course design, research, and facilities. Although the stated objectives of EPIC support the arguments made in these pages, its quick growth into an umbrella organization already incorporating dozens of institutions confirms that, at this point, the only thing left to do is participate. Get in.
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**CHRISTOPHER DAY WITH ROSIE PARNELL**

Architectural Press, 2003
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In 1993, Mack Scogin brought the late Samuel Mockbee to lecture at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. The auditorium was only one-third full. Mockbee spent the first 30 minutes recounting, in excruciating detail, his biweekly routine to borrow the money necessary to meet the payroll in his small office, including his ruminations on how his employees were going to spend that money to sustain their families and to fix their broken cars. He accompanied his tale with numerous slides of a rural Alabama dirt road, one of the treacherous legs of his odyssey to reach his bank and beg for another business loan. In 1993, Mockbee was a guy who stood out from the turtleneck-wearing lecturers at the GSD who were obsessed with dominating the global practice of architecture. After putting most of the sleep-deprived audience to bed, he went on to present his projects, which with their alien locations in the rural south immediately reawakened the audience with unorthodox design problems and the architect’s innovative design solutions. As a student in the crowd, I remember the lights coming back up and thinking that the power of architecture can indeed transcend economy.

*Good Deeds, Good Design and Consensus Design* both question the role of the architect in society and explore a redefined set of relationships between architect, client, and user. Both seek to contrast the prevailing conventions of practice by invoking the social responsibility of the architect as a departure point for the definition of the design problem, the design process, and the delivery of the project. *Good Deeds, Good Design*, a compilation of more than twenty short essays and case study anecdotes edited by Bryan Bell of Design Corps, is anchored by contributions by Robert Gutman and Samuel Mockbee as well as several young practitioners, many of whom have roots in Mockbee’s Rural Studio program at Auburn University. *Consensus Design* reads as a treatise on design methodology,
charting a set of axioms for the architect to empower a project’s stakeholders to determine the design outcome.

Good Deeds, Good Design begins with Robert Gutman’s call to architects to embrace political action in the context of the vast majority of building projects that are completed each year without a design architect. The voices of this book speak directly to the design practitioner. Gutman’s own Architectural Practice: A Critical View (Princeton Architectural Press, 1988) is used as the point of departure for staking out a critical practice of architecture, one that returns to the vision of a “Master Architect” who is responsible for total project delivery. The book can be read as tribute to Sam Mockbee’s legacy at the Rural Studio and an attempt to promote and disperse his ideas. Mockbee, who won the 2004 AIA Gold Medal posthumously, is the recipient of deserved recognition for his voice of integrity and action in the face of architecture’s position of political marginalization. The posthumous recognition being paid to Mockbee also includes a touring exhibition, and taken together this attention serves to induct Mockbee into the canon of American architecture. In this text, Mockbee champions the inclusion of “democratic purpose” in the practice of the “social art” of architecture. Jason Pearson concludes the compilation with an analysis of the emerging concept of “operative practice.”

In Consensus Design, Christopher Day outlines his stakeholder-oriented process and its logical conclusion of a “receding” design architect who is to willingly embrace the loss of individual authorship. Day’s message to designers: make sure you check your egos. The book reads as an instruction manual, complete with ideograms sketched by the author throughout the text. The heralding of the design process as the apotheosis of the democratic social ideal and the cornerstone to “community building,” is so stakeholder driven and process oriented that, when Day finally turns to case studies, he makes the most powerful arguments against his own thesis, that is, the architect is confounded by the form-giving aspect of the design process and manages to lose a coherent language of architecture along the way. Ironically, the author communicates with diagrams that will be understood only by architects themselves, while ignoring the critical discourse pertaining to the derivation of architectural form. He does not situate his thesis in relation to the many theoretical touchstones that address architectural authorship such as Christopher Alexander’s Pattern Language or Bernard Rudolphsky’s Architecture Without Architects, and he most definitely has seemed to avoid influence by any of Robert Venturi’s writings.

Do these cries sound familiar? Isn’t the “new” moral imperative in architecture getting a bit old? With the high ground safely secured by these authors, one thing that is painfully missing is a critical sense of architectural history and a broader understanding of the history of practice. Much of the rhetoric in both of these texts is strikingly similar to the efforts of Jose Lluis Sert to influence the early CIAM conventions and Louis Mumford’s charge to architects to take responsibility for creating community and social identity in the context of the anonymous industrial metropolis.

Are the suggested attitudes toward practice really that ground breaking, or is embrace of stakeholder process only a means to provoke the profession out of a postulated state of complacency? Or, as Mockbee freely admits, is this “total immersion” theory of practice only an updated pedagogical tool to train and educate architects in the tradition of the Taliesin shelter building exercise or the Yale first-year construction project? At its most basic level, it is a charge for a more honest and ethical engagement with society, one that the architectural profession will continue to struggle with as the economies of the built environment and the economies of design practice continue to evolve. Let’s...
hope that this “emerging practice” does not devolve into a philanthropy of branded design projects that showcase innovations in built form over the while weaving of a humane and well-designed built environment.

_Uwe Steven Brandes is the project manager of the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative in Washington, D.C. He can be reached at waterfront@dc.gov._
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The New York architectural scene is enjoying an orbital level of worldwide visibility due to the World Trade Center redevelopment and memorial processes following the September 11, 2001 disaster. In the midst of this international discourse on downtown Manhattan is equally vibrant uptown activity in Harlem. The accelerated pace of new housing and commercial development in Harlem is bringing about socioeconomic and cultural shifts that challenge the racial and urban image of the uptown neighborhoods. A provocative exhibition at the Studio Museum in Harlem entitled *harlemworld: Metropolis as Metaphor* (January 28–April 4, 2004) explores the question of Harlem in the future through the creative voices of eighteen young architects of African descent.

Thelma Golden, the exhibition curator, describes her vision for the project as “what Harlem is and might be” in the future as opposed to a documentation of Harlem’s past. The phrase “Metropolis as Metaphor” was chosen “because it (the exhibition) seeks to understand Harlem beyond the bricks and mortar and territorial designations of the streets and avenues that surround the Museum” (p. 9). The selection criteria were based on the architects’ “inspired embrace of multi-media practices and for the creativity and rigor evidenced in their previous endeavors” (p. 10). Each architect was given the task of acting as a conduit of Harlem life, spirit, and energy through metaphor, without a prescribed brief from the curator — a challenging endeavor for any designer.

Metaphor as a vehicle for physical and visual transference can be a powerful, poetic device for layering the real (past) and the imagined (future). The works in the exhibition range from drawings to video to sculptural installations that meet the curator’s goal of creating a highly visual museum experience. There is immediate visual intrigue upon entering the museum setting. However, these are very opaque installations in both their implied meaning and cultural connections to the “real and imagined” Harlem. The cultural questions are present, but often, as with heavy makeup, too deeply hidden.

In general, the dominant questions that do manage to surface deal with the black “voice,” (How can a people be heard and understood on their own terms?), gentrification (What are the remnants of culture and how can they be spatially marked?), and commercial commoditization (How does a racially distinct commercial environment maintain its identity?). There is a broader question, however, that appears absent from the curatorial foundation of the exhibition itself: How can a kaleidoscope of architectural and cultural ideas express a coherent and relevant vision for the future Harlem? Thus, the exhibition becomes a “metaphor machine” that is intellectually demanding, and visually alluring but often too complexly coded to project its cultural relevance: art often usurps important cultural questions.

The success of the exhibition is not in its separate parts but in the energetic dialogue that is created between each installation. With this understanding, moving through the museum provides rich discoveries — often perplexing, but never dull. Along this journey are works resonant with the whole. Two works in particular stand out to unify the many cultural questions throughout the show.

_Harlem: The Ghetto Fabulous_ by Nathaniel Belcher and Stephen Slaughter is one of the works that layer many questions of race, culture, aesthetics, and urbanism. This installation is a visually alluring video production of Harlem history spiced with hip-hop lifestyles, lavish interiors, and other overtones of the contemporary hip-hop cultural scene. The video culminates in a spatial penthouse play-ground tour of Cadillac-style, over-the-top architecture, interiors, and fantasy rooftop landscapes. The video sends a subliminal message that implies “we made it to the top without compromising our identity, we echo the extravagance of our Harlem predecessors (the Cotton Club set), we make no apologies for our stylized urbanism, and we signify a Harlem that development can never alter.” This is an installation that accepts the historical voice of Harlem’s past and transforms it into a believable contemporary genre.

_If This Ain’t Harlem . . ._ by Zevilla Jackson Preston is another strong work that helps to fuse the exhibition into a cultural statement. This room-scale installation of historically referenced words and images questions the racial, cultural, and urban future of Harlem through a prism of encroaching redevelopment and gentrification. As an architect who works and lives in Harlem, Preston insightfully provides a canvas for museum visitors to lend their voice to the physical changes occurring in Harlem. The end metaphor in her series of “in your face” propositions takes the form of a mirror behind a door that visitors are encouraged to write on, suggesting a view into the future of Harlem as expressed by the museum visitor and in particular the forgotten people “in” Harlem. These two projects convey a vision of culture that moves forward by looking back, that translates cultural questions into visual power, and that cleverly uses metaphor as a key to unlock the door to reality and imagination. These are culture-building concepts that allow the more art-as-object-driven installations to advance their individual visions and at the same time link to the collective vision formed by the exhibition as a whole.
By the time this review is published the exhibition will have ended, but the exhibition catalog, *harlemworld: Metropolis as Metaphor*, is a well-crafted record not only of the featured architects’ work but also of one literary and five photography essays that were a part of the exhibition. The catalog also provides insight into the concepts and philosophies of each architect. The Studio Museum in Harlem has provided a rare opportunity for conversations on race and space to take place beyond the walls of the museum. Companions to *harlemworld* also included architectural walking tours of Harlem and three panel discussions: Is Harlem on Your Mind? A Conversation on a Changing Community; The Changing Face of Harlem; and Architectural Dialogues: Contemporary Black Architects Reflect on Harlem. These programs gave a platform not only to the black designers and activists but also to a broad spectrum of the community who live, work, and contribute to a transitional Harlem. Most importantly, the museum has provided a unique opportunity to showcase the work of architects of African descent. This is a powerful opportunity in the history of blacks in architecture. The eighteen architects participating in the exhibition included Nathaniel Belcher, Milton S.F. Curry, J. Yolande Daniels, Felicia Davis, Darell Wayne Fields, Olalekan B. Jeyifous, Coleman A. Jordan, Gordon Kipping, Leyden Ynobe Lewis, Ronald Norsworthy, Todd Palmer, Emanuel Pratt, Zevilla Jackson Preston, Shawn Rickenbacker, Stephen Slaughter, Amanda Williams, Wilber Williams, and William Daryl Williams.

The curator’s choice of a metaphor-driven process to inspire works of visual allure was a wise choice. Art can be a great equalizer, and, in the case of this exhibition it serves to distance the work from the burden of form-driven expressions of architectural style. New York awaits further exhibits at the Studio Museum in Harlem that can pose the question of Harlem’s future.

**Glenn L. Smith is a landscape architect and urban designer practicing and teaching in Washington, D.C.**
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### Naming Names in the Battle Against Sprawl
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**DOLORES HAYDEN**

Pantheon Books, 2003

318 pages, b&w illustrations
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The unprecedented growth of cities in the last two hundred years has produced an epistemological quagmire from which we are still trying to extricate ourselves. The creation of the first residential suburbs in the beginning of the nineteenth century signaled the rapid erosion of the distinction between city and country. As the periphery of cities has continued to expand into agricultural hinterlands, and as the spatial relationships between home and workplace, families and communities have been stretched across the metropolitan landscape, the meaning of such terms as *urban, suburban, and rural* has become so ambiguous as to render them useless. *Suburbia*, the standby of the mid-twentieth century, no longer captures the essence of a landscape we all recognize but whose history we still misunderstand. Metaphors abound — asphalt nation, crabgrass frontier, bourgeois utopias — and new words are coined everyday — *edge city, runurb, privatopia* — each informed as much by ideology as analysis. *Sprawl* is the new catchall, so comprehensive and evocative that left and right have declared war in its name, the former in the name of sustainability, and the latter in the name of efficiency.

---

**A Field Guide to Sprawl**

**DOLORES HAYDEN** with aerial photographs by **JIM WARK**

W.W. Norton and Company, 2004

128 pages, color illustrations

$24.95 (cloth)

Into this epistemological and political fray, Dolores Hayden advances with two new books, a historian’s patient attention to the facts and a cultural critic’s eye for the absurd. “Contestation is the real story of suburbia,” Hayden believes (*Building Suburbia* p. 244), and her work is meant to provide ammunition to sustain the battle. The first book, *Building Suburbia: Green Fields and Urban Growth 1820–2000*, will be the more familiar to Hayden’s readers. She provides a diachronic categorization of the successive eras of suburban landscape formation and a review of seminal works of suburban history and criticism, including her own. The second, *The Field Guide to Sprawl*, is an illustrated dictionary of the morphology of sprawl. A complement to the first, it provides a synchronic view of this landscape in the making, using outstanding aerial photography.
by Jim Wark to illustrate and critique new development. With these two books, Hayden’s impulse is to “fix” and to act. She deliberately sheds the neutrality of the historian for the anger of the activist and articulates an agenda for her scholarship. These works are intended “to stimulate observation, discussion and organizing” (Field Guide p. 10). Her agenda is twofold: descriptive, because as she says “naming is critical to identification” but also political, because “identification is crucial to action” (p. 8). For Hayden, long overdue reform is clearly the responsibility of a general public and a professional community informed by history. It is for them, as well as the academic community, that she is writing. If in the end her prescriptions interfere with a balanced account, they do have the merit of being explicitly articulated. Hayden knows that the one who defines the terms defines the debate.

Building Suburbia displays Hayden’s skills as a cultural historian and feminist critic, honed in her previous work on domestic and public landscapes. She identifies seven suburban landscapes, from early-nineteenth-century borderlands to streetcar build-outs at the turn of the century to the rural fringes of recent decades, situating their formation in history and in the contemporary metropolis. She draws her material from a veritable “who’s who” of suburban history: Kenneth Jackson, Henry Binford, Robert Fishman, Lisbeth Cohen, and Grady Clay (to name but a few), as well as her own work. She also makes extensive use of primary source data such as reports published by the Washington-based Real Estate Corporation. The morphological description is enhanced by a historical account of the development process, notably the battles over land between what she identifies as the growth machine—developers and builders manipulating local and national government policy—and residents struggling to reconcile the American triple dream of a decent house, a connection to nature, and a sense of community.

Hayden’s tone shifts from historian to critic as she describes late-twentieth-century suburban development. Clearly there are bad guys (the real estate and highway lobbies), good guys (the planners), and victims (residents seeking a better life). She names four public subsidies as the primary culprits for fueling suburban expansion at the expense of city centers: FHA mortgage insurance, mortgage interest deductions, accelerated depreciation of new commercial property, and federal funding for highways. By the concluding chapters of her book, the architect and activist displace the critic, and she proposes a solution: to reinvigorate and reclaim the older suburbs. While Hayden is all too aware of the reform of the tax structure that this would require, her acute sensitivity to the spatial politics of age, race, gender, and income help her build a passionate case for the merit of doing so: savings in housing, infrastructure, and schools as well as a revitalization of transit and a better balance between housing and jobs.

Having established a historical nomenclature with Building Suburbia, Hayden pursues her epistemological charge with Field Guide, a “devil’s dictionary” that revels in the precision of fifty-one colloquial terms describing the physical elements of sprawl. Hayden argues that, in its vividness, slang fuses description and critique, mobilizing the imagination in a way that expert speech cannot. Phrases such as ball pork or mansion subsidy brilliantly evoke the thing itself as well as the process of making it. She argues that “sharpening citizen’s and professional’s ability to critique bad building patterns helps them to visualize positive changes” (p. 15). Each image is also accompanied by a definition—from alligator (investment producing negative cash flow) to zoomburg (a place growing faster than a boom burg)—that is a political and economic critique of what Hayden calls the “material representation of a political economy organized around unsustainable growth” (p. 13).

However, the book lacks an etymological dimension that would legitimate her selection and her sources, rooting the words in culture rather than in ideology. As a result, the tone of the book occasionally grates. It is a fine line between revelations that expose abuse and keep politicians and developers honest, and revelations that condemn, an easy shot for intellectuals critiquing popular culture. Her focus on edge conditions rather than on a more comprehensive representation of the metropolitan landscape reinforces the too easy dichotomy of urban versus suburban, planner versus entrepreneur, intellectual versus philistine, us versus them.

Nonetheless, and once again, Hayden has chosen to look where others had not thought to look, and if, in these two books, her passion for a better world has compromised her stance as a historian, it is to our benefit. Armed with more knowledge of what came before us and with what stands before us, we are better prepared to take position within the contested landscape of sprawl.

Jacqueline Tatom is assistant professor and director of the Master of Urban Design Program at the School of Architecture of Washington University in St. Louis.