CONTEXT ESSAY
CONTEXT ESSAY
MODERN MOVEMENT IN MARYLAND
Year One

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS ESSAY

The development of the Modern Movement in Maryland illustrates well the complexity of the Movement internationally: its range of pure and hybrid expressions, the interactions between design solutions and society, and its internal reassessment and change over time. In Maryland, the Movement unfolded in close relation to four kinds of modernization campaigns, which we will outline in section 1.4 below. Understanding the Modern Movement in the Free State, then, requires learning about the social, political, cultural, and economic contexts within which architects, planners, builders, landscape architects, and their clients designed modernist components of the built environment. Knowledge of the historical contexts will also enable preservationists to make informed decisions regarding the value of Modern Movement buildings and sites. This essay will set out those contexts in detail by focusing on the following questions: What major themes of development best characterize Maryland's Modern Movement resources? What were the economic, political, cultural and social currents of modernization in Maryland and how did they shape the built environment in different parts of the state? Which major factors pertaining to planning and architectural history does one need to take into account in order to understand the origins and evolution of the Modern Movement in Maryland? Which scholarship and research on the Modern Movement can help us better understand what happened in Maryland? What types of resources best exemplify the Movement's expression in Maryland and its impact on ordinary citizens of the State?

1.2 CHRONOLOGY

Modern architecture was slow to take root in Maryland.[1]   Indeed, Marylanders might be characterized as culturally conservative overall in their preference for a regional architecture derived from the State's colonial past. (Hill 1984, 202) This can be seen in the choice of Georgian Revival architecture for many official buildings, e.g., Government House, the University of Maryland College Park campus, and countless residential subdivisions across the state. Nonetheless, the Modern Movement began to assert itself after 1930. By analyzing our research—our resource database, biblio-biographies, windshield surveys, and interviews with architects and scholars—we discern four distinct periods in the development of modern architecture and planning in the state.

1930-1940. Before 1940, the state's significant contributions to the historiography of the Modern Movement were limited to the planning and design of Greenbelt, the competition for Goucher College, and Albert Kahn's Glenn Martin Aircraft Factory Buildings B and C in Middle River. In addition, a few houses, schools, and commercial structures manifested a willingness on the part of a handful of local designers to depart from traditional regional forms and Art Déco applied ornamentation. The Modern Movement in Maryland grew in close connection with politically sponsored modernization efforts and, during the 1930s, with the exception of Federal programs, economic and political conditions simply could not support extensive modernization.

1940-1946. During the Second World War, the technical and stylistic modernization of the built environment around industrial sites and military bases was a significant milestone in the development of Maryland's modern architecture, though it has been little studied previously. Progressively planned, rapidly built defense worker housing estates sprang up at key industrial installations and a new generation of designers was introduced to "modernity" by working in various government agencies.

---

[1] The close of the first phase of European modernism, 1930, after which the movement shifted due to internal critiques, marks the beginning of the Modern Movement in Maryland.

1947-1965. After the war, modernism blossomed in the most urbanized sections of the state and in the burgeoning middle-class subdivisions of Baltimore and Washington, D.C.   It shaped public housing and urban renewal policies in downtown Baltimore. Out-of-state designers of international stature received influential "prestige" commissions, while national firms also exercised their expertise, especially in the industrial and retail fields. Based either in the Baltimore or Washington regions, highly competent practitioners contributed to the shaping of fast-growing suburbs, creating schools, churches and synagogues, shopping centers, small commercial buildings, and a modern residential vernacular. Many of these local firms achieved great originality and design excellence; a number of them received national recognition, and others deserve to be re-evaluated.

1965-1972. The late 1960s and early 1970s witnessed major social, functional and stylistic transformations. Modern architecture entered a period of transition and some of Maryland's public and large commercial buildings reflected national trends, e.g. the new mannerism, brutalism, and theatrical minimalism. The broadening palette of modernist expression was also evident in new building types, e.g. day care centers, building campaigns for community and state colleges, suburban office complexes and campuses, and religious commissions, particularly Roman Catholic churches and schools. This late period of modernism also featured breakthroughs in residential community planning, the largest and best known being James Rouse's Columbia.

Some important examples of the Modern Movement in Maryland have been demolished or disfigured, but many highly significant structures remain extant and substantially unaltered.   This essay will provide an overview of these cultural resources, embedded in a narrative that provides the historical context necessary to evaluate their importance.

1.3 WORKING DEFINITIONS: MODERNIZATION, MODERNITY, AND MODERNISM

What was the Modern Movement? How can we best understand the social, political, economic, and cultural circumstances that helped to give the Movement its distinctive forms, internationally, nationally, and in the State of Maryland? The concepts of modernization, modernity, and modernism form a heuristic triad explaining the different dimensions of the transformations of the built environment that were encompassed in the Modern Movement. (*Gournay & Vanlaethem 7*)

The concept of **STRUCTURAL MODERNIZATION** denotes the concurrent systemic and organizational processes by which Western societies transformed their economies and societies and adopted modern ways of producing and living. The key components were industrialization, technological innovation, individualization, cultural differentiation, urbanization, bureaucratization, rationalization, and the growth of a consumer economy. These changes reinforced Western beliefs in human dominance over nature, and brought with them new patterns of working and living. For example, mechanical production entailed the division of labor, the separation of work from home, mass production, and the development of an emotionless, secularized, and depersonalized problem-solving attitude transmitted by mass education and the media. Modernization produced untold misery for its victims: peasants, artisans, women, and the colonized**.** The abstract notion of linear time replaced traditional cycles of work and holidays. Assembly line production brought scientific management and standardization, but it also created the conditions for generous wage policies for some workers and an expanding market for mass consumer goods. In the building industry, modernization implied a higher degree of organization, specialization, standardization, and efficiency. It included the professionalization of architectural practice and the introduction of new building types, construction materials, and techniques.   In planning, an inherently modern impulse, modernization implied metropolises organized into specialized districts and cities viewed as business propositions, planned for efficiency and productivity. (Cohen 1995)

MODERNITY focuses on the ideological dimension of the "modern." The term traces its origins to the invention of printing and, according to the French intellectual Jean Baudrillard, is neither a sociological or a political concept, nor strictly a historical one. It is a mode of civilization opposed to traditional culture and simultaneously tied to a technologically induced economic growth. (*Baudrillard 553*) Like all ideologies, it

pretends to be universal, a social practice relying on innovation, mobility (professional, geographical, marital…), and a dependence upon expert systems and their practitioners, with all the insecurities and destabilizing effects mobility and dependence on others' expertise can engender. It is a liberal bourgeois project tied to metropolitan culture. Modernity entered ordinary peoples' everyday lives "through the dissemination of modern art, the products of a consumer society, new technologies, and new modes of transportation and communication." (*Baudrillard 553*) It produced a set of disciplinary institutions, practices, and discourses that legitimated its modes of domination and control. (*Best 1991, 2-3*) It is popularly associated with the expectation of continual social and technological progress.

By the 1960s, when leisure and consumption began replacing labor as the foundations of Western civilization, advocates of "post-modernism" (in all cultural fields, including architecture) claimed that modernity had reached a dead end. For them, what began as a moral ideology and a philosophy of progress had become a mere fashion, an aesthetic of change for change's sake that destroyed old values without replacing them. Modernity was criticized for its "universalizing and totalizing claims," for "its belief that theory mirrors reality, and for its supposition of the rational and unified (as opposed to decentered and fragmented) subject. (*Best 4-5*)

When applied to architecture, Modernity usually refers to aesthetic and stylistic factors, but it can also manifest itself through technological and programmatic achievements. This was the case in the United States and in Maryland, especially before World War II, when the "form" of a building could remain traditional while its "content" was already progressive.

MODERNISM is a cultural construct that applies to a creative process, literary or artistic. It repudiates precedents and conventions inherited from the past and promotes new, subjective forms of cultural practice, aimed at exploring the specificity of each of the arts (*Greenberg 1965*). Modernist writing, for example, is highly subjective and self-referential, reflecting back to the creative process, the author's mind, to language itself. With regard to architecture, modernism is an autonomous exploration of abstract space and tectonics. We can think of it as an evolving design philosophy, which we shall analyze in greater detail below.

1.4 THESIS

Who sponsored the Modern Movement in Maryland? The primary argument that weaves through this context essay is that four kinds of modernization campaigns, led by very different agents, shaped the Free State's built environment between 1930 and 1972. First were Federal policies from the New Deal era and World War II defense build-up, national defense highway construction, and urban renewal. The second kind of campaign was state-sponsored. Several governors promoted agendas to modernize the state's infrastructure and public services. Governor Ritchie began modernization efforts in the 1930s, but the lion's share of the work must be credited to Governors McKeldin and Tawes in the 1950s and early 1960s. The new middle-class suburbanites in the Baltimore-Washington corridor, who rose to political power in the 1950s and 1960s, spearheaded the modernization of planning, infrastructure, nonpartisan municipal management, and education, frequently choosing modernist forms for their schools, homes, and offices. (Callcott 2001) A fourth set of campaigns was undertaken by entrepreneurs, e.g. Glenn Martin who greatly expanded the aircraft industry in the state in the 1930s and 40s, and James Rouse, who developed several planned residential and commercial centers in the 1950s and 60s, among others. One additional factor cannot be overlooked in accounting for the acceptance of non-traditional design in the state's most forward-looking cultural circles: Baltimore's cultural elites introduced modernity and modernism and an appreciation for the avant garde through their cultural patronage of music and art, especially after the late 1940s.

Until recently, scholars of Modern Movement architecture have mostly emphasized the third component of this triad, especially the notion of a break from historicism and tradition. Our research has demonstrated the need to supplement this mode of thinking. Consequently, we propose the following three-step rationale for comprehending the full scope of the Movement in the State. First, the popularization of modern design in Maryland must be studied within larger anterior and concomitant processes of modernization. Second, we must understand it

as the outcome of local embodiments of the modernity concept, i.e., embodiments that are particular to the United States and to the Mid-Atlantic region. Third, we must carve out definitions of modernism that are appropriate to the ways modernist design unfolded here. To further clarity this rationale, we refer to recent scholarship that has broadened the conceptual framework and factual knowledge of twentieth century architecture and shaped a more pluralistic historiography of the Modern Movement.

1.5 COMMON WISDOM AND RE-EVALUATION OF MODERN MOVEMENT ARCHITECTURE

Early scholarship tended to produce a canonical narrative of the Modern Movement that focused on early European modernism and presented the "International Style" as the purest expression and the mainstream of a movement that, in fact, had complex contours, responded to local cultures and climates, and changed with the times. It is useful to review the canonical definition of the International Style as a point of departure for exploring the Movement's particular manifestations in Maryland. We have already referred to modernism as an exploration of abstract space and tectonics. Several other key tenets were identified by European architects in countless published manifestoes, starting with Adolf Loos' "Ornament and Crime" of 1908 (*Conrads 19-24*). They included an idealistic adulation of the new, a cult of originality, and a desire to express the spirit of the age, as opposed to ancestral values.   Several writers made aesthetic and moralistic reference to industrial forms and to the use of industrial materials (glass, concrete, metal) and methods of production, resulting in a "machine for living" philosophy. Others articulated a desire to implement and express greater hygiene--literal and moral transparency through the penetration of light, sun, and air. Just as central was the belief that rational design could be an agent of internationalism, a social equalizer, and solve the evils of industrial society; architects had a major role to play, in other words, as social engineers. Another tenet, promoted particularly strongly by Walter Gropius, a father figure for several post-World II Maryland architects, was an emphasis on the principle of collaboration in the arts: art, architecture, furnishings, interior design, and landscape.

How did these canonical tenets translate into ideal or built forms? Standard texts teach that the Modern Movement instituted a "black-and-white" credo based on categorical rejection of anything connected with tradition, eclecticism, and academicism and an endorsement of "contrary" and "unprecedented" design principles:

- No static mass, but free flowing and dynamic volumes
- No academic bi-axial regularity, but balanced asymmetry
- No applied ornament, but an integral expression of structural (and programmatic) integrity
- No added furniture, but built-ins
- No clustered, specialized rooms, but interconnected, generally multi-functional spaces

Le Corbusier, arguably the primary figurehead of the Movement, published his famous "Five points towards a new architecture" in 1926 (*Conrads, 99-101*). In it he promoted the adoption of universal design tenets**,** abstracted from the local landscape, materials, and traditions.   He encouraged other architects to differentiate between structural (skeletal frame) and non-load bearing elements of a building (as walls did not have a supportive function anymore) and to favor flat terrace roofs. This newly found freedom from structure affected both design in plan and elevation. It meant that architects could employ ribbon instead of rectangular elongated windows—bands instead of holes in the wall—and abandon tightly bounded rooms to experiment with the free flow of interior space. (*Jordy 122*)

Despite all these universalizing dogmas, the Modern Movement left room for personal interpretation and singularities. For instance, unexpected juxtapositions, and ironic collisions of form and metaphor were especially visible in the work of Le Corbusier, while the purification of primary forms, achieved by refining, adjusting, simplifying, perfecting primary shapes and their relationships, reached its climax in the work of Mies van der Rohe. (*Jordy 124-7 and 128*)

Recently scholars have challenged how well the International Style represents both the Modern Movement and its aesthetic values. They have questioned the canonical assertion that modernist architects worked in an aesthetic, non-referential vacuum, that they were hostile to design precedents, and adopted the Machine aesthetic as a universal answer in all locales and for all requirements. The new scholarship refuses to focus only on "highbrow design," canonical landmarks, and isolated masters, such as Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe and Frank Lloyd Wright. It also challenges the assertion that structural and functional integrity was fundamental to modernism, an item of faith that, in fact, was frequently more perceptual than real.

Indeed, several scholars have developed counter-narratives that more accurately portray the scope and contours of the Modern Movement on both sides of the Atlantic. They emphasize, for example, the "humanist" dimensions of modern design--how modernity and modernism did not always require the radical rejection of traditional urban and suburban forms *(Wright 1995)*. Much modern design was keenly attuned to social and political change and it was "filtered through the particularities of local tastes and conditions" *(Wright 30)*. The machine aesthetic, in other words, was integrated into vernacular forms. Other scholars have analyzed how compliance with tectonic and environmental requirements re-directed the modernist credo *(Banham / Frampton)*. Greater attention is also being paid to the cross-fertilization of collaborative work between the planning and architectural professions, designer(s) and client(s), and among architects themselves (*Friedman*). "Hybrid movements" that combined traditional or eclectic values with state-of-the-art functional requirements, and academic methods of composition with cutting edge technology, are now included in accounts of modernism *(Gournay 1990)*. Also, a transatlantic perspective has allowed scholars to see how North Americans first put forward the technological and programmatic dimensions of modernity, as opposed to the stylistic dimensions first worked out in Europe, and how the New World's tradition of pragmatism played against European modernist ideals (*Gournay 1998)*.

What does our research suggest about the characteristics of the Modern Movement in Maryland with respect to canonical narratives of modernism and the challenges to them? It is apparent that the practitioners who designed the Free State's modern built environments participated avidly in the broad postwar international discourse on modernism's prospects. (*Goldhagen 21*). Modern architecture in Maryland is best thought of as a movement with a set of generative principles rather than a style. (*Goldhagen 302*) The buildings and landscapes we have identified and the architects we have interviewed suggest that designers experimented with a range of modernist design solutions and took different positions as architects critiqued from within and changed the direction of the movement during the postwar era. Many of the architects of significant modernist structures or cultural landscapes in Maryland can be considered "Situated Modernists." Situated Modernists adapted the principles of modernism to specific contextual and programmatic requirements; in Maryland's case, they responded to the exigencies of the modernization campaigns we mentioned previously, among other stimuli. They emphasized local materials, vernacular traditions, and sense of place, seeking to shape buildings and neighborhood to the needs of their users. (*Goldhagen 312-13*) Modern design in Maryland was stylistically heterogeneous and evolving, in other words, but those characteristics placed it near the heart of modernist discourse internationally after World War II.

1.6 HISTORICAL SCOPE / INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS

These characteristics of the Modern Movement in Maryland have affected the scope and our decisions about what to include and exclude in our study. Because of the timing and pace of the key modernization campaigns, most modernist planning, landscaping, and architecture in Maryland, whether high style or vernacular, occurred after World War II, from 1947, when construction took off, to the mid-1960s, when the seeds for "post-modern" design started being planted. In the standard historiographies, this period relates to the second phase of modern design in the United States or what is commonly referred to as the late International Style (although we have indicated previously the shortcomings of the standard account). We shall focus the context essay on this period when modern design flourished in the Free State and across America.

How did we select structures to be included in our survey? Resources constructed between 1947 and 1965, the period when the Movement flourished in Maryland, generally had straightforward modernist characteristics. They were closely tied to the governors' modernization campaigns, middle class migration to the Baltimore / Washington suburbs, or urban renewal. Their character will be discussed in detail in Section 5. The World War II era represented a discrete entity in the history of the Modern Movement. Buildings constructed as part of the defense emergency and mobilization for war had unique features that will be outlined in Section 4. In the remainder of Section 1.6, we will focus on special inclusions and exclusions for the pioneering experiments of the 1930s and the transitional designs of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

During the pioneering decade, the 1930s, the Modern Movement in Maryland consisted of a handful of experiments and structures, as indicated in Section 1.2 and discussed more fully in Section 3. These designs varied substantially from one another; some were clearly transitional to modernism. They are "all over the place" in terms of physical characteristics or style. From these years, we shall only consider resources in four categories. The first is designs that demonstrated significant departures from academic composition and historical styles in elevation and plan and/or displayed little or no applied ornamentation. (See, for examples, the Dr. Strong House in Gibson Island, FIG 1.1, and Patterson Park High School, FIG 1.2). The second category we shall study consists of designs that announced new directions in their use of original, and generally industrial, construction methods and materials. Here we are thinking of experiments in heavy prefabrication (e.g., John Joseph Earley's Polychrome Houses in Silver Spring, FIG 3.8), commercial or residential facades and interiors that make extensive use of glass blocks, reflective panels, accents in aluminum, and matte metal accents in general. The third category includes buildings that translated their functional modernity into a-historical forms. These could be manifestations of mass consumption (e.g., department stores) and mass entertainment (e.g., movie theaters) or buildings otherwise complying with the "advertising agenda," structures catering to the automobile (e.g., gas stations) and mass transit (e.g., bus stations and highway stops). We will also pay attention to a fourth category, a version of Streamline Moderne which can be dubbed the "Greenbelt style," after the architecture of this community's flat-roofed row houses, apartments and shopping center. These buildings were clearly inspired by modernist housing experiments in Europe, however. They exhibit straightforward masses, often with rounded corners. They are often built of brick or cinder block painted white, sometimes with banding in contrasting colors. They have large metal casement windows, sometimes placed in corner positions, as well as thin canopies held up by slender supports.

"Art déco" and its particular manifestation, "Streamline Moderne," require additional discussion, however. The Art déco style met with moderate success in the mid-Atlantic region, which remained more attached to Beaux-Arts classicism and the Georgian Revival than most other parts of North America. Few examples of the flamboyant, pre-Depression "Jazz Moderne" designs were built in the state. (*Gebhard 1970/Wirz and Striner/Cuchiella*). In the 1930s, during the second phase of Art déco, the "Streamline Moderne" was more popular. Although it never approached the Colonial Revival in appeal, it lingered well into the 1940s. In our survey of pre-1947 modernism, we shall include only the most forward-looking interpretations of Art déco, those that showcase structural and aesthetic transformations that anticipate postwar design. We shall also consider on a case-by-case basis--after direct examination, as photographs can be misleading--a few remaining Moderne structures as precursors to the Modern Movement. We do not want to emphasize Art déco because there is little historical continuity between "Moderne" and "Modern" in Maryland. Besides James R. Edmunds, Jr., few Baltimore architects switched from one idiom to the other. A new generation of local practitioners trained in the 1930s popularized modern design.

Thus, among the Art déco examples, we intend to exclude designs that exhibit rich ornamentation, polychromy, elaborate craftsmanship, and syncopated motifs of chevrons, as exemplified in New York's skyscrapers of the late 1920s. In Maryland, this idiom found expression in Taylor and Fisher's Baltimore Trust Building (currently Nations Bank, 1929) the only déco skyscraper in the state, and in small garden apartments. We will also exclude modernized versions of neo-classical designs, which were popular for civic and high-end commercial commissions in the 1930s. Buildings such as Rockville's First National Bank (1931) for example, do not qualify in a study on the Modern Movement. Their design results from the streamlining of academic, symmetrical compositions and the geometric stylization of classical decor without reevaluating the role of tectonics and ornamentation.

From the late 1960s to the early 1970s, Maryland, just like the rest of the country, went through a transitional period, when rejection of minimalism gave rise to early manifestations of post-modernism. Buildings expounding this trend, such as certain domestic designs and the early work of Frank Gehry and his then associates in Columbia, will be included in our survey, because they will expand considerably our understanding of late modernity and modernism in the Mid-Atlantic region. We shall end our study with designs finalized by 1972. One of the reasons we chose this cut date was to include Peterson and Brickbauer's Baltimore County Public Safety Building (today the Maryland Blue Cross Building) in Towson (FIG. 1.4). This cube sums up the modernist fascination for pure form and the poetic and tectonic qualities of glass, while it simultaneously announces the coming obsession for reflective glass of architects designing during the 1970s, as well as a new era in suburban office design.[2] We do not want to go later than 1972 because the early 1970s marked a notable rupture in Maryland's "everyday modernism." After 1972, a more heavy-handed design approach muddled ideals of minimalist elegance, clarity of composition, simple balance between void and mass, transparency, and economy of materials. We shall see, in fact, the premises of this rather inauspicious evolution in designs of the late 1960s. In small, service-oriented buildings (e.g., libraries, community centers, and schools) modesty gave way to heroic posturing, as expressed by thick cornices hiding terrace roofs. The popularization of air conditioning as well as justified or exaggerated security concerns made buildings much more opaque and introverted. Such an unfortunate evolution renders even more urgent the survey and protection of the few modest examples of High Modernism by very competent, but currently obscure, designers that have remained almost untouched.

1.7 GEOGRAPHIC SECTORS

Maryland has remained, as stated by historian George Callcott in <u>Maryland and America, 1940 to 1980,</u> "a mosaic of particulars" (*Callcott 1985,1*). Although one of the smallest, Maryland is also one of the most diverse states, in terms of both physical and cultural geography. The geographical realities distinguishing the mountainous west, piedmont, tidewater, the Eastern shore, southern Maryland, and the Washington-Baltimore conurbation have strongly influenced the distribution of Modern Movement resources. Our research and surveying has attempted to cover all aspects of the diverse landscapes of Maryland. Adding to the geographic particularities of the state's regions, each area we researched exhibited major differences in terms of historical legacy and economic development—which relates directly to whether or not a particular part of the state was a fertile ground for the adoption of the Modern Movement, how early, in what building types, and so on.

As expected, we found, in general, a great deal of Modern resources in metropolitan Baltimore and Washington and significantly fewer Modern resources in counties outside the core consisting of Montgomery, Prince George's, Baltimore (City and County), Howard and Anne Arundel. Some building types transcended this geographical patterning, e.g. schools, banks and office buildings, and factory complexes. Architectural publications provided the best coverage of designs commissioned in the population centers of the state, both urban and suburban, and buildings constructed within the boundaries of American Institute of Architects local chapters. In addition, specialized publications focusing on particular building types, e.g. schools, banks, and churches, provided valuable information about these types of resources across the state. The following order reflects chronological and numerical primacy of Modern resources, as our research has revealed.

• **Greater Baltimore:**
The Modern Movement made a substantial imprint on downtown Baltimore as well as the outlying residential districts, and suburbs. Many out-of-state firms of national stature had important commissions in greater Baltimore. In addition, the Baltimore chapter of the AIA was a dynamic organization and many Baltimore firms, e.g. Fisher, Nes, and Campbell and Partners, RTKL, and Cochran, Stephenson, and Wing designed important works of modernism in the city and its surrounds. During the 1950s and 1960s, downtown Baltimore was the site of an important urban

_____

[2] Another, better known, early example of reflective glass abstraction is Cesar Pelli's Pacific Design Center in Los Angeles completed in 1971, dubbed the Blue Whale.

renewal project, the Charles Center. Baltimore inherited an "elite suburban tradition" to a greater extent than other Eastern Seaboard cities. Since the 18th century, many rich merchants "pretending to be country gentry" had elected to live on the outskirts of the city *(Callcott 1985, 20)*. During the late 19th century, Baltimore's upper-middle class suburbanites established two widely renowned planned, exclusive suburbs, Roland Park and Guilford. From 1917 to 1940, the proportion of Baltimore's social register families who lived beyond the Johns Hopkins University grew from 8 to 60 percent *(Callcott 1985, 20)*. The explosive suburbanization of both elite and middle-class Baltimore coincided with the widespread acceptance of Modern Movement design in the late 1940s, resulting in a landscape well-stocked with many types of Modern buildings and landscapes.

• **The D.C. suburbs:**
Montgomery and Prince George's Counties were transformed in the mid-20th century, and this transformation produced many Modern Movement buildings and landscapes.[3] Montgomery County was considered part of Western Maryland until the 1920s--"sharing the west's conflicting agrarian and industrial economy, its two-party system and its fear of Baltimore City" *(Callcott 1985, 19)*. Serious suburban development picked up in both counties in the 1930s, but it was the postwar boom between 1945 and 1965 that produced significant Modern resources in towns such as Silver Spring, Bethesda, Wheaton, Rockville, and many suburban tracts in between. Prince George's County was initially part of Southern Maryland, "with a tobacco and slavery heritage and dominance by community elites." *(Callcott 1985, 19)*. Its suburban development trajectory was different from Montgomery County's. As Callcott put it, "suburban country club developers mostly found their way to the rolling wooded lots of Montgomery, while factory industries and their workers followed the rail lines" across Prince George's *(Callcott 22)*. By mid-20th century, both counties had been pulled firmly into the metropolitan Washington orbit, sharing regional transportation and economic webs. In the 1950s, a group of gifted young architects infused the D.C. architectural scene with a spirit of adventure; they are responsible for many important Modern Movement examples of housing tracts and estates, commercial facilities, churches, and office buildings throughout the region.

• **The Baltimore-Washington corridor:**
The land connecting suburban D.C. and Baltimore—upper Prince George's, Howard, Anne Arundel, and Baltimore Counties—was a hotbed of the Modern Movement, as Gottman's idea of a continuous urban "Megalopolis" was realized in the postwar period. The pioneering modernism of Greenbelt and Columbia stand out as exemplars of the Modern Movement's transformative architecture and planning models (both in the state of Maryland and nationally). For the purposes of this study, Annapolis can be considered as an analog to the Baltimore-Washington corridor. Though the main and defining buildings of the city remained traditional in character, new building activity at St. John's College, the Naval Academy, and on the outskirts of the capital was strongly influenced by the Modern Movement, just as the other suburban counties were in the postwar period.

• **Western Maryland:**
The Western counties (which by 1960 included Garrett, Allegany, Washington, Frederick, and Carroll) encountered Modernism in less encompassing ways than the rest of the state. Although each had some industrial presence—Fairchild Aircraft in Washington, Kelly-Springfield Tire and Westvaco Paper Mill in Allegheny, for example--many industries suffered precipitous declines in the 1940s and 1950s, or had erratic growth at best. *(Callcott 17)* As a result, the kinds of local building activities that might find expression in Modern Movement architecture were relatively flat in the cities and nearly non-existent in rural areas during the postwar period. For example, more than 75% of the housing stock in Allegheny County today dates back before 1930. Nonetheless, what prosperity there was registered in pockets of Modernist architecture or planning in the few urban centers, e.g. Hagerstown, Cumberland, and Oakland. The Modern Movement made a stronger appearance on the scene of these less prosperous parts of the State in the form of schools, libraries, college campuses, churches, prisons, and small banks and commercial

---

[3] Developments in Washington, D.C., had a lot to do with architectural design in the adjoining Maryland and Virginia counties. In the perfect world, this region would be treated as one. We must exclude D.C. proper and Northern Virginia from any comprehensive treatment in this context essay and survey, though we will allude to the District's architectural milieu and establishment on occasion.

buildings—the sort of building types comprising the everyday fabric of effectively <u>all</u> communities, and receiving renewed investment in the postwar period as part of the Governors' modernization campaigns.

• **Eastern Shore and Southern Maryland:**
Like the Western counties, the Eastern Shore and Southern counties have a fundamentally different geography of Modern Movement resources from that of the state's metropolitan, Baltimore-D.C. core.   Callcott characterizes this region as "the most self-consciously separate of the sections within Maryland." (*Callcott 10*) Remaining mostly rural, Modernism arrived late and more sporadically, evidenced in the urban centers (places such as Salisbury, Cambridge, and Easton), and in 'everyday' building types such as schools and churches. Other anomalies in the region's economic development—notably the tourism industry on the shore, and military facilities—did, however, result in significant Modern Movement developments in these outlying areas of the state.

SECTION 2: CONTEXTS OF THE EARLY MODERN MOVEMENT IN MARYLAND

2.1 MARYLAND'S INITIAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC MODERNIZATION

Although by 1910, Maryland had become a predominantly urban state, neither city nor state governments responded adequately to the consequences of industrialization and congestion in the cities. Maryland lagged behind most other Eastern Seaboard states in its implementation of structural modernization. Between 1910 and 1920, urban migration stimulated by World War I triggered population increases of 70% in industrial Hagerstown, 36.6 % in Cumberland; 31.4% in Baltimore, and 30.3% in Annapolis, although during the same decade the Eastern Shore began experiencing demographic decline. (*Crooks 590*) Perhaps the State's failure to implement thoroughgoing improvements in urban infrastructure stemmed from the fact that the capital, Annapolis, remained poor and "off the beaten paths of commerce" (*Brugger 1988, 435*). Or perhaps it was because the rural counties were over-represented in the state legislature and there existed an uneasy partnership between Baltimore, which had half of Maryland's population, and the rest of the state. Whatever the reason, Baltimore's congestion was extreme and its infrastructure completely inadequate.

If the State was not able to undertake significant structural modernization in Baltimore during the opening years of the 20th century, neither was Baltimore's political machine. By 1900, Baltimore was "the only major city in the United States without a sewage system." The fire of 1904, which devastated 70 city blocks, did not trigger sweeping municipal reforms, despite the need to reconstruct a large sector of the downtown (*Crooks 1983, 619*). What planning and building did occur was piecemeal. Although a Municipal Art Society was created in 1899 and the Public Athletic League spearheaded by banker Robert Garrett in 1908 helped create parks and playgrounds, the city did not play a significant role in the national planning scene. The seeds of reform planted at the time did not extend to architecture. The progressive reform agenda spearheaded by Johns Hopkins University's faculty took the form of social science and public health programs, anchored by an outstanding medical school, but did not extend to the planning or architecture of its campus or the city beyond. (*Crooks, 1983, 657*)[4] Even so, many physical and mental health problems were not adequately addressed; throughout the state, sanatoria and mental hospitals were not erected in sufficient numbers.

During the 1920s, Downtown Baltimore, which had seen an upsurge of fine buildings after the 1904 fire, did not experience as extensive a building boom as some other Northeastern cities. Nor did it develop comprehensive planning policies, although zoning regulations, resulting in greater functional segregation of city districts, were adopted in 1927. As inner city neighborhoods continued to decline, Maryland's largest city experienced significant housing problems. Row houses of East Baltimore were subdivided into unhealthy tenements. Although a housing code passed in 1908 provided some regulation, it did not establish standards for one- or two-family homes, which were very numerous in the city. No public funds were directed toward housing betterment until the New Deal era.

Also during the 1920s, a notable modernization of industrial infrastructure began to unfold in Baltimore and across the state. "Baltimore became the eastern center of the new glamour aircraft industry as Glenn L. Martin, Berliner-Joyce, Doyle Aero and Curtiss-Caprivi built factories and fields in the area." Bethlehem Steel, which was also involved in shipbuilding, invested $100,000,000 to expand its Sparrows Point facility. American Sugar and Western Electric also developed major new plants, (*Brown 697*) as did Kelly-Springfield in Cumberland, the Celanese Corporation in nearby Amcelle, Black and Decker in Hagerstown, and Bendix Corporation in Towson. Generally, because their headquarters were not in Maryland, these companies had little stake in the areas where they settled. Their economic activity "alternated between feast and famine" (*Callcott*)

---

[4] During the early 20th century, the JHU faculty included Woodrow Wilson and liberal economist Richard Ely.

Maryland started exceeding the national rate of population growth only in the 1930s, when demographic expansion benefited Greater Washington most. Several communities in D.C.'s Maryland suburbs, which cropped up along train and trolley lines, were peopled by the many men and women who had joined federal agencies during World War I and decided to remain in the Capital region after the Armistice. *(Brugger 443, 447)* The number of civil servants increased again during the Depression, leading to a new influx of population in the capital region, which remained concentrated along transportation corridors leading out from the District of Columbia. Hence the surge of Art deco garden apartments and streamlined neo-Georgian townhouses in Silver Spring, when developers created what Richard Longstreth calls an "alternative downtown" *(Longstreth 19)*.

In Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, structural modernization was also piecemeal and took several forms. A few residential communities, such as Chevy Chase and Garrett Park in Montgomery and University Park in Prince George's, had been well or even comprehensively planned; they featured extensive modern infrastructures and, in the case of Chevy Chase and University Park, were ruled by strict deed covenants.[5] (*Lampl 1998/ Fawcett 1903/Sies 1987*). A few outlying shopping centers with provision for parking were constructed during this era as well; Silver Spring, in fact, was a regional leader in planning ample parking lots in close proximity to suburban stores (*Longstreth 250*).

Regional planning for the Washington suburbs became a reality with the creation of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission in 1927. M-NCPPC had the power to zone, to control plats, and to acquire, develop, and maintain parks on an area of approximately 141 square miles in Montgomery and Prince George's counties. Approved in 1928, its comprehensive zoning scheme was meant to organize and regulate metropolitan Washington. It encouraged the growth of major existing business centers, providing for three of these, in Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Hyattsville. It also specified industrial areas, multiple-family housing zones, and zones for single and for a mix of one-and two-family houses.[6] (*Eliot 114)* The park and creek system, which extended D.C.'s Rock Creek Park, provided passive and active recreation and picturesque settings for single-family homes. Local private interests, still very powerful in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, devised in 1928 the East West Highway connector—a relatively unusual instance of inter-county cooperation, but essentially a tool for landowners to increase the value of their abutting property. In 1916, the General Assembly created a Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSCC) to coordinate planning for water and sewage disposal in the belt around Washington. Costing taxpayers $2.2 million, the system provided water, fire hydrants, sewer systems, and storm drains for the growing Maryland suburbs. (*Brugger, 443, 446-7)*

One other major federal planning decision, moving the Naval Hospital to Bethesda (1937), was also quite prophetic of further suburban trends. As stated by Eric Hurtt, the National Naval Medical Center was "emblematic of modernism as it influenced suburban development in a variety if ways: the expansion of government and business out of the cities, and the beginning of the abandonment of the city; the consequent self-referential nature of suburban towers in the park; and the parasitic growth strategies of the suburban hospital." (*Hurtt 2002).*[7]

---

[5] It should be pointed out that Roland Park, outside Baltimore, was one of the most comprehensively planned, exclusive suburbs in the nation; it was widely published and publicized and, no doubt, influenced other planned communities nationwide.

[6] The powers granted to M-NCPPC to govern planning and zoning were extensive and rivaled some of the most progressive park and planning agencies nationally, e.g. the Minneapolis Park System. Such entities were often created by progressive or "good government" reformers to maneuver around urban political machines.

[7]Hurtt also noted that although Paul Cret argued for a limestone cladding for the Naval Hospital, President Roosevelt chose instead a thoroughly modern material: an aggregate of Portland cement, white sand, and quartz which had been used at David W. Taylor Model Basin, and could be cast as panels, resulting in the appearance of limestone but at a considerable savings.

2.2 THE WEIGHT OF TRADITION IN THE MID-ATLANTIC REGION

2.2.1 SOCIAL AND CULTURAL FOUNDATIONS

During the years between World Wars I and II, Maryland remained a politically, socially, and culturally conservative state. The climate was simply not supportive of radical or even moderate social modernization of the kind that might have underwritten substantial architectural or planning innovation. It would require a major shift in political power after the war—from farmlands and urban political bosses to civic minded, professional-managerial suburbanites—before modern management and liberal progressive ideas would replace "patronage politics." (*Callcott 53; Callcott 2001*) Democrats, entrenched in the status quo, generally controlled the governor's office; Republicans won elections only when Democrats were divided. If none of the "Old Line" governors, senators, and Baltimore mayors were ultra-conservative, few could be considered liberal, by any stretch of the imagination. Millard Tydings, Democratic Senator for 24 years, strongly opposed public housing measures in the Senate, for example. Governor Ritchie (Dem., 1920-1936) was among the most progressive movers and shakers of the State; he fought prohibition, improved education, and distinguished himself as an early advocate for efficient management. Still, Ritchie was adamantly anti-Federalist, and a proponent of small government; his positions resulted in Maryland receiving the smallest amount of New Deal aid among the Eastern states. *(Brown 1983)* Baltimore mayor Howard Jackson (Dem., 1931-43), on the other hand, was "generally supportive of the New Deal and somewhat ahead of the state in expanding social and welfare services during the depression" (*Callcott 1985*). Bolstering the status quo politics was the most influential press consortium in the State, the *Sunpapers* group. It remained conservative, as did its best-known staff writer, H.L. Mencken, who was reputed to have generally acerbic reactions toward modernism (*Brown 676).*

Socially and culturally, Marylanders generally shunned innovation and risk during the interwar years. Racial and religious segregation was the norm, even in liberal Montgomery County, and the resulting social divisions further hampered efforts at social modernization.[8] From a cultural standpoint Maryland elites were generally conservative. George Callcott distinguishes three categories among Baltimore's civic-minded elite, each with its own places of worship and gentlemen's clubs. First was the former "Southern aristocracy," connected with the Maryland Club and Maryland Historical Society; they made their cultural mark collecting and promoting history. The second group was the "Northern Elite," whose members emigrated to Baltimore in the 19th century; they promoted educational enterprises and were closely associated with Johns Hopkins University. The third group consisted of Jewish merchants who collected and patronized the arts; they were associated with the Peabody Institute and the Baltimore Museum of Art (BMA). (*Callcott 2001*) Despite these groups' generally middlebrow tastes, a few seeds of avant-garde "high culture" were planted, particularly in the arts. For example, the famed collection of European avant-garde painting assembled by the Cone Sisters was exhibited at the BMA in 1930 and donated to the institution in 1949. From the late 1930s onwards, the BMA showcased progressive art, introducing ideas of modernity into Baltimore's cultural scene.[9] Popular culture, and especially jazz, which represented an important facet of America's cultural modernity, proliferated in Baltimore, but we have yet to find any direct influence on architecture.[10]

2.2.2 MARYLAND'S ARCHITECTURAL MILIEU

---

[8] African Americans comprised only 17% of state residents, but 51% of black residents lived in the City of Baltimore in 1930. [

[9] In 1938, the museum exhibited *Modern Crafts*, as well as a retrospective of photographs by Edward Steichen; in 1939, it displayed a collection of "non-objective paintings" on loan from New York's Salomon R. Guggenheim Museum; in 1944, it showed an exhibition of contemporary American crafts. More research is needed on the role of other Baltimore institutions, such as the Walters Art Gallery, the Maryland Art Institute, the Peabody Institute, and the Enoch Pratt Free Library, in the early dissemination of ideas of modernity.

[10]Possible connections between popular culture and architecture might take the form of clubs, bars, restaurants, lounges, and movie theatres.

Although Baltimore's elites, like their counterparts in Washington, D.C. and Philadelphia, may have possessed conservative tastes in artistic matters, this does not mean that they turned their backs on good design. Indeed, wealthy citizens had been commissioning buildings from first-rate, nationally known, architects, especially from New York City firms, since the "American Renaissance" period (1876-1917). The results could be outstanding, as, for example, in Stanford White's Lovely Lane Methodist Church (1887), which was quite "modern" for its time period, and Delano and Aldrich's palazzo-like Walters Art Gallery (1905-09). In the 1920s, John Russell Pope, Charles McKim's designated heir, received two of the city' most prestigious commissions: University Baptist Church (1926) and the BMA (1929). Pope's designs epitomized the gentility and classical rigor that was synonymous with refined tastes at the time.

As for the architectural communities themselves, they were thriving during the early 20th century—although neither group in Baltimore or Washington, D.C. was as large as those in Philadelphia or New York City. Turn-of-the-century Baltimore counted many competent local firms. Some of them (in particular, Parker & Thomas and Wyatt & Sperry, which became Wyatt & Nolting) provided the first employment after graduation. They were an additional training ground for many of the designers who would play a significant role in popularizing modern design in Maryland later on. Compared to New York and Philadelphia, Baltimore could not boast as powerful a "Beaux-Arts lobby," since few local designers had attended the Paris Ecole des Beaux-Arts. Nonetheless, in the 1920s, the tenets of French academic training were passed on to a new generation of future Baltimore designers: John Henry Scarff, who studied at MIT; Julius Caesar Meyer of Meyer, Ayers, & Saint, Robert Erskine Lewis, G. Comer Fenhagen, Jackson P. Ketcham, and Lucius White, who studied at the University of Pennsylvania under Paul Cret; William D. Lambdin, who studied at Cornell; Wrenn & Jencks, who studied at Columbia; and Charles M. Nes, who studied at Princeton. *(Please see biographies).* The local "darling" of the Baltimore elite during the early 20th century was Lawrence Hall Fowler (1876-1971), an erudite and sociable graduate of Columbia University who successfully passed the challenging examination to enter the Paris Ecole des Beaux-Arts, but apparently never entered any design competition once registered. Fowler, who maintained the tradition of the gentleman architect, worked extensively on the Johns Hopkins campus and designed a number of houses in the planned, exclusive suburbs of Roland Park and Guilford. (*Verheyen 1984).* For some firms established prior to 1940 -- a good example being Wrenn, Lewis, and Jenks -- the transition from revivalism to International Style after World War II was slow, "rocky," and sometimes never complete, as they adopted traditional or more modern idioms, depending upon the client's taste and the requirements of the program.

2.2.3 A MUTLI-FACETED REVIVALISM

During the opening years of our study period, Maryland's architecture might best be characterized as a multi-faceted revivalism. Many large public and civic structures built throughout Maryland in the 1930s -- such as the Montgomery County courthouse and the Enoch Pratt Library -- followed the "Washington idiom," a severe neo-classicism inspired by Imperial Rome and the work of Robert Mills. Domestic and religious architecture remained essentially indebted to historical precedents as well, as evidenced in entire districts or towns, such as Rodgers Forge in Towson and University Park in Prince George's County. Revivalism also reflected a strong attachment to fine craftsmanship. Perhaps expressing the "zeitgeist" of heightened isolationism and nationalism, however, the Colonial Revival might be considered Maryland's "official" revival style. Good examples are Fowler's Hall of Records, completed in Annapolis in 1933, and two schools, very conservative, erected with PWA funding: the Bethesda-Chevy Chase and Montgomery-Blair High Schools. (*Short 1939).* The College Park campus of the University of Maryland reflected the attachment of state legislators to the Maryland colonial vernacular.[11]

Why was Maryland so invested in these revival styles and so slow to take up the challenge of modern design? Our hypothesis is that before World War II, Maryland did not really need Modern Movement architecture. The occasion for aesthetic embodiments of structural modernization had not yet arrived. Besides the state's

---

[11] Research is needed to determine whether the State of Maryland ever made an official decision to market its colonial architectural style and landmarks as state heritage or tourist attractions.

entrenched conservatism, there were at least four explanations for this. First, the principal city—Baltimore—was strapped for cash and unable to generate a modernization campaign in the 1920s or 1930s. Although there was tremendous need to modernize infrastructure and housing, little investment money or political will was available to do it. Second, in addition to the depletion of architectural offices caused by the Depression, there seems to have been a creative vacuum in Baltimore in the late 1920s and 1930s as principals of major firms passed away and were not replaced by designers of the same caliber. Third, there was no architectural school, journal, or progressive professional association in Maryland to push the issue of modernity and modernism to the forefront. Fourth, Federal housing policies implemented during the 1930s to stimulate the construction industry rewarded conservative and standardized housing designs, essentially codifying a safe and middlebrow approach to domestic architecture.

Federal policies form an important component of the context for this study, because they underwrote the boom in suburban house building. In 1933, the Home Owner's Loan Corporation (HOLC) developed a system for appraising real estate according to the stability of the neighborhood, making it easier to obtain a mortgage for a new house in a white middle-class suburban neighborhood than for an older house in a city or in a racially mixed or lower class neighborhood. Building Codes developed by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) in 1935 mandated up-to-date standards in construction and climate control as the condition for issuing FHA-insured long-term mortgages to private lenders for home sale or construction. The new standards made it more profitable for builders to invest in new construction - essentially single-family homes in the suburbs - rather than improve existing structures. They were further elaborated in the FHA Underwriting Manual of 1938. As long as its standards were met, the FHA would make a "conditional commitment" to an approved lender that it would insure all the home mortgages for qualified homebuyers in the subdivision. As a result, builders were discouraged from undertaking the more radical experiments in modernism; flat roofs, window walls, and other avant-garde ideas deviated from the standards of the Underwriting Manual. New regulations underwrote and enabled suburban housing, but they also embraced a multi-faceted revivalism at the cost of actively discouraging innovation.

Even so, there were still some elements of modernism to be seen the State's architecture in the 1920s and 1930s. Planned communities of period homes epitomized "modernization" trends in terms of their infrastructure, technology, interior features, and, occasionally, their materials. Even a traditionalist like Fowler was not entirely immune to modernism. In 1922, he collaborated with avant garde painter and costume designer Leon Bakst, of Ballets Russes fame, to transform part of Baltimore's Evergreen House (*NR nomination form 2*). Nor were the academic methods of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, whether learned in Paris or in American schools, de facto reactionary. Beaux-Arts trained architects have generally been cast as conservative influences on architecture by scholars sympathetic to the Modern Movement, but the Ecole's composition and problem-solving methods could be adapted to any program, construction method, or "style," traditional or progressive.[12] Ernest Flagg's Chapel at the Navy Academy, for example, featured cutting-edge concrete technology. Finally, as noted by David Gebhard, even a historical style like the Colonial Revival offered a versatile design formula. It involved rather inexpensive construction methods, could be as "archaeological" or as "modern" as desired, and was hardly anti-modern in its approach to achieving the greatest degree of domestic comfort (*Gebhard, 1987*).

2.3 MODERN AMERICAN ARCHITECTURE COMES OF AGE

We cannot possibly recapitulate the history of the Modern Movement in this essay. Nonetheless, we need to explain how the Movement and the idea of an "International Style" began in the United States in 1929 with Henry Russell Hitchcock's canonical narrative and how that narrative influenced the historiography of architectural history criticism and scholarship through much of the 20th century. It is important as well to note the eccentricities of that narrative: its Eurocentrism, how it emphasized certain principles of modern design and overlooked others, and its focus on only a narrow range of forms and expression within the Movement. Maryland's modern resources

---

[12] Beaux-Arts-trained architects have generally been cast as conservative influences on architecture by scholars sympathetic to modernism, but many Beaux-Arts buildings contain elements dear to many modernist designers, e.g. abstraction, simple masses, clean lines, and functional programs.

eventually came to embody a fundamental truth regarding Modernism: that it encompassed much more than Hitchcock's conceptualization of the so-called International Style.

2.3.1 THE CANONICAL HISTORIOGRAPHY OF MODERNISM

In 1929, a young Harvard-trained art historian, Henry Russell Hitchcock, published the first book-length survey of the Modern Movement authored by an American. His prose was convoluted, but Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration dropped all the right names of architects and buildings and established definitions, inclusions, and exclusions for Modern Movement architecture that would shape scholarship and criticism in the US until the 1980s. Hitchcock's interpretation was excerpted in Architectural Record; it was well received among progressive critics and architects, and had an immediate and profound impact in cultural circles.

Modern Architecture, Hitchcock argued, had already gone through two distinct phases: New Tradition and New Pioneers. The New Tradition, which Hitchcock found wanting, had reached its maturity by 1910 and "concluded" at the 1925 Exposition des Arts Décoratifs in Paris. The New Tradition appeared when "architects turned from eclecticism of taste to the eclecticism of style with the intention of founding a rational and integral manner" *(Hitchcock 1929, 90)*. Among its very early manifestations were Philip Webb's Red House (1859) and Henry Hobson Richardson's Marshall Field Wholesale Store in Chicago. Holland, represented by Hendrik Petrus Berlage, Michael de Klerk and Willem Dudok, provided some distinguished examples as well—in particular, "fine brickwork" and ambitious housing projects. Otto Wagner and Josef Hoffman in Austria, Peter Behrens in Germany, and Auguste Perret in France were also presented as major exponents of the New Tradition. These architects and their works were merely the harbingers of a modern architecture, however.

The more significant strain of modernism Hitchcock attributed to a group of European architects he dubbed the New Pioneers, a movement he dated back to the appearance of abstract painting and Walter Gropius's Fagus (1911) and Werkbund factories (1914). Hitchcock struggled to characterize the aesthetic of the "international style," calling it variously "pure architecture" (Oud's claim), "time-space architecture" (Lonberg-Holm's term), or "the triumph of the technical point of view," his own description. The Chicago Tribune Competition of 1922, he argued, provided one of the few opportunities his countrymen had to discover the work of Europe's New Pioneers.[13] Hitchcock was not subtle in praise of his culture heroes. He asserted that Le Corbusier's "international influence" had been "without equal since the War," although, rather prophetically, he did point out the French architect's "failure as sociological architect" in Pessac and questioned the soundness of his ferro-concrete work *(Hitchcock 133)*. Germany, thanks to the Bauhaus and breakthroughs in mass housing, Hitchcock placed at the helm of the Modern Movement. But his favorite avant-garde architect was his Dutch friend J.J.P. Oud, whose shops for the Hook van Holland housing project near Rotterdam **(FIG. 2-1),** no doubt an inspiration for Greenbelt's shopping center, he illustrated.

How did American architecture figure in Hitchcock's Eurocentric narrative? The American critic was severe in his assessment of work on this side of the Atlantic. He classified Frank Lloyd Wright as belonging to the New Tradition, one of its founding fathers, but no longer an active proponents of modern architecture. Hitchcock did not deny Wright's skill at place making but found his interiors too "dark, uncomfortable … cluttered and monotonous" (*Hitchcock 115*) and his "intemperance in ornament" aggravating (*116*). He also commended Finnish architect Eliel Saarinen for importing to America Scandinavia's unaffected approach to domestic design.

Were there any New Pioneers in the United States in 1929? The evidence, in his view, was slim. So far American-born modernists had only executed interior designs. Among recent émigrés, the "most important" was the Austrian Richard Neutra, Wright's only "worthy disciple" (*Hitchcock 117*). Only a single photograph attested to the burgeoning of an American avant-garde: it captured the nearly completed Oak Lane School in Philadelphia, by

---

[13] Here, Hitchcock greatly underrepresented the number of opportunities for exposure to European Modernism in the United States, however.

the Swiss-born William Lescaze, who had worked in Le Corbusier's office and attended the first Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM).   Mainstream architects, he suggested, were still painstakingly adapting to the New Tradition. To his credit, Hitchcock astutely foresaw the danger of applying avant-garde "tricks" and merely expanding the palette of eclecticism *(202)*. He was also weary of architecture that imitated engineering icons, such as automobile factories and grain elevators, until those building types were raised to the level of architecture worthy of emulation. Still, the young critic remained hopeful: "Beside France, Holland, and Germany it is already America which appears to have the greatest significance for the development of a new architecture. There very possibly in the future it will take the most individual and characteristic form" (*206*)

    In fact, during the interwar period, the New Tradition had a strong impact upon architecture in America, and in Maryland, more than Hitchcock was willing to concede. Frank Lloyd Wright's influence, both direct and indirect, was still quite strong, even though he was deprived of major commissions until the mid-1930s. The elegant manipulation of brick masses by Willem Dudok, the Dutch architect Hitchcock admired, influenced American school designs. And among the New Pioneers, Oud, Le Corbusier and Gropius were not the only designers to impress Americans. In particular, Erich Mendelsohn's commercial work in Germany[14] was seminal in shaping the Streamline Moderne, a specifically American style that was used in Maryland in the 1930s and 1940s for transportation buildings, e.g. the Greyhound Bus Terminal in Baltimore (1942) and the Airport Terminal Building in Middle River (1942); small and medium commercial buildings, e.g. Kresge's (1937) or Schwing Motors (1948); industrial buildings, e.g. the Canada Dry building in Silver Spring (1946); and a scattering of houses, garden apartments, and public buildings, as well as the commercial center of Greenbelt (1937).

    Hitchcock was able to further his campaign in favor of the New Pioneers under the aegis of New York's Museum of Modern Art (MOMA). He was the major scholarly and theoretical force behind the groundbreaking Modern Architecture: International Exhibition that opened at MOMA in 1932, demonstrating impressive progress on the part of the New Pioneers. It was through this venue that Hitchcock and Philip Johnson, an equally young MOMA curator, reduced the essence of the International Style to three fundamental principles: 1) an architecture of volume rather than mass, 2) composition dependent on the rhythmic organization of regular units, with asymmetry prevailing over the symmetrical arrangements of academic architecture, and 3) the outlawing of ornament. (*Jordy 119*) Among the most striking items included were large, custom-made models of Le Corbusier's Villa Savoye and Mies van der Rohe's Tugendhat house.   Works by Neutra and the New York architect Raymond Hood were on display in a second section called "The Extent of Modern Architecture." Critics, however, thought that Wright's work seemed a bit anti-climactic and most attempts by US designers at emulating European Modernism rather superficial.   In another room, a third section was devoted to housing; it was essentially the brainchild of Lewis Mumford and his protégée Catherine Bauer. It included a model of the Rothenberg Development in Kassel, Germany, designed with long parallel slabs, sharply contrasted with views of the planned communities of Sunnyside and Radburn by Americans Clarence Stein and Henry Wright. The decision to consider dwellings for the lower classes as a separate design field turned out to be both a blessing and a curse. It brought attention to the need to do something about shelter, but had the long-term consequences of construing housing as a social experiment rather than a field for aesthetic or architectural innovation. That unfortunate division manifests in our survey and still endures.

    According to Terence Riley who has studied it in great detail, the New York show did not draw especially large crowds, but its companion publications (which were manifestoes as much as catalogues) Modern Architects and The International Style: Architecture Since 1922 spread the gospel of modernism across the United States.[15] (*Riley 1992*, *Barr 1932, Hitchcock/Johnson 1932)* Written by Hitchcock and Johnson, this second, small, book was decidedly Eurocentric and laden with "artifact-oriented connoisseurship" (*Riley 25)*. It detached modernism from

---

[14] We are thinking of, for example, Mendelsohn's Schoken Department Stores, in Stuttgart, 1926-28 and Chemnitz, 1928-9.

[15] For an account highly critical of the exhibit's "packaging" of the International style as the be-all and end-all of modern architecture, see Gebhard 1970.

the political and ethical mission that Gropius or Le Corbusier had pursued. Nonetheless The International Style had the merit of being seductively didactic and of widening the geographic and programmatic spectrum of modernism, since it included illustrations of department stores, gas stations, factories, theaters, clubhouses, a city employment office, a retirement home, a beach hotel, and an exhibition pavilion in Continental Europe and the United States.

MOMA organized many other compelling exhibitions on modern architecture and design, such as the famous exhibition on Machine Art in 1934 and the sequel to the Hitchcock and Johnson show in 1945, Built in USA: Since 1932. But did any of these events have an impact on the Modern Movement in Maryland? In 1935, MOMA also helped organize a lecture tour for Le Corbusier, which included, on November 18, a talk at the Baltimore Museum of Art, sponsored by the Municipal Art Society.[16] There Le Corbusier advocated "vertical garden cities on 'artificial sites'" (*Bacon 70*). According to scholar Mardges Bacon, a favorable article in The Sun (FIG.2-2) "publicized Le Corbusier's criticism of the prevailing conditions that removed man from his 'natural element' and acknowledged the social dilemma attending modern cities." (*Bacon 102*) Le Corbusier also lectured at Yale, where young architecture student Alexander Cochran heard him speak on "Modernism in Architecture" *(Weeks 11)*. Le Corbusier was the epitome of the "architectural hero" on whom the modern movement relied (*Archibald Rogers, quoted in Weeks 19*). In the schools he visited, he crystallized students' desire to embark on a new course of study.   No doubt these events helped disseminate the modernist message in Maryland's architectural circles, although the precise nature of that influence remains to be determined.

2.3.2 EVOLUTION DURING THE 1930s

In the United States, the 1930s was a time of experimentation where traditional and modern cohabited, and sometimes mingled. Through publications, information on modern design became more available to building professionals and to the general public. The architectural press, which Maryland practitioners consulted for reference, experienced modernization both in terms of format and editorial policy,[17] but journals remained essentially eclectic in their coverage of new construction. A particularly progressive journal was the American Magazine of Art, affiliated with the American Federation of Arts, located in Washington, D.C.. For example, in 1937 it published William Lescaze's address to this group's annual meeting, entitled "America is Outgrowing Imitation Greek Architecture." In publications aimed at a large audience, modernism was promoted as exciting, even glamorous. Its futuristic character made for good copy. Such was the case, for example, with Keck and Keck's spectacular House of Tomorrow and Crystal House, widely publicized from the 1933-34 Century of Progress exposition in Chicago.

During this decade of widening publicity for the Movement in the U.S., European modernism was entering a period of questioning, self-criticism, and evolution. These changes took several trajectories. With the worldwide economic downturn, blind faith in progress and technocracy diminished considerably. "Skin and bone," hard-edged design—the machine aesthetic--was no longer seen as a universal panacea and, in fact, became associated in some quarters with a "corporate international style that undermined the movement's early socio-critical orientation." (*Goldhagen 12*) In private homes, the "machine for living" philosophy gave way to designs that drew from local culture and climate, using fieldstone, wood and other natural materials. An early example of this trend was Le Corbusier's de Mandrot House, illustrated in Hitchcock and Johnson's International Style. In the United States, Frank Lloyd Wright returned to the spotlight; both Fallingwater and the Johnson Wax Complex brought greater magnitude to his architectonic vision. His space-efficient, moderate-cost Usonian houses, built without attics and

---

[16] This is as far South as the famous Swiss/French architect went during his journey; drawings for this talk have been preserved. Further research is needed on whether this lecture represented a turning point in Maryland architects' embrace of modernism or what other impacts the lecture had.

[17] The most striking transformation occurred at the Architectural Forum under the aegis of the Danish émigré Knut Lonberg-Holm; see Dessauce 1993.

basements, provided a viable solution to the "small house problem." In 1940, he built an example, Euchtman House, on Baltimore's Cross Key Boulevard, while another was built in D.C.'s Virginia suburbs.

The late 1930s also witnessed the coming of age of a "modern regionalism," more topographical than historical in spirit, which situated buildings in place and time. In part, architects sought this shift to counteract the dehumanizing aspects of technology; it also acknowledged that the early symbols of the Movement were not serving "the needs of the common man." (*Goldhagen 17*) This more situated modernism clothed simple masses and open plans with local materials and did not consider sloping roofs or allusions to vernacular conventions anathema. A good example was the domestic work of Pietro Belluschi, who was based in Portland, Oregon at the time. For Belluschi, "the so-called international style must be as varied as the different landscape and people." This advocate of an architecture "close and sympathetic to the soil" would play, as we shall see, a considerable role in post-war Baltimore *(Belluschi quoted in Ford 123)*.

In the American suburbs, there was considerable evidence of modernism, both in planning and architecture, but it often took hybrid form.   Modernism could manifest in the suburbs in four ways. First, many (but by no means all) suburban communities were designed with increasingly rationalized forms of planning; they were part of a series of international conversations that had been going on throughout the early 20th century on the appropriate forms of settlement for a technological age. Leading examples were Chatham Village (1920s), Sunnyside Gardens (1920s), and Radburn (1928-9), which included such features as greenways, superblocks, and the separation of pedestrian and automobile traffic. In 1929, Clarence Perry codified a highly rationalized concept of townsite planning in his Neighborhood Unit Plan, which became a key component of federal housing policy during the 1930s and was adapted by countless private developers over the next 30 years. Second, these examples embodied a strong emphasis on control through design to accomplish the social engineering of society. Building model, prescriptive houses and neighborhoods that would demonstrate the proper form of modern American living and mold productive middle class families was an important modernization strategy contained in the most famous planned communities of the era, such as Greenbelt, but present in the broadly popular suburban ideal as well. Third, modernism's impact frequently concentrated on the interiors of houses, where it could be seen in the free flow of space, technologically controlled interior environments, built-ins, model kitchens, and the opening up of walls to create indoor-outdoor living spaces. These features were abundantly on display in the model houses created for the 1933 and 1939 World's Fairs in Chicago and New York. Fourth, as architectural historian Beatriz Colomina has argued, the modern house became the consummate modern commodity, demonstrating "the impact of technology on the most mundane aspects of human behavior." In this way, modern design in suburban houses came to represent the "commercialization of domestic life," an important strain in the internal critiques modernists began to generate in the 1930s and later. *(Colomina 143, 151)*

2.3.3 INFLUENTIAL GEOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN MODERNISM IN THE 1930s

The enthusiasm for Modernism did not permeate all sections of the country simultaneously. It caught on faster in parts that boasted a cosmopolitan, liberal, and upwardly mobile metropolitan culture and where designers who cultivated direct personal ties with European modernism practiced, whether as European émigrés or American converts.   In addition, Modernism flourished where it was publicized, through publications, exhibitions, or other kinds of media. In this regard, it is interesting to follow the itinerary of Modern Architecture. An International exhibition in 1932-33 after it left MOMA. Its first stop was the Philadelphia Museum of Art, the closest it came to Maryland. Hosted by two department stores – Bullocks in Los Angeles and Sears, Roebuck & Co in Chicago -- the exhibition had museum stops in Cleveland, Toledo, Milwaukee, Cincinnati., two in upstate New York (Rochester and Buffalo), and five in New England (Hartford, Harvard, and Dartmouth, and in towns as small as Worcester, Massachusetts, and Manchester, New Hampshire).[18]

---

[18] At each venue, the exhibition lasted from three to six weeks.

The growing popularity of the Modern Movement in and around Los Angeles, New York City, Philadelphia, and Boston is of interest because these places influenced the advent of modernism in Maryland in some way. Southern California, with its laid-back, automobile-oriented lifestyle, led all other regions. Before Rudolf Schindler's and Richard Neutra's arrival (in 1915 and 1924, respectively), it already boasted a significant number of sparsely decorated designs, often based on the Spanish Colonial vocabulary of white, unadorned masses and geometric openings, inherited from Franciscan missions. Most innovative was the work of Irving Gill, a pioneer in concrete prefabrication. Gill had an eye for detail, an obsession with spotless hygiene, and a keen interest in affordable housing. A prolific writer, Neutra was the only American to attend the seminal second CIAM meeting of 1930, which discussed minimum housing. He was a tireless champion of standardization and the use of industrial materials. Nearly as charismatic and media-savvy as Le Corbusier, he undoubtedly played a key role in acclimating the International Style to America. Along with the Villa Savoye, his steel-framed "Health House" for Dr. Philip Lovell was, upon its completion in 1930, the most striking example of the Machine Aesthetic at a domestic scale. Undoubtedly, Mediterranean-like flora and the dramatic California topography were no small part of the tremendous photogenic appeal of this widely published house.[19]

During the 1930s, thanks to their "zeitgeist" quality, elegance, and technical advances, Neutra's large and small houses, garden apartments, and modest commercial buildings received more attention from Europeans than contemporary designs by his former employer, Frank Lloyd Wright. His designs for schools were nearly as influential, however. Expanding upon the formula of the "open air school" with sliding-door classrooms, which was already popular in Southern California, his experimental Corona Avenue School, commissioned in 1934 by the Los Angeles School Board, established a precedent for many post war elementary schools around the country. *(Johnson 1916)* Neutra grew increasingly concerned with the human response to the built environment, particularly after WWII. On this issue, he was an important influence on Alexander Cochran. He was one of Cochran's mentors *(Weeks 1995 18-19, 31-34),* and, in return, the Baltimore architect helped Neutra receive a prestigious commission from Saint John's College in Annapolis (1956-58). Neutra had a crop of former employees and followers, e.g., Raphael S. Soriano, and Gregory Ain, who helped produce a regional modernism adapted to Southern California. As for his countryman Rudolf Schindler, whose Lovell Beach House of 1923-24 remains one of the premier and early American monuments to Modernism, his influence on Maryland's architects is hard to detect. Far less adept at self-promotion, he was ostracized by the East Coast establishment, for the most part.[20] His work had a much less "platonic," more quirky and localized quality than Neutra's that would prevent much impact outside Southern California until it was reinterpreted in the 1960s by the likes of Frank Gehry.

New York City was simultaneously a bastion of Beaux-Arts respectability and the crucible for transatlantic novelties. It was also where America's most influential art, architecture, and interior design journals and book publishing companies were based. Between the wars, New York was home to several modernist developments--and architects--that later had an impact on Maryland. Beginning in the late teens, designers associated with or influenced by Viennese and German modernism began to remodel interiors for an affluent and urbane clientele; as Hitchcock pointed out, modernism was first popularized--perhaps "domesticated" is the better word--in the United States in stark interior remodelings of houses or apartments *(Stern 461-476).*[21] Frederick Kiesler, a Viennese émigré affiliated with the De Stijl movement, designed a series of "little cinemas" in a rigorously abstract modernist vocabulary that beguiled New York's avant garde film community (Stern 264). Beginning with William Lescaze's Chrystie-Forsyth slum clearance housing scheme, exhibited at MOMA in 1932, New York's urban renewal projects were as radical as those put forward by Le Corbusier and Hilberseimer. (Stern 440) Masterminded by Lescaze, for example, the Ten Eyck Houses (currently called Williamsburg) of 1935-38 was the first of a long series of built housing estates that employed innovative street patterns *(Lanmon 1987; Pommer 1979).* New York's earliest experiments with modernism

---

[19] In the 1930s Neutra built the Brown House near Providence. (*Neumann 2002).*

[20] Hitchcock had rebuked Schindler for being too much a New Tradition architect and having achieved "mediocre success" in paralleling the work of Le Corbusier and the de Stijl designers.

[21] See, for example, the work of Paul Frankl, Ely Jacque Kahn, Eugene Schoen, and Donald Deskey *(Stern 261-276).*

also extended to secondary homes on Long Island; the first example, dating back to 1929, was commissioned by the Publicity Director for the Fox Films Corporation--to William Muschenheim, who had just returned from studying in Vienna *(Gordon 1987)*. After having visited Europe, young New York architects like Percival Goodman, Wallace K. Harrison *(see Newhouse),* and Edward Durrell Stone, who designed MOMA's new home in association with Philip Goodwin, became early and brilliant converts to modern design.[22] All would contribute to Maryland's post war architecture.

Analyzing early modernism in Philadelphia is crucial, since many Baltimore architects (not only those trained at the University of Pennsylvania), tended to look to this city for new directions, as would continue to be the case after World War II. Boasting innovators like Buckminster Fuller and Lonberg-Holm, the T-Square Club, the magazine Shelter, and the Architectural Research Group, modern architecture in Philadelphia had entered the professional arena and, along with the Philadelphia Museum of Art, positioned the city at the forefront of the artistic avant-garde *(Dessauce 1993)*. The completion, in 1932, of Howe and Lescaze's PSFS building, which answered Hitchcock's call for a truly modern skyscraper, was a development of world-wide significance for modern architecture. Lescaze also built Washington's first major modern office design, the Longfellow Building, completed in 1940.[23]

From 1932 to 1936, Philadelphia hosted the partnership of two German-born designers, Alfred Kastner and Oscar Stonorov. Their major contribution to American modernism was the Carl Mackley Houses, a finely detailed, well-equipped, low-rise cooperative housing complex, commissioned by the Full Fashion Hosiery Workers Union. It was a design that "softened" Germany's hard edge modernist *zielenbau* configuration, a further instance of the American "domestication" of iconic European modernist ideas *(Radford 1996, 111-144)*. The partners also worked directly in Maryland, building demonstration houses in Bethesda. Although Stonorov remained in Philadelphia, Kastner moved to Washington, D.C., working for the U.S. Resettlement Administration and the War Housing Administration before starting a private practice. With Cloethiel Woodard Smith, he organized the first exhibition of modern urbanism in D.C. in 1939 *(Helfrich)*. He was the architect of one of the first truly modern homes in the Maryland suburbs, the relatively little-known Walter Teichmann Residence of 1941, in Kenwood.

Around Boston, affluent suburbanites began commissioning modern homes around Boston several years before Gropius and his cohort arrived from Germany. The earliest example may well be the house Eleanor Raymond designed for her sister Rachel in Belmont, which was completed in 1931 *(Cole 1981 / Lipstadt 2001)*. By 1938 German émigrés had endowed Harvard's Graduate School of Design with the most radical architecture program in the US, inspired by the Bauhaus curriculum. The Maryland-GSD modernist connection would acquire significance in the immediate post-World War II period, operating in two major ways. GSD instructors Marcel Breuer, Gropius' associate until 1941, and Walter Bogner would re-interpret for the Baltimore suburbs the kind of houses combining open plans, natural building materials, and a properly American connection with their surroundings which they had already built in Concord and Lincoln, MA. In addition, recent adventurous GSD graduates would establish practices in Baltimore--Alexander Cochran, who "worshipped" Gropius *(Weeks 19 and 79)*; his associate James Stephenson**;** and David Wilson and Peter Christie--and in Washington (Arthur Keyes, Nicholas Satterlee, and Caspar Neer). The influence of these young architects on the Modern Movement in Maryland would come to fruition in the fifteen years after the war.

When we look back over the pre-1940 geography of American Modernism, we have to admit that the mid-Atlantic region was less adventurous than most. Even the Midwest and Texas seemed more fertile ground for

---

[22] Stone also designed with Donald Deskey the Richard Mandel House in Mt Kisco (1934-35).

[23] During his partnership with Howe, Lescaze who worked from New York while his associate lived in Philadelphia, completed two important houses in lower Merion Township in 1934 (illustrated in *Bacon 291*).

architectural innovation.[24] By 1940, as evidenced in James Ford and Katherine Morrow Ford's <u>The Modern House in America</u>, one could find isolated but superb "specimens" of International Style houses scattered throughout the country. Not a single design from Maryland, however, was apparently worth publishing (Helfrich 2001). Nonetheless, as we shall see in the next section, the Free State had a scattering of noteworthy early modernist design.

---

[24] In the 1910s, Texas had been receptive to the Midwestern Prairie School; at the 1936 Texas Centennial Exposition in Dallas, Lescaze designed a sleek pavilion for an oil company (*Henry* 279) and Richard Neutra built a house in Brownsville in 1937 (*Henry 275*).

Between 1930 and 1940, with the exception of the DC suburbs, Maryland was hit hard by the Depression, and building activity slowed down. Nonetheless, the decade witnessed modernization efforts of three kinds, many of which generated some of the State's earliest examples of Modernism. The first strain of modernization was sponsored by the Federal Government. Federal monies, generated by the New Deal programs, were spent to improve, and therefore modernize, infrastructure. Although Maryland received a smaller share than most states, Federal assistance financed the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, rural electrification, bridges across the Potomac and Susquehanna rivers; drainage projects on the Eastern Shore, the C&O Canal Park, and a city park in Salisbury. No less than $25.4 million were invested in underwriting Maryland mortgages, most for homes conservative-looking on the outside (*Brugger 510-518*). In addition, PWA funds infused into the University of Maryland, College Park campus also underwrote traditionally designed buildings. So Federal money generated modernization but not modern architecture in the state—with one very significant exception: the Resettlement Administration's Greenbelt, a large-scale modern model community.

A second strain of modernization activity was initiated by entrepreneurs. Two outstanding examples of Modernism resulted—the Goucher College campus design competition and the "Plant B and C" sections of Glenn Martin's aircraft Factory #1 in Middle River. A third strain consisted of the private efforts of individuals to commission single-family homes in the suburbs; the 1930s saw the beginnings of a coming wave of suburban modernization as professional-managerial households moving to the suburbs sought to take political and economic control into their own hands. These were the first manifestations of an "everyday modernism" that would proliferate in Maryland after the war. A few additional modernization efforts sponsored by the State, especially schools and health care facilities, were constructed in the 1930s and we discuss them briefly below.

3.1 GREENBELT (FIG.3-1)

Greenbelt, one of three federally owned and planned Green Towns constructed during the New Deal, remains one of the most thoroughgoing and significant experiments in modern town planning ever executed in the United States. The Resettlement Administration (RA) selected a site in Prince George's County for its first experimental model suburb because of its proximity to Washington, less than 15 miles from the White House, and the availability of land adjacent to the National Agricultural Research Center in Beltsville.[25] The RA's Rexford Tugwell, who originated the Greenbelt program, recalled

> One day in the fall of 1935, I asked the President if he'd go for a ride in the country. I brought him out here on what roads there were then and asked him what he thought of it for a housing project. He, too, fell in love with the place. So we got started right off (*Williamson 29*).

On April 30, 1935, FDR authorized the RA with Executive Order 7027. The Agency acquired 12,189 acres of unencumbered land and on October 12th, groundbreaking took place. The first stage of construction included the digging of a lake; 217 acres of homesites, public buildings, and a commercial downtown; 641 acres of park and recreation land, 150 acres of allotment gardens, and 100 acres of farms. (*Fogle 25*) On January 13, 1936, construction began on the first building, and on September 30th, 1937 the first tenants moved in. The community included 887 original housing units in brick or concrete block, followed by another 1000 frame units built in connection with defense housing programs in 1941. They were arrayed in courts along an efficient street outline in a double crescent shape; many units faced landscaped superblocks furnished with playground equipment for children.

---

[25] Greenbelt was administered by the Resettlement Administration (1935-37), the Farm Security Administration (1937-42), the National Housing Administration (1942), and the Federal Public Housing Administration (1942-27). One of the attractions of the location was a promise by the National Agricultural Research Center to buy the land from the Resettlement Administration if the experiment failed. (*Williamson 25*)

Like Radburn, Greenbelt contained separate pathways for pedestrians and automobiles, including a series of below grade passageways that conducted residents safely underneath the roads.

Rexford Tugwell's initial vision for the Greenbelt Towns seemed to have been more radical than the one implemented.[26] Nonetheless, Greenbelt belongs in a survey of Modern Movement architecture in Maryland. It represented the outcome of the campaign for "Modern Housing" undertaken by Mumford and Bauer, whose eponymous book was published in 1934, and it embodied many of the progressive ideas developed by the RPAA planners in the 1920s and 1930s. The New Deal planners envisioned the Greenbelt Program as both a social and design experiment. They wished to build near a city that had many moderate-income workers who couldn't find affordable housing. At the time the District of Columbia had no housing vacancies, rents were 30% higher than in comparable cities, and affordable housing was completely inadequate. With Henry Wright as General Consultant, Clarence Stein as Architectural Consultant, and Tracy Augur on board as well, the Greenbelt Town Program benefited from an extraordinary synergy among experts coming from many fields[27] The heads of Greenbelt's design team, architects Douglas Ellington and Reginald J. Wadsworth , may not have been leaders in their profession and outspoken advocates of modernism like Neutra or Lescaze, but they were very well trained and highly competent.

Greenbelt's planners meshed two kinds of experiments: Radburn's superblock concept, which dictated the street pattern and the segregation between pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and the *siedlungen* of Weimar Germany. We have already mentioned the Oud-inspired corner treatment for the buildings of the town center. The cinder-block, flat-roofed townhouses and garden apartments were most likely indebted to Berlin's Uncle Tom's Cabin subdivision, by Bruno Taut, and to Ernst May's celebrated and highly photogenic Römerstadt complex (1926-30) in Frankfurt (*see Haskell 1932 and MOMA exhibit 77-88).*

Greenbelt was intended to be an exemplar of middle-class cooperation (in the spirit of Ebenezer Howard's Garden City ideal), and of religious, if not racial, diversity. The model planned community pursued and acclimated the ideals of Europe's almost defunct Social-Democracy and represented the first and most aggressive comprehensive combination of social engineering and modern design in the US. Greenbelt's planners included the swimming pool and shopping center, with its movie theater, as loci for social interaction. The same was true of the model progressive school, which doubled as a community center. Design input for the Center School was provided by a Los Angeles firm, Marsh, Smith and Powell, with a commendable track record of educational building in Southern California, including the Hollywood High School. Several cooperative enterprises, including a supermarket, a credit union, and the community's newspaper, the Greenbelt Cooperator (now the Greenbelt News Review) helped to weave the community's activist social and political fabric (along with a number of other clubs and organizations).

As a monument of modernism, the Greenbelt experiment is significant on several levels. It demonstrates that, contrary to canonical historiography, American modernism did not "emerge in a cultural vacuum and develop without formal principles or political imperatives"(*Wright 27).* It also exemplifies how "the natural environment figures prominently in American conceptions of modernism" *(Wright 32),* a design attitude where the community as an ensemble, its landscape infrastructure as much as its architectural superstructures, is taken as the unit of design, superceding the dwelling itself. Individual buildings were not meant to make visual statements, overpowering the open space between them. In the mind of Greenbelt's designers, the issue of style was secondary to that of community planning. Greenbelt was a pragmatic experiment as well, responding to the economic crises of the 1930s. Construction methods were intentionally labor intensive, not highly mechanized and industrialized, in order to provide as much work as possible to unskilled workers. As a result, the units were extremely well built but cost

---

[26] Tugwell was influenced by Le Corbusier's Ville Contemporaine, according to David Myrha *(Myrha 1974).*

[27] It also benefited from the indirect but significant influence of Sir Raymond Unwin, the planner of Letchworth, the original garden city, who visited DC in 1934.

almost three times as much as private market housing. This aspect of Greenbelt's creation could not be realistically emulated.

Greenbelt generated tremendous media attention. It was given pride of place in Lewis Mumford's social realism documentary, "The City" (1939).   In addition to half a million tourists (*Callcott 1983, 74),* the new town attracted national and international attention in planning circles *(Barret 1946)*.   An article in the authoritative British journal Town Planning Review stressed the high quality of materials used *(10, Winter 1942-43)* and contemporary press coverage noted Greenbelt's modernity.[28]   Not all of the publicity was positive, though; Greenbelt was described as a communist or socialist experiment and the Federal Government denounced for interfering with the private housing market.

Greenbelt served as a key link in the transatlantic chain of model garden communities, starting with Unwin and Parker's English garden cities and the experimental defense housing communities of the WWI era in the United States, and pursued after World War II in Finland's Tapiola, then at Reston and Columbia, and in certain New Urbanism projects. In addition to being a very important urban design experiment, Greenbelt represented an extraordinary political phenomenon, as it defied conservatism and came to symbolize what was judged as either desirable or alarming: government control over the land and intervention in the housing market. Providing a holistic approach to civic life, Greenbelt currently has 18 active cooperatives, and still offers an alternative to socially fragmented and privatized residential suburbs.   Greenbelt is designated as a National Historic Landmark.

3.2 THE 1938 COMPETITION FOR GOUCHER COLLEGE

Maryland reached national prominence on another occasion during the 1930s for the adoption of modern design for a major, high profile commission: the competition for the new Goucher College campus design. The Goucher competition was one of four taking place during the late 1930s, which indicated a new emphasis on campus planning in American architectural circles. [29] Goucher was a small women's liberal arts college, established in 1885, with a local reputation. Its downtown Baltimore campus, which bore the mark of Stanford White, had become too small; in 1921, the College President, William Westley Guth, acquired 421 acres of land just north of Towson's civic center and shopping district. In the 1920s, Guth dreamed of hiring Bertram Goodhue and envisioned a neo-Gothic quadrangle, like those at Princeton or Yale. When the effect of the Depression began dissipating, a subsequent President sought advice from the Baltimore Chapter of the AIA and organized a competition for a new campus design, adhering to the rules of this national organization.

Announced and noted (if not thoroughly discussed) in the national architectural and art press, the competition attracted 35 submissions, many by prominent firms; the entries reflected the transitional architectural scene of the 1930s. Howe, Lescaze, Neutra, and Harrison and his then partner André Fouilhoux all submitted entries. Gropius and Breuer, sensing the conservative bias of the jury, applied but did not submit. Awards went to projects expounding widely diverging stylistic options. The fourth prize was indebted to a Colonial Revival design,

---

[28] Note the language used in describing Greenbelt: "modern engineering," "modern and quite homelike," and "effect is quite modern" in "Comparative Arch Details in the Greenbelt Housing," American Architect and Architecture, Oct. 1936; and "There's Room for Originality in Model Houses of Greenbelt," Washington Daily News, Apr 27, 1937. Major John O. Walker, "Life in a Greenbelt Community," clipping, no date, c. 1938, noted that "glass brick is put to modern use," but described several elements of Greenbelt that made up a mantra of modernism in "Modern Homes to Persons of Moderate Means" clipping from scrapbook, n.d., c. 1937. The Washington Post article by Jean Green, "Kitchen of Future Discovered in Model Houses in Greenbelt," clipping, n.d (c.1940), (Tugwell Room, Greenbelt Public Library), uses the term "modernistic houses".

[29] The second was for Wheaton College's Art Center, near Boston, sponsored by MOMA and Architectural Forum; Gropius and Breuer won second prize for it, while the winners were Richard Bennett and Caleb Hornbostel. The third and fourth took place at William and Mary College in Virginia, and the Smithsonian Institution building on the National Mall, where Eliel and Eero Saarinen won first prize.

the third used an extremely formal Art déco approach, and the second went to the father-and-son team of Eliel and Eero Saarinen who produced a quiet and elegant modern design. Endorsed by the faculty, the winning design (FIG.3-2) by the newly established New York firm of John C.B. Moore and Robert S. Hutchins took a middle course and essentially won on the strength of a brilliantly composed, natural, and flexible master plan. The plan, which took seriously the competition's directive that "emphasis should be upon the informal rather than the institutional and monumental," divided the campus into small units, a scheme that was much less rigid than either more modern or traditional submissions and could be easily implemented in several construction campaigns (*Goucher 1938*). Like Greenbelt, the winning entry exhibited a successful alliance between nature and architecture. With low overhanging roofs, unadorned fieldstone walls, simplified fenestration, and buildings designed to fit the contours of the site, its architecture betrayed the impact of both Frank Lloyd Wright and Eliel Saarinen. *(Kornwulf 1985)*

Thus, Moore and Hutchins' campus design embodied the more hybrid kind of modernism that would come to be favored in the Free State. Both plan and buildings were respectful of context and drew on local materials, while significantly updating locally conventional architectural forms and excellently fulfilling the programmatic requirements of the campus. Construction proceeded relatively fast in the hands of Moore and Hutchins, with the first part of the core complex --Mary Fisher Hall, a residence hall (FIG.3-3)--completed in 1942, and the erection of other dormitories, a science building, and library between 1947 and 1952. The design excellence of the campus certainly impressed the students who, as they became wealthy and influential citizens, donated money for additions and new facilities. When the College hired new designers in the 1960s, including Pietro Belluschi; Rogers, Taliafero and Lamb; and Wilson and Christie; as well as Hideo Sasaki's firm for an updated master planning; the Goucher faculty and administration maintained a high quality of design and preserved the character of the competition scheme. Goucher President, Otto F. Kraushaar, stated the aims of the second master planning and architectural campaign this way:

> Well-designed college buildings have a significant place in the total teaching function of the institution. Learning takes place not only from books and the lips of living teachers, but by concourse in buildings and association with furnishings that are honest, congenial and have good manners, and by living familiarly with a landscape that subtly blends nature and art. To this end, the alert college avoids clichés and pedestrian architecture and strives for freshness and distinction in design. *(Kraushaar 1960)*

As a result Goucher has maintained a remarkable physical integrity. As a "departure from campus planning tradition," it must be regarded as a significant benchmark in American architectural history. *(Turner 252)*.

3.3 MODERN BUILDINGS FOR INDUSTRY

A remarkable Maryland entrepreneur, Glenn L. Martin, commissioned in the 1930s two modernist landmarks for his aeronautical assembly complex in Middle River, ten miles outside of Baltimore: the 1937 Assembly Hall and its 1939 addition (often referred to as Buildings B and C). The work of America's pre-eminent industrial architect, Albert Kahn, the designer of Ford's Highland Park and River Rouge plants, these well-known architectural icons are rarely directly identified with the history of the state. Martin began to expand his original factory, Building A, constructed in 1928, in anticipation of the war. Buildings B and C housed the production of bombers for the French government, and the PBM Mariner and the PB2M Mars, the latter the largest plane to serve in WW2, for the U.S. Navy. The complex sat alongside Middle River so that assembled aircraft, "flying boats," could be tested in the river feeding the Chesapeake Bay. For a time during WW2, the complex was the largest aircraft factory in the world. (*Breihan 2002*)

Architectural historian Grant Hildebrandt has given us a thorough account of the genesis and analysis of these buildings. The 1937 Assembly Building is an unobstructed space of 300 ft by 450 ft, an unprecedented dimension for a plant that Martin, ever the visionary, estimated he would soon need to erect airplanes with wingspans of 300 feet. To create the longest flat span yet realized for a building, Kahn turned to bridge technique to design the Martin factory trusses; he also implemented as light a structure as could be achieved at the time. The

depth and wide spacing of the trusses suggested the use of monitors running parallel with them; they admit tremendous light as does the glazing at the ends of the building, and allow the great trusses to be seen from outside. (*Hildebrand 183-4*) The extraordinarily photogenic interior (FIG.3-4) was reused by Mies van der Rohe for one of his most famous collage buildings. *(Reed 8)* The vast scale and elegantly simple expression of underlying structure of the Assembly Building is awe inspiring; Hildebrandt notes, quoting William MacDonald, that in the same way as the Pantheon in Rome, "the space swallows up human gesture." (*Hildebrandt 193*) In 1939, Martin, who was then receiving wartime orders, gave Kahn less than three months to design and build a contiguous manufacturing unit, which also counts as one Martin's greatest achievements and one of Kahn's "finest designs". (*Hildebrandt 194*) both buildings still survive, although they are now clothed in corrugated steel painted blue and white; the glass, likewise, has been painted over. In 1941, Kahn designed plant # 2, a mile to the east, where "he repeated almost verbatim the various portions of the original complex." (*Hildebrandt 197*)

One cannot find in pre-World War II America many more compelling examples of a fusion between modernity, modernism, and modernization than in the Martin factory. All three of Kahn's designs, the buildings of 1937, 1939, and 1941, are unusual examples of Modernism in Maryland for the boldness and purity of their expression of the logical physical structure for plants that produced flying machines during a time of emergency with unprecedented speed and scale. But this may not have been such an isolated feat in Maryland after all. We need to dig into the state's industrial legacy from the 1920s and 30s to find other harbingers of modern design. One good candidate is Harford County's Bata compound (FIG.3-5), recently demolished to a make room for waterfront redevelopment. Its architects adopted a design similar to its mother establishment in Zlin, Czechoslovakia, which has been recognized as an important modernist landmark.

3.4 FIRST MANIFESTATIONS OF MARYLAND'S "EVERYDAY MODERNISM"

In the late 1930s, when the economy started to recover and construction picked up a little, a few isolated structures espousing some tenets of modernism were erected in Maryland. Since the most prestigious public commissions remained traditional, these examples of early modernism were generally single-family homes, public commissions with tight budgets, and private commercial endeavors. There was not yet a core of modernist buildings in the Free State (with the exception of the Greenbelt cluster), only occasional examples that received passing attention from the national architectural press.

The year 1938 seems to have been a watershed of sorts, marked by the completion of a few significant structures, mostly in the Baltimore and Washington suburbs.[30]   Toward the end of the decade, we begin to see the first glimmers of a local modernist vernacular, expressed in some everyday buildings.   We shall argue, provisionally, that most of these early modern designs were commissioned by the first wave of professional-managerial suburbanites who would come to play a large social and political role in shaping the suburban built environment after WWII. These early modernist "pioneers" were not wealthy, for the most part, but rather members of a new bourgeoisie—new money, in other words. A few early modern schools and medical facilities during the late 1930s represented Governor Ritchie's state-supported modernization efforts, in addition.   We shall make a few observations about the key building types in what follows in the order of their prevalence in the State.

Single-family detached houses were the principal early vehicles for the expression of an everyday modernism. This should not come as a surprise, since custom-designed homes, whether built by a young designer for himself, relatives, or friends, or by a more experienced architect deciding to try something different, had long been testing grounds for new building materials, construction techniques, and spatial concepts.   We do well to remember, as well, as Beatriz Colomina has pointed out, that "virtually all architects of this century have elaborated their most important architectural ideas through the design of houses." *(Colomina 127)* By the late 1930s, the idea of

---

[30] This is a speculative section. We hope, as our research progresses, to identify additional structures from this period and to refine our account.

building a non-traditional dwelling was "in the air." Even in conservative Maryland, a few designers were encouraged by the success of architects in other cities (such as Chicago's Keck and Keck), who were developing a niche building modern suburban homes. Enlightened clients were tempted by alluring examples illustrated in the popular press and shelter magazines. They may also have been attracted to the promise of low maintenance through the use of unadorned surfaces, without moldings and recesses, and uncluttered space with built-in furniture.

Thus a few of Baltimore's suburban pioneers took the bold move of commissioning houses with modernist features. Good examples are the Dr. and Mrs. G.L. Streeter House, 3707 Saint Paul Street (1937) by John Alhers; the Judge Emory H. Niles house in Poplar Hill (1938) by John Scarff (FIG.3-6); the Soderstrom Residence (1941) by S. Shakelford; and 333-335 Belvedere Avenue, by Palmer and Lamdin. These houses did not embrace modernism in a radical way, but they exhibited features that would become part of a suburban modernist vernacular in Maryland. Their exteriors featured simplified massing, flat overhanging roof s (sometimes used as terraces), and asymmetrical openings; they were sometimes painted white or used light shades of materials, and boasted little to no ornamentation, large casement windows, ocean liner style balconies, and porthole circular windows. Although these houses did not expound a totally new vision of space or a radical departure from traditional notions of domesticity, they did embody the modern elements of simplicity and efficiency as well as technologically up-to-date utilities, rationalized service spaces, and indoor-outdoor living. They were hybrids, rationally designed, attuned to the comfort of their users, and sensitive to natural surroundings.[31]

D.C.'s Maryland suburbs also participated in the emergence of a modern vernacular, akin to that of Frank Lloyd Wright and the regionalists. Taking advantage of the many wooded, steep lots in Montgomery County, several houses, built of textured natural brick and wood and opened to their natural surroundings, had a rustic feel. They departed significantly from traditional period homes. A good example is the dwelling designed by Francis Palms Jr. in Bethesda published in the Architectural Record in June 1941 (FIG.3-7) that featured a dramatic glazed sunroom, no ornamentation, and was beautifully sited on a wooded lot. The Polychrome Houses built from concrete panels by John Joseph Earley (FIG.3-8) represented more dramatically modernist expressions. There were also a few prefabricated houses, built according to the latest experiments, such as the 1935 Motohome in Bethesda *(Jandl)* and the two Moderne prefabricated residences constructed in Greenbelt in Prince George's County.

Beach houses were also good candidates for early modernist design, since they were conducive to a more casual, "opened" life style. A significant experiment in modernism, for example, can be found on Gibson Island in Anne Arundel County, an exclusive resort community for affluent Baltimoreans launched in 1925. The first homes were generally eclectic. Edward Livingston Palmer designed several of them; he preferred to use small windows to fight inclement winter weather, rather than opening up the walls to water views and the summer breezes *(Hyde 2002).* But there was at least one notable exception: the week-end and vacation retreat that New York Beaux-Arts trained architect Alexander Buell Trowbridge designed for his sister and her husband, Dr. L. Corrin Strong. This house was the subject of a six-page article in the December 1931 issue of Architectural Record (FIG.3-8 and 3-9). Photographs attest that it has changed very little. Views of the two-story living room, with Bauhaus chrome and leather chairs and armchairs, showed Marcel Breuer's iconic "Wassily" armchair (1925), which must have created quite a stir on the island.[32] One can see in the Corrin summer cottage the influence of Frank Lloyd Wright's Prairie houses in the doorway, the wide, almost upturned overhanging eaves, and the horizontal profile of the entrance façade. The fenestration of the living room on the water side also echoes the Millard House in Pasadena. But the wood-clad house has its own personality, with "ocean liner" balcony railings painted white,

---

[31] More research is needed on the nature of interior spaces, the extent to which floor plans were standardized or custom-designed for the commissioning family, the number of multi-use spaces, the use of built-in furniture, and the degree of control clients gave architects over interior design.

[32] Or could it be that such avant-garde furniture was placed only for shooting the photograph, as often happens today in architecture journals?

contrasting with the dark blue-gray of the walls and the vermilion red paint of the doorway.[33] The proportions are very pleasing, asymmetrical but exquisitely balanced. Next door, a garage with additional living quarters above was designed in the exact same style, most likely by Trowbridge himself at a later date. A few other beach houses of the 1930s, on Gibson Island and elsewhere, exhibited ocean liner themes. A particularly fitting and elegant example of this aesthetic, still in existence but unfortunately in poor condition, is the Cambridge Yacht Club. Designed by Samuel and Victorine Homsey, a Delaware husband and wife team who ran one of the most creative offices in the Mid-Atlantic Region, the Club was published in Architectural Forum in 1938 (FIG. 3-10).

Public schools were a key part of Governor Ritchie's modernization campaign and also good candidates for early modern design. For functional and economic reasons, schools needed to be low-maintenance, functional, unfussy structures. In the United States, large windows had long been the norm, since bringing light and air to classrooms was deemed essential for the well being of students. Stunning examples of modern schools had been built all around Europe and published extensively in the US[34], and by the mid-1930s, their impact, especially that of Dudok's work in Hilversum, was felt on this side of the Atlantic. Between the two wars, improving Maryland's school system involved two objectives: raising teachers' qualifications and upgrading existing facilities, some of which were vastly inadequate[35] (*Burdette 723-724*). Also, the State decided to consolidate one-room rural schools. Improvements were spearheaded by Albert S. Cook, a student of John Dewey, who was Superintendent of Schools for Baltimore County from 1900 to 1922 and of the entire state from 1922 to 1942. *(Brown 724-725)* Generally, modernization was more evident in the plans and interior finishes than in the elevations of newly constructed schools, to which historical motifs were (sparingly) grafted.[36] Two monumental-looking schemes exhibited powerful modern exteriors, however: the Greenbelt School, already mentioned, and the arresting, factory-like Patterson Park Middle School, designed by Wyatt and Nolting in 1933. (FIG.3-11and 3-12) Showcased in the September 1935 Architectural Record, Patterson Park was the first Baltimore school to break dramatically with eclectic revivalism. An eight-story building filling an entire city block in a working-class rowhouse neighborhood, the school presented a Bauhaus-like façade of alternating bands of dark brown and red brick and large areas of steel-sash industrial windows, without seeming to violate the scale of the surrounding neighborhood. The interior was imaginatively and functionally planned and included beautifully and sparingly detailed auditorium, library, and cafeteria, and a state-of-the-art heating plant. (Milwee 2001)

Health care facilities answered to an even more "functionalist" building rationale since programmatic demands had to be met without fail. The firm Palmer and Lamdin led the movement for the modern hospital in Maryland, their employee Charles M. Nes designing a radically simple exterior for the Tuberculosis Building, the most modern of the five units comprising the campus of the Baltimore City Hospitals when expansion was completed in 1937. (Soeprapto 2001) Other significant early modern healthcare facilities, besides the Bethesda Naval Hospital (1939-42), already mentioned, were the University Hospital in Baltimore by Herbert G. Crisp and James R. Edmonds Jr., published in Architectural Record in July 1937, and Palmer and Lamdin's Nurse's Home and Gateway (1932). These facilities were distinguished by elegantly rational but expansive design solutions tied less to their local surroundings than to the straightforward fulfillment of their programs.

---

[33] This color scheme seems very close to the original condition, as far as can be ascertained from the black and white photographs in the 1931 Architectural Record.

[34] See, for instance, the special issue of Architectural Forum 62 (January 1935).

[35] The school modernization effort was triggered by a 1920 report undertaken by a team from Columbia Teachers College, which declared that a large number of Baltimore's schools were "unsafe, unsanitary, unattractive, inadequately planned" and "almost entirely lacking in the equipment for modern instruction." Over 94 per cent were rated low on fire prevention; 82 per cent on heating and ventilation. Over a quarter of the schools were placed in the "abandon category." Baltimore ranked fortieth among forty-one largest cities in the proportion of high schools students to total school enrollment.

[36] Despite the need for improved facilities, new school construction between the wars was limited. The suburban demographic boom in school age population would not occur until after World War II.

Commercial architecture was also a good target for modernization. The movement to adopt modern design elements began slowly, however, with remodeling on shop windows and the construction of isolated small establishments. A good example of the latter in downtown Baltimore is Charles Nes, Jr.'s commercial building at 1020 St. Paul Street. (FIG.3-13) This simple structure, designed in 1938, featured an austere white façade with clean horizontal lines, industrial windows, a slight second story overhang, and curved walls flanking the entry, giving it a Moderne flair. It began a new, if halting, commercial trend in architecture; isolated instances of modern design could be seen early on in several Maryland cities, even as far west as Cumberland and Frostburg. The design of whole clusters of modernist commercial buildings would have to wait, however, until after the war, when economic conditions picked up and a whole new cohort of Marylanders emigrated out to the suburbs determined to patronize their own commercial cores.

According to MOMA Curator Peter S. Reed, the Second World War marked a genuine turning point in the history of American modernism: "That everyday life would take place in modern architecture was a widespread cultural assumption at the end of World War II." (*Reed 3*) The wartime economy brought booming prosperity to many Americans. Defense related activities selectively transformed the landscape through the massive expansion of industrial capacity; the surge in military and defense worker housing; experimentation with materials, construction techniques, and bureaucratic management of wartime architecture; and the enlistment of many prominent modernist architects in these projects and processes. Proximity to Washington made wartime's long-term impact particularly important in Maryland. (Albrecht 1995)

The war effort taxed Maryland's resources in health and sanitation, law enforcement, transportation, and power production. *(Burdette 785*) Wartime rationing restricted new civilian construction.[37] The Free State was quick to organize a statewide preparedness campaign. Shortly after FDR created the National Defense Advisory Board to mobilize the country for the coming conflict in May 1940, Governor Herbert R. O'Conor established the Maryland Council of Defense. The Council established eight committees to plan the State's mobilization. They covered 1) industrial production, 2) the organization of manpower for defense work, 3) agriculture, 4) citizen welfare, 5) housing, 6) public information, 7) defense, and 8) emergency legislation. *(Callcott 30-31)*

4.1 NON DEFENSE-RELATED STATE MODERNIZATION EFFORTS

During these years, 1940-46, Maryland benefited from at least one kind of modernization effort that was not directly related to the war: state sponsored school construction. According to Callcott, "the one state service which managed to expand during the war was education, the state service that actively promoted middle-class values and that had long been acceptable to middle-class taxpayers." *(Callcott 55)*. State Superintendent Thomas G. Pullen, another student of John Dewey, gave the movement for progressive education the final push it needed to transform school construction. As a result, some very progressive schools were planned and built; a good example was the Dundalk High School, begun in 1944, by William D. Lamdin. Private home construction remained the other building activity not directly related to the war that flourished, relatively speaking, during the war. As Americans flocked to the Nation's Capital to fill war emergency-related jobs, private residential developers and builders were able to remain quite active in the Maryland suburbs, although their output mostly conformed to the eclectic historicism traditionally favored by Marylanders for their single-family dwellings.

4.2 THE IMPACT OF THE DEFENSE EMERGENCY

Most of the modernist legacy from the World War II era in Maryland was defense-related, however, of either military or industrial origin. Federal funds poured into the state. By August 1941, Federal spending caused Maryland's defense industries to boom; the State received over a billion dollars in direct contracts in just 13 months, but that was supplemented by additional monies for training and industrial construction. The Lanham Act, appropriating funds from Congress for defense-related housing, was passed in 1940, and Maryland received a generous allotment of those funds. In addition, private industries secured another $500 million worth of orders for machinery, iron, steel, and other raw materials. (*Burdette 785)*. The proximity to Washington paid off through such activities as federally sponsored hospital construction. Federal funds contributed to the design of the remarkably modern Suburban Hospital in Bethesda, by Faulkner and Kingsbury in cooperation with Marshall Shaffer, the Chief Architect, Hospital Facilities Section, of the United States Public Health Service. (FIG 4-1). The hospital is a

---

[37] Rationing could have dramatic effects on the building industry. For example, the rationing of steel during the Korean War would redirect public school building toward cinder block construction.

monument to design ingenuity as the architects had to navigate a series of wartime limitations and shortages of materials, including fire-resistant materials, which necessitated the one-story scheme.

In addition to the concentration of defense-related industries in Maryland—particularly shipbuilding and aircraft assembly—the State benefited from the noteworthy network of individuals who poured into the nation's capital to support the war effort. A remarkable synergy of talent and progressive spirit converged on Washington, as architects, civil engineers, and reformers sought federal employment. Some were leading modernists. In 1942, George Howe became Deputy Commissioner for Design and Construction at the Public Buildings Administration; he replaced Louis Simon, Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and designed Federal Office Building #4 at the Suitland Federal Center. Catherine Bauer, Alfred Kastner, Paul Nelson, Eugene Klaber, Rhees Burket, and Vernon de Mars worked for various federal housing agencies. Professionals already based in or near Washington turned to federal jobs as well. So did young college graduates, e.g. Joseph Miller, of Catholic University, who served with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alexander Cochran, a graduate of Yale, who hired on with the U.S. Housing Authority before joining the U.S. Naval Reserve, where he became a design and engineering officer with the Seabees, and Charles Goodman, graduate of the Armour Institute, who served with the Army Air Forces Air Transport Command. Faced with daunting time and money constraints, these architects gained invaluable practical and organizational experience in these positions.

This extraordinary constellation of historical circumstances, federal emergency spending, experimentation with materials and construction, and design talent centered on the nation's capital would affect Maryland's economy and its built environment for years to come. The short-term impact of these rapid federal modernization efforts was most strongly felt in three areas: military bases, heavy industry, and housing for defense workers. The long-term effects underwrote postwar modernization and will be discussed in Section 5.

4.2.1 MILITARY BASES

Military bases were located in eleven of Maryland's counties, but the largest operations took place at Fort Meade (training infantry and artillery troops), the Amphibious Training Base in Calvert County (providing invasion training), the Bainbridge Naval Training Center in Cecil County (basic naval training and hospital), the Aberdeen Proving Ground and Edgewood Arsenal (developing and shipping ordinance and manufacturing war chemicals), and the Patuxent Naval Air Station (testing aircraft). *(Callcott 44)*. The Patuxent Naval Air Station, for example, transformed St. Mary's County. It became the principal eastern center for testing naval aircraft, flying instruments, and aircraft weapons, and by 1944, it had swelled the county's population of 24,620 by another 14,000. *(Callcott 41)* Its twin-arch reinforced concrete hangars relied on technology developed during the First World War *(Albrecht 206)*.

Like other military bases in Maryland, Patuxent's demographic explosion happened so quickly that housing and social problems followed and overwhelmed the local community's ability to respond. Similar situations developed at other bases, such as Andrews Air Force Base in Prince George's County, and at defense industry sites, e.g. Elkton. At Patuxent, the base commander secured federal funds to design a planned community. Lexington Park was built in 1942-43 by Kahn and Jacobs of New York City and architect Louis Justement of Washington, D.C. Well-designed and prosperous, Lexington Park was "federally financed, state designed [supervised by the Maryland State Planning Commission], and self-governing." *(Callcott 43-43)* In Aberdeen and nearby Edgewood, new construction was scattered over fifteen miles. The army provided schools and recreational facilities, making "Aberdeen-Edgewood a desirable wartime assignment" that, after 1950, turned into normal suburbia. *(Callcott 39)*

4.2.2 HEAVY INDUSTRY

Federal defense spending stimulated a gigantic boom in Maryland's heavy industry. Most of the industrial activity "extended forty miles along the Chesapeake shore in Cecil, Harford, and Baltimore counties" *(Callcott 36)*, but Hagerstown and Cumberland were important centers as well. The City of Baltimore, with its substantial industrial complex, was especially well positioned to receive defense related contracts because of its two principal industries, shipbuilding and aircraft. Bethlehem Steel and its subsidiary shipyard in Baltimore grew from 2,000 to

60,000 employees; Fairchild Aircraft in Hagerstown from 200 to 8,000; Kelly-Springfield Tire in Allegheny County from 1,000 to 7,000; and Bendix Radio in Towson from 700 to 8,600 (*Callcott 1985, 41*).   Some of these industries added striking modernist buildings to their physical compounds during the World War II era. By far the most significant resources were the Glenn Martin Aircraft Buildings B, C, and E, discussed in Section 3, but Fairchild Engine and Airplane Corporation, later Fairchild Industries, commissioned a number of important modernist buildings, during the war era and after.

4.2.3 DEFENSE HOUSING

        This dramatic surge of workers and military personnel and, often, their families posed serious housing challenges, but architects and planners combined lessons learned over the previous two decades in the fields of minimum housing and community planning to solve emergency housing issues in a true spirit of experimentation. In 1941, the Federal Works Agency established a Division of Defense Housing. Under its aegis several widely acclaimed modernists experimented with innovative designs ranging from single family prefabs to entire planned communities, all meeting the Lanham Act's required minimum cost of no more than $3750 per unit.[38] Richard Neutra, for example, used the superblock concept at Channel Heights, near the San Pedro shipyards, beautifully siting 220 radically modernist buildings to house 600 families along irregular hills and canyons overlooking the Pacific Ocean. Examples of futuristic prefabricated homes went on public display in the Capital region: Buckminster Fuller's Dymaxion House at Hains Point[39] (*Offspring 1941*) and a sprayed concrete Bubble House, by California architect Wallace Neff, in Falls Church *(Albrecht 66)*.

        Maryland's defense-related housing structures were not as spectacular, and many of them have been altered beyond recognition or are gone. Good examples of typical but undistinguished defense housing are the 1000 frame townhouses built during Greenbelt's second phase in 1941 and the more barrack-like single story housing constructed in Aberdeen.   Still, we have found one noteworthy example of modernist housing in the Calvert Houses subdivision in College Park, unfortunately not extant.[40] They were distinguished for their fine siting and massing as well as the open and spacious feeling of their interiors (FIG.4-2 and 4-3), as we can see in an outstanding series of photographs preserved at the Library of Congress. A subdivision at Indian Head (1941), a demonstration site in Charles County, on the Potomac River, serving the nearby Naval Ordnance Plant, featured mundane Cape Cod-style houses but was laid out by no less a designer than Clarence Stein. It represents the distinguishing features of the best defense housing in Maryland: imaginative planning that took advantage of the waterside topography, innovative prefabrication and construction techniques that decreased labor and increased the speed of the building process, and economy.[41] The houses, originally required to be demountable, survive, dramatically altered, *(Rabinowitz 1970)* suggesting the durability, flexibility, livability, and sound investment of the World War II experiments in prefabricated housing.

4.2.4 MIDDLE RIVER

        In Middle River, Maryland has a relatively intact World War II era defense emergency cultural landscape.   It was created between 1939 and 1943, when the Glenn Martin Aircraft Factory's employment ballooned from 3000 to 53,000, with workers employed around the clock in three shifts at two monumental Assembly Plants designed by Albert Kahn (see Section 3.3). As we know from historian John Breihan's research, Middle River, a little hamlet of

---

[38] Among well known modernists working for the FWA were William Wurster, Neutra, Gropius, Breuer, Howe, Louis Kahn, Kastner, and Frank Lloyd Wright. *(Reed 11-12)*

[39] The house was removed in 1942.

[40] We are tentatively attributing the design of the Calvert Houses to SOM, but more research is required to confirm this.

[41] The site was erected by the Defense Housing Program to demonstrate and evaluate prefabricated defense housing. Ten manufacturers were invited to erect 586 units as quickly and economically as they could.

161 persons in 1938, was overwhelmed by the influx, nor would Baltimore County respond to the need for new roads, sewers, water lines, and schools. The Martin Company undertook the initial planning and called on the Federal Government to do the rest. *(Breihan 2000 4, 7)* To house workers and their families, Martin "agreed to build one house for every two the government paid for." He brought in a former Boston developer, James E. Cody, who brilliantly masterminded Middle River's transformation. With Lanham Act funds, 4,000 government owned trailers were brought on site and 1,000 one-bedroom duplexes as well as four large dormitories were erected in Trailertown, Victory Villa Gardens, and Glenmar Gardens. *(Callcott 41)* Three permanent developments of 1,000 units each were built: Aero Acres, Stansbury Manor, and Victory Villa, the latter constructed by the Federal Government, through the FSA. The basic house in Aero Acres and Victory Villa was a Cape Cod with modern features, such as large industrial windows, porch latticework, and uncluttered functional interior spaces (FIG. 4-4). These were prefabricated units made of "Cemesto," a new fiber and asbestos material developed by the John B. Pierce housing research foundation and the Celotex Corporation, after plans by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill (SOM).[42] *(Breihan 2000 8-10)*

A key part of Middle River's importance for the Modern Movement in Maryland lies in the comprehensive and excellent quality of its planning, produced under extraordinary pressures of time, economy, and organizational challenge. The Martin Company began the process by pressuring the State Roads Commission to build two divided highways, intersecting at the Assembly plant.   For Stansbury Manor, a 184-unit garden apartment complex, and Stansbury Estates, a single family house development, the Company drew from a 1937 master plan Albert Kahn had prepared, calling for a garden city along the Chesapeake Bay shoreline at Wilson Point. Houses in Stansbury Estates were grouped around superblocks where pedestrian pathways lead to parkland and playgrounds. In Aero Acres, SOM designed gently curving streets in a symmetrical pentagonal layout. The street layout carefully separated local from high-speed through traffic, and the subdivision boasted one or Maryland's first strip shopping centers in walking distance. In 1941, the Federal Government hired Hale Walker, the planner of Greenbelt, to develop a new master plan for Middle River and to design the Victory Villa subdivision. Walker laid out "curving streets, pedestrian ways, school sites, and a strip shopping center" and introduced more than 30 cul-de-sacs into his subdivision plan. *(Breihan 1998, 2000)* Hilyard Robinson, an African American architect, who designed Langston Terrace in DC after traveling to Germany to study worker housing, designed Armistead Gardens for the Federal Public Housing Authority. Several private developers built additional housing, some of it financed with federal money. During the peak years for defense work, Middle River provided over 40 cafeterias, and a two building community center, featuring an auditorium/gymnasium and a cooperative nursery.

In 1946, Glenn Martin Company cut back on its production. In 1973, the Company left Middle River, but other industries took its place, and the town has remained an "above-average working-class neighborhood that never declined." (Callcott 41) Although the once-identical Cemesto houses have been altered and individualized, and residents have disregarded some of the planning features, e.g. the superblocks and pedestrian pathways, *(Breihan 2000 17)* Middle River offers an outstanding collection of national defense era resources in its buildings, land-use patterns, and community institutions.   In general, the legacy of wartime working-class housing communities has endured in Maryland, although this may not always be easily identifiable from a visual standpoint.

4.3 SETTING THE STAGE FOR POSTWAR MODERNIZATION

Although Maryland possesses significant and a few outstanding modern architectural and planning resources from the World War II era, the greatest impact of the war came later. As Donald Albrecht put it, "for millions of Americans at home, a booming wartime economy produced a remarkable prosperity that ended the Great

---

[42] A single panel of Cemesto could be used as both exterior and interior wall, insuring low cost and high speed construction. A 24 x 28 foot two-bedroom house could be erected by unskilled laborers using only hammers and levels. After government housing priorities shifted to Oak Ridge, TN, and the Manhattan Project, Cemesto was restricted and the last 600 units of Victory Villa were constructed of plywood panels. *(Breihan 2000 8,10)*

Depression, sparked a postwar economic miracle, and made the American dream of suburban homes, shopping centers, and modern kitchens a reality." *(Albrecht xvi)* Real income for Marylanders increased by almost 50% between 1939 and 1946, with a disproportionate amount of the increase reserved for working class households, whose wages and salaries increased 140% nationally. *(Callcott 43)* Defense highway construction near factories, begun during the war years, laid the groundwork for suburban sprawl. And with more Americans in a position after the war to buy homes and anxious to raise families, suburban home and subdivision building boomed.

Wartime housing served as a catalyst for both suburban subdivision development and modern architecture. The many innovative housing experiments undertaken by well-known modernist architects working for Federal agencies attracted significant media publicity and helped acclimate the middle class public to modern design ideas. *(Albrecht xxiii)* Accomplishments in mass production and economies of scale, crucial during the wartime housing emergency, were applied to the private housing industry after the war, underwriting the boom in large and small suburban tract subdivisions and keeping the houses affordable for working and middle class households, for at least two decades. Prominent architectural critics, such as John Entenza, editor of <u>Arts and Architecture,</u> reacted to the more mundane models of prefabricated defense housing by establishing the Case Study House Program in January 1945. He commissioned a series of architects to "design and build furnished prototypes of good design," which he showcased in his magazine. One of the most famous was Case Study House #8, designed by Charles and Ray Eames, which combined modernist aesthetics, wartime materials, and spatial ingenuity to produce a breathtaking and forward looking suburban design. *(Reed 31-32)*

But the lessons learned and the popular exposure to avant garde design ideas from wartime construction would influence a wide range of design commissions after the war: houses, hospitals, office complexes, commercial buildings, churches, planned communities, and a wide range of public commissions. We will look in detail at the modernization of Maryland's landscape after the war in Section 5.

SECTION 5: THE BABY AND BUILDING BOOM YEARS: c.1947-c.1965

   "World War II, like the American Revolution and the Civil War, was one of the watersheds of American history, not so much for what happened on the battlefield, but for the change the war signaled in the kind of life Americans led….During the next forty years Americans experienced an unprecedented material and social well-being, and the gain for Marylanders was considerably greater than the national average." (*Callcott 28*) War and its aftermath influenced nearly every aspect of the Free State's built environment during the baby and building boom years. It shaped the scope, pace, and contours of Maryland's modernization campaigns, as well as their sponsorship. So, too, did the war have a cultural impact. Media outlets both publicized and promoted modernity, as the wartime economy was transformed into "the strongest consumer economy the world had ever seen," and consumers were urged to sample and acquire all kinds of new modern lifestyles, products, and ideas. (*Hine 10*) A new generation of architects brought Modernism to established firms, just as a forward-looking breed of clients sought a contemporary brand of architectural expression for their new suburban homes and businesses. These unique postwar circumstances brought about the full flowering of the Modern Movement in Maryland: a stylistically heterogeneous and steadily evolving mode of planning and architecture, tailored to the specific needs and regional character of a given commission.

5.1 PROSPERITY, SUBURBANIZATION, AND THE ACCELERATED PACE OF MARYLAND'S STRUCTURAL MODERNIZATION

   All four kinds of modernization campaigns that we set out in Section 1.4 were at work in Maryland between 1947 and 1965. Three governors—Lane (1947-50), McKeldin (1951-58) and Tawes (1959-66)—led the state through substantial efforts to upgrade physical infrastructure, improve education, and commit significant resources to developing a planning function in state government. The Federal Government continued its influence in the state as well in three ways: 1) through the physical decentralization of government bureaus and agencies into the Maryland suburbs, 2) defense spending channeled to various public and private businesses and enterprises, and 3) support for urban renewal projects. The most profound source of structural modernization—and one whose support strongly underlay the State's efforts—was the spectacular postwar growth of a new progressive suburban political cohort in the corridor stretching from the Baltimore metropolitan area to the Maryland suburbs of Washington, D.C. This constituency of mostly professional-managerial workers demanded new leadership, nonpartisan planning, and considerably greater investment in all kinds of metropolitan infrastructure. They commissioned a whole range of suburban building and planning types, as we shall see later in Section 5.5. Within the aggressive settlement of post World War II suburbs, several small but significant entrepreneurs sponsored distinctive projects of Modernist planning and/or architecture.

5.1.1 SPECTACULAR DEMOGRAPHIC, ECONOMIC, AND SUBURBAN GROWTH

   Several historical circumstances combined to underwrite Maryland's prosperity and its building and planning booms during the postwar years.   The first was a massive shift in demographics. During the 1950s, the state's population grew by nearly a third to reach 3,100,689 inhabitants in 1960. The "baby boom" climaxed in 1957, bringing with it tremendous pressures for housing, education, consumption, and recreation. From 1960 to 1965, population growth was not as speedy, but was nonetheless 13.5%; by 1970 there were almost 4 million people living in the Free State.

   The most profound shift, however, was the movement of population to the suburbs. By 1960, 72.8% of Maryland's households were considered urban, the vast majority living in the corridor extending from the city limits of Washington, D.C. to Baltimore's northern suburbs. Baltimore City, whose boundaries were fixed in 1948, actually lost population to the suburbs: 10,000 inhabitants during the 1950s and another 3.5% of its population during the next decade. Most of those departing were home owning, affluent families. During the 1950s, four suburban counties experienced tremendous increases: Baltimore gained 222,000 inhabitants, Montgomery County 176,00, Prince George's County 163,000, and Anne Arundel 89,000. During the 1960s, the most spectacular growth rate

(84.8%) was found in Prince George's, which became the State's most populated county, but demographic growth was also strong in Montgomery (53.3%) and Baltimore (26.1%), the second most populated county in Maryland. This massive suburbanization affected rural land uses and lifestyles as well. Each year between 1959 and 1964, 50,000 acres of Maryland farmland were diverted toward suburban development *(Brugger, 613)*.

A second factor influencing Maryland's dramatic boom in building activity was the manufacturing sector's increased productivity, as existing plants were enlarged, modernized, and converted from wartime to peacetime activity. In the 1960s, the Tawes administration expanded the state's industrial base by aggressively recruiting new industries and corporations. Even venerable firms, long resident in the state, commissioned new buildings. A good example was the Mack Trucks factory in Hagerstown, designed by Giffels and Rossetti (c.1962) of precast concrete panel construction. Most new industrial buildings were horizontal sheds, but talented designers were called upon to fashion a slick facade and harmonize proportions, as in Alexander Cochran's expansions for the Lion Brothers Office and Plant, in Owings Mill in 1950, 1957, and 1964. Charles Goodman's design for the Techfab factory in Beltsville (1956) in Prince Georges County was an elegant assembly of the prefabricated panels this company manufactured. After the war, light manufacturing tended to concentrate in planned industrial parks; the Bethlehem Steel Company compound at Sparrows Point was one of the largest in the world. During the Cold War era, industrial decentralization, intended to counteract nuclear threats, spread many industrial enterprises away from major cities *(Burdette 811)*. The Westinghouse Electrical Company, for example, became one of Anne Arundel County 's major employers and erected a spectacular Molecular Electronic Laboratory (FIG.5-1), designed by Vincent Kling in 1964. One of the consequences of industrial growth southeast of Baltimore was the creation of waterside subdivisions that attracted executives and engineers. In the late 1950s, Gibson Island became a destination for permanent residents; see, for example, Bryden Hyde's houses for the Tippens and Butler families.

The postwar economic boom extended to government offices and service industries as well as manufacturing plants. Between 1947 and 1965, the number of workers employed by state, local, and federal agencies in Maryland increased enormously. This phenomenon galvanized growth and construction in the suburbs, particularly because of the Federal Government's planned dispersal of employment across the National Capital region *(Parsons)*. Indeed, the Government's deconcentration of federal agencies for security reasons during the Cold War can be considered a key component of one of the principal modernization campaigns stimulating new building in the Free State. One of the first suburban areas affected was Bethesda. Across Rockville Pike from the Naval Hospital, which had opened in 1942, the National Institutes of Health expanded its campus considerably. Some of its flagship buildings, such as the National Library of Medicine, designed by O'Connor and Kilhma (1960) (FIG. 5-2), are striking designs, representative of a period when the General Services Administration was concerned with design excellence and originality. Rockville Pike, a major route into Washington, D.C., developed as a major corridor for federal employment. In 1955, the Atomic Energy Commission moved to Germantown, and in 1959 the National Bureau of Standards relocated to Gaithersburg. Their new buildings were stark, mammoth structures, just like the U.S. Social Security Administration Headquarters in Woodlawn, West Baltimore, around which a considerable amount of commercial development began to gravitate *(Hiebert 352-354)*. Significant public sector buildings in the suburbs were commissioned by county governments as well, though. The handsome air-conditioned, granite clad Baltimore County Office Building (FIG. 5-3) by William F.Stone (1955) -- which the dedication brochure called "as contemporary in style as a jet liner" -- marked the beginning of a new phase in development for downtown Towson where, in the same period, the county implemented even more daring designs for its police and fire stations.

A second, and related, dimension of the Federal Government's postwar modernization campaign affecting growth in the Free State was defense spending. Both investment in military installations and in defense-related research and development led to the construction of many modern structures. Military compounds were significantly enlarged during the Cold War era. Although we have not yet been granted access to these sites and their archives, external research has turned up some hidden modernist architectural treasures, such as the wonderful parabolic band shell (FIG. 5-4) at Fort George C. Meade, designed in 1957 by one of its staff engineers, and the Officer's Club at Andrews Air Force Base, designed by Charles Goodman in the same year. The Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt was established as one of the National Aeronautical and Space Administration's principal research centers. Cold War politics and the arms and space races also affected Maryland's postwar built environment in indirect ways when, for instance, the steel shortage during the Korean War forced architects to select alternate

structural materials for public schools.

In addition to population growth and shifts, economic productivity, and federal building and modernization campaigns, the Free State's growing affluence significantly influenced the sponsorship of modern planning and architecture during the postwar years. These circumstances were not unrelated. According to Callcott, "the real income of Marylanders rose by 70 percent during the 1950s and by another 75 percent in the 1960s." *(Callcott 1985, 63)*. During the 1950s, the gross state product increased by 46 per cent (as opposed to 39% on average for the rest of the U.S.) Overall, state residents' incomes were nearly 10% higher than the national average. Even so, wealth was not equally distributed. There were notable differences of incomes and standards of living between lower middle class communities, such as Greenbelt, Hyattsville, Middle River, Catonsville, and Woodlawn and more affluent suburbs. By 1960 Montgomery County had one the country's highest median-family incomes, with Bethesda and Potomac topping the scale. In Baltimore County, Ruxton, Pikesville, Owing Mills, and, within the Baltimore City limits but along the same general northwestern direction, Stevenson, were also pockets of affluence.

Despite differences in wealth, the new postwar suburban communities shared considerable interests and their residents emerged as political forces to be reckoned with. Callcott refers to a "suburban consensus" that developed during the 1950s, a decade when "lower middle-class economic interests coincided with upper-middle class idealism" *(Callcott 1985, 26)*. The new suburbanites put an end to political corruption and traditional political organizations, at least in suburban jurisdictions. Predominately liberal in outlook, they supported home rule for counties, rigorous planning, and a technocratic, nonpartisan brand of administration. It is not too strong a statement to say that suburban voters ushered in a new brand of politics—and a new political elite—in the Free State after the war. Their support was a key factor underlying the ability of Governors Lane, McKeldin, and Tawes to achieve substantial improvements in state education, transportation infrastructure, public health, planning, and bureaucratic efficiencies in government.

The new suburban counties had a strong impact on their built environments as well. Suburban affluence was a powerful factor. After the initial postwar housing crisis had been addressed, the lion's share of new housing investment focused on substantial single-family homes. According to Callcott, the "average price of new homes in the Washington suburbs rose from $6,300 in 1947, to $11,800 in 1957, to $34,000 in 1965." (Callcott 1985, 64) Many modern architects resided in the more prosperous suburbs of both Washington and Baltimore, often building "demonstration" homes for themselves. The above-average affluence and level of education of suburban households did not automatically correlate with the embrace of modernism, however. It is probably accurate to say that most prosperous suburbanites remained tradition-bound when deciding upon the design of their own houses. Nonetheless, money and suburban social standing played an important role in nurturing high quality modern design in the state. There were notable residential experiments in modernism scattered throughout the suburbs. Moreover, members of the new cohort clearly enjoyed working and shopping in modern, technologically advanced environments. We shall explore these themes in more detail in Section 5.5 below.

5.1.2 POLITICS, BUREAUCRACY, TECHNOCRACY, AND PLANNING

With the shift in state power from cities and rural areas to suburbs, Maryland politics became less conservative and more technocratic. Indeed, by the 1960s, a "Culture of Bureaucracy" predominated in the state, producing a bigger government, but one now made up of centralized and specialized modern bureaus. *(Callcott 1985, 224)*. The trend toward technocracy began with the Lane administration. A supporter of Truman's Fair Deal, Governor Lane (Dem., 1947-50) "launched the state into the postwar era along a progressive course" *(Callcott 1985, 150 and 99)* that focused on significant increases in State services: education, road-building, public health, prisons, and welfare institutions. During his administration, the state budget expanded more than 25% each year; to pay for his programs, Lane established new state taxes and increased existing ones. *(Callcott 1985, 104)* Despite its beneficial effect on the state's economy, Lane's tax policy was unpopular and he was not reelected. His successor, from 1951 to 1958, was former Baltimore mayor (1943-1947 and again from 1963 to 1967) Theodore McKeldin, a liberal Republican who greatly extended big government and state services. The functional and physical modernization of state institutions dramatically transpired under his leadership.

By the end of the McKeldin Administration (1951-58), planning had become an essential modus operandi

for state government. The significance of this development (as well as its lateness in relation to adoption by other state and city governments) should not be underestimated for understanding the development of the Modern Movement in Maryland. Planning is the consummate embodiment of the modernist impulse: the rational and deliberate structuring of what are deemed the essential functions of government and society. A state planning department was created in 1959, its staff increasing rapidly under the Tawes administration (1959-66), during which planners took charge of shaping the "five modernizations: education, roads, regional industrial development, health, and the environment." (*Callcott 1985, 178*)

Planning was hardly confined to state government during these years, however; it had broad support throughout the suburbanizing regions of the state.   Both the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, established during the 1920s, provided some planning functions for the entire D.C. suburban region. After World War II, though, M-NCPPC's planning purview expanded.   During the 1950s, the Commission produced master plans for highways, schools, parks, and libraries. A more comprehensive vision emerged in 1958, however, in a notebook entitled Looking Ahead. This document called for "orderly regional development with residential communities, shopping areas and employment centers built up in a harmonious fashion," "logical distribution of school and park facilities," "a regional highway system with ample rights of way for future widening, and improved rapid transit." In January 1964, M-NCPPC's General Plan for the Maryland-Washington Regional District was adopted. It encouraged growth of wedges of open spaces and corridor cities, such as Gaithersburg, although, interestingly, the green wedges seemed to concentrate in Montgomery County while the commercial corridors clustered in Prince George's. (Brugger 584-85)

There were other significant planning efforts during the postwar years that must be considered part of the story of Modernism in the Free State. One novel effort was the establishment of architectural review boards, on which sat architects who rallied the cause of modernism. These boards were formed by the State as well as by different counties and cities.   Another important planning effort was the series of ambitious urban renewal projects for the centers of suburban towns that had grown too fast and erratically, and were beginning to suffer from the competition of regional shopping centers. (We will talk about urban renewal in downtown Baltimore in Section 5.4). In 1961, Baltimore County officials created a Redevelopment and Rehabilitation Commission to obtain federal funds for their renewal plans. However, three years later, Towson's and Catonsville's urban renewal projects were sidetracked when a public referendum rejected County Executive Spiro Agnew's application for federal funds to implement them. (*Callcott 1984, 80*).   In Rockville, the Directors of Planning and Renewal prepared and partly implemented a well-publicized Mid-City Redevelopment Program. The full architectural impact of urban renewal policies on suburban centers would be felt after 1965 and will be analyzed in Section 6.

With such a dramatic shift of population and political power, the governance of the booming suburbs took a distinctively un-Marylandlike turn. By 1945 the new suburbanites had clearly signaled their desire to govern themselves according to a "middle-class democratic ideal that pretended it was not political at all" *(Callcott 1985, 20)*. A nonpartisan "better government" movement, put forward by neighborhood improvement associations and suburban service clubs, began playing the key role in local politics. Suburban constituents made clear that they would not tolerate machine politics and the old line Democratic Party organizations were systematically turned out in all of the burgeoning counties. Montgomery County was one of the first to do so; in 1946, Montgomery adopted the first home rule charter government. In 1956, Anne Arundel fashioned a home rule charter that provided for an elected County Executive/County Council government. Baltimore County adopted a home rule charter government in 1962, and Prince George's County—the site of an entrenched machine that took a little longer to overthrow--followed suit in 1970. (*Callcott 1985, 2*) Around 1960, Howard and Harford counties evolved "almost directly from the culture of community elites to that of middle-class suburbia" *(Callcott 1985, 22)*.   One of the consequences of this change in governance was the severing of County from State Assembly politics; in essence, it was a movement on the part of suburban constituencies to garner local control over their political affairs.

Although postwar suburban politics may have been progressive in many dimensions, that liberality did not extend to race relations. In the immediate postwar years, suburban migration was predominantly white. Racial integration remained a major challenge for politicians and a societal issue that cast a long shadow over the cultural and physical landscape of the state. In both affluent Montgomery County as well as the more democratic Prince George's County, there existed small exclusively black suburban communities, e.g. Hayti and Lakeland, respectively.

Tightly bounded, these communities featured many owner-built homes, some of them substandard; they were self-provisioning communities, mostly hidden from view. Once the migration of white well-to-do suburbanites reached a critical mass, these long-standing black neighborhoods were labeled an embarrassment; they were frequently targeted for redevelopment or even more tightly circumscribed. Ironically, State politics were somewhat more enlightened during the 1950s. Under McKeldin's leadership, the 1950s were an "interlude" when Maryland politicians "could seek black support without threatening whites." Thus, McKeldin appointed many African Americans to state commissions, and several institutions in Baltimore—fire departments, department stores, theatres, and hospitals—agreed to integrate. The northernmost segregated state was one of the first to accept the *Brown v. Board of Education* court decision integrating public schools, and Baltimore integrated its public housing in 1954 (*Callcott 150 and chronology 151*). Thus far, we have found little evidence that mainstream architecture and building construction had opened their doors to African Americans, however. Although Howard University's architecture program expanded during these years, we have only been able to identify a limited number of modern buildings by African-American architects, most designed in the late 1960s.

5.1.3 THE STATE'S POSTWAR MODERNIZATION CAMPAIGNS: TRANSPORTATION, EDUCATION, HEALTH, THE ENVIRONMENT, AND HOUSING

Postwar productivity, prosperity, and population growth put the Free State in a position for virtually the first time in its history to sustain a series of important improvement campaigns to modernize key state services. The well being of progressive, well-educated suburbanites and the state's expanding private commercial and industrial enterprises depended on a modern built environment, excellent transportation, and a well-educated citizenry. Their combined political clout coalesced with three gubernatorial administrations committed to rational bureaucratic modes of conducting state business, in order to provide the political will to undertake long overdue campaigns of structural modernization. Improvements affected five sectors, primarily: transportation infrastructure, public education (both K-12 and higher education), public health, environmental protection, and housing. These modernization projects were financed through taxpayers' contributions, shifts in priorities within the State's budget, as well as by occasional federal subsidies.

Of these categories of improvement, transportation infrastructure may have been the most urgent. Maryland had one of the poorest road systems in the country. After the war, the state witnessed a spectacular increase in automobile ownership: nearly 800,000 cars were registered in the state in 1951 and over 1,300,000 in 1959. *(Callcott, 143)* Federal subsidies, special bond issues, and an increase in the gasoline tax provided ready if not uncontroversial sources of funding. In 1953, the McKeldin Administration saw its highway master plan accepted by the State Assembly; it called for rebuilding over 3,100 miles of existing highway and laying 300 miles of new roads, with estimated spending of $568 million spread over 12 years (*Brugger 578*). McKeldin, Lane, and Tawes were all on hand in 1952 for the official opening of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge. The spectacular new span signaled a turning point for the state, connecting two cultures, enabling the poultry, truck farming, and seafood industries to have improved access to the Baltimore and Washington markets, and providing a major impetus for ocean front resort development. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway, initially designed for defense purposes to serve Fort Meade, was completed in 1954, and the John Hanson Highway (I-50) linking Washington to Annapolis in 1961. In 1957, I-270 between Washington and Frederick opened. Two years later it was I-83's turn, connecting Baltimore to Harrisburg. The I-70 section from Frederick to Ohio was completed in 1970 and I-95 from Baltimore to Wilmington the following year (*Callcott 1985, 67-68*). Major urban centers of the state received their share of transportation improvements as well. New bridges crossed the Severn in Annapolis and the Potomac in Cumberland; in 1957, the Baltimore Harbor Tunnel connected Canton and Brooklyn. In 1962 Baltimore's Jones Fall Expressway and Beltway (I-695) opened to traffic; the Capital Beltway around Washington, D.C. was completed in 1964. A few suburban towns also built high-speed bypasses; in Rockville, the Washington-Frederick traffic was diverted from the center of town as early as 1951, and Westminster was bypassed in 1954.

What were the effects of these new high-speed roadways? Planned well in advance of their actual construction, the placement of new roads directed long-range suburban development and planning, especially office, retail, and light industry construction. Freeway and beltway construction shaped and enabled industrial decentralization and residential sprawl; concentrated commercial, industrial, and apartment zoning close to interchanges; and even affected architecture, as designers fashioned large commercial and industrial buildings to

create visual interest when viewed at high speed and from a long distance.   At the level of the ordinary citizen, improved roadways made commuting to work easier for new suburban households and enabled more families to move out of urban centers. Bypasses spared suburban towns auto congestion while stimulating new commercial activity on the bypass as well as bold, large scale architectural treatments. Nearby freeways generally elevated property levels in the suburbs, subsidizing a "middle-class, auto-owning, shopping-center culture." In center cities, it was an altogether different proposition, however.   When freeways slashed through urban neighborhoods, they inevitably displaced hundreds of households and caused property values to plummet.   A secondary effect was commercial disinvestment and the relocation of considerable retail activity from the urban core to regional shopping centers and corridors on the periphery. *(Callcott 1985, 68)*

Of the improvement campaigns undertaken in the postwar years, education may have exceeded even road building in popularity. Certainly all three gubernatorial administrations worked hard to improve school buildings, teacher's salaries, and the quality of instruction.   Beginning in 1949, the State spent vast amounts of money to house a fast growing public school population, authorizing $70 million for new construction. *(Burdette 798)* From 1945 to 1951, 208 public schools were built or substantially added on to, teacher salaries increased 53%, and the average class size declined from forty to thirty-three pupils. (*Callcott 1985, 105*) In the 1950s, the public school population increased 58 percent as workers of childbearing age streamed into the state and the postwar baby boom peaked. From 1958 to 1965, the state distributed an additional $84.8 million for elementary and secondary school construction and raised teacher salaries another 45%. In addition, Maryland pursued a policy of consolidating rural and neighborhood schools, reducing their total number, but providing students with a broader curriculum. As a result, there were 1,300 public schools in the state by 1970, including 291 high schools. (*Callcott 1985, 142*) Rich counties placed special emphasis on education, but Maryland was far more successful than its neighbors in equalizing the quality of education and school buildings across the state. As our field surveys demonstrated, educational establishments commissioned during this era seemed quite similar and equally well built, regardless of whether they were located in blue-collar neighborhoods like Middle River or posh sections of Montgomery County, in the dense belt of population between Washington and Baltimore or in the far western reaches of the state.

In addition to rising teachers' salaries and massive school-building campaigns, cutting-edge pedagogic experiments took place in Maryland during the postwar era, encouraging equally progressive educational master planning and design. The most publicized of these experiments took place in the late 1950s in Washington County, which was selected because it represented mainstream America and had one of the most liberal school boards and superintendents in the nation. There, in the Hagerstown Public Schools, the Ford Foundation funded a five-year program for educational television. *(Brugger 597)*. It was coupled with an extensive construction campaign, mostly in the hands of the D.C. architectural office of McLeod and Ferrara (see bio), that produced crisply modern buildings like the South Hagerstown High School (FIG. 5.5).

Public universities experienced tremendous growth after the war, as veterans returned home and used the G.I. Bill to go to college, and knowledge acquisition seemed the key to an unlimited future. The University of Maryland at College Park saw its enrollment surge, from 6,000 students in 1945, to 13,850 in 1955, and 36,980 in 1966. (*Callcott 1985, 180*) This growth spurt caused anxiety among many politicians for whom the University's D.C. suburban location represented alien territory. In 1963, the legislature approved a tri-partite system of higher education—University of Maryland campuses, smaller state colleges, and community colleges—and shortly thereafter Governor Tawes presided over the beginning of a huge building campaign that enhanced campus facilities across the state. *(Brown 859)* Nonetheless, administrators remained quite conservative in their tastes, in matters architectural as well as educational.   A particularly unfortunate missed architectural opportunity was University of Maryland President Byrd's rejection of SOM's elegant proposed design for the Glenn L. Martin College of Engineering and Aeronautical Sciences (FIG. 5.6), on the pretext that Georgian columns were indispensable to buildings on the College Park campus. (*Van Fossen Schwab 2002*) In 1960, the State Teachers College in Towson was endowed with a spectacular "testing" Elementary School, and Morgan State College was also expanded. Meanwhile, Johns Hopkins University, on which the state's political elites used to rely heavily for leadership and counsel, reduced its undergraduate student body proportionally. Modern design did not take center stage on this campus until the late 1960s, with the notable exception of the Embryology Building (1962) funded by the Carnegie Institute and built by a Boston firm specializing in academic buildings.

Prior to the 1950s, Maryland had thoroughly neglected physical and especially mental health facilities and services. In 1949, the *Sunpapers* "ran a dramatic series showing mentally ill local children in dungeons, ankle deep in filth, and adults chained together, forty to a room." *(Callcott 1985, 106)*. Shortly thereafter, the General Assembly authorized new state facilities at Rosewood, Mt. Wilson, and Spring Grove, as well as an important research psychiatric institute at the University of Maryland (see also *Brugger 568)*. These were low-rise compounds, based on principles inherited from nineteenth century hospital planning. Spring Grove in Catonsville (FIG. 5-7) merits further examination, however, for its group of three residential buildings, designed to humanize modern medical treatment in a natural wooded setting.   In 1955, the Patuxent Institution for the criminally insane (FIG. 5-8) opened, designed by Lucius White, Jr.. This grand, elongated structure with a strong institutional character was slightly industrial looking. In general, the postwar period was one of steady building of state and local medical facilities. The Maryland Department of Health commissioned a series of nursing homes. A large Veteran's Hospital was built in Baltimore. County hospitals started small, but they were numerous and usually pleasantly designed, in the same spirit as contemporary elementary schools. Good examples are Prince George's (Kea, Ross & Walton, 1944), Calvert County (The Office of James R. Edmunds, 1954), and Carroll County (1960) Hospitals, although they acquired increasingly larger and generally less distinguished additions over time. Small clinics exhibiting good design were also built by several county health departments. Whether in the public or private sector, however, hospital design became increasingly a matter of accommodating sophisticated programmatic demands while maintaining some measure of patient comfort and appeal. By the end of our period, medical architecture had become primarily the province of specialist firms.

Environmental and conservation improvements were a priority for the Tawes administration, and one of the ways that governor distinguished his modernization policies from those of his predecessors. Indeed, on this issue, Tawes may be considered a truly progressive governor; his environmental measures preceded rather than followed the public's enthusiasm, which developed late in the 1960s. *(Callcott 180)* Under his administration, Maryland developed master plans to improve water resources and air quality, and to maintain the fisheries of the Chesapeake Bay. The latter effort led to the construction of modern research laboratories for studying the Bay's ecosystems. During the 1960s, the number of state and regional parks doubled **(***Burdette 863)***,* generating a few interesting park structures, such as recreational facilities and guard posts.

Unlike transportation, education, health facilities, and the environment, public housing did not appear to be a subject of great pride or concern for the State; perhaps the relative lack of interest was a continuation of old line conservatism, on display during the Great Depression when Millard Tydings staunchly opposed the Maryland Housing Authority Law of 1937. Public housing was considered, at best, a necessary evil everywhere but Baltimore City, which developed quite an aggressive and, eventually, nationally renowned approach to policing substandard housing and attracting Federal funds to construct new public housing (see Section 5.4.1). Elsewhere, the record of local housing authorities, acting upon the 1937 Law for cities of more than 1,000 inhabitants, was modest, both from a qualitative and quantitative standpoint. Montgomery County voluntarily shunned public housing. Annapolis built College Creek Terrace, with federal subsidies, and Frederick commissioned at least two public housing complexes. A notable exception regarding the quality of design was the John F. Kennedy Apartments, a high-rise tower constructed for the elderly by the Public Housing Authority of the City of Cumberland in 1967.

A few other kinds of public buildings were commissioned as part of Maryland's postwar modernization. Because it maintained the second largest ratio of prisoners to citizens in the nation, the State added important modern buildings to the Maryland Correctional Institution complex in Hagerstown, and Montgomery County built a dramatically modern Detention Center in Rockville, by Stann & Hilleary (1963) (FIG. 5-12). A few significant public cultural facilities were designed in the modern idiom. Most important, both for their cultural and design interest, were the dozen or so branches of the Enoch Pratt Library, erected remarkably fast, from 1950 to 1965, by Cochran, Stephenson & Wing; Smith and Veale; Finney, Dodson, Smeallie, Orrick; Locke & Jackson; and other prominent local firms. A modest gem in Garrett County is the Ruth Enlow Library in Oakland (S. Russ Minter, 1950, 1969). Apparently, however, the State of Maryland did not devote much attention to enhancing the visual and performing arts. Private patronage of the arts existed, especially in Baltimore, but it essentially relied on pre-existing facilities. No major museum building campaign occurred in the 1950s and 1960s. Apparently theater construction was limited to the Charles Center's Mechanic Theater and a few college buildings, such as the Tawes Performing Arts Center on the College Park campus, hardly a Modernist monument.

To conclude this section, it is important to note that private organizations made significant contributions to social welfare and educational modernization during the postwar years as well. Parochial and private schools provide good examples. Catholic Colleges in and around Baltimore made significant modern additions to their campuses. Particularly fine examples were the Student Residence and College Dining Room (Doyle Hall) at the College of Notre Dame (Gaudreau and Gaudreau, 1957-60) and a dormitory at Saint Charles College in Catonsville (Johnson and Boutin, 1961). (*St. Charles College*) The Baltimore Hebrew College also commissioned a dramatic building with a monumental entrance of Indiana Limestone (Tyler, Ketcham & Myers, c. 1957). Among numerous Catholic hospitals, two were particularly elegant when first completed: St. Agnes Hospital in southwest Baltimore (FIG. 5-9) (Faulkner, Kingsbury and Stenhouse, 1963) and St. Joseph's Hospital in Towson (Fisher, Nes, Campbell, 1965). In 1965, Mercy Hospital acquired a spectacular tower (FIG. 5-10) (Taylor & Fisher with Helge Westermann & Richard Miller). Jewish charities also played a key role in Baltimore, sponsoring the tuberculosis unit at Mount Pleasant Hospital (FIG. 5-11) (Office of James Edmunds), which was strikingly modern for the early 1950s.

5.2 THE EMBRACE OF "MID-CENTURY MODERNISM"

5.2.1 NEW INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL TRENDS

After and, perhaps, partly in response to World War II, modernists worked to renew the Movement by engaging with the new circumstances of postwar culture: the Cold War, advances in science and technology, the postwar economic boom, and the rising standard of living for middle and working class people. (*Goldhagen 12-13*) Significantly, the Modern Movement was no longer centered on Western Europe (Germany, Holland, and France). Thanks to Frank Lloyd Wright's new burst of creativity, the new regionalism, European émigrés, and war-related building efforts, the United States boasted a compelling body of modern work. By the 1950s, while Europe was still struggling to rebuild its cities and to modernize its economy, contemporary American architecture demonstrated to the rest of the world what modern design could bring to a prosperous mass civilization that operated at the cutting edge of technology and efficiency. As Jean-Louis Cohen argued, "Americanization—the actual transformation of European and other societies in the image of America—[had become] one of the principal modalities of modernization." (*Cohen 15*)

During the postwar years, Americans continued to look for fresh inspiration and new experiments in modernism. Most significant for understanding the Modern Movement in Maryland was the impact of Scandinavian domestic and civic design. The situated modernism of Finland's Alvar Aalto was especially inspirational; his national pavilion at the 1939 New York World's Fair was a revelation for American designers. After the war, Aalto established close links with MIT, which led to the construction of his influential Baker House dormitory in 1947-48. His approach to siting, akin to that of Pietro Belluschi, and his use of brick and wood, masterfully expounded at Saynatsalo's Town Hall and Civic Center in Finland (1949-52), appealed to the design sensibility of many young Maryland architects.

As early as the late 1930s, Swedish cooperative housing, which streamlined and stylized the domestic vernacular of board and batten construction, became a widely acknowledged social and aesthetic model for designers interested in housing and planned communities. In the 1950s, Scandinavian new towns, especially Tapiola near Helsinki and Vallingby in Sweden, attracted the attention of American architects and homebuilders. These settlements mixed row house and low-rise garden apartments in a preserved wooded environment, and offered humanly scaled, user-friendly civic, commercial, and cultural amenities, including non-intrusive solutions to parking. There is some evidence that Maryland architects were directly inspired by these places. Alexander Cochran visited Vallingby, and the New Mark Commons community in Rockville has a street named after this town. Designer Edmund J. Bennett, who boasted that New Mark avoided both the "sterile planning and visual pollution of suburbia and the growing pains of the big new towns," took a swing through Europe to study the best of the new planned communities before commencing preliminary drawings. (*Village Life / National and Regional*) Mexico and Brazil also emerged as testing grounds for new modernist ideas. In Brazil, Oscar Niemeyer and Lucio Costa led the way with buildings like the groundbreaking Ministry of Education and Health, built in collaboration with Le Corbusier in Rio de Janeiro (1937-43). Niemeyer's churches in thin shell concrete expounded an abstract lyricism that would become

quite popular in church construction; see, for example, St. Mary's Church in Rockville.

In the postwar U.S., modernism was finally registering in the mainstream of society. The late 1940s and early 1950s were exciting years, with new landmark structures that would soon become icons in their own right. The history of modernism was no more that of singular personalities and isolated monuments, as it had been before World War II, but of a new everyday environment sustained by the major economic and societal changes we outlined in Section 5.1.

Throughout the U.S., modern architecture would assume a broad range of expressions. Hard- and soft-edge modernisms might be matched with different social agendas. For institutional and rather dehumanizing projects, especially prisons, the hard-edged manner projected an effective image of authority, as demonstrated in the Montgomery County Detention Building (FIG. 5-12) in Rockville. It also suited the demands of the period's efficiency-driven corporate ethic; the "less is more" aesthetic was perfected to consummate sophistication in office spaces. Important benchmarks were Pietro Belluschi's Equitable Life Assurance Building (1944-47) in Portland, Oregon; Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill's Lever House in New York City (1951-52, Gordon Bunshaft designer); and Mies's Seagram Building in New York (1954-58), later emulated at One Charles Center in Baltimore. Soft-edge approaches were more appropriate for programs that needed to create healing or congenial environments, such as medical buildings or schools, or for buildings designed to nourish individuality or regional identification. (*Goldhagen 306*) A good example of the former is the set of residence buildings for Spring Grove Hospital in Catonsville, Maryland (FIG. 5-7) (Lucius White, 1963) that we mentioned in Section 5.1.3. Wurster, Bernardi, & Emmons produced a clever synthesis of congenial meeting rooms and individual writing and living spaces in the "scientific monastery" they designed around a beautifully landscaped series of major and minor courts for the Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences in Palo Alto, California (c. 1955). (*Von Eckardt 154-55*) For reasons of bias in the historiography of the movement, favoring the more hard-edged corporate International Style over examples of Situated Modernism, fewer examples of the latter have been accorded benchmark status. Nonetheless, as our research has made clear, Maryland architects and planners experimented with the full range of mid-century modernist expression.

Modern designs for single-family houses went in two general directions, either one of which might be well integrated with its site. The first were variations on the minimalist flat-roofed glass box, emphasizing ideals of lightness and transparency and using industrialized materials and construction methods. The two best known and most extreme examples are Mies's Farnsworth House, in Plano, Illinois (1946-50), and Philip Johnson's Glass House, in New Canaan, Connecticut (1949), neither of them primary residences. This type was best adapted to, and most popular in, warm climates and resort locations, as, for example, in Southern California, where John Entenza's Case Study Houses Program, in particular the Eames House in Santa Monica (1949), attracted considerable press attention. Interesting renditions included the early work of the Sarasota School, the "snappy little week-end boxes" that sprang up on Long Island in the 1950s (*Gordon 1987, 22*), and Eichler Homes, Inc.'s popular custom-built houses, all "undecorated surfaces, sharp edges, and the open plan," in the San Francisco suburbs. (*Adams 1995*) Examples of this modernist direction in Maryland are relatively sparse. We can mention Alexander Cochran's Charles E. Smith residence, (1953), some of Thomas Jewell's, and Tatar & Kelly's houses around Baltimore, and Harold Esten's dwellings in Maryland's D.C. suburbs, such as the Residence of George Katinas, in Bethesda (c. 1959) (FIG.5-13).

The second general direction included expressions of "new regionalism" and houses that might be considered modern interpretations of vernacular design. These were more numerous and more popular. At one end were hybrids between the minimalist box and the natural house, brilliantly interpreted by Marcel Breuer in the Hooper House I in Baltimore (1949). On the other end were modified modern houses that appeared lighter, buoyant, and strove for livability. Often their interiors conveyed more radical modernist values than their facades, with flexible spaces, open and flowing into one another. They featured an intimate indoor-outdoor relationship, enabled by glass walls, balconies, patios, or interior courts, and other inventive ways of bringing nature into the living spaces. They also aimed to provide "the amenities and aesthetics of comfortable living." (*Goldhagen 22*) Some houses reflected their designers' interest in passive solar energy, achieved by using overscaled eaves. Nationally, Frank Lloyd Wright remained the master at synthesizing these elements. Good examples in Maryland are many of Charles Goodman Associates' houses in the D. C. suburbs, such as the Verl E. Roberts dwelling in Bethesda (c.

1955), with its open plan and creative siting to secure spectacular outdoor vistas from every room (with landscape design by Lou Bernard Voight), and James Rose's modern home in suburban Baltimore (c. 1959), a consummate experiment in indoor-outdoor living.

5.2.2 PROFESSIONAL AND POPULAR ACCEPTANCE OF MODERNITY

In the fifteen years following World War II, everyday modernism gained tremendous media exposure and cultural acceptance. We can go so far as to say that modernism and modernity became intertwined in popular thought so that it was not just an architectural style but a state of mind, a way of life, that was being promoted in the media.   At the national level, architectural journals promoted modern design, but more important for reaching the American middle classes were shelter magazines, such as House and Home, Condé Nast's House and Garden for the smart set, and less highbrow magazines, such as House Beautiful and Better Homes and Gardens.   Even more widely circulating general interest magazines, such as Look and Life, featured the new modern suburban American dream, with special stories like "$15,000 'Trade Secrets' House," in the January 5, 1953 Life and special issues like "Suburbia: The Good Life in Our Exploding Utopia" in the May 16, 1967 Look.   Maryland's modern landmarks received a reasonable share of media exposure. Indeed, the national architectural, art, interior design, and engineering press increasingly took note of modern landmarks in the Free State, beginning in the 1960s. In the influential special mid-May home number of Architectural Record the first Maryland examples were published in 1961, and steady coverage began in the late 1960s.   Please refer to the bibliographical references accompanying the biographical profiles in the appendix for citations.

At the local level, the media took note of modern buildings as well, although it remains to be seen how much they actively endorsed progressive design. Publications such as Baltimore Magazine and Maryland Living; the real estate sections and Sunday magazines of the major Baltimore and Washington newspapers (the Sun, News American, Post, and Herald), and local gazettes, such as the Montgomery County Sentinel, provided exposure to everyday modernism. Critics like Wolf Von Eckardt and Phoebe Stanton also helped to shape public opinion and taste on architectural matters.   Undoubtedly, mid-century recognition of progressive design related to the much greater appreciation of modern art that was being encouraged locally by major cultural institutions, e.g. the Baltimore Museum of Art, the National Gallery, and the Hirschhorn Museum.

Historians interested in the role of the media in promoting modernism have concentrated on important landmarks of domestic design.   Canonical precedents for everyday modernism almost certainly exist for other urban and suburban building types, but they have not yet been clearly identified by historians. We hope to discover additional seminal and inspirational precedents for Maryland's architects by consulting Baltimore's Architects' Report, the Potomac Valley Architect, popular local and national publications, Alexander Cochran's slide collection (preserved at the University of Maryland, College Park), and by interviewing surviving designers. The selection presented by Washington, D.C.'s tastemaker Frederick Gutheim, in the AIA-sponsored One Hundred Years of Architecture in America, 1857-1957 (1957), is suggestive (*Gutheim*). For example, a cursory examination of this text shows likely candidates for schools to be the Crow Island Elementary School in Winnetka, Illinois (Perkins, Wheeler and Will, in association with Eliel and Eero Saarinen, 1940) and Heathcote Elementary School in Scarsdale, New York (Perkins and Will, 1952). For corporate campuses, Eliel Saarinen's General Motors Technical Center in Warren, Michigan (1948-56) and SOM's headquarters for the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company in Bloomfield, Connecticut (1954-57) appear to be significant.

5.3 A NEW CAST OF CHARACTERS

5.3.1 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CLIENTS

The history of the Modern Movement in Maryland is not only a matter of international and national trends, but the story of initiatives taken by local individuals, institutions, or groups. Clients significantly shape design outcomes, and they can play a tremendous role in the promotion or rejection of a particular approach to architecture. Public clients were more likely to involve themselves in modernist planning in an ongoing way—or planning that might help enable or promote modernist design—sometimes forming public/private partnerships to

promote large projects, as in the case of urban renewal or redevelopment. They were less likely to find themselves in the position of frequently commissioning specific buildings, although examples included public housing, hospitals, prisons, police and fire stations, and the occasional civic building. Good examples are the City of Cumberland Public Safety Building (a combined police, fire, and public works facility), the Calvert County Hospital (Office of James Edmunds, Jr., c. 1953), and the Maryland-National Capital Parks and Planning Commission Building in Riverdale, Prince George's County (Edwin Ball, 1967) (FIG. 6-2). During the postwar years, given the reorganization of state and local government, the commissioning of public buildings was generally governed by a bureaucratic process. Nonetheless, while elected officials and civil servants may not have had particular aesthetic agendas, they sometimes found modern design to be an efficient channel for implementing a social engineering agenda. This may have been the case with the most ubiquitous public commissions in Maryland to routinely take modernist form: schools.

From the end of World War II to the early 1960s, however, the majority of commissions for modern buildings were from private sector clients, many of them contributing to the new landscape in the burgeoning Maryland suburbs. Educated upper-middle class and middle class suburban couples, in particular, adopted modernism as a sign of refinement and distinction. For a certain brand of sophisticated and urbane household, a new suburban home in a modernist idiom, designed by an up and coming architect, was an impressive status marker, but many middle class households eagerly bought houses in "tract modernism" subdivisions as well. A group of affluent and socially prominent women in the State became important advocates of modern design. For example, Edith Hooper commissioned not one, but two houses from Marcel Breuer and arranged to have him get the job for the Bryn Mawr Lower School. From 1949 onwards, the Wellesley Club organized annual tours of Modern Homes, which were well publicized in the local press and well attended; Alexander Cochran's slides provide precious records of these visits. Some members of the business community also saw themselves as arbiters of good, i.e. modern design, construing it as a symbol of economic dynamism and efficient management. The Metropolitan Washington Chamber of Commerce and the Baltimore Association of Commerce, in consultation with local architectural organizations, gave design awards and produced brochures to publicize them. Church groups, especially those affiliated with the most liberal denominations, such as Unitarians, commissioned modern sanctuaries.

Among developers and financial backers active in Maryland cities and suburbs, James W. Rouse, the mortgage lawyer turned visionary entrepreneur, profoundly shaped some of the Free State's most interesting modernist landscapes. A national, if not international, figure with extraordinary business acumen, Rouse came "from an old Eastern Shore (Easton, Maryland) family of devout and public-spirited people" and was "one of the first nationally-known people, along with geographer Jean Gottman and planner Christopher Tunnard, to perceive the reality of the East Coast Megalopolis" (*Clay 53*). Rouse introduced Pietro Belluschi to Baltimore by hiring him as a consultant on the Mondawmin Shopping Center (1956). As early as 1947, he had a modern home built by Alexander Cochran, who also remodeled his downtown office in 1953. Rouse's Waverly Redeployment Project, set amidst blighted Baltimore rowhouses, was once gain entrusted to Cochran. It consisted of well-planned and landscaped garden apartments (1953) with pedestrian pathways leading to an adjacent shopping center (1958-59), and was also a precedent-setting experiment. We shall discuss his influential suburban new town, Columbia, in Section 6.5. Other developers sponsored important modernist commissions as well. Herbert S. Greenwald of Metropolitan Structures, Inc. of Chicago and New York City brought his favorite designer, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, to Baltimore. Other developers, such as Carl M. Freeman, are little known today although they seem to have been energetic converts to modernism. Some had ambitions bigger than their pocketbooks, especially Marvin and Herschell Blumberg, whose mammoth project for Prince George's Plaza near Hyattsville, commissioned to no less than Edward Durrell Stone, was not even half completed. The Panitz Brothers of Baltimore were eclectic developers, cashing in on the advertising appeal of sleek, modern designs with educated clients. While their Joppatowne project, which opened in May 1962 in Harford County, was not stylistically adventurous, their nearby Rumsey Island project offered stylish modern townhouses and apartment units. Stanley I. Panitz also commissioned Hugh Newell Jacobsen to design Bolton Common in Baltimore.

A few progressive homebuilders also played major roles in finding alternatives to mainstream suburban ranches and colonials. Before erecting Twinbrook in Rockville, Joseph L. Geeraert, a self-styled designer, visited Levittown, Long Island and determined to improve on its 1949-50 ranch models, by adding modern elements, such as large picture windows. The best educated, most charismatic and articulate among the homebuilders was Edmund

J. Bennett, who nurtured a long-term and fruitful relationship with architects Keyes, Lethbridge, and Condon. They partnered to create three outstanding examples of situated modernism: Potomac Overlook (Fig.5-14), Carderock Springs in Bethesda, and New Mark Common in Rockville, which we will explore in more detail as part of our research on modernist expression in high end suburban planning and housing. Paul Burman and Paul Hammond of Hammond Brothers worked out a similar arrangement at a smaller scale with architect Charles Goodman, who also maintained a long and fruitful working relationship with the National Homes Corporation of Lafayette Indiana, the nation's largest single home builder in 1953. Other noteworthy homebuilders include the Luria Brothers (mostly active in Northern Virginia, however), Mario Doccolo of Baltimore County who worked with Wilson and Christie, and Milford Twilley of Salisbury who operated on the lower Eastern Shore. Among these builders, there were a few colorful personalities, such as Swedish-born Bertil Malmsted, who named an upscale subdivision in Bethesda Dada Woods (1961), in honor of the scandalous artistic movement that preceded Surrealism. Its cul-de-sac street was called Picasso Lane because a sculpture by this uber-artist was supposed to adorn the roundabout at the end of the property (this did not happen!). At the same time, Malmsted also built traditional subdivisions like Bradley Court, catering to the broad Maryland preference for the Colonial revival style.

5.3.2 ARCHITECTS

Identifying the architects who produced modern work in Maryland and characterizing their collective and personal contributions is of great significance for our project. So is understanding the mechanisms of design production—the nature of the commissioning process and how architectural practice was structured and conducted in the State during the years of our study. We intend to do considerably more research on this topic. Our findings will enable us to guide and inform studies of other North American states and regions for the same time period, since to our knowledge, scholars have not adequately studied the nature of architectural practice on the scale of a given U.S. State. In Maryland, the architects who designed modern buildings can be divided into four major categories according to the location of their practice: out-of-state architects, Baltimore architects, Washington, D.C. architects, and architects located in and operating primarily in the D.C. suburbs.

Out-of-state architects can be divided into two groups. The first consisted of highly respected members, even stars, of their profession. Although the careers of these men have been extensively researched, their Maryland buildings are not generally among their most famous works and therefore deserve additional study. If we classify according to fame, the first tier is represented by some of the father figures of modernism: Frank Lloyd Wright (see section 2.3.2), Richard Neutra (FIG. 5-15), Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, and Walter Gropius, who was solicited by Virginia architect Sheldon I. Leavitt when members of the Oheb Shalom congregation in suburban Baltimore asked for a prominent architect to contribute to the design of their new synagogue (1957-60) (FIG. 5-16). The second tier consisted of nationally known architects whose Maryland work was as important and influential as that of the bigger stars. A good example is New York's Percival Goodman whose contribution was memorable: the Rothschild House in Pikesville (1948-50) and the Baltimore Hebrew Congregation Synagogue, (1948-53). Most out-of-state designers were hired to build a single prestige commission. Repeats were unusual, but there were some exceptions. Besides Goodman, Mies contributed two major structures, Marcel Breuer four houses, and Wright two houses. The sole truly long-term involvement was that of Pietro Belluschi in Baltimore and at Goucher College. Out-of-state architects usually worked in association with local architects, often young firms for which this connection could become a springboard for personal commissions. Their association with Belluschi, for example, opened many doors for Rogers, Taliafero, and Lamb. The presence of world or nationally famous designers also brought greater media exposure to the State's built environment; we intend to analyze any benefits that accompanied the publicity. Some prestige commissions, however, remained on paper; Erich Mendelssohn's project for the Beth El Synagogue is a good example. We hope to identify all or most of these and the reasons they were never built.

The second group of out of state architects consisted of firms with a particular expertise, for example, specialists in large-scale retail and industrial work. Shopping centers and department stores were designed by Ketchum, Gina & Sharp (Hutzler's in Towson, 1951-52); Lathrop Douglass (Prince George's Plaza in Hyattsville); Victor Gruen (interiors for Hochschild Kohn Department Stores, several locations), and Raymond Loewy (Chevy-Chase branch of Lord & Taylor's and Stewart & Co. in Reisterstown Plaza, c. 1960). Some firms worked primarily for one corporate client. New York's Abbott Merkt and Company, for example, established plans for all Hecht's department stores, producing competent if predictable buildings. Along parallel lines, John Johansen was hired to

design the Mechanic Theater due to his groundbreaking theatrical work. Several large firms known for their technical expertise more than for their design excellence, such as Emery Roth and Sons of New York City, served as consultants for large office structures. A third, small sub-group has also emerged from our research. Many Pennsylvania-based firms worked in Western Maryland, a part of the state where very few architects were established. These were not nationally renowned architects, but some of their work is compelling. Two good examples are churches by T. Norman Mansell and the Antetiam National Battlefield Visitor Center by William Cramp Scheetz (1961-62).

Differentiating Baltimore architects from their Washington, D.C. colleagues was not an arbitrary decision. Both Charles Lamb (the "L" of RTKL) and David Yerkes confirmed in conversations that each group built very little in the other's territory and had limited opportunities for professional interaction. In Baltimore City, established firms slowly converted to modernism, thanks to the arrival of new designers and partners. Good examples are the Office of James R. Edmunds; Gaudreau and Gaudreau; Fisher, Nes, Campbell and Partners, successor to Palmer and Lamdin and Maryland's largest architectural office around 1960; and Meyer and Ayers (successor to Buckler and Fenhagen). During the postwar period, several new offices were founded and staffed by architects trained in the best East Coast offices and schools (Harvard, Princeton, and the University of Pennsylvania). Alexander Cochran set up shop in 1947; his career followed a very successful trajectory, thanks to his patrician origins and independent wealth, his social skills and connections, and a strong humanistic background. First based in Annapolis, Rogers, Taliaferro & Lamb, opened an office in Baltimore in 1957; in the early 1960s, as RTKL, the firm acquired national prominence, in great part for its out-of-state urban design work in locations such as Hartford, Connecticut. By the mid-1950s, Baltimore boasted a very lively architectural community, where talents and specialties were quite diverse. The work of some firms that are little known today amply deserves re-evaluation. Good candidates are Smith and Veale, whose Union Trust Company building in Brooklyn (Anne Arundel County, c. 1953) won a merit award from the Baltimore chapter of the AIA (FIG. 5-17). Also deserving further study are the long-term relationships between an architect and a company, such as Ferdinand Kelly who designed more than fifty buildings for the Equitable Trust Company.

In Washington D.C. and its suburbs, the local training ground for architects was Catholic University. Although it was hardly a hotbed of modernism, Catholic trained competent and open-minded practitioners, such as Edwin F. Ball, Jack C. Cohen, James F. Hilleary, Donald Steele Johnson, Ronald Senseman, and John Henry Sullivan. Most adventurous was a group of gifted "young Turks," often Ivy League trained, who established practices in the District of Columbia and worked throughout the Capitol Region. They are best known for their work in the Southwest D.C. Redevelopment Area, but they also had a significant impact on Montgomery County. They were Robert Deigert and David Yerkes, to whom Progressive Architecture devoted a Progress Report of 11 pages in 1958; Arthur Keyes, Nicholas Satterlee, and Francis Donald Lethbridge; Charles Goodman; and a lone but influential woman, Cloethiel Woodard Smith, who was initially trained as a planner. Among the hidden jewels of modern architecture in Maryland is a Therapy Building at Chestnut Lodge, a psychiatric institution in Rockville's historic district designed in the early 1950s by Keyes, Smith, Satterlee, and Lethbridge (FIG. 5-19). There were also larger and very competent firms such as Faulkner, Kingsbury & Stenhouse, who specialized in hospitals, and Chapman and Miller, who had an eclectic practice and were awarded a PVA-AIA Award of Merit for their Town and Country Day School in Wheaton (1957).

The fourth category of modernist architects in Maryland is a less coherent group. It includes firms that capitalized on the intense suburban growth of the postwar years to set up shop in a suburban satellite of Baltimore or Washington and did a great deal of their work in or close to their home community. Good examples are Wilson and Christie in Towson, whose exquisitely finished houses ranged from a hard science fiction look, as in the Alice Bosley House (1960) to a woodsy regionalism influenced by Japanese architecture, as in the Harvey (1958) and Kaufman Houses (FIG. 5-18). Other significant suburban architects were Ronald Senseman or Eugene Delmar of Silver Spring, John Sullivan of Rockville, and Paul Kea in Hyattsville. Architects in the Washington orbit and their colleagues in Western Maryland formed and were served by their own chapter of the AIA, the Potomac Valley chapter, established in 1955.

We have found few exponents of modernism so far among architects established in other parts of Maryland. We can list two Salisbury firms: Malone & Williams, whose practice included schools, libraries, and

university buildings, and George Miles & Victor Buhr, who designed nursing homes, churches, and education buildings. Not suprisingly, architecture was a man's profession throughout Maryland. In 1961, according to Architects Report, Helen Ross Staley of Pasadena was the only registered woman architect practicing in Maryland.

During the postwar years, Maryland firms received more than their share of national awards for design excellence, but their best output was restricted to the Mid-Atlantic Region. Some local architects also possessed expertise in urban design and sat on planning and review boards. From this position, they were able to apply modernist design concepts to the broader fashioning of the built environment. Many also exercised a significant influence in local business and planning organizations, such as zoning commissions and Chambers of Commerce. (Please see Biographical entries for numerous examples).   A few Maryland architects attained professional leadership positions at the national level: James Edmunds, Archibald Rogers of RTKL, and Charles Nes were AIA Presidents. The Baltimore Chapter of the AIA and the Potomac Valley Chapter were dynamic organizations, attempting to build bridges to politicians, planners, other members of the building industry, and the general public. In 1955 and 1957 the Baltimore chapter published albums entitled Work of Maryland Architects, which provide precious evidence for our study. Subsequently both chapters issued journals, the Architects' Report and Potomac Valley Architect, where they not only published members' designs and publicized their numerous lectures, juried award competitions, and tours, but also discussed broader issues like urban renewal and the creation of a School of Architecture in Maryland.

   It is worth pointing out that design was not entirely the responsibility of AIA members. Many other members of the building industry played important roles and must be accounted for. Structural engineers, planners, landscape architects, interior designers, and artists collaborated with architects. Many of their names are recorded in the appended biographies.

5.4 URBAN RENEWAL IN DOWNTOWN BALTIMORE

Both architects and public and private sector clients worked steadily during the postwar years to tackle Baltimore's urban blight.   At the end of the war, no American city of comparable size had as much substandard housing. (*Brugger 557*) "The greatest change in the city was a replacement of wealth by poverty, power by powerlessness," according to Callcott (*Callcott 1985, 84*), much of it connected with the migration of affluent households and retail enterprises to the suburbs.   After 1945 the black enclaves on the east and west sides of the business district swelled "to embrace almost half of the city." (*Callcott 1985, 1*) The population exodus, disinvestment, falling property tax base, job losses in certain neighborhoods, rising taxes, and dwindling quality of services left citizens, business leaders, and city officials with a challenging set of circumstances and tight resources for addressing them. In 1940, Baltimore had 47% of the state's population and 54% of its total assessed wealth; by 1980, the figures were 19% and 12%, respectively. (*Callcott 1985, 84*)

Initially, Baltimoreans responded by pursuing a strategy of slum clearance, but by the mid 1950s, they had adopted a broader set of urban renewal policies.   Downtown Baltimore offered an excellent testing ground for new ideas on how to modernize large cities and create hygienic housing, which had been expounded in theoretical designs by Le Corbusier, Neutra, and Lescaze. As early as 1941, an idealistic group of citizens, including architect John Scarff, formed a Citizens' Planning and Housing Association (CPHA) and persuaded the City Council to pass and enforce basic livable housing codes. This strategy, which became known as the Baltimore Plan, was selectively applied to certain neighborhoods, such as Sharp Street and a 27-block area of East Baltimore. It received favorable publicity nationally, mixed success locally, and was crafted to maintain the city's streetscapes of traditional rowhouses. New public housing units erected by the Housing Authority of Baltimore City, established in 1937, were also exercises that recapitulated the rowhouse environment. Between 1941 and 1945, the Authority added 5,021 units to the housing stock, including the Edgar Allan Poe Homes, and the Clarence Perkins Homes by Henry Powell Hopkins in association with Lawrence Fowler, Howard F. Baldwin, and Frederic A. Fletcher.

After the war, however, urban renewal quickly replaced slum clearance as the new buzzword for attacking blight. Both Washington, D.C., with the Southwest project, and Philadelphia, with its Market Street efforts, took up the new concept, with striking results for modernist reconstruction.   In Baltimore, there were two different

incentives for embracing urban renewal and redevelopment.   To bridge the gap between falling revenues and rising costs, the city needed to tap into abundant Federal dollars available for urban renewal; the percentage of the city's budget made up by these grants rose to as much 61% compared to 18% before the war. (*Callcott 1984, 85*) In Mount Royal Plaza, **a** 74-acre redevelopment area (1958), Federal, State, and City agencies formed a partnership to remove several thousand substandard structures and build three massive state office buildings. According to Architect's Report, this project brought "the renewal process into focus, substantiating its desirability, its practicality, and its economic feasibility" (*Spring 1960, 12*).

The second set of incentives was generated by Baltimore businessmen who, led by James Rouse in 1955, formed the Greater Baltimore Committee (GBC) upon determining that the urban crisis was too serious to be left in the hands of the politicians. (*Callcott 1985, 85-86*) Eventually raising a war chest of nearly a million dollars, the GBC hired its own planner, David A. Wallace, Director of Planning for Philadelphia's successful urban redevelopment program, as Director of its new Planning Council. The Council established six goals: improved port facilities, new industrial parks, the Jones Falls Expressway, a civic center, improved transportation, and urban renewal. Deliberately organizing itself to bypass planning bureaucrats and the political encumbrances of any given mayoral administration, the GBC was remarkably successful achieving its goals. From a purely architectural standpoint, its crowning urban renewal project was the Charles Center, begun in 1961, which we shall discuss in Section 5.4.2 below. (*Callcott 1985, 86-87*)

5.4.1 PUBLIC HOUSING

Although the Baltimore Plan's strategy of cajoling citizen action to improve housing continued throughout the 1950s—the City even embraced it formally with Mayor d'Alesandro's Pilot Program--Baltimore increasingly pursued an agenda of slum clearance and selective rebuilding of public housing units. From 1946 to 1950, the Baltimore Redevelopment Commission cleared 100 blocks of houses; still, the 1950 census reported 70,000 unfit dwellings in lower Baltimore (*Brugger 587, 588*).   Something more had to be done.   With increasing aid made available by the Federal housing and highway acts of 1949 and 1954, the City undertook more aggressive urban renewal/public housing projects. These large-scale projects provided architects with a tremendous opportunity to produce breakthrough designs for modern housing complexes. Yet although they rejected the rowhouse streetscape and the established city grid, firms known for their excellence in projects with a larger budget stumbled, producing designs that could not be differentiated from public housing complexes in other large U.S. cities.

A good example is Flag House Courts, designed in 1952 by Cochran, working in association with Wrenn, Lewis & Jencks, now demolished (FIG.5-20). Mixing three-story garden apartments with twelve-story high-rise towers, the nine-acre project was praised at the time as a great improvement over the substandard rowhousing it replaced. A similar project, Lafayette Courts, designed by Fisher, Nes, Campbell & Associates, provided playgrounds and playing fields; both complexes were described by the Housing Authority as "close to schools, churches, shopping centers, leisure time pursuits, and places of employment for low-income residents." (*HABC 1955*) With their stark masses, repetitive windows, and conspicuous balconies, the design of these buildings was modern more by default than by inclination.   On the other hand, the Waverly Apartments (1953), which Cochran created for James Rouse, exhibited relatively low density site planning, several recreational centers, and careful landscaping, emphasizing diagonal perspectives. The first privately funded urban redevelopment project in the US *(Weeks 87),* Waverly has been recently rehabilitated without disfiguration and appears to be a successful modern 23-acre garden apartment neighborhood. Unlike Waverly, Baltimore's public housing projects have now mostly been demolished, and we must consider whether they had any redeeming qualities.

5.4.2 THE CHARLES CENTER

A much more ambitious and glamorous urban renewal project, although not entirely successful from a functional standpoint, was the Charles Center and its satellites, which gave Baltimore an outstanding modern business district and civic center. The Charles Center has many claims on our attention. It was remarkable for its scope, the quality of its planning vision, its unusual private sponsorship, the architectural distinction of its buildings, and the extent of its implementation according to the original plan. The project was developed by the Greater Baltimore Committee's Planning Council, with financial support from a closely related organization, the Committee

for Downtown.   In 1958, David Wallace and his team of planners, which included George E. Kostritsky, the "K" in RTKL, presented the Charles Center Project to the Mayor for adoption as an official urban renewal project. Connecting Baltimore's financial district and its major retail center, the 22-acre location necessitated the removal of 251 (all but five) properties in an area bounded by Lombard to the South, Saratoga to the North, Charles to the East, and Hopkins Place. The Planning Council began work on the Center in late 1957, made its master plan public in 1959, broke ground in 1961, and the Center reached completion about 15 years later.   Of the estimated cost of $180 million, less than 25% came from city and state funds and the rest from private monies. No federal funds were used. *(Callcott 1985, 87)*

The original plan included an 800-room ultra-modern hotel, a TV center with an auditorium seating 3000 (built as the Mechanic Theater), seven office towers, a proposed federal office building, three small parks, an underground transportation terminal, Hamburger's Department Store, and garages for 4,000 cars. The master planning included the principle of segregating automobile and pedestrian traffic, necessitating the closing of three streets and the partial relocation of Fayette Street. It also emphasized both the economic and aesthetic advantages of public open space in the form of the three urban parks. The land uses selected were common sense ones; they were all logical functions for downtown and designed to blend into the adjacent areas. *(Rogers 1959/Jacobs 1958)* Several measures insured that the Center would develop according to plan, but perhaps the most important were the City's continuing contractual relationship with the Planning Council for overall design services, and David Wallace's insistence upon an Architectural Review Board for the individual building proposals. *(Potts 1969)*

In 1960, the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency (BURHA) organized a competition for the first office tower at One Charles Center, retaining Pietro Belluschi, Gerald Holmes Perkins, Dean of the School of Fine Arts at the University of Pennsylvania, and Joseph Hudnut as consultants. Their role was to select the best design from among the six proposals submitted by teams of developers and architects from different parts of the country. They included Marcel Breuer teamed with American Trading & Production of Baltimore, allied with the Blaustein family and McCloskey and Co. of Philadelphia; and Rogers, Taliaferro, & Lamb with Community Research and Development of Baltimore. But the winning proposal was designed by Mies van der Rohe on behalf of Metropolitan Structures of Chicago. The competition set off an intense rivalry between the Blausteins, whose appeal of the decision to city officials and the GBC fell on deaf ears, and the Charles Center backers. Determined to make their mark on downtown redevelopment, the Blausteins purchased an adjacent property at Charles Center North and hired Philadelphia architect Vincent G. Kling, who designed a more distinctive and imaginative curtain wall tower than the one for One Charles Center. The rivalry continued for some time, with the Charles Center feeling threatened by the Blaustein's tactics for gaining tenants and the Blausteins sensing some anti-semitism in the GBC's decision to award the new businessmen's Center Club to One Charles Center. *(McCarthy)* Ultimately, both the competition and the high quality of the International Style buildings contributed considerably to the success of downtown urban renewal. The national press followed the progress of the Charles Center closely. Commentators lavished praise on the design attention paid to public space, a principle that extended to the lobbies of the office buildings, as exemplified in Peterson and Brickbauer's sculptural and muscular Sun Life Building (FIG.5-21).

Clearly the Charles Center is one of the notable modernist urban renewal projects to be completed nationwide. During its development, accolades poured in. Fortune Magazine's assessment was that "Baltimore's Charles Center is magnificently different….The plan builds on the strengths of Baltimore….the plan is so good [because] it has been disciplined by a regard for economics." *(quoted in Rogers 1959)* In a 1958 evaluation published in Architectural Forum, Jane Jacobs lavished praise on the early planning. Nonetheless, the Charles Center was not entirely successful.   As early as 1970, a staff reporter for the News American characterized it as "33 Acres of Loneliness" and proceeded to develop a remarkably Jane Jacobs-like critique of its alienating landscape and desertion after dark. *(Theroux)* We wonder whether the Center's apparent lack of appeal to users derived from the loss of the planned hard modernist landscape, which complemented and enriched the architecture of the superstructures.   Regardless, the Charles Center a is rich monument to Maryland's postwar modernism and the particular historical moment that invested so much faith in progress and physical renewal of the environment.

It is worth noting that the Charles Center included two apartment towers. Indeed, while tract houses were built by the hundreds in the suburbs, Baltimore also experienced a rise in in-town high-rise apartment construction during this period. Monumental high-rise apartment buildings, which we tend to associate with ill-fated public

housing policies and economic and racial exclusion, could also function as symbols of social status and sophisticated metropolitan living. Most famous nationwide were Mies van der Rohe's Lake Shore Drive Apartments in Chicago (1948-51). Hence the success met by Highfield House on Charles Street, not far from the Johns Hopkins Campus, by the same architect.

5.5 THE SUBURBAN BUILDING BOOM: PRINCIPAL BUILDING TYPES

As settlement spread during the postwar years, the suburban counties near Baltimore and Washington became a definable social, political, and cultural bloc in the state, as different from Baltimore City as Western Maryland was from the Eastern Shore. As their populations exploded, certain suburbs rivaled the State's smaller cities in size. For example, Rockville, which in 1959 had annexed 2,210 acres, surpassed Cumberland and Hagerstown to become the second most populated city in Maryland (*McGuckian 216*). This kind of statistic helps to explain why so many of the modern buildings identified in this survey are located in the Washington/Baltimore suburbs. The building types we discuss below substantiate one of our principal observations: that the new postwar suburbanites became major sponsors and consumers of the Modern Movement in Maryland.

The postwar migration to the suburbs entailed both the extension of existing communities and the creation of totally new subdivisions, some of which approached the size of small towns. Speculative residential construction, particularly during the immediate postwar housing crisis, generated growth corridors such as Viers Mill Road in Montgomery County. Just a few years later, residential enclaves rapidly assumed a more upscale tenor, as along McArthur Boulevard in Bethesda and Potomac, where one can see the growing accoutrements of affluence by comparing the early cooperative homes of Bannockburn (1950s) with the much more upscale enclaves of Tulip Hill (late 1950s) and Dada Woods (early 1960s). Several of these communities provide well preserved pockets of the suburban modernist landscape; so does, for example, the area centered on the intersection of Adelphi Road and East West Highway in Prince George's County, a multifunctional suburban landscape of a more comprehensive and middle-class character.

The suburbs presented particular social, cultural, and political conditions that, in turn, influenced their built environments. Most notably, the suburbs' political power and independence, and the desire of residents to separate themselves from Old Line power and ways of doing things, registered in their warmer embrace of modernist idioms for the new suburban landscapes. Women represented only 34% of the state's work force in 1960. There were many stay-at-home mothers who could devote energy to their homes, especially the interiors, and to suburban community life. In many suburbs, civic pride, volunteerism, and activism remained the modus vivendi and operandi they had been before the war. Hence suburbs lavished attention, if not always money, on the design of community centers, public libraries, and fire stations. Although Blacks did not participate widely in white suburban culture, they migrated steadily to small, segregated enclaves in the suburban counties where they could own their own homes. In communities such as Glen Arden, Lakeland, North Brentwood, and Fairmount Heights in Prince George's County, they worked hard to raise the quality of their surroundings, starting sometimes from substandard conditions (Denny/ McGuckian 148-149). These independent neighborhoods, which supported churches, schools, and sometimes community centers, deserve more attention; on the surface, they do not appear to be sponsors of modernism, but that hypothesis needs to be confirmed and understood. The postwar era was a period of intense church and temple building, as many suburban congregations undertook significant building programs. Some of these generated strikingly modernist buildings, but even some of the most mundane, low-budget structures contained interesting modern interior details and furnishings. Public schools presented one of the most interesting and widespread demonstrations of suburban power in the Free State after the war. In determining the design of schools, the new suburban culture's preference for a modern, nonpartisan, pedagogically liberal approach to education and educational facilities seems to have prevailed and, indeed, functioned as an effective vehicle for introducing modern architecture to parts of the state far from the population centers. The postwar years also witnessed the burgeoning of a modern suburban commercial landscape, as retail and office complexes decentralized and adapted to an automobile-oriented, family centered suburban consumer. We shall talk about each of these suburban typologies in the sections below.

5.5.1 RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS: Custom houses, tract modernism, and garden apartments

The migration to the suburbs generated an enormous demand for new housing. Most suburbanites were attracted by the promise of the suburban ideal--a detached single-family home surrounded by a garden--and postwar affluence enabled many of them to afford it as well as the automobile and other consumer goods that made up the modern suburban lifestyle. The Maryland suburbs offered a mosaic of houses designed in different styles and developed for different income levels, particularly after 1950. (*Martin 5*) A good many of them possessed at least some modern elements, especially on their interiors: modified open plans, large expanses of window, indoor outdoor living features, new materials, structural rationalism, and state-of-the-art technological solutions to practical functions. We will concentrate, however, on houses that were predominantly modern, inside and outside. Between suburbs in the Baltimore and Washington orbits, we found some differences. In the Baltimore suburbs, more modern custom designed houses were built. Washington, on the other hand, was the headquarters of "tract modernism," whole subdivisions planned and designed in a modern aesthetic. After the mid-1950s, certain locations in both orbits witnessed an increase in suburban apartment living as well.

In the affluent suburbs of Montgomery County and especially Baltimore, modern custom-designed houses became less of an anomaly. Architects built "demonstration homes" for themselves, a topic that we would like to investigate further. Completed in 1950, Alexander S. Cochran's home on West Lake Avenue truly launched his career. It won a national AIA award, was widely published in both the professional and popular press, and "got Baltimoreans talking and thinking about modern design" (*Weeks 79*). Building a modernist home could be tricky, however, as some architects discovered; Charles Lamb told us he was forced to add a pitched roof to his house in order to secure a mortgage. *(Lamb 2001)* Although New Deal federal housing policies encouraged builders to turn out suburban single family houses, private insurance regulations discouraged innovation, since traditional forms were presumed to have better resale values. Thus, we do well to remember that the modern homes and subdivisions we shall study represented a significant but small part of the residential market.

Custom homes varied; they might use local materials conducive to a regional or vernacular aesthetic or employ a less localized International Style vocabulary. Cochran's home was a good advertisement for modernist features. It was situated on a large lot; the primary living rooms and master bedroom faced south onto a landscaped lawn structured by a crisply modern stone retaining wall. The house, balanced in its massing, followed the site's natural contours, with a central skylit wing housing the main rooms, flanked by a two-story bedroom wing to the east where the ground sloped down, and a one-story service wing to the west. Like many homes, Cochran's was designed for a large family; it provided ample space for entertaining guests, clear separation between parents' and children's spaces, and rooms for a nurse and a maid. The interior finish met both practical and aesthetic needs: flagstone and asphalt tile that was scuff-proof, cork flooring to soundproof the playroom, and natural plywood to fashion a smooth wall surface but hide finger marks. (*Weeks 48-49*) The Sally Kaufman House in Baltimore County, designed by Wilson & Christie in 1956 (FIG. 5-18) , presented large expanses of floor to ceiling glazing in the primary living rooms, allowing the surrounding wooded area to literally penetrate into the house. The interior was artistic and simple: stone walls interspersed with glazing and finished with built-in custom wood cabinets designed by the architects as space dividers, and built-in furnishings. On the outside, an elegant, unobtrusive carport extended the line of the house and substituted for a garage, a common feature. Most custom houses contained innovative floor plans, particularly in the living, dining, and kitchen arrangements; many experimented with other modern elements, such as new materials--for example laminates--reputed to require minimal or no maintenance. Such houses lent themselves to very appealing photographic depiction and became popular items in the press, often decorated with modern furniture by such designers as Eames, Aalto, Herman Miller, Knoll, lamps by Noguchi, or lights by Kurt Versen and Von Nessen. A few more modest custom-built homes, like the cinder block jewel by Cloethiel Woodard Smith at 135 S. Van Buren Street in Rockville (1949) were scattered across the landscape; it is a good candidate for landmarking. Even traditional firms built modern homes for progressive clients; Wrenn, Lewis, & Jencks' house for Jack Williamson, Sr. in Cockeysville (1948) is a good example.

Most smaller modern dwellings were tract houses, however. The first were built quickly in response to the postwar housing crisis and catered to young couples wishing to start a family and needing to economize. In the four suburban counties of Washington, D.C., more houses sprang up between 1947 and 1952 than had been built there in all the preceding years put together. In Montgomery and Prince George's, "huge firms that [had] been building military bases launched developments of thousands of homes at a time. … countless veterans entered the

contracting business with little more than a pickup truck" *(Calcott 1985, 61)*. Most of these subdivisions contained traditional-looking homes and room arrangements. A case in point was Viers Mill Village in Montgomery County where 1,105 identical Cape Cods, very much like those in Levittown, Long Island, sold for $ 8,700 apiece. Developers made no provision for schools, street maintenance, or police protection, and residents battled for years afterwards to obtain these amenities. The firm of Levitt & Sons itself built a gigantic project in the Belair estate of Bowie in Prince George's (begun 1960); two of their ranch house models offered quite modernized fenestration. The Twinbrook subdivision (1948-1954) more than doubled Rockville's housing stock; its starter homes "abandoned the traditional grid pattern of streets and lots in favor of irregular side and rear lot lines that followed the contour of the land and streams." *(McGuckian 126)* The units themselves conformed to a few standard variations with the occasional modern element, such as glass picture window walls and dramatically pitched, asymmetrically extended rooflines. More modern was the small pioneering subdivision of Bannockburn, a cooperative project in Potomac (1949), designed by Vernon de Mars, who had built significant FSA communities during the war, and local architects Reese Burkett and Joseph Neufeld. As noteworthy for its careful site planning as for the light, airy open plans of its houses, Bannockburn catered to young, educated suburbanites with limited earning power.

With increased prosperity and less urgency to house returning veterans any way possible, a second wave of suburban home building began after 1955, offering much more expansive designs and more amenities at greater cost. Although many subdivisions reflected the period's "emphasis on larger families and traditional values" *(Hiebert, 358)* and favored well-worn housing styles, a few home builders began to see in the trade press that stylistically advanced homes could be profitable. For example, the November 1952 issue of House and Home carried an article entitled, "Lesson for builders: to sell houses, get a fine site plan, fresh designs/for architects: one design job for builders can lead to others." *(Lesson 140)* Chris Martin's research has shown, in fact, that "at both the local and national levels, Washington, D.C., was a formative arena in the promotion of builder-architect collaboration in tract housing." *(Martin 2)* Through these partnerships, developers and architects introduced the public to tract houses in contemporary stylings that shared many of the features of custom-built homes but at a much smaller scale. Perhaps the best exemplar was Charles Goodman, who worked with a number of area builders to design modestly sized subdivisions of modern houses. In neighborhoods like Hammond Hills in Wheaton, he achieved a formula that was as modern as one could get in the tract housing market of the 1950s (FIG. 5-22). His houses featured floor to ceiling glazing, sometimes with a geometrical play of mullions; low-pitched gable roofs creating a strong sense of triangulation; no attics; play between board and batten painted wood; a nearly square brick wall hosting a fireplace inside; and ingenious planning to vary the placement of houses on the site and thereby gain privacy for the big-windowed houses. Everything was devised to make the houses and lots look more spacious than they really were. Another successful builder-architect collaboration was that of Edmund Bennett and the firm of Keyes, Lethbridge, and Condon in the more upscale subdivision of Carderock Springs in Bethesda (1963-67), among other developments. Using a similar formula, the architects created a number of models calculated to integrate with the rolling topography on the heavily wooded site. Carderock Springs, which also contained a recreational complex and neighborhood school, was marketed to environmentally conscious households who wanted a subdivision with a rustic feel.

Several subdivisions and individual houses are worth studying for their experimentation with prefabrication or high tech materials. With more than 1,000 units, Harundale, erected in the late 1940s near Glen Burnie, was one of America's largest experiments with the mass production and heavy prefabrication of small homes. Although the two and three bedroom homes were traditional Cape Cods, they featured modern utilities, all-electric kitchens, and ample storage space in heavily overbuilt, steel-framed structures. The experiment did not prove profitable. (8 ½ *1949*) Independently built prefabricated homes were very few, but they deserve study and protection. They include the Lustron House in the Calvert Hills section of College Park (1947 or 1948), built of exterior and interior porcelain enamel-finished steel *(MHT Forbes)*, and examples of Techbuilt Homes in Garrett Park (c. 1956), the modular houses of prefabricated parts designed by architect Carl Koch.

In addition to single-family houses, a number of multi-unit complexes were part of Maryland's postwar modern suburban landscape, including nursing homes. They adopted a residential character, and had the same clean lines, glazed openings, and hovering roofs as private homes. So far we have found three examples: one in Wheaton, one in Denton, and one in the suburbs of Cumberland. In the close-in suburbs to Washington and Baltimore, many garden apartment complexes were built. Some of the earliest showed significant merit both from a landscaping and

architectural standpoint. They include Joseph H. Abel's Prince George Apartments, constructed for the government's civilian workers in Hyattsville in 1940, the 1,000-unit Queenstown Apartments in Prince George's County, and Alexander Cochran's Lakehurst Apartments (1949), a composition that Weeks described as bringing the Bauhaus to Baltimore. (*Weeks 89*) After 1950, garden complexes began to proliferate in Baltimore County along Merritt Boulevard through Essex and Dundalk, as well as in Middle River, Towson, Catonsville, and Liberty Road-Woodlawn. In Montgomery County, apartment buildings were erected in greater number from 1955 onwards; many of those built after 1960 were condominiums (*Calcott 1985, 69*). According to Hiebert, apartments accounted for half of the new housing in the 1960s, much of it located inside the beltway and along the I-70 Corridor from Rockville to Gaithersburg (*Hiebert 359*). Two complexes designed by Cohen, Haft & Associates deserve further study. Wheaton House (1962), with landscape design by Thurman D. Donovan, staggered units facing inward around a park of locust trees (FIG. 5-23). The two bedroom/one bath and three bedroom/two bath apartments were designed as through units to gain cross-ventilation; they rented for $150 to $175 a month. Springhill Lake (groundbreaking in 1962) in Greenbelt was a huge complex of 2,899 that eventually housed 10,000 people. It was also arranged around interior courtyards to conform to Greenbelt's master plan, with Donovan designing the landscaping. When completed, it contained 29 playgrounds, six basketball courts, six tennis courts, a nine-hole golf course, pedestrian pathways, an elementary school, a recreation building, and an office building.

5.5.2 SCHOOLS, PARKS, AND RECREATION

The State of Maryland featured a remarkable range of fine modern educational buildings built between the late 1940s and mid-1960s. Schools comprise by far the largest share of our inventory. Public schools represented perhaps the principal vehicle for structural modernization that disseminated modern architecture to every county in the State. During all three postwar gubernatorial administrations, education was a priority, as it remained for citizens as well. The motivation for rethinking and modernizing of school planning and building stemmed from a growing awareness that the school, both as an institution and as shelter, was a key social catalyst. Thus, in this important policy arena, progressive leadership and liberal pedagogy prevailed. Backed by a strong, well-educated suburban political base, educational leaders and architects cooperated to modernize the physical plant of Maryland's public schools. To help plan this endeavor, the most respected educational consultants were called in, in particular, Dr. N. L. Engelhardt. Educators embraced the Dewey-endorsed "learn by doing" liberal pedagogy, and applied school design to help foster it. During the baby boom years, educational consultants and architects produced an abundant literature, in both article and book form, that established quantitative and qualitative norms for classroom sizes, shapes, and illumination. School design was debated in national fora such as the annual meetings of the American Association of School Administrators, based in Washington, D.C., where models were displayed. Maryland educators and architects took an active part in this stimulating debate.

Schools were deemed to be social equalizers and since segregation was the norm in the Free State, those for African American children were associated with racial justice. Still, the separate but equal approach was hardly satisfactory, because most of the state-of-the-art new schools were built in white neighborhoods. An exception can be found in Rockville. The George Washington Carver High School and Junior College, designed by McLeod and Ferrara, one of the premier firms specializing in educational buildings, was erected in 1951 as a model high school for Black children. Sharing its campus with the Rock Terrace Elementary School, Carver hosted students from a wide geographical area, some of whom spent three to four hours on busses daily to attend; at night the facility became the only post-secondary institution for African American students in Montgomery County. (*McGuckian 151*) After the Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court case in 1954, Carver High School students were integrated into other schools; until 1958, the school remained the Black campus of Montgomery Junior College. (*Hiebert 345*) The Montgomery County Board of Education made the handsome building its headquarters in 1961, but Carver is currently under threat of demolition because the Board finds the structure no longer suits its needs.

The tremendous volume of new school construction needed during the baby boom years presented an exciting challenge to architects and, despite the tight budgets that always governed school construction, they responded with a rich and innovative set of designs. These can be categorized and analyzed according to the age groups to which they catered (elementary, junior, or senior high), to their location (inner city, near or far metropolitan suburbs, county seats towns, or countryside), whether they were public or private and, in this sub-group, whether they were religious or secular establishments. As a general rule, geographical differentiation seemed

to be far less significant a factor than in the prewar years. The vast majority of the schools erected between 1945 and 1965 that we have visited appear well built and user friendly. Those that have not been altered beyond recognition still achieve great dignity and civic presence. Indeed, much was at stake for counties and suburbs; given citizens' concern for excellence in education, the ability to boast that one's locale possessed not only good education but also state-of-the-art schools attracted affluent residents. This proved especially the case for Harford County where the city of Bel Air entrusted Charles Nes with the design of an innovative multi-school campus.

The design of the new suburban schools (FIG. 5-24) differed markedly from that of prewar inner-city schools, beginning with significant landscape work that included the leveling of ground for playing fields, and the creation of public approaches and vast parking areas. Due to the abundant availability of land, most had a single-story or two-story layout, generating horizontal streamlined profiles with flat roofs balanced by vertical markers. As in the Featherbed Lane School in Woodlawn, designed by Tyler, Ketcham & Myers (1956), the massing generally took into account the greater bulk of the cafeteria/auditorium/gymnasium. Clustering around closed or open landscaped courtyards was common practice. Sometimes the separate wings for administration or classrooms for different age groups or functions (such as science, art, or shop classes) formed interesting compositions with open as opposed to 90 degree angles. Many mid-century schools had prominent short or elongated canopies running either perpendicular or parallel to the entrance, to welcome children getting out of buses. We found these in schools as far afield as the Deep Creek Elementary School in Baltimore County and the Route 40 School in rural Garrett County. The canopies create a secondary scale and a sense of procession; some are even gently curved. Inscriptions, such as the name of the school, often add architectural interest to the main entry. For materials, red brick was used almost universally, and outside walls sometimes displayed fine workmanship. The proportions and rhythms of fenestration were well studied and differentiated between different uses. On the inside, classrooms were well lighted and thoughtfully finished with built-in cabinetry scaled to the size of student bodies and ingenious storage partitions. Often, as in Hawthorne Elementary School in Middle River, they were designed with direct access to the outdoors for both pedagogic and safety reasons. Many of these schools have had alterations and additions; the earliest changes, often by same architect, were generally unobtrusive and respectful of the original design.

High schools sometimes reached very large proportions, becoming veritable academic campuses. The North and South Hagerstown High Schools by McLeod and Ferrara (FIG. 5.5) provide excellent examples of the complexity and adaptability of these large physical plants. The schools were configured in a series of six units. In the main academic unit, each grade was housed in a separate section, creating four small and intimate schools within the larger high school. Each little school had its own classrooms, faculty, and social life. The Hagerstown schools dispensed with ordinary box-like classrooms, deeming them "too rigid to provide the best atmosphere for learning." Instead it pursued a strategy it termed "opening the cages" and designed a series of glass-sided rather than walled general education spaces that could be partitioned differently, depending upon the need. Vocational and special use rooms were also integrated into each little school rather than being restricted to a separate unit, while large specialized spaces, such as the library and gymnasium, were shared by everyone (*Clinchy 1960*). Economic constraints and the pressure to cope with the constant rise in student population entailed a certain amount of standardization in school design and construction. This is most evident in the use of prefabricated facade elements, and sometimes even the creation of identical twin schools, such as high schools in Laurel and Bowie, and the Northern and Southern Garrett County High Schools. Throughout the postwar years, school design was a bread-and-butter activity for Maryland architects, who fought against schools manufactured by large prefabricators like National Homes (*Architects 1956*)

The general formulas we have summarized were well established for public schools and met with very few exceptions. There are some worth noting, however. The circular Bushey Drive Elementary School (FIG. 5-26) in Montgomery County, built in the late 1950s by Deigert and Yerkes of pre-cast concrete panels, is not used as a school anymore. The Lida Lee Tall is a spectacular demonstration elementary school adjacent to the State Teachers College in Towson (c. 1960). Designed by Dodson, Smeallie, Orrick & Associates of Baltimore, it featured a skylit tower with a spiraling ramp and a precast concrete frame, as well as a delightful glazed ceramic tile mural of children exercising at the playground entrance. Baltimore City schools remained more formal than the suburban schools, as a general rule; their massing and openings were often classical in character, as in the Northwood Elementary School (1952).

The private grade schools built in affluent suburbs differed dramatically from the more institutional-looking public elementary schools. They were usually much smaller, with a lower teacher/student ratio, only 10-15 students per class. Bastions of liberal pedagogy, they focused on nurturing and challenging children and prided themselves on innovative learn-by-doing curricula. Openness to the out-of-doors was not just symbolic, as in most public schools, but a way of teaching. Many of these schools were constructed incrementally, receiving several additions. There are several examples worth studying: the Gibson Island County School, designed by Bryden Hyde in 1947; the Primary Day School in Bethesda, by Deigert and Yerkes in 1955 (FIG. 5-25); and the Green Acres Nursery and Elementary School in Rockville, by Davis, Brody, Juster & Wisniewski, built in 1957.

Catholic schools during the postwar years were of two kinds. The first were relatively modest and low budget parochial schools. Most of them had solid, essentially utilitarian buildings, a good example being St. Margaret of Scotland School and Convent in Seat Pleasant, Prince George's County (1955). It is a mistake to associate Catholic schools with conservatism in architectural matters, however. Some buildings boasted quite radical and minimalist designs, such as the Convent and School for St. Matthias the Apostle in Lanham, by John Sullivan (c. 1963). (*Parochial 1950*) The second category includes the larger and more affluent academies that were independent from specific parishes. Many of them have maintained most of their remarkable design integrity. Good examples are the Academy of the Holy Cross in Kensington, Montgomery County, designed by Murphy and Locraft in 1954; St. John's Catholic High School in Bel Air (1964); and Calvert Hall, with buildings and master plan designed by Gaudreau and Gaudreau in 1957.

Many communities supplemented the recreational opportunities provided by school playgrounds with county or city-built recreational facilities. These might be quite modest "recreation centers," not much more than glorified picnic shelters with bathrooms. Still some were nicely designed and proportioned, not unlike a constructivist composition. Other "community buildings" were more elaborate, even resembling private homes where classes, dances, and sports activities were held almost every day of the week. A good example was the Elwood Smith Center in Rockville, designed by John Henry Sullivan in 1968, which, unfortunately, has been entirely rebuilt. Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon seem to have made suburban recreation centers a sub-specialty. Their Frederick YMCA building (1966) was given a merit award by the Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA, but their most original design, and one very well preserved, was the Wheaton Youth Center, built for the M-NCCPC in 1964 (FIG. 5-26). With its oriental-looking curved roof, it deserves closer study. We have identified few modern YMCAs of architectural merit, though the one in Dundalk by Jamison and Marcks (1955) deserves mention.

Suburban parents also sent their children to camps in the woods or the countryside, some of which featured interesting outdoor structures combining rusticity and modernity. The striking and unusual Girl Scout Lodge in Annapolis (1954) earned Rogers, Taliaferro & Lamb their first national AIA award. They also designed the Milldale Camp for the Jewish Community Center of Baltimore in 1965. Other suburban recreational buildings that proliferated during the 1950s and 1960s were swim clubs and community pools, sometimes containing "cool" modern cabanas, bowling alleys, bingo centers, and, of course, country clubs. A few elite country clubs in Baltimore's outlying districts built modern structures worth noting. A good example is Alexander Cochran's Suburban Club on Park Heights Avenue in Baltimore, built in 1960 (FIG. 5-27), a quiet, coherent design despite its use of a complex range of materials and its provision for a wide range of social and recreational activities. Also deserving further study are the Sparrows Point Country Club for the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, designed by Edmunds and Hyde (c.1955), the Bonnie View Country Club on Smith Avenue in Baltimore County by Bonnett and Brandt (1959), and the Lakewood Country Club in Rockville, designed by Clark Thomas Harmon in 1962. Of course, we cannot go without mentioning that other popular leisure activity for this time period that produced interesting and sometimes grand architectural statements: horse racing. The Grandstand at the Laurel Race Track (c. 1957) is a good example (FIG. 5-29).

5.5.3 PUBLIC SERVICES

Maryland's suburbs did not follow any special pattern of incorporating at a particular stage in their growth. Some did incorporate, but many of the largest and best known suburbs, such as Silver Spring, Bethesda, Wheaton, Towson, Dundalk, Catonsville, and Columbia, did not. Those that are official municipalities have worked out all

kinds of solutions to house their offices and basic services, but in all cases they have done so with genuine fiscal constraints. Thus, in Prince George's County, for example, Bladensburg (1954), Greenbelt (1964), and Seat Pleasant (1965) built modest, utilitarian, modern municipal buildings of no special distinction; Bowie's, Laurel's, and New Carrollton's city offices occupy former schools, Capital Heights' offices are housed in a former fire station, and North Brentwood (1952), Edmonston (1957), and University Park (1982) are housed in administrative buildings of traditional design. (*Denny*) Suburban city halls, as a general rule, do not constitute a significant building type in our survey.

In non-incorporated suburbs, civic presence was expressed through an array of small structures: community centers, recreational centers (discussed in Section 5.5.2), police stations, fire stations, and post offices. Police stations, for example, were generally boxy and functional, but the Baltimore County Police Headquarters in Towson by Wilson & Christie (1961) and the Rockville Police Station by Stann& Hilleary (1962) were quite distinguished. Among civic buildings, fire stations, with the straightfoward massing and openings required by their functions, were usually the best candidates for effective modernist statements. Fire departments in Baltimore and Montgomery Counties seem to have been particularly design-conscious and they represented a wide range of modernist forms. The Hillendale Fire Station by Finney, Dodson, Smeallie, & Orrick (1960) (FIG. 5-29) is a modest and simple building of strong merit. A very different approach has been taken by Wilson & Christie for the Baltimore County Fire Department Headquarters in Towson (1954). Other distinctive fire stations were constructed in MiddleRiver, Bethesda, Laytonsville, and Columbia, the latter designed by Frank Gehry and his then associates (1967). Post offices, although federal buildings designed under the auspices of the U.S.P.S., served as important community landmarks and sources of information. We found a series of nicely composed small post offices in suburban Baltimore from the first half of the 1960s in Arlington (1963), and Brooklyn-Curtis Bay (1964), and well as Joppatowne in Harford County (c. 1967).

5.5.3 - PLACES OF RELIGIOUS ASSEMBLY

As Marylanders populated the new suburbs in the 1950s and 1960s, a period of intense construction of religious structures ensued. Organized religion pursued two general goals: to meet the demands of the automobile-centered, decentralized culture and to design places of worship that would become suitable landmarks in the modern suburban landscape. Those goals revealed an interesting tension over how religious buildings would be oriented on the site, necessitating a balance between the traditional building placement in urban settings and the new demands of an automobile-oriented life style. The tension was expressed in the way sanctuaries were situated to face large, busy roads, when congregants would process toward them mostly from back parking lots. Many churches were obliged to build with tight construction budgets. Consequently, throughout the suburbs, one sees countless A-frame brick churches. Although many of these exteriors were banal and poorly detailed, they opened up to lofty interiors, lit by colored glass, sometimes offering good design surprises. Many other churches exhibited fine craftsmanship and a wide range of interesting textures both inside and outside, including outstanding custom-designed artwork in the form of murals, stained glass windows, monumental sculptures, and richly worked textiles.

In assessing the Modern Movement's impact on religious architecture in the suburbs, it makes the most sense to identify trends according to denomination. Those drawing most heavily on modernism for their architectural expression were Jewish, Lutheran, Unitarian, and Catholic congregations. Baltimore's northwest suburbs contained the heaviest concentration of Jews in the state. Thus Baltimore played a significant role in the renewal of synagogue architecture that took place throughout the United States in the late 1940s and 1950s. The new synagogues were not just houses of worship, but complex centers used on a daily basis for suburban activities, such as recreational programs, organized youth groups, social gatherings, study, service work, and professional networking. Many temple complexes also included schools. Built close to each other, with the highest concentration in Park Heights, these large compounds helped shape Judaism into a way of life, not just a weekly worship ritual. *(Sussman 31, 42)*. The most impressive were built by well known out-of-state architects: The Baltimore Hebrew Congregation by Percival Goodman (1948-53); Temple Oheb Shalom, by Walter Gropius and Sheldon Leavitt (1957-60); Chizuk Amuna by Daniel Schwartzmann (1958); and Beth Tfiloh Congregation, by Morris Lapidus (1962, dedicated 1967). We propose to study these places as a single cultural landscape.

Protestant denominations were slower to experiment with new silhouettes and iconography. For Pietro

Belluschi, persuading the Episcopal congregation of the Church of the Redeemer to accept his design (1954-1958) was an uphill battle. He accomplished the feat by designing a sanctuary that was brilliantly nontraditional while "drawing on the historicized English Parish church in its overall massing, pitch of the gabled roofs, materials of stone, wood, and slate, and cruciform plan." (*Clausen 98*) It was a tribute to situated modernism. Lutheran congregations, on the other hand, seemed happy to commission modernist churches with dramatically steep profiles that created exquisite spaces within. Several deserve closer scrutiny, including St. Luke's in suburban Cumberland, designed by T. Norman Mansell in 1958-60 (FIG. 5-30), Grace Lutheran Church in Lutherville, Baltimore County, by Thomas Silcox (1965-66), and Ascension Lutheran Church in Landover Hills by Ronald Senseman (1959), a modest A-frame on the outside that opens up to reveal a visually satisfying sanctuary space within. Two striking modernist Unitarian Churches were commissioned in Montgomery County. They are noteworthy for their excellent siting in relation to the landscaped terrain, their dramatic assembly halls with the play of light and glass and structure, and for their economic realization of complex plans that included administrative, service, daycare, recreational, and worship spaces. Perhaps the best is the River Road Unitarian Church by Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon in 1966 (FIG. 5-31), but the Cedar Lane Unitarian Church of Bethesda, by Belluschi, in association with Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon (c. 1960) also deserves attention. Unfortunately, Belluschi's initial plans for a larger complex could not be realized because of financial constraints.

During the postwar years, many Catholic families moved to Montgomery County, where six new parishes opened between 1959 and 1962 *(Conley 107)*. The Archdiocese of Washington was created in 1939, despite opposition from its counterpart in Baltimore. In 1947, when Patrick A. O'Boyle was named Archbishop by Pius XII, the Archdiocese was enlarged to include not only the Maryland suburbs but also Charles, Calvert, and Saint Mary's Counties. O'Boyle was progressive in matters both social and architectural. He was an advocate of desegregation; in the District of Columbia, he succeeded in integrating parishes by 1948 and schools in the early 1950s. On this issue, the Catholic Church was far more liberal than most local Protestant denominations. In establishing a building program in the Archdiocese, O'Boyle "solicited the advice of professionals in real estate, architecture, and the construction trades" (Conley 106). He gave priority to the erection of parish schools, with a chapel and an auditorium for hosting Sunday services, and a convent for nuns employed as teachers. Later, when more money became available, the Church commissioned monumental looking churches. Those in the suburbs of Baltimore and Washington were generally designed by a small pool of local, approved architects. Around Washington, many were graduates of Catholic University, where they had been trained by Frederick Vernon Murphy and Thomas Hall Locraft, the pre-eminent Catholic firm for the District of Columbia and its region until 1950. The designs of the suburban churches reveal conflicts between references to traditional massing and iconography and new ideas. Indeed, a number imitated traditional designs for simple European parish churches. A favorite profile up to the early 1960s consisted of a gently sloped gable-roofed sanctuary, with the lightweight wooden or steel structure left exposed in the rectangular sanctuary. This inexpensive but visually effective architectonic solution was exploited, for example, by Philip Schreier in Our Lady of Lourdes Church and Rectory in downtown Bethesda (1950-51) and in Saint Philip the Apostle in Camp Springs in 1959. Brick exteriors prevailed, with patterning and textures often adding interest to simple forms. Some churches featured an elaborate, single steeple in a lateral or central position. Stained glass windows helped to create an atmosphere of spirituality in spartan interiors. On occasion, however, Catholic churches could adopt memorable expressionist designs, as in Thomas H. Locraft's Mount Calvary Catholic Church in Forestville, 1958-60 (FIG. 5-32).

5.5.4 SHOPPING CENTERS, CORPORATE OFFICE PARKS, AND LIGHT INDUSTRY

Where prosperous middle class residents went, shopping was sure to follow. During the 1950s and 1960s a distinctively suburban retail landscape developed in the Maryland suburbs, based on the premises that new shopping centers would have to accommodate hundreds of automobiles and offer lots of amenities to attract shoppers to their particular location. The first forays of retail into the suburbs were tentative. Sears built large stores in outlying areas of Baltimore and Washington as early as the 1920s, but Silver Spring became the first place to provide a genuine shopping alternative to downtown Washington, beginning in 1938 but developing into a destination between 1945 and 1950. As Richard Longstreth has argued, "Silver Spring drew national attention as a business center created to meet the demands of a mobile, prosperous middle class—an entirely new district, with large, modern stores and ample parking, that set the pace for future urban growth." (*Longstreth 248*) Opening in 1947, Edmondson Village, four miles out on U.S. 40 in West Baltimore, developed the suburban merchandising concept

further by including an attractive array of consumer goodies in one complex: a major department store branch (Hochschild-Kohn), a supermarket, a theatre, a restaurant, and at least twenty other stores. The Meyerhoff Company, which developed Edmondson Village, selected a conservative and homey Colonial Revival theme for the architecture, however.

A massive decentralization of retail activities in the Baltimore-Washington orbit followed in the 1950s. According to Callcott, the suburban population increased 87% in the 1950s while retail sales increased 22%, but in the 1960s, retail sales in the suburbs increased by another 165% as new stores were completed and suburban retail caught on. These places went a long way towards freeing the suburbs from dependence on the cities for goods and services. (*Callcott 1985, 66*) Brugger opined that "architects made fat commissions designing these centers, which only occasionally did them credit" (*Brugger 583-84*), but we found many of them to be fashioned in a clean, straightforward modern idiom. The Friendship Heights shopping center began the rush in 1949. It was followed by the Freedom Shopping Center on Erdman Avenue in Baltimore, a sleek retail and garden apartment complex designed by Cochran for developer James Rouse in 1951, which had the advantage of supplying a captive audience of neighborhood shoppers. The Langley Park shopping center by David Baker Architects for Abbott, Merkt, & Co. was next in Prince George's County in 1951 (FIG. 5-33). Ground was broken in 1953 for Wheaton Plaza in Montgomery County, which was eventually "ranked fourth in size among the nation's gigantic shopping hubs" *(Hiebert 356).* Rouse's next experiment was the Mondawmin Mall in Baltimore's northwest suburbs (1956); it provided two levels of stores grouped around an interior courtyard with a spectacular spiraling staircase descending to a walkway across a sparkling pool. Congressional Plaza on Rockville Pike, with its jazzy Populuxe sign to attract shoppers from the highway, opened in 1958, as did Prince George's Plaza in Hyattsville. At the same time, Eastpoint (1956) and Westview (1958) welcomed consumers in suburban Baltimore. The next logical development was again spearheaded by James Rouse, who developed Harundale Mall (1958), the state's first enclosed mall with year-round climate control and ample seating, only the second of its kind in the country after Victor Gruen's design in Minneapolis *(Break-through 1956).* Towson Plaza (1959) concentrated on additional amenities to attract shoppers: wrought iron railings, terrazzo flower boxes, clean modern lines of precast concrete panels, and piped in music *(Brugger 584).* The Montgomery Mall opened in 1968. Around the state, suburban-style shopping centers were also commissioned in Easton (Talbottown in 1953 by Cochran) and Parole Plaza (1962). The vital lifespan of suburban retail complexes appears to be about 15 years before they are altered, expanded, or receive radical facelifts; frequent updating has become an expected part of the suburban retail mosaic. (Callcott 1985, 66) Thus only a very few of these places retain portions of their original design; most have been irreversibly altered.

Nearly every shopping center had some kind of major anchor. It could be a grocery store, such as the distinctive Penn Fruit Company on Governor Ritchie Highway (1956) (FIG. 5-34) but often it was a department store. A fine example was Hutzler's in Towson, the combined effort of local architect James R. Edmunds, Jr. and retail specialists Ketchum, Gina & Sharp of New York City.   Hutzler's is a fitting symbol of the postwar golden age of the suburban freestanding department store. A sleek and graceful structure with curved corners and horizontal bands of windows, it was described by the <u>Evening Sun</u> in an article with the title "Suburban Age Reflected In Department Store" when it opened in 1952. (*Suburban 1952*) Hutzler's catered to "young people and young families"; it featured such amenities as escalators, a pedestrian bridge from the parking structure to the store, dramatic lighting, and a great panoramic lunchroom called the Valley View Room. Each department received an individualized color scheme and decor. The quality of the streamlined profile was best apprehended from Towson Road, where large windows were not meant so much for merchandise display, as to allow motorists a glimpse of the attractive interiors. Marred by the addition of an additional story in 1967 and parking structure in 1968, Hutzler's closed in 1990; it has been defaced beyond recognition.

Shopping centers were by no means the only new suburban retail establishments worthy of mention. Examples of automobile-oriented suburban architecture abounded. These included service stations and automobile dealerships. During the late 1940s and 1950s, the Sun Oil Company built a series of flamboyant Sunoco gas stations in greater Baltimore; Esso stations, with their dramatic canopies, were also distinctive.   Some of the early fast food restaurants with their streamlined buildings and catchy signage are fondly remembered. And banks, especially drive-in establishments, acquired modern looks that attracted customer attention. Alexander Cochran convinced the Baltimore National Bank (now the Maryland National Bank Building) to accept an elegant modernist design for its Woodlawn branch in 1961.   Fine modernist designs were contributed for the Citizens Bank of Maryland in

Riverdale (c. 1957), the First National Bank branch on the Pulaski Highway near Baltimore by Fisher, Nes, Campbell & Associates (c. 1959), and for a series of banks for the Suburban Trust Company in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties in the 1950s and 1960s.

Retail wasn't the only category of enterprise to move to the suburbs, as we pointed out in Section 5.1.1 when we discussed the decentralization of Federal agencies. Beginning in the 1950s, suburban office and corporate compounds became more frequent components of the suburban landscape. An excellent example of the latter, deserving more study, is the Fairchild Engine and Airplane Corporation, by Fordyce & Hamby, on the north side of Hagerstown, from 1953. (FIG. 5-36) In the Baltimore and Washington suburbs, the formula of a combined company headquarters and large warehouse set in a landscaped park became quite popular. At least two examples received national press coverage upon their completion and have remained practically unchanged. A compound for the Noxell Chemical Company in Hunt Valley was designed by no less a firm than S.O.M.; the warehouse was completed in 1964, and the office building in 1967. Among automobile companies, Volkswagen seems to have commissioned especially striking designs. The Volkswagen South Atlantic Distributor building (now owned by the Hargrove Company) by Mills Petticord & Mills in association with Leon Safrata (1965) in Landover, Prince George's County, is spectacular (FIG. 5-36). Sitting on a podium, wrapped by a colonnade, the building centers on a spiral free-standing staircase and is furnished with a blue-tiled sauna, an all stainless cafeteria-size kitchen, and a large Japanese garden.

SECTION 6: THE LATE 1960s - VERY EARLY 1970s

6.1 SOCIAL UPHEAVALS

Between 1965 and 1972, the closing date for our survey, there were sufficient changes in Maryland's social, historical, and architectural circumstances to justify a separate, if succinct contextual analysis of these years. Several factors framed the architectural and planning activities of late Modernism. It was a time of continued prosperity in some quarters but increasing social tensions. Maryland's economy remained healthy. The unemployment rate was only 2.9% in 1966, compared to a 3.8% national average. Nonetheless, these years witnessed an increasing gulf between those doing well and those who were not, a trend that led developers to practice niche marketing in housing and retail, with most of the activity concentrated at the prosperous end of the continuum. Spiro T. Agnew's ascendance to the governorship in 1967 and 1968 marked the final triumph of the new suburban population's political power and a strongly bureaucratic structure of governmental organization. During the mid-1960s and 1970s, local and state bureaucracies expanded as those entities assumed a much greater burden of administering social and economic services than ever before.

Planners and architects found themselves in awkward positions sometimes. At the same time that cities, Baltimore and Rockville as examples, undertook ambitious urban revitalization programs, assisted by generous federal grants, groups of citizens began to assert themselves in opposition to selected programs. Thus, during this short period, citizens mobilized to block highway construction when it would cut through urban neighborhoods and protested urban renewal when it succeeded in tearing down more housing than it rebuilt. A grassroots historic preservation movement emerged to challenge the tabula rasa mentality of urban redevelopment. For example, the Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA played an important role in helping save Rockville's Richardsonian Romanesque courthouse from the wrecking ball. Public sentiment became more critical of the planning function of government and less inclined to see planning as an impartial technocratic exercise of expertise for the public good. Ironically, as public planning became more encumbered by these criticisms and the need to obtain greater citizen participation in decision-making processes, private developers increased the extent to which they combined architecture and planning in various high-end projects, e.g. gated subdivisions, planned unit developments, and corporate or industrial campuses.

During these years, social tensions of race and class erupted into civil unrest. Significant riots broke out in Cambridge in 1967 and in Baltimore between 1968 and 1971, although they were not as dramatic as in some other parts of the country. During the same period several college campuses in the state experienced strong protests over Civil Rights issues as well as in opposition to the Vietnam War. Perceived or real threats of civil disobedience would generate a hostile, fortified architectural style that only took full effect after our period of study. At the same time, this short period marked a tremendous increase in the migration of African Americans to the suburbs, especially from Washington, D.C., to Prince George's County.

All four sponsors of modernization were at work during the last years of the Modern Movement in Maryland and had some impact on the state's architectural and urban resources. The Federal Government's influence was felt most powerfully through monies that helped to underwrite major urban revitalization projects such as the Inner Harbor of Baltimore and downtown Rockville. The State's ongoing structural modernization and support of public education was most evident in the restructuring of higher education and the massive building campaign that followed on many campuses. The suburban counties continued to host many vigorous projects, many of them of architecture and planning combined, but during these last eight years the centers of activity were in or near the new urban growth corridors, with much emphasis on planned unit developments and new office complexes. In these projects entrepreneurs, large (such as James Rouse) and small (such as housing developers and information technology companies just starting out) played important roles in shaping the landscape of the suburbs.

6.2 NEW PLANNING POLICIES AND PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT

At the same time that planning came increasingly under fire in connection with highway construction and urban renewal, its role seemed to expand in urban revitalization and private community building campaigns. Indeed many architects found planning an indispensable tool as they shifted from thinking of themselves as the creators of freestanding monuments to urban designers. Downtown Baltimore continued to be the site of nationally significant redevelopment projects. Now that the Charles Center was complete, attention turned to reviving the Inner Harbor, a project that was four times the size and cost of the former. The first proposals raised the issue of preserving warehouses abandoned around 1950. An alluring model and perspective sketches of the development were published in Progressive Architecture in April 1965. In 1966, a $17.7 million federal grant was awarded, the first of several. In 1971, the election of William Donald Schaefer as Mayor indicated a new turn in Baltimore's local politics. Schaeffer "served with striking success by combining strong organizational support, a dynamic television personality, and an aggressive program of urban rebuilding that brought liberals and conservatives together." His popularity, ability to obtain federal funds, and the success of Harborplace made him a "national symbol for urban renaissance." *(Calcott 1985, 10)* The Inner Harbor project would not be completed until 1980. In its first year, it attracted more people than would visit Walt Disney World in the same period. While citizens seemed generally supportive of the waterfront redevelopment, they organized to reject the more radical form of urban renewal, a tenet of modernist planning, especially when it threatened neighborhoods. In Bolton Hill, the Mount Royal Improvement Association was able to fight a devastating expressway project. Instead, they obtained an approach to revival that combined rehabilitation, respect for the area, and construction of unobtrusive townhouse groups. Those designed by Alexander Cochran and Hugh Newell Jacobsen (FIG. 6-1) were not pastiches but interesting re-thinkings of the rowhouse form that featured innovative layouts and space-saving ideas.

In the suburbs, two contradictory trends were significant during this period. Sprawl endured, but so did increasing densities in suburban centers and calls for suburban renewal. Among many examples of sprawl and the continuing decentralization of employment, we can cite the transformation of the eastern part of Harford County, where several industries relocated *(Jones 1971)*. Bel Air gained many interesting buildings in the process. Many office structures, including the fine M-NCPPC Building, designed by Edwin Ball in 1967(FIG. 6-2), were erected along Kenilworth Avenue in Prince George's County and other well-traveled highway corridors. From being the object of plans on paper, large-scale high-rise construction and drastic renewal became a reality in the center of some of the largest suburban communities. An increasing number of suburban cities, each fending for itself, competing with its neighbors, and often blinded by unreasonable ambitions, sponsored modernization plans. Examples in Prince George's County were Glenarden in 1965 and Laurel in 1969. Rockville hired Philadelphia planner and architect Robert Geddes in 1966 to restructure its town center into a dense multi-functional fabric with connections to a future metro station (FIG. 6-3). Over-planned and under-designed, the Rockville Civic Center did not prove a success and was almost entirely demolished in the 1990s. It is a good example of modernist planning that misfired by miscalculating the extent to which physical restructuring could generate social and civic improvement. The Bethesda - Chevy Chase (Friendship Heights) area also acquired a dense core that expanded northward along the Wisconsin Avenue corridor and out Rockville Pike. This kind of rapid growth along highway corridors began to characterize suburban growth around 1970. It was even later given a name—edge city *(Garreau)*. Its major feature was the recombination in dense corridors of residences, retail, and places of employment, a series of land uses that classic residential suburbs had carefully separated. Thus along Rockville Pike, high rise apartment complexes sprang up, such as the Grosvenor Park Apartments (1963), right next to office towers and down the street from major retail complexes, such as the White Flint Mall. Similar changes were added to the Towson skyline with Hampton Plaza, and to downtown Silver Spring with the 800-unit Georgian Towers. These changes were not often user-friendly. The Towson Public Library, for example, favored a rather megalomaniac theatricality over human scale and gentility. The tower in the park design solution, inherited from pre-War European utopianism, was introduced to the Maryland suburbs in the form of apartment buildings, but also with the National Agricultural Library in Beltsville, designed by Warner, Burns, Toan & Lunde in 1966-70 (FIG. 6-4).

As the suburban population continued to expand and land grew more expensive and less available, politicians and developers advocated large planned unit developments (PUDs) prepared by planning and design experts instead of piecemeal growth in the hands of small developers and home builders. A forerunner of this movement was James Rouse's village of Cross Keys in Northern Baltimore. Many PUDs had traditional homes, as in Crofton and Northampton, along the D.C./Annapolis corridor. Two ambitious projects were the work of well-respected modern architectural firms: New Mark Commons and Montgomery Village. Both strove for greater

diversity in lot sizes and housing types, achieved by mixing townhouses and single-family homes. To save space and prevent excessive monotony, the designers developed the concept of "clusters." They also carefully studied the provision and design of recreation facilities. Built by Edmund Bennett, New Mark Commons (Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon and, subsequently, other architects) opened in 1967 in Rockville; its projected shops, however, were never built, due to residents' opposition to a retail district on their landscaped grounds. Kettler Brothers developed Montgomery Village in Gaithersburg, planned for 30,000 people on 2,000 acres (FIG. 6-5). RTKL was "responsible for land planning, architectural design of multi-family and commercial units and architectural co-ordination of the total project" (*Montgomery 134).* Using the same principles of walled entrance courts, patios, and shared driveways, a number of smaller, inventively designed infill subdivisions with a high density of single-family homes were built, such as Deigert and Yerkes' Drumaldry in Bethesda. Large PUDs in which the developer remained responsible for upkeep and grounds also proliferated during these years; many of these were gated and aimed at affluent retirees. The most ambitious, Rossmoor Leisure World, which opened in 1966 in the distant Montgomery County suburbs, exhibited a mildly modern look.   Similar communities were Heritage Harbor in Annapolis and Crestwood in Frederick. In addition, large planned garden apartment complexes, such as Springhill Lake in Greenbelt, were also considered as a winning formula for moderate-cost suburban housing.

The coastal building boom on the Eastern Shore was another important phenomenon in the late 1960s. Beach locations were often conducive to sleek, modern forms for motels and restaurants. In Ocean City, the center of activity, the Caliban Corporation built a 14-story, 104-unit condominium building above the North Beach Area (FIG. 6-6). An ambitious modern convention center was planned for Ocean City by Loewer, Sargent & Associates in 1969 (FIG. 6-7), but the design was rejected in favor of a more conventional building.

6.3 MODERNISM AT THE CROSSROADS

The late 1960s was a period when architectural design experienced renewal and transition throughout the world and Maryland was not immune to changing styles and values. **The design for I. M. Pei's World Trade Center in the Inner Harbor was made public in 1968; it may have marked a watershed of sorts.** In the hands of architects like Edward Durrell Stone and Minoru Yamasaki, the International Style evolved toward a certain mannerism, producing buildings that were out of context in terms of scale and depleted of social and cultural meaning. With the resurgence of monumental public commissions this approach could be tempting, as evidenced by the new Court of Appeals in Annapolis, designed by Gaudreau Inc. in 1969. Even some small buildings were affected by the mania to add prefabricated arches to box-like masses; an example we found was a post office in Joppatowne.

"Brutalism," as expounded at Boston's City Hall and Paul Rudolph's School of Architecture at Yale, was another new stylistic option that produced striking forms (*Banham 1966*). The raw energy delivered by the battered stone walls on Howard County's Government Office Building (FIG. 6-8) in Ellicott City (1967) was exciting indeed. The vernacular interpretation of this trend resulted in buildings with much heavier roof lines, including the cosmetic neo-mansard roofs of many townhouse communities. While concrete was a popular material for office buildings, brick—particularly beige, buff, or painted white—became used more frequently in residential work as architects sought a lighter palette for their heavier and more mannered forms.

During the Late International Style, another popular variation entailed the use of abstract masses clad in reflective glass. The results could sometimes be alienating and disheartening but these glass cubes could also be mesmerizing in a nondescript suburban environment. One of America's most striking and successful variations on the theme of theatrical minimalism is to be found in Towson: Peterson and Brickbauer's Maryland Blue Cross Building of 1971(FIG. 6-9), designed like one of Donald Judd's or Sol Le Witt's minimalist box sculptures or "Double Cubes".

By the mid 1960s, the modernist aesthetic and ethic, with its emphasis on progress, heroism, and originality, began to be challenged by a series of theorists. They included, most notably, Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown, who advocated in contrast the "ugly and ordinary" and "complexity and contradiction" in architecture, and Charles Moore, who later built a house in the Washington suburbs with William Trumbull.   In post-modernism,

Moore and others revisited the vernacular and the notion of urbanity, injecting a dose of irony into both modernism and historicism. In effect, though, the kind of domestic design proposed by Moore in the small but very influential square cottage he designed (1960-62) for himself in Orinda and in the seminal Sea Ranch Condominium north of San Francisco (1963-65) with Donlyn Lyndon, William Turnbull, and Richard Whittaker, was hardly antagonistic to Maryland's earlier modern vernacular of Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon. This particular vision rang a chord with a new generation of designers, especially those educated at Yale who made a name for themselves designing private residences. Good examples are the media-savvy Hugh Newell Jacobsen, whose career as a designer of houses took off in 1965, upon completion of the Naftalin Residence in Riva, near Annapolis; Hartman Cox; and Walter Dodd Ramberg, who created the Azrael Residence in Ruxton in 1968 (FIG. 6-10).

Thus, the late 1960s saw the emergence of a new crop of talented local practitioners. In addition to the architects just mentioned, they included Gerald Baxter in Bel Air as well as more entrepreneurial designers like Neil Greene, who formed Contemporary Homes, Inc., to sell his domestic designs. His "hillside model with an indoor swimming pool" followed the example established by Cochran and others of architects building their own homes to serve as models for their practices (FIG. 6-11). Another important trend to emerge in this short period was experimentation with heavy prefabrication and building systems. These were put to various uses: for school buildings by Christie and RTKL, housing at Fort Meade, and a well-intentioned but, in the end, unsuccessful attempt to re-house the African-American residents of the enclave of Scotland in Bethesda (*Bailey 1966*). On the wackier end of things, Utopian-futurist designs initiated by Archigram in England and by the Metabolists in Japan made their way to Maryland in the shape of a Mystery Space Ship that was exhibited in Baltimore in 1971 (FIG. 6-12).

6.4 THE BROADENING PALETTE OF MODERNIST EXPRESSION: NEW BUILDING ACTIVITY

Although our starting date is not always precisely 1965, we have observed major changes in the design of several building types, as the palette of late modernist expression broadened. The most significant occurred in public educational buildings, including college and community college campuses, suburban office complexes, and Catholic churches.

6.4.1 PUBLIC EDUCATION

During the 1960s, both the State and the counties continued to make public education a priority. New schools were built, albeit at a slower pace than previously, as needed to replace older facilities and to accommodate population shifts; many renovations of existing schools were undertaken as well. Important structural and functional transformations occurred in education and were reflected in architectural design. The differences between rich and poor school districts seemed to have deepened somewhat. Boards of Education were constantly trying out new pedagogic and design principles and manipulating space in new schools to accommodate them. The linear organization of entirely separate classrooms was abandoned for pod-like and open space configurations for "team teaching," which led to schools with massive footprints, such as Sykesville Elementary in Carroll County, designed by Smeallie, Orrick & Janka in 1969 (FIG. 6-13). The presence of air conditioning and increasing security concerns led to the generally unfortunate reduction of window space. There was considerable experimentation with unusual geometric layouts, a trend that began during the early part of the decade, for example, in schools by Fisher, Nes, & Campbell. However, the polygonal arrangements of classrooms that sometimes resulted, as in, for example, the Walter J. Mitchell Elementary School in La Plata by Harder & Dressel (1965), did not always produce exciting elevations. Because of civil unrest and increased crime, many inner city schools become veritable fortresses. Some educators, politicians, and designers tried to find alternatives to locking down and policing the buildings, for instance by designing new schools that would double as community centers. The Commodore John Rodgers School in East Baltimore, commissioned from George Von Fossen Schwab in 1965 and completed 1972, featured an imaginative "adventure playground" by landscape architect Paul Friedberg.

As the number of working mothers in Maryland increased, educators and designers took greater interest in pre-kindergarten education and out-of-home childcare. This new demand and the research that went into satisfying it produced a new building type. Excellent examples were the day care center by Von Fossen Schwab, the only surviving component of Columbia's Bryant Wood Community Center from 1968 (FIG. 6-14), and the Robinwood

Center by McLeod, Ferrara & Ensign, affiliated with Hagerstown State College (1970). A noteworthy related building type was an orphanage: St. Vincent's Infant Home and Child Care Center, built in 1964 by Gaudreau & Gaudreau for the Archdiocese of Baltimore.

The striking changes to public education registered most powerfully in building campaigns for community and state colleges. Well established universities maintained a steady rhythm of construction during these years; the School of Architecture by Fisher, Nes, Campbell (1972) was a solitary late modernist addition to the College Park campus, for example. However, the most distinctive development of the period with regard to higher learning was the massive extension or creation ex nihilo of local colleges. This phenomenon had many historical and ideological explanations. The children of the immediate post-war baby boom had reached college age, the State was anxious to retain a student population that had tended to leave its boundaries once out of high school, and there was a broad recognition among public officials that the State's future prosperity depended upon training good teachers and technicians.

The reorganization of the State of Maryland's system of higher education in 1963 involved three tiers of schools, as we mentioned in Section 5.1.3. At the top was the University of Maryland, with the College Park campus designated as the flagship research institution. The next tier was made up of six teachers colleges that would be transformed into liberal arts institutions, and the third tier included an indefinite number of community colleges. The tri-partite system would be coordinated by an Advisory Commission for Higher Education (*Callcott 1985, 180, 251*). This restructuring took full effect in the late 1960s and early 1970s when the State Department of Education estimated that over 35 per cent of the Free State's high school graduates went on to college (*Burdette 859*). Enrollment at the University of Maryland increased from 13,850 in 1955 to 36,980 in 1967. At the second tier of colleges, it grew from 5,067 to 16,651. During the same period, the number of community colleges grew from four (1,452 students) to twelve (20,580 students) (*Callcott 1985, 180*)

During the massive building campaign that followed, architects must have felt the same kind of pressure to churn out college plans that they had felt designing grade schools fifteen years earlier, particularly since the pool of firms with the appropriate expertise was quite small. For their campus master plans, they generally chose either pavilion grouping or a kind of megastructure rationale. Budgets were limited and time was short. The material of choice was brick, in modern-looking beige or red, sometimes with banding in white concrete. Field stone accents were used on rural campuses in Frederick and Hagerstown. The designs strove to combine user-friendliness with a dose of grandeur as in Essex Community College (McLeod & Ferrara, late 1960s) (FIG. 6-15). Although they stemmed from excellent intentions on the part of both administrators and architects, many were aesthetically disappointing. Students, when they protested, may have also been rebelling against the sanitized and predictable working environments imposed on them. A more successful example was the set of buildings and plan for the new South Campus of Frostburg State Univeristy (1964-82), particularly the Millard Tawes Building (1968), the Fine Arts Building (c. 1970), and the Lane Center (1973).

6.4.2 SUBURBAN OFFICE COMPLEXES

The popularity of low lying, extensive suburban office complexes surged between 1965 and 1972. This was one of the characteristic new building types associated with "edge city" development along growth corridors. We have found many examples located between Rockville and Gaithersburg, along Rockville Pike and I-270. State, county, and federal bureaus sometimes contributed buildings along these "growthscapes" as well. They can perhaps best be appreciated as transitional landscapes between Late Modernism and Post-modernism. Their architectural approaches could range a good deal, but they usually communicated a sense of forward-looking design and state-of-the-art technology, while being well-sited on landscaped grounds. Good examples are the IBM Building in Gaithersburg, a very bold brutalist composition by Curtis & Davis in association with Donald B. Coupard (c. 1965), and the more famous Comsat Laboratories by Cesar Pelli in association with Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall, along I-270 in Clarksburg, ten miles north of Rockville (FIG. 6-16). Comsat (short for Communications Satellite Corporation) built this facility for research and development of communications satellites in 1967-68, just around the time its products helped enable people around the world watch the United States land a man on the moon. A relatively low-cost industrial structure, the Lab was built to house spaces with highly specialized functions while remaining flexible in plan in order to accommodate new technologies quickly. It is a steel frame building with

concrete infill floors cantilevered to the exterior walls; the latter are constructed of aluminum panels not unlike the skin of an aircraft. Labeled "Technological Imagery: Turnpike Version," the Comsat Lab projects the striking image of a highly futuristic man-made object situated in the middle of 42 acres of northern Montgomery County's pastoral landscape, an incongruous but fitting early symbol of this aggressive new mode of suburban growth. (*Technological*)

6.4.3 MARYLAND'S CATHOLIC CHURCHES

As a result of major liturgical changes, the design philosophy behind Maryland's Catholic churches evolved dramatically during the waning years of the Modern Movement in Maryland. Bringing to Rome priests, secular experts, representatives of the laity, and even non-Catholics from all around the world, Vatican II (1962-65) was spearheaded by Pope John XXIII and pursued by Pope Paul VI. The council undertook to modernize the Catholic Church, reassess its spiritual and social significance in the contemporary world through greater involvement of the laity, and renovate its liturgy. Changes in the celebration of mass led to important changes in the planning of church sanctuaries. Existing churches were refurbished to fashion new seating configurations, whenever possible adopting centralized plans to bring the congregation closer to the celebrant. For new churches, the changes led to design "in the round." Maryland's pool of diocese-approved architects caught up with the renewal movement, which had already reshaped the architecture of Catholic churches in Western Europe (France in particular) and the province of Quebec *(Bergeron 1987)*.

We can view the impact of the changes on architecture by following the evolution of the work of Johnson and Boutin, a firm that was very prolific in the Archdiocese of Washington. In 1964, they completed St. Hugh's in Greenbelt, which had a slightly modernized vernacular character. St Catherine Labouré Parish Church in Wheaton, completed five years later, was infinitely more assertive and spatially adventurous. Johnson and Boutin were also responsible for the bombastic and kitsch new St. Mary's in Rockville, which was at the time of its completion in 1966 unfavorably compared to a "Howard Johnson's eatery." In Baltimore, William L. Gaudreau, whom we interviewed, assumed leadership among the approved architects in that region. His design for Our Lady of Hope, completed in 1970 (FIG. 6-17 and 6-18), provided a drab neighborhood in Dundalk with a monumental anchor. As many as 1,200 persons can sit, arena-like, on either side of an elongated, curved central platform acting as sanctuary but usable for other activities as well. A semi-circular arrangement is used in the smaller meditation chapel; in both cases natural light coming through clear panes and restrained stained glass create a sacred atmosphere. The grand open spaces are made possible by large-scale steel frames, as at St. Nicholas Church in Laurel, designed by John Sullivan in 1969, another Post-Vatican II example deserving further study.

5.5 BREAKTHROUGH IN RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY PLANNING: COLUMBIA

Many of the Modernist planning, stylistic, and programmatic transformations that we discussed in Section 5 came to full fruition in the new town of Columbia, a fitting conclusion for our chronology. As early as 1963, James Rouse announced his intention to build a new town in rural Howard County, along the Washington to Baltimore suburban corridor. Columbia's first residents moved to Wilde Lake Village in 1967, and construction proceeded briskly during the following years. By 1968, 1,200 families, 18 industries, 4 restaurants and one retail establishment had located there. In 1970, the population had grown to 8,798 and construction had begun on the Columbia Mall. By 1972, at the close of our survey period, there were 23,000 residents in Columbia, 60 industries, 140 retail establishments, and six banks (*Timeline*). The town has grown apace since then.

Two of Rouse's key goals were to develop a viable alternative to suburban sprawl and fight the social homogeneity of new developments. According to Calcott, his primary aim was "making community a marketable commodity." *(Calcott 1985, 78)*. Columbia benefited from an aggressive and effective public relation campaign, with the Rouse Corporation issuing lavish promotional brochures and town magazines before any building was above ground, and opening an Exhibit Center in 1967 that had received its one-millionth visitor in 1971. The venture was discussed as a novelty in the popular newsmagazines (Time, New Yorker, Look), financial journals (Business Week and Fortune), and it quickly attracted international attention with articles in L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui and Architectural Design in 1969.

"Planned to the Nth degree" as House and Home shrewdly stated (Planned 103), Columbia was and remains best known and appreciated for its multidisciplinary, comprehensive planning process, which involved a plethora of experts, including prominent sociologists like Herbert J. Gans of Levittown fame (Siegel 1964). Its system of "overlapping communities" was attractive and provided for interesting gradations of building scale, character, and cost. At the base of the spatial pyramid were the "neighborhoods," each including an elementary school, a nursery, and stores for daily and emergency shopping (FIG. 6-19). They were grouped into "villages," roughly two miles in diameter, for 2,500-3,500 families, and included a high school and a shopping center, complete with a supermarket. Topping all this off was the "town center," with its office buildings, high-rise apartments, and a large, enticing, and rather futuristic-looking shopping mall (which, indeed, it was when it first opened), complete with public art and a trendy hard modernist landscape.

Rouse compiled an interesting toolkit of planning devices to fashion Columbia in the way that he envisioned. He deployed zoning variances to achieve the kind of density he wanted. To ensure a decent employment base, he attracted companies of different sizes to Columbia's industrial parks. He banked on the contemporary craze for water front housing by creating several artificial lakes. He also developed a careful design code to control changes to the landscape and architecture that residents are obliged to follow. Most of these measures worked. Right from the beginning, the Columbia's early occupants expressed an extraordinary degree of satisfaction with the new town.

The Columbia experiment was socially progressive in several significant ways. One of the most important was Rouse's policy of open occupancy to generate a more diverse sociological spectrum of residents. This effort was relatively successful with regard to race and religion, if not so much to income; the population remained consistently 20% African American, for example. Columbia schools and libraries were programmatically advanced as well. A third progressive element was an interfaith center, as ecumenism was the order of the day. It was built for eight major denominations and the Archdiocese of Baltimore; the congregations pooled their resources instead of building separate churches. The Interfaith Housing Corporation--a collaborative venture between Columbia's Cooperative Ministry, the Archdiocese of Baltimore, and the Jewish faith—was another socially liberal enterprise. The unique non-profit organization produced well designed, below-market town house units by Collins and Kronstadt of Columbia (1970), although generally the program was more remarkable for its social engineering than the ensuing designs. Finally, by attending so carefully to the process of financing and designing community amenities, Columbia was able to provide a greater number of and better-quality facilities for middle-income households than other planned developments built at the same time in Maryland and elsewhere in the United States.

On a first visit to Columbia, one can feel frustrated by the way architecture plays second fiddle to infrastructure. From the parkways, Columbia's civic and commercial structures do not project themselves well. Their presence is easily overwhelmed by parking lots or lush nature. One senses an unresolved ambiguity between the desire to achieve urbanity by, for example, mixing housing types and creating residential clusters, and the need to comply with the prevailing automobile-oriented suburban lifestyle.

When assessing design excellence, Columbia has always been compared unfavorably to its northern Virginia counterpart, Reston. However, the quality of some of its early (pre-1972) buildings should not be overlooked. There are, first of all, structures associated with the budding career of Frank O. Gehry (b.1929) who, with another Los Angeles based architect, C. Gregory Walsh, had formed a rather flexible partnership with Baltimore designer Noel David O'Malley. Columbia planner Robert Tennenbaum believes that Gehry should not be solely credited for the design of the Merriweather Post Pavilion (1971) (FIG. 6-20), host to summer concerts by the National Symphony Orchestra and others, for which much design impetus came from acoustical engineer Christopher Jaffe. (*Tennenbaum 2002*) We also give O'Malley primary credit for Columbia's Public Safety Building, as does Tennenbaum, an attribution that is corroborated by the fact this fire station was not included in Gehry's first large monograph (*Futagawa, 1993*). The same applies to the Exhibition Center, which Tennebaum credits to O'Malley and Mort Hoppenfeld, Columbia's Head of Planning and Design. Exactly what Gehry's role was in these buildings may become clear when we are able to consult the Columbia Archives. According to Tennenbaum, "[f]or most of the early projects Rouse staff architects developed concepts and schematics, had them approved by management and then selected the appropriate outside architect to further develop the plans and seal the documents." (*Tennenbaum 2002*)

Undoubtedly, Columbia's early residential architecture deserves a fresh examination. The Wilde Lake area features many well-designed modern homes. The one Tennenbaum designed for his family, the customized model owned by planner William Finley, and the patio homes by builder and self-styled designer John N. Bowers were all fairly radical flat-roofed structures of considerable interest. Hugh Newell Jacobsen's sculptural Tidesfall townhouse complex overlooking the lake, designed in 1971, is a major architectural achievement (FIG. 6-21). South of the Hobbits Glen golf course, there is a fine sample of modern vernacular wooden homes.

Columbia, which triggered considerable change in Howard County, seems little aware of the historical and architectural significance of many of its groundbreaking experiments. The circular Wilde Lake High School, which was much discussed upon its construction, is already gone. So is the Bryant Woods Community Center. Replacement structures are generally much less interesting in their design. Awareness of Columbia's design legacy should be premised on far more than Frank Gehry's name. The new town is a complex cultural landscape and certainly one of the foremost Modernist social, architectural, economic, and planning achievements completed in the State. It encapsulates well the ways that modern design could touch the everyday lives of ordinary citizens.

WORKS CITED

Adams 1995 Annmarie Adams, "The Eichler Home: Intention and Experience in Postwar Suburbia," in Elizabeth Collins Cromley and Carter L. Hudgins, eds., Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture V (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1995), 164-178.

Albrecht 1995 Donald Albrecht, ed., World War II and the American Dream, How War Time Building Changed a Nation. (Cambridge, Mass.: 1995).

B-CC 1966 "B-CC: Progress or Decay?" Montgomery County Sentinel (June 30, 1966): 1.

Bacon 2001 Mardges Bacon. Le Corbusier in America : travels in the land of the timid. (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2001).

Bailey 1966 "The Town that Refused to Go Away," Architectural Forum 125 (October 1966), 78-81.

Banham 1966 Reyner Banham, The New Brutalism: Ethic or Aesthetic? (London, 1966).

Barr 1932 Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Henry Russell Hitchcock, Jr., Philip Johnson, and Lewis Mumford, Modern Architects. (New York, Museum of Modern Art, W.W. Norton and Company, 1932).

Barret 1946 L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui (1946).

Baudrillard 1995 Jean Baudrillard, "La modernité," Corpus, vol.15 (Paris: Encyclopedia Universalis, 1995), 552-554).

Bergeron 1987   Bergeron, Claude, "L'architecture des Églises du Québec: 1940-1985," (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1987).

Best 1991 Steven Best and Douglas Kellner, "In Search of the Postmodern", in Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations. (Guilford, 1991): 1-33.

Bletter/Robinson 1975 . Rosemarie Haag Bletter and Cervin Robinson, Skyscraper Style. Art Deco New York. (New York, 1975).

Break-through 1956 "Break-through for two-level shopping centers; Southdale near Minneapolis and Mondawmin in Baltimore," Architectural Forum 105 (December 1956): 114-23.

Breihan 1998 John R. Breihan, "Necessary Visions: Community Planning in Wartime," Maryland Humanities (Nov. 1998): 11-14.

Breihan 2000 John R. Breihan, Garden Suburbs for the Working Class: Prefabrication, Planning, and Racial Discrimination in Suburban Baltimore during World War II," conference paper, April 2000.

Breihan 2002 John R. Breihan, Interview, Middle River, MD, March 2002.

Brown 1983 Dorothy M. Brown, "Maryland Between the Wars," in Richard Walsh and William Lloyd Fox (ed.) Maryland. A History. (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1983), 672-772.

Brugger 1988 Robert Brugger, Maryland, a Middle Temperament 1634-1980. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988).

Burdette 1983 Franklin L. Burdette, "Modern Maryland Politics and Social Change," in Richard Walsh and William Lloyd Fox (ed.) Maryland. A History. (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1983), 773-906.

Bushong 1987 Bushong, William, A Centennial History of the Washington Chapter, the American Institue of Architects, 1887-1987. (Washington, D.C.: Washington Architectual Foundation Press, 1987).

Callcott 1985 George Callcott, Maryland and America, 1940 to 1980. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985).

Callcott 2001 Interview with George Callcott, University of Maryland, October 17, 2001.

Clausen 1992 Meredith L. Clausen, Spiritual Space: The Religious Architecture of Pietro Belluschi (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992).

Clay 1982 Grady Clay, "The Roving Eye on Baltimore's Inner Harbor," Landscape Architecture (November 1982): 53.

Cohen 1995   Jean-Louis Cohen, Scenes of the World to Come: European Architecture and the American Challenge, 1893-1960 (Paris, 1995).

Cole 1981 Doris Cole, Eleanor Raymond, Architect (Philadelphia: Art Alliance Press, 1981).

Colomina 1998 Beatriz Colomina, "The Exhibitionist House," in At the End of the Century: One Hundred Years of Architecture (New York, 1998).

Conley 2000 Rory T. Conley, The Truth in Charity: A History of the Archdiocese of Washington (Strasbourg, France, 2000).

Conrads 1970 Ulrich Conrads ed., Programs and manifestoes on 20th-century architecture, Cambridge, Mass., 1970.

Crooks 1983 James B. Crooks, "Maryland Progressivism," in Richard Walsh and William Lloyd Fox , eds., Maryland. A History, (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1983), 590-671.

Cuchiella 1984 Sheryl Cuchiella, Baltimore deco : an architectural survey of art deco in Baltimore (Baltimore: Maclay and Associates, 1984).

Denny 1997 George D. Denny, Jr. Proud Past, Promising Future: Cities and Towns of Prince George's County, Maryland. (Brentwood, MD: Tuxedo Press, 1997).

Dessauce 1993 Marc Dessauce, "Contro lo Stile Internazionale: 'Shelter' e la stamp archiyrvttonica americana," Casabella 57 (September 1993), 46-53, 70-71.

8 ½ 1949 "8 ½ Million Bust," Architectural Forum 90 (April 1949).

Eliot 1929 Charles W. Eliot, "Regional and Local Planning Progress in the Maryland Suburbs of the National Capital," The American City, January 1929, 114-116.

Fawcett 1903 Waldon Fawcett, "Roland Park, Baltimore County, MD: A Representative American Suburb," *House and Garden* 3 (April 1903), 175-197.

Ford 1940 James Ford and Katherine Morrow Ford, The Modern House in America New York: Architectural Book Publishing Company, 1940 (reprint Dover Publications, 1989).

Frampton 1995 Kenneth Frampton, Studies in Tectonic Culture: The Poetics of Construction in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Architecture (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995).

Friedman 1998 Alice T. Friedman, Women and the Making of the Modern House: A Social and Architectural History (New York: Abrams, 1998).

Futagawa 1993 Yukio Futagawa, ed., Frank O. Gehry (Tokyo: A.D.A. Edita, 1993).

Garreau 1991 Joel Garreau, Edge City: Life on the New Frontier (New York: Doubleday, 1991).

Gebhard 1987   David Gebhard, "The American Colonial Revival of the 1930s," Winterthur Portfolio, vol.22, n.2/3, Fall 1987, 109-148.

Gebhard 1970   David Gebhard, "The Moderne in the U.S., 1920-1941," Architectural Association Quarterly 2, July 1970, 4-20.

Goldhagen 2000   Sarah Williams Goldhagen and Rejean Legault, eds., Anxious Modernisms: Experimentation in Postwar Architectural Culture (Montreal: Canadian Cetre for Architecture, 2000).

Gordon 1987 Alastair Gordon, Long Island modern: the first generation of modernist architecture on

long Island 1925-1960, exhibition catalogue, (East Hampton, NY: Guild Hall Museum, 1987).

Gottmann 1990 Jean Gottmann and Robert A. Harper, eds., Since Megalopolis: The Urban Writings of Jean Gottmann (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).

Goucher 1938 "Goucher College Campus Competition," Pencil Points (Dec. 1938): 736-750.

Gournay 1990 Isabelle Gournay ed., Ernest Cormier and the Université de Montréal, (Montreal: Canadian Center for Architecture, MIT Press), 1990.

Gournay 1998 Isabelle Gournay, "Gigantism in Downtown Montreal,", in I. Gournay and France Vanlaethem ed., Montréal Metropolis: 1880-1930, (Stoddart and Canadian Center for Architecture, Toronto, 1998), 153-182.

Gournay and Vanlaethem 1999 France Vanlaethem and Isabelle Gournay, "A Long-Term Perspective on Place Ville-Marie," Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada 24 (1999): 6-15.

Greenberg 1965 Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting," Art and Literature, 4 (Spr. 1965): 193-201.

Gutheim 1957 Frederick Gutheim, One hundred years of architecture in America, 1857-1957, celebrating the centennial of the American Institute of Architects (New York: Reinhold, 1957).

HABC 1955 Housing Authority of Baltimore City, "Flag House Courts News Release,"(August 26, 1955).

Haskell 1932 Douglas Haskell "Modern Architecture, Occupied," (6 August 1932).

Helfrich 2001 Kurth Elfrich, Designing the Moderne: Kem Weber's Bixby House, (Santa Barbara: University Art Museum, 2001), exhibition pamphlet.

Hildebrand 1974 Grant Hildebrand, Designing for Industry: The Architecture of Albert Kahn (Cambridge, MA, 1974).

Hitchcock 1929 Henry Russell Hitchcock, Modern Architecture. Romanticism and Reintegration, (New York: Lawson & Clarke, 1929).

Hitchcock/ Johnson 1932 Hitchcock, Henry Russell and Philip Johnson, The International Style: Architecture Since 1922, (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1932).

Henry 1993 Jay C. Henry, Architecture in Texas, 1895-1945, (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1993).

Hiebert 1976 Ray Eldon Hiebert and Richard K. MacMaster, A Grateful Remembrance. The Story of Montgomery County, Maryland (Rockville, 1976).

Hill 1984 "Revolution and Evolution: Maryland Architecture of the Twentieth Century," in Mary A. Dean, et al., Maryland: 350 Years of Art & Architecture (College Park, 1984).

Hine 1986 Thomas Hine, Populuxe (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986).

Hise 1997 Greg Hise, Magnetic Los Angeles: Planning the Twentieth Century Metropolis (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).

Howland 1953 Howland, Richard H. and Eleanor P. Spencer, The Architecture of Baltimore, A Pictorial History, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1953).

Hurtt 2002 Eric Hurtt, student paper, ARCH 635, Professor Isabelle Gournay (University of Maryland, May 2002).

Hyde 2002 Diana Hyde, conversation with Isabelle Gournay (Gibson Island, MD, May 2002).

Jacobs 1958 Jane Jacobs, "New heart for Baltimore," Architectural Forum 108 (June 1958): 88-92.

Johnson 1916 William Templeton Johnson, "An Open-Air School in California by Wm. Templeton Johnson," AIA Journal, 1916, 162).

Jones 1961 Charles W. Jones, "Upsurge in Harford," <u>Maryland Magazine</u> 3 (Summer 1971), 16-19).

Jordy 1976 William H. Jordy, <u>American Buildings and Their Architects: The Impact of European Modernism in the Mid-Twentieth Century</u> (Garden City, NY, 1976).

Kornwolf 1985 James D. Kornwolf, "Goucher College Competition," in James D. Kornwolf (ed.) <u>Modernism in America, 1937-1940: A Catalogue and Exhibition of Four Architectural Competitions</u>, (Williamsburg, Va.: College of William and Mary, 1985).

Kraushaar 1960 Otto F. Kraushaar, "Planning a College Campus," <u>Architect's Report</u> 3 (Fall 1960): 4-5, 21.

Kurtze 1991 <u>Survey of Architectural Record in Maryland</u> Phase I, Questionnaire to architectural firms, Baltimore Foundation for Architecture, (Typrwritten report, 1991).

Lampl 1998 Elizabeth Jo Lampl and Kimberly Prothro Williams, <u>Chevy Chase: A Home Suburb for the Nation's Capital</u> (Crownsville, MD: MD Historical Trust Press, 1998).

Lanmon 1987 Lorraine Welling Lanmon, <u>William Lescaze, Architect</u> (Philadelphia: Art Alliance Press, 1987).

Lipstadt 2001 Hélène Lipstadt, "Revising Giedion, Redefining the International Style and Preserving 'Invisible' Modernism in Massachusetts," <u>SAH Newsletter</u>, June 2001, 8-10.

Longstreth 1994 Richard Longstreth, "Silver Spring, Georgia Avenue, Colesville Road and the Creation of an Alternative "Downtown" for Metropolitan Washington," in Zeynep Çelik, Diane Favro and Richard Ingersoll, <u>Streets. Critical Perspectives on Public Space</u>, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 247-257.

McCarthy 1995 Michael P. McCarthy *,* "Renaissance Rivalry in Baltimore: One Charles Center vs. One North Charles," <u>Maryland Historical Magazine</u>, 90 (Summer 1995), 195-215.

McGuckian 2001 Eileen McGuckian, <u>Rockville: Portrait of a City</u>   (Franklin, Tenneessee: Hillsboro Press, 2001).

Milwee 2001   Amber Milwee and David J. Downs, "Baltimore Schools Grow Up," Seminar Paper for ARCH 628E, Professor Isabelle Gournay (University of Maryland, Fall 2001).

"Modern Cities" 1935 ""Modern Cities Waste Human Energy, Architect Asserts," <u>Sun</u>, Baltimore, November 19, 1935, 5 and 22.

Montgomery 1967 "Montgomery Village: A New Town Within a Corridor City," <u>Architectural Record</u> 142 (July 1967): 134-141.

Myrha 1974 David Myrha,, <u>AIP Journal</u> 40 (May 1974), 176-188.

National and Regional "National and Regional Awards Won by Bennett," <u>Montgomery County Sentinel</u>, undated clipping, 8.

National Register Nomination Form National Register Nomination Form for Evergreen House, Baltimore, MD.

Offspring 1941 "Offspring of Grain Bins Shown as Solution to Housing Problem," <u>Washington Post</u> (May 6, 1941).

Parsons 1989. Kermit Carlyle Parsons, "Shaping the Regional City, 1950-1990: The Plans of Tracy Augur and Clarence Stein for Dispersing Federal Workers from Washington, D.C.," (unpublished paper, in author's possession).

Planned 1966 "Planned to the Nth Degree" <u>House and Home</u> (June 1966): 103.

Pommer 1979 Richard Pommer, "The Architecture of Urban Housing in the United States during the Early 1930s," <u>Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians</u>, vol.37, 1979, 235-263.

Potts 1969 William H. Potts, Jr., "Charles Center in Baltimore: How the Plan Didn't Get Compromised," Landscape Architecture (January 1969): 122-127.

Rabinowitz 1970 H.Z. Rabinowitz and James Stanek, "Forgotten Breakthrough; defense housing at Indian Head, Md." Progressive Architecture 51 (April 1970).

Radford 1996 Gail Radford, Modern Housing in America. Policy Struggles in the New Deal Era, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

Reed 1995 Peter S. Reed, "Enlisting Modernism," in Donald Albrecht, ed., World War II and the American Dream (Washington, D.C., 1995), 2-41.

Renewal 1964 "Renewal in Rockville," Potomac Valley Architect (Spring 1964).

Riley 1992 Terence Riley, The International Style: Exhibition 15 and the Museum of Modern Art, New York: Rizzoli, 1992.

Rogers 1959 Archibald Coleman Rogers, "The Charles Center Project," AIA Journal 31 (March 1959): 30-35.

St. Charles College 1983 St. Charles College, National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form, 1983.

Schoeberlein 2003 Robert Schoeberlein

Short 1939 C.W. Short et R. Stanley-Brown, Public Buildings. A Survey of Architecture by Federal and Other Governmental Bodies Between the Years 1933 and 1939 with the Assistance of the Public Works Administration (Washington, 1939).

Siegel 1964 Robert L. Siegel, "Can these thinkers help put across a vast new town?" House and Home December 1964, 82-89.

Sies 1987 Mary Corbin Sies, "The City Transformed: Nature, Technology, and the Suburban Ideal, 1877-1917," Journal of Urban History 14 (Nov. 1987): 81-111.

Soeprapto 2001 Elvie Soeprapto, "Health Care By Design," Seminar Paper, ARCH 628E, Professor Isabelle Gournay (University of Maryland, Fall 2001).

Spring 1960 Spring Architect's Report (1960).

Stern 1987 Robert A. M. Stern, Gregory Gilmartin, and Thomas Mellins, New York 1930: Architecture and Urbanism Between the Two World Wars (New York, 1987).

Suburban 1952 "Suburban Age Reflected In Department Store" Evening Sun (November 21, 1952).

Sussman 1985 Sussman, Lance. "The Suburbanization of American Judaism as Reflected in Synagogue Buildings and Architecture, 1945-1975." American Jewish History 73 (September 1985): 31.

Technological 1970 "Technological Imagery: Turnpike Version," Progressive Architecture (August 1970): 70-75.

Tennenbaum 2002 Robert Tennenbaum, Letter to Isabelle Gournay (May 20, 2002).

Theroux 1970 Fred Theroux, "33 Acres of Loneliness: Charles Center After Dark," Baltimore News American (Aug. 30, 1970).

Timeline n.d. "The Timeline," (pamphlet, Columbia, MD: City of Columbia, c. 1996).

Turner 1985 Paul Venable Turner, Campus. An American Planning Tradition (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985).

Van Fossen Schwab 2002 Van Fossen Schwab, interview with Isabelle Gournay, April 2002.

Verheyen 1984 Egon Verheyen ed., Lawrence Hall Fowler (1876-1917): a catalogue of drawings in the Milton S. Eisenhower Library of the Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, Maryland; Baltimore: Johns

Hopkins University, 1984).

Village Life 1970 "Village Life in New Mark Commons Offers Values Lost in Suburban Sprawl," <u>Montgomery County Sentinel</u> 1(3), (January 15, 1970), 1.

Von Eckardt 1961 Wolf Von Eckardt, ed., <u>Mid-Century Architecture in America: Honor Awards of the American Institute of Architects, 1949-1961</u> (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1961).

Weeks 1995 Christopher Weeks, <u>Alexander Smith Cochran. Modernist Architect in Traditional Baltimore</u>, (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1995).

Williamson 1987 Mary Lou Williamson, <u>Greenbelt: History of a New Town</u> (City of Greenbelt, 1987).

Wirz and Striner 1994 Hans Wirz and Richard Striner, <u>Washington Deco: Art deco design in the Nation's Capital</u> (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994).

Within 1963 "Within Five Years … the All-America City of Rockville, Md., expects to complete a plan for its downtown area that wipes out any hint of obscolescence," <u>The American City</u>, March 1963, 95 ff.

Wright 1994 Gwendolyn Wright, "Inventions and Interventions: American Urban Design in the Twentieth Century," in Russell Ferguson, ed., <u>Urban Revisions: Current Projects for the Public Realm</u>, (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press,1994), 27-37.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIG. 2-1 J.J.P. Oud, Shops, Hook van Holland housing project near Rotterdam (Henry Russell Hitchcock, <u>Modern Architecture. Romanticism and Reintegration</u>, New York,1929)

FIG.2-2 Le Corbusier in Baltimore (Modern Cities Waste Human Energy, Architect Asserts," <u>Sun</u>, Baltimore, November 19, 1935, 5 and 22)

FIG. 3-1 Greenbelt ("America from the Great Depression to World War II: Photographs from the FSA and OWI Library of Congress")

FIG. 3-2 John C.B Moore and Robert S. Hutchins, winning design, Goucher College Competition, 1938

FIG. 3-3 John C.B Moore and Robert S. Hutchins, Mary Fisher Hall, Goucher College, (<u>Pencil Points</u>, July 1943)

FIG. 3-4 Albert Kahn, Glenn L. Martin Company, Baltimore, 1937, (<u>Legacy of Albert Kahn</u>)

FIG. 3-5 Vladimir Karfik, Bata Shoe Factory, Belcamp, 1939 (demolished c.2000), (BNA 355-21)

FIG. 3-6 John H. Scarff, Judge Emory H. Niles House, 1938 (<u>Century of Baltimore Architecture</u>)

FIG. 3-7 Francis Palms, House in Bethesda (<u>Architectural Forum</u>, June 1941)

FIGS. 3-8 and 3-9 Alexander Buell Trowbridge, Strong House, Gibson Island, c.1930 (A<u>rchitectural Record</u> December 1931)

FIG. 3-10 Samuel and Victorine Homsey, Cambridge Yacht Club, c.1938 (<u>Architectural Forum</u> October 1938)

FIGS. 3-11 and 3-12 Wyatt and Nolting, Patterson Park High School (currently Highlandstown Middle School), Baltimore, 1933 (<u>Architectural Record</u> September 1935)

FIG. 3-13 Charles Nes Jr., Architectural Office, 1938 (Dorsey 1981, p.173)

FIG. 4-1 Faulkner and Kingsbury, [Suburban Hospital], Bethesda, 1944 (<u>Pencil Points</u> April 1944), 49-53

FIGS. 4-2. and 4-3 Calvert Houses, College Park (Library of Congress)

FIG. 4-4 "Cemesto" House developed by the John B. Pierce Foundation and the Celotex Corporation after plans by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, Middle River, 1941 (National Archives, RG208-EX-D-L-240)

FIG. 5-1 Vincent G. Kling, Westinghouse Molecular Electronic Laboratory, Anne Arundel County, first phase c.1964 (<u>Progressive Architecture</u>, November 1964)

FIG. 5-2 O'Connor and Kilham, National Library of Medicine, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, 1960 (<u>AIA Journal</u> December 1959)

FIG. 5-3 William F. Stone, Baltimore County Office Building, Towson, (<u>BNA</u>)

FIG. 5-4 Band Shell, Fort Meade, (<u>BNA</u> 140-8)

FIG. 5-5 McLeod and Ferrara, South Hagerstown High School and Junior College, 1956

FIG. 5-6 Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, Project, Glenn L. Martin College of Engineering and Aeronautical Science, University of Maryland, College Park, 1947 (Architectural Record December 1947)

FIG. 5-7 Lucius White, Tawes Buildings, Spring Grove State Hospital, Catonsville, 1963 (BNA 358-1)

FIG. 5-8 Lucius White, Patuxent Institution, Jessup, c.1955 (Work of Maryland Architects 1955, 17)

FIG. 5-9 Faulkner, Kingsbury and Stenhouse, St. Agnes Hospital, Baltimore, 1963 (BNA 220-11)

FIG. 5-10 Taylor and Fisher, Mercy Hospital, Baltimore, 1965 (BNA 220-5)

FIG. 5-11 Office of James Edmunds, Tuberculosis unit, Mount Pleasant Hospital, c.1955

FIG. 5-12 Stann and Hilleary, Montgomery County Detention Building (photo James Hilleary)

FIG. 5-13 Harold Esten, Katinas Residence, Bethesda, c.1959 (PVA 6/1960)

FIG. 5-14 Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, Potomac Overlook, c.1958

FIG. 5-15 Richard Neutra with John E. Alexander, Key Memorial Hall, / Francis Scott Key Auditorium / Mellon Laboratory / McKeldin Planetarium, St John's College, Annapolis, 1956-58 (Cochran, Stephenson and Wing resident architects) (Architectural Record. September 1959)

FIG. 5-16 Walter Gropius, Sheldon I. Leavitt, Temple Oheb Shalom, Baltimore, 1960 (Architectural Record, June 1964)

FIG. 5-17 Smith and Veale, Union Trust Company of Maryland, Brooklyn Branch, Anne Arundel Co, c.1954

FIG. 5-18 Wilson and Christie, Kaufman House, Baltimore (Co.), 1956 (BNA 140-11)

FIG. 5-19 Keyes, Smith, Satterlee & Lethbridge, Therapy Building, Chestnut Lodge, Rockville (Architectural Forum, September 1955)

FIG. 5-20 Alexander Cochran / Wrenn, Lewis and Jencks, Flag House Courts, Baltimore, 1952

FIG. 5-21 Peterson and Brickbauer, Sun Life Building, Charles Center, 1966 (Architectural Record September 1966)

FIG. 5-22 Charles Goodman, Hammond Hill Subdivision, Wheaton, Montgomery County, 1949-51 (Architectural Forum June 1952)

FIG. 5-23 Cohen, Haft and Associates, Wheaton House Garden Apartments, Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, 1961, Thurman D. Donovan landscape architect

FIG. 5-24 Tyler, Ketcham & Myers, Featherbed Lane School, Woodlawn, 1956, (BNA 327-7)

FIG. 5-25 Deigert and Yerkes, Primary Day School, Bethesda, 1955 and Bushey Drive Elementary School and Primary Day School, Bethesda, c.1958

FIG. 5-26 Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, Wheaton Youth Center, Wheaton, 1964 (PVA December 1964)

FIG. 5-27 Alexander Cochran, Suburban Club, Baltimore, 1960

FIG. 5-28 Laurel Race Tracks (BNA 662-1)

FIG. 5-29 Finney, Dodson, Smeallie and Orrick, Hillendale Fire Station, 1960 (BNA 355-16)

FIG. 5-30 - T. Norman Mansell, St. Luke's Lutheran Church, Cumberland, 1958-60

FIG. 5-31 Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, River Road Unitarian Church, 1966 (PVA)

FIG. 5-32 Thomas H. Locraft, Mount Calvary Catholic Church, Forestville, 1958-60

FIG. 5-33 Abbott, Merkt, & Co. and David Baker Architects, Langley Park Shopping Center, 1954-55

FIG. 5-34 Penn Fruit Company, 1956 (BNA 345-2)

FIG. 5-35 Fordyce & Hamby, Fairchild Engine and Airplane Corporation, Hagerstown, 1956 (Gottscho Schleisner Collection Library of Congress)

FIG. 5-36 Mills, Petticord and Mills and Leon Safrata, Capital Cars, Lanham, 1966 (Gottscho Schleisner Collection Library of Congress)

FIG. 6-1 Hugh Newell Jacobsen, Bolton Square, Baltimore, 1967 (House and Home, October 1968)

FIG. 6-2 Edwin Ball, M-NCPPC, Riverdale, 1967 (PVA December 1970)

FIG. 6-3 Geddes, Brecher, Qualls, Cunningham, Master plan for town center of Rockville, 1966 (L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui June-July 1967)

FIG. 6-4 Warner, Burns, Toan & Lunde, National Agricultural Library, Beltsville, 1966-70 (PVA December 1970)

FIG. 6-5 RTKL, Montgomery Village, Gaithersburg, begun 1966 (House and Home February 1968)

FIG. 6-6 14-story 104-unit condominium Ocean City (Baltimore Magazine, April 1971)

FIG. 6-7 Loewer, Sargent & Associates, Convention Center, Ocean City, 1969 (BNA 329-22)

FIG. 6-8 Howard County's Government Center, 1967 (BNA 338-14)

FIG. 6-9 Peterson and Brickbauer, Baltimore County Public Safety Building (Maryland Blue Cross Building), Towson, conceived 1971, completed 1975 (Architectural Forum, April 1971)

FIG. 6-10 Walter Dodd Ramberg, Azrael House, Ruxton, 1968 (House and Home March 1970)

FIG. 6-11 Neil Greene for Contemporary Homes, Inc., Neil Greene House, Silver Spring, c.1967 (House and Home September 1968)

FIG. 6-12 Mystery Space Ship, exhibited in 1971 (BNA)

FIG. 6-13 Smeallie, Orrick and Janka, Sykesville Elementary School, Carroll County, designed 1969 (BNA 359-1)

FIG. 6-14 George Van Fossen Schwab, Bryant Woods Nursery School-Day Care Center, Columbia, designed 1966 (Progressive Architecture April 1968)

FIG. 6-15 McLeod and Ferrara, Essex Community College, Late 1960s

FIG. 6-16 Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall, Cesar Pelli designer, COMSAT Laboratories, Clarksburg, Montgomery County, 1968-69 (<u>Progressive Architecture</u> August 1970) 70-5.

FIG. 6-17 and 6-18 Gaudreau and Gaudreau, Our Lady of Hope, Dundalk, 1970 (Gaudreau archives)

FIG. 6-19 Cohen, Haft & Associates, Village Green, Wilde Lake, Columbia, 1968 (<u>PVA</u> July-August 1969)

FIG. 6-20 Gehry. Walsh & O'Malley, Merriweather Post Music Pavilion, Columbia, 1966-67

FIG. 6-21 Hugh Newell Jacobsen, Tidesfall, Village of Wilde Lake, Columbia, (<u>House and Home</u> June 1971)