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In the Art Institute of Chicago there is a painting of youths in an Arcadian landscape by Pierre Puvis de Chavannes, once owned by Mrs. Potter Palmer, Chicago’s first social doyenne. It displays an idealized classical landscape with a small lake and is entitled The Sacred Grove, Beloved of the Arts and the Muses. How different from the grim Chicago existing at the end of the nineteenth century with its vast stockyard and smoking mills, consuming waves of immigrants living nearby in deprivation, polluted by refuse of their own employment. With no organization to protect workers from exploitation, they fell victim to the industrial barons enforcing inhumane practices with private armies of security guards.

These same oppressors became the city fathers to the outside world, amassing and donating immense fortunes to establish civic enterprises such as schools, cultural institutions, and settlement houses. Their philanthropic generosity and business acumen attracted gifted and ambitious architects, for Chicago had become the fastest-growing city in the world after the devastating fire of 1871. Among others, Daniel Burnham and Louis Sullivan had been drawn to Chicago, where an architect’s production was now measured in the linear dimension of street frontage, not individual buildings.

As social unrest grew, the resident captains of industry on the South Side of the city relocated their families north of the Loop, away from the mills and stockyard, and their workers. Some moved even farther afield to newly organized suburbs such as Lake Forest, where roads abandoned the speculative grid for a more bucolic approach to domestic life in immense hidden estates of direct historical inspiration. Meanwhile, Oak Park and River Forest provided a more Emersonian vision of man in Nature conceived by Frank Lloyd Wright through his Prairie style.

Even in Arcadia, death prevails and the city fathers arranged for their final resting place in Graceland Cemetery. They imagined a private world, created precisely on the image of Puvis de Chavannes’s Sacred Grove. Separated from the surrounding tenements by a brick wall, those who cherished the arts could mingle undisturbed for eternity. Visitors are transported by winding lanes through a native landscape, passing classical temples before glimpsing Potter Palmer’s open temple protecting its two sarcophagi. In close proximity, a single Corinthian column identifies the tomb of George Pullman, the man who built an ideal town for his workers only to lower their wages and raise their rents. His body lies under a web of steel columns embedded in concrete for perpetual protection. In close adjacency is the powerful black granite Martin Ryerson tomb by Louis Sullivan, formed by the interpenetration of two unadorned mastabas, culminating in a pyramidal apex. Barely visible on the opposite shore is found the astylar limestone Carrie Eliza Getty tomb, its battered walls delicately inscribed with an octagonal lattice. Monolithic slabs of limestone form the roof, and arched openings are outlined with shallow vegetative relief, while the gates and the recessed door are cast in bronze with ornamentation of transcendent beauty. The Getty tomb overlooks a small island in the lake, with a boulder marking the mute resting place of Daniel Burnham. On the adjacent bank, just below the Getty tomb, is found an inscribed gray granite slab marking the grave of Mies van der Rohe, while Louis Sullivan’s is lost elsewhere in the wilderness of monuments.

Frank Lloyd Wright escaped Graceland and the cultural hegemony of the city in pursuit of a more populist path that led him back to the rural lands of his ancestors in Wisconsin. Tragedy of mythic scale unfolded there with his dreams consumed in a conflagration of epic proportion. Our dreams live on, but we are cautioned by these words of Mies, from an address given in 1950:

“I hope you will understand that architecture has nothing to do with the invention of forms. It is not a playground for children, young or old. Architecture is the real battleground of the spirit.”

—Thomas H. Beeby

---

**FOREWORD**

Left, The Sacred Grove, Beloved of the Arts and the Muses (detail), 1884/89, oil on canvas, by Pierre Puvis de Chavannes.
For many years the narrative of Chicago's architectural importance was defined by twentieth-century historians of modernism. It is equally true that assessments of the 1893 World's Fair and Chicago's contributions to the classical revival at the beginning of the twentieth century have been limited to discussions of the "City Beautiful" movement—the planning of building ensembles and the creation of civic spaces.

It was Daniel Burnham's genius to recognize classicism's potential to represent the aspirational nature of American society. While the World's Fair would introduce Americans to an idealized vision for the American city, the classicism of its buildings, despite their temporary nature, communicated the idea of longevity and permanence as an embodiment of the values of America's institutions. After the fair, Burnham and his new partners, Charles Atwood and Ernest Graham, modeled this through their classical buildings: city halls, courthouses, post offices, concert halls, and train stations built across the cities of this country. These buildings were immediately recognizable, as they are today, for their civic nature. This dissemination of classical architecture constitutes Chicago's important classical legacy.

From the 1890s on, beginning with the construction of the Chicago Public Library and the Art Institute of Chicago, the city's civic and commercial buildings were classical. In addition, from the turn of the century well into the 1930s, Chicago's architecture programs at both the School of the Art Institute and the Armour Institute, which taught joint classes, were modeled on that of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. It was David Adler who recommended Mies van der Rohe for the directorship of the architecture program at the Armour Institute, soon to become Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT). While Mies's American work has been referred to as classical in its symmetry, axial planning, and purposive emphasis on proportion, it was historian William Jordy's discussion of the symbolic content of this work that suggested that Mies may have had an agenda. This was arguably the invention of a universal language of classical architecture representing the elements of construction not as abstractions of trees, the human form, or wood construction, but utilizing the steel "I" beam as a twentieth-century icon of technology. It was reported that Frank Lloyd Wright said to Mies, upon seeing the plans for the IIT Library and Administration Building in 1944, "You know what you've done? You have invented a new Classicism" (David Spaeth, *Mies van der Rohe, 1985*).

In Chicago today, classicism and traditional architecture exists primarily in the private realm. Recent townhouse construction has given Chicago's Near North Side new classical stone facades and influenced high-end residential developers. New high-rise apartment buildings continue to be predominantly concrete and glass. An occasional new building, however, recalls the elegant apartments designed by Benjamin Marshall in the 1920s.

Understanding the legacy of Chicago's classical architecture is the focus of this issue of the *Classicist*. The impact of the Chicago World's Fair, classicism's influence on Frank Lloyd Wright, the urbanism of Chicago's classical skyscrapers, Chicago schools that taught classicism, and the reintroduction of historical elements into Chicago design in the 1980s are all topics we have included. An enthusiasm for history and tradition in contemporary Chicago architecture may be seen in the professional portfolios that conclude the issue. It is our hope that this *Classicist* will help to further a dialogue about classicism here in Chicago.

—Stuart Cohen and Julie Hacker, Guest Editors
When John Wellborn Root, the designing partner of the Chicago firm of Burnham & Root, died suddenly of pneumonia in January 1891, Daniel H. Burnham despaired of replacing him. He wrote, “John’s death has left a hole into which not one, but several strong men must be flung.” Yet he had to replace him, and soon he did, with a middle-aged New Yorker named Charles Bowler Atwood. Hired to work on the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition—the Chicago World’s Fair—Atwood was made the chief architect of the fair by 1891. He played an important role in designing individual works and determining the overall appearance of the ensemble. In addition, he would soon be involved in the task of helping Burnham shift from his Romanesque style of the 1880s to a more discreet and urbanistically conscientious public and commercial style of architecture that was classically inspired.

Charles Atwood was born on May 18, 1849, in Charlestown, Massachusetts. At age sixteen, he entered the architectural office of Elbridge Boyden in Worcester to learn drafting. The following year, he moved to Boston where he worked at the firm of Ware & Van Brunt, enrolling at the Lawrence Scientific School of Harvard University in the fall of 1869. By the end of 1875, he was in New York City working as an architect for the interior decorating firm of Herter Brothers. In 1878 or 1879, he worked on the plans for the lavish Fifth Avenue double residence of William H. Vanderbilt. The Vanderbilt houses were famous from the moment they were completed and were celebrated in a four-volume publication. By 1885, they appeared, under Atwood’s name as the designer, in a list compiled from choices by readers of American Architect and Building News of the ten best buildings in the United States. During this same period, Atwood began to try his hand at competitions. In 1884, he won a competition for the new Boston Public Library building. The competition yielded twenty submissions, with Atwood awarded the first prize of $4,000. None of the submissions were judged suitable for construction and the commission for the library was eventually given to Charles McKim.

By 1891, Daniel Burnham was enjoying the greatest coup of his already enormously successful career. Chicago was selected as the site of the 1893 World’s Fair and Burnham was named chief of construction, with John Root assigned the role of consulting architect to the fair. With this commission, Burnham was in a position not only to assert his presence on the Chicago architectural scene but also to ensure the national prominence of his firm. With the death of Root, Burnham immediately began looking for a new assistant, in the hope that he might also find a suitable design partner to join him in private practice after the fair.

“The has been nothing to equal it since the Parthenon.”

—Augustus Saint-Gaudens

Fig. 1. Fine Arts Building (now the Museum of Science and Industry) designed for the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair by Charles Atwood (detail). Rebuilt as a permanent structure in the 1920s.
At this time, Atwood was building a small church in Manhattan and feeling terribly dejected about his prospects because of the financial depression beginning to sweep the country. Frederick Dinkelberg, with whom Atwood was sharing an office, mentioned that he had seen a notice of Root's death in the newspaper. Dinkelberg encouraged Atwood to go to his old employer William Ware, by then head of the school of architecture at Columbia University, and ask his advice on how to get a position working on the World's Fair. Burnham later recalled that he received letters from both Ware and Bruce Price “calling my attention to Atwood and claiming for him the highest rank as an architect.” When he consulted Charles McKim, though, “McKim shook his head in doubt.” Burnham nevertheless contacted Atwood and went to New York to meet him. Atwood missed their appointment but followed Burnham back to Chicago and presented himself at Burnham's office. The exact date of these events is not recorded, but by April 21, 1891, Atwood had been hired as chief architect of the World's Columbian Exposition (fig. 2).

What moved Burnham to hire a man who had so quickly justified McKim's misgivings by missing his interview, then following him halfway across the country in desperate pursuit? Burnham himself supplied part of the explanation, writing about Atwood after his death, “Atwood was tall and rather slender, of elegant figure and bearing ... I often found myself marveling at his clearness and accuracy of statement, and the apt expressions which constantly issued from the mouth of this gifted man.”

Atwood must have had a remarkable presence and a deeply alluring personality, which had survived even the grief and disappointment of the death of his son and divorce from his wife in the late 1880s. It appears that Atwood easily must have fulfilled Burnham's ideal of the artistic type. It is clear from Burnham's relationship with Root that he needed as a partner someone who was not only a skillful designer but who behaved like an artist; that is, who was brilliant, tasteful, and a little unworldly, thus lending a certain tone of culture to Burnham's entrepreneurial skills while depending on Burnham for all the practical matters connected with actual commissions. It was this latter element of dependency that loomed larger after Root's death, for Burnham was no longer satisfied to have so full a partner as Root had been. He wanted final control of and final credit for the work of his firm, and this was undoubtedly easier to achieve when his design partner was, by Burnham's own account, “a mere child in the practical things of life.” Sadly, those qualities that made Atwood attractive had a darker side that ultimately destroyed him.

Atwood's further virtue, which went unmentioned, was that he represented the world that Burnham was anxious to become a part of. Successful and famous in his own right for the bold Romanesque buildings that he and Root had produced during the 1880s, Burnham nevertheless had obviously been electrified by the imposing classical designs presented by the East Coast architects attending the February meeting of the World's Fair designers. He was delighted by Augustus Saint-Gaudens's assertion that theirs was “the greatest meeting of artists since the 15th century,” and he desired to be to be a full-fledged member of that company of Renaissance men. As he told his biographer, Charles Moore, about his selection of architects for the fair, “My scheme was to bring about men of the greatest experience. I was forty-four and one-half years of age and knew who the men were.” While Burnham had social status and a professional reputation, he had none of the formal European academic education enjoyed by most of his East Coast counterparts and no practice in designing in classical terms. Atwood provided an easy remedy for this situation.

As the principal designer working under Burnham's direction, Atwood was surely not a replacement for Root, who had been Burnham's intimate friend, but an employee who enjoyed his employer's complete confidence and often elicited his frank admiration. Burnham later wrote that after their initial meeting, he and Atwood had agreed that the latter would enter his private practice, but Burnham then decided that Atwood was most urgently needed on the World’s Fair. In his role as the fair's chief architect, Atwood was answerable to Burnham and to Ernest Graham, assistant chief of construction, who later would become a member of the D. H. Burnham & Company partnership that also included Atwood. Atwood's tasks were probably not very well defined, but he was responsible for reviewing the designs of architects contributing to the fair and seeing that they were ready for execution, and it was to him that the problems of designing a vast number of secondary buildings for the fair were referred. In this latter capacity he became the author of some sixty structures scattered about the exposition grounds. He was also certainly, if sometimes fortuitously, involved in important decisions about the ultimate appearance of the fair. For example, Graham wrote to Thomas Eddy Tallmadge in the 1920s that it was in a meeting at which he, Atwood, and Frank Millet were present that the decision was made to whitewash the buildings of the fair because there was not enough time to give them individual color treatment. Graham claimed that this meeting was the source of the idea for the white coloring of the fair, which became one of its most famous attributes.

Atwood undoubtedly began at once to work on the secondary and unifying features of the World's Fair. His chance to prove himself on an equal footing with the fair's principal architects came abruptly in May 1891, about a month after he had taken up his duties.
Although early plans to use the lakefront just east of the Loop as an adjunct site for the fair had been abandoned on February 11, 1891, the question of whether a Fine Arts Building for the exposition, to be subsequently converted into a new Art Institute, might be erected on the lakefront continued to be debated throughout the late winter and early spring. As late as mid-April, it was still thought that the boards of the Art Institute and the exposition would join in financing construction of the design for an Art Institute, which John Root had made shortly before his death. On May 9, 1891, the Chicago Tribune ("Art Palace for the Lake Front") finally announced that while an exhibition building would be constructed at the lakefront, it would not be the fair's Fine Arts Building, but would serve to house the many congresses held to coincide with the exposition before being turned over to the permanent exhibit and teaching activities of the Art Institute. The job of designing it went to Shepley, Rutan & Coolidge of Boston, which had opened a Chicago office (to complete their work on the Chicago Public Library). It was at this point that it became apparent that yet another major commission for the fair was available in the form of a new Arts Building. Burnham first offered the job to Francis Whitehouse, who was already working on the fair. When he declined on account of illness, Burnham turned to Atwood. By that time, the matter was urgent; drawings for all the other major structures of the fair were already submitted and some had even gone out for bids. Atwood rose to the occasion. His design was completed by mid-June, and on June 17, the Chicago Tribune published an accurate drawing of the building. But more important for Atwood’s career than his quick response was the fact that his design won the unreserved admiration of his new employer. Burnham told Charles Moore in 1908, that the Fine Arts Building was “the most beautiful building I have ever seen.” And Burnham claimed that Augustus Saint-Gaudens had said, grasping him by the shoulders, “Do you realize the rank of Atwood’s building among all the structures of the world! There has been nothing to equal it since the Parthenon.” In one stroke, Atwood had captured in the Fine Arts Building the flavor of the monumental classicism Burnham so admired and made it a symbol of the fair. In short, it embodied the best of all the buildings at the fair and the dream-like vision of a new classical civilization, which the “White City,” as the fair came to known, represented in the public eye. Burnham wrote that during preparations for the fair, Charles McKim remarked of Atwood’s design, “Damn him, he is right every time.” In the context of the fair’s supposedly exemplary architecture, Atwood chose to use precise details to heighten broad and largely original visual effects. The Fine Arts Building (also known as the Palace of Fine Arts) places a central dome on an essentially Greek building based on an 1867 Prix de Rome project done at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts by Emile Bénard for an art museum. Atwood’s design introduces precisely this element. The strength of his arts building lies in the elements that are drawn neither from classical antiquity nor from

![Fig. 4. The Chicago World’s Fair’s Fine Arts Building including the lions, which were relocated to the Chicago Art Institute building on Michigan Avenue.](image)

![Fig. 5. Court of Honor at the Chicago World’s Fair, illustration c. 1893. View east of The Grand Basin and the 65-foot gilded statue of “The Republic.” Beyond is the Peristyle, a Corinthian colonnade, topped with 85 allegorical figures, and a triumphal arch at its center, designed by Charles Atwood.](image)

![Fig. 6. Chicago World’s Fair, with the Agricultural Building (right) and the Atwood-designed Peristyle beyond.](image)
recent Beaux-Arts design: the dramatic elongation of all parts and the crispness of its relation-ship to its site, with its two subsidiary pavilions creating a monumental forecourt to the north (figs. 3–6). Pressed tight against the edge of the North Pond, in steps descending directly into the water, the Arts Building seemed at night to float like a ghostly antique island (figs. 1, 3, 4). This combi-nation of monumentality and romance was itself the essence of the White City. It undoubtedly also delighted Burnham and contributed to his faith in Atwood’s ability to carry over the ideals of the fair into private practice.

The Fine Arts Building was not Atwood’s only success at the fair. On November 2, 1891, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings discarded the Casino in the lake and the thirteen colonades, replacing them with Atwood’s proposal for a Peristyle connecting a Music Hall, restaurant, and cafe, subsequently also referred to as the Casino.16 The Peristyle’s double colonade included forty-eight columns, now representing all the states of the Union, with a statue over each one, the composition centering on a triumphal arch topped with quadri-form structures. Left Atwood in a professional position that he had not enjoyed since the completion of the Vanderbilts’ houses. He was awarded medals for his work alongside the established East Coast architects of the main buildings, and his Fine Arts Building was repeatedly referred to as the best building in the exposition.

Rewarded with profession- al and social recognition, Atwood, more important- ly, assumed a position of authority in Burnham’s practice. On March 1, 1894, Atwood was made a partner in the newly incor-porated D. H. Burnham & Company, with a share of 27 percent of the firm’s profits, surpassing the 19 percent shares given to Ernest Graham, office superintendent, and Edward Shankland, engineer and overseer of plans and construction.17 While not a full successor to John Root in his personal relations with Burnham, Atwood was nonetheless firmly established as the resident architect that Burnham needed to complement his own role as masterful organizer and entrepreneur.

Even before Atwood became a partner, he was heavily involved in the affairs of Burnham’s firm. As early as March 1892, well over a year before he left the position of chief architect of the Chicago World’s Fair, Atwood was designing commercial buildings for Burnham. It was his work on the fair that brought Atwood wide public acknowledgment, but the designs he made for Burnham’s private prac-tice, such as the Marshall Field Annex Building in Chicago and the Eliott Square Building in Buffalo, New York, were more important for the course of Burnham’s architecture and its shift to classicism at the end of the nineteenth century. While Atwood remains largely unknown, his design for the Reliance Building (fig. 7) for Burnham is now illustrated in almost every major history book on the development of twentieth-century architecture.

The late Ann Lorenz Van Zanten was appointed the first Curator of Architecture at the Chicago Historical Society (now Chicago History Museum) in 1962. This article is published courtesy of David Van Zanten and was excerpted and edited by Stuart Cohen from an unpublished manuscript for a book on Charles Atwood.

Notes

4. Arthur Woltersdorf, “A Portrait Gallery of Chicago Architects: III, Charles B. Atwood,” Western Architect 33, no. 8 (August 1924); Atwood does not appear in New York directories until 1885, when he was living at 105 E. 16th Street.
7. For the late John Wellborn Root and the obituary he wrote of Atwood, “Charles Bowler Atwood,” Inland Architect and News Record 26, no. 6 (January 19, 1896): 36.
9. Atwood was frequently depressed, and by the time he was in Chicago working for Burnham he had become a heroin addict. Atwood’s presence in the firm became more unreliable and Burnham finally had to dismiss him. Atwood’s early death may have been a suicide or a heroin overdose, prompted by his dismissal.
14. Burnham, interview by Moore. In Daniel H. Burnham (49), Moore writes, appearing Burnham a bit differently, “He [McKim] spent one entire afternoon look- ing over Atwood’s drawings. Every little while he took down the books, looked at them and then, returning to me would say: ‘Confounded him, he’s in right every time.’”
Before the first architecture program was founded at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in 1865, Americans who wanted to study architecture in an academic setting went to the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris. The curriculum of the Ecole focused intensely on classical architecture and influenced the training of generations of American architectural students beginning in the 1840s. When MIT—and later Columbia University, in 1881—established their schools of architecture, they both employed faculty and pedagogy from the Ecole. Classicism as taught by the Ecole and instilled in architectural students proved to be so popular that “Beaux-Arts” became a distinct style of architecture and an influential movement in twentieth-century American architectural history. The Beaux-Arts style in Chicago began with the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition, also known as the World’s Fair.

Chicago’s most successful architect at the time was Daniel H. Burnham, and he and his partner John Root were named supervising architects of the World’s Fair. Burnham was appointed director of works and was in charge of choosing the architects to design the buildings. Desirous that the fair be viewed as a national and not just local event, and at the same time keenly aware that the artistic and architectural reputation of Chicago was at stake, Burnham approached leading architects from the East Coast to solicit their involvement. While the architects were initially reluctant to participate, Burnham convinced the group that they would be building a “dream city” that would influence the future of American architecture. Burnham and the other architects agreed that the fair should be designed in one cohesive classical style, with buildings bearing a common cornice line, thus ensuring a harmonious composition.

The chief architects of the fair were Richard Morris Hunt, Charles Follen McKim and Stanford White of McKim, Mead & White, and George Browne Post, all from New York; Henry Van Brunt and Frank Maynard Howe, of Van Brunt & Howe, originally from Boston.

Along with D. H. Burnham & Company, three other firms dominated the design of classical buildings in Chicago.

but later from Kansas City; and Robert Swain Peabody and John Stearns of Peabody & Stearns, from Boston. All were influenced by Hunt, who was the first American graduate of the Ecole, president and co-founder of the New York Society of Architects, which became the American Institute of Architects, and founder of the Society of Beaux-Arts Architects. Of those remaining architects, McKim, Peabody, and Howe studied at the Ecole; Post worked in Hunt’s office; and Post and Van Brunt trained in the Beaux-Arts atelier that Hunt developed. Facing criticism from the Chicago architectural community for hiring only East Coast architects, Burnham later added William Le Baron Jenney and William B. Mundie, Henry Ives Cobb, Solon S. Beman, and Louis H. Sullivan and Dankmar Adler.
The organizers of the fair emulated the Paris Universal Exhibition of 1889, which featured a Court of Honor framed by monumentally large exposition buildings. All but Cobb’s and Adler & Sullivan’s buildings were classical in design, and of those Chicago architects who designed for the fair, only Beman’s was placed on the Court of Honor. Thus, the influence of the East Coast architects, whom Burnham called the “Beaux-Arts Boys,” dominated. Burnham’s respect for their work and his friendship with Charles McKim resulted in Burnham’s emergent admiration for the classical style, and Burnham’s success and powerful presence influenced generations of architects in Chicago and throughout the country.

Burnham was recognized for his accomplishment in planning the fair, and in 1909 he published The Plan of Chicago with Edward H. Bennett (a graduate of the Ecole). Without question the single most influential planning document in American urban planning history, the Chicago Plan is a direct expression of the City Beautiful movement, which incorporated civic order and rational arrangements of buildings, monuments, long vistas, and open spaces in a hierarchical manner along major and minor axes according to function.

Beaux-Arts buildings were typically monumental in feel and embellished with classical ornament. Skyscrapers were designed in the Beaux-Arts style using a classical column for reference, and their facades were divided into three separate and distinct elements following a classical column’s base, shaft, and capital, with applied classical ornament. Burnham’s firm enjoyed the success resulting from planning for the Field Museum of Natural History (1893), the Merchants Loan & Trust Company Building (1909); the Railway Exchange (Santa Fe) Building (1904); Orchestra Hall, now the Chicago Symphony Center (1904); the Heyworth Building (1904); an addition to the Carson Pirie Scott Store (1906); the Peoples Gas, Light, and Coke Company Building (1911); the Insurance Exchange Building (1912); the Reid Murdoch Building (1914); and the Continental and Commercial National Bank Building (completed by Graham, Anderson, Probst & White in 1914). Outside of Chicago, the firm designed, among other buildings, Union Station in Pittsburgh (1898), the Flatiron Building in Pittsburgh (1902), the Flatiron Building in New York (1902), Union Station in Washington D.C. (1907), Selfridges in London (1909), Wanamaker’s Department Store in Philadelphia (1911), and Feline’s Son Company Building in Boston (1912).

Almost two hundred employees worked for Burnham. Of those, several notable architects continued designing in the classical tradition in Chicago and elsewhere in the country, including Karl M. Vitzthum, Frederick Dunkelberg, Peter Weber, and Willis Polk.

Daniel Burnham
Daniel Burnham (1846–1912) failed his entrance exams at Harvard and Yale, although later, in recognition of his success, both universities awarded him honorary degrees. He became a draftsman for architect and engineer William Le Baron Jenney, and later joined the firm of Carter, Drake & Wight, where he met John Wellborn Root. The two formed Burnham & Root, one of the nation’s preeminent architectural firms. Together they designed the Montauk Building (1893), the Rookery Building (1888), the Monadnock Building (1892), and the Masonic Temple (1892), among others. After Root’s death in 1891, Burnham hired Charles Atwood as a replacement. In 1894, Burnham reorganized his firm and named Charles Atwood consulting architect and, for a short while, chief designer, with Ernest Graham as junior partner.

Designs by D. H. Burnham & Company for Chicago include the Marshall Field department store (1892, with an annex done with Charles Atwood, 1907, fig. 2); the Illinois Trust & Savings Bank (1896), planning for the Field Museum of Natural History (1893), the Merchants Loan & Trust Company Building (1909); the Railway Exchange (Santa Fe) Building (1904); Orchestra Hall, now the Chicago Symphony Center (1904); the Heyworth Building (1904); an addition to the Carson Pirie Scott Store (1906); the Peoples Gas, Light, and Coke Company Building (1911); the Insurance Exchange Building (1912); the Reid Murdoch Building (1914); and the Continental and Commercial National Bank Building (completed by Graham, Anderson, Probst & White in 1914). Outside of Chicago, the firm designed, among other buildings, Union Station in Pittsburgh (1898), the Flatiron Building in Pittsburgh (1902), the Flatiron Building in New York (1902), Union Station in Washington D.C. (1907), Selfridges in London (1909), Wanamaker’s Department Store in Philadelphia (1911), and Feline’s Son Company Building in Boston (1912). Almost two hundred employees worked for Burnham. Of those, several notable architects continued designing in the classical tradition in Chicago and elsewhere in the country, including Karl M. Vitzthum, Frederick Dunkelberg, Peter Weber, and Willis Polk.

Charles B. Atwood
Charles B. Atwood (1849–1895), who attended the Lawrence Scientific School at Harvard University, is credited with the design of the original Vanderbilt double house in New York. He designed more than sixty buildings for the Chicago World’s Fair, including the Palace of Fine Arts (1893, today the Museum of Science and Industry, rebuilt from the temporary fair building), which is often considered the most successful design of all of the buildings, and is the only structure still standing on its original site. While working for Burnham, Atwood designed the Reliance Building (1894–95, see p. 14) and the Fisher Building (1895–96), both with simplified neo-Gothic ornamentation.

Karl M. Vitzthum
Karl Vitzthum (1880–1967) graduated from the Royal College of Architecture in Munich. Vitzthum worked for Burnham and for Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, and later joined John Burnis, a graduate of Washington University in St. Louis. Vitzthum & Burnis designed several significant Beaux-Arts-influenced buildings, including the Bell Building, now the Old Republic Building (1928); the Hyde Park-Kenwood National Bank Building (1927–28); the Midland Club Building, now the W Chicago Hotel City Center (1927); and the Stroum Club Building (1929), now the Randolph Tower City Apartments.

Frederick P. Dunkelberg
Frederick Dunkelberg (1888–1955) studied architecture at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts in Philadelphia. He worked on the World’s Fair and later with D. H. Burnham & Co. designing the Santa Fe Building (1903–04; today the Railway Exchange Building), which contained Burnham’s offices and later the offices of Burnham’s successor firms; the Heyworth Building; the Commercial National Bank Building (1907); and the Conway Building, now known as the Burnham Center (1914). In 1918, Dunkelberg formed his own firm with Joachim G. Giaever, a structural engineer, and was the principal designer for the Jewelers Building (1929–37), now known simply by its address, 35 East Wacker Drive.
In 1908, Burnham and Graham reorganized the firm, placing Graham in charge of business and overseeing (William) Peirce Anderson, head of design, Edward Probst, head of plans, and Howard J. White, in charge of superintendence. When Burnham died in 1912, the firm was reorganized as Graham, Burnham & Company and practiced for five years until the Burnham brothers left to form their eponymous firm, and Graham formed a partnership with Anderson, Probst, and White. Graham, Anderson, Probst & White proved to be arguably the most successful firm in Chicago that designed in the classical tradition and applied Beaux-Arts planning principles to its designs.

Graham, Anderson, Probst & White

Ernest Graham Ernest Graham (1866–1936) joined Burnham in working on the World's Fair in 1893. Like Burnham, the Michigan-born Graham, who received technical training at Coe College and later at the University of Notre Dame, admired the work of the "Beaux-Arts boys from the East," and the firm's designs during the period they worked together through Burnham's death in 1912 were unabashedly and exuberantly neoclassical. Graham was Daniel Burnham's sole junior partner from 1898 until 1910 while Burnham's sons, Daniel Jr. and Hubert, joined the firm. Burnham and Graham's collaboration was not only prodigious; it also made the architectural firm one of the most successful in the nation.

Notable designs by Graham, Anderson, Probst & White in the classical tradition in Chicago include the Field Museum of Natural History (1921; fig. 4), and the Shedd Aquarium (1930). Outside of Chicago, principal works of the firm include the Equitable Building in New York (1915); the U.S. Post Office in Washington D.C. (1914, with an addition in 1933); the Cleveland Terminal Group (1930); the Gimbel Brothers Building in Philadelphia (1927), and the Thirtieth Street Station in Philadelphia (1934).

Graham, Anderson, Probst & White was the largest architectural firm during the early twentieth century. Extant records of the firm identify only a few names of draftsmen, among them Theodore Lescher, George Robard, and Edward Brentner, who led the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and worked with George Post. Other draftsmen who had significant careers were Charles Beansman, Alfred Shaw, Sigurd Naess, Mario Schiavoni (Shedd Aquarium), and Charles Murphy.

Charles G. Berman Charles Beansman (1888–1946) studied architecture at the University of Pennsylvania and joined Anderson's firm in 1919. He participated in designing the Federal Reserve Bank, the State Bank of Oregon; the Builders' Building, the Foreman State National Bank Building, the Straus Building, and Chicago Union Station. Beansman was the primary architect under Peirce Anderson responsible for the design of the Wrigley Building.

Alfred P. Shaw Alfred Shaw (1895–1970) studied architecture at the Boston Architectural Club. He became head of design at Graham, Anderson, Probst & White after Anderson died and completed Chicago Union Station to Anderson's designs, in addition to the Pittsfield Building, the Chicago Civic Opera House, and the Merchandise Mart (1928–30). Shaw respected classical architecture, but he brought a more streamlined aesthetic to the firm, and under his leadership and with the help of his assistant Sigurd Naess, the firm's designs were transformed into the simplified modern forms of Art Deco. Shaw later formed a firm with Naess and Charles Murphy.

HOLABIRD & ROCHE

Another prominent firm that designed classically influenced buildings was Holabird & Roche. William Holabird (1854–1923) studied at West Point and moved to Chicago to work for William Le Baron Jenney. Martin Roche (1853–1927) also worked for Jenney without formal architectural training. Holabird & Roche designed buildings for the Chicago World's Fair, and while they later became known for their skyscrapers, they also designed smaller classical architectural projects.
buildings. Among the firm’s many achievements are the Marquette Building (1895), the Arthur T. Aldis House (1895), the University Club of Chicago (1908), the Cook County Courthouse (City Hall, 1910), the Monroe Building (1912; fig. 5), the Lumber Exchange Building (1915), the Chicago Temple Building (1923), Soldier Field (1924), and the third Palmer House Hotel (1925).

Significant architects who worked with Holabird & Roche include E. A. Kenrick, the firm’s third partner after Holabird and Roche, and Oskar Welle, who later partnered with William J. Dodd. Welle and Dodd designed numerous classical buildings throughout the Midwest. F. J. Thielbar was superintendent of construction at Holabird & Roche until 1918 and lead designer of the Chicago Temple Building. He later partnered with John Reed Fugard, and together they worked with Gaeav- and Dinkelberg as supervising architects on numerous properties for the Historic American Building Survey, including Chicago Union Station, prepared several successful Illinois Historic Property Tax Assessment Freeze Applications for Susan Benjamin of Benjamin Historic Certifications, and drafted reports documenting the history and architecture of multiple buildings on the University of Chicago campus. Sylvester received a B.A. in history from Northwestern University and a J. D. from DePaul University College of Law, and recently earned an M.S. in Historic Preservation from the School of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Charles E. Fox studied architecture at MIT and left Holabird & Roche in 1905 to join Benjamin Marshall in forming Marshall & Fox. Notable classical designs for Chicago by Marshall & Fox are the South Shore Country Club (1905), the Blackstone Hotel (1909), the Drake Hotel (1919), and the John B. Murphy Auditorium (1926; see p. 6), built for the College of Surgeons and now the site of the award ceremonys for The Driehaus Architecture Prize for classical architecture.

SHEPLEY, RUTAN & COOLIDGE

In 1892, the Boston-based firm of Shepley, Rutan & Coolidge—the successor firm that formed after the death of Henry Hobson Richardson—won a competition to design the Chicago Public Library (1893), now the Chicago Cultural Center (figs. 6, 7). A year later, the firm designed the “palace of culture” that was to serve as a meeting hall for the World’s Fair and is now the Art Institute of Chicago, as well as the Ryerson and Burnham Libraries (1901) and McKinlock (1924) at the Art Institute.

Charles Coolidge (1858–1936) studied at both Harvard College and MIT. He was familiar with Chicago, having supervised the construction of Rich-

ardson’s Glessner and McVeagh houses. In 1915 the firm, which included George Shepley (1860–1913) and Charles Rutan (1851–1914), opened an office in Chicago where Coolidge partnered with head draftsman Charles Hodgdon. Known for its designs of educational buildings, Coolidge & Hodgdon designed about a dozen buildings for the University of Chicago in the Collegiate Gothic style, including Swift Hall, Joseph Bond Chapel, William Rainey Harper Memorial Library, and Ida Noyes Hall, as well as the classical Tenth Church of Christ Scientist in Hyde Park.

The legacy of Daniel Burnham and the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition was the inspiration of generations of architects whose designs imbued the city with a rich built heritage. For almost four decades, the civic, institutional, and commercial buildings designed by these men formed the classical face of not only Chicago architecture but architecture throughout the country. Burnham famously captured this, as quoted in “Stirred by Burnham, Democracy Champion on October 15, 1930: Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men’s blood … Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-growing insistency. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do the things that would stagger us. Let your watchword be order and your beacon beauty.

Jeanne Sylvester is the founder and managing member of Sylvester Historic Consultants, LLC. She has documented numerous properties for the Historic American Building Survey, including Chicago Union Station, prepared several successful Illinois Historic Property Tax Assessment Freeze Applications for Susan Benjamin of Benjamin Historic Certifications, and drafted reports documenting the history and architecture of multiple buildings on the University of Chicago campus. Sylvester received a B.A. in history from Northwestern University and a J. D. from DePaul University College of Law, and recently earned an M.S. in Historic Preservation from the School of the Art Institute of Chicago.
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With the opening of the Illinois and Michigan Canal in 1848, Chicago saw exponential growth in the areas of transportation, industry, and population. After the Civil War, the city’s stockyards became a commercial juggernaut led by such business trailblazers as Philip Armour. The flood of poor European immigrants into the city helped fuel the feverish domestic and commercial building activity after the Great Chicago Fire of 1871, which would lead to the innovations that spotlighted Chicago on the world’s architectural stage.

Even while Chicago was experiencing unprecedented growth, in 1886, fewer than 100 architectural degrees were awarded in the United States by what were the three established architecture schools—the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT, 1868), Cornell University (1871), and the University of Illinois (1867). By the spring of 1886, the general consensus among architects throughout the Midwest was that practitioners in Chicago and farther west were no longer looking only to the East Coast for architectural ideas, but were originating designs of their own, and that there was a need for an architecture school in Chicago.

Civic boosters, architects, and contractors saw no reason why Chicago should not also be a center of architectural education. Members of the Illinois State Association of Architects held meetings in Chicago to address the question of architectural instruction.

While not coming to specific conclusions, these meetings affirmed the need for formal training for architects. Dankmar Adler and Normand Smith Patton suggested that the Chicago Architectural Sketch Club was ideally suited for the establishment of an architecture school in Chicago modeled after the traditional French Beaux-Arts style. Adler’s main concern was cost, and he speculated that “at least $25,000 a year would be required.” Chicago Architectural Sketch Club members Patton, Henry W. Will, and George Beaumont formed a committee to look into the matter.

Early in 1889, the Chicago Woman’s Club requested that “in the formation of the contemplated architectural school, there should be no distinction between sexes, and that students of either sex should be admitted.” Of the university architecture programs, only MIT’s was headed by an academically trained architect, William R. Ware, who had spent a year at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. Cornell’s Charles Babcock had earned a B.A. before

Civic boosters, architects, and contractors saw no reason why Chicago should not also be a center of architectural education.

Teaching Classicism in Chicago, 1890–1930
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Fig. 1. Paul Durbin McCurry (American, 1903–1993), Student Project, Junior Year Design Project at Armour Institute of Technology, 1924, graphite pencil, ink, and watercolor on watercolor paper; 95.2 × 55.5 cm (37 7/16 × 23 7/16 in.). The Art Institute of Chicago, gift of Paul McCurry, 1983.899.
and the cultivation and extension of the arts of design by any appropriate means.” Charles L. Hutchison was appointed its president, Alfred Emerson its curator of classical antiquities, and William Merchant Richardson French (brother of the sculptor Daniel Chester French) its director.

French had come to Chicago in 1867 as a Harvard-educated engineer, but gained a national reputation for his lectures and articles on art. In 1878, he became secretary of the Chicago Academy of Design which was, a year later, reorganized as the Chicago Academy of Fine Arts and changed its name again, to the Art Institute of Chicago, in 1882. French served first as its secretary and then its director, from 1885 until his death in 1914.

With what became known as the School of the Art Institute of Chicago (SAIC) flourishing, several of the Chicago Architectural Sketch Club’s lectures kept the issue of an architectural school in Chicago alive. On July 1, 1889, R. A. Densell presented a paper titled “Architectural Students.” It received wide attention when it was published in Inland Architect in September of the same year.1 Densell outlined a course of study that might take “four to eight years.” He also carefully crafted a statement suggesting that to become an architect required both formal study and actual practice rather than just an apprenticeship.

Already in SAIC’s Tenth Annual Report, published in June 1889, it had been noted that “the departments of modeling and decorative designing, which were introduced four years ago [headed by Louis J. Millet], are now fully established and doing excellent work. A department of architecture will next urge itself upon our attention, and there are encouraging elements in the interest of the architectural societies and private architects. While it would be impossible to open a comprehensive school of architecture without a considerable endowment, it may be possible to establish certain classes for architectural students at the Art Institute this fall.”2 With support from the Illinois State Association of Architects and other groups, the Art Institute of Chicago announced that “with the beginning of the new school year, Monday, September 23 [1889], classes in architecture will be opened as a part of the regular course of the art school.”3

There seem to be no surviving records for the classes offered that first year, or the number of students attending. Existing records for the Department of Architecture start with the year 1891–92.

The Art Institute catalogue for the following school year, 1892–93, names two women and twenty-four men enrolled in the Department of Architecture and states that they were accorded the same privileges as art students. The intent of the new department, which also called itself the Chicago School of Architecture, was to offer technical instruction at moderate cost to the student of architecture, the draftsman, and the designer.

The founding faculty consisted of Louis J. Millet for architecture and design; Walter F. Shattuck for mathematics and architecture; William A. Otis as lecturer on history of architecture; W. S. MacHarg as lecturer on sewerage and ventilation; Irving K. Pond as lecturer on theory of design; William Le Baron Jenny as lecturer on construction; and Miss C. D. Wade (and other teachers in the art school) for free-hand drawing, watercolor, and pen and ink. William French lectured to the architecture students as well.

Millet also was the founding director of the Department of Decorative Designing, in 1889, when he was asked to additionally serve as director and then dean of the new Department of Architecture. His joint appointment lasted until 1901–02. Millet was a proponent of “pure design,” which proposed teaching composition before historical precedents with the intent that the study of

---

2. SAIC, Tenth Annual Report (1889).
3. SAIC, Eleventh Annual Report (1890).

---

Fig. 4. Architecture class, Chicago School of Architecture, 1898.
precedents would then lead to the identification of architectural principles.

From its start, the department’s catalogue announced that this was a two-year program, which also offered classes three evenings a week and Saturdays, and that a drafting room would be accessible at all times. Evening classes were “available to draftsmen and other persons engaged in the actual practice.”7

The 1891 catalogue outlined the architecture program as follows. The first term of the first year encompassed mathematics, geometry, and descriptive geometry; architecture with an emphasis on the study of the five orders, and readings in the history of architecture; and a third course focused on freehand and instrumental drawing as well as lettering.

The second term again included mathematics but with a focus on descriptive geometry, plane trigonometry, and logarithms. There was another class on the history of architecture and a studio on “original architectural problems.” The required drawing course concentrated on freehand and instrumental drawing with the addition of instruction in watercolor.

The third term of the first year featured mathematics and descriptive geometry. The lectures on architecture were devoted to the theory of design. There was also a design studio dedicated to problems and a class in drawing covering freehand and instrumental drawing and watercolor.

The first term of the second year brought students mathematics with a focus on perspectives. The class on architecture included instruction in specifications and estimating. There were also lectures on general construction in addition to a design studio. Pupils studied the history of ornament with prescribed readings. The drawing class repeated freehand and instrumental drawing and gave instruction in pen-and-ink and watercolor.

The second term of this year once more featured mathematics with a focus on perspectives. The class on architecture included instruction in specifications and estimating. There were also lectures on general construction in addition to a design studio. Pupils studied the history of ornament with prescribed readings. The drawing class repeated freehand and instrumental drawing and gave instruction in pen-and-ink and watercolor.

The second term of this year once more featured mathematics with a focus on perspectives. The class on architecture included instruction in specifications and estimating. There were also lectures on general construction in addition to a design studio. Pupils studied the history of ornament with prescribed readings. The drawing class repeated freehand and instrumental drawing and gave instruction in pen-and-ink and watercolor.

The third-term architecture course continued the study of specifications and estimating, with lectures on general construction, ventilation, and sewerage. The design studio focused on the design of ornament.

This two-year day program was full-time, providing a comprehensive class schedule that effectively eliminated the possibility of students working even part-time in architectural offices. With the completion of the library, SAIC boasted an extensive collection of new books and photographs for student use.

The Department of Architecture’s published catalogue did not specifically state that the school had a stylistic focus, however, from its first published illustrations of student work, projects were classically inspired, especially by the buildings of the Chicago World’s Fair. By 1905, there were renderings and floor plans of domestic spaces, theaters, an occasional skyscraper, and even a gas station. Even while the 1902–03 catalogue proclaimed that Chicago, “by force of its position is one of the most potent influences in the development of American architecture,”8 the published drawings did not reflect the now-acclaimed commercial architecture that students saw daily in Chicago’s Loop.

In 1890, Chicago architect Frank W Ackely Gunsaulus delivered what came to be known as the “Million Dollar Sermon” from the pulpit of his South Side church. In it he said that with a million dollars he could build a school where students could learn to think in practical not theoretical terms—where they could be taught to “learn by doing.” Inspired by Gunsaulus’s idea, Philip Danforth Armour gave Gunsaulus one million dollars with which to establish the Armour Institute. Armour, who ran his family’s meat-packing enterprise, saw the founding of a namesake institute as a way to fill his need for skilled engineers and technicians. When the Armour Institute opened in 1893, with Gunsaulus as its president, it offered professional courses in engineering, chemistry, architecture, and library science in its own five-story fireproof building at the corner of Armour Avenue and 33rd Street.

Throughout the nineteenth century, architecture was considered a fine art and it was taught as such. As a department within a school and museum devoted to fine art, SAIC’s Department of Architecture was unique, but the faculty also realized that architecture was both an art and a science. To this end, an alliance with the Armour Institute was seen as natural and symbiotic. This partnership furnished both schools with resources in their respective strengths. SAIC’s architecture students could use Armour’s laboratories for courses in electrical, mining, and mechanical engineering, much of which had direct application to architectural study.

In 1893, the Art Institute moved into its new building along Michigan Avenue facing Adams Street. It had been built for the World’s Columbian Exposition and was designed by Charles A. Coolidge from the Chicago office of the Boston-based firm Shepley, Rutan & Coolidge. In the new spaces, AIC set up permanent rooms and facilities for the school and its departments.

In 1894, Americans who had studied at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris founded the Beaux-Arts Society...
The first board was composed of Daniel H. Burnham, certificate. To connect the School of Architecture more nor the means to devote four years to the study of archi-

During the four-year course of study, classes were arranged so that the technical subjects were studied in the morning at the Armour Institute, while the afternoon sessions were devoted to drawing and purely architec-
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From 1902 through the academic year 1916–17, the Department of Architecture enrolled about 100 students annually. There were few women among them. By 1916, there were nearly twenty schools offering formal training to architects in the United States, almost all, like the Art Institute, following the curriculum developed by the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris.

In 1928, SAIC was reorganized and the study of architecture was reduced to one class in architectural design taught by an MIT graduate with a year of experience at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. The evening architecture class was taught by Charles D. Failliker, of the Armour Institute, Earl H. Reed Jr., with a B.S. from MIT, taught architectural design. Armour and SAIC continued their alliance, but the reorganized Chicago School of Architecture published a separate catalogue stating that all questions about curriculum and enrollment were to be directed to the Armour Institute. From 1919 on, SAIC students were graduated from the Armour Institute of Technology.

For another two decades, graduates of SAIC's Chicago School of Architecture and the Armour Institute were still classically trained. These graduates became the backbone of Chicago's great firms, among them D. H. Burnham & Company; Graham, Anderson, Probst & White; and Holabird & Root.

Charles A. Coolidge, Charles S. Frost, J. Gamble Rogers, and Howard Van Doren Shaw; with Alfred F. Grainger joining in 1901. This committee apparently did not approve of Louis Miller’s “pure design” classes and had enough sway that for the academic year 1902–03, Victor C. Alderson was named dean of the Chicago School of Architecture, returning the curriculum to the study of classical precedents.

In 1989, SAIC’s Department of Architecture adopted a four-year program allied with the Armour Institute. This course load resembled the architectural courses offered by several East Coast schools. At the same time, the department retained its two-year program of shorter courses resembling those of schools in Boston and New York. It also kept its evening and Saturday programs as options. For the first school year of its new alliance with Armour (1894–95), with rooms in the AIC’s new build-

In 1898–99, the SAIC classrooms were enlarged by the addition of a new building with a skylit-study room. The designation “Special Course” was established to meet the needs of students who had neither the time nor the means to devote four years to the study of archi-

In 1908, SAIC was reorganized and the study of architecture was reduced to one class in architectural design taught by an MIT graduate with a year of experience at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. The evening architecture class was taught by Charles D. Failliker, of the Armour Institute, Earl H. Reed Jr., with a B.S. from MIT, taught architectural design. Armour and SAIC continued their alliance, but the reorganized Chicago School of Architecture published a separate catalogue stating that all questions about curriculum and enrollment were to be directed to the Armour Institute. From 1919 on, SAIC students were graduated from the Armour Institute of Technology.

For another two decades, graduates of SAIC’s Chicago School of Architecture and the Armour Institute were still classically trained. These graduates became the backbone of Chicago’s great firms, among them D. H. Burnham & Company; Graham, Anderson, Probst & White; and Holabird & Root.
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graduates of Architects (renamed in 1912 the Society of Beaux- Arts Architects which, in turn, in 1916 evolved into the Beaux-Arts Institute of Design) in New York City to promote the educational activities and principles taught in Paris. The Society quickly set up evening classes across the United States for working architects to learn Beaux-Arts design. It supplied the written programs for studio projects and student competitions used by most of America’s university-based architectural programs. Chicago had its first Beaux-Arts atelier by 1900, with several other ateliers opening within the decade. The Society’s yearbooks included competition entries from Chicago with the names of studio instructors, suggesting that its competition programs were used by the School of the Art Institute.

In 1894, SAIC’s Department of Architecture adopted a four-year program allied with the Armour Institute. This course load resembled the architectural courses offered by several East Coast schools. At the same time, the department retained its two-year program of shorter courses resembling those of schools in Boston and New York. It also kept its evening and Saturday programs as options. For the first school year of its new alliance with Armour (1894–95), with rooms in the AIC’s new building, the Department of Architecture had thirty-two students, including two women.

In 1898–99, the SAIC classrooms were enlarged by the addition of a new building with a skylit-study room. The designation “Special Course” was established to meet the needs of students who had neither the time nor the means to devote four years to the study of architecture. Two years of special work was rewarded with a certificate. To connect the School of Architecture more closely with the architectural profession and to aid the students with counsel and critiques, a Board of Advisors made up of practicing architects was formed in 1900. The first board was composed of Daniel H. Burnham,
After visiting the United States in 1911, H. P. Berlage wrote in the Schweizerische Bauzeitung, “I don’t know whether Sullivan studied in Paris, but Wright is a student of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts.” A number of very intelligent contemporary observers, encountering the work of Frank Lloyd Wright around the time of the publication of his 1911 Ausgeführte Bauten, reacted similarly. Le Corbusier, for one, wrote to his friend H. T. Wydeveld in 1925, “One senses in the plans of Wright the good teaching of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts here [in Paris], that is to say, an attention to order, to organization, to the character of pure architectural form.” We know from Wright’s Autobiography (1932, second edition 1943) that when Charles Atwood left Daniel Burham’s office, Burnham offered first to send Wright to the Ecole, then a place in his office—to which Wright responded, “It’s too late now I’m afraid. I am spoiled already. I’ve been too close to Mr. Sullivan” (Sullivan had been trained at the Ecole). Colin Rowe years later remarked to Chicago architectural historian Kevin Harrington, echoing his friend and teacher Henry-Russell Hitchcock, that this was because Wright was already the best “Beaux-Arts” architect in Chicago.

Did Wright—like so many of his contemporaries in America—learn something from Paris? Certainly the dominating cross-axial spaces of his George Blossom House of 1892 (figs. 1, 2) would make one think so—not to mention its categorically classical decorative vocabulary. The Blossom House we can visit and we find all the spaces of the ground floor opening to each other—not through square openings but through broad archways producing a much more dramatic play of architectural form. Wright seems to be seeking something already suggested in his Beaux-Arts-trained teacher Louis Sullivan’s very compressed Charnley House of 1890. Later in the 1890s, Wright transformed this geometric play into one of octagonal spaces in his plans for the Devin and McAfee houses and his executed George Furbeck House in Oak Park (1897; fig. 3).

These houses are neither modern nor revivalist, as we have been made to understand them. What might have been going on? I think to answer this question we must first ask what really constituted the famous “Beaux-Arts” approach. In the abstract it was a technique of sequential design elaboration starting with an idea and ending with a delineated spatial form. This pivoted on certain selections among choices of shape and relationship obliging the designer to take a general philosophical stand visible as a graphic pattern. Only in final elaboration would this be adjusted to emerge in three dimensions with section and elevation, a pictorial-spatial manifestation of the origi-

Fig. 1. George Blossom House, Chicago, by Frank Lloyd Wright, 1892.
nating idea. The value of the Beaux-Arts system consequently lay in that it was conceptual, generating a solution from a problem rather than applying some ready-made “model”—stylistic or functional—which might “fit.”

Instructional texts specified how the student was to proceed: from the “elements” of architecture (rooms and courtyards, corridors and stairways, doors and windows) to their arrangement—their “composition”—as a building. This was a test of ordering and logic. The student was to start with a quick reading of the program to grasp its spirit, then a slower and attentive reading to grasp the details (the school programs being carefully written to aid such analysis), then a quickly thrown-off mass of sketch plans testing as many arrangements—“partis”—as possible. (In the Grand Prix competition this was specifically to be done in twelve hours.) Last came the famously detailed final carpet plans (in the Grand Prix competition rendered, with help, in four months). Julien Guadet, a professor at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, put it very simply: the student divides the problem into its constituent parts, selects one as the characterizing dominant, then “proceeding from the whole to the parts, from the building masses to their details, you proceed effortlessly,” but, he warns, “if your point of departure has been well-chosen.” The outside, thus, manifested the inside; the inside was transparent to the parti. This parti was the most minimal sketch idea settled on at once after the intense analysis—and because of the conceptual nature of this exercise, it determined whether the building was a good or bad design.

One of the last French Beaux-Arts teachers in America, Jean-Paul Carlhian, liked to remark that this method was clear thinking and clear exposition, as one was taught in lycée. Edouard Arnaud in 1928 compares it to the game of chess: “This intellectual work is comparable to that involved in a chess problem. In both cases one seeks a solution based, not on fixed principles, but [on] an imaginative suggestion aided by a solid working method.” But this was all a matter of the plan. The elevations—was all too often observed—were all too similar and predictably “classical” in vocabulary. The plans made up for this predictability by their extraordinary intricacy and intertwining, the deciphering of which became like following a sable game or exploring a complex pattern.

What were the tangible results of this Beaux-Arts method? In Wright’s archive (recently catalogued at Columbia University’s Avery Drawings and Archives Collection) we find two classical competition schemes for the Milwaukee Public Library of 1892: one working off Perrault’s west facade of the Louvre, the other off Émile Bénard’s celebrated 1867 Grand Prix project already the inspiration of Charles Atwood’s Fine Arts Building at the World’s Columbian Exposition, although for Wright’s library we lack a plan, which is the core of Beaux-Arts composition (fig. 4). Another American example of Beaux-Arts from the years we are discussing might be a library design submitted in 1892 for what became the 42nd Street Central Building of the New York Public Library by Ernest Flagg (fig. 5). Here we see Flagg first privileging the stack blocks in three wings extending from a domed central link, then fixing the reading space divided into four octagonal volumes projecting on the diagonals at the crossing. But was this all there was to Beaux-Arts design? It...
is interesting to compare this declarative solution to that of a leading French designer establishing himself in the United States, Paul Philippe Cret, who handles this more adroitly in his Indianapolis Public Library of 1914–20 in their common selection of the book check-out space as the central feature and in their centrifugal layering of circulation, stacks, and window-lit reading spaces around it. The layout is similar but the result dramatically different, and that lies in Cret’s tight joining of the spaces and their access to light (fig. 6).

The difference between Flagg and Cret’s plans is that between the literal and the metaphorical, between student work and architecture. The point in design, Cret wrote, presenting this design in his article “Library Architecture” in the twelfth edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica,10 is to divide the problem into its spatial parts—here we would understand the catalogue and check-out space, book stacks, reading rooms, and entry and corridor spaces—then to select the one most immediately characteristic and characterizing—the “point” in Beaux-Arts parlance—then arrange the remaining parts symmetrically but subordinate around it—that Gestalt, the composition’s commitment or “paris.” In the case of the American big-city public library, he continued, the borrowing of books rather than their reading on site was the central activity so that, by Beaux-Arts logic, the catalogue and check-out space should dominate the composition with reading spaces subordinate around it.

Yet perhaps we are missing the point. Flagg sees this problem as one of geometric play. His “building” is only a drawing, and as such it is fascinating even though, if it had been executed, it would have been labyrinthine—a drawing, and as such it is fascinating even though, if it had been executed, it would have been labyrinthine—like a Beaux-Arts project but also like what it was, not the reality he sought, but an abstraction, a method, a state of mind that was local and specific—not universal.11 This, perhaps, is just the point.

An incident, repeated twice: Louis Sullivan presenting himself thoroughly with the theory of the School, which, in his mind, settled down to a theory of the plan, yielding results of extraordinary brilliancy, but which, after all, was not the reality he sought, but an abstraction, a method, a state of mind that was local and specific—not universal.11 This, perhaps, is just the point.

What was the source of Wright’s Beaux-Arts plans? Here . . . we have to note the presence of Louis Sullivan . . .

Fig. 6. Competition plan for the Indianapolis Public Library by Paul Philippe Cret, 1914.

Fig. 7. Darwin Martin House, Buffalo, New York, by Frank Lloyd Wright, 1904. Overall site plan.

What was the source of Wright’s Beaux-Arts plans? Here I think we have to note the presence of Louis Sullivan—winner of the French prize at Boston English High School and trained in the Beaux-Arts system, first by Eugene Letang at MIT in 1872–73, then at the Ecole itself as a student of Letang’s teacher, Emile Vaudremer, in 1874–75. What might Sullivan have learned in Paris? He denied that it was the literal program of the Ecole, writing in his Autobiography of an Idea, “He familiarized himself thoroughly with the theory of the School, which, in his mind, settled down to a theory of the plan, yielding results of extraordinary brilliancy, but which, after all, was not the reality he sought, but an abstraction, a method, a state of mind that was local and specific—not universal.”11 This, perhaps, is just the point.

Paris in 1893 (this latter trip with his decorator George Healy that he seems not to have mentioned afterward but is clearly documented in New York customs records). In his various trips, he read his audience a poem of his own authorship and, in the case of Paris—surviving to this day in his own handwriting—in French.

These were important moments. I have wondered for years why Sullivan judged poetry to be the language to “speak” under these uniquely formal circumstances. At the end of his career, he produced two similarly puzzlingly perverse productions—masterpieces really—from his mind, settled down to a theory of the plan, yielding results of extraordinary brilliancy, but which, after all, was not the reality he sought, but an abstraction, a method, a state of mind that was local and specific—not universal.11 This, perhaps, is just the point.

Sullivan was folding [the Beaux-Arts method] back on its basic idea, its universality.

Did Frank Lloyd Wright, as Sullivan’s self-proclaimed student, come to understand this in his mature, post-1900 work, and does it help us grasp his work as “Beaux-Arts”? One may immediately respond to this by emphasizing the evocative qualities of the Beaux-Arts in his presentation drawings—that it is a matter of rendering rather than architecture. Yet in certain instances, the tricks of circulation and poché seem to appear, not in his Chicago houses,
living room–dining room-library extending out on axis and cross-axis to the right, and an entry block mirroring it to the left divided down its length between kitchen and vestibule. But two important novelties appear here transforming it more overtly into a Beaux-Arts composition: Wright’s two halves are thrust apart by his opening a central void which becomes the origin of an unexpected cross axis shooting out across the back property as an air. And, just as Wright’s conventional domestic apartments step aside to permit this grand new element of circulation, that most fundamental mark of Beaux-Arts planning, poché, appears in the unique “pier clusters” pushing in on that central space at its four diagonals, these reappearing left and right to stake out and unify the entry and living room–dining room masses. Yet this is in no way overt: the pier clusters are decorative passages of larger and smaller ink squares and masses. Yet this is in no way overt: the pier clusters are decorative passages of larger and smaller ink squares and repeat the house’s geometry as a whole. And as these scale down the spatial pattern of the house, a great arc of exterior planting scales it up responding to that geometric pattern in another scale and shape. The pattern of the house plan itself is a modulation between these two, the pier smaller, the flowered larger. Wright has taken the Paris graphic vocabulary a step further and lightened it, paralleling this abstraction but less impressively, although with an intriguing hint of a picture to come visible literally through it—then revealed after careful lifting up the delicate cover sheet. There is no way that the reader can miss his point, that the plan comes first and is the generator—literally, in the gesture of lifting the transparent page—and the actual building something only to be discovered beyond it. We have noted the complaint about Beaux-Arts work as privileging the plan over the elevation and section. Here Wright offers a response, both in how one encounters his project and in how the building actually works: the two are “transparent” to each other conceptually and literally in the lifting of those transparent cover sheets. Wright’s work is “Beaux-Arts” in the very profound sense that he solves the great dilemma of domestic architecture as fundamentally as Sullivan did with Piranesi’s Campus Martius. In a sense, the public spaces of this plan are merely an elaboration of his Lakes’ Home Journal “Prairie” type of 1901: a T-shaped . . . Wright has taken the Paris graphic vocabulary a step further and lightened it . . .

Basten that makes this unmistakable: unlike the many subsequent inexpensive reprints, in the original, plans and perspectives of houses are paired pages, a board perspective and a tracing paper plan glued along its longer top edge. That is to say, Wright repeatedly obliges the reader to start with the house’s plan—although with an intriguing hint of a picture to come visible literally through it—then revealed after careful lifting up the delicate cover sheet. There is no way that the reader can miss his point, that the plan comes first and is the generator—literally, in the gesture of lifting the transparent page—and the actual building something only to be discovered beyond it. We have noted the complaint about Beaux-Arts work as privileging the plan over the elevation and section. Here Wright offers a response, both in how one encounters his project and in how the building actually works: the two are “transparent” to each other conceptually and literally in the lifting of those transparent cover sheets. Wright’s work is “Beaux-Arts” in the very profound sense that he solves the great dilemma of domestic architecture as fundamentally as Sullivan did with Piranesi’s Campus Martius. In a sense, the public spaces of this plan are merely an elaboration of his Lakes’ Home Journal “Prairie” type of 1901: a T-shaped . . . Wright has taken the Paris graphic vocabulary a step further and lightened it . . .

The perspectives in Wright’s Ausgeführte Bauten are not what is important, it is the plans—as Otto Antonia Graf’s four thick volumes of analysis make clear (following earlier such analyses, especially that of Heinrich de Fries, published in 1926). And there is a peculiarity of the original publication of the Ausgeführte . . .
3. Frank Lloyd Wright, “une caractère de pure architecture.”

4. There is an immense and fascinating literature of the Ecole doctrine and architectural composition, including Arthur Drexler, ed., The Architecture of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977); Richard A. Etlin, Symbolic Space: French Enlight-

5. In the 1880s, the Ecole des Beaux-Arts had to face a crisis of purpose, as its students were becoming more and more discontented with the traditional method of education. This crisis was caused by the rise of the Nouvelle Architecture, which emphasized the use of modern materials and techniques. The Ecole had to adapt, or risk losing its students.

6. Wright’s work is characterized by a strong sense of geometric continuity, which is evident in his designs for Larkin Building, Unity Temple, and the Imperial Hotel.

7. Wright’s work is characterized by a strong sense of geometric continuity, which is evident in his designs for Larkin Building, Unity Temple, and the Imperial Hotel.

8. Wright’s work is characterized by a strong sense of geometric continuity, which is evident in his designs for Larkin Building, Unity Temple, and the Imperial Hotel.

9. Wright’s work is characterized by a strong sense of geometric continuity, which is evident in his designs for Larkin Building, Unity Temple, and the Imperial Hotel.
Today’s interest in traditional urbanism, the idea that a building should be shaped by its physical context, and an interest in classicism as idealized form all seem to be at odds with the contemporary development of American cities. The construction of tall buildings in the 1960s and ’70s was driven by images of “the city in the park” and zoning bonuses for open plazas along the street. It is now driven by structural engineering in the service of form making. This has failed to produce a satisfactory, let alone humane, version of the public domain. These buildings totally disregard the potential of the skyscraper to engage with the city street or respond to issues of urban context. The skyscrapers of the 1920s and ’30s seemed to understand this potential. Perhaps this is what was being suggested by Werner Hegemann and Elbert Peets when they wrote, in their 1922 compendium of great urban spaces, The American Vitruvius: An Architects’ Handbook of Civic Art, “The intelligent use of the skyscraper in civic design will be America’s most valuable contribution to civic art.”

How are we to reconcile this prediction with the late twentieth-century development of the skyscraper? For America’s tall buildings of the 1920s and ’30s, this was not an issue. Zoning and building codes required setbacks to ensure light and air at the street. The schema was to fill out the site at its base. This provided definition of the street. Skyscrapers then tapered or set back into a tower to present a profiled, often romantic silhouette when seen from a distance. Thus, these buildings with a nonfigural lower mass could act as a “ground” to the adjacent street space. The idea that a tall building could simultaneously be both a figure (foreground) and a ground (background) can be seen in building ensembles such as the relationship of the Church of Sant’Agnese in Rome to the other buildings encircling the Piazza Navona. The church’s dome and towers establish a presence in the space while the church’s facade remains part of the defining wall of the plaza.

If we consider the layout of most traditional cities, including grid cities, it is easy to understand the potential of skyscrapers to be used urbanistically. The skyscraper . . . will be America’s most valuable contribution to civic art.

They can act as urban gateposts marking important points of transition in a city, terminate a vista, create a focus within a space, and even define an urban space. Chicago was where the skyscraper originated, and the city features many examples of skyscraper urbanism. As a city laid out on a grid, Chicago offers few opportunities for terminating streets with a building. An important exception is the Board of Trade Building, part of a unique building ensemble at the end of La Salle Street, the center of Chicago’s financial district. As early as 1885, the street ended in the facade of the “old” Board of Trade Building designed by William W. Boyington, the architect of Chicago’s “Gothic-style” Water Tower and Pumping Station on North Michigan Avenue. La Salle Street was visually terminated by the Board of Trade’s clock tower that rose 300 feet above the pavement. On either side of the foot of the street, facing each other, are the Federal Reserve Bank of 1922 whose articulated base was built at the scale of the main block of Boyington’s building, and to the west,

Fig. 1. Chicago Board of Trade Building, designed by Holabird & Root, 1929–30.
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the Continental Illinois Bank, built in 1924. Both were
designed by Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, the
successor firm to D. H. Burnham & Company. These
buildings each feature two-story classical entry porti-
cos, which push the main facades back from the street,
and along with the Board of Trade, create a shallow
symmetrical space. The pairing and the scale of the
porticos establish a cross axis that further reinforces the
perception that La Salle Street ends in an urban
space rather than a building facade.

shaft of Goodhue’s design sets back by dropping off its
corners to articulate the ascending central mass into a
cruciform-shaped point tower. The Holabird & Root
design provides a base that defines the street at street
level, with a clock as a centralized element. The build-
ing then sets back in steps at its center, reversing the
Goodhue design and suggesting an apse-like recess that
functions to receive the axis of the street at the scale
of the city. This spatial complex is an urban ensemble
formed entirely of skyscrapers that evolved as a series of
responses to a unique location in the city.

The creation of a large-scale urban space at a signif-
icant location in the city may be seen in the sequen-
tial development of the space around the Michigan
Avenue Bridge. Here the Chicago Tribune Tower and
its surrounding structures—the Wrigley Building, the
London Guaranty and Accident Company Building
(later named the Stone Container Building), and 333
North Michigan Avenue—form an extraordinary

grouping of skyscrapers, built independently over time,
that work to define an urban space as a gateway to the
north (figs. 3, 4).

Originally there was no bridge connecting South
Michigan Avenue (then called Michigan Boulevard) and
Pine Street, which was to the north of the Chicago River.
Before their Michigan Boulevard plan of 1909, Daniel
Burnham and Edward Bennett proposed the construc-
tion of a plaza that would span the river. This included
a classical building terminating the northern axis of
Michigan Avenue, formally resolving the misalignment
of Michigan Avenue and Pine Street behind it. The plaza
would have served as a significant point of transition in
the city. In 1910, Benjamin Marshall proposed spanning the river not with a bridge, but with a giant triumphal arch that the street would run through.3

In 1912, property owners north of the river formed the North Central Business District Association. They commissioned a number of Chicago architects, including Andrew Rebori and Howard Van Doren Shaw, to propose plans for the extension of North Michigan Avenue. Recognition of the importance of the bridge and the development of North Michigan Avenue, as a major link between the two sides of the river, is delineated in early proposals made by Rebori. He published several designs for the area at the bridge and for the imagined extension of Michigan Avenue north of the river. In the first he proposed two paired office towers joined by a triumphal arch (fig. 5), perhaps influenced by Marshall’s design.

In his next proposal, Rebori included a space of arrival between two splayed seven-story buildings with a pair of office towers, as gateposts, at the north end of the space (fig. 6). These are shown flanking the entrance to the street. The space also takes up the axial shift between the street to the north and the street to the south of the Chicago River. In Rebori’s third proposal, titled, “Chicago Practical,” made in 1915 and published in American Architect in 1918, Rebori proposed two rounded “Gothic-style” towers, again, large-scale gateposts, emphasizing their function as points in space by making them omnidirectional. Their national publication and the overall massing of these towers suggest that they could have had an influence on Howells & Hood’s winning entry in the Tribune Tower Competition (figs. 7, 8).

The Wrigley Building was the first building of this urban ensemble to be constructed. William Wrigley Jr., the chewing gum magnate, purchased the site for his building in 1918, knowing that eventually a bridge would be constructed at this location, although it was not completed until 1921. In 1919, Wrigley commissioned Graham, Anderson, Probst & White to design his building. A partner in the firm, Peirce Anderson, designed a white terra-cotta clad office block with its angled face splayed to follow the angle of the Chicago River to the west. At the center of Anderson’s facade was a central tower patterned after the Giralda Tower of the Seville Cathedral. The Wrigley Building was fully rented when it opened in 1920, and in 1923 Wrigley constructed an annex building to the north. It was identical in finish and detail to the original and was connected at the ground level by a two-story arcade screen that ties the two buildings together. The completion of the bridge was shown in a perspective drawing that includes the “bridge houses” designed by Edward Bennett (fig. 9). The drawing announces that their construction marks a “first step in making this gateway as famous as the Place de la Concorde in Paris.” It also features the completed Wrigley Building, and, across the river, a continuous wall of buildings along South Water Street—a placeholder that turns from South Water Street (now Wacker Drive) onto Michigan Avenue and cups back in an exedra shape at the corner to define a shallow space at the north side of the bridge. This is the corner strategy that Alfred Alschuler would use in his 1922–23 design for the classical London Guaranty and Accident Company Building, a curved front office tower topped by a colonnade of Corinthian columns and a circular lantern.

In 1922, the Chicago Tribune company planned to build an office tower for its own use along North Michigan Avenue immediately in front of the newspaper’s printing plant, which was completed in 1921 and designed by Jarvis Hunt. The Tribune had purchased the land in 1919 while the bridge was under construction. An international competition for the tower was...
announced on June 10, 1922, asking for “the design of the most beautiful office building in the world.”

The Tribune Tower competition drew hundreds of entries from all over the world. The winner was a “Gothic-style” tower design by Howells & Hood of New York, based on the south tower of Rouen Cathedral. The architects understood that their building would stand at the edge of an urban space forming a gatepost and situated so that it would dominate the view looking east from the river and South Water Street. They wrote, “The structure is carried to its full height as a square on the Michigan Avenue front only, thus always giving the same impression from where ever and showing the same from all points as the Tribune’s landmark.”

The competition designs, shown in perspectives, were published by the Tribune company in a book documenting the competition. The most influential were those by Eliel Saarinen and Bertram Goodhue. The Saarinen design, lauded by Louis Sullivan, would have understood that the site was one of the few European entrants who had been to the site of the significance of the site (fig. 10). Loos was put aside the symbolism of the column, who proposed a skyscraper in the form of a giant Doric order. By 1922, however, was that of Adolf Loos, whose writings make clear that he only objected to the use of ornament on utilitarian structures, not on civic buildings. At the time of the competition, Loos was living in Paris and the resemblance to Claude-Nicolas Ledoux’s design for gates at the Place de la Nation is unmistakable, making his Tribune Tower design both an idealized classical reference and a site-specific proposal. (fig. 11)

The final element of the building’s ensemble was constructed at the southeast corner of Michigan Avenue and South Water Street in 1927–28. Designed by Holabird & Root, the building is known only by its address, 333 North Michigan Avenue. The architects chose to vertically articulate the north end of the building with the building’s main bulk extending south along the street. The building’s south end is articulated as a narrow vertical tower, which, according to John Holabird, was influenced by Eliel Saarinen’s design in the Tribune Tower competition. What is most remarkable about the north end of the building is the way it presents as a narrow pointed tower directly on axis with the center of Michigan Avenue, a result of the angled shift in alignment of the street that begins at the bridge.

Although this grouping of buildings lacks spatial enclosure, it does define an urban space. Quintessentially American, it is a space of transition rather than repose, and one of America’s most important urban spaces defined entirely by skyscrapers. While the same may be said for Rockefeller Center in New York, built somewhat later, the architects of Rockefeller Center shared a commission that ensured the unity of the project, while in Chicago, the architects who built at the Michigan Avenue Bridge shared only an idea. This idea, the city composed of defined public space, was seen by them as compatible with the scale of the American city and with the skyscraper. Today, at a time when skyscrapers are being given a variety of twisting, gyrating, and cantilevered forms, the idea of a vertically differentiated tower using the specifics of its form to respond to its urban site, seems a rational and eminently arguable starting point for a skyscraper’s design.

The competition, as it might look today on the site it had been built. Contemporary visualization and reconstruction by Thomas Kemmer.

Fig. 9. “New Gateway of the Greater Chicago.” View of Michigan Avenue Bridge looking south.

Fig. 10. Adolf Loos’s entry in the Chicago Tribune Tower Competition, as it might look today on the site it had been built. Contemporary visualization and reconstruction by Thomas Kemmer.

Notes


5. Because of the angle of the street, the old Water Tower remains on the central axis of Michigan Avenue looking north from the bridge.
The death of German-born Ludwig Mies van der Rohe on August 17, 1969, was the most consequential inflection point in Chicago’s architecture since the 1893 opening of the World’s Columbian Exposition. While the latter spawned the City Beautiful movement, which brought classical art, architecture, and urban design to almost every settled region of the United States (as well as the country’s extensive international territories), Mies’s passing—although internationally notable—was more local in its direct effects. Mies had arrived in Chicago in 1937 to take over the architecture program at the Armour Institute, soon rebranded as the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) with a Mies-designed campus. In the final three-plus decades of his life, he came to dominate the city’s approach to architecture, and ultimately define the very essence of Chicago’s architectural culture, including how its earlier work was commonly framed and understood.

Mies’s influence on the city could seem downright hysterical. Chicago architect Ben Weese once confessed that he had attended Mies’s seventy-fifth birthday party at the Arts Club: “[That] was the closest I ever got to him because I purposely never wanted to meet him,” he recalled. “I thought I might get infected.” But such hysteria actually had a precedent in Chicago: The vitriolic reaction of Louis Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright to Daniel Burnham’s classical turn at the World’s Fair continued to inform much of the Chicago architectural community’s reaction to classical and traditional work throughout the twentieth century.

In the mid-twentieth century, Mies’s acolytes portrayed the city’s architecture as a linear development of “modern” forms and space that disallowed alternate histories or practices. Historians Sigfried Giedion and Carl Condit penned distinctly constrained views of Chicago’s architectural legacy, which placed structural and engineering problem-solving as the primary sources of aesthetic and cultural outcomes.

But Mies’s death—and the obviously inferior nature of much work produced by his successors—created an opening for a serious reappraisal and reevaluation of Chicago’s architectural production.

Mies’s death created an opening for a serious reappraisal and reevaluation of Chicago’s architectural production.
his brother Harry's large law firm two decades before leaving in 1977 to start his own small shop.

Nagle recalls that the group was frustrated by the city’s architectural scene. “Seventy-four was a recession time,” he says. “We had time to look around and wonder, why isn’t the world more interesting and better? And there were these other people who had practiced in the city during similar hard times.”

The group eventually found a voice in 1976, when Tigerman and Cohen co-curated an exhibition called Chicago Architects: As a Counterpoint to 100 Years of Architecture in Chicago. Continuity of Structure and Form—an exhibition of the prevailing orthodox modernist view of the city’s architecture first presented in Europe in 1973, and subsequently updated for an exhibition at Chicago’s Museum of Contemporary Art in 1976. Tigerman would refer to Chicago Architects as a salon de refusés.

Viewing the competing catalogues for the two exhibitions side by side today is instructive (figs. 2, 3). Once, they appeared to be almost diametrically opposed; now, not so much. Chicago Architects was about revealing the diversity of the city’s legacy beyond the Giedion-Condit-constricted structuralist story told by their Miesian rivals. And yet the more “diverse” collection of buildings—while selected to avoid the strict constructivist slant of the predominant history of Chicago then in vogue—moved the needle just a little bit. Although there’s a dab of Howard Van Doren Shaw, Benjamin Marshall, and David Adler, it’s hardly enough to acknowledge the lush early twentieth-century classically inspired production that still dots Chicago’s North Shore and Gold Coast. But upon the exhibition’s opening in March 1976 at the Cooper Union in New York, Ada Louise Huxtable in the New York Times called both the show and Cohen’s catalogue essay “revisionist history.” “The show is an iconographic feast and an exercise in provocative scholarship,” she wrote.

Later that year, the friends added IT Dean James Ingo Freed (b. 1930) to their insurgency, and dubbed themselves the “Chicago Seven” after the political radicals of Chicago’s 1968 Democratic National Convention. They then mounted an exhibition at Richard Gray’s North Michigan Avenue gallery. Each showed a single house design, in drawings and a model, and they were all for sale. Memories vary, but it seems several drawings may have sold, although no one was willing to purchase an actual house. And yet the more “diverse” collection of spaces and shapes, but ultimately becomes a statement which seems to go beyond architecture.” This was in sharp contrast to the other renderings, which Gapp noted, “range from mildly interesting to mundane.”

The group reprised the exhibition the following year, adding Helmut Jahn for a total of eight participants, and mounted a subsequent exhibition that expanded the count to eleven with the inclusion of Jerry Horn, Ken Schroeder, and Cindy Weese. In 1978, members held a townhouse competition at the Graham Foundation, displaying winning entries from eight young individuals, who enlarged the group that in 1979 formed the nucleus of the reconstituted Chicago Architectural Club.

In 1979, Beeby designed an addition for the North Shore Congregation Israel. His brick-clad Palladian-inspired design for the North Shore suburb of Glencoe, Illinois, was a direct rebuke to the congregation’s existing building, a typically composed concrete sanctuary by Minoru Yamasaki. The client’s brief, as recalled by Beeby, was to “play two traditions,” which were described as the “elegant, Classical Sephardic synagogues of Spain, Venice, and Amsterdam” and the “rustic, vernacular Ashkenazic synagogues of Eastern Europe.” Beeby told Architectural Record, which published the addition in June 1983, that his building incorporated Mies, Asplund, Wright, Sullivan, and Kahn as well, noting, “Who knows where ideas come from?”

The seemingly offhand comment, from one of Chicago’s most thoughtful and articulate architects, can be seen as emblematic of the work of the era in general, and this particular group of Chicago architects specifically. It’s not that none of them cared—they all very much did, if in somewhat uneven regard for delving into actual scholarship—but Beeby’s attitude freed him to explore a diverse series of influences through an artist’s rather than a scholar’s lens, and equally allowed him to move forward without the stultifying straitjacket that had hampered the Miesians. The resulting intimate square sanctuary set within a circular envelope, thoughtfully decorated with details ranging from Doric columns to ram’s horn-shaped railings, demonstrates a highly synthetic approach to architecture that embraces an inclusiveness toward historical form that seemed so alluring at the time.

The June 1989 edition of Progressive Architect turned a spotlight on Chicago, with work of the “Seven” at the forefront. But interestingly, this extensive coverage of the city’s collective output, more than a decade after Mies’s passing and four years after Chicago Architects, didn’t include much that can be considered either classical or traditional. The cover featured Helmut Jahn’s “Late Entry to the Chicago Tribune Tower Competition,” part of an elaborate international exhibition of the same title organized by Tigerman and Cohen with gallerist Rhona Hoffman (fig. 5).

Included were Tigerman’s Villa Proeh (1979–80) and Booth’s Herman Miller Health Science Division Building (1979), which employ classical plans, but not forms. Nagle’s South Side House incorporates an arched entry in an otherwise modern brick box. Even the work of Beeby, whose firm receives portfolio treatment, includes three frankly modern structures among five projects. But Cohen and Weese were traditional, the former with a speculative Tudor home, the latter with a bank inspired by Louis Sullivan’s work. It’s clear from the entire issue of the magazine that Chicago by now had become a more eclectic place, but the role of classicism seems tepid at this time.
Digest, inserted interlocking multilevel John Soane-inspired spaces into a nineteenth-century North Side Chicago structure (fig. 7). The project definitively moved Cohen beyond theory and into actual building, drawing subsequent commissions, almost exclusively residential, that continue to the present day in his practice with his wife and partner, Julie Hacker.

The reigning design partner of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Bruce Graham, initially dismissed the exhibition Chicago Architects—not least because of its celebration of in-house rival Walter Netsch as part of the extended Chicago narrative. But even Graham would eventually surrender to the pull of history later in the decade. His protégé, Adrian Smith, would design an abstracted Richardsonian arch for Neiman Marcus (1983) on Michigan Avenue and move on to even more classically inspired work like Boston's Rowes Wharf (1987) and Chicago's NBC Building (1989). The architectural success of Rowes Wharf was immediately apparent, as it graced the March 1988 cover of *Architectural Record* (fig. 9).

In 1988, Beeby completed the Daniel F. and Ada L. Rice Building for the Art Institute of Chicago. As architecture critic Paul Goldberger pointed out in the *New York Times*, this wasn’t the first “turn back” for the art museum—a renovation of its original 1893 building completed the previous year had installed traditional moldings to its earliest galleries, to designs by SOM. Beeby’s addition was featured on the cover of *Progressive Architecture* that November, and Pilar Viladas noted the design’s “almost perversely contemporary spin” on classicism—“the balusters, which appear in elevation as flat, Doric-column paper dolls, are in fact solid, rectangular blocks that are chamfered at the corners.” This same motif would be reprised by Beeby in the cast-in-place concrete columns within the loft-like spaces of the Harold Washington Library Center.

That same year, recent University of Notre Dame alumni David Mayerik and Thomas Rajkovich, both employees of Beeby, debuted as the first wave of Beeby’s new team, which he dubbed the “Boothean” wave.

Beeby’s Sulzer Regional Library (designed 1980, completed 1985) built on the architect’s earlier attempts to create a hybrid design of traditional and classical, melding the constructional clarity of Mies with neoclassical idioms based on Schinkel. Rosettes, acroteria, scaled to the library’s status as a neighborhood building, fore-shadow the gargantuan motifs that top Beeby’s Harold Washington Library Center at the end of the decade.

The two most clearly classical buildings designed by Tigerman are located on a single Chicago block, on Ontario Street between Dearborn and Clark. The first, a single-story-tall EIFS-clad orangery was produced as a restaurant for the then-popular Hard Rock Cafe. Completed in 1985, it was Tigerman’s whimsy that drove the depiction of rock ‘n roll cool using straight Tuscan (albeit stucco/Styrofoam) classicism.

Stuart Cohen’s Carrigan Townhouse (1984), designed with Anders Nereim and published in *Architectural Record* (fig. 9), expanded on the architect’s increasing interest in vernacular and traditional vocabularies, Weese described his attempt to “bridge between historic replication and tabula rasa by modifying, combining, and permuting known and experienced shapes and forms.”

Booth’s House of Light (1983) (fig. 6) expanded on the architect’s increasing interest in vernacular form. Named a Record House by *Architectural Record* in 1984, its central stair hall provided the cover for the July 1985 issue of *Architecture*. “I think we’ve all had our fill of funereal buildings,” Booth told the Record. “We now want things to be light, lively, and delicate.” But despite its distance from his more modern works, the house remains a highly abstracted work whose most classical elements are primarily appliquéd.

The Evelyn Chapel (1984) at Illinois Wesleyan University in Bloomington, by Weese, was featured on the cover of *Architectural Record*’s January 1985 issue (fig. 8). Building on his seemingly perennial interest in combining vernacular and traditional vocabularies, Weese described his attempt to “bridge between historic replication and tabula rasa by modifying, combining, and permuting known and experienced shapes and forms.”
of the next generation of Chicago’s classical architects, producing a project for the completion of the Capitol Mall in St. Paul, Minnesota. Their unfailing embrace of precedent, uninfluenced by the Miesian modernism or irony of their mentors, placed Cass Gilbert’s classical state capitol in a setting that would have appealed to the original architect three-quarters of a decade later.

Also in 1988, Beeby’s Harold Washington Library Center won a public competition, resulting in Chicago’s most traditional public building since the Great Depression (Fig. 1). Its thick masonry exterior walls were set against a fourth curtain wall of glass that extended to all four sides under crowning pediments ornamented with exuberantly oversized acroteria. Remaining true to the architect’s synthetic approach, it was both Beeby’s most classical, and yet still so very postmodern building.

Adjacent to the earlier Hard Rock Cafe, Tigerman created his most straightforward classical design for a two-story former substation (completed 1989) for municipal electric power provider Commonwealth Edison (Fig. 10). What he didn’t do himself, he either encouraged others to do, or assumed credit after the fact. Tigerman, no doubt, saw himself as a Philip Johnson-styled Chicago kingmaker. Architect John Macau summarized Tigerman’s omnivorous attitude in a cartoon for the 1989 Chicago Architectural Club Journal that depicts Tigerman as a rooster-tailed weathervane that can point toward any of the period’s trends—Mies, postmodernism, classicism, anti-functionalism, deconstructionism, not-yet-invented-ism, or modernism.

While Chicago had entered the 1970s with a more clearly defined crisis—the death of Mies—than other locales, at the conclusion of the ensuing two decades, there began a return to the city’s modernist formal roots, rather than a large-scale embracing of the classical and traditional. Unlike the East Coast in general (and New York in particular), where the same period of time provided tacit approval and encouragement for several generations of practitioners to flourish with classically oriented practices, the moment in Chicago was shorter-lived. Of the seven agents provocateurs, only Beeby and his office’s leadership would continue to build in a classical vein in subsequent decades. Freed returned to New York in 1978 and ceased to be an influence on the Chicago scene. Nagle never embraced any type of classical design. Tigerman and Booth quickly retreated by the early 1990s. Weese would continue to explore a more vernacular-based version of both the traditional and modern. Cohen’s work would be most transformed by the personal, but while always informed by the classical, would remain staunchly in the less rarefied air of the traditional.

Of the generation whose educations occurred during the 1970s and ‘80s (who often studied with or worked for members of the Seven), those most affected include Rajkovich, Mayernick, R. Michael Graham, Phillip Liederbach, and Arci Lasher. Except for Mayernick, who uses Notre Dame as his base of operations (with most of his built work in Italy), they all continue to produce classical work in Chicago. Liederbach and Graham not and studied together with Beeby, Booth, and Cohen at UIC, but their considerable body of work remains more traditional than classical. And Lasher, who now holds the design reins at Beeby’s firm (renamed HBRA in 1999), continues to produce highly synthetic classical work that builds on Beeby’s voracious approach to architectural precedent.

Now fifty years after the death of Mies—and more than a quarter century after the close of the postmodern period, it’s worth asking why classicism hasn’t flourished in Chicago as it has in other places. The genuine handful of practitioners in the genre—including Beeby, Cohen, Graham, Liederbach, Rajkovich, and Lasher—produce work that’s every bit the equal of that being done around the country and by their Europe-based contemporaries. But the lack of a wider scene of contemporary classicists might be seen as an inevitable outgrowth of its 1970s roots. While all seven of the original Chicago protagonists seemed sincere in their attempt to widen the architectural conversation, many of them weren’t interested in widening it too much. All staunch civic boosters, their investment in Chicago’s “modern” legacy of architecture ultimately proved too much for most. And the small remnant, slightly increased in number by their former students and employees, finds itself as a perpetually in the architectural community.

Edward Keegan is an architect, writer, curator, broadcaster, and educator who has used these diverse platforms as an outspoken critic and strong advocate for Chicago and its unique architectural legacy for more than three decades.
For better or for worse, I was taught that if you loved architecture, you loved it all, and if you grasped first principles, you could find in works of all kinds that which relates them to one another and allows you to love them equally. I was never taught that some ideas were forbidden, or that demonstrably good ones could grow obsolete. The depth of my loves didn’t allow me to discard things that I have since been told are only acceptably appreciated at a distance, entombed in the amber of historical perspective. History could serve modernity through transformation, opposition, or extension. But it could not be ignored. Your course of practice was your own choice, but architecture was ideally an art capable of absorbing many, and often opposing, means to reach the same ends.

I am now an architect in Chicago, a city for which the grid of its streets and the frames of its buildings provide a unifying scaffold for a multitude of ideas expressed through architecture. I am also, as it were, interested in both the classicism of the grid and the fullness that recognizable, architectural expression might impart to it.

The sanctioned narrative of Chicago architecture is compelling and, as usually presented, consistent. It shows a relentless and glorious trajectory away from the subjectivities of evolved languages or inherited cultures toward a universal and neutralizing modernity. The greatest examples that buoy this narrative are breathtaking, hence its vigorous embrace by both architects and the public: Burnham & Root’s Monadnock Building, Sullivan’s Carson Pirie Scott Store, Mies’s Lake Shore Drive Apartments and Crown Hall, C. F. Murphy’s Daley Center, SOM and Smith+Gill’s current super-talls, and Ronan’s Poetry Foundation. Still, potent exceptions in this city betray the persistence of familiar, inherited form in the buildings of great practitioners and in the affections of its citizens. Works designed by Atwood, Adler, Rebori, and Shaw, or the pioneering corporate practices of Holabird & Roche and Graham, Anderson, Probst & White are hard to ignore but are often brushed aside as speed bumps on the road to an apotheosis of unencumbered modernism.

Chicago’s architecture has historically demonstrated ambivalence regarding “received” architectural expression. Utilitarian tendencies have dominated the priorities of its buildings and their planning, and its architects have generally been tentative in the application of style, as it is broadly understood. Exceptions can be found in the City Beautiful promised by the World’s Columbian Exposition, which was more or less totalizing in its embrace of classicism as an endorsed language and methodology for both architecture and city planning, and the subsequent Plan of Chicago of 1909 by Burnham and Bennett. Their privileging of classicism and the buildings they inspired were met with either enthusiasm or disdain, depending on the audience. But not indifference.

Fig. 1. Competition proposal for a memorial to D. H. Burnham, “The Burnham Promontory,” by Aric Lasher, 2009.
Sullivan sought liberation from what he found to be an irrelevant and indiscriminately applied cultural overlay while pursuing his urge to embroider nearly all surfaces and elements with ornamental efflorescence. Adler and Sullivan's work is now history, but it is Chicago's history. Chicago: a city that is architecturally quite specific but perceives itself as having liberated architecture from specificity. Where is the place today for a rich and varied city of conflict, a place for engagement of the divergent currents of persistence and rejection, each challenging and buttressing its opponent? Does such a place exist? Can these things reside side by side? I believe that they can. A more elastic understanding of classicism can unite, impart clarity, and relate opposing narratives. The Chicago canon got it right there, I think. Its grid of streets and frames can go naked or clothed. And these most American elements can be found in all modern cities.

A more elastic understanding of classicism can unite, impart clarity, and relate opposing narratives.

Isn't Chicago's distinctive modernism ultimately classical? Related parts, proportionally refined, with their origins in construction and assembly, legible and transparent in their arrangement, adaptable and easily accommodated to either ornamental embellishment or the abstract expression of construction, comprise the canon of "Chicagoism." Before the prodigal return to America—the person of Mies—of modernist ideas first explored by Wright and his cohort and later digested by the European avant-garde, the engineer's "Chicago frame" was typically hung with representational ornament, though usually only as much as the service of propriety and speculative profit required. These exercises in style and embellishment were often naive, brittle, bloodless, and lacking in conviction, in my estimation, but familiar motifs were found there for reasons of custom, expectation, or public affection.

Mies's inscrutable prisms and the work of his acolytes seemed to represent an impossible achievement: a fully realized system of principles that was applicable to all building problems and scales, with its own approach to construction, expression and spatiality. It was as if a single answer to many questions had emerged miraculously, in its adult state. These buildings were classical in their disciplinary rigor, their subjugation to order, clear relationship of form, space, and their constituent elements, expressed through an almost instantaneously evolved and refined language derived from, if often (like classicism) only imitative of, construction and assembly. And these principles could be taught, imitated, or transformed. What could be more classical? What was missing? We had everything we needed. Everything except the particular and the subjective, the memory of myth, mystery, and the vulgar sensualities and inherited refinements that gratify the greedy eye and receive its loving touch.

The experience of pure form can be exhilarating, and compelling in its promise of heroic originality, but can it satisfy all desires in all circumstances? Retreat to the world of the past denies us the spectacular unfolding of new experiences through new means, but must that be all there is, always? I wonder. It seems as if the persistent appeal and potency of forms that are, like human language, inherited and arbitrary, but describe a fuller world, challenge the notion of the absolute triumph of a self-correcting "style to end all styles."

In my personal pursuit of meaningful work, designing buildings and places that strive to resonate and survive the churn of time, change, and transformation, I take the broadest possible view. I am wary of some classicists' narrow boundaries, and I remain unmoved by the esoteric abstraction that encompasses so much of contemporary theorizing and practice. I am convinced that there is a small but important place for work that specifically addresses the potential of recognizable form enlisted in the service of either new, evolving, or persistent needs and specific identities. Circumstances in which historically derived expression is either appropriate or desired is deserving of a rigorous, creative, and vital engagement of the architect's art.

I have benefited from great mentors. Mentors whose affections straddled the rigors of their education in Chicago modernism, and the inexorable pull of things swept away or imprisoned by taut, "zeitgeistian" boundaries. They sought reconciliation. I found this...
path to be compatible with my own yearnings, and it points toward a methodology that rewards with challenges and satisfaction, and is constantly born anew. In my office, common interests and methods provide a stable, if evolving, foundation for our practice, and though much of our work has been realized outside of the city, the lessons of the “Chicago way” are evident in the design of many of our buildings.

Chicago lacks the ostentation and voluptuary splendors of Paris or classical New York. But Chicago has something else—a seriousness and an underlying order, or at least it did, when architects paid attention to such things. This order undergirds the architecture of the city in whose grids Colin Rowe saw the defining element of a “modernist Florence,” an order that relates its infrastructure, its plan, and its significant modern and pre-modern buildings. This order is the essential lifeblood of Chicago’s homegrown classicism, the DNA of buildings demonstrative of this city’s native technologies and lust for profit and utility, realized through the indigenous materials smelted and milled from Midwestern ore, fired from regional clay, or carved from Indiana’s limestone. Here is a place that has evolved means that just might be capable of reconciling the usually segregated realms of persistent grammars and emerging methods.

The city that strove to transcend inherited histories has many of its own. They are what drew me here, offering something to embrace or reject as the case may be, but not to be ignored. During my Los Angeles years, spent inventing or evoking architectures as a set designer for the film industry, the late California architect Frank Israel, having seen some of my architectural work, declared that “even your modernist designs show a deep love for history.” He was, I think, correct in his assessment. And in Chicago, modernism is just one of Chicago’s histories.

I envy those architects who are never challenged by doubt, or who see beauty only in the orders, or endorse the genesis of meaningful form only in new and wholly unencumbered ways. These are the attributes Chicago wants to celebrate in its architects—no-nonsense, clearly positioned within the orderly scheme that is so often used to characterize the progress of Chicago architecture. A world in which all is alive at once is a messy place of conflict, promise, and fecundity. I embrace that world, and am confident in my belief that surrender to an unprejudiced love for architecture, not uncritical, but open and liberated from the exclusions of indoctrination and bias, can unleash tremendous possibility and inexpressible joy. And a path can be found in Chicago.

Aric Lasher is president and director of design at HBRA Architects in Chicago, where his projects have included buildings for government, cultural, academic and public institutions, residential projects, landscapes, and renovations and restorations of historic structures. In addition to his work in architecture, he has designed sets for numerous films, including Minority Report, Pearl Harbor, and What Dreams May Come. Lasher is a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects and serves on the boards of the Mies van der Rohe Society and the Society of Architectural Historians.
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Classic Georgian Town House, Chicago  
Booth Hansen

Private Residence on School Street, Chicago  
Sullivan, Goulette & Wilson Architects

Private Residence, Chicago  
Booth Hansen

Georgian Town House in Lincoln Park, Chicago  
Liederbach and Graham Architects
Georgian House, Winnetka

French Norman Style House, Lake Forest
Restoration Architect: Adrian Smith, FAIA  Original Architect: David Adler

Ragdale, Lake Forest
Restoration Architect: Johnson Lasky Kindelin Architects  Original Architect: Howard Van Doren Shaw

North Shore Mediterranean House, Winnetka
Restoration Architect: Morgante Wilson Architects  Original Architect: Clark & Walcott
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Lake Shore Residence, Evanston
Konstant Architecture & Planning

Palladian Style Guest House, Glencoe
Gibbons, Portman & Associates

Private Residence, Winnetka
Booth Hansen

Mediterranean Villa on the Shores of Lake Michigan, Lake Forest
Liederbach and Graham Architects
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Photo: Jon Miller © Hendrich Blessing
House on Sleight Street, Naperville
Derrick Architecture

Farmhouse, Lake Bluff
Edward Deegan Architects

Private Residence on Greenview Avenue, Chicago
Sullivan, Goulette & Wilson Architects

Arts and Crafts Style House, Evanston
Stuart Cohen & Jake Hacker Architects LLC
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Chestnut Row Homes, Chicago
Booth Hansen

Grant Place Townhomes, Chicago
Sullivan, Goudet & Wilson Architects

One Bennett Park, Chicago
Robert A.M. Stern Architects
Walsh Family Hall, University of Notre Dame
John Simpson Architects

Jenkins and Nanovic Halls, University of Notre Dame
HBRA Architects, Inc.

Campus Crossroads Project, Stadium with Academic and Student Life Additions, University of Notre Dame
The SLAM Collaborative

Stayer Center for Executive Education, Mendoza College of Business, University of Notre Dame
Robert A.M. Stern Architects
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**Mundelein Hall, University of Saint Mary of the Lake**
Architect of Record: Bureau|AD
Design Architect: Thomas Norman Rajkovich Architect, Ltd.

**Buffalo Grove Bank & Trust, Buffalo Grove**
Melcher Architects

**Private Women’s Club, Chicago**
Restoration Architect and Interior Design: Craig & Company
Original Architect: Philip Maher

**Chicago Union Station-Burlington Room, Chicago**
Restoration Architect: Goettsch Partners, with murals by EverGreene Architectural Arts
Original Architect: Graham, Anderson, Probst & White
Garden Folly, Lake Forest
Liederbach and Graham Architects after Samuel McIntyre

The Morrison Family Education & Outreach Pavilion at the Notre Dame Linked Experimental Ecosystem Facility
Buccellato Design, LLC
Annapolis Gateway, Annapolis, Maryland
Patrick Suarez, 4th Year; Instructor: James McCrery

The Annapolis Market, Annapolis, Maryland
Tommy Vince, 1st Year Graduate; Instructor: James McCrery

Democracy of the Library, Clarksburg, Maryland
Patrick Suarez and Jacob Chase, 4th Year; Instructor: Christopher J. Howard

Library, Clarksburg, Maryland
Ryan Gebhart, 2nd Year Graduate; Instructor: James McCrery
El Nexo Martín Peña, San Juan, Puerto Rico
Nathan Bolkovic, 5th Year; Instructors: Andrew von Maur and Tony Homenchuck

The Run for the Roses
Adele Bischel, 3rd Year; Instructor: John Haigh

Proposal for a Penn-Hudson Elevated Walkway,
New York, New York
Matthew Bridge, Margaret Jones, Mary Leihy, Michael Miller, Dalton Smith, John Weber, 3rd Year; Instructor: John Haigh

Beaux-Arts High-Rise
Abraham Calloun, 2nd Year

The New Country City
Zi Ken Toh, 4th Year; Instructors: Miraj Ahmed and Martin Jameson

Clear Creek Main Street, Adams County, Colorado
Zac Scott, 1st Year Graduate; Instructor: Keith Loftin
VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY
Richmond, Virginia

Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

KTH Royal Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia

Universe of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida

Aquatic Center, Miami, Florida
Cecilia McCammon, 2nd Year; Instructor: Oscar Machado

Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

KTH Royal Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden

High Street Bridge, London, England
Jinyu George Kannathrayil and Jerome Tryon, 2nd Year Graduate; Instructors: George Knight and Paul Florian

Nymphaeum
Nathan Varble, 1st Year Graduate; Instructor: Peter Hoshun

Memory Forum, Stockholm, Sweden
Liam Gordon Price, 5th Year, Instructor: Ian Alexander

Nymphaeum
Nathan Varble, 1st Year Graduate; Instructor: Peter Hoshun
Restaurant, Syracuse, Italy
Anthony A. Fitheoglou, 1st Year Graduate; Instructors: Timothy Smith and Jonathan Taylor

Restaurant, Syracuse, Italy
Michail Sarafidis, 5th Year; Instructors: Timothy Smith and Jonathan Taylor

Greek Revival Fragments
Marwa Al-Khubaisi, Sonal Bajaria, Peter Camilleri-Dias, Peter Folland, Parvin Gholami, Tes Lok Hoo, Christodoulla Iannou, Kate Ivenson, Tabeer Meman Khan, Purnam Lee, Michelle Megajalpi, Imad Almudawsa-Salana, Greg Oleniacz, Guiditta Pedace, Michail Sarafidis, Shpetrim Serami, Fatima Tahan, Marwan Twemolo, Aleksandra Zmitri, 4th and 5th Years; Instructors: Timothy Smith, Jonathan Taylor, Alexander Gore
INTBAU
Engelburg Summer School in Classical Architecture, Engelburg, Sweden

Marvão Traditional Architecture Summer School, Portugal

INSTITUTE OF CLASSICAL ARCHITECTURE & ART
Intensive in Classical Architecture: Los Angeles

New Classical Pavilion, Los Angeles, California:
(Upper Left) Stephanie Jazmines; (Upper Right) Donald McDonald;
Instructor: Michael Mosko and Chris Eiland; (Lower Left) Architectural Rendering in Wash,
Eric Enderling; Instructor: David Genther;
(Lower Right) Lemon Hill, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,
Robert O’Grady; Instructor: Stephen Chrisman and Martin Burns
Christopher H. Browne Williamsburg Drawing Tour

Robert Carter House, Williamsburg, Virginia, and Study of a Dairy House, Williamsburg, Virginia, Kevin Ohlinger; Instructor: Stephen Chrisman and Martin Burns; Place des Vosges, Paris, France, Jacques Levet; Petit Trianon, Versailles, France, Jori Colarusso; Studio Exercise, Josh Pickering; Instructors: Kahlil Hamady and Leslie-Jon Vickory; Wash Rendering, Julie Chandler, University of Colorado Denver; Instructor: David Genther; Light and Shade Study, Ian Reilly, Benedictine College; Instructor: Giuseppe Mazzone

Entry Pavilion to Prospect Park, Brooklyn, New York: Casey Rutledge, Catholic University of America; Gary Glinsey, Hampton University; Andre Johnson, University of Cincinnati; Evan Markley, Catholic University of America; Jacob McCarthy, Princeton University; Instructors: Michael Mesko, Mark Santurch, Javier Perez

Christopher H. Browne Paris Drawing Tour

Summer Studio in Classical Architecture
Drawing from the Live Model
Jeanette Lee, 2nd Year Graduate; Instructor: Joseph Brickey

Ariadne
Rodney Wilkinson; Instructor: D. Jeffrey Mims
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY
ON CHICAGO ARCHITECTURE

In 1924, Architectural Record ran a series called “The Library of the
Architect” for which it asked a number of nationally known architects to provide a list of must–own books on architecture. When the Art Institute of Chicago began acquiring the books that would become the Burnham Architecture Library and later the Ryerson and Burnham Libraries, the director of the Art Institute, in 1905, asked Daniel Burnham for a list of twenty–five to thirty titles. The same request was made of Howard Van Doren Shaw, James Gamble Rogers, Charles Frost, Alfred Granger, Solomon Beman, Louis Sullivan, Irving Pond, and Dwight Perkins. Shaw, a trustee of the Art Institute and a contributor to Architectural Record’s series, was put in charge of purchasing books, and would leave his own extensive library to the Art Institute. Funded by a $50,000 bequest, made in 1912, from the estate of Daniel Burnham, the Ryerson and Burnham Libraries are considered today, along with the RIBA Library in London and Columbia University’s Avery Library, to be one of the great architectural libraries of the world.

In keeping with this tradition, the editors have asked a number of architects, historians, and educators for their lists of books on Chicago architecture. Those who responded were Thomas Rajkovich, William Westfall, Robert Braegeman, John Zukowsky, Jeanne Sylvester, and Nathaniel Parks. The following list focuses on Chicago’s classical era, although it includes some texts that also reflect Chicago’s place in the history of twentieth–century architecture.


The offset pivot hinge is an integral part of our legacy: it was sold by Ostrander and Eshleman, and manufactured, like the Harmon hinge, by the W. C. Vaughan Co. (Both companies have since merged with E. R. Butler & Co.)

In the specification of hinge configurations, offset pivots offer many advantages: a seemingly endless variety of mounting options, greater concealment, and an infinitely adjustable pivot point. Offset pivot hinges are ideal for concealed or jib doors, as well as built-in furniture and cabinetry. As with our other heavy-duty hinges, we have enhanced the traditional design to increase load capacity and reduce wear by adding full-complement drawn cup needle roller bearings, thrust needle roller and cage assemblies, and thrust washers for all door and panel conditions.

Projection from pivot point to back of hinge is a primary consideration: it is variable and must be specified. E. R. Butler & Co.’s heavy-duty offset pivot hinges are made to order from 1 × ⅛ inch extruded material. Offset pivot hinges are available in all standard, custom plated and patinated finishes.

E. R. BUTLER & CO.
Heavy-Duty Offset Pivot Hinges

“CITY HALL PIVOTS”
Pattern Board for the New City Hall, Boston, Massachusetts
MIDDLE PIVOTS
Also Known as Door Hinge Leaves

LOWER PIVOTS
Also Known as Sill, Floor, or Bottom Hinge Leaves

UPPER PIVOTS
Also Known as Header or Top Hinge Leaves

UNIVERSAL PIVOTS
Also Known as Studs or Plates
BULLEY & ANDREWS
Proud builder and admirer of beauty, harmony and proportion since 1891.
bulley.com | @BulleyAndrews
For four decades, Hedrick Brothers Construction has built some of South Florida’s iconic landmarks, including innovative office buildings, high-performance industrial complexes, automobile dealerships, country clubs, historic structures, equestrian estates, and world-class residences. We take pride in our accomplishments and deliver on our promises with the highest degree of excellence. Not sometimes. Every time.
Pictured: French Mediterranean Gardens, 2016 Acanthus Award Winner in Landscape Design
The finest quality stonework for your new build and restoration projects, hand crafted by Haddonstone

Call 866 733 8225   Visit haddonstone.com

HYDE PARK MOULDINGS
North America’s premier resource for custom plaster mouldings.
Lovingly fabricated in the U.S.A. Serving projects across the nation and worldwide.
1.631.PLASTER   www.hyde-park.com

HADDONSTONE
PROVIDING ELEGANCE AND DISTINCTION

Crafted in Lancaster County with a high caliber of detail and quality in traditional and contemporary materials and finishes.

SAFETY, SECURITY, PRESTIGE AND PROTECTION

Distinctive architecture and design enhanced with great craftsmanship and protected with perimeter security that can be integrated into smart home/security technology.