Calls for immediate attention and action regarding modernist landscape architecture are timelier than ever, given the changes that have occurred since this book appeared. Death claimed landscape architects Dan Kiley in 2004 and John Simonds in 2005; and in Denver, a redesigned and reconfigured Skyline Park that reveals little of Halprin’s initial design was dedicated in 2004.

Other than the lack of an index, this is a well-conceived and well-executed volume that will appeal to a wide range of readers. Those who already belong to the “preservation chorus” will acquire considerably more knowledge about familiar lost landscapes, whereas others who are just being introduced to landscape preservation may be motivated to join the movement.

Arnold R. Alanen
University of Wisconsin-Madison


Campus Heritage Preservation: Traditions, Prospects & Challenges

Edited by Elizabeth Lyon. Eugene: University of Oregon, School of Architecture & Allied Arts, 2003; 65 pp., notes, bibliography, participants list; free of charge.

The choice of a college is an important step in defining identity. As colleges become broadly diversified—even global—in their student body, the appearance of the campus becomes a principal aspect by which students make their selection. The preservation of historic buildings has long been one of the means by which established colleges represented their status—often signified by a building with “old” in its title, “Old Main,” “Old West,” etc. To those applicants attuned to traditional cultural markers, historic buildings validate their choice.

Preservation is an issue for most college campuses. Colleges have preserved by default, adapting old structures to new uses to save money, or, for purely emotional reasons, keeping buildings that tug at the heartstrings of alumni and provide access to their wallets. But there are also times when colleges trying to evolve beyond their origins are constrained by outsiders who use the tools of preservation to prevent their evolution. Unfortunately, preservationists often oppose changes inherent in the evolving culture of the late 20th and early 21st centuries.

As the 21st century begins, the old top-down cultural hierarchy has been transformed into a multidimensional “nobrow” culture (to borrow John Seabrook’s 2000 title) that, rather than being based on a singular elite high culture model, is based in identity and subcultures that create a kaleidoscopic mainstream driven by media buzz. The old “high culture” is but one subculture in the new order and as Seabrook demonstrates, the old unified elite culture has been replaced by popular culture. Elite college campuses are responding to this change by shifting from architecture that parroted the college’s origins to a burst of original design that seeks to engage students attuned to the contemporary world of pop culture, television, and the Internet. As new becomes a magnet for students seeking to determine their own identity, it is reasonable to question the value of the old.

It is against this background that the Getty Grants Campus Heritage Initiative prompted the University of Oregon’s 2002 symposium on college
planning and heritage. The symposium, in turn, produced the booklet, *Campus Heritage Preservation*. Coming at a time when the Getty was making its first round of Campus Heritage grants, it was useful to raise the broadest questions about how colleges should approach preservation issues on their campuses. The conference brought together old lions of preservation, the Boston Globe’s Pulitzer Prize winning architecture critic, Robert Campbell, and the chair of George Washington University’s program in historic preservation, Richard Longstreth, to provide a cultural historical overview, as well as college presidents and other administrators to explain the impact of preservation on their institutions. College planners and outside consultants also spoke to an insider group of preservationists, college administrators, and foundation leaders. Notably there were no students on the list of attendees.

To meet the modest scale of the publication, papers were summarized to frame the larger arguments: Colleges have been major architectural patrons and their campuses therefore present significant architectural challenges; colleges are often multiple fiefdoms shaped to some extent by need as well as by opportunities donors present; modern planning incorporates outside forces ranging from alumni to community groups; buildings of the recent past are especially difficult problems that now risk demolition even as their significance is being re-evaluated; and finally, since the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the preservation movement has developed tools and processes that can be utilized to resolve the larger issues. Of particular interest is preservation on historically black college campuses—though the choices of architecture being preserved on many of these campuses warrants discussion.

Lyon’s concluding text was written to summarize the conference and it gives a clearer account of the issues than the individual essays provide. The brevity of the booklet makes it unsatisfying, but as a means of whetting the appetite for more study, it succeeds. Beyond the specific issues of college heritage there is a pressing need for a serious study of the cultural role of preservation. What better place than colleges with their intellectual and physical capital that can be applied to the task? The time has come to ask how preservation fits our contemporary world and how its role can evolve to meet the needs of the 21st century. This might become the basis for a broader Getty-led symposium with an appropriate publication.

George E. Thomas
CivicVisions, LP
University of Pennsylvania


2. This reviewer’s consulting firm, CivicVisions, directed two of the first round of Getty’s Campus Heritage grants.

---

**Building San Francisco’s Parks, 1850-1930**

By Terence Young. Baltimore, MD and London, UK: John Hopkins University Press, 2004; 270 pp., photographs, illustrations, tables, notes, index; cloth $45.00.

While horticultural history of the 1990s was comprised mostly of biographies of distinguished horticulturalists such as Andrew Jackson (A. J.) Downing (1815-1852) and Jens Jensen (1860-1951), more recent scholarship has focused on horticulture as a manifestation of values associated with the natural landscape. In *Building San Francisco’s Parks, 1850-1930*, Terence Young takes advantage of his background as a horticulturist to interpret early undertakings in Golden Gate Park. Young demonstrates that a call for a park befitting a great city in 1865 implied certain types of plants and terrain, primarily determined by the precedent of Central Park and, more generally, the eastern landscape of the United States. The book emerged from Young’s 1991 geography dissertation at the University of...
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