

“Christian, Neoplatonic and sympotic notions of *choros*, *Sophia*, mirroring (*esopteron*), and *empsychosis*, which collectively lead to the experience of a temporal divinization” (185).

In her conclusion Pentcheva offers thought-provoking suggestions about how scholars should approach images and monuments: not as static objects, but as performances, as aesthetic totalities, and as “augmented spaces” featuring multiple spatial and temporal dimensions.

This handsome volume reflects the author’s deep and sustained engagement of more than a decade with the sensory world of Byzantine worshippers as they experienced objects, ritual performance, and Hagia Sophia’s architectural setting. She displays great erudition in her use of approaches, concepts, and terminology from an expansive range of fields: phenomenology, film studies, speech act theory, musicology, literary analysis, acoustics, and more. The chapters’ structure and Pentcheva’s beautifully poetic yet lucid writing style allow readers to easily navigate the densely constructed argument; still, a glossary of Greek terms would have been helpful for non-Byzantinists. Scholars and students of architecture, music, acoustics, ritual, and sensory anthropology will benefit greatly from *Hagia Sophia: Sound, Space, and Spirit in Byzantium*, and we can hope that Pentcheva will continue this line of investigation to explore eventually the tactile and gustatory aspects of a synesthetic experience of Byzantine objects and architectural spaces.

NINA MACARAIG
Koç University

Notes

1. Deborah Howard and Laura Moretti, *Sound and Space in Renaissance Venice: Architecture, Music, Acoustics* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010); Niall Atkinson, *The Noisy Renaissance: Sound, Architecture, and Florentine Urban Life* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016).
2. Sound samples are available on the project’s website: <http://iconsofsound.stanford.edu>.

William E. O’Brien

Landscapes of Exclusion: State Parks and Jim Crow in the American South

Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016, 208 pp., 50 b/w illus. \$39.95 (cloth), ISBN 9781625341556

Dell Upton

What Can and Can’t Be Said: Race, Uplift, and Monument Building in the Contemporary South

New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2015, 280 pp., 59 b/w illus. \$35 (cloth), ISBN 9780300211757

In late July 2018, someone shot at a historic marker commemorating the place along Mississippi’s Tallahatchie River where Emmett Till’s mutilated, bullet-riddled corpse was found. Till, a fourteen-year-old African American boy, was abducted and viciously murdered by two white vigilantes in the summer of 1955. Vandals stole the site’s first sign and then shot up a second one. A third marker had been erected and dedicated only five weeks before the 2018 incident by the Emmett Till Interpretive Center, located in the nearby Sumner, Mississippi, courthouse where Till’s murderers were put on trial. A similar spate of vandalism befell a marker sponsored by the Mississippi Freedom Trail, a historical initiative dedicated to marking important sites of civil rights struggles in the state. That marker is located at the former site of Bryant’s Grocery in Money, Mississippi, where Carolyn Jones, a white woman, falsely claimed that Till made sexually explicit gestures toward her while he was visiting the store to purchase candy. Incensed by the child’s alleged behavior, which transgressed the code of racial apartheid that kept black residents in fear and poverty—and, more important, separate and in their place—Bryant’s husband and brother-in-law kidnapped Till, who was in the area visiting family while on holiday from his Chicago home. The two men beat and shot the teenager, then threw his weighted-down body into the river. Till’s killing made national headlines when his mother, Mamie Till Bradley, requested an open casket at his funeral to expose the barbaric treatment of her son. The haunting photographs of Till and his grieving mother stunned the nation. Equally incomprehensible were the acquittals of his murderers four months later by an all-white, all-male jury following a five-day trial. These events proved that racial violence had not abated since the Civil War and the end of slavery, and that justice was still unattainable for black Americans. The case galvanized activists of the burgeoning civil rights movement.

The installation of the Till markers constructed a poignant commemorative geography of events of the civil rights era, and yet this project has been met with a mixed reception: many want to call attention to Till’s violent death as a reminder of the lives destroyed by systemic racial violence and inequality, but others are disinterested in remembering how violence and injustice functioned as catalysts in the crucible of the South’s long history of racial domination. It should be noted that along with the Till markers, other signs denoting sites of Mississippi’s civil rights struggles have also been routinely defaced, stolen, or destroyed. The vandalization of these markers illuminates how racial divisions and racially motivated violence persist long after the civil rights victories of the 1960s.

As the first generation of civil rights leaders and rank-and-file activists passes away (Mamie Till Bradley died in 2003), various groups have made efforts to commemorate this important chapter in U.S. history, erecting monuments, memorials, and markers in public spaces around the South. This initiative, undertaken mostly by black southerners, has not progressed without robust debate within the black community (concerning, for example, exactly who and what should be remembered) and political wrangling with white citizens and politicians who have their own opinions and desires regarding how southern history should be represented. This fraught intersection—where the historical geography of racial segregation and violence meets the commemorative landscape of the American South—is the subject of two probing histories on race, commemoration, and public space: William E. O’Brien’s *Landscapes of Exclusion: State Parks and Jim Crow in the American South* and Dell Upton’s *What Can and Can’t Be Said: Race, Uplift, and Monument Building in the Contemporary South*.

The violence against black communities around the Mississippi delta, including Till and his family and friends, ensured their obedience to a regime of white supremacy that has sustained deep social, political, and economic inequalities ever since the nation’s founding. European colonialists conceived racial difference to create hierarchies that would enable the exploitation of people and the expropriation of land. What is relevant to scholars of the built environment is how

the racial apartheid of Jim Crow segregation, codes, and practices of separation and policing was, in part, created through the design of public spaces throughout the South. In *Landscapes of Exclusion*, O'Brien reviews how the planning and construction of southern state park systems were shaped by policies of racial exclusion from the 1920s through the 1950s. His close study of policy, planning, and design processes offers an unparalleled perspective on how architects, landscape architects, and planners, serving at the behest of local and state officials, designed racially exclusive parks, which in turn created segregated state park systems. Across the southern states, politicians, government agencies, architects, and planners created parks to give white visitors access to camping, hiking, picnicking, boating, swimming, and a host of other recreational activities, while black visitors, if allowed access to parks at all, were corralled into smaller areas that typically lacked equivalent facilities, or else they were given completely separate parks, which were too few and too far apart to be accessible to most black citizens.

In his thoughtful introduction, O'Brien provides an excellent primer on the history of racial segregation in the United States. He quotes historian Leon Litwack on how systemic segregation and antiblack violence was used "to impress on black men and women their political and economic powerlessness and vulnerability—and, most critically, to diminish both their self-esteem and their social aspirations" (4). The effort to denigrate and disempower black citizens was contradictory to the ethos of those recreational parkland advocates who championed parks as places to foster healthier citizens and better civic cooperation through outdoor play and sport. The park movement in the South brought together one of America's best ideas—that people should have easy access to fresh air and greenery—with one of its worst practices: racial subjugation that denied black Americans their basic civil rights.

Individual state park systems evolved from a host of factors. The national park system began with civic efforts to create an enduring nationwide network of pristine parks, inaugurated by Frederick Law Olmsted's early work at Yosemite. The second-tier state park systems started with the realization that not all areas are worthy of

national designation and that people need access to parklands close to their homes. In the early decades of the twentieth century, key conservationists responsible for the national park system's formation, like Theodore Roosevelt, harbored racist beliefs that access to nature would maintain Anglo-Americans' healthy physiques and racial purity and defend against the arrival of dysgenic immigrant groups and black southerners migrating into other regions of the country.¹ The more progressive work of activists like Jane Addams and Jacob Riis, who advocated for playgrounds, recreational facilities, and parks as means of social betterment and physical improvement, especially in crowded urban centers, was another key factor in the growth of the public park movement at the municipal and state levels.

Despite the efforts of state governments to expand access to parklands for all Americans, African Americans were routinely left out of plans for new parks. Widely circulated racial stereotypes of black residents as disinterested in outdoor activities rationalized this exclusion. If there was a lack of enthusiasm for the great outdoors among black southerners, O'Brien astutely asserts, it was most likely because racism made travel so difficult for them. Demeaning treatment by white rail agents, threats of violence in transit, and the lack of hotels and rest facilities catering to black travelers limited African American mobility, whether by car, train, or other forms of transportation. By the 1950s, according to one survey that O'Brien cites, African Americans had access to less than 1 percent of the parks in nine southern states. Since a few parks did permit limited access to black visitors, white politicians were reluctant to build separate parks for African Americans, and most black citizens were left with little or no access to recreational landscapes.

Through revealing drawings and photographs, O'Brien catalogues the design grammar of racial exclusion: borders and fences for visual and physical separation, separate park entrances and pathways, and fewer and more basic amenities in black-only areas. Despite the prohibitions, African Americans desired recreational facilities and fought to have their own parks and to be included in plans for new parks, which often meant being isolated in segregated areas. When the National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) included state parks as a front in its widespread legal challenge to segregation following the landmark Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the era of segregated state parks ended. In 1955 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that all public parks—national, state, and municipal—must desegregate their facilities. Some states integrated their parks without much friction between black and white visitors, while others, like Georgia and South Carolina, had to close their parks for several years for fear of violent encounters between white and black visitors, the latter of whom many whites still saw as interlopers.

By the 1970s, parks in the South were integrated and the markers of segregation had mostly disappeared. In his closing chapter, O'Brien reflects on current visitors and park staff, many of whom remain unaware of this important legacy, one that illustrates how the states sponsored the racial segregation of public spaces. How this history is interpreted for the public, O'Brien writes, depends on "who controls the message, what the message ought to be, and even whether remembrance is a good idea in the first place" (155).

The question of who controls the historical message is central to Upton's compelling history, *What Can and Can't Be Said*, which offers important lessons in how the erection of black monuments in civic spaces across the U.S. South engages local power dynamics rooted in legacies of racial strife and exclusion. "The monuments are less about remembering the movement" observes Upton, "than they are about asserting the presence of black Americans in contemporary Southern society and politics" (vii). Upton's impressive oeuvre on American architecture includes critical analyses of the architecture of racialized landscapes that have become invaluable resources for scholars writing about race and architecture. His latest effort illustrates his fervent belief that architecture's aesthetic and formal character cannot be disentangled from social histories, particularly the history of racial subjection in the United States.

Central to Upton's study is the question of whether the monument, a Western architectural type, can capture the complexity of the history of racial segregation and

violence in the South, particularly if public review processes remain situated within struggles for racial equality and social justice. For Upton, the monument type—whether it be a vernacular type, such as the gravestones marking the sites of many early African American struggles; the “great-leader monuments” that adapt the victorious language of war memorials to celebrate triumph over adversity; or the abstract monuments that emerged with Maya Lin’s sublime Memorial Wall, commemorating lives lost in the Vietnam War—cannot be separated from its European origins. As scholars such as Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze have shown, Immanuel Kant, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, and other Enlightenment thinkers conceptualized modern history through the careful parsing of ethnographic and geographically determined racial hierarchies. Uncivilized Africans, according to this paradigm, lacked consciousness of historical time and were thus incapable of creating anything of cultural value. By contrast, civilized Europeans, with their greater awareness of history, produced culturally transcendent works of art, architecture, music, science, and historical narrative. The monument type is therefore a signifier of history and cannot be separated from its own racialized European origins.

This legacy meant that those who wanted to erect monuments to African American history had to engage with fraught political processes in preexisting landscapes shaped by white supremacy. These negotiations with a host of political agents and civic interests subsequently muted the transformative power of what was trying to be communicated—that the South had a harrowing history of violence and domination of its black residents. In cities like New Orleans and Selma, Alabama, where one of the most iconic and violent events of the civil rights movement (Bloody Sunday) took place, the commemorative landscape was highlighted by Confederate memorials to heroic generals and common foot soldiers. The proliferation of Confederate monuments not only crafted the mythic narrative of the “Lost Cause,” which valorized defeated traitors and defenders of slavery, but also concretized the specter of white supremacy that loomed daily over black citizens. That assertion of white dominance has continued to the present day, as demonstrated

by the placement of monuments such as the one to Confederate general and Ku Klux Klan founder Nathan Bedford Forrest erected on the border of a black Selma neighborhood in 2000, at a moment when black residents were gaining political authority. Such acts of territorial aggression, many white citizens argued, were merely commemorative gestures aimed at preserving their disappearing heritage and history—neutral terms, writes Upton, that attempted to deflect criticism. Their arguments appropriated the rhetoric and logic of inclusion while ignoring the fact that whiteness undergirds the Euro-American monument tradition.

In time, black communities accrued political power and wanted to construct their own monuments to important historical events—events and monuments that were both meaningful to local residents and relevant to national audiences. White civic groups reactively refused to remove Confederate monuments but were willing to accept monuments to black history as a parallel historical narrative. Upton identifies this as the “dual-heritage concept,” which maintained separate but equal histories. It forced black citizens to take a more conciliatory approach in selecting subject matter for memorialization so as to ensure consensus building. In some instances, black communities, led by middle-class representatives, chose strategies of positive reinforcement, honoring black achievement. This approach, according to Upton, abandoned historical figures and events that emphasized racial violence and radical acts of liberation—such as the 1822 Charleston slave revolt led by Denmark Vesey—because their inclusion might make some audiences, particularly white ones, uncomfortable or antagonistic.

The apologetic tenor underlying the racial uplift strategy appears in the debates that Upton parses in great detail in his third chapter, which addresses the erection of monuments honoring the noted civil rights leader and advocate of nonviolent resistance Martin Luther King Jr. The popularity of King as a symbol of justice and peaceful change exposes a fundamental challenge for artists charged with representing well-known figures whom people recognize from widely circulated photographs and television footage. For African Americans, King’s familiarity links to questions of who

can most accurately or appropriately capture his visage, a task that many believe is best undertaken by an African American. The case of Lei Yixin, the sculptor from China who carved the controversial King memorial in Washington, D.C., challenges this presumption.

The African American History Monument created by artist Ed Dwight, which is located on the grounds of the South Carolina State House in Columbia, was initiated by African American citizens and provided an instance where the many themes Upton addresses—dual heritage, the respectability politics of uplift, the representation of black life, contentious review processes, and charged contexts—converged. For Upton, the intense debate in this case about appropriate content and form led to a compromised monument where representations of pan-Africanism, connecting to an essentialized Africa, along with canonical figures and events, displaced more challenging local histories of violence and resistance. In the end, the choices made compromised the powerful messages that the civil rights movement should convey to audiences. What Upton finds more compelling are monuments like the memorial to the enslaved at the Hermitage, Andrew Jackson’s former home in Nashville; this memorial, titled *Our Peace—Follow the Drinking Gourd*, gathers a “tangled story” together on one site, including as it does the reburied remains of enslaved people near the family burial sites of white plantation owners and the graves of Confederate soldiers.

O’Brien and Upton offer timely histories worth reading at this critical moment in U.S. race relations, when crimes that have gone unpunished, like Emmett Till’s murder, have been reopened for review by the U.S. Department of Justice. Most Americans see attitudes toward race as individual matters of moral choice, rather than as the results of historically derived social formations that have created numerous structural inequalities: economic, social, juridical, cultural, and political. But race also has an architectural analogue in the way that spaces have been racially divided or inflected, as illustrated by the public squares, cemeteries, neighborhoods, and state parks of O’Brien’s and Upton’s incisive historical studies. Architectural history has much to tell us about these places, as O’Brien’s rich history reveals. But it can

do so only if it recognizes that historical discourse has been central to how racial inequalities have been represented—an important lesson to be drawn from Upton's exceptional meditation on the state of monuments in the U.S. South.

MABEL O. WILSON
Columbia University

Note

1. See Theodore Roosevelt, "Race Decadence," *The Outlook*, 8 Apr. 1911, 763–68; Theodore Roosevelt, "A Premium on Race Suicide," *The Outlook*, 27 Sept. 1913. O'Brien mentions Roosevelt's views in his first chapter (32). See also Ian Tyrrell, *Crisis of the Wasteful Nation: Empire and Conservation in Theodore Roosevelt's America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015); Jonathan Peter Spiro, *Defending the Master Race: Conservation, Eugenics, and the Legacy of Madison Grant* (Lebanon, N.H.: University Press of New England, 2009).

Marc Treib

John Yeon: Modern Architecture and Conservation in the Pacific Northwest

San Francisco: ORO Editions, 2016, 282 pp., 68 color and 152 b/w illus. \$40 (cloth), ISBN 9781935935278

While John Yeon's overall creative output was relatively small, his life and career present an expansive and complex topic for any author to tackle. In *John Yeon: Modern Architecture and Conservation in the Pacific Northwest*, Marc Treib has undertaken this task in a manner as distinguished and thorough as his subject. Yeon was a self-taught architect, landscape architect, conservationist, preservationist, and art collector, whose architecture was widely celebrated during the later 1930s and early 1950s but ultimately faded from standard studies of the field.

Born in 1910 to Elizabeth Mock and John Baptiste Yeon II, a self-made businessman who accrued a fortune in lumber and real estate, Yeon was raised in Portland, Oregon. Following matriculation from the Culver Military Academy in Indiana and a short stay at Stanford University, he spent time in New York working for the architectural firm of Young, Moskowitz, and Rosenberg and attending extension courses in architecture at Columbia University, but he never registered as an architect. Following travel in Europe, Yeon returned home

in 1930, where he initiated his lifelong passion for conservation when he purchased property along the Oregon coast, preserving it from development. Several years later he became involved with the movement to preserve the integrity of the Columbia River Gorge, in which he played a pivotal role.

During this same period Yeon produced studies for several architectural projects (nonrealized) and designed a garden for his mother. In 1936, at age twenty-six, he developed plans for the Portland home of Aubrey Watzek and his mother. Watzek turned to Yeon after rejecting plans by Pietro Belluschi, a friend of Yeon then working in the Portland office of A. E. Doyle; Watzek and Yeon had met in 1931 when both were serving on the Oregon State Parks Commission. Lacking the professional training needed to undertake the venture, Yeon brought the project to Doyle's office, where working drawings and specifications were developed by the staff. Completed in 1937, the single-story Watzek House was arranged around a courtyard garden and sheathed in Douglas fir, with pitched cedar roofs echoing the slopes of Mount Hood visible to the west. Yeon likened the building's form to those of the rural vernacular barns and chicken coops of the region. Fully integrated into its own landscape (also designed by Yeon), the house was lavishly finished inside with broad expanses of wood paneling and meticulously detailed joinery and moldings. A photograph taken by Walter Boychuk in 1937 perfectly captured the house's relationship to Mount Hood and the Oregon landscape. The photo's inclusion two years later in the Museum of Modern Art exhibition *Art in Our Time* and in 1944 at MoMA's *Built in USA, 1932–1944*—and the accompanying catalogues—firmly cemented Yeon's first major commission as an icon of Pacific Northwest regionalism.

Following this success—and working with the contractor for the Watzek House, Burt Smith—Yeon designed a series of inexpensive, speculative plywood houses for Portland and its suburb Lake Oswego (1938–39). In these, specially milled battens crisply expressed the module of the plywood sheets that were attached to standard balloon framing. Using this same system, Yeon designed the Jorgensen House for a heavily wooded site in Portland in

1939. Situated amid native shrubs and trees, it clearly expressed the relationship between architecture and place that so often characterized Yeon's work. In 1945, following two years of service during World War II, Yeon purchased the Jorgensen House, where he would live until his death in 1994. In 1973, upon the death of Aubrey Watzek, Yeon also bought the Watzek House as a residence for his long-time companion, Richard Louis Brown. It was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2011 and now forms the centerpiece of the John Yeon Center for Architecture and the Landscape, which was founded by Brown in 1995 with the gift of this house to the University of Oregon. The center also supported the publication of Treib's book.

After the war, Yeon resumed his architectural practice, in 1948 producing the Portland Visitors Information Center, which was also exhibited at MoMA. More conventionally modern than Yeon's earlier residences, with flat roofs and wide expanses of glass, the building was oriented around open courtyards and pergolas and framed in wood, which loosely allied it with what was seen as a growing Pacific Northwest regionalism. In 1950 Yeon designed the Swan, Cottrell, and Shaw houses, all in Portland, and all of which shared seminal features with the Watzek and Jorgensen houses. During this time Yeon also produced a series of elaborate but never-realized schemes for more expansive formal residences, which he dubbed, somewhat facetiously, "palaces," as opposed to the more modest wooden "barns" he had designed earlier.

By this time, however, Yeon appears to have become disillusioned with his earlier ambitions. In a lecture presented at the Portland Art Museum, for example, he noted that he had "once hoped to contribute architecture which translated the spirit of places into forms which were habitable. I accomplished merely a drop in the bucket of these hopes" (171). At the same time, he was turning to other interests, including a passion for collecting, ultimately assembling a museum-quality—and thoroughly eclectic—collection that included Asian ceramics and paintings and Asian and European furniture. In the early 1960s he purchased a large tract of land, nearly a mile long, on the Washington bank of the Columbia River, opposite Multnomah